

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"Under a government which imprisons any unjustly, the true place for a just man is also a prison."
—H. D. THOREAU.

THE DOCKERS' STRUGGLE TODAY IS A LEGACY OF BEVINISM

THERE were two main reasons why the Government held back troops from the London docks, after stating that they would be sent in last weekend if the men had not returned by then.

The first and most important reason was that, as we pointed out last week, there were no key men left in the docks under whose direction the troops could have worked. The unskilled labour of conscripts is wasteful at the best of times, but with no skilled men to instruct them in the proper handling of the cargoes, the results would have been pitiful and would have made the effort ridiculous. And no Government can afford to look ridiculous.

The second reason for holding back the troops was the known effect that sending them in would have upon workers in industries allied to the ports.

Workers at Smithfield Meat Market, in British Road Services, on British Railways and at London's fruit markets have already stated that they would refuse to handle the 'black' goods unloaded by troops. In sending its forces into the docks, then, the Government might have to undertake the whole process of distribution—and probably, since the dock strike has now brought Merseyside, Hull and Southampton as well as some minor ports to a standstill, the Government's operation would have to cover very nearly the whole country—with an increasingly rebellious working class refusing to co-operate.

With an election in the offing, the Government must consider very seriously the effects of such developments. If in spite of a fairly tranquil three years, as far as labour relations are concerned (thanks to the T.U.C. 'prepared to work harmoniously with any government'), the Conservatives should find themselves with a general strike on their hands, it would certainly not enhance their chances of re-election.

The Labour Party may not have much to recommend it, to make a choice worth making between it and the Tory Party, but at least it can keep the workers quiet. As we have so often pointed out, Labour's appeals for loyalty ('Don't embarrass our Government') have led to work-

ers accepting terms and conditions under Labour they would never put up with from the Conservatives.

During the war, for example, the coalition government was able to make overtime compulsory in the docks without a murmur from the men. The wartime Minister of Labour, Ernest Bevin, whose name has been invoked by the men's spokesmen in the present dispute, was the architect of all the present disciplinary set-up in the docks, and in return for the advantages of decasualisation (the fall-back pay of £4 8s., if no work is available, is really the only advantage*) the dock workers have had to accept disciplines which do not apply to any other industry.

The present position in which the dockers find themselves, having to fight a bitter fight to establish the principle of voluntary overtime, stems directly from the wartime agreements made by Ernest Bevin and the establishment of the National Dock Labour Board—an unholy alliance of Port of London Authority, employers and trade union fakirs—which tied the dockers hand and foot for the period of the 'emergency' with the unions' agreement. And even Dick Barratt, militant enough to-day as the official leader of the Stevedores' & Dockers', Bill Lindley, Lightermen's leader, and Vic Marney, unofficial leader of the strikers from the Transport & General who, as a Stalinist party-liner, opposed militancy by the workers from 1941-45, all these must have accepted the 'necessity' for workers giving up their rights during the war.

Now the dockers can see that war-

*And even that figure is subject to insurance deduction, and is less than a man with several children can draw as unemployment benefit.

MCCARTHY NO INFORMER!

Senator McCarthy who would turn all Americans into Government informers has nevertheless excluded himself from doing the same when urged to disclose the accounts for his anti-communist funds.

He declared recently that he would never disclose who gave him money for his anti-communist campaign nor who received it.

Workers in N. Rhodesia's Copper Mines

... But some are more Equal than Others

IN its report on native working conditions in the copper mines of N. Rhodesia published last week in Lusaka, the Committee under the chairmanship of Sir John Foster, Q.C., expressed the belief that the African worker has not yet been permitted to advance to the full extent of his capabilities.

According to the B.U.P. the report admits that the *minimum* wage paid to a white worker was 500 per cent, more than the highest wage for an African miner, but gives a "warning" that

the conclusion was inescapable that, were Africans promoted to European jobs and paid on a European basis, it would disrupt the African wage structure throughout the Federation and seriously threaten the national economy. It recommends the advancement of African workers into European-held jobs, but not on an equal pay for equal work basis, and also suggests that the splitting-up of some European jobs into a number of African jobs is necessary.

If we understand the warning correctly it means that the economy of the nation is based on slave labour, and that to pay the Africans the wage for the job, would make it more difficult to compete in world markets. It would be interesting to see whether the report goes into the detail of the trading accounts of the

mining firms, for obviously they must either be inefficient compared with those in other countries not relying on slave labour, or they must be carrying a lot of dead weight in the form of directors, administrators and other white men!

Needless to say, the European workers' union at the mines has already voiced its vigorous opposition to both the Committee's proposals, and has threatened strike action if they are put into effect!

One Strike Ends in N. Rhodesia

NDOLA, OCTOBER 19.

