

# Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

In this Issue:

Children & Ourselves - p. 2

Party Conferences - p. 3

A Criticism of Stirner - p. 3

"One is free in proportion as one is strong; there is no real liberty save that which one takes for one's self."

—MAX STIRNER.

Vol. 15, No. 40

October 2nd, 1954

Three pence

## A NEW CIVIL DEFENCE CAMPAIGN OPENS

# Maxwell Fyfe & Morrison Agree

THE largest Civil Defence publicity campaign since the war, began last week, when a 500-yard column of vehicles drove through ten of London's Metropolitan boroughs. The column was reviewed in each borough by the Mayor and Council members, and the campaign will last for 30 days, with similar processions in other areas.

This is the beginning of the Home Secretary's reply to the 'rebel' local authorities (Coventry and Islington) which have decided to disband their Civil Defence committees on the grounds that there is no adequate defence possible against H-Bombs, and that the Government's present basis for organisation is so inadequate as to be worse than useless.

The Home Secretary, Sir David Maxwell Fyfe, has clearly been shaken by these boroughs' attitude, and is now, belatedly, vaguely and ineffectively, attempting to stir up some enthusiasm for the task of shovelling up the corpses, patching up the wounded and cheering up the homeless, which, it seems, is going to be the main contribution the C.D. forces can make to the defence of civilisation.

At a rally at Cambridge last week, Maxwell Fyfe could really add nothing to the peurile and horrifying arguments that have been used before. None of the advocates of an expanded C.D. Organisation deny that in fact there is nothing that can be done—or, shall we say, nothing that will be done—for the defence of those living in the centre of what will be a target area in an atom war.

Fyfe said that developments in atomic weapons would make necessary an expansion in peacetime establishments for civil defence, and that it would be 'prudent to raise larger forces in those areas where hitherto the rescue requirement had been small,' and the same consideration might apply to the welfare services.

We must make plans, he said, to disperse people, stores and equipment as much as we could, and those who lost their homes must be fed, housed and cared for. Did anybody seriously argue that measures like those would not be worth taking, would not save lives and mitigate suffering? If a hydrogen bomb should fall, it was obvious there would

be a great deal for civil defence forces to do in the perimeter zone and the country beyond.

### Written Off

In these glib phrases this unctuous politician seeks to cover up the real horror of what he is saying. The millions of people in the Metropolitan areas—the areas where the processions took place last week—will in fact be written off.

### Just to Remind Us

MORE than 500 mourners, most of them weeping women, to-day attended a funeral service for Aikichi Kuboyama, a young fisherman, who died on Thursday from the effects of radio-active ash from the hydrogen bomb explosion at Bikini on March 1.

Doctors stated that 22 of his ship-mates on the fishing boat *Lucky Dragon*, who were also affected, had lost their appetites and had been unable to sleep since Kuboyama's death. No change had been noticed in their physical condition, but they were depressed.

The fishermen at the hospital are being treated for jaundice—a severe attack of which almost killed Kuboyama earlier this month. Japanese doctors said that Kuboyama's jaundice was the result of "radiation disease."

Observer, 26/9/54.

Assuming that the hydrogen bombs are well aimed, and the scientists and airmen will take good care of that, and that they land well in the centre of the cities, all but the very largest cities will be completely wiped out. Inescapable death and utter destruction would extend over a very wide radius—and the self-appointed task of the good neighbours in Civil Defence will be to give aid to the survivors who crawl out of the radio-active rubble that was once their homes—on the wide perimeter of the destroyed area.

This would mean, in the case of London, that if a hydrogen bomb exploded above the City—the very centre of the great wen—it would be in places like Finchley in the North, Mitcham in the South, Barking in the East and Hounslow in the West, where the Civil Defence could be of its limited use.

Anybody living within the area bor-

dered by these suburbs might as well reconcile themselves to the fact that they are among the expendable.

In towns and cities smaller than London—and every other one is—the well-placed H-bomb could obliterate the whole of the central and suburban areas and the perimeter zone that Maxwell Fyfe refers to would be well out in the country. Coventry is a town small enough to be completely covered by the area of complete destruction.

### Small Cities Completely Covered

The only preparation that Civil Defence is prepared to make at the moment is the setting up of stations and depots at points outside towns and encircling them, ready to move into the fringe of a bombed area.

No wonder the Coventry town council decided they might as well spare themselves the expense of maintaining an organisation for that!

Maxwell Fyfe is not the only one who wants the country to rally to its own grave-digging. From the other side of the House comes the thunder of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Herbert Morrison. He is worried by the prospect of Labour councillors thinking for themselves, and in an article in 'Labour Press Service', a monthly service for Labour editors, he has laid down the law under the heading 'Civil Defence: Labour's Duty to the People.'

### 'Treachery!'

From a man who was a conscientious objector in the First World War, you might think that Labour's duty might be construed as making sure that another war does not occur. But this same man was Home Secretary himself during the Second World War, and must be remembered

Continued on p. 4

## Deakin Tries Blackmail

UNABLE to keep the Hull and Birkenhead dockers in the Transport & General Workers' Union by appeals to loyalty, Arthur Deakin has now resorted to blackmail to keep them in the ranks.

Because most dockers throughout the country (64,000 out of 75,000) are in the T.G.W.U., Deakin has been able to make monopoly terms with the employers in most ports, who have agreed to employ only T.G.W.U. card-holders, and to recognise only that union as a negotiating body.

On Merseyside, jobs in the docks are offered only to men whose names appear on lists supplied by the T.G.W.U. Deakin has now decided to operate the power this monopoly gives him, and has threatened that any docker going over to the Blue Union and falling behind in his subs for the White, will have his name struck off the list—in other words, will be deprived of his job.

To fill the jobs that will thus be vacant, the Birkenhead branch of the T.G.W.U. has posted notices inviting 1,000 new registrations for the waiting list. In other words they are prepared to recruit non-union labour (they mustn't take members of another union—that's against their own rules!) or their own members from other trades or other ports, to fill the jobs they have taken from their own ex-members.

This is the action taken by a man who so boldly denounces Communist dictatorship! This is the democratic behaviour of the man who helped to found the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions!

We think Deakin will lose. We think this blustering, dictatorial blackmail, will lose him more members rather than save his existing ones. Already the Manchester dockers have asked for a Blue union official to hold a meeting there;

it only requires the Liverpool men—across the Mersey from Birkenhead—to join in the transfer and there will simply not be a thing Deakin can do about it.

Even as it is, in Hull and Birkenhead, there is already a sufficient majority of dockers swinging over to give the Stevedores' & Dockers' Union a strong hand. And even though, as we outlined last week, we would rather see the creation of a Portworkers' Syndicate than the dockers simply going into another reformist union, we cannot but have some sympathy for the little Blue union in its struggle against the big-headed dictator in Transport House.

## COMMUNISTS OPPOSE BREAKAWAY

AN amusing sidelight on the dockers' breakaway, although of no importance whatsoever, is the Communist Party line.

Much as they hate Deakin's guts, the Commies are opposing the dockers' move from his union, although the General Secretary of the Stevedores' & Dockers', Dick Barrett, has been a fellow-traveller for years!

