

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"The State is the curse of the individual, he (Ibsen) wrote to Brandes; and it is not only the State, but all ideals, all aims, which ignore the simple, solid happiness of the individual and his right to it, that are also curses."

—DESMOND McCARTHY, from "Drama".

Vol. 15, No. 28

July 10th, 1954

Threepence

U.S. TRIUMPH IN GUATEMALA

EVENTS in Guatemala have moved rapidly since FREEDOM last went to press and have underlined the difficulties in forming a judgment to which we referred earlier. In the main, however, the surmises on which our assessment was based have proved fairly correct, while full information on certain important aspects is still lacking.

The rapid advance of Colonel Armas' forces after the Army had forced the resignation of President Arbenz suggests that the Army as always was a conservative stronghold and that both Colonel Armas and his U.S. sympathisers were counting on an Army coup to win the day for them. Guatemala is today (that is, at the time of going to press) ruled by a military junta of a type which has been all too common in Spanish and Latin-American history.

The facts about the United Fruit Company and of United States economic interests in Guatemala which were outlined in FREEDOM last week made quite clear the economic causes behind Washington's attitude in the whole affair. The U.S. Government's response to Colonel Armas' success underline all this, and go far to suggest that as far as they were concerned events have gone according to plan.

The American Intervention
 On June 30, the *Times* correspondent in Washington reported that "there is no hiding the delight of officials here at the latest turn of events in Guatemala. President Eisenhower said to-day that the . . . Communists were on the run and he added with a smile that he would be deceitful if he did not reveal satisfaction."

The *Observer* remarked editorially (4/7/54) that "Mr. Dulles' description of the Guatemalan Communists as a threat to the Western hemisphere, and the inspired hints of a threat to the Panama Canal, appear grotesque in view of the swift collapse of the Arbenz régime and its military inability to defend itself against a few light aircraft." The *Observer* goes on to speak of "Mr. Dulles' exultant remarks on the success of the rebel 'rising', by which he implicitly admitted the much-dreaded 'Yanqui intervention'."

In such observations the liberal and progressive press over here declares that the State Department's handling of the Guatemala affair has been "inept", even "ludicrous", and that the U.S.A. has lost more than it has gained. All this is based, however, on the idea that the American rôle as "good neighbours" and denial of any wish to dominate the Latin-American world is to be taken at its face value. Actually, as was suggested in the last issue of FREEDOM, the U.S. Government has de-

monstrated successfully that any attempt to curtail its economic power will be ruthlessly stamped on. This episode shows the U.S.A., no less than Britain in Kenya and Malaya, or the Soviet Union in the satellite countries, as an Imperialist power seeking to make brutally clear that no challenge to its supremacy and authority will be tolerated. To observers in Europe the Guatemala affair may be only a storm in a teacup, but it has been turned by Washington into a demonstration of power politics which can scarcely be lost on the other States in Southern and Central America where the U.S.A. has economic interests.

Alleged Communist Influence

FREEDOM has hitherto been sceptical about the alleged Communist influence in the Arbenz administration, in the absence of any very clear facts supporting it, and meaning by "Communist" a devotion to the foreign interests of the Soviet Union. But we also pointed out that this is not the meaning attached in reality by the State Department to the word "Communist". For them it is a term of abuse which seeks to attach all the political horrors of a ruthlessly totalitarian régime to any kind of move which threatens American vested interests. In this, too, they are successful, for the press in this country, even when the extent of Communist influence in the Arbenz government was initially questioned, have slipped into calling all the opponents of Colonel Armas Communists.

"Cleaning-up operations" have begun, and executions have taken place of alleged Communists. On July 4, it was reported from Guatemala City that more than 800 supporters of the Arbenz régime have been arrested. Meanwhile all the propaganda machinery with which recent decades have familiarized us are being brought into operation. "The citizens of Guatemala are being given examples of what happened to men who dared to oppose the Arbenz régime. The new military government has put on display in the tropical heat the mutilated bodies of those who, they said, were tortured to death under the old régime." (*Times* 3/7/54). There will, however, be many besides anarchists who will say that terror and counter-terror are weapons of government generally rather than of any particular government.

Meanwhile the American Government will have to accept moral responsibility for the cruelties that follow their intervention on behalf of the United Fruit monopoly. On July 2, the State filed a suit against United Fruit under the anti-trust laws. This may be regarded as a clumsy attempt to demonstrate neutrality. It will be interesting to see whether the U.S. Ambassador in Guatemala, Mr. John Plurifoy, "who has done so much behind the scenes to end the fighting and to overthrow the Arbenz régime." (*Times* 5/7/54: our italics) will succeed in preventing the building of the road from Puerto Barrios to the capital or to reverse the agrarian reforms. Alternatively whether the U.S. Government will decide to provide the capital for the "development" of Guatemala and so acquire further sources of income and further means of domination.

One Who Got Away

VAL LORWIN was "Case No. 54" on the original list cited by Senator McCarthy in his Senate speech of Feb. 20, 1950. In this speech McCarthy said that Lorwin had "been connected with a number of Communist-front organizations and was active in attempting to secure the issuance of a non-immigration visa to a French Communist leader." These charges had already been investigated and Lorwin had been cleared without a formal hearing in 1949. But because of McCarthy's speech, a new investigation was begun. In the course of it, the FBI came across one Harold Metz, who testified that while he had been a guest at the Lorwin home in 1935, Lorwin had told him that he was a Communist Party member and had shown him a Communist Party card. (At the period in question, Lorwin had been a member of the Socialist Party and active in the fight against Stalinism.)

On the basis of the Metz testimony, formal charges were brought against Lorwin in the State Department in 1950. At the time, he was on leave of absence, studying in France. He returned to the United States to face the charges, and after two hearings before the State Department Loyalty Board, he was completely cleared. In the course of these hearings, ninety-seven witnesses appeared on his behalf, headed by Norman Thomas and including numerous others who had known him in the Socialist Party or in the course of his anti-Communist activity in government and in the labor movement. The only evidence against him, apparently, was that of Metz.

The quality of this evidence may be judged from the fact that Metz testified that the card he had seen was red—the color of the Socialist Party card; the Communist Party, it was proved, used a 16-page black book, rather than a card, in 1935. That so fantastic a story should have been the basis for charges, when even a moderately competent investigation would have shown how ridiculous it was, was bad enough. But worse was to come.

A few months after his clearance and reinstatement, Lorwin resigned from the

State Department to join the faculty of the University of Chicago. He, and everyone else, assumed the case was closed. Suddenly, on Dec. 3, 1953, the Department of Justice announced his indictment for "false statements," based on his denial of the Metz charges in the State Department hearings. Mr. Olney has now, in moving for dismissal of the case, revealed how that indictment was obtained.

A Justice Department attorney, William Gallagher, took Metz before the Grand Jury and told the jurors that the FBI had two other witnesses who were not then available but would testify in the trial. Olney has now admitted, on behalf of the Justice Department, that no such witnesses ever existed. Gallagher also told the Grand Jury that there was no point in calling Lorwin or his wife to testify, because they would only resort to the Fifth Amendment "like all the other Communists"—this in spite of the fact that both Lorwins had testified under oath in the State Department hearings! (Gallagher has since defended his failure to call the Lorwins on the ground that he was in a hurry to go to Chicago!) While the Justice Department now repudiates the indictment, Attorney-General Brownell boasted of it at the time.

