

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"It is impossible to give the soldier a good education without making him a deserter."
—H. D. THOREAU.

Solidarity at the Docks

THE strike in London's docks has reached greater proportions than any since the General Strike of 1926. For mile after mile, from Tilbury to Tower Bridge, silent wharves and motionless cranes bear mute testimony to the near-100 per cent. solidarity of 18,000 workers in the world's greatest port.

The beginnings and background of the strike were described in last week's FREEDOM, and at the time of going to press then some 11,000 men had stopped. A simple action by some employers, however, pushed that figure up to 18,000 within a day.

This was when, on Wednesday, the Peninsular & Orient shipping line brought some truck-loads of Lascar seamen from Tilbury to the Royal Docks and set them to work unloading mail from the *Chusan*.

It was perfectly clear to anyone with any knowledge or experience of dockers in action that there was only one possible result of that particular piece of provocation. And by Thursday that result was achieved—the strike spread, and even the 'permanent' men—traditionally the last to come out—joined the strikers. Even 'limited' men, men whose permit to work in the docks is restricted to one employer only, and for whom dismissal might mean no work in the docks ever again—even the limited men walked out.

No Anti-Colour Feeling

It is a typical boss-class tactic to use men of another nationality (even better when they are of another colour too) as blacklegs. Instead of the London dockers beginning to voice any anti-colour prejudice, however, they showed a wonderful tolerance for the East Indian seamen's position, in general regarding them as ignorant of the principles of trade union struggle, and blame and contempt was reserved for the

P. & O. employers who had been prepared to use them in this shabby way.

The immediate response by those who came out was, it seems, a strong enough argument to persuade the port employers that the P. & O.'s action was unwise, for the Lascars were called out—though not before they had been switched from unloading mail to loading cars for export. It would be interesting to discover just what exchanges of opinion took place between the P. & O. and those other port employers whose workers had walked out as a result of the P. & O.'s stupid action!

All of which, however, adds up to

Socialist Outlook Packs Up

WHEN we discussed the Labour Party Executive decision to bar the Trotskyist journal *Socialist Outlook* from distribution or support within the Party, we maintained that the Labour Party had the right to so protect itself, but that the Executive were wrong to give the order without consulting the membership.

Now democracy has been vindicated, and at the annual conference at Scarborough last month, the Party voted to support the Executive by 4,500,000 to 1,500,000. This whacking majority was probably made up of people who had never read the *Socialist Outlook* until told by their leaders that it was bad for them.

In spite of big talk about putting up a fight, however, the publishing committee of the journal has decided to fold the paper up. It would seem that there is no market for Trotskyist views except among disgruntled Labour Party members—and probably that is correct.

Or can it be that the editor, Mr. Gerald Healy, realises that an Executive ban on a paper called *Socialist Outlook* cannot be said to apply to a paper called *Socialist Lookout*?

Tory Party Conference

NO SIN IN THE GARDEN OF EDEN

IF only the Lord had had the foresight to install television cameras in the Garden of Eden, the whole unhappy story of the Fall of Man would never have unfolded.

If only Old Adam and Mother Eve had known for sure that they were being observed they would have been far too careful to have risked the wrath of the Lord just for a bit of the forbidden fruit of knowledge.

But our good Lord Woolton, it seems, learning from the mistake of our original parents, is quite prepared to benefit from Man's downfall, for at the Winter Garden of Eden at Blackpool last week, T.V. cameras were trained upon the assembly of little angels and big archangels—and lo! there was no sin. And, behold! there was precious little knowledge either.

The orderly and virtuous tone of the assembly was set by the chairman, archangel Colonel Sir Godfrey Llewellyn, who warned the concourse that they had better behave themselves, since T.V. sees all. Lest this warning was in rather bad taste, he himself added: "We are not afraid that the public will find us unruly or badly behaved."

And how right he was. At least the Labour Party conference does make allowances for discussion and disagreement, even if the hierarchy does come out on top all the time. But not even the semblance of debate mars the universality of opinion in the Conservative heaven.

The conference only lasts three days anyway, and the first two and a half of those are actually a curtain-raiser for the entry of the Lord himself. The pattern

of harmony was carefully laid down on the Thursday, when in the presentation of the Gospel on Germany, amendments to the resolution were simply not called. And Archangel Anthony's reception in the afternoon was little short of idolatry, with all the cherubs puffing away in a rather breathless rendering of 'For he's a jolly good fellow'. Even Julian Amery (a bit of a Lucifer, that one) who had some heretical things to say about Suez in that other place, bit his tongue and chanted a little psalm in the proper manner.

The great revelation, however, came on the Saturday afternoon. The heavenly choirs burst into ear-splitting harmony and Archangel Anthony, the Son of God, introduced Jehovah himself, clothed, as befits his wisdom, in the guise of a doddering old man with a cigar. 'The greatest man on Earth' quoth Anthony. 'Please, sire, speak to us.'

And speak the good Lord did. A bit incoherently, certainly. Slipping up over his words here and there, undoubtedly. But what pearls of wisdom—what priceless prophecy! The Nine Power Agreement on Germany he said, 'may well become a monument and a milestone in our march towards that peaceful co-existence, during which the lasting peace, which is our heart's desire, may find its sure foundation.'

We, who have read our gospels faithfully, know how true that is.*

GABRIEL.

*Compare: Neville Chamberlain, 1938: 'I believe this is peace in our time.' *Daily Worker*, 1939: 'Moscow-Berlin Pact for Peace and Socialism.'

demonstrate once again the magnificent solidarity of which dockers are capable. The 'blue' union, which is officially supporting the strike, has no funds and cannot offer its striking members any strike pay. The 'white' union, opposing the strike, has done no more than promise to pay dispute pay 'according to rule' to those men unable to work because the dispute has affected their job. So far these men have received nothing. The vast majority of the 'white' union strikers have not even the hope of getting anything, for they are unofficial strikers, who have come out against the orders of their leaders because they feel the greater loyalty to their fellow-workers.

Wanted—ONE Organisation

When this is shown to us so strongly it presents once again the argument against the present trade union set-up. There are three unions in the Port of London—the Transport & General, the Stevedores & Dockers, and the Lightermen, Watermen & Tugmen. Three organisations which, when they are functioning properly, divide the portworkers into watertight compartments between which there is no common (union) action and very little liaison at all.

The natural solidarity of portworkers in time of conflict breaks

down these divisions and we find the rank and file of two unions engaged in a bitter feud for members acting in consort in their common interests. The leaders have a quarrel as to who shall control who, but the rank and file, as workers on the job, do not carry this quarrel into their relationship, because that relationship is functional and comradely—they are fellow workers before they are white or blue card-holders.

Anarchists maintain that the function and the common interest which unites them in fact should also be the unifying forces in their organisations. This is made difficult by the existence of three unions and by the divisions maintained by their existence. We maintain that portworkers should not allow themselves to be divided into separate organisations for dockers, stevedores and lightermen, let alone subdivided into 'white' dockers or 'blue' stevedores.

Portworkers should learn the lesson of their own inspiring solidarity. It is that they have one struggle which they do meet as one body and there they should have one organisation to effectively co-ordinate their strength. This is the idea of a portworkers' syndicate—a militant organisation directly under the control of the rank and file, uniting all who work in the port industry, educating them in responsibility for their work

through the struggle at their work, and paving the way for what should be the aim of every working class organisation—workers' control of the means of production and distribution.