Behind it lies the C.P. infiltration of the T.G.W.U. Having been boring away for years, they hate to see the membership they have been trying to capture, suddenly walking out and leaving them high and dry. This attitude is likely to alienate Dick Barrett's sympathies (the fellow-travelling has been a matter of mutual convenience rather than ideology) and the Commies will find themselves without any following among dockers at all—except among those remaining in Deakin's union!

Their attitude has, so it is said, already led to Albert Timothy, a well-known unofficial leader in London who joined the Blue union some time ago, tearing up his C.P. membership card.

The path of the party-liner is certainly hard!

## BUT HE ONLY USES IT

IN how many ways do the advantages of nationalisation not seem to materialise!

At the annual conference of the Smoke Abatement Society at Scarborough (just before the experts on the smoke screen got busy) a British Railways official vigorously defended his employers' policy on the use of fuel, and denied that the railways are bad offenders in polluting the atmosphere.

A Birmingham City Councillor, W. A. N. Jones, however, disagreed. He said that the coal used on railways was in very many instances the worst possible for locomotives, and the great liaison hoped for between the National Coal Board and the Railways seemed to be lacking in practical ways.

What does a City Councillor know about it? He happens to be an engine driver. He only uses the coal the N.C.B. supplies.

ANARCHO-SYNDICALIST.

## Schine (of Cohn, Schine & McCarthy) Sent to Alaska

David Schine, former special investigator for Senator McCarthy, is being sent next month to military duties in Alaska, according to an Army announcement yesterday. He has been promoted from private to private first class (equivalent to lance-corporal).—Reuter.

Is the posting of McCarthy's former bloodhound to Alaska an indication of Eisenhower's displeasure (as banishment to Siberia was of Stalin's) or, on the basis that once a bloodhound always a bloodhound, has he perhaps been sent, on McCarthy's advice, to investigate the Indians and the Seals, and to obtain an assurance from the local foxes, that they have nothing in common with that old Fox in the Kremlin?

## THE BUILDING RACKET

(From a Correspondent)

A REPORT published by the Monopolies Commission this week accuses London builders of price-fixing among themselves, of conducting their affairs in such a way as to restrict competition, as well as of other practices which the Commission considers harmful to the public interest.

Of the London Builders' Conference it complains that member firms communicate prices among themselves or even adjust amounts of tenders by arrangement. This, says the report, appears "to frustrate the purpose of this system of tendering, since the tenders cease to be the independent offers they are held out to be."

The L.B.C., of course contend that price-fixing tends to discourage price-cutting "which leads to depreciation of quality". And this of course in theory is true. In practice it does not work out. The majority of contractors will get away with bad work if they can whether they have put in a good price or not. What is more, their outside Staff—foreman, gangers, etc., have been trained to "skimp" the work whenever possible, and it becomes a kind of conditioned reflex with many of them. The present writer recalls working on a job which was on a "cost-plus" basis (i.e. the contractor was reimbursed for all costs and a percentage was added for his overheads and profits) and therefore the more money spent in labour and materials the greater were the contractor's profits. Yet the men on the job were encouraged by the foreman to do such things as drop "plums" (large lumps of stone or rubble) into concrete foundations, whenever the inspector's back was turned, so as to economise on

the concrete. The poor man was so conditioned that he could not adjust himself to the new "cost plus" conditions!

Even the Commission cannot find anything "either in the evidence or in reason" to show that the L.B.C.'s price-fixing achieves their avowed purposes of preventing bad quality work.

Furthermore, the report criticises the L.B.C.'s "fair price" scheme. The scheme, it says, is in abeyance, but it is an indication of how the L.B.C. conduct their affairs. This, says the report, is how it works:

"Where, in the chairman's opinion, the preliminary [tender] prices show an unduly wide spread, the average of the lowest two-thirds becomes the fair price and the chairman directs the lowest tenderer to increase his price by a sum sufficient to raise his price to the fair price."

"An even clearer case of restriction of competition occurs when the chairman detects an 'uneconomic' price, and the tenderer accepts a recommendation to withdraw."

We are always reminded that competition is the life-blood of capitalism and the guarantee that the customer has choice. In fact the only real competition is carried on between the small miserable shopkeepers—much of it dishonest since the customer pays in the long run through short-weight and standard stock. On top are the monopolists who make sure that there will be no undercutting. It is not only the Building trade that is a racket. Read about the Electric Lamp Monopoly. Or to be more topical, read about the king of monopolists, William Lever, of Unilever, whose history has been published only this week.

## BRITISH DESTROY HOSPITAL

IN all wars the strongest argument advanced by governments to convince their countrymen of the brutality of the "enemy" is to be able to say that he bombs hospitals. For those who believe that there are rules of conduct in war, a hospital is not a military target. This country has been one of the strongest upholders of this "rule" of war, and has exposed the "bestiality" of those countries that have broken it.

Yet in the *Times* for September 25, in a report from that newspaper's correspondent in Nairobi which refers to the brutalities of Mau Mau in stabbing to death two children and a woman on a farm in Kiambu, a district of Nairobi, we also read the following:

"On the outskirts of Nairobi, Kikuyu guards and men of the Kenya regiment killed four terrorists, destroyed a Mau Mau hospital furnished with a supply of medicine and food and arrested six Kikuyu women food carriers" (our italics).

## THE TEMPLE OF MIDAS?

THE two weeks hold-up in building operations on the London site where a Roman temple has come to light, is costing money. Sir David Eccles, Minister of Works, said last week that the company which is building the office block is losing about £10,000 every week that work is delayed, but that Mr. Aynsley Bridgland, chairman of the company, "has been very sporting about the whole thing."

We can only surmise that Mr. Bridgland's firm can well afford to be "sporting". Could you afford to have £10,000 knocked off your wages each week without noticing it?

May we make a suggestion, that the office block to be built on the site of the Temple of Mithras, should be named the Temple of Midas?

## VIEWPOINTS

## CHILDREN AND OURSELVES

IN an age when everyone talks about "discipline", it is necessary for the philosophical educator to talk about spontaneity. And today, when so many talk about spontaneity and love—"a child needs love, and love alone"—the philosophical educator may again find himself trying to restore psychological balance.

Actually, there is a common denominator of these terms, even though their meanings are usually set off one against the other. When a condition of understanding love exists between two people, this bond of itself imposes a stricter "discipline" than any other force possibly could. This is because no one performs tasks so well, devotes himself so thoroughly to the details of perfection in action, as the man who has an absorbing interest in the end to be served. And so it is that the men who unselfishly devote themselves to the service of group or nation seem to have a greater energy potential than the mere self-seeker, no matter how ambitious the latter. For a child, the desire to serve or benefit a loved parent will command a concentration and meticulousness which no cat-o-nine-tails punishment threat could duplicate. Thus the man or child who truly loves will have the world and all of discipline. So far as society and family are concerned, it is also important for the one loved to be worthy of devotion, but even those who love unworthy people are committed to the disciplines which love demands.

However, as always, when the much used and abused word "love" is used, its meaning needs to be made clear. Love as philosophers define it is not an emotional state—though emotional states of a pleasing nature may indeed accompany it. Love, we should say, is a voluntary identification with the needs of another person, so that in all events, whether favorable or unfavorable to self, the needs of that other are held in mind and fully incorporated into each action. Since "discipline" means a continued application of energy, a constancy of behavior and attitude, it seems that no other discipline would be as complete as that inaugurated and maintained by love. A complication, however, is that when human beings mature, they de-

velop more exacting stands in regard to the people they may love. This is not done consciously, and in some cases, indeed, it may seem clear that an actual retrogression has taken place in discrimination, but most people show themselves capable of evolution in perspective. So what actually happens is that few persons able to evoke full love are encountered.