In the months since the indictment, Lorwin and his attorneys and friends gathered additional evidence, in addition to the mountains which had been presented at the State Department hearing, to demonstrate Lorwin's actual activities and prove the absurdity of the charges. And his attorneys, Benjamin O'Sullivan and F. Joseph Donohue, secured a court order directing the government to turn over a transcript of the testimony Metz had given in secret before the Loyalty Board, so that he would be unable to change it in order to avoid the contradictions which had discredited him there. But this order was in conflict with the loyalty proceedings. (It should be noted that, since the entire prosecution was based on the record of the loyalty hearing, the principle was entirely different from that involved in McCarthy's efforts to get at loyalty records.) When the Judge threatened to cite the Attorney-General for contempt unless the transcript was produced, the Department of Justice was forced to review the case on a high level. And the result was that the Department suddenly realized that it had no case, and would be laughed out of court if it went to trial. Hence Olney's action.

Val Lorwin had been vindicated, and Gallagher has been fired for his scandalous behavior. So far, so good. But what about the higher-ups in the Justice Department who, under the Truman administration, authorized Gallagher to initiate the prosecution without evidence? What about the Republican Attorney-General who boasted about a prosecution into the validity of which, it now appears, neither he nor any responsible official of his Department had ever inquired? What about the years of jeopardy which Val Lorwin went through, and the tremendous expense of defending himself in proceeding after proceeding against the entire machinery of the United States Government—and all with no reason?

(*The Socialist Call*, N. York, June, 1954).

The Psychology of Propaganda

THE problem for the propagandist in any field is twofold: the understanding of the social reality as it is perceived and understood by the different individual men and women that make up society, and the recognition of the general operative principles of learning and understanding.

Unless the propagandist is prepared to study most acutely what goes on in the minds around him, to understand the essential differences between many different mental pictures of the world which individuals hold, he is wasting breath or printing ink. It is useless for the propagandist merely to declare the truth as he sees it. The same facts which he gives may have entirely different meanings for different people and lead them to make opposite deductions and conclusions.

Selection

The sum total of any one individual's experiences and beliefs tend to be organized into a meaningful pattern; that is why an individual tends to think of him or herself as a Conservative, Methodist, Teddy Boy, Working Class Housewife, Anarchist, Plain Man, Intellectual—or some other stereotype. That he does not quite conform to the model, he knows, but the measure of his conscious divergence is often the measure of his discontent with himself. The most usual self-comforting device is to consider his particular organisation of prejudices, illusions, hopes and faiths and declare—"There you are—the Conservative (or Methodist, etc.) Viewpoint—that's me!"

In his relations with the outer reality the individual is highly selective in what he perceives. Ordinarily, he perceives those things, pleasant or unpleasant, which tend to fit in with his individual

picture of the world. A great deal, a very great deal indeed, of that which goes on around him is simply not perceived because it has no coherent meaning for his own picture of the world.

By 'perceived' I imply seen as meaningful, apprehended and remembered. Data do not have a logic of their own which are appreciable to all observers. The sight of a fat smiling priest in a big shiny car may mean for one that the Church is a money-making racket run by luxury-loving parasites; for another observer it may mean that England is still a Christian country, thank God, and that due honour is being paid to His ministers.

Two acquaintances of mine went to see the film "Viva Zapata". On coming out one of them said that it was a telling picture of the tragedy and futility of violent revolution; his companion replied that on the contrary the film had inspired her with some faith in popular uprising.

Reaction

What is the propagandist to do? First he must realise the futility of simply putting forward simple, emotionally-charged statements of opinion and expecting his hearers or readers to react as he himself would react. If he is confronted by a mixed audience, his opinions will evoke a mixture of emotions—boredom, admiration, disgust, laughter and pity.

Suppose an Anarchist speaker attacks one specific belief, say belief in conventional trade unionism. His audience will react in accordance with how trade unionism fits into their total perceptual pattern of the world. The typist, who knows nothing and cares less about trade unionism (but who finds the speaker

most attractive) will decide that trade unionism is something silly that live young people don't go in for. Her office friend (who thinks the speaker looks and sounds just awful) will decide that trade unionism is probably a very sensible thing that only unkempt young men object to. Thus the two girls who have hitherto no niche for trade unionism in their personal world-picture, absorb the existence of it with anti-pathetic and sympathetic feelings.

Another hearer, a Conservative shopkeeper say, may have his opinions about trade unionism quite unaffected by the speaker's attack, but his world-picture is modified to the extent that *Anarchists* are now regarded as not so crazy after all. Another listener, say a T.U. official, may know that all that the speaker says is

Continued on p. 3

CATCHING ON

WATCH for the unexpected phrase that touches the nerve and lingers in the mind.

Here is a girl the world has never heard of. She is 20-year-old Irma Capese Minutolo. She is a friend of ex-King Farouk.

And yesterday at Naples, just before stepping into Farouk's car with her mother to drive to his villa in the hills near Rome, she turns to the reporters, says she will not marry Farouk, and then throws off a memorable sentence: "Marriage is the tomb of love."

Signorina Minutolo cannot expect much formal support for her view, of course. But, at some time or other, is there a household in the land where that thought has not crept in?

Ask your wife, sir.
 Ask your husband, madam.

Sunday Express, 4/7/54.

American Union Racketeers

THE Federal grand jury in St. Louis, Missouri, recently reported to United States District Judge George H. Moore that a few union leaders hold "a great concentration of power," and that the handling of union funds has been characterized by inadequate control and loose accounting. It charged that union business agents sent their best workers to certain contractors, their poorest to others; that some agents had acquired an interest in contracting concerns; that some had profited illegally from placement of insurance under welfare plans, and that union demands had driven business concerns from the city.

The grand jury's report was part of an extremely unflattering picture of high-

level union activity which has been given the public by Federal court action since last summer. Four grand juries have indicted 38 union men, or former union men, in eastern Missouri and southern Illinois. 33 of the total were indicted under the Federal anti-racketeering law.

First to be tried was Paul H. Hulahan, a St. Louis business agent for the AFL Building Laborers and Hodcarriers Union. His case involved three shakedowns, or attempted shakedowns, of contractors, and a jury found him guilty after only two hours' deliberation. Judge Moore sentenced him to 12 years in prison and fined him \$8,000.

(*New Leader*, N.Y., June 28).

LIBERTARIAN COMMUNISM

THE former Fédération Anarchiste Française has changed its title to Fédération Communiste Libertaire.* Their manifesto describes the orientation of the new federation.† "At the moment when the capitalist régime has reached its culminating point of crisis . . . it appears necessary and urgent to pose in a manifesto the communist libertarian analysis and solution." Although right through the pamphlet the names of Bakunin, Kropotkin, and Malatesta are invoked, it is exceedingly doubtful if the last two of them at least would have supported the views put forward in it. In fact one gets an uneasy feeling that these names are brought in in order to give you the impression that this document is in the anarchist tradition, and to still doubts that might rise in the mind of the reader.

Fontenis, who clearly speaks for the whole of the F.C.L.L. more or less, cheerfully jettisons La Boétie, Godwin, Stirner, Tucker, and other anarchistic writers in a manner that may irritate some of their admirers, and seems to me a bit sweeping. . . . But the theories of Godwin, Stirner, Tucker, are only reflections on society without taking account of history and the forces that determine it, without taking account of the objective conditions that the problem of the Revolution poses."

Anarchism, says the author, should not be reduced to a sort of super-liberalism, losing thus its revolutionary character. "Anarchism cannot then be assimilated to a philosophy, or to an abstract or individualistic ethic. It was born in and by the results of the social milieu, and it was necessary to wait for a given period of history, and a given state of class antagonism, for anarchist communist aspirations show themselves clearly, for the phenomenon of revolt to end in a coherent and complete revolutionary concept."