The strike by members of the African Government Workers' Union in Northern Rhodesia, which kept thousands of African workers in Government departments idle for more than a week, has practically ended. It was officially announced to-day that more than 90 per cent. of the strikers had returned to work. But members of a second African union—the General Workers—are continuing their strike which began on October 11, and which involves more than ten thousand African bricklayers and labourers.

—Reuter.

time sacrifices are used by the bosses to establish worsened conditions in peacetime. They can also see that those workers who remained militant during the war (and were denounced by the Communists as 'Trotskyist agents of Hitler') were fighting for trade union rights and working class conditions far more fundamentally and with deeper understanding of the nature of capitalist wars than those who gave up hard-won conditions in order to advance more effectively the interests of their masters.

This is something that should not be forgotten when this dispute is over. It is something fundamental to the whole leadership basis of working class organisation to-day, and is inescapable within the reformist and political nature of those organisations. Just as the British ruling class supported Hitler in his early days and then the workers had to supply the blood, toil, sweat and tears to get them out of their mess, so the leaders of the labour movement are continually landing their followers in the soup and then the rank and file have to fight their own way out.

This is the result of the workers allowing themselves to be used in the interests of leaders, in supporting temporary expediences which always turn out to bolster the position or power of those on top.

The answer to it all is clear. The strength of the workers shows itself—if only partially—in the present strike, as consisting in solidarity and its use in direct action. The political representatives of the labour movement in Parliament are at one

Continued on p. 4

Democracy in Action

Detention in Kenya

Mr. A. T. Lennox-Boyd (Colonial Secretary), answering a series of questions of the number of persons now held in detention in Kenya, said that at the end of September, the number was 48,022, including those held for screening as a result of the Nairobi operation, as well as other persons temporarily in police custody for interrogation. Of the 17,435 persons against whom detention orders had been made, 724 had appealed to the Advisory Appeal Committees, who had heard 642 cases. "It is the aim of the Government to place as soon as possible on the road towards release those who are capable of being recalled to a decent life and in the meantime to make the method of confinement such that it will lead to the least bitterness possible."

Casualties in Kenya

Mrs. Harriet Slater (Lab. Stoke-on-Trent N.) asked the Colonial Secretary for the numbers of civilians, security forces, and Mau Mau terrorists killed in Kenya since the beginning of the emergency.

Mr. A. T. Lennox-Boyd replied: "Up to September 25, 6,608 terrorists have been killed and 11,524 captured, of whom 727 were wounded. Casualties to security forces were 476 killed—28 Europeans, 2 Asians, and 446 Africans,—and there were 426 wounded—55 Europeans, 12 Asians, and 359 Africans. In addition, 25 European, 18 Asian, and 1,234 African civilians were murdered and 24, 27, and 703 respectively were wounded by Mau Mau terrorists."

Night Passes

Mr. A. T. Lennox-Boyd (Colonial Secretary) explaining in answer to Sir Leslie Plummer (Lab. Deptford) the ground on which the Lusaka Municipal Board imposed a night pass system for Africans, met ironical Opposition laughter when he quoted an African as saying, "A person who does not like being asked for a pass is no good."

Mr. J. Dugdale (Lab. West Bromwich) asked if he shared that view.

Mr. Lennox-Boyd replied: "Certainly,

if the conditions are as they are in Lusaka in the case of night offences. The overwhelming majority of law-abiding citizens—this goes for the Africans—are in favour."

Stiffer Penalties for Reds are urged

Stiffer prison sentences should be given to convicted Communist subversives, said Assistant Attorney General William F. Tompkins who is head of the Internal Security Division of the Department of Justice at a meeting (televised) of the New York Youth Forum, last week.

He said that: "The most a Communist convicted of conspiracy, can receive under present law is a sentence up to five years. I believe the law should be changed to give longer sentences to convicted Communist party leaders."

Mr. Tompkins held that recent legislation outlawing the Communist party and depriving its members of citizenship gave the Government a strong weapon in its fight against subversion.

"Loss of the right to vote is a serious thing," he said. "Taking a Communist's citizenship away from him is the toughest thing you can do to him."

These's Money in Africa—for Some

TANGANYIKA CONCESSIONS.—The profits of this company, most of which are derived from dividends paid by Union Minière, increased from £2,057,914 to £2,504,282 after providing £115,000, compared with £143,734 for Southern Rhodesian taxation. The final dividend is raised from 35 per cent. to 45 per cent., making 55 per cent. against 45 per cent., and the margin over the payment, together with tax provisions no longer required of £123,110, permits £372,546 to be added to the carry forward. The profit figures again do not include the profit on redemption of Benguela Railway debentures amounting on this occasion to £168,650. This has been placed direct to capital reserve.

(Manchester Guardian).