This suggests that the reason why so few are loved completely is not because there is no one willing to love them, but, instead, because they themselves have never become sufficiently disciplined to command continuous respect and admiration—essential elements in any true love. If this is so, then we have said, in effect, that one must love to be self-disciplined, and that one must be disciplined to know how to love or be loved.

The relationship here suggested between "love" and "discipline" is clarified by a third term—"devotion." "Devotion," when separated from its sentimental or fanatical associations, implies a constancy in which love and zeal combine. Joseph Shipley's *Dictionary of Word Origins* has this to say about "devotion":

When the ancients devoted themselves to a thing—or devoted a thing to a god—they made a vow concerning it: L. *de*, in regard to, + *vovere*, *vo-*, to vow. Vow itself is via OFr. *vou* from the same L. *votum*; hence *vow* and *vote* are doublets; the *vote* registers the determination. The word *vot* meant first a solemn pledge; then an ardent wish.

Since we usually associate "discipline" with authority—and then deprecate both—it is well to note that there are two kinds of authority, just as there are two kinds of discipline. Erich Fromm makes this clear in a passage from *Escape From Freedom*:

The use of the term "authoritarian" makes it necessary to clarify the concept of authority. So much confusion exists with regard to this concept because it is widely believed that we are confronted with the alternative of having dictatorial, irrational authority

or of having no authority at all. This alternative, however, is fallacious. The real problem is what kind of authority we are to have. When we speak of authority do we mean rational or irrational authority? *Rational authority* has its source in *competence*. The person whose authority is respected functions competently in the task with which he is entrusted by those who conferred it upon him. He need not intimidate them nor arouse their admiration by magic qualities; as long as and to the extent to which he is completely helping, instead of exploiting, his authority is based on rational grounds and does not call for irrational awe.

Joining the implications of these paragraphs, we should say that there is always a distinct human need—not simply societal need, but a per-

sonal or individual need—for recognition of the principle of order in human conduct. The fact that the authoritarians, whether of church or state, have always insisted that *their* order be the one accepted does not countermand the imperative. It is simply that people are happiest when they live up to an ideal of constancy and consistency, linked to some form of transcendent purpose. Now, while no parent can "give" a set of transcendent purposes to his children, he can provide an environment in which the young gain experience with discipline. They are in a natural position to do so, according to Fromm's point, when their own "competence" in evaluating the total needs of the household is adequately demonstrated. Their "authority" can, in a general sense, be accepted without question, *precisely because it does have a rational base*. The parent who has practised sufficient self-discipline upon his own wayward and negative emotions, moreover, earns respect as a just man, and those who are known to be just are trusted. If it is announ-

ced by such a parent that the child's share of work in the household should consist of such and such, there is no immediate reason for questioning, nor a natural desire to question, his decision. And such an assumption of natural prerogative, based upon the recognition of the need of the child for constructive disciplines of work, must by no means be regarded as *ipso facto* authoritarian.

So, to come back to the relationship between "love" and "discipline", is it not possible that the introduction of children to the meaning of discipline is one of the best ways of preparing them to enjoy the meaning and benefit of love itself? Such is the view defended here, one which encourages parents who have been intimidated by slogans such as "Don't be an authoritarian in your own home" to analyze their meaning and to recognize that while authoritarianism based on fear is always a bad thing, competent authority need not be at loggerheads with love and affection between parents and children. (from *Manas*, U.S.A.)

## ON TRADITION &amp; DISCUSSION

IT is a pertinent question to ask why many anarchists are almost systematically against traditional values and institutions. The reasons are many, and one of them is that new would-be values and institutions hold the initiative of an attack, which with good or bad arguments and the power and determination to suppress arguments is directed against anarchists as well as others, while the traditional ones are comparatively unaggressive, resting as they do on the assumption that they are firmly established, and that their preservation is merely a matter of routine education and police duties, requiring no exceptional display or exertion of power.

I suppose it is quite possible to draw up a logical case against tradition in general, and to justify the turning of it into a term of opprobrium, but in any concrete case in which a tradition is attacked there is usually some psychological and emotional element behind. Behind each defence of tradition, on the other hand, there is usually some privilege or interest at stake, but that does not invalidate the argument that for anything to become traditional there must have been in it some adequacy and efficacy, and that the test of time and experience has shown its value. There remains the question of beginnings which if marked by persecution and suppression

of dissidents exposes a tradition to severe ethical condemnation. Because I do not consider man's loyalty to ethical ideals utterly suppressible, and for other considerations besides, I do not believe that Communism will ever universally triumph or live indefinitely undisturbed. The reckoning in the Kremlin, however, seems by many signs to be that its rightness is to become undoubted when all doubters will be disposed of, and a whole generation be brought up with no other experience than that of the Communist dispensation. This generation, it is claimed, will be perfectly happy. It is a sinister claim, and some of this sinister quality is attached to more modest yet similar claims in favour of practically any tradition. Yet, even so, tradition *qua* tradition is not to be condemned.

★  
MAN is the animal presenting the greatest variety of modes of behaviour, and the only one that alters them continually. Some specimens and some whole sections of the species at some time making it their main business, either directly, or by first altering radically their immediate surroundings. That does not prevent him, though, from enjoying stability and regularity of patterns, and even in his eagerness for change, one motivating force is the desire of achieving a new pattern possessing these qualities when the old possess them no more or are otherwise unsatisfactory. Novelty and change may be sought for their own sake, but the same people who seek them are then led to oppose them in turn simply out of tiredness or because they think they have finally found the novelty and effected the change which they particularly wanted. The revolutionary, in other words, if successful at all, turns into a reactionary, and the anarchist revolutionary, if given the chance, will probably prove no exception to the general rule. He will make it his business, at any rate, to defend and preserve the anarchist dispensation. Thinking that it is good he will look forward and contribute to its lasting in time, and rely on its lasting in time to convince himself and others of its goodness.

There will be, therefore, an anarchist tradition. Already, to a certain extent, there is an anarchist tradition in thought, attitudes and means. It is unfortunately very seldom defined, and opinions about it are contradictory and confused, one reason for it being that frequently there goes with attachment to, and respect for, the tradition the feeling that it is in many respects inadequate or that it has actually broken down. In some cases, then, there is no tradition at all, and if the fact can be boasted as a proof of a one hundred per cent. anarchist practice and vitality, it can also, and more rightly, be lamented as an indication that in those particular cases anarchists have been unable to actualize and develop forms of their own.

One of these cases is the running of meetings, the principles abided by in a discussion, and the manner of reaching and carrying out decisions. From my own limited experience I can only recollect examples of more or less rigid democratic procedures, of waste of time, goodwill, and energies, and quite a few in which *de facto* dictatorial methods carried the day. Theoretically, the Quakers' method of not reaching a decision until unanimity has been arrived at

seems to me the most in keeping with anarchist principles and postulates. To achieve unanimity, however, the Quakers rely on what they take as a direct inspiration from God, and if anarchists, rejecting inspiration from God, cannot achieve unanimity, there must be something wrong either with them or with the principles they hold. There may be something wrong with them because, apart from individual idiosyncracies they do not go to their meetings with purity of intentions, and there may be something wrong with their principles because these have not been clearly sorted out or are too big for the issues under discussion. Unanimity of course, need not always be achieved, especially when two or more courses of action can be taken separately or successively. But more often than not, for the strength and good name of the movement or simply because material conditions are such that only one course of action can be taken, unanimity is essential. If it is not achieved the minority is voted out on the same bad grounds anarchists reproach to parliamentary methods, no course of action is taken or those individuals act who have the power to act, as they could or might as well have acted before without calling a meeting.