One feels that one is reading "The Communist Manifesto" in the wrong cover, and in fact the whole thing is strongly imbued with Marxist theories. (Not that that necessarily means that it is wrong, of course). The orthodox Marxists consider that anarchism was an ideology associated with the petty-bourgeois, small scale production, and

["It would be more exact to say that following the expulsion or resignation of groups and individual members of the French Anarchist Federation, Fontenis and his friends then proceeded to reorganise those who remained into a "Libertarian Communist Federation". But meanwhile the F.A.F. has been reconstituted by those elements who were expelled or had resigned from the Fontenis dominated Federation—see *The French Anarchist Federation* (FREEDOM Jan. 23, 1954).—Eds.]

†MANIFESTE DU COMMUNISME LIBERTAIRE, *Problèmes Essentiels*, G. Fontenis. Editions "Le Libertaire".

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP
OPEN DAILY

OPEN 10 a.m. to 6.30; 5.0 SATURDAYS
Postage free on all items

New Books—out this week

The Invisible Writing
Arthur Koestler 21/-

Dialogue with Death
Arthur Koestler 12/6

A Lover for Lucia
Charles Humana 10/6

Physical Basis of Mind
P. Laslett 5/-

Some outstanding books

from stock . . .

Faith for Living Lewis Mumford 3/-

Soul of Man Under Socialism
Oscar Wilde 1/-

My Disillusionment in Russia
(1925) Emma Goldman 10/-

The Book of the Simple Way
(The Tao-Teh-King) Lao Tze 5/6

The Clash (Spanish Civil War)
Arturo Barea
published at 12/6 now 2/6

Nineteen Eighty-Four
George Orwell 12/6

Second-Hand . . .

Seven Shifts
(edited by Jack Common) 2/6

Death Pays a Dividend
Fenner Brockway &
Federic Mullally 2/6

Valley of the Moon Jack London 4/6

A Source of Embarrassment
Mary McCarthy 3/-

Periodicals . . .

Perspectives No. 7 (Katherine
Anne Porter, E. B. White, etc.) 2/6

Encounter, July (Dylan Thomas,
Bertrand Russell, W. H. Auden, etc.) 2/6

Individual Action, No. 12,
June 18th 3d.

Adam No. 239 (V. Seckville
West, Herbert Read, etc.) 2/6

Obtainable from

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

craftsmen, and was doomed to perish with these people. What Fontenis is doing is to stand their arguments on their heads, saying in effect, "On the contrary, anarchism (of our type at any rate) is the historically determined form of revolutionary movement, not state socialism. We are the scientific revolutionaries, it is you who are the Utopians."

This is no doubt a good debating point, but is it really true? The writer regards anarchism as something quite modern, originated by Bakunin, and continued by Kropotkin, Grave, Malatesta, and others. Any previous anti-authoritarianism is really thrown away, just as Marx dismissed most of his predecessors as "unscientific", and "petty-bourgeois".

The author feels the necessity of a definite programme to which anarchists will subscribe. This seems rather hopeless. There are as many forms of anarchism as there are anarchists, but they all seem to work together well enough, and surely that is the important thing. It is of course quite true that anarchism, in the hands of some of its supporters does tend to peter out into vague humanitarian and religio-pacifist aspirations, but I do not see that there is much that can be done about it, or that it matters very much.

"That which ought to determine the programme, is then the study, the experience, the tradition even, of that which is permanent in the aspirations of the masses." This seems to me a bit vague. What at the moment may be said to be the "aspirations of the masses"? I think that at the moment they accept the present society, and try to make the best of it.

It is however when one gets to the section entitled "Internal principles of the

Theatre

WILDE & SARTRE
at the Q Theatre

ALTHOUGH Oscar Wilde's *Salomé* shares with "Vathek" and "The Grammont Memoirs" the distinction of being a work written in French by an English-speaking man of genius, Wilde became a playwright of social importance only when he began his series of four comedies of manners with *Lady Windermere's Fan* in 1892. His keen intelligence made him a brilliant critic of society, and the pleasure he took in epigrams for their own sake did not preclude sound and serious observation. The man who made such shallow remarks as "A well-tied tie is the first serious step in life" also wrote: "All authority is absolutely degrading. It degrades those who exercise it and it degrades those over whom it is exercised." *The Soul of Man Under Socialism* is still one of the superb defences of Anarchist idealism in the English language: it is as fresh to-day, in its lessons for the society of the time, as when first published over 60 years ago. *Salomé* this Grand Guignol of the beheading of John the Baptist at the instance of the love-mad daughter of Herodias, had the merit of introducing the pungent element of sadism into the subject of passion which the Victorians had so liberally sprinkled with rose-water.

I personally find this play rather tedious and absurd, with its continual repetitions and short contradictory sentences. The other one-act play in this double bill, Jean-Paul Sartre's *The Respectable Prostitute* seems even more effective by the contrast, with its brilliantly exciting climax, when the terrified and hunted negro implores the woman to save his life from the ruthless lynchers by allowing him to hide in her room. *The Respectable Prostitute* shows that Sartre is an excellent theatrical craftsman, and that he could have written fine plays, even if he had never heard of the philosophy of existentialism. The most imaginative of the existentialist plays is Sartre's *Huis-Clos*. The scene is laid in Hell. It is a stuffy Second Empire room with locked door and walled-in windows, lit only by an unshaded electric bulb. The attendant informs Garcia, in reply to his questions, that outside there are more passages and more rooms, and then nothing. The only torturers are the three damned souls who share it. "Hell is other people." They can only read their judgment in one another's eyes, and the other always judges by results, by what he sees, not by the conflicting motives, the noble aspirations, that lie beneath the surface. They are trapped by isolated actions which distort what they really are; as with the room, the windows of the soul are walled-up, there is no possibility to reveal an inner life, or change the emphasis upon the action of their lives. D.M.M.

revolutionary organisation or Party" that one begins to doubt the right that the F.C.L.L. has to go on using the term "anarchist". It is a pity that they did not drop it altogether (Bakunin, to whose thought they owe most, was never very fond of it), for here we have the outline of the organisation of a "Party" with all that that sinister word implies.

In order to achieve "unity of tactics" the principle of majority voting is accepted. The organisation will be based on "internal democracy", and there will of course be "discipline".

"Be it understood, the militants and the different sections of the organisation can take the initiative, but only in the measure that they do not enter into contradiction with the agreements made, and the measures taken by the regular organisations, that is to say if these enterprises are in fact the applications of collective decisions, but in detail; when they concern the whole organisation, each member should consult the organisation through its representative and liaison organs. Therefore, collective activity and not activity decided personally by separate militants."

The "classic" form of anarchist organisation, favoured in France until the First World War, and still existing in England, was of many small independent groups, who, despite their looseness of organisation, managed to carry on their work, and keep in touch with each other pretty well. The type of organisation put forward in this manifesto seems to make it possible for a bureaucracy to arise, but even if this did not happen it still seems too rigid. Anarchists are, whatever Fontenis may say, "individualistic". The position that they give to the individual is one of the most important things that distinguish them from all the other political organisations. They do not care to run to some organisation to get permission to do something. They consider that they are sufficiently sensible to act for themselves.

Defence of the Revolution

The question of the defence of the revolution is of course a very difficult one. It is faced up to here.