T.U.C. Warns Stevedores

THE T.U.C. General Purposes Committee has found the National Amalgamated Stevedores & Dockers' Union (the 'Blue' union) guilty of breaking a 'non-poaching' agreement by signing up dissatisfied members of the Transport & General Workers' Union (the 'White' union) in Hull and Birkenhead.

The T.U.C. has asked the N.A.S.D.U. to give two assurances:

1.—To stop all "poaching" activities and organisation of meetings in any port where they had no members before Aug. 17;

2.—To disown a statement made in Hull by their official, Mr. G. Hern, that "expulsion from the T.U.C. would not worry his union" and that the T.U.C. employed "autocratic and domineering methods."

If these assurances are given, the T.U.C. will set up a disputes committee to hear the two unions' cases against each other.

The Blue union, however, is clearly prepared to discuss this matter only from a position of strength. Recruiting is going on in both Hull and Birkenhead. If N.A.S.D.U. presents the T.U.C. with a *fait accompli* the only reaction could be expulsion. And since the T.U.C. is little more than a rubber stamp for Arthur Deakin's T.G.W.U.—it will not be a lot of use to N.A.S.D.U. anyway.

W. German T.U. Opposes Rearmament

THE decisions of the Nine-Power London Conference on German rearmament will, it seems, receive most opposition from within Germany itself. The Social Democratic Party had already offered opposition to rearmament until a "final" effort had been made to reach four-power agreement on the German problem; and last month the 670,000 members of the trade union youth groups had voted unanimously against an armed contribution of any kind. According to the *Manchester Guardian's* Bonn correspondent, German youth in the post war period has been systematically taught to believe in a supra-national European Army and to look upon a national force as retrograde.

Now, the West German T.U.C., with a membership of about six million, has rejected German rearmament "in present circumstances" on the same grounds as advanced by the Social Democrats and in addition because:

"For the internal development of the Federal German Republic, the rearmament and organisation of a German Army as laid down by the London agreement would bring the danger of the creation of a militaristic, authoritarian State. This would in turn defeat the efforts of the German workers' movement to erect a political, social, and economic democracy."

Whilst it is considered that this opposition will not prevent Dr. Adenauer

from going ahead with the task of creating his army of twelve divisions, observers point out that the difficulties he will encounter are not so much financial as of man-power. It is estimated that of the 822,000 unemployed workers in W. Germany some 360,000 are women. About a third of the unemployed are people changing from one job to another and another third are described as "unemployable". Thus, to find the 500,000 men needed for the armed forces, the Government will have to look for them in industry, and by the introduction of conscription. The effect on industry and German economy is viewed with apprehension by Germans, but perhaps with some satisfaction by their foreign competitors in Europe and America, for the figures of German production are more than impressive.

In 1951 the gross social product of the Federal Republic was 113,000 million marks. In 1952 it was 125,000 million and it is estimated that this year the figure will have risen to approximately 144,000 million marks.

Already, of course, even without an army, W. Germany has been "contributing" during the past two years 600 million marks a month to defence. Under the new arrangement it will be stepped up to 950 millions when rearmament begins, but this is a minimum figure, which will progressively increase. And at the same time there will be some 500,000 productive workers less in industry.

One further problem for the authorities in Germany is that of conscientious objection, which will be dealt with by Tribunals rather similar to those operating in this country and which will consider moral, but not political, reasons as valid grounds for refusal. It will be of considerable interest to see to what extent anti-militarism expresses itself among the youth of Germany to-day. Indeed, there would be a touch of irony in the possibility that of all the countries of the West determined resistance to war preparation should come from the country which we have been told is the cradle of militarism!

National Newspaper Stoppage

ANOTHER inter-union argument brought the presses of most of Britain's national newspapers to a halt at 12.30 a.m. last Monday. It is the first stoppage since 1926.

The suddenness of the shut-down bears no relationship to the time the dispute has been going on, for it dates back to early 1953, when Associated Newspapers Ltd. and the *News of the World* Company bought up the London *Daily Sketch* and proposed transferring the printing from its old home, Kemsley House, to the *News of the World* building off Fleet Street.

The dispute is over which union's members should run the machines when printing the *Sketch*. The Printing Machine Managers' Trade Society had organised the printers at Kemsley House. At the *News of the World*, however, the National Society of Operative Printers and Assistants (N.A.T.S.O.P.A.) had provided the men. These two organisations could not agree as to which should provide the wage-slaves under the new arrangement. P.M.M.T.S. says the principle should be 'follow the job', N.A.T.S.O.P.A. say it should be 'custom of the house'.

The dispute has been referred, during its history, to the Industrial Court, to

a disputes subcommittee of the General Council of the T.U.C., to the conciliation officers of the Ministry of Labour and National Service, and, finally, to the Minister of Labour himself. It came to a head on Sunday night after the Minister, Sir Walter Monckton, had failed to restore peace.

The immediate cause of the strike was the planned departure on holiday of three machine managers working on the *Daily Sketch*. The P.M.M.T.S. and N.A.T.S.O.P.A. could not agree about their replacements, so at midnight the call went out to stop the machines. Then, because of an agreement between members of the Newspaper Proprietors' Association (the owners' trade union), whereby if one paper is stopped because of a dispute all others stop also, every national paper in London, with the exception of the *Daily Worker*, had to stop also.

Could this not be called a restrictive practice on the part of the Press Lords? Or simply workers' solidarity?

The thing that strikes us is how militant and determined trade unions can be when fighting each other. Pity they cannot show as much spirit when fighting the boss—and as much union solidarity when the papers print vicious attacks on strikers in other industries.

AT the beginning of the eleventh century the towns of Europe were small clusters of miserable huts, adorned only with low clumsy churches, the builders of which hardly knew how to make an arch; the arts, mostly consisting of some weaving and forging, were in their infancy; learning was found in only a few monasteries. Three hundred and fifty years later, the very face of Europe had been changed. The land was dotted with rich cities, surrounded by immense thick walls which were embellished by towers and gates, each of them a work of art in itself. The cathedrals, conceived in a grand style and profusely decorated, lifted their bell-towers to the skies, displaying a purity of form and a boldness of imagination which we now vainly strive to attain. The crafts and arts had risen to a degree of perfection which we can hardly boast of having surpassed in many directions, if the inventive skill of the worker and the superior finish of his work be appreciated higher than the rapidity of fabrication. . . . If the mediæval cities had bequeathed to us no written documents to testify to their splendour, and left nothing behind but the

monuments of building art which we see now all over Europe from Scotland to Italy, we might yet conclude that the times of independent city life were times of the greatest development of human intellect during the Christian era down to the end of the eighteenth century. . . . The very fact that of all arts, architecture—a social art above all—had attained the highest development, is significant in itself. To be what it was, it must have originated from an eminently social life. Mediæval architecture attained its grandeur—not only because it was a natural development of handicraft; not only because each building, each architectural decoration, had been devised by men who know through the experience of their own hands what artistic effects can be obtained from stone, iron, bronze, or even from simple logs and mortar; not only because each monument was a result of collective experience, accumulated in each 'mystery' or craft—it was grand because it was born out of a grand idea. Like Greek art, it sprang out of a conception of brotherhood and unity fostered by the city. It had an audacity which could only be won by audacious struggles and victories; it

had that expression of vigour, because vigour permeated all the life of the city. A cathedral or communal house symbolised the grandeur of an organism of which every mason and stonemason was the builder, and a mediæval building appears—not as a solitary effort to which thousands of slaves would have contributed the share assigned them by one man's imagination; all the city contributed to it. The lofty bell-tower rose upon a structure, grand in itself, in which the life of the city was throbbing—not upon a meaningless scaffold like the Paris iron tower, nor as a sham structure in stone intended to conceal the ugliness of an iron frame, as has been done in the Tower Bridge. Like the Acropolis of Athens, the cathedral of a mediæval city was intended to glorify the grandeur of the victorious city, to symbolise the union of its crafts, to express the glory of each citizen in a city of his own creation. After having achieved its craft revolution, the city often began a new cathedral in order to express the new, wider, and broader union which has been called into life.