★  
I HAVE recently seen a method experimented, though not very successfully yet, but I feel confident that with further experiments and with participants better trained and more conscious both of the method and of the experiment whose faults could be mended which impede it at present and make me hesitant to affirm that it corresponds to anarchist desiderata. The method consists in a presentation of the various points of view, and if these cannot be reconciled, win or give way on the strength of their own merits, then a search is started for the motives and intentions behind each speaker's arguments, and success is found to depend on the degree of honesty and perceptibility of the persons concerned. It does not take long for most of them to learn the usual tricks of rationalization and deal with them accordingly. It has been objected that those with more exerted logical powers or reader to accept logic as their guide fare better in the discussion than the others, but it soon becomes evident that motives and intentions do not need logical support in order to be valid. It is to my mind a sign of rationality to recognize the strength and validity of most irrational motives. The method demands and tends to achieve the utmost frankness. From frankness follows not only clarity but also mutual trust; from clarity and trust there follows communication, and from communication agreement. That is when everything goes well. Acceptance of the method, in any case, is already a basis for agreement, an authority within the individual and not imposed from without. Another great advantage is that the method brings out or actually creates common grounds, standards of rationality, ideas, feelings, and intentions from which agreement on particular issues follow without difficulty. The method is also made to reveal differences and these are either ironed out at their origin or else are shown to be irreconcilable; in which case the persons at the meeting must make a rule of compromise or break up the meeting and go their several ways.

GIOVANNI BALDELLI.

## FILM

## A Blight on the Corn

"Le Blé en Herbe" (translated by the English distributors as "Ripening Seed"), which is now at the Rialto cinema, had a stormy passage on its tour of the French provinces, where the Catholics tried, by means of organized hooliganism and behind-the-scenes pressure on managements, to prevent its being shown. This may perhaps surprise those who still suffer from the delusion that puritanism is a peculiarly Protestant vice unknown in those warmer and more human climes where Catholicism flourishes. The Catholics' hostility was probably aroused because the film deals with an "immoral" subject—the seduction of a boy of 16 by a woman of 40.

But perhaps, too, they were affronted by an early scene in the film where the boy, whose canoe has capsized, staggers ashore quite naked on a part of the beach where some young Catholic school-girls are being superintended at their bathe by two gorgons from the *Sacré Coeur* convent. This scene, in which the little girls' delight at the apparition of the naked young man is in sharp contrast with the shocked horror of their guardians, underlines with devastating irony the negative and repressive attitude of life that has been Christianity's main contribution to Western civilization.

The film, taken from a novel by Colette, is the sort of thing that only the French can do well, and the Anglo-Saxons not at all. The boy, Phil (Pierre-Michel Beck), is on holiday in Brittany with his parents and a 15-year-old girl, Vinca (Nicole Berger). The boy and girl have been playmates for many years; but this summer their relationship has become unstable and strained, for their affection for each other is changing slowly to love. They are unsure of themselves; the girl is as unprepared for it as the boy but undismayed; he resents the change that he can feel and resist

it, wanting their relationship to remain as it was before. We discover, too (and we are not surprised, for he is a well brought up boy), that he feels himself trapped in the web of present-day society: he is only too well aware of the pattern of behaviour that seems to the young an inevitable and eternal part of this sorry scheme of things. He feels his economic dependence keenly. "A girl can get married at 15," he says, "but a boy must wait until he is 25. Even at 21 he is still only almost a man."

Mme. Dallaret (Edwige Feuillère), spending a lonely holiday at her seaside villa, understands what is happening to Phil better than he does himself. When he meets her he is charmed. She is as self-assured and well at ease as he is uncertain, shy, and awkward. She has that enviable grasp of things that the young believe all older people to possess.

Their liaison is short, secretive, and troubled; but it is enormously beneficial. When the holiday ends we feel that Phil and Vinca are at last finding their feet on firm ground that will take them safely through the morass of social convention even if it does not lead them out of it. For they will never, of course, be rebels against the society that has made growing up so difficult for them: they will compromise with it; but it will not break them as it has broken so many.

The director, Claude Autant-Lara, has handled his difficult subject well. He has eschewed the device used in so many films nowadays of having a running commentary to tell us what emotions are masked by the agonists' deadpan faces and inflexible voices. This has meant that the actors have had to act, and they act uncommonly well. I cannot remember any other film in which such a range and depth of feeling has been so convincingly suggested. E.P.

## FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

## OPEN DAILY

OPEN 10 a.m. to 6.30; 5.0 SATURDAYS

## New Books . . .

The Assassins F. A. Ridley 8/6  
A History of Soviet Russia: The  
Interregnum E. H. Carr 30/-

## Reprints &amp; Cheap Editions . . .

The Old Wives' Tale Arnold Bennett 7/-  
The Republic (Lindsay trans.) Plato 6/-  
Complete Plays Henry James 7/6  
Seven Men Max Beerbohm 2/-  
Oblomov Goncharov (trs. Magarshack) 3/6  
Leibniz Ruth Lydia Saw 2/6

## Second-Hand . . .

The Prince N. Machiavelli 2/-  
An Assessment of Twentieth Century Literature J. Isaacs 2/6  
The Death of a Moth Virginia Woolf 2/6  
The Color of a Great City Theodore Dreiser 2/6  
My Father's House (Oneida) P. Noyes 6/-  
Geography of Hunger Josue De Castro 4/-  
Attempts at General Union G. D. H. Cole 5/-  
A Coat of Many Colours Herbert Read 2/6  
Lectures and Essays R. G. Ingersoll 5/-  
The Paris Commune Frank Jellinek 5/-  
How to be Happy though Human W. Beran Wolfe 6/-  
Principles of Freedom Terence MacSwiney 3/-  
Man's Worldly Goods Leo Huberman 4/-

Postage free on all items

Obtainable from

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

## PARTY CONFERENCES

PARTY conferences are no more than formal symbolic gestures to a democratic principle which has long been sacrificed to realism, control from above and the block vote. At the Labour Party Conference which has been held at Scarborough during the past week the voice of the 607 Constituency Parties with some 2,000 votes each has been swamped by the 70 Trade Unions each with an average of 70,000 votes, though from the purely democratic point of view it is the voice of the Party and not the Unions—whose rôle is allegedly non-political (or at least so we understood when the Union leaders pledged themselves to work as harmoniously with the present government as they had done with the Labour government), which should determine the policy to be adopted by the party. But then the party machinery is kept oiled mainly by the millions of pennies deducted from the millions of Trade Unionists, rather than from the Constituency Parties, and the old rule that who pays the piper calls the tune is not lost on Mr. Deakin and his fellow Union bosses, nor, one supposes, on the paid party officials at the receiving end.

But it would also appear that even when the National Executive's policies are turned down by the vote the leadership can still turn a deaf ear and a blind eye to the majority wish and carry on in its own sweet way.