Have you asked
for VOLINE'S
NINETEEN-SEVENTEEN
at your
local PUBLIC LIBRARY

THE BRIGHT TOWER by Andre Breton

IT was in the black mirror of anarchism that surrealism first realized its identity, even before our movement's outlines had become clearly defined and when it was still only a free association between individuals who rejected spontaneously and collectively the social and moral constraints of their epoch. Among the different inspirations which united us, in this aftermath of the 1914 war, with a rallying power which never failed, none was more important than this final verse of Laurent Tailhade's *Ballade Solness*:

Strike our threadbare hearts
Anarchy! oh bearer of bright flame!
Banish the night! crush the parasites!
And raise to the skies, on our tombs if
need be,
The bright Tower which holds sway
over the storm-waves!

At this moment the surrealist refusal was total, absolutely incapable of being canalized in the political sphere. All the institutions upon which the modern world was based and which had just given the measure of their worth in the first world war were considered by us to be false and scandalous. To begin with, we set ourselves against the whole apparatus of social defence: army, "justice", police, religion, pathological and forensic medicine, official education. Our collective declarations as well as the individual writings of the Aragon of those days, of Ernst, of Leiris, of Masson, of Péret, of Queneau or myself bear witness to our common desire to unmask these institutions as the plagues they were and to declare war on them as such. But to fight them with some chance of success, it was primarily necessary to attack their roots which, in the last analysis, were based in logic and morals: the so-called "reason" which was accepted, sponsoring with its fraudulent pretensions the most wretched "common-sense"; "morals" falsified by christianity with a view to discouraging

any resistance to the exploitation of mankind.

A deep fire smouldered within us at that time—we were young—and I think it necessary to emphasize how constantly this fire was renewed by the inspiration we derived from the work and life of poets:

Anarchy! oh bearer of bright flame!
whose names were not only Tailhade, but Baudelaire, Rimbaud, Jarry: names which all our young libertarian friends should know just as they should know Sade, Lautréamont, the Schwob of *Paroles de Monelle*.

Why could not an organic fusion have taken place at that time between the genuine anarchist groups and the surrealist group? Even now, twenty-five years later, I continue to wonder why not. Without doubt the idea of efficacy, which was surely the magic mirror of that entire epoch, made the decision impossible. What appeared to us to be the triumph of the Russian revolution and the appearance of a workers' State entailed for us a complete change of focus. The only flaw in the picture—a flaw which was eventually to show itself as an indelible stain—lay in the crushing of the Kronstadt revolt on March 18, 1921. The surrealists were never wholly able to forget this. But even so, it still seemed during 1925 that the Third International alone possessed the means necessary for a transformation of the world. It was possible to believe that the signs of degeneracy and regression already clearly visible in the East might still be exorcised. The surrealists lived at that time in the sure conviction that the social revolution triumphant in every country would of necessity bring into being a libertarian world (some would say a surrealist world, but it is the same thing). All of us, at first, thought in this way, including those (Aragon, Eluard, etc.) who, in the end, fell so far from their original ideals as to make for themselves a desirable career in stalinism (from a

sion, in the heart of the masses, can only be a factor of culture."

This is just the sort of argument used by capitalist democracy in this country, when it allows revolutionaries to spout to their hearts content at Hyde Park. So long as their propaganda remains on the theoretical level it can be allowed. But if anarchists start acting anarchically, or if their ideas look like spreading and gaining influence—then look out!

You see the sort of situation that arises as soon as one starts to fight a revolutionary war one has to suppress enemy organisations, and if one does that one soon ceases to be anarchist, one becomes Bolshevik. It is not a far cry from suppressing "enemy" organisations to suppressing various minority groups of anarchists, and libertarian communities, who do not accept the views of the majority of revolutionaries.

In fact the point of view advanced in this pamphlet can quite fairly be described as "anarcho-bolshevik". It is in fact a freer form of Bolshevism, and in no great length of time I can imagine the F.C.L.L. becoming nothing more than another opposition Marxist party. At the moment it falls between two stools like the Anglo-Catholics, having neither the authority and discipline of the Communist Party, or its various imitators, nor the free spontaneous organisation of the anarchists.

All the same, comrades able to read French should get a copy if they can. It raises a great many problems to which some answers should be made, particularly as regards the defence of the revolution.

ARTHUR W. ULOTH.

OLD AMERICAN SECRET
WEAPON

A READER sends me a fascinating mail order advertisement for Personalized Panties from a newspaper called the *Air Force Daily* and I think you might enjoy the copy:—

"Thrill her with these sheer French-style briefs. She'll love . . . you'll love the peek-a-boo black lace . . . the saucy satin bows. And the so-personal touch—your name or her name beautifully monogrammed on each pair. Order a set: one with girl's name . . . one with boy's name. Colours: bewitching black or bridal white. Sizes: small, medium, large."

The street address of this mail-order house is *Lovers Lane, Dallas, Texas*, believe it or not!

Advertisers Weekly, 3/7/54.

business man's point of view). But human desire and hope should never be at the mercy of traducers:

Banish the night! crush the parasites!

We all know well enough how ruthlessly these illusions have been stripped bare during the second quarter of this century. By a fearful irony, our dream of a libertarian world has been displaced by a world where the most servile obedience is demanded, where the most elementary rights are denied to human beings, where the life of society revolves solely around the policeman and the executioner. As in all cases where a human ideal reaches such a pitch of corruption, the only remedy is to plunge again into the great spiritual well-spring where it had its birth, to return to the source which first gave it life. It is in the very process of this act, more vital than ever before, that one will inevitably come face to face with anarchism and with anarchism alone—not the caricature that is drawn of it or the bogey it is made out to be—but what our comrade Fontenis describes as "pure socialism, that is to say this vital demand for the dignity of the human being (his liberty as much as his well-being); socialism, no longer conceived simply as a solution of an economic or political problem, but as the expression of the exploited masses in their desire to create a classless, Stateless society, where all human values and aspirations can be realized."

This conception of a revolt and a magnanimity indissociable from each other and (despite the strictures of Albert Camus) each as illimitable as the other, is one to which the surrealists unreservedly subscribe today. Seen clearly through the poisonous fog which sweeps through this age, we recognize it as alone capable of raising again, in the view of ever more numerous beholders,

The bright Tower which holds sway
over the storm-waves!

(Paris, 1951. Translated from the French by S.W.T.)

ADVANCING TIDE

MANY people in this country can remember in the twenties the dismay which the conduct of affairs in Fascist Italy evoked. Incidents like the murder of Matteotti, and the beatings up and castor-oil administrations by Mussolini's *squadristi*, or gangs of thugs, were a new and horrible thing in politics. The similar subordination of "justice" to the needs of the State in Russia were too little known to evoke much apprehension, and the trials of Sacco and Vanzetti, though widely regarded as a miscarriage of justice, were not then thought of as symptomatic of a general trend.

A far more profound shock was administered by the seizing of power by the Nazis and the anti-Jewish and anti-socialist horrors that ensued. Once again, the remoteness of the Soviet Union, combined with its adroit assumption of anti-Fascist leadership in intellectual circles, diverted attention from the basically similar trend there until after the war was over, the cold war made anti-Russian propaganda an affair of governments.

Anarchists have often pointed out that the war managed to canalize and make use of this horror which Nazi atrocities had been producing for six years; and that the losses and sacrifices of war make intolerable the idea that they were in vain. Yet the enslavement of the satellite countries, the development in China and the "little wars" in Korea, Indo-China and Malaya show that the physical effects of totalitarianism are now more widespread than ever.

It is against this background that one must consider the impact of yet another profound shock: the spread of these same methods of government and propaganda to the English speaking nations. "It can't happen here" has for so long been an article of belief that the facts of recent years are not yet acceptable for consideration by liberal minded people. Nevertheless McCarthyism and the implications of the case of Dr. Joseph Cort are evidence which unequivocally shows that the direction pointed by Mussolini and Hitler and Lenin-Stalin is also the direction of events in the democratic world. It is also clear that the Sacco and Vanzetti case was a symptom, early indeed, but still in the light of hindsight, a highly significant symptom of just these trends.