MALAN TO RETIRE

What Now in South Africa?

THAT good Christian, Dr. Daniel Malan, has announced his intention of retiring from the premiership of the South African Government on November 30th.

Under his leadership, the Union of South Africa has passed from a State in which 'a Kaffir had to be kept in his place' and which discriminated against African and coloured peoples in hundreds of ways, but loosely and relatively inefficiently, to one in which the fiercest racialism has become official policy, and is ruthlessly carried out.

Malan's predecessor was Jan Christian Smuts, a good friend of Britain, but since the Nationalist Party's triumph, the Union has been steadily moving towards a republic, seeking to loosen its ties with the British Commonwealth—although, in the way these things operate with politicians, the Nationalists' Boerish nationalism will rub along with British democracy, and the British rulers will be not embarrassed at all by the increasing fascist nature of the State, as long as it suits the immediate interests of both.

Dr. Malan's racial policies have been, not different in kind, but different in degree, from those of General Smuts. Where Malan has struck a new note in totalitarian practice is in his interpretation of the Bible and his use of a Protestant Church to implement his policies.

It is nothing new, of course, for opposing points of view to find documentary support in the Bible, but even now—and anti-Christians have to admit that Malan has stretched interpretation of the teachings of gentle Jesus almost to breaking point in order to justify treating non-Europeans in the way he does.

The Dutch Reformed Church is the National Church of South Africa, and is the only church allowed any freedom of operation—but that is because it is hand in glove with the State in all matters. Other Churches are now to be rigidly controlled, especially in African

villages or locations, and a circular to that effect has recently been sent to all urban local authorities by the Native Affairs Department.

The right to build a church can only be granted by the Minister of Native Affairs, and will be valid for only one year at a time. No non-African (e.g. a missionary) may reside on the site without Ministerial permission, and notice to quit the site without compensation within three months will be given when, in the words of the circular:

... in the opinion of the Minister of Native Affairs the occupier uses the site, or allows or suffers it to be used, for purposes other than those for which it was granted, or the activities of the said occupier or any of his representatives, whether on the site or elsewhere, are such as to encourage or tend to encourage deterioration in the relationship between Natives and the Government, or governmental persons or bodies ...

By these means, the Nationalists can control dissident religious bodies in the same way that its control of Communism laws have given it the powers to suppress political and social and trade union organisations which do not conform.

The Dutch Reformed Church's acceptance of apartheid, and all that goes with it, is a source of embarrassment to other Christian bodies outside of South Africa, too. Only last week, in the United Nations Assembly, the permanent representative of Iraq, Awni Khalidi, blamed the Church in South Africa for a large part of the racial segregation there.

Mr. Khalidi said it was "a source of pain that a church which worships God and His law on earth should perpetrate a doctrine of racial inequality."

"How far removed is the Dutch Reformed Church and its doctrine of racial supremacy from the Sermon on the Mount," he declared. "How far removed is this unfortunate philosophy from the teachings of Christ."

It may be a source of pain to Mr.

Khalidi, but it can hardly be one of surprise. Christian churches in various places at various times have supported—and benefitted from—many forms of behaviour which can hardly be said to have much in common with the Sermon on the Mount. All established churches support wars on the sides of the States in which they are established, as well as coming to terms with fascist and communist régimes where 'necessary'. The South African Government is fighting a war against a large part of its own population, and the loyal Church is by its side, with copious quotations like that one about 'hewers of wood and drawers of water' to prove that Africans, Indians, and 'Cape Coloureds', are sent by God to serve those superior beings privileged to have white skins.

What will follow immediately after Malan's retirement will depend upon which of two likely successors step into his shoes. If Nicolaas Havenga (present Finance Minister) gets the job, it is likely that the present steady progress towards a totalitarian, apartheid State will continue at a slow pace. It is thought, for example, that he would not press urgently for the segregation of coloured voters on a separate electoral register—although this will come eventually.

If, however, the other candidate, Johannes Strydom, is promoted to premier (he is leader of the Transvaal Nationalists) we can expect to see the pressure on racial issues stepped up. He is a fanatical Nationalist who wants to shift coloured voters right off the white register, and to curtail the power of the Appeal Court, which rejected as unconstitutional the Government's Segregation Bill on that issue last year. He is also a strong Republican and, unlike Havenga, violently anti-British Commonwealth.

The lot of non-Europeans will continue to deteriorate under Havenga. Under Strydom, South Africa would take rapid steps towards fascism.

BOOKS

Old Horizons--Somewhat Modernised

NEW HORIZONS, by Wilfred Wellock. Houseman's Book-Shop, 2/6.

I HAVE read this pamphlet with some disappointment. It is the collected Orchard Lea Papers, published separately by Wilfred Wellock some time ago, to which has been added an introduction and an addendum.