The *Manchester Guardian*, which, since its change of editorship, has never concealed its open hostility to the Labour Party in general, and the Bevanites in particular, could be expected to report unfavourably on the Conference. But with all that, the *M.G.* is a firm believer in democracy, party politics, and rule by government and all those values dear to both Labour and Conservative politicians. Yet in its issue for last Monday dealing with the debate on the rearmament of Germany that was to take place on the second day of the conference (and we write these lines before the opening of the conference), its Labour Correspondent presented a picture of what might happen if the Executive was defeated, which, had it been written by an anarchist, would be dismissed as another example of our hostility on principle to all politics!

If the rebels are successful—wrote the *M.G.* correspondent—and the official policy rejected then the brain reels at the conceivable consequences. Political logic would insist: the alternative is the abdication of the leaders whose policy has been overturned or the acceptance of the leaders of a policy the direct opposite of their own. Either the party would be shorn of leaders (for their defeat would not be to the same extent a Bevanite triumph), or the leaders of their integrity (for if they bowed down before the will of the conference their new creed could only be an hypocrisy).

The brain reels, logic insists. But at your shoulder the nagging critic is there to whisper, "Don't be a fool. If they're beaten, nothing at all will happen. No one will resign. There'll be a few fine speeches about Conference being the policy and the need to preserve the unity of the party and accept majority decisions. For a month or two Dalton or someone will be the spokesman, and the situation will change, and there'll be room once more for another Executive resolution..." An imp, too, propounds yet another possibility. There are to be two votes on Tuesday, so both resolutions could be carried in spite of one meaning precisely the opposite of the other. Everyone would have won, and everyone lost, the roundabout would start turning again, and the swings swing.

So it transpires that in spite of an agenda as long as the Bible, and an impressive gathering of some 1,300

## A CRITICISM OF STIRNER

EVER since Stirner was rediscovered by Mackay, about fifty years or so ago, his philosophy has been popular in the anarchist movement. It is no coincidence that his rise to popularity coincided with the dulling of the bright hopes of an early social revolution, that had acted as such a potent inspiration for the revolutionaries of the nineteenth century. Stirner's romantic individualism, for that is what it is, though it mask itself under the disguise of "science", fills the breach left by the world-wide collapse of revolutionary hopes. This accounts no doubt for the religious fervour of his devotees, when they counsel you to read his book, his only important work, *The Ego and its Own*. They are so enthusiastic about this work that it recalls a hymn that we were made to sing as children. It goes:

*Oh, the best book to read is the Bible!*  
(three times)  
*If you read it every day,*  
*It will help you on your way.*  
*Oh, the best book to read is the Bible!*

The book was published in 1844, and had a period of shortlived fame. Then it and its author fell into oblivion, from which they were not rescued till Mackay published his *Max Stirner, his Life and Work* in 1897. This brought Stirner back into the public eye, where he has remained.

However, during his shortlived heyday he caused no little stir, as the following doggerel proves. Incidentally it also seems to set the tone of the general attitude to him adopted both by friends and enemies ever since.

*D'ye see Max Stirner sitting there?*  
*At present he is drinking beer,*  
*But, I am sure that he will*  
*of human blood soon drink his fill.*  
*Others cry, "Down with kings for ever-*  
*more!"*

*But Stirner adds, "Down with all law!"*

Stirner, who real name was Kaspar Schmidt, was born in Bayreuth in 1806, and his life was uneventful until he became a member of the club of the "Affranchis" ("The Liberated Ones") in Berlin during the thirties and forties. The Affranchis were a group of "intellectuals" who discussed all sorts of things, politics, theology, and philosophy. These young men were rather wild, by German standards, and once provoked the reproof of Arnold Ruge, who visited them. "It is not with piggish behaviour that one liberates men and peoples!" Marx and Engels frequented their meetings for a time, but not for very long.

Stirner, although he attended their meetings for ten years, never seemed quite to "belong". "He always wore his ironic smile, a dreamy but penetrating glance came from his blue eyes behind their steel-rimmed glasses. Mackay shows him to us as cold, impassive and impenetrable, keeping himself to himself, even with those he was on familiar terms with... His character did not lead him either to love or to hate passionately." He was eminently respectable, although his wife tried to vilify him in her old age. He died in 1856 in poverty and obscurity, the notoriety that his book had brought him disqualifying him from continuing his profession of schoolmaster.

His ideas were considered unsuitable for young minds, especially female ones.

Stirner's philosophy, as expounded in *The Ego and its Own*, is quite simple, though the book itself is heavy going by modern standards. A courageous friend of mine fought his way through it with gritted teeth, on trips round the Parisian métro. No doubt it took his mind off the discomforts of the journey. Its main point is this. Man consults his own good, not that of Humanity, God, Morality, The State, Duty, or Honour. The wise man, however, is conscious of this and unashamed of it, whereas the ordinary person seeks unconsciously to cover up his self-seeking by sacrificing and abnegating himself. In some cases the process is conscious. Mystics, especially Christian ones, have in all ages tried to throw away "the weary burden of self", and have tried to persuade others (or force them) to do the same. The "conscious egoist" is the man who is not not ashamed of putting himself first, the "unconscious egoist" is the one who is, and tries to conceal his egotism from himself and everyone else.

Stirner says in effect, "Consult your own interest first. You will in fact do so in any case, but why not be open about it and try to do the best you can for yourself. Do not throw yourself away for some abstract principle." It can easily be seen what a lot of disputes there are going to be about the interpretation and practice of his doctrine. Some will see in it a gospel of revolt, others simply regard it as an incitement to abandoning the struggle, and seeking one's advantage by going along with the stream. It seems to me to be true, but only part of the truth.

For Stirner did not shrink from taking his idea of "looking after number one"

to its ultimate conclusions. He praised the Frenchwoman who strangled her baby during the Retreat from Moscow. She is supposed (at least by Stirner) to have done this so as not to be encumbered, but the reason may well have been that she could not bear to see it suffering from hunger and cold.

There is no such thing as "right" says Stirner, "right" is an abstraction; the Frenchwoman has a "right" to strangle her baby simply because she was the stronger. This is a return to:

*The good old rule, the simple plan,*  
*That he takes, who has the power,*  
*And, that he holds, who can.*

This justifies the worst evils of capitalist exploitation, according to Stirner's opponents, and it is difficult to see where they are wrong.

For society as a whole Stirner envisaged "an association of egoists". He seems to have imagined that if everyone were a "conscious egoist" they would be all about equally strong. Each person would consult his own interest, and their striving would result in a balance. This is most improbable. Such a society would surely lead straight back to a class-based social system, with all the humbug and false idealism that Stirner hated so much.

People talk of "Stirnerites" as if Stirner had disciples. But in reality Stirner is one of the few great teachers who have had no disciples. We blame Christians for not following Christ, but no one, not even the most ferocious rebel, will blame a so-called "Stirnerite" for not following Stirner. Stirner's teaching seems to run in a circle. What indeed is the distinction between "conscious egoist" and "unconscious egoist"? The early Christians seem to belong to the latter category, and yet no psychologist

would deny that in a sense they enjoyed being martyred. If so, surely they were consulting their own interests in sacrificing themselves?