If McCarthyism itself did not effectively prove it, it would be necessary to show that this trend has roots in every country and is not due to Communist influence, fascist propaganda and so on. The facts are far more sinister: it is due to a general necessity facing all governments to-day, and is inherent in the governmental method itself. This necessarily is the need of governments for methods whereby they can control large masses of people without giving up the pretence of democratic forms. (It should be remembered that Hitler's justice, no less than Communist law, was administered by "People's Courts").

The rights of governments over the individual have been decisively underlined by the Home Secretary in the Cort case. But few intelligent observers of the political scene in this country can have been surprised, for Britain has for years ceased to be the country of asylum from political persecution. It may be true that there is more political liberty here than in many another country, and that political persecution is the exception rather than the rule: but it remains an inescapable fact that the defence of individual freedom is no longer carried on with the zeal and conviction of former periods, although our epoch needs that defence more than any earlier one did.

THE GIST OF REBELLION

I SCRUPLE to preach rebellion, not because I am not in favour of it, but because the responsibility of preaching it is more than my courage or my honesty permit. Love and other values need effort and care, and a long process of assimilation and cultivation in which the part played by a preacher is circumstantial even if initial, and never decisive. Love and similar values also tend to unite people together, and their reward, either spiritual or material, is usually commensurable with the sacrifice they demand. They are subject to correction, revision and compromise, and, if involving conflict, they admit of such things as new alliances, truces and strategical retreats. But rebellion is a step that once retraced can only mean defeat. When taken and not retraced it seldom means victory, and brings injury more often than not, sometimes even death. Rebellion is always a risk, not infrequently a physical risk, which the preacher of rebellion is usually too clever seriously to incur. The power to rebel is always available and needs no cultivating. Measures to prevent it from showing may be developed to a degree, but it is like an explosive charge needing only a little spark to go bang, and a preacher may supply it, causing considerable damage, yet remaining himself unscathed.

Legend, history, literature, the cinema and the comic strip are all full of rebels. There almost invariably rebellion appears successful or if it fails it is in martyrdom and to be vindicated at some later date, by another generation. The earnest and generous youth, therefore, when choosing rebellion cannot help expecting some kind of social recognition, and, rather absurdly, sometimes from those very strata and pillars of society against which he intends to rebel. Some forms or, rather, attitudes of rebellion are in fact socially applauded and fostered, but only when they are not seriously meant, when they are not truly pushed home, or when the authority they attack is in such a position of weakness that it would require great courage and an act of rebellion on its part to be able to retaliate. When rebellion is more than attitude and actually harms or endangers a firmly established authority retaliation is swift and heavy, and a rude awakening it is for the rebel who fell in love with rebellion because of its histrionic charms. The wages of rebellion are destitution, brutalization and blows. Hymns of praise

and monuments occasionally pay posthumous tribute to a rebel, but long imprisonment and a summary grave usually awaits him. In those rare cases in which a rebel triumphs ironic fates mar the beauty of his victory by turning him into a watchful, ruthless oppressor.

This melancholy, pessimistic outlook is abundantly, though not entirely, supported by facts, and yet rebellion is wonderful with unsuppressible charm. If great miracles are ever to be achieved, as they are ever needed to make life fully worth living, then it is rebellion and rebellion alone which can achieve them. Take war, for example, the most obvious of present-day avoidable evils. It is not love that can prevent it, if for no other reason because you have to know your enemy before you love him, and in modern wars you are killed before you are given a chance to meet him or make sure it is not your friend. But rebellion could stop a war right at its start. If nobody paid any attention to call-up notices, if officers refused to transmit orders to soldiers or soldiers to carry them out, if transport workers or simply the medical profession should go on strike, the bloody flower so many poets, preachers and teachers have gone hysterical about would be nipped in the bud. For the whole fabric of coercion does not rest on brute force but on a convention of powerlessness and a mistrust of your fellow-oppressed, on the cumulative effect of repression of daring, and foolish, extravagant hopes of being spared when others succumb. Paul Valery has a few penetrating words on this subject in his essay on Montesquieu. And then there is the story of the Russian boy who dared say to his father: "I shan't do my homework to-day". His father was so struck by this unprecedented statement that when he went to work he said to his foreman: "I won't do my quota to-day". Equally struck the foreman told the factory board: "You won't have your quota of production". The factory board told the same thing to the industry planning council. The council informed the ministry, and the ministry told the politburo, and the politburo told Stalin who, as the example of the little boy spread horizontally as well as vertically, racked his brain to find a remedy, developed a tumour and died.

It is as simple as that, and it is nothing new. The moral of the story, rather, its inspiring vision was clearly

and pithily put by the most respectable and law-abiding German philosopher, Immanuel Kant. His one and only necessary rule of moral conduct was, "Before undertaking any action just ask yourself whether it would be good for mankind if everyone acted likewise". Unfortunately if you stop to ask yourself that question before deciding to rebel the answer you will get is that it would be wonderful and good for mankind indeed if everyone followed your example but since the chances are that nobody will follow your example it will be a miserable performance and very bad for you. Anarchism inviting rebellion stands therefore very little chance of success. If it cares about success the best way of utilizing whatever brains and energies it commands would be to organize itself as a scientific enterprise making research and developing a technique for the practical solution of the one single problem of precipitating and synchronizing those acts of rebellion which practically every individual, not excluding the bulk of the oppressors, at some time or other intensely wishes for and contemplates. For the amazing, preposterous core of the situation is that everybody is fed up with the existing system, and yet everybody does his little bit to perpetuate it, crying punishment and opprobrium on the few that lose their natural caution. The rebels in fact are scapegoats, Christs taking upon themselves the sins of omission and pretermission of the rebels in which, giving a pang, a thrill and a new lease of life to their bad conscience. Each time a rebel in fact meets with the inevitable punishment a thousand rebels in wish say to themselves: "That's what would have happened to me had I been such a fool". They thank the God of the shrewd and pat themselves on the back.

Coming down to particular instances there is no end to circumstantial arguments against rebellion, which mutually engendering cowardice and wisdom supply in turn. There is one argument, however, which the sincere believer in rebellion should carefully reflect upon if he wants the cause and practice of rebellion to gain ground. The power of tyranny and any system of coercion stand well high and secure, as we have seen, because rebellion from below is not concerted and synchronized. In other words it is division among the oppressed which makes oppression possible and open to

The Psychology of Propaganda

Continued from p. 1

perfectly true, but his world-picture may be altered in that now Anarchists are regarded more as active enemies than as historical curiosities.

The above instance is of course a quite artificial construction. What is important is to realise that the properties of every mental sub-structure (e.g. the idea of trade unionism) are determined by the properties of the mental structure or world-picture as a whole. When people have to take notice of new facts or experiences they do so in a manner which necessitates the least possible reorganisation of the structure as a whole.

Contradiction

This is a general rule which applies to us all. Each one of us, looking back on his own past, can see how ingeniously the mind dealt with new experiences in order to fit them into existing mental constructions, and how the most glaring contradictions could exist unrecognised side-by-side in comparative mental harmony.

When a mental sub-structure exists in a more or less isolated condition, it can be modified drastically with comparative ease. The adolescent who takes up communism for a little can be made to see the folly and irrationality of it without great difficulty. But let this mental sub-structure, communism, once become an integrated part of his whole world-picture, bound up with his loyalty to his friends, his hatred of his enemies, his sexual pride, his professional ambitions, and then the most gross inconsistencies of the Party line will not cause his faith to waver.