The author makes a plea for a revival of community life, a development of small-scale decentralised industry, thus giving scope to individual craftsmanship, production for use rather than for profit, an agricultural revolution based on the ownership of the land by peasant proprietors on a small scale; and this he maintains will pull European civilisation out of the bog into which it has fallen. He considers that the evils of present society are due to the rapid development of industrialisation, the swamping of the community in the big city, the drift from the land, the monotonous work that industrial society demands, the "materialist" cult of money that capitalism brings in, and the empty pleasures with which people must drug their minds to escape the boredom of modern civilisation.

We have heard this many times before, and there is no doubt that it is, in the main, true. But Wellock's plans for the future do not really go far enough. His idea of the better society would not be objected to on the whole by most anarchists, although they might object to certain details of it. But it seems to me that there is a fatal flaw in his reasoning, which makes one feel vaguely uncomfortable.

I am not thinking of his rather reformist attitude. One cannot really object to every writer on sociological questions because he is not a hundred per cent. anarchist. Most of the books on such questions that one reads are in fact of a reformist type, to a greater or lesser extent, and one becomes used to making a sort of mental reservation as one reads.

The real trouble is that he seems to imagine that the evils of our world all started with the Industrial Revolution. Before then it is true, we did have a well-integrated community life, and craftsmanship, but what did these craftsmen sometimes make? Swords and guns, instruments of torture, sacrificial bowls and knives. The fact of the matter is that the Middle Ages had all the things that Wellock desires. It also had the Inquisition, witch hunts (real witches supplied free of charge; it was not the degenerate modern sport that bears the same name, it was the real thing), plagues due to insanitary conditions unknown in previous more enlightened civilisations, and perennial warfare.

Nor is Medieval Europe the only example. Practically all societies up till the Industrial Revolution had communities, peasant cultivators, and craftsmen, and yet there flourished among them barbarities that would sicken modern man. This is an exceedingly complicated question I know. Heaven forbid that I should pose as the champion of the Industrial Revolution, but one has got to recognise that it has emancipated man from as many horrors as it has created.

I can journey to London this afternoon without fear of highwaymen. This is not the result of increased police forces, but of the thickness of the population, the presence of street lamps, and the general softening of manners. All these are the products of industrialisation. I read recently in a book, on quite another question, of how a poor young girl, somewhere in the East Indies, was put to death for eating a fish during her menstrual period. From such stupidities industrialism has saved us. Science and the machine have liberated us from superstition. The truth would seem to be that community life *by itself* is not enough. If we are to have the good life we must have communities with a more healthy basis than those of the Middle Ages. But this aspect of the matter Wellock never seems to notice. (In this incidentally he follows Kropotkin).

The trouble with Wellock's analysis of society is that it does not go deep enough, though in general it is all right as far as it goes. However on the matter of religion I think most anarchists would like to join issue with him. He says:

"The right to wholeness is basic, and it should be one of the major aims of religion to make it possible for all men to achieve it. It was the failure of religion to do precisely this, and also to demand economic justice for the workers during the first century of the Industrial Revolution, that was responsible for the great exodus from the Churches of Britain during the first three decades of the present century."

This may have been one of the reasons, but surely another very important one was that people were finding out that religion just is not true? That men are not born from virgins, that you cannot multiply loaves and fishes, and that whatever incantations you may choose to make over water it still remains water. Even if Christ was crucified, dead and buried it was no great help to people living a couple of thousand years later, and it is quite impossible, however hard you try, to ascend into heaven, without some sort of machine to lift you.

By mixing up their teachings with fairy tales the Churches did quite a bit to dis-

credit themselves, quite apart from the reasons Wellock gives. Moreover, even stripped of these impossible stories, their teachings were so authoritarian that people were glad to emancipate themselves from them; and although there is occasionally a temporary religious revival, the churches remain most of the time obstinately empty.

Not all beliefs, formerly thought to be superstitious, or legends, have in fact turned out to be so. But generally speaking religion is now discredited. At any rate the Christian one (as most people understand it) certainly is. To revive it, if one could, would be most desirable. In those countries where the Catholic Church is dominant we have examples of what such a revival of faith would mean.

It is no gain to have a well-integrated community (as in many Catholic countries) if a person is sexually frustrated, and tortured by fears of Hell-fire. If the future community is to have a religion, if it is necessary, then it will have to be some sort of pagan celebration of the processes of nature, some kind of matriarchal fertility cult. We cannot afford to have the worship of the brutal sky-god Jehovah (even if mitigated by the Virgin) back again at any price.

The evils against which we fight did not originate at the end of the eighteenth century, and they are far too complex to have originated in one single cause, Industrialism. Industrialism is a new development within an already completely authoritarian society. It is this authoritarian social structure that we must fight. The communal society of to-morrow must be something more than the Middle Ages plus electrification.