—PETER KROPOTKIN: Mutual Aid.

The Glory of the Mediæval City

I CAME into Lincoln along the Fosse Dyke, the eleven mile canal which the Romans built to connect the river Witham with the Trent so as to bring grain from East Anglia to their garrisons at York and along Hadrian's Wall. We tied up at Brayford Mere, the broad confluence where the canal ends, and walked up the steep cobbled street through the mediæval town to the cathedral, two hundred feet above the city which it dominates just as the other cathedrals of East Anglia do.

Ely stands high on its island in the Fens so that when darkness has fallen on the streets below, the last light of day still shines on the towers. Peterborough with its great west end of three arches rising to the full height of the cathedral, and Norwich with its enormous length, dwarf their surroundings in the same way.

Who built the cathedrals? There have been many answers to this question, though considering that the English cathedrals must be, with Shakespeare and our lyric poetry, this country's greatest contribution to European art, it is perhaps extraordinary that there should be such a variety of opinions.

THE first thing to bear in mind is that Gothic architecture, like all art

forms and like the societies of which they are the expression, and its phases of development, of maturity, and of decline. The transition from Gothic to renaissance building was described by W. R. Lethaby, one of the wisest of architectural thinkers, in these terms: "In the Middle Ages the 'architecture' to which we give the modern name 'Gothic' was the customary way in which masons and carpenters did their work. In Italy as the Middle Ages neared their close, the people of the land, who had long been dominated by German rulers, awoke to the thought that they themselves were not *tedeschi*, but Italians and Romans. Then, national consciousness being re-born, a movement was initiated for the 'revival', that is, the copying of classical Roman art in Italy. At first, and this has not been sufficiently understood, the Renaissance of the arts was part of a national, patriotic and political movement. When this national native movement had proceeded far in Italy, travellers from other countries, clergy and nobles, saw that the fruit was fair to the eye, and they set about grafting and then transplanting the more or less natural growths of the Italian soil into northern lands, not seeing that the Renaissance, which was national in Italy, was anti-national in Germany and Britain. The

new way of building imported into these lands was no longer a customary art growing up from the bottom and out of the hearts of the people. It was a 'taste' imposed from the top as part of a subtle scheme for dividing off gentility from servility. It was an Architecture of Aristocracy provided by trained middlemen of 'taste', who now wedged themselves in between the work and the workers, who were consequently beaten down to the status of mere executioners of patterns provided by a hierarchy of architectural priests."

Of course as time went by the new fashion in building became absorbed into the vernacular as what we know as Georgian architecture, but by then the arbiters of 'taste' had developed a romantic affection for the buildings of the Middle Ages and had invested them with the sort of cobwebby mystery which you find in the lesser novels of William Godwin or the other 'Gothick' novelists. As Nikolaus Pevsner says, "The Romantics of a hundred years ago had endeavoured to eliminate masons' names. Their thesis was that cathedrals and abbey churches grew to their glorious sizes and shapes by the zest of bishops and abbots and the pious industry of monks and laymen carrying stones and mixing mortar." William Morris in a lecture in 1877 declared that "You look in your history books to see who built Westminster Abbey, who built St. Sophia at Constantinople and they tell you Henry III,

Justinian the Emperor. Did they? Or, rather, men like you and me, handicraftsmen who have left no name behind them, nothing but their work?"

SINCE Morris's day the researches of W. R. Lethaby, established without doubt that the cathedrals were built by lay masons and carpenters, and more recently those of the late Dr. G. C. Coulton and Mr. John Harvey have uncovered with varying degrees of certitude the identity of the master-masons of Gothic buildings, and have brought to light so much material that Mr. Harvey has even been able to write a biography of Henry Yevele, the master-mason for much of Canterbury Cathedral. Other dominant figures emerge from the obscurity of centuries, like Hugh Herland the great carpenter who built the roof of Westminster Hall or William Wynford who, rather than the priest William of Wykham is now thought to have been the 'designer' of Winchester Cathedral.

The use of the word designer invites the question as to how far these master-masons were architects in the modern sense. Here again vague ideas about spontaneous creation have to be abandoned. When Henry Yevele became the King's Master Mason in 1360, he was named "devisor of masonry", and Mr. Harvey declares that, "Certainly the system of Gothic architecture left less to individual freaks of fancy than did the highly artificial pack of cards with which the Renaissance masters conjured. At any rate, positive ugliness and disharmony are comparatively rare in mediæval building. This must not lead us to suppose that Gothic architecture grew automatically out of one fashion into another, and that the master-builders were the helpless slaves of current practice. Then as always a minority of personalities endowed with genius made innovations startling to their contemporaries, but by the next generation regarded as the touchstone of their art. . . . A very large mass of evidence has been brought forward proving that skilled masons and carpenters provided designs for the erection of stone or timber buildings (or parts of buildings), to be erected by themselves or by others. I italicise the last three words, because it was the separation of the architectural from the constructional function of the craftsman which ultimately led to the formation of

the architectural profession as a separate entity."

BUT the most telling generalisation I ever came across on the difference between the world of the cathedral builders and the building industry of to-day was that of Eric Gill who wrote: "The architect (unlike his modern bourgeois counterpart) rose from the scaffold and did not come down from the university. There was as little self-consciousness among them, as 'artists', as there is to-day among engineers. The only difference between a modern engineer and a mediæval builder is that the latter controlled gangs of human labourers most of whom shared his enthusiasms and understood his theory (for he had risen from their own ranks) and none of whom was entirely deprived of intellectual responsibility, whereas the former is not a practical workman but a mathematical calculator and his buildings (however grand and useful) are the work of men reduced to a subhuman condition of intellectual slavery."

HERE, surely, is a more important fact about the building of the great cathedrals than the names of master-masons, so painstakingly unearthed by Mr. Harvey. As I go round these East Anglian cathedrals I am interested, but little wiser, to learn that the vault over the great nave at Norwich was designed by John Everard in 1463-72, that the chapels at Peterborough were designed by John Wastell between 1496 and 1508, that the roof for the octagon at Ely with its 65-foot span was designed by William Hurley, a consulting carpenter from London in 1334, or that here at Lincoln the central tower was built by Richard Stow between 1307 and 1311.

This does not help us to comprehend the impulse to erect these great buildings, in fact, the concentration upon personalities in modern mediæval studies may tend to obscure our understanding of mediæval society as a whole. Kropotkin saw the cathedrals not as a religious manifestations but as expressions of the glory and pride of the free cities themselves. The city *arises* for the sake of life, said Plato, but *is* for the sake of the good life. This is the reminder and the reproach of the great cathedrals to the sprawling modern cities below them.

C.W.