The sub-structure cannot be broken down when it becomes a prop of the whole edifice without most disastrous consequences for the whole. Ex-communists not infrequently have to embrace the Roman Church immediately in order to save themselves from schizophrenia.

Satisfaction

I have mentioned that it is idle to point out the sleek, worldly priest in his limousine to one of his flock and to ask if that is in accordance with Christ's spiritual philosophy. If we are to modify the outlook of the true believer

we must approach his system of illusions by indirect means and not by direct attack. Let him be introduced to the means of satisfying his sexual appetite in a direct and healthy fashion and he will have no need to adore the Holy Virgin; let him receive some real education and he will be less credulous of the childish fables of his Church; let him find some satisfying work and intelligent companionship and he will achieve as good a conceit of himself as God has of Himself.

I do not want to represent an oversimplified picture of the issue. I know that it is an extremely complex problem that admits of no easy solution. It is essential to keep in mind certain general principles, however, the chief among these is the principle of paying attention to the sub-structures rather than attacking unified wholes. The work of the Anarchist propagandists, as I see it, to undermine the power of the "authoritarian personality".

It is useless to repeat "Down with the State! Outlaw War! To Hell with religion!" in endlessly worded denunciations. What is more important is to analyse the very varied sub-structures which support the overall world-pictures which necessitate the continued support for the State, war and religion. The task is made infinitely complex by the fact that the world-pictures of no two individuals exactly agree, and we have to proceed by certain generalised principles.

Application

The "authoritarian personality", be it that of a Civil Servant, policeman, T.U. boss, heavy father, Communist, bishop, sergeant-major, schoolteacher, or a hundred other types, has certain general mental sub-structures which, although by no means shared by all, are common to most. I will risk listing a few: patriotism, repression of children, belief in hierarchy, contempt for negroes, worship of appearance of order, fear of sexual license, social snobbery, contempt for women. A much longer list might be prepared, but the longer it became the less specific would it be to the main varieties of the authoritarian personality.

I must here pay a tribute to FREEDOM for its policy of printing matter on a

wide diversity of subjects, in spite of the occasional protest that "art, sex and literature" have been favoured at the expense of "The Workers' Struggle". By allowing a fairly wide range of topics to be discussed in its columns FREEDOM has certainly done a great deal more to advance anarchist ideas than all those pathetic journals that have sought to slay the Church, State and Capitalism by sticking strictly to business. Some cynics have suggested that FREEDOM prints 50 per cent. "Non-anarchist stuff" simply because it cannot get enough anarchists to write for it. I do not myself hold this view, but even were it true I think the practical result is fortunate, for many "anarchists" can be so deadly dull and so inept in their propaganda that they certainly deserve to be prophets crying in a very empty wilderness.

Communication

Much of the foregoing implies that a great deal of propaganda, anarchist and otherwise, is completely useless. Pictures of the horrors of war distributed by ardent pacifists and anti-militarists may do more harm than good to the anti-war cause. Descriptions of the tyranny and intrigue in Russia may, surprisingly enough, invest totalitarianism with an attractive glamour for neurotics—and so all political parties become more power-hungry in their aims. The propagandist must beware of expecting other people to react as he does. Other people do not share his world picture—if they did they too would mount soap boxes.

Yet I do not suggest that the propagandist is wasting his time. Even though his efforts make not one single convert to his way of thinking, they are valuable—to him. If the propagandist is aware of what he is doing he knows for whose principal benefit he is talking or writing—his own. "I sing because I am a singer". But the singer gains most satisfaction who sings with most effect. It is not sufficient that he has a mouth and his audience ears; if he realises that so great is the divergence between the content of his message and the mental concepts of his hearers that the only emotions that he stirs are pity, disgust, and mocking laughter, his efforts will be of little value even to himself. It is necessary to discover how to sing as well.

so many people with no special abilities or qualifications. Now an unwise act of rebellion can strengthen this oppression, and, in spite of all appearances, be a cowardly act. Knowing what they are talking about staunch supporters of oppression openly praise rebellion, invite and reward it, and if that would not be giving the game away would make it an institution. More than once in European history rebellion against the king's servants strengthened the king's position, and similarly nowadays rebellion at the periphery or at some low rung of the ladder strengthens the central and higher seats of power. Tyrants have nothing to lose by endorsing rebellion against some of their subordinate officials and henchmen. Josef Stalin actually can be said to have been able to keep power so long in his hands because he timely supported rebellion against his own policies in the person of his most zealous associates. So oppression has its scapegoats the same as rebellion, and both achieve the same object. What is cowardly in rebellion, and defeats the abiding value of rebellion *per se* is the rebel's playing into the hands of the oppressors, and his more or less conscious aiming at winning the oppressors' approval. For reasons it would serve the cause of oppression to manifest, and more through an instinctive perception than calculation, it so happens in fact that those people in an oppressive system are usually rebelled against who in their thoughts, and half-openly already even in their actions, clearly resent and undermine the system. What the rebel does, then, in this case, is the job of a policeman. Fortunately, with insight if not imagination, it is always possible to gauge whether an act of rebellion is genuine or not. If you rebel against some authority and a higher authority approves of your rebellion then you can be sure that it is the interests of this higher authority you have served and not the cause of rebellion.

Continued on p. 4

FREEDOM PRESS

- VOLINE :**
Nineteen-Seventeen (The Russian Revolution Betrayed) cloth 12s. 6d.
- 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 Pesterity paper 7s. 6d.
- TONY GIBSON :**
Youth for Freedom paper 2s.
Food Production and Population 6d.
Who will do the Dirty Work? 2d.
- PHILIP SANSON :**
Syndicalism—The Workers' Next Step 1s. paper 6s.
- GEORGE WOODCOCK :**
Anarchy or Chaos 2s. 6d.
New Life to the Land 6d.
Homes or Hovels? 6d.
- M. BAKUNIN :**
Marxism, Freedom and the State. cloth 5s.
- ERRICO MALATESTA :**
Anarchy—What For? 6d.
Vote—What For? 1d.
Railways and Society 3d.
What is Anarchism? 1d.
The Basis of Communal Living 1s.
- PETER KROPOTKIN :**
The State: Its Historic Role 1s.
The Wage System 3d.
Revolutionary Government Organised Vengeance Called Justice 2d.
- JOHN HEWETSON :**
Sexual Freedom for the Young 6d.
Ill-Health, Poverty and the State cloth 2s. 6d., paper 1s.
- RUDOLF ROCKER :**
Nationalism and Culture cloth 21s.
- ALEXANDER BERKMAN :**
ABC of Anarchism 1s.
- F. A. RIDLEY :**
The Roman Catholic Church and the Modern Age 2d.
- ★
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)
- ★
K. J. KENAFICK :
Michael Bakunin and Karl Marx
- 27, Red Lion Street, London, W.C.1.**

REFUGEES FROM TITO'S YUGOSLAVIA

The normal trickle of Yugoslav refugees crossing the border into the British zone of Austria showed a remarkable increase between May 16 and 31.

According to sources close to the Ministry of the Interior, altogether 100 persons crossed the border illegally during this period and asked for asylum. In common with earlier refugees the majority gave poor living conditions as their reason for wanting to leave Yugoslavia. Thirteen wished to emigrate; 11 complained of political persecution, three wished to settle with relatives already living in Austria, and one wished to escape military service.