Stirner's genius lay in the fact that he saw clearly a facet of the truth, which is, after all, as much as any of us can expect to do, and having perceived it, he explored it to the full. Unlike the other "intellectuals" of his day, who made a god of Humanity, Justice, Freedom or the General Good, he saw that men have an inherent tendency to put themselves first, and therefore the way to true emancipation lies in getting them to gratify that desire openly and sanely. After all, society is composed of a collection of persons, not of noble principles.

In our movement one finds that most people read Stirner, find great encouragement in him, and then pass on. The actual number of "Stirnerites" is small although noisy. They talk about their "egoism" and then go and behave in the most self-sacrificing manner. *The Ego and its Own* is a rung on the ladder of self-emancipation. It is not the end of the journey; still less is it a holy book to be made the very centre of a person's philosophy. One draws from Stirner a feeling of courage and an increased respect for oneself. One becomes more inclined to seek one's resources from within than from without. But that does not mean that one becomes a worshipper.

ARTHUR W. ULOTH.

## Generosity with Strings Attached

CAIRO, SEPTEMBER 26.

A Government spokesman said to-day that Egypt had refused an American offer of military aid because of certain conditions attached to it. He said Egypt was receiving increasing quantities of arms from abroad, especially Belgium and Sweden.—*British United Press.*

What are the "conditions attached" we wonder? Was there some kind of political interference involved?

## FILMS HUMAN SOLIDARITY

ONE imagines that one of the difficulties facing the producer of a worthwhile film with a propaganda theme is holding the "message" in check so that it does not intrude to the exclusion of all the other considerations. Judging from the general standard of films, it seems that most producers get over this difficulty by ignoring it.

The film, *Salt of the Earth*, now showing in London,\* contrary to the opinions of the selective carpers of Fleet Street, avoids vulgar over-emphasis and combines an acting ability which is astonishing considering that more than half the cast, including the male lead, are non-professional. The story was written by Michael Wilson, who wrote the script for *A Place in the Sun*. The film was sponsored by the International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers and was shot entirely on location in a zinc-mining district of New Mexico. It was from here that the majority of the cast was selected—Mexican miners and their families, who daily live with the problems

\*At the Academy Cinema Oxford Street.

portrayed in the film. Some of the group (reputed to be Communists) responsible for the production have been up before the un-American Activities Committee and have thereby lost their jobs in Hollywood. Their answer to their inquisitors is to set up an independent unit of their own, and even while on location for this film, attempts were made by local vigilantes to intimidate them into stopping it, and at one point the leading actress, Rosaura Revueltas, was arrested.

The story is simply about a strike, the culmination of a long series of accidents in the mine due to the refusal by the Company to observe proper safety precautions. Involved in the strikers' demands is also the question of equality between the Mexican and American miners, or "Anglos" as they are called, and the fact that the housing conditions supplied by the company are very poor for the Mexicans' families, but for the Anglos there is hot piped water and proper sanitation.

The men successfully picket at the pit-head for a few weeks, combatting attempts to import blacklegs, and one of the leaders is beaten up by the sheriff's men and thrown into jail for "resisting arrest". Where intimidation fails, an injunction is brought under the Taft-Hartley Act making it illegal for striking miners to continue picketing. This is overcome by the women folk, who are determined to add their demands for proper sanitation to those of the men, and are in fact carrying on a campaign of their own for equality with their menfolk. The women, in spite of resistance by the men, take over the picket line, and when in time some are arrested, scores of other women and girls come from surrounding villages to take their places.

Eventually, as a last resort, the Company decide on eviction. But as the news flashes round, hundreds of silent, bitter men and their families gather round the striker's house, doing and saying nothing, but menacing enough to make the sheriff and his men lose their nerve—especially as the women start carrying back the furniture through the back door, as they throw it out the front.

The film conveys in a moving way the spirit and inspiration of solidarity. The perceptible realisation of Ramon Quintero (played by Juan Chacon, himself a miner) that women have rights of their own gives the impression of a man painfully involved in a conflict of ideas.

In approving of this film and congratulating the group responsible for it, we are not unaware of their probable political opinions, nor are we insensitive to the position of the film industry in the Soviet Union. But the observation, made

by at least one critic in a daily paper, that such an independent group could not operate inside Russia is totally irrelevant to the film itself. Nor did we notice the critics informing their readers of the attempts by an American Senator to prevent the film being exported.

Most critics in the capitalist press have tended to ignore the technical, artistic and human merits of the film, and to be more concerned with its origin. This leads us to believe that these critics, where they are not frankly prejudiced, have no more freedom to express an opinion than writers in the Soviet Union. If journalists choose to sell themselves in this way, that may be their own affair, except that their highly prejudiced comments can help to prevent such films as *The Salt of the Earth* being exhibited on the ordinary cinema circuits.

We suggest this might be combatted if our readers outside London request for the film to be shown at their local cinemas. It will be well worth their effort to do this.

R.M.

## & Poetic Anarchy

ALSO in the same programme at the Academy is a little film that should greatly appeal to anarchists. Made in a light fantastic vein, photographed in the grounds of the old Crystal Palace, it is a charming fable of the triumph of love and life over the black forces of death and repression.

Into the old park, peopled by statues, comes a selection of odd characters who, for all their differences, have one thing in common—love has escaped them. And to make darned sure they stay that way, Colonel Pall K. Gargoyl, a prude from the Ministry, rules the park by regulation and restriction.

However, a subversive American, all the way from Californ-i-ay, lights a lamp in the heart of a girl hitherto dominated by her Aunt, which sets fire to love-matches all round. Colonel Gargoyl turns out with his troop of grave diggers from the Ministry, who prepare to put down the rebellion, which has been started by the good fairy (Hattie Jacques of *ITMA* fame), but she loses her magic scarf and things look very black, with every pair of new-found lovers being rounded up for the grave.

It all comes right in the end, however, with a little more magic and a lot more love—which, as we see, is the thing Col. Gargoyl is really frightened of—and a tug-of-war between the forces of law and order and the freedom lovers ends just the way it should. I think we could do with a few good fairies in the anarchist movement.

P.S.

## Moroccan Leaders Released

AFTER being held in prison for nearly two years, fifty-one Moroccans, mainly leaders of the Istiqlal party and of the C.G.T., have been released by the French military authorities.

They were originally arrested on charges of having instigated the Casablanca riots of December 1952 but now the military investigating magistrate dealing with their case has recognised that there is no ground for the prosecution.

It is suggested by some observers that the decision to release these men without trial is a political and not a judicial, measure implementing the Resident General's promise of clemency so that representatives of all opinions might take part in the promised Council of Reforms.

delegates, covered by hundreds of journalists, and watched by foreign and home observers the Labour Party Conference is like all the other party conferences: a mere façade. Policy only is discussed at Scarborough; decisions are taken elsewhere!

On the other hand it is also possible that the authorities feared that if the men were brought to trial more light would be shed on the provocative rôle played by the police in the riots.

Whatever the motives, as the *Manchester Guardian's* correspondent points out, the withdrawal of the charges against the 51 men released is by implication a denial of the statements on the causes of the riots solemnly made by the present Resident General's predecessor. And also by implication these 51 innocent men have spent a total of nearly one hundred years in prison on false charges.

## MCCARTHY

The Watkins Committee, consisting of six Senators, three Republicans and three Democrats, who have been investigating THE Investigator, Senator McCarthy, have now published their findings. They have recommended that the Senate should censure McCarthy on two of the five counts under investigation.