State Education

GOVERNMENTS are always striving to increase their power. This continual struggle is carried out in the name of the people; the action is justified as increasing the people's welfare either directly or indirectly. Whether it is nationalisation where (theoretically) the profits that previously went into the pockets of shareholders now accrue to the State, or the manufacture of arms for 'the defence of the people', or the censoring of broadcasts and newspapers, it is all done for the good of the people. The most powerful means which is within the control of governments for increasing their power is that of education; and the justification for State control of education is the same weary theme that those in authority know what is best for you.

In most of the Western democracies the State lays down the general framework of the system of education within which there is a certain amount of freedom as to the method employed. But there has been an interesting development in India within recent months towards a considerably more rigid attitude (there almost all education is under the control of the individual States). Travancore-Cochin and now the State of the Telugu-speaking peoples, Andhra, have decided that the State alone shall publish all textbooks used in their elementary schools. The arguments advanced in support of this step are (1) 'that uniform textbooks will be available at low cost' (2) that the sale of these textbooks will provide a useful additional income to the State Treasury (3) that private persons and companies should not be allowed to profit from the State-controlled activity of education.

To deal with the financial aspect: as a correspondent in the *Eastern Economist* points out, it is highly probable that the country as a whole will be losing money by this system. He maintains that the revenues lost by the decreased income tax payable by booksellers and publishers for the majority of whom school textbooks are their 'bread and butter' line) will more than counterbalance the

profits made by a State (on which no tax is payable). This loss would not only be a loss to the Central Government but also to the individual States who have a share in the income tax pool. Thus it is quite likely that neither the Central Government nor the State will be any richer.

However, financial considerations apart, the really serious aspect of the system of the State as publisher-cum-bookseller is the step, or rather leap, that it represents in the direction of totalitarianism. Any form of de-centralisation, any anti-monopolistic tendencies, even on capitalist lines, is preferable to State monopoly. When there is a monopoly in textbooks there can only be one system of thought: it is *diversity* of ideas that is a sign of health in any education system. This is evident when one looks at the Soviet system—there is a never-ending insistence on the superiority of the Soviet way of life, the chauvinist attitude is present in every subject taught: it is always a Russian who was the first to invent *x* or to discover *y* or to make *z*. In India particularly, every State government has its own political axe to grind and the temptation to make use of the ready-made propaganda tool of the schools will almost certainly be yielded to. The logical and likely outcome of monopoly in education is the world of "1984".

These disturbing events in what is usually regarded as a 'progressive' country show clearly that when the fallacy of the proposition that governments are an expression of the general will is developed, there is an inevitable tendency towards totalitarianism (if the government represents the people, the government monopoly must be for the general good—so the argument runs). In order to become more powerful governments must restrict liberty; through an education system used for propaganda purposes such restrictions can be made to appear as part of the natural order of things. It is the possibility of such indoctrination that all freedom-loving people must oppose.

M.G.W.

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP OPEN DAILY

OPEN 10 a.m. to 6.30; 5.0 SATURDAYS

Our latest list of second-hand and remaindered books is now ready. Let us know if you want it. All books are now sent post free so please get your books from us. We can supply any book required, including text-books.

New Books . . .

Sexual Behaviour in the Human Female Kinsey, Pomeroy & Martin 50/-
The Sayings of Lao Tse (trans. Lionel Giles) 5/-
Nationalism and Culture Rudolf Rucker 21/-

Reprints . . .

The French Revolution Peter Kropotkin (2 vols.) 12/6
Science of Society Stephen Pearl Andrews 7/6

Remainders . . .

One Hundred Years of Revolution (edited George Woodcock) 5/-

Second-Hand . . .

Primitive Folk Elie Reclus 7/6
Best Stories of William Saroyan 3/-
Emile Rousseau 3/-
Morals, Manners and Men Havelock Ellis 2/-
Forbidden Freedom Chedi Jagan 5/-
Russia in Flux John Maynard 3/-
A People Who Loved Peace Roy Walker 2/-
Russian Child and Russian Wife Tanya Matthews 3/-
Shadow of the Gallows Viscount Templewood 2/6
The Servile State Hilaire Belloc 3/-
The Little Fellow (Charles Chaplin) Peter Cotes & Thelma Niklaus 3/-
The Lost Library Walter Mehring 4/-

Postage free on all items

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

Another Prophecy

THE NEXT MILLION YEARS,
by Charles Galton Darwin.
(Rupert Hart-Davis).

WHAT is it that impels people to prophecy woe to their fellows? It would be interesting to know. The psychology of the philosophical pessimist would make an exceedingly instructive study. In this grim book we are told that the fuel supplies of the world are due to run out, that food supplies are going to become very short, and that, thanks to the bringing to an end, by our civilised way of life, of the normal process of natural selection, we are well on the way to breeding a race of half-wits.

Now, it is clear that some of this may well be true. But what distinguishes this book from most others of its kind is that the author is completely pessimistic about the future. Unlike Hyams and Massingham (*Prophecy of Famine*), or Hoyle, he does not really seem to think that much can be done about the situation. Throughout he insists on the permanent existence on the verge of famine of a certain section of the human race. He follows Malthus of course. Malthus is the god of the pessimist.

. . . not long ago the province of Sind was mainly desert; the ground was quite fertile but there was no rainfall. A great engineering undertaking, the Sukkur barrage, has spread the water of the Indus over a very wide area, and turned much of the desert into a garden. According to the universally accepted standards this was a great benefit to the world, for it made possible the adequate feeding of a people previously on the verge of starvation. But things did not work out like that, for after a few years the effect was only to have a large number of people on the verge of starvation instead of a small number."

This is the Malthusian argument in a nutshell. Population always outruns food supply. One would have thought therefore that Darwin would have been gratified that the population of Western Europe is sinking, and that presumably when all have reached a decent standard of living this trend will be universal. But he isn't. And I become mystified.

Moreover, his arguments, when carefully analysed, seem to be mainly supposition and wishful thinking. For instance, he says, without giving much reason why, "that the voluntary limitation of populations is an unstable

process." He then proceeds to give an argument to support this contention.

"The peasants of province A are not reproducing themselves, with the result that the villages are only partly inhabited and that part of the land has gone out of cultivation. Province B on the other hand has an excess of population, and the land-hunger of the B's will drive them into taking over the deserted houses, and into cultivating the neglected land, even though it will have been the poorest land that had gone out of cultivation. Some departments of France have in fact already been partly repopulated in this way from Italy." Now if the immigrant B's retain their own customs, they will continue to increase in numbers in their new settlements, and in a few generations the province A will be fully populated, but now chiefly by B's. But it may be that in their new surroundings the B's will feel the influences which led the A's to decrease, so that they too will start to decrease, and again villages will be deserted and land will go out of cultivation. If this happens there will be a fresh influx of B's, unless perhaps the province B has by now got itself into a state where its own population is decreasing. In that case there will be a new immigration from a province C which has an excess population. If the C's go the same way after immigration, then the D's will come in, and so the process will go on, with a succession of immigrations, each of which may later fade out by experiencing the same decrease. But at some stage one set of immigrants will come in who decline to decrease, and then the province A will experience over-population." (My italics).

You see the fallacy? He creates an entirely hypothetical people who are to be quite different from all who have gone before. This is the sort of argument that forms the basis of the whole book.

Darwin is writing a prophecy of the next million years. He chooses that time because it needs roughly a million years for a species to evolve into another species. He says, "That is the reason for the title I have chosen for this essay—for a million years to come we have got to put up with all the defects in man's nature as it is now."