Do not misunderstand me, I am not saying that that is what the author wants. What I am saying is that the form of society that he envisages could easily become as bad as the "materialist" civilisation that he deplures. There is nothing to prevent it becoming thoroughly authoritarian, mystical, or ascetic. In this connection it is an exceedingly worrying thing that the movement for the restoration of communal life should contain such a high proportion of Gandhians and Catholics. Something more radical and fundamental than the Wellockian solution is needed.

ARTHUR W. ULOTH.

The Pope has Spoken

The Pope has formally pronounced the Virgin Mary to be Queen of Heaven, something which Roman Catholics generally have believed for centuries.

(Sunday Pictorial).

CINEMA

REFORM AND REVOLUTION

"RIOT IN CELL BLOCK 11" (at the Academy Cinema) is more than just another prison film. Walter Wanger, who has served a jail sentence himself and therefore knows only too well what his film is about, has succeeded in making us feel what it is like to be in prison. The sense of actuality has been achieved by shooting the film inside a prison—at Folsom, California, with the co-operation of the prison authorities and the inmates.

In this parable the jail is a microcosm: "We get good and bad in here just like on the outside," says the warden (Emile Meyer). The warden is a typical liberal. He is a humane man who thinks of his prison as an instrument for redeeming men from their life of crime, but he knows that, with things as they are, it is not doing anything of the sort. The jail holds 4,000 convicts. The guards are too few and badly paid. For years he has asked for improvements and reforms only to have them pushed aside by the State legislature.

One night there is a riot in Block 11. The leader is a convict named Don (Neville Brand), who is in for armed robbery and second-degree murder. He can be brutal, but it is a brutality born of desperation, and he has the intelligence to see the strength and weakness of the rioters' position. His lieutenant, Carney (Leo Gordon), is unmistakably a psychopath. Violent and sadistic, he delights in cruelty for its own sake, and it is all Don can do to restrain him.

The rioters are not trying to escape. Their aims are limited to a few simple reforms—an end to the overcrowding, the abolition of leg irons and manacles, and the separation of the dangerous "nut cases".

In framing the convicts' demands Don seeks the help of a convicted colonel, a man serving sentence for manslaughter in a drunken brawl. The colonel is for the demands but against the riot. "You're against the riot because you were brass," says Don, who knows a conservative when he meets one.

When news of the riot reaches the State governor he sends his man Haskell (Frank Faylen), to see what is to be done. "I don't know what that politician will do here," says the harassed warden. "He knows these men haven't got votes." He is not left long in doubt. Haskell will have none of the demands: he is not a man to bargain with convicts.

The rioters are holding nine guards as hostages. There is the brutal Nnadev, who knows that he will be the first to die if it comes to the pinch. And there is the youngster who is worried about his wife, who is expecting a baby. "You can't afford a child on your salary," says one of the amazed convicts with

whom the young guard is pleading. He always treated them fairly, he points out. He had no favourites. He was just doing his job as a guard. "That's what we've got against you," is the reply.

Finally the governor agrees to the demands, just in time to prevent Haskell from carrying out his plan to blow a hole in the wall of the block.

But it is a pyrrhic victory. After the rioters have surrendered the State legislature repudiates the agreement, declaring that neither the governor nor the warden had any right to make a bargain with convicts. Don's bewilderment when he learns that he is to stand trial for his part in the riot is that of all reformists brought face to face with betrayal. Has their struggle been all in vain? The warden is not sure. Perhaps good will come out of evil, is as much as he can suggest: at least he has managed to get Carney transferred to a mental hospital, which he could not have done otherwise.

But ultimately? The film ends on a questioning note, and the questions that come to one's mind are not confined to the possibilities of penal reform.

E.P.

Government Enquiry into Homosexuality and Prostitution

A COMMITTEE has recently been appointed under the Chairmanship of the Home Secretary to enquire into the desirability of changing the law relating to homosexuality and prostitution. The Chairman is Mr. J. F. Wolfenden, Vice-Chancellor of Reading University.

The Progressive League is preparing a memorandum of evidence to present to this committee, and they are anxious to ascertain as far as possible the facts on which a right judgment should be based. To this end they have prepared the questionnaire designed to elicit the attitude of socially responsible men and women towards this very difficult problem.

FREEDOM has devoted considerable space in the past to the problems which the Parliamentary Committee will be considering, and it is hoped that any readers who hold views on this subject will co-operate with the Progressive League by answering the questions. Copies of the questionnaire can be obtained from Mr. R. S. W. Pollard, J.P., Solicitor, 17 Victoria Street, London, S.W.1., under whose auspices the Progressive League's enquiry will be conducted. The evidence submitted through the questionnaire will be treated as completely confidential.