# Reflections from the Ivory Tower

IN a recent article in FREEDOM certain references were made to my opinion on the problems of Anarchists. Once again the issue of the "Ivory Tower" has cropped up and I would like to add a point or two. In a subsequent article in FREEDOM I suggested that the characteristics of any social idea by virtue of its essence, either cements one to a group, or isolates one. One cannot maintain any idea in a vacuum. The object of these comments is to try and explore whether orthodox anarchist activity is not really the "Ivory Tower" that the community of to-day is supposed to be. I make these comments in a spirit of observation rather than criticism as obviously anarchist activity is a real and vital thing to the comparatively few that it reaches.

Whether we like it or not politics is made by political parties and any real movement in politics is to-day made either directly by the Communist Party or by groups very much influenced by it.

The anarchist, guided by his ideas and rejecting correctly the structure of a political party as well as the authoritarianism of Communism has excluded himself from this vast field of socio-political activity. The structure and change of a party or programme is determined by the vote. This too, rejected by the anarchist on very rational grounds, has again isolated him from the broad masses. The

people as a whole, geared as they are to political parties, votes and programmes, find the sudden responsibility the anarchist suggests to them alien to their political thought processes, and a large school of psychology even suggests that sudden responsibility thrust on to someone who has never possessed it can only produce a reaction of anxiety and bewilderment. As rational as the anarchist, in his analysis of the futility of political activity may be, to the man in the street this kind of political activity is what he understands and within its framework may even operate.

Although it may not be part of an official anarchist ideology, the anarchist of to-day is sufficiently acquainted with the fact that the average adult has his character foundations laid in his youth by education and family structure. The foundation for any political attitude or value judgment has been laid in early youth. Hence the contemporary moral family structure must be destroyed to produce a "free" thinking individual.

To the man in the street the family is the most stabilising influence he knows to-day. To destroy his most fundamental anchor for a nebulous theory which as yet has no concrete example can only tend to isolate him from anarchists and in turn anarchists from him. The millions who may feel the strictures of the family structure, yet see no obvious living

alternative, will hardly consent to destroy something for nothing.

Further the anarchist is so often guilty of judging changes in the social scene from his ultimate focal point—a free society, so that when, say, he is confronted with the fact that in Poland, Bulgaria and Hungary, since the advent of Communism, there has been free education, free hospitalisation, and work for all with paid holidays, the anarchist reply is always "What about their political freedom?"

Of course, they have no political freedom, but they lacked that before the Communist régime as well as having no education, hospitalisation, unemployment and certainly no paid holidays. This was verified for me personally by one who had left those countries and was no Communist. I may add that this was confirmed by a number of people of my acquaintance.

This is a further factor that isolates the anarchist from groups whose ideas we judge from the ultimate focal point of a free society. And perhaps last, but not least for the average man who comes into contact with anarchist ideas, his first reaction is that though it may be all very well in theory, practically at the moment it is impossible, for he says "How can a society be run without leaders? Who'll do the monotonous work? What will you do about anti-social behaviour? Who'll be the policemen? People will never work if they don't make a profit out of it!"

What concrete answers has the anarchist to those objections? Theoretically we have a vast store of answers, but one is so painfully aware of the difference between theory and practice that one must answer with one's tongue in one's cheek or with a modest blush.

The nearest one may get to a working proletarian unit is the trade union and with that too the anarchist has little to do. What is more he often condemns the trade union as an organisation which controls the worker (which it does) rather than see it as the collective voice of the working class.

We offer freedom to slaves and expect them wholeheartedly to accept it. But children who through the war years ate only inferior margarine, to-day dislike butter.

One cannot help feeling that these attitudes, as rational as they may be, have only helped to cut us off from the mass of people. And we have unwittingly created an Ivory Tower from which we gaze at the antics of the irrational but find the cold winds of isolation a little discomforting. S.F.

## Civil Defence Campaign Continued from p. 1

bered with gratitude as the author of the inspired rallying-cry of the days and nights of the London blitz: "London Can Take It!"

This still seems to be his philosophy. In his article he maintains that with the more destructive modern bombs we could not be sure what would happen or know what active defence would do.

"All we can do," he writes, "is to do our best and learn as we go, as we did before. But it would be treachery to our people, our country, and to our Socialist and humanitarian principles if Labour local authorities threw up the sponge and went on strike. No Government could be indifferent to that."

There are some of us, however, who prefer to learn before we go, and we have learned our own humanitarian principles sufficiently well to know that Governments can be very indifferent to them. This highly charged emotional language of Morrison's means nothing. But it is certainly gross impertinence for someone with his record to talk of treachery.

### No Dilemma for Revolutionists

One sentence is, however, one hundred per cent. correct. "No Government could be indifferent to that." And that is the very strength of a boycott of Civil Defence—the very reason why it is one of the most effective means available to express opposition to the very thought of atomic war.

Sentimental appeals to think of the wounded and attempt to mitigate suffering can present a dilemma for well-meaning people who are prepared to spend their lives trying to patch up the holes in our social system.

For revolutionists there is no dilemma. Governments are not concerned with mitigating suffering—if they were they would never get involved in war.

They make appeals on grounds of humanity but are preparing to drop bombs themselves on other sections of humanity.

The only defence against the hydrogen bomb is to make sure it is never dropped, for if it is it will blow such holes in human existence that all the do-gooders in the world could not patch them up. But how to prevent the lunatic governments of the world launching another war—in which H-bombs would certainly be used?

There is only one final answer: take away from governments their power to make war. And whereas that entails, in its entirety, a social revolution, there is not the slightest reason why voluntary assistance should be given to a war machine.

Civil Defence is still voluntary. It should be boycotted until the Government make it compulsory—and then still boycotted after that. It is as much part of the war machine as making or dropping the bomb itself, and the Government could not go to war without it.

## 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.

**HERBERT READ :**  
*Art and the Evolution of Man* 4s.

*Existentialism, Marxism and Anarchism* 3s. 6d.

*Poetry and Anarchism* cloth 5s., paper 2s. 6d.

*The Philosophy of Anarchism* boards 2s. 6d., paper 1s.

*The Education of Free Men* 1s.

**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 ...* paper 7s. 6d.

Vol. 2, 1952, *Postscript to Posterity* paper 7s. 6d.

**TONY GIBSON :**  
*Youth for Freedom* paper 2s.

*Food Production and Population* 6d.

*Who will do the Dirty Work?* 2d.

**PHILIP SANSOM :**  
*Syndicalism—The Workers' Next Step* 1s.

**ALEXANDER BERKMAN :**  
*ABC of Anarchism* 1s.

**JOHN HEWETSON :**  
*Sexual Freedom for the Young* 6d.

*Ill-Health, Poverty and the State* cloth 2s. 6d., paper 1s.

**M. BAKUNIN :**  
*Marxism, Freedom and the State.* cloth 5s.

**ERRICO MALATESTA :**  
*Anarchy* 6d.

*Vote—What For?* 1d.

**PETER KROPOTKIN :**  
*The State: Its Historic Role* 1s.

*The Wage System* 3d.

*Revolutionary Government* 3d.

*Organised Vengeance Called Justice* 2d.

**GEORGE WOODCOCK :**  
*Anarchy or Chaos* 2s. 6d.

*New Life to the Land* 6d.

*Homes orhovels?* 6d.