He assumes that the troubles of the world are not the product of this or that social system, or of superstition, or of other things controllable by us, but man's

Continued on p. 3

KENYA

On not seeing the Wood for Trees

IT is of more than academic interest to observe how the undue stressing of details by Press and politicians can result in the real issues, of which the details are but a minor part, becoming all but completely obscured.

This is what has happened over Kenya since the declaration of the Emergency more than two years ago. So far as the general public is concerned the troubles in that unhappy land started with Mau Mau terrorism, and the rôle of the British forces is to wipe out these "gangs", protect both the white settlers and the "loyal" Africans, and restore the *status quo* of peace and prosperity. But the terrorism and counter-terrorism of the past two years is simply the climax to a situation which has existed for some fifty years, whereby a small minority of white settlers have sought to organise the country and exploit the African in the own interests. So inhuman and rapacious have these settlers been in their outlook and their behaviour to the overwhelming African majority that even the British Government has at various times during these past fifty years found itself in serious conflict with them, and to this day—and in spite of the Emergency—they refuse to accede to the demands of an influential section of the settlers for the transfer of power from Whitehall to Nairobi. "Kenya for the Kenyans" which is the battle cry of these settlers means in effect "Kenya for the White settlers", and they make no more attempt to sugar this pill than do the Malanites in South Africa. Yet generally speaking, public opinion in this country is almost universally hostile to the racial-fascism of Dr. Malan; whereas, perhaps because the real facts about Kenya have not been exposed as clearly, they do not seem to realise that the same situation exists there too, with the difference that the Africans are in open revolt.

FREEDOM has never disguised its horror at some of the methods used by the Africans in this struggle; methods which have harmed their cause and obscured the real issues. But their terrorism has been more than matched, individually and collectively, by the forces of law and order. It would therefore seem to follow that to explain the horrors of Mau Mau by such arguments as that the Africans are but one stage removed from barbarism, or that they are under the witch-doctors' spell is as false as to blame the horrors perpetrated by the armed forces onto their over-civilisation and their god mumbo-jumbo! Anthropologists appear to be unanimous in describing the Kikuyu (who are now the spear-head of the revolt) as a most peace-loving, easy-going people. And without the aid of the anthropologists we could say the same of our fellow-countrymen taken as a whole. There must be therefore a reason for these peace-loving people suddenly becoming so violent. The government knows the reason, so do the settlers.

The movement in Kenya is a slave revolt. Perhaps they have not such a sophisticated, complex, concept of freedom as defined (has it in fact been defined?) in the so-called civilised world. Perhaps all they seek is "freedom" from the white man's tyranny and his God, and more land to grow their food, and in the process they may become entwined in their former customs,

R.M. appears to have been dazzled by some of the "Reflections from the ivory tower", so may I offer a pair of glasses through which she may see things in a different light. But before I make my offering let me categorically state that I am no "fellow-traveller". No self-respecting communist party would have me, nor would I, in fear of losing my self-respect, join one. And now to the fray.

Whether the community will further the anarchist ideal I don't know, but a living community with all present-day anarchist activity as merely a small part of its total life would be a far more tangible argument than the anarchist nowadays can present when confronted with the question as to whether such a classless society is possible with man's present attitude and social make-up. It is a flimsy barricade R.M. hides behind—to say, "For those who feel the need for the kind of life envisaged by the community" should lead it, and exclude herself. Because is the alternative we live in to-day better than what a community is capable of being? We pay lip service to a classless society, a wageless society, people living without coercion, without laws in statute books, mutual aid, but can still say without blushing that those who advocate those things are incapable of living them. Perhaps it is logical to be a conscious hypocrite. I may get up at a meeting which may have in its audience crooks, perverts, exploiters, obnoxious characters, bosses, whores; yet I get up and open my address with, "Ladies and Gentlemen" . . . Whether the community is acknowledged by the masses or not does not matter, but an anarchist community strengthens the anarchist case spontaneously. To-day anarchist ideas are not acknowledged by the masses. Must we therefore give them up?

It is also unfortunate that R.M. should give the bookshop, club, and printing press as total examples of anarchist acti-

many of which seem to us the very antithesis of freedom. Whatever their outlook, one thing is clear: that a white minority in Kenya has no right to impose its will on the African population, nor to use it as cheap labour, nor to use its privileged position to import its religious prejudices and customs.

THE roads to peace in Kenya are three: (1) equal rights for all who live and work in the country, black and white, (2) the removal of all white settlers, (3) the systematic extermination of militant Africans until there is peace by fear and exhaustion.

The new Colonial Secretary's visit to Kenya last week indicates that the third is the Government's present course, and the draconian measures he has announced, ostensibly to protect the "loyal" Kikuyu are in fact a recognition of the settlers overriding "rights". He declared that the "unredeemable" Mau Mau leaders and followers *would never be allowed to return to areas where loyal Kikuyu lived*. He had found fear among Africans that those who had promoted the reign of terror would be allowed to live among them again. It was later learned that Mr. Lennox Boyd (the Colonial Secretary) had told the Kenya Christian Council that

"the Kenya Government was planning to detain such inveterate Mau Mau on an uninhabited island in Lake Victoria. It is believed that there may be as many as 10,000 Kikuyu regarded as unredeemable by the Government." (B.U.P.)

Such is the way the British Government seeks peace in Kenya. Such is the way Stalin, Mussolini and Hitler brought "peace" and "unity" to their countries. But ultimately such is also the road to disaster.

CORRECTION

In the editorial column last week "That Gap—and other Matters", a misprint made us say:

"In saying that, we are not yet so satisfied as not to be able to re-live our own youthful enthusiasms and understand what our comrade S.F. is saying . . ."

For satisfied read "ossified".

ISOLATION AND ANARCHISM

One cannot call a branch a tree. These activities do not spring from an anarchist totality; those who work in the club, press, or bookshop earn their daily keep elsewhere, are still part of the wage system and only gather in one place for the above-mentioned activities. As commendable as these activities are, they are nevertheless not organic anarchist activity of a total anarchist life. They very well could be, and would be far more efficient, for the total energies of the people involved in these activities could be fully utilized if they knew that all their basic needs would be met by the community they belong to. Why should Freedom Press be continuously working under a strong monetary deficit, with periodic appeals to comrades to help; and why should a modern pioneer in education like A. S. Neill, still suffer from a lack of funds? An anarchist community could still have a printing press, school, orphanage, hospital, workshop, supplying the needs of the people of the community, but these would be integrated activities, like the housing section or the bakery. It is this kind of communal activity which would give comrades more time for leisure and cultural activities than the present set-up could possibly afford unless one belonged to the leisured class. It is this added time which would allow people "enthusiastic about publishing a paper, or public speaking, as well as other activities, etc." to do these things more devotedly than ever before.

Further on in her Reflections R.M. reads a meaning into my examples of the Soviet satellite which I certainly never suggested. I certainly never implied that what you never had you never feel the lack of; that is R.M.'s interpretation, but what I suggested was that before the Soviet occupation the dire poverty and hunger that was the lot of the mass of the people who couldn't find work, or if they did find work, earned miserable wages that had no relation to their basic needs. Ask any hungry man what he would choose—political freedom, or bread. The answer is obvious. I put the same question to my informant and he frankly told me that though work may be hard (an artificial tempo to repair war ravages), there is plenty of food to be got with the money one earns, plus all the other free amenities which I mentioned in my article. This has produced a popular support for the communist régime. (The same as although there is now no real political freedom in America, can one honestly say that Americans as

a whole would not support the present American government in any venture it undertakes?) It stands to reason. Though I may not like the colour red, I have to nevertheless admit it is red when I see it. From the comfort of Hampstead we may talk about political freedom and misplace its importance only when the stomach is full. An empty one may make different sounds. What I have suggested about the Soviet satellites does not blind me to the authoritarian structure of the régimes, but an abundance of food available to those who work, when not so long ago none existed suggests to me a stage of progress.