Reflections on the First International—2

(Continued from last week)

Since 1877 the federalist form of organisation has been vindicated again and again. Centralist-type organisations, while superficially more powerful, suffer from two great defects. The first is the fact that they invariably degenerate into rigid bureaucracies and the second—which is related to the first—is that when they are vanquished in a struggle with an even more powerful organisation, they lack the resilience necessary to effect a revival; witness the collapse in 1933 and subsequent history of that gigantic bureaucratic octopus, the German Social Democratic Party. Federalist organisations, on the other hand, since they are based on the local autonomous group, have the advantages (and of course the disadvantages) of guerilla forces. They can suffer defeat, apparently crushing defeat, but yet rise again, like the Phoenix from the ashes, more powerful than before. As Brennan has observed, it is this autonomous organisation which has served the Spanish anarchists so well in the past and which, we have no doubt, will prove to have served them well in the future.

III

The second of the three main issues that divided the International was the question of the State. On this issue it is easier for an anarchist to pronounce judgment since it is this issue which has rightly come to be regarded as the principal criterion for distinguishing the anarchist from the non-anarchist. Opposition to existing States is a common feature of the policies of revolutionaries of all shades of thought. In those halcyon days before the workers had created States of their 'own', the marxists too were opposed to existing States. But what they objected to was not the State as such but the 'police State' of the feudalists and the capitalists. The feudal or capitalist State, they argued, must be overthrown, not in order to create a State-less society but in order to build a new State, a *Volksstaat*, based directly on the power of the working class. Since, by definition, the State was simply an organ for the suppression of one class by another—in capitalist society, an organ for the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, in socialist society, an organ for the dictatorship of the proletariat—it followed, according to the marxists, that when, after a period of transition, classes had been finally abolished, the State would necessarily disappear. In Engels' phrase, it would 'wither away with the spinning wheel and the bronze axe'.

This marxist notion of an eventually State-less society

presents a trap for those who do not see that the 'proof' of the eventual abolition, or rather, withering away, of the State is no more than a verbal trick. It suggests that the essential difference between the marxist and the anarchist is a question of timing. How often one has heard from the sympathiser: 'I agree with your ideal but the time is not yet ripe. Come back and see me a hundred, five hundred, a thousand years hence! Meanwhile, let us make the most of what we can by employing the great instrument of coercion for our own ends.' But the difference is not a question of timing: it is a question of means and of practical uncommon sense. For the great contribution of anarchism to revolutionary theory lies in its unqualified insistence on the impossibility of achieving one's end without using the appropriate means. To imagine that a free society will somehow emerge gradually from a society in which the coercive power of the State has been concentrated to the *n*th degree is to be guilty—if one may use the word against them which the marxists themselves have done so much to debase—of the most ridiculous of all forms of utopianism. As James Guillaume, the author of the *Sonvilliers Circular*, stated in another but related context: 'How could one want an equalitarian and free society to issue from an authoritarian organisation? It is impossible.'

Who were right, therefore, the anarchists or the marxists? We would not be posing the question, if we were not morally certain of the answer. It was the insight of genius which led Bakunin to declare that the People's State of Marx would result not in the abolition of classes but in the creation of a new class. The marxist State having concentrated all economic power as well as political power in its own hands, would result, as he put it, in 'the reign of scientific intelligence, the most aristocratic, despotic, arrogant and contemptuous of all régimes. There will be a new class, a new hierarchy of real and pretended scientists and scholars, and the world will be divided into a minority ruling in the name of knowledge and an immense ignorant majority. And then, woe betide the mass of ignorant.'

But that was in the 1870's. The year is now 1954—one generation from the arrival of the Orwellian nightmare. It requires no prescient genius now to divine that the People's State, the dictatorship of the proletariat, is the harbinger of a tyranny more terrible than the old. New priest is but old presbyter writ large—and how large!

Nevertheless, it would be a little self-righteous of the modern anarchist to adopt the attitude of 'How-right-

we-were' and leave it at that. The weaknesses of our opponents in this instance are glaring but we gain nothing by ignoring the strong points in their case, such as they are. We can now see that the International marked the parting of the ways but it would be naive in the extreme to believe that the great mass of the working-class movement would have chosen the State Socialist rather than the anarchist road, unless there had been some strong incentives for them to do so.