*Railways and Society* 3d.

*What is Anarchism?* 1d.

*The Basis of Communal Living* 1s.

**RUDOLF ROCKER :**  
*Nationalism and Culture* cloth 21s.

**ALEX COMFORT :**  
*Delinquency* 6d.

*Barbarism & Sexual Freedom* boards 3s. 6d.

**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* paper 6s.

**27, Red Lion Street,**

**London, W.C.1.**

## Monogamy—A Step Towards Emancipation?

WHILE anarchists in Europe argue against life-long monogamous marriage because of the restrictions it places on normal sexual needs, Indonesian women are fighting for monogamy as a step towards their emancipation! It is reported that President Soekarno, who was hailed as the embodiment of the "new enlightenment" when Indonesia won her "independence", has now reverted to the old Moslem practise of polygamy—"to satisfy passions", and seems quite unrepentent. Women from 35 organisations are clamouring in protest, because they obviously see in the President's move a danger to their "freedom", and perhaps a return to the old practises, which admittedly gave women little choice in their sexual partners.

Now, we do not know much about President Soekarno and his sexual habits, but judging from human needs the world over it seems quite likely that the President has no real desire to return to Moslem customs, but, he wanted a change of partner and has taken advantage of the laws still in existence to get

himself another wife, without going to the trouble of getting rid of the first one (she is actually the second, since he divorced his first because she bore him no children).

In most countries where polygamy is the recognised custom, the introduction of monogamous marriage seems to come like a breath of fresh air to women born into a culture which offers them little freedom of choice. We can understand their desire to free themselves from a polygamous union which seems to operate in favour of the man, but the argument (used by the Stalinists in connection with Chinese women) that freedom to choose a partner resulting in monogamous marriage, is emancipation, is obviously quite false. It assumes that women can carry their freedom of choice into the marriage union. This is generally quite untrue. Apart from a few enlightened people who ignore the senseless values of our time, should a man or woman desire to change their partner they cannot do so by merely announcing their intention to the partner concerned. They are bound not only by law and economic dependence on the part of the woman, but by jealousy—"if I can't have her, neither can you".

Monogamous marriage encourages, if indeed it did not instigate, possessive jealousy, because it gives social and legal sanction to the immature idea that the one man one woman life-long relationship is normal, and all other perversions.

It is not our intention to lay down yet another norm for sexual behaviour. Some people may genuinely want one partner only for a lifetime. We are concerned however, with the freedom of choice which is offered neither by polygamy nor monogamy. We suggest that only by the conviction that we have no right to restrict individuals in their personal and social lives, provided they do not interfere with others, will we bring about our real emancipation. R.M.

### PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT! WEEK 38

Deficit on Freedom

38 x £15 = £570

Contributions received £491

GAP £79 (or \$226)

September 16 to September 23

S. Francisco: C.S. £7/0/10; London: S.E. 11/6;

Northwood: E.H. £1; Maidenhead: L.S. 2/6;

San Francisco: F.S. 7/-; London: J.S.\* 3/-;

London: P.Q.\* 2/6; Bolton: R.T.S. 5/-; San Francisco: G.F.M. 6/9; Walsall: R.J. 11/6;

Belmont, Mass.: M.R. £1/15/5; Waco: H.H. 19/-;

Moline: E.J. 17/6; London: S.B. 3/7.

Total ... 14 6 1

Previously acknowledged ... 477 13 3

1954 TOTAL TO DATE ... £491 19 4

GIFT OF BOOKS: London: A.W.U.

## IN THE "DEEP SOUTH" Reactions to Non-Segregation

A *Worldover Press* writer has recently spent six weeks travelling in two States of the "Upper South" and three of the "Deep South" investigating how the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States unanimously outlawing segregation in the schools is being received. He found "in educated white and Negro circles a general belief that, like it or not, legalized segregation is doomed. Because of ingenious devices being contrived for the avowed purpose of circumventing the Court's decision, that doom will not be fully sealed for perhaps a generation.

In Orange, Texas, a gang known as the 'Moonlighters' has threatened death for 'any Negro who tries to go to a white school'. In Virginia, a small-town editor of an unimportant weekly is holding out a dream that, after the death or retirement of five or six of the Roosevelt-appointed and Truman-appointed justices, the Court in a few years may reverse itself and legalize segregation once again. In Arkansas, a politician suggested that another McCarthy investigate the Court to determine if the justices are Communist-infiltrated. In Alabama, a number of

Negroes are signing petitions inspired by their white employers, urging that segregation be retained.

But in each of these states impersonal economic, political and cold-war pressures, supplemented by arduous efforts of white and Negro individuals, are at work to expedite compliance with the Court's ruling.

★

In a moderate-sized town in Virginia a white school superintendent told me in private that, like many other educators, he accepts the findings of anthropologists that no race is superior or inferior, and he therefore cannot justify segregation. But Virginia, he pointed out, is almost completely controlled by one man—the very conservative Democratic Senator, Harry Byrd, who favors segregation. In that context school officials and teachers are not free agents able to expound their views publicly without inhibition. If, as a hired employee of the local school board, he is invited to guide the members along a path toward integration, he will do so. But, he confessed, he is primarily an executor of policy as framed by others, and he does not know what will happen in his country or in Virginia as a whole during the next several years.

As for Negro opinion in the South, the one colored member of the Greensboro, N.C., school board declared Negroes are in a position somewhat comparable to that of the newly freed slaves. Some, fearing insecurity, stayed with "old master"—as many now will want to avoid any risk of their jobs. In Talladega, however, one such Negro mother, after hearing a speaker argue that Negro parents owed it to their children to give them an education in a setting of equality, said: "I guess I'd better not feel as I did any more," and sat down amid applause.

### OIL PROFITS

Profits made by the Royal Dutch Shell Group during the first six months of this year were substantially higher than the corresponding period last year as the following figures clearly show:

	6 mths. to June, 54.	6 mths to June, 53.
	£ m.	£ m.
Net income before tax	124.7	112.7
Estimated taxation	46.6	43.1
To minority interests	8.9	7.1
Net income for period	69.2	62.5

No part of this income has yet been distributed to the parent companies, the Royal Dutch Petroleum Company and the Shell Transport and Trading Company, whose interests in the group are 60 per cent. and 40 per cent. respectively. The financial experts take the view that from the general outlook for oil there seems to be a good chance that the profit trend will be maintained in the second half of this year.

### CORRECTION

In our last issue the article entitled *Some Father* referred to the 30,000 Japanese strikers. It should, of course, read 13,000.

## 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)

OCT. 3—Sam Fanaroff  
The Commune—Spearhead of the  
Libertarian Revolution.

OCT. 10—J. McGregor  
A Gradualist Approach to the  
Classless Society

### OPEN AIR MEETINGS

Weather Permitting  
HYDE PARK  
Sundays at 3.30 p.m.

### NORTH-EAST LONDON

DISCUSSION MEETINGS  
AT MANOR PARK  
Alternate Wednesdays  
at 7.30 p.m.

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 200 Buchanan Street  
Every Friday at 7 p.m.

### PUBLIC MEETING

at Baldwin Institute,  
Eton High Street, Eton, Bucks.  
Saturday, Oct. 2nd, at 7.30 p.m.  
"Anarchy & Modern Drama"  
Speaker: D. M. MACTAGGART.

## 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