Further, R.M. asks about where real politics are being made by the communists. The whole of the Far Eastern imperial set-up has been destroyed, mostly by communist insurrections. Before the Chinese Communist revolution, China was being bled to death by foreign imperial powers. Indonesia has thrown Dutch rule off; Indo-China and Malaya are all in the process of destroying the last outposts of imperial exploitation. And all these movements are led by the Communists, and to me it is not important whether the Kremlin supports these movements for her own safety or prestige. What is important however is that a large section of the people of the Far East support these popular revolts because of some immediate benefit, otherwise the communists would fail to get this popular support.

Note Labour Delegation report on China and one can't say that the Labour Party is particularly interested in blowing the Communist trumpet. The Imperial powers were only interested in taking out of the exploited regions, so it may take some time before world-wide tangible benefits are evident in those countries which have thrown off their Imperial yokes.

Those events are the real politics of to-day and it is also the so-called Communist menaces which prompts governments to set up the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation, 9 Power Conferences, etc., for which they seek popular support from the masses via the vote.

These are the real politics of to-day made directly or indirectly by the Communists and their opponents the Democrats, and these "irrational" exercises are still made through votes, governments, elections, parties, and programmes, all of which the Anarchist has no connection with.

Right as he may be in his reasons for not involving himself in these irrational activities he unwillingly alienates himself from the mass of political people. Let us at least admit that and have no conscience about it. I'm not apportioning blame, just making my usual observation.

I am not suggesting we participate in the irrational politics but to keep our "self-respect and dignity", as R.M. suggests surely we must practice what we preach. None of the work done by the Anarchists now would suffer if all these activities were part of the community.

So it is not a matter of choosing between running a press, club, or meetings, and a community, but rather making all these activities and many more the "Culture" of the community.

R.M. knows very well that example will not change "character structure", nor would I delegate the jobs to the Communists, but the character structure would undergo a radical change as far as the children of the community are concerned. What to-day constitutes our ideology will for them become the everyday pattern of Life. S.F.

[S.F. here goes on to outline his ideas upon community life. For reasons of space we are holding this over to next week.—Eds.]

Now Ready: **SELECTIONS FROM FREEDOM**

Volume 3—1953

Colonialism on Trial

230 pp. paper 7/6; cloth 10/6

Still available:

Vol. 1.

MANKIND IS ONE

Vol. 2.

POSTSCRIPT TO POSTERITY

NOTE: The paper editions of the three volumes are offered to readers of FREEDOM at the special rate of

FIVE SHILLINGS

per volume by ordering direct from F.P.

Another Prophecy Continued from p. 2

fundamental nature. This is, to say the least of it, sweeping. It is almost as certain as anything is that humanity lived the greatest part of its existence in a warless, governmentless, propertyless society, "Human nature", although no doubt fundamentally the same as now, must have been very different in its manifestations. Thus for example, sexual desire was the same, but being in all probability less encumbered with taboos it did not produce the neuroses and perversions that it does now. The man of a few thousand years ago, let alone a million, was probably very different from modern civilised man. He was, although no angel, most likely a "better" man, in the sense that he was more co-operative and social in his behaviour than we are.

So is it not too much to hope that man in a thousand years' time, or in a few centuries even, may be quite a different person from what he is now? Do we have to wait a million years, with the possibility that the change, when it does come, may be one for the worse? Is it not possible that a more satisfactory form of society may not evolve, or be devised, in which the population may be stable, and in which war and competition for power do not exist?

With a million years to play about with, and in view of the immense social changes that have taken place in the last ten thousand or so, it seems to be not unreasonable to suppose that such a thing might take place. It is at least quite as reasonable as the theories here advanced.

On the subject of eugenics I admit to severe prejudice. I suffer from one or two slight deformities, which no doubt the eugenicist would regard as disqualifying me from reproducing myself. These defects have never of themselves occasioned me any serious trouble of any sort, and I would feel no guilt sense in passing them on to my offspring. I must also point out that a large number of the leading spirits of the human race were men who suffered from some physical handicap, of a kind that they had inherited or would pass on to their descendants, that would in a eugenicist's Utopia debar them from having children. Adler

believed that it was just such handicaps that drove men on to achievement, and the evidence strongly points in that direction.

However there is more to the question than that. Practically all eugenists are supporters of the political "right". Darwin is no exception. "There is at present current in some quarters an equalitarian trend of opinion which is quite dangerously unsound; it is the type that condemns all eugenic views on principle, presumably because they conflict with a dead level of equality. It tries to prejudice the case in advance by stating that the eugenicist rates the rich higher than the poor, without any examination whatever of the very different things that he really does claim . . ."

But in point of fact that is exactly what our author does do in the following pages. He is alarmed that the people at the top of the social scale reproduce themselves less than those at the bottom. He seems to ignore the fact that people from the bottom are continually rising to the top. Thus, our Norman aristocracy were largely killed off by each other during the Wars of the Roses. They were replaced by the merchant class, and the capitalists who enriched themselves by plundering the monasteries. These men, though not perhaps very likeable fellows, were in no way inferior to the men who had preceded them. If anything they were superior, from the point of view of orthodox evolution, whose sole criterion, as this book tells us, is fitness to survive.

There is also of course a continual dribble from the top to the bottom, but this is prevented to a certain extent by the fact that the man with money is in a favourable position, and has an advantage from the start over the man without, even though the latter may have the most talent. When a situation arises when this state of affairs becomes universal, and a whole class, bursting with talent and the rest of it, finds itself disfranchised, we get a situation like that in France before 1789, and eventually a revolution takes place.

It must not be forgotten too that the environment of the "lower classes" is

much less favourable to them in every way than that of their rulers. "The dead level of equality" that the "lower orders" are always seeking to impose on "their betters" is a complete myth. The truth of the matter is that it is the rulers themselves who try to impose this "dead level", of course not upon themselves, but upon those they dominate. The studious encouragement, semi-official by now, of the myth of the Little Man, John Citizen, or Billy Brown of London Town, is a good example of this.

At the risk of being personal, one must indicate the reason for the author's attitude is as much a result of prejudice as my own. He says, "Thus there have been men of pre-eminent ability, risen from the ranks, whose descendants have sunk back in a generation or two, whereas there are families where generation after generation goes on producing men of very good ability. Clearly the probability of producing able men is rather greater in a family that has shown it can do so over several generations." One gets the feeling that the author is thinking of his own family. The Darwin family of course do have a most remarkable record in the world of science. But to generalise from a few cases is dangerous.

The rather hostile attitude of many men towards science is encouraged by these sort of theories. It is natural enough after all. Nor is it restricted to the "inferior types" or the "unfit". One of the reasons why men of considerable intelligence adopt various mystical theories of evolution, or attack science out and out, and even throw themselves into the bosom of the Catholic Church as Chesterton did, is because of this pessimistic and ruthless tendency that one finds sometimes, alas not infrequently, among men of science.