After the collapse of the International the State Socialist road itself divided into two: the social-democratic road and the bolshevik or 'communist' road. The division here was in effect between those who accepted the Lassalleian heresy that one could use the existing State machine for the introduction of socialism and those who adhered to the more orthodox marxist view that the capitalist State must be destroyed and superseded by a workers' State.* This division has at certain times and places been important and it would be absurd for instance at the present time to lump together without further qualification the Labour State Socialists and the Communist State Socialists in Britain. Nevertheless, from a wider point of view, the distinction is less important than it seemed, say, to the generation of Lenin. Whether social democrats take over the existing State or whether the 'Communists' destroy it and build a soviet State, one thing is certain: the concentration of power in the hands of the State, in practice the concentration of power in the hands of the new ruling class which controls the State, is increased. The difference is essentially a difference of degree, not of kind.

For theoretical purposes, though not for practical, one may usually ignore the distinction. Consider, then, the question we originally raised: Why has the mass of the working class movement chosen the State Socialist and not the anarchist road?

The obvious first answer is that the former represented an apparent short cut to socialism. The State is centralised and organised power. This power is an existential

*I say only 'more orthodox' because Marx himself, at least until the Paris Commune, never expressed himself clearly on this point. After the Gotha Congress of 1875 which united the marxists and the Lassalleians, Marx accepted, under protests which were ignored at the time, something akin to the Lassalleian heresy. It was left for Lenin, by selective quotation, to bring out clearly the distinction between the 'true' marxist and the social-democratic attitude towards the State.

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.

Second-Hand . . .

The Bomb (on the Chicago Anarchists) Frank Harris 10/-
The Yellow Ticket Frank Harris 5/-
Russia Under the Czars Stepiak 5/-
The Career of a Nihilist Stepiak 6/-
The Social Revolution Karl Kautsky 5/-
Life, Trial and Death of Francisco Ferrer William Archer 7/6
Terror Over Yugoslavia Avro Manhattan 5/-
The Smaller Democracies E. D. Simon 2/6
And He Did Hide Himself Ignazio Silone 2/6
The Cry for Justice (ed.) Upton Sinclair 15/-
A Hero of Our Time M. U. Lermontov 3/-

Cheap Edition . . .

What is Property? P. J. Proudhon (2 vols.), the set 3/6
Periodicals . . .
London Magazine (Auden Huxley, Moravia, etc.) 2/6
Individual Action, October 5th. 3d.
The Libertarian (Special 'Omnibus' Edition) 6d.
Have you had our new list yet?

Postage free on all items

Obtainable from

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

IN AMERICA— Sadism & Persecution

MUD-SLINGING appears to be an integral part of politics and in this age of Radio and Television and "news-hungry" mass circulation newspapers it has reached unbelievable proportions, and especially is this the case at election time. In the United States we have the unsavoury spectacle of, on the one hand, politicians instigating the investigation of the private citizen's political virginity before he can be allowed to practise certain professions and trades, while on the other, they are engaging among themselves in a glorious campaign of mutual vilification and exposure which, apart from making them unfitted for any office (let alone of judging the moral and political fitness of schoolmasters, scientists and civil servants) should result in a mass boycott by the public at the coming elections. But it would seem that the American public is too accustomed to politics being wrapped up in dirt to expect anything else. Indeed, viewed from this side of the Atlantic (and therefore only an outsider's impression), we get the impression that there is more than a streak of sadism in the American public. How else can we understand the hounding of McCarthy's victims by Senatorial inquisitors every sordid and sadistic detail of which is brought into your home by the snooping eye of the Television camera; of the remorseless persecution of such men as Alger Hiss, Professor Oppenheimer or currently of Owen Lattimer reported in every intimate detail by the press. The guilt or innocence of the victims is of minor importance compared with the long-drawn-out persecution by the representatives of the State. And one must conclude that the American public derives some considerable satisfaction from all this for otherwise steps would have long ago been taken to put an end to it.

The American daily Press, its columns filled with the blackening of Harriman by Iving Ives, his senatorial rival for the Governorship of New York; of the revelation that the New Jersey Republican Senatorial candidate has a communist sister and that the former governor of Arkansas was not re-elected as a result of interference by private power interests (Dixon-Yates Unit)—the American daily Press we say strikes one as the adult equivalent of the horror comics for the young. And, the sad thing is that there appears to be as much a demand for the one as for the other.

SLUMS AND MENTAL HOSPITALS

IN the November 2 ballot New Yorkers will vote on two propositions. The first is for authorizing a bond issue of \$350,000,000 for a long-term programme of mental hospital construction and improvement (which is in addition to the \$200 million already spent during the past eleven years). The second is a bond-issue borrowing of \$200 million for low-rent slum clearance.

Is it not a sign of the times that there are probably more families with cases of mental illness than there are families living in the slums? At least that is what the figures would indicate when we are told that in New York the "patient roster" in mental hospitals has risen from 90,000 to 112,000 and that mental illness "strikes one family out of four at some time or other".

RUSSIA AFTER STALIN

RUSSIA AFTER STALIN, by Isaac Deutscher. (Hamish Hamilton, 1953).