The previous peak for such illegal crossings, according to a recent statement by Herr Graf, the State Secretary at the Ministry of the Interior, was March 31 when 18 Yugoslavs came over within 24 hours. The total number of refugees from Yugoslavia in 1953 was 1,200.

The higher rate of illegal crossings from Yugoslavia compared with Hungary and Czechoslovakia, is attributed here to the fact that the Hungary and Czechoslovak frontiers are more exposed and heavily guarded. There is also the added hazard of crossing the Soviet zone of Austria. Times.

Set the People (WITH MONEY) Free!

LAST Sunday, at midnight, another tremendous step was taken towards the freedom promised by the Tories in 1951. Their slogan at that election has been forgotten by many who voted for them, but for the record, let it be re-stated here. "Set the People Free!" was the stirring cry at which the serried ranks of company directors, dowagers, stock-brokers, retired army officers and backwoods peers went into action.

Since that date, as memorable in its way as that of Magna Carta (which I have forgotten), hardly a month has gone by without some tremendous step being taken to strike off one by one the chains that seven years of Socialist tyranny had forged around our limbs and necks. Every Englishman knows that prior to 1945 England was the Home of the Free, the Englishman's Home (likewise the Scotsman's, Welshman's and Northern Irishman's) was his Castle and that the Bulldog Breed, in carving out of history our Rough Island Story, had earned us the love and respect of the rest of the civilized world.*

Great Days

We need not reiterate the steps towards freedom that have been taken since the glorious victory of 1951—these are burned into the hearts and minds of every patriot. Since, however, not many patriots read these columns, we will refer briefly to a few landmarks.

There was for example the day when speculative builders (who had done so much to beautify our suburban landscapes) were set free to build again houses for sale, not for rent. There was the day when freedom-loving Englishmen on the Stock Exchange were able to over-subscribe for shares in the steel industry, rescued from the bureaucrats to be returned to free enterprise. There were the great days when detergents were freed to compete, and their advertising, in such splendid taste, assaulted our sight through the Press and Cinema Screens. There

*Arabs and Africans, Indians and Irish, Jews, Germans and Japanese, French, Dutch, Chinese, Burmese, Ceylonese, Malays, West Indians, East Indians, Spaniards, Italians, Greeks, Cypriots, Maltese, Egyptians, Persians, Russians, Turks, and about a hundred other nationalities who at various times have tasted British steel, are clearly not civilized.

were the glorious days when commercial T.V. was accepted in the Mother of Parliaments, when the Rent Restriction Act was rescinded, giving landlords freedom to raise the

THE GRABBERS

On the first day of "freedom" at Smithfield, London's great meat market, there was traffic and price chaos as all the grabbers tried to get in first.

In the shops prices varied. But these figures were typical:

FILLET STEAK.—Up to 6s. per lb. from 3s. 4d. last week. In some shops the old price was doubled.

RUMP STEAK (also 3s. 4d. last week), now 4s. 6d. to 5s. per lb.

BEEF.—Sirloin at 2s. 2d., topside 2s. 6d.

LAMB.—Best cuts up by about 1s. per lb., but some varieties down by 4d. to 6d.

PORK.—Up by 1s. 2d. per lb.

rent (in return of course for a solemn promise to carry out essential repairs) when margarine was de-controlled, and Road Transport denationalised, and—oh, great day—when sausages were set free.

But last Sunday, at midnight, the most glittering jewel in this crown of achievement was set in place. Lord Woolton's very own promise of "More Red Meat" was nobly fulfilled. Meat rationing was abandoned, and for the first time for fourteen-and-a-half years the Free British Housewife was able to walk into the shop of the Free British Butcher and help herself to some Free British Meat.

Better Off Than Ever

There is only one, tiny, unimportant restriction left. Can you afford it? Silly question really, for every freedom-loving Britisher is to-day better off than he has ever been (or, if he is a Member of Parliament—soon will be!). Everybody knows that the miners are the highest paid section of the community and dockers running them a close second, and that the company directors, dowagers, stock-brokers, retired army-officers and backwoods peers who set the People Free are a long way down the list. Engineers and electricians and a lot of other common chaps are in fact better off to-day than speculative builders, steel-investors, detergent, T.V., margarine or sausage manufacturers, while Road Haulage Contractors, brewers and advertising men are scraping

along on the very minimum of expenses.

But these anomalies will soon be ironed out and the liberated classes will soon be able to hold up their heads again. After all, the Bank Rate has just fallen, gold and dollar reserves are higher than for years, and convertibility is just round the corner—so the evidence that the People are being Set Free is overwhelming.

Unfortunate Coincidence

It is unfortunate (for some) that the first reaction of the released meat marketeers was to raise their prices—although there was no shortage, in fact quite the reverse. Even more unfortunate was the coincidence that on the very week before this great liberative act was made, an old lady died of exposure on Brighton beach.

Poor old Mr. and Mrs. Dudgeon were turned out of their lodgings, had no-one to turn to for help and only their old age pensions to sustain them. They would not go to an old folks' home because they knew of other old couples who had

been separated, to spend the last years of their lives, not together in peace and comfort, but apart in institutionalised segregation.

Shivering under their old overcoats on the beach, this homeless old couple clung together. She died.

For people like the Dudgeons there has always been freedom to die of want. For most working people there has always been the nagging fear of what will happen to them when they get too old to work. For them, the freedom to buy and sell the best cuts of meat, television sets, and steel shares means very little indeed.

The "freedom" of the Tories is a sham and a lie. It means nothing more than the uncontrolled exploitation, through their property and money, of the dispossessed and poor. All the much-vaunted political freedoms and civil liberties of this country mean little if they are not allied to economic freedom. And that is not likely to come from those whose interest is profit and power.

The Tory slogan should be: Set the People With Money Free to Make More Money. It might not be so popular, but it would at least be honest. P.S.

Problems of Passenger Transport

A GRAVE crisis is hanging over Britain's passenger transport system, the immediate cause of which is the growing lack of drivers and conductors. Statistics relating to the major cities show that in Glasgow, during a single year, 4,751 out of 7,115 men and women left their jobs with the Transport Department, while at Birmingham similar figures were 2,872 out of 4,742. Both the above departments are now understaffed by about 1,000.

A similar situation exists in London. Here again, the working staff were reduced by 1,000 during 1952, and figures now available indicate that the 'wastage' in 1953 was more than twice as much as in the previous year.

The only kind of answer to this problem that is ever thought of by the L.T.E. and similar bodies seems to be a reduction in the number of services run, coupled with a drive to urge workers to undertake vast amounts of overtime and rest-day working. Unfortunately, the latter is quite easy to do, since the basic wage, paid for a 44 hour week, is quite insufficient to satisfy the needs of a worker with a family, and he is forced to work overtime, frequently to the extent of a seven day, 80 hour week. This increase in hours of duty keeps the buses running, temporarily; but it also makes working conditions even worse than before, and forces more employees than ever to take to alternative work. Obviously, a major collapse will occur. What can be done about it?

Several bright suggestions were put forward by the Transport Managers, at their Institute conference this year. One was that buses were too luxurious, and the passenger had no right to expect a seat for his journey, and so buses should be built without seats, to accommodate more passengers. Another was that trailers should be attached to buses in peak periods. They would be perfectly manageable, and could even be backed into narrow alleyways! All this raises the questions of whether the Managers had ever driven buses themselves, and how much money they received for making these suggestions.