Whether there is something in science itself, with its abstractions, its world of machines, its artificial constructions, or simply the huge scale on which its enterprises are conducted, that makes scientists sometimes so "tough" in their outlook. Or whether it is just that scientists, like most ordinary persons, are authoritarian as a result of social conditioning, I do not know.

ARTHUR W. ULOTH.

American Comics

MUCH publicity has recently been given to the sale in Britain of American comics. Attempts are being made by well meaning groups of people to persuade the Home Secretary to place some kind of legal prohibition on it, and to exert pressure on newsgang members with a similar object in view.

Clearly the effect of this type of literature, features of which were described recently by Kingsley Martin in the *New Statesman*, is very different from that of the more naturally erotic reading matter against which magistrates also direct their anger, and from that of the 'under the counter' literature produced mainly for adults whose sexual desires have already been orientated in that direction. Many recent outbreaks of violence in the U.S.A. have been attributed in a large degree to the efforts of the readers of such 'comics' to emulate their heroes, and it seems quite reasonable to accept this as one of the causes.

Unfortunately, as is usual in a society in which superficiality is often far safer than truth, no real attempt has been made to discover why there is such a ready market for sadistic literature, and it is most unlikely that any official body will make one.

A CALL TO ACTION

Writs have been issued for the by-election in the London constituency of Shoreditch and Finsbury. Polling day is on Thursday, October 21.

Elections are useful times to propagate our ideas concerning the futility of the ballot-box as a means of emancipation. Last year London comrades carried out an anti-vote campaign during the North Paddington by-election. On this occasion 2,500 leaflets were distributed, questions were asked from the anarchist viewpoint and our case was put before a large audience at one of the candidate's meetings in a local theatre. The present election in Shoreditch gives us an opportunity to go into action again. Let us take it!

By the time this call appears in print only a few days will be left before polling. This makes all the more urgent the greatest possible concentration of comrades in the Shoreditch and Finsbury area during these days. Those comrades who realise the importance of this type of work, and are prepared to assist in it, should contact me at the Malatesta Club, or write to me at the address given below.

S. E. PARKER.

79, Warwick Avenue, London, W.9.

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT! (Or Progress of a SURPLUS?) WEEK 40

Deficit on Freedom 40 x £15 = £600

Contributions received £624
SURPLUS £24

September 29 to October 7

Per O.M.:— San Francisco: Part proceeds picnic at Pleasanton £35; San Francisco: A. £1/15/0; Sheffield: G.P.* 5/-; Cambridge: Anon. 5/-; Sutherland: R.W. 9/-; Thornton Heath: P.J.H. 3/-; London: B.McK. 10/-; W.F.* 1/6; P.Q.* 2/6; Anon. 3/-; Photo 2/-; Anon. 4/1; D.R.* 5/-.

Total ... 39 5 1
Previously acknowledged ... 584 14 11

1954 TOTAL TO DATE ... £624 0 0

GIFT OF BOOKS: London: P.A.

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.
SELECTIONS FROM FREEDOM
Vol. 1, 1951, Mankind is One paper 7s. 6d.
Vol. 2, 1952, Postscript to Posterity paper 7s. 6d.
Vol. 3, Colonialism on Trial paper 7s. 6d., cloth 10s. 6d., cloth 10s. 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.

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

The appeal which stories of Superman and his imitators exert is due, as is that of much other literature, to the identification of the reader with one of the leading characters. The mass of young people between the ages of say, 8 to 15, are not only emotionally repressed at the hands of adult society, but suffer the additional disadvantage of being unable to satisfactorily understand the causes of their unhappiness, or even explain them away by, for instance, making a religion out of them. Hence the thrill of reading about the fantastic achievements of supermen who never suffer the disappointments and trials of ordinary life. It is interesting to note that the activities of these fictitious characters are not radically different from those expected of humans, and presented as natural by the State educational system, but are usually exaggerations. "Good" men, nations and policemen, with the help of benevolent supernatural powers, use horrifying violence in their attacks on obviously "bad" countries, or law breakers. Furthermore, they seem to derive great pleasure and satisfaction from doing so. How attractive this must seem to a potential conscript faced with two years of dreary military duties, imposed with the object of defeating a rather vague danger of aggression! Support for the idea that repressed emotions lie behind the desire for sadistic literature is to be found in the fact that it flourishes despite the counter-attraction of nice,

democratic spacemen such as Dan Dare, who provide good, clean fun and adventure and so on without so much brutality.

In view of this, any attempt to treat the dangers inherent in the widespread circulation of these publications as an issue distinct from that of the complete emancipation of society from emotional oppression is doomed to failure as an attack on the symptoms instead of the cause. Legislation cannot prevent the emotions of young people from being expressed, although it can, and to a large degree does, prevent them from expressing themselves in a natural way, and consequently diverts them into more easily accessible channels. The enthusiasm with which priests, empire-builders and similar people crusade against American comics and set up watered-down rivals is perhaps an indication that they subconsciously realize their guilt. Free and happy children would rarely 'see anything in' lurid and sadistic pictures, and so would not provide a market for exploitation by unscrupulous publishers.

The problem is insoluble while the current attitude towards children persists, and is therefore inseparable from the general problem of achieving a libertarian society. Its alleviation can however be advanced, not by supplication to the Home Office, but by interested individuals doing what they can towards propagating and practising a healthy attitude towards children. P.H.

Bevan Goes into Reverse

ANEURIN BEVAN'S manoeuvre to get himself out of the executive of the Labour Party without actual resignation, has been completely successful. In deciding not to sit for election by the constituency parties but to run for Treasurer, he knew perfectly well that the solid weight of the union votes would keep him out.

What then was his reason for quitting the leadership? Principle? But it wasn't a very principled way to leave. Fundamental disagreement? But he has still remained in the Party that has committed itself (and all its members) to policies which he opposes.

Perhaps his own words give us the best clue. At the now notorious meeting he addressed in Scarborough after the conference (when he spoke of the modern labour leader as a 'despicated calculating machine') he said that he was glad to return to the rank and file—which is where the power really lies.

Now this is the reverse of what he decided years ago when, as a young miner, he set out to reach the seat of power—through the local council, and then on to Parliament. In other words, away from the rank and file into the haunts of the leaders.

Are we to take it, then, that Nye is now about to reject the leadership principle? That having learned his lesson he will now submerge himself among the ranks and claim no more power for himself than the most humble party member?

Forgive us if we doubt it. If Bevan is to remain an active politician it can only be as a leader and he can only attempt to sway the Labour Party's policies by rallying sufficient support for himself and his counter-policies as an alternative leadership. For the Labour Party is a leadership organisation—no Parliamentary party could be otherwise.

There are two alternatives to that. The drastic one of founding another party. There is already a small body of Marxist opinion wanting to do that, but to be successful, a very sizable chunk of the Labour Party would have to be prised away. This is remotely possible, but improbable.

The other alternative would be equally drastic for Nye. It is retirement to his newly-acquired farm in Sussex. Not the best answer for a man still in his prime whose whole life and interests are bound up with the hurly-burly of political life.

Well, we suppose we shall see. If

Moral Rearmament *Continued from last week*

OPIMUM

It seems to me, that with its nursery morality, Moral Re-Armament is to be yet another drug, that is to be used to "gull the mob and keep them under". Its activity in the field of industry show this very clearly. It is a sort of Boy Scout movement for adults, all adults. Its ideal is a world wherein all submit to their rulers with a jolly smile, think in clichés prepared for them by others, and keep the wheels turning in a world without quarrels or trouble of any sort, social or domestic. Whether such a society would break down from sheer boredom, or whether revolutionary movements would arise preaching selfishness, greed, and cruelty, in order to make life a bit more interesting, I do not know.