It is clear that if drivers and conduc-

tors were guaranteed a 44 hour week, and paid a basic wage which enabled them to enjoy a high standard of life without working overtime, then the situation would at least be relieved. Yet no-one attempts to put this into practice. In a revealing statement Mr. H. Muscroft, manager of Huddersfield Transport Department said "A top rate driver willing to work for 60 hours a week . . . can reach £11." In other words, the 60 hour week is put forward as the norm by which the pay must be judged.

What obstacles stand in the way of the solution given above? Firstly, reasons connected with the transport industry itself. Among these are the number of clerical workers employed in doing work which is quite unnecessary, except to enable corporations, councils and the government to keep control over the entire transport system and its workers, and the draining of money into the pockets of shareholders or stockholders. The more people there are doing nothing, or socially useless work, the less there are to do the useful work, but they all take a share of the product of labour, or to put it more directly, a share of the fares which passengers pay to use the buses.

Secondly, there are problems which face the people as a whole, and affect each section of industry indirectly. For instance, part of the high fares goes to the State as petrol tax, made necessary in order that the government should be able to carry out its armament drive.

All the above are necessary features of a capitalist, or indeed a governmental, society, and cannot be completely eliminated until the State itself has been. This however, should in no way deter us from fighting for an easing of the oppressiveness of the present society. The fight for a specific reform can be of the greatest educational value, provided it is fought for from below, and not just handed out as a sop to militancy. In addition, every normal person would be happy to see an increase in the living standards of a group of workers, however it is obtained.

The remedies put forward by rank and file busmen are far more sensible than those of the managers, and correspond roughly to the specific faults listed above. That is, that money should be saved on administrative work, and interest payments, and that the expensive governmental policies of re-armament and colonialism be abandoned, thus providing the means to pay a living wage in return for a shorter working week.

Unhappily, there is no such clarity as to how all this is to be achieved. The usual line is that some of the evils will be put right by the next Labour Government, and the rest by negotiations between an enlightened trade union leadership and the executives and corporation officials who control transport. The most radical suggestion is that everyone should attend his or her trade union branch meeting, to persuade the leaders to take a more active line in their negotiations.

It is very important that workers should attend meetings at which their standards of life are being defended, but can this be said to be true of the trade union movement? Part of the blame for the low attendance must be laid at the foot of the form of organisation and aims of trade unions. The only work

that can be done through the official unions has to be done in the face of opposition from the leaders, and when it is all finished, the only thing that has been learned is how to conduct underground internal struggles in a union, while if militant workers look to their own 'unofficial' groupings first, they are gaining experience of direct action against capitalism, of the type needed to inaugurate a free society.

Now that reformist organizations have arrived at the stage when they cannot even win reforms, the only way forward lies in the adoption of anarchist and syndicalist ideas, which will lead both to the successful fighting of individual reforms, and to the eventual emancipation of the whole people. P.H.

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

LECTURE-DISCUSSIONS

Every Sunday at 7.30 at THE MALATESTA CLUB 155 High Holborn, W.C.1. (Nearly opposite Holborn Town Hall)

JULY 10—Jack Robinson on Aspects of Anarchism (4) INDUSTRY

OPEN AIR MEETINGS

Weather Permitting HYDE PARK Sundays at 3.30 p.m.

NORTH-EAST LONDON

DISCUSSION MEETINGS

IN MANOR PARK

Alternate Wednesdays at 7.30 p.m.

JULY 7—Group Discussion

JULY 12—Arthur Uloth

TO BE ANNOUNCED

AUGUST 4—"Contra" on

APATHY

(To be held at East Ham)

Apply to Freedom Press for details

GLASGOW

OUTDOORS

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

INDOORS

at Workers' Open Forum 50 Renfrew Street, Glasgow. Every Thursday at 7 p.m.

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

The Gist of Rebellion Continued from p. 3

I mentioned the abiding value of rebellion *per se*. In countries and times in which oppression was cruder it was not rare to find people for whom anarchism was nothing more than awareness of and loyalty to his value. As it belonged to the 'simplicity of anarchism' they never bothered to fathom and conceptualize it as I intend to do briefly here. On the most general and permanent level of experience evil is what hurts. If I stumble and fall, hitting my nose on the floor I know that that is evil because it hurts. The same applies if instead of my nose going to hit the floor it is somebody's fist that comes to hit my nose. But when I punch somebody else on the nose or, better still, when I hit him with a stick, when, best of all, I get a third person to give him a sound beating, then I don't feel any hurt, and I have no reason to believe that there is any evil. True, there is a feeling of sympathy, solidarity and oneness with all living creatures which can be developed to a nicety, but it can quite easily also be blunted into inexistence. On my allotment I kill slugs and wireworms almost without a qualm. Evil is what is done to you, not what you do to others, unless others can speak your same language and give you some of your medicine back. If slugs and wireworms were as big as I am and could use chemicals as effectively as those used against them I am practically certain that most farmers as well as myself would leave them alone. But the poor creatures are small and die without a word. As they have nothing to say for themselves and don't stand up for their rights they obviously have none. They are a pest to the garden while the gardener who is after the same vegetables is not. The gardener is a very virtuous person that kills as many slugs and wireworms as he can find. Now oppression is just that: something done to others that does not hurt the

doer, which the doer believes will avert hurt from himself and from the things he is after, a virtuous act so easy to perform that it makes it a pleasure to be virtuous. The fortunate or, as one used to say, the ruling classes, had so much leisure to think about their good fortune that they could not help reaching the conclusion that they fully deserved it. In fact they want more and more of it; they want it perfectly undisturbed. That is what they mean by progress, peace and prosperity, and other notes of their ethical drumbeating. They want a world with no evil, that is with nobody doing them harm, with nobody daring to turn up and tell them that he is harmed. So rebellion is the neatest and most efficient means to prove that "also" the weak and the unfortunate can be hurt, and that they are an authority on evil if they cannot be one on good. Rebellion thus prevents confusion between good and evil, keeps moral sense alive, and prevents hypocrisy from smothering everything under its cloak. The child that rebels against its father's punishment leaves him no longer sure that punishment is right. The pupil rebelling against his master makes the master reconsider the nature, purpose and methods of his teaching. Workers rebelling against their employers reveal the injury to human wholeness done by industrial exploitation, and the refusal to carry out an order in a police state shows up all the arbitrariness and violence that is behind and within any system devised to regulate a people's life. Rebellion is the surest guarantee against the triumph of false values, the defence of human heart-and-flesh reality against cerebral simplifications, a truth-reminder and a light which if nothing else makes prickly the laurels of the evil-doers and prevents them from sleeping with a good conscience.

GIOVANNI BALDELLI

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT!

WEEK 26

Deficit on Freedom 26 x £15 = £390

Contributions received in 26 weeks = £226

GAP £164

June 25th to July 2nd

Newcastle, Staffs.: R.E.W. 10/-; Glasgow: S.M. 2/6; New York: J.R. £1/15/0; London: S. 5/-; London: F.B. 3/-; Denver: R.B. £1/15/0; Menlo Park: O.R. 4/2; Gosport: H.G. 1/-; Chilcompton: J.C. 10/-; Kettering: E.A.N. 1/6; London: E.S. 3/-; London: Malatesta Club £5; Bolton: R.T.S. 5/-; London: P.J.B. 10/-; London: W.F.* 1/6; Cambridge: Comrades 3/-; London: W.F.* 2/-; London: D.R.* 5/-; Chelsea, Mass.: J.M. 14/-; San Francisco: per C.S.: C.S. £3/13/6; A.L. £1/1/0, P.P. £1/1/0; H.J. 14/-; P.S. 7/-; P.M. 3/6.

Total ... 19 10 8

Previously acknowledged ... 206 12 4

1954 TOTAL TO DATE ... £226 3 0