Ancient Peru seems to have been run on lines that would have appealed to supporters of "the M. R. A. way", for they were a people at once docile and efficient, who did as they were told. Their society collapsed before the attack of a handful of brigands and ragamuffins, who preferred to practise selfishness. But I suppose a morally re-armed society would always have the upper-hand in the future, for they would have all the super-scientific weapons, unlike the Peruvians.

THE OXFORD GROUP

The Oxford Group from which the movement grew has now retreated into the background. In Switzerland the name is unknown, Moral Re-Armament having completely ousted it. This is symptomatic. In origin the whole thing was non-political, the Oxford Group being no more than a collection of young men who searched their souls, and bared them in public confession. Traces of

this survive in the Bible-searching, and in the morning "assemblies". Then in 1938 Dr. Buchman launched the phrase "Moral Re-Armament" at a speech in the town hall at East Ham (of all places). From then on the movement has become increasingly political, and the politics have swallowed the religion. During the war the movement supported the Allied cause, though Dr. Buchman had formerly praised Hitler in rather the same way as Churchill, because he had built his nation into a rampart against Communism and materialism. After the war it became increasingly an anti-Communist crusade, and that naturally enough means that it is becoming more and more like the thing it is fighting. It is a hotbed of fanaticism of the worst kind, that makes men, and children too, into simple robots, surrendering their personalities.

But for all that, the Oxford Group period was exceedingly important. Dr. Buchman had travelled widely in the East, especially China, and the writer of this book makes the interesting suggestion that he was influenced by the ideas of Confucius. Certainly some of his followers do claim that his purpose in concentrating on these young students was to "create leadership", in order that he could give his plans more scope, and indeed spread his ideas over the world.

The author makes a series of parallels between the teachings of Buchman and Confucius. "Confucius held that moral order must precede political order. So does Buchman. Confucius loved good food. So does Buchman. Confucius trained 3,000 young followers. Buchman has trained 'a lot of little Wesleys'. Confucius taught: 'If we could all be courteous for even a single day the hatreds of humanity

An Englishman's Home

ACTING on the good old democratic principle that what's yours is mine, what's mine is my own, sundry petty officials have been taking advantage of the power vested in them by the people to divest a certain number of the same of their houses and plots of land.

Like all shrewd business men the local councils know that it is an axiom of big business to pay the minimum price for the maximum amount. They are greatly assisted in this by having the "law" behind them and by their victims' ignorance of that law.

Mrs. Corbettis is a widow living in Streatham Hill, South London. Assisted by her daughter and two sons she manages a fruit and milk business from her home which has a back garden that was the late Mr. Corbettis' pride and joy. His special pride was in the cultivation of his roses, of which he had a wonderful and abundant variety.

This pleasant little plot of land, contrasting favourably in colour and appearance with the surrounding drabness of suburbia, came under the covetous eyes of the gentlemen of the London County Council.

Once they had noticed this land they moved fast.

"We want your garden," these elected representatives of the people told Mrs. Corbettis, who not unnaturally protested. A notice of entry followed, and a warning that the Council would issue a warrant for possession if Mrs. Corbettis did not allow her land to be filched.

To ensure that nothing so outrageous would occur these modern highwaymen then proceeded to have a high fence erected across the land to prevent the Corbettis family from using it. It was regrettable that in the course of this operation the rose trees that had once been so carefully tended were trodden underfoot, but then the planners must not be hindered by such trivial considerations.

Mr. J. E. Toole, valuer to the L.C.C., explained that Mrs. Corbettis can still claim for compensation but that the matter was too urgent to delay.

Too urgent to arrange a suitable price for the land before starting anything. Too urgent to worry whether Mrs. Corbettis was satisfied. Too urgent to pay for the article before you use it. Grab first and ask questions afterwards. We've

Bevan can sincerely reject, after all these years, the leadership principle, we should not spurn his support for the ideas of anarchism. But if he still retains it, and has some plans for himself as a leader of the masses—however sincere he may be—and thinks of himself as another Tito (for whom he has much admiration), then we should hate to see him in power and should oppose him along with every other politician.

would turn to love'. Buchman has taught his followers to sing: 'Sorry is a Magic Little Word.'

In an earlier article in FREEDOM I feel that I may have been somewhat unfair to Aldous Huxley in what I wrote about his "Brave New World". Although much of my criticism of that work still stands, I must say I had no idea that a movement actually working to produce something of the sort of world he described did in fact exist. Moral Re-Armament, though strongly Puritan, certainly does not aim at the grim dictatorship of "1984", or modern Russia, with its artificially induced "austerity". The utopia of M. R. A. is one in which "contented cows give most milk". You and I are going to be the cows—and the sheep!

As against the teachings of Confucius I would set those of an even greater philosopher.

"The Sage says:

I do nothing and the people are reformed of themselves.
I love quietude and the people are righteous of themselves.
I deal in no business and the people grow rich by themselves.
I have no desires and the people are simple and honest by themselves."
(LAOTSE).

However if this new "Inspired Democracy", as they call it, becomes a reality, we may well as revolutionaries find ourselves nailing the Jolly Roger to the mast in order to resist this effort to turn the whole world into a super holiday-camp-cum-Y.M.C.A.-hostel, and to fight for our right to be selfish, lazy, sour, and generally unpleasant.

ARTHUR W. ULOTH.

got it, now let's settle the price—to our satisfaction.

Mrs. Corbettis can still claim compensation, for what it is worth; Mr. Pilgrim, of Romford, Essex, is not so fortunate. When the local council decided to build council houses on his half an acre of land they settle on £65 for it. The price paid by Mr. Pilgrim was £450 on a 10 year mortgage, only two years of which had elapsed.

On his little plot, which adjoined his home, he grew vegetables and flowers until Romford Council took a hand in them.

Protests and appeals by Mr. Pilgrim to the Ministry of Housing went unheeded. For over a year he fought for his land but the contest was too one-sided. Last month he gave up the struggle. In a small hut on what had once been his own plot of land, Edward Pilgrim hanged himself. A Housing Ministry official said that it was "very distressing." S. Croydon, Oct. 7. R.H.L.

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. 17—David Jones (National Secretary Family Service Unit) on
THE PROBLEM FAMILY

OCT. 24—Albert Grace on
DIRECT ACTION IN THE DOCKS

OPEN AIR MEETINGS

Weather Permitting
HYDE PARK
Sundays at 3.30 p.m.

ANARCHIST YOUTH GROUP

SAT. OCT. 16—DANCING from 9 p.m.
SAT. OCT. 23—ANARCHIST COMMERCIAL TV.

Commentator: Shirley Rantell.
Including: Fashion Show in the year 5,054 A.A.R. (After Anarchist Revolution)

TUES. OCT. 26—Bob Green on
RECENT TRENDS IN BEHAVIORIST PSYCHOLOGY.

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 Kramrich
Hugh McKeefery

INDOORS

at 200 Buchanan Street
Every Friday at 7 p.m.

W. LONDON

LECTURE & DISCUSSION
THURS. OCT. 21 at 8 p.m.
Rita Milton on
ASPECTS OF ANARCHISM
691 Fulham Road,
London, S.W.6.
All Welcome.

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