THE keenest contemporary historians of the Russian revolution have made theirs to some degree the attitude of mind characteristic of the party that identified that revolution with the defence and furtherance of their particular ends. At least that is the impression that an E. H. Carr or an Isaac Deutscher give, especially in their assessment of the groups and parties which the Bolsheviks brushed aside, slandered and liquidated. Already when an author extends the term of Russian revolution to cover the Stalinist period it is obvious he does not share the traditional view according to which a revolution is an attempt on the part of the masses to shake off their fetters and realize their aspirations. Although he may not say it in so few words he is in perfect agreement with one of Stalin's last pronouncements, namely that revolution can be started and carried out from above. The extermination of the so-called kulaks in the thirties, assumedly a necessary step towards the industrialization of the country, is given by Deutscher as a momentous revolutionary act, and one is left to wonder whether, had Germany not been defeated, he would have thought the same of Hitler's extermination of the Jews.

The marxist contagion appears most crudely in Deutscher when in reviewing the events following Lenin's death he repeatedly insists that each of them had to happen for such and such a reason. The best comment upon this familiar line of thought is an old Italian proverb: "Del senno del poi son piene le fosse", meaning that wisdom after the event is just as plentiful as it is useless. Unfortunately this spurious and harmless wisdom can be drummed into people, and people can be bludgeoned to bow before it in awe. Starting from the premise that a régime is right because it is strong if argues that it is strong because it is right. Contrary to logic it gives past successes as a categorical proof of victories to come, and contrary to the spirit of Marxist dialectics, denies that any opposition to a self-styled communist régime can be based on genuine historical realities and meet one day with success. In one of his moments of grim humour Milosz has given a crisp example of how this false dialectics, but genuine Stalinism, works. You say that somebody's house has to be burned, you go and set fire to it, and so your statement is proved correct with the sinister implication that any one who dares contradict it will be proved wrong by having his house burnt in the same way.

IT is not my intention to suggest that Deutscher is an apostle of Stalinism

turning up belatedly and in an unexpected quarter, but he holds that Stalin was great, and it is the idea of greatness associated with the name of Stalin to which I object. I remember how fatal it was in Fascist Italy to start accepting that Mussolini was great or had done a few good things. The man who accepted that was invariably lost to the anti-fascist cause. One is an anti-stalinist not last because one has an idea of greatness which simply cannot be applied to Josef Stalin, not even now that he is dead. Deutscher gives him as great because he was successful, and the most unpleasant part of the book comes from the task its author sets himself to explain Stalin's success. As Deutscher endorses Plekhanov's thesis that "owing to the specific qualities of their minds and characters, influential individuals can change the individual features of events and some of their particular consequences, but cannot change their general trend which is determined by other forces" he had no need to impose himself such a task. It will be a sign of intellectual health when historians and readers of history will rid their minds of the notion and idolatry of success, for there is nothing to say about success except that it is successful. If generalizations were possible in history

as they are in science, in the sense that they would cover future as well as past events, then history would no longer be history but a chapter of natural history. What makes history so singularly a human affair is in Marxian terms a dialectical process, and in plain terms a dramatic element of daring and risk. Victory cannot be foreseen before the battle is fought, and a battle is fought precisely because there is no way of telling or agreeing beforehand who will be the victor. Even in the case of what is known as a desperate or a lost cause, if people fight for it they commit the supporters of the victorious cause in such a way as always to affect its conditions to a certain degree, and sometimes its content. The best reason that can be given for Trotsky failing whereas Stalin succeeded is, apart from pure accidents, that Trotsky was Trotsky and not Stalin. A saying attributed to the English nation states that it is only the last battle that counts, and as in history there is no such thing as a last battle, Stalin cannot be said to have been successful, especially if all that he most personally fought for and strove to achieve is undone by his successors. Deutscher himself contends that "it was the peculiar paradox of Stalinism that with one hand it fought ruthlessly and desperately to perpetuate

its domination over the mind and body of the Russian people and with the other it was, with equal ruthlessness and persistence, destroying the very prerequisites of self-perpetuation. In other words, Stalin has done much, both positively and negatively, to ensure that Stalinism should not be able to survive him for very long." (p. 17).

THERE is, moreover, in Deutscher's historical interpretation, a confusion between causes and effects which is quite familiar to the reader of writers who professedly and professionally apply the dialectical method to political events. According to Deutscher, Stalinism, as a policy of self-containment and socialism in one country, was successful because there were no revolutionary possibilities outside Russia, so that it was fatal that the champions of internationalism, all the old Bolshevik guard, should lose the day. I hold that the cause of internationalism was lost because its champions in Russia were defeated purely on a power-politics terrain, and also because with Lenin's founding of the Third International, vast sections of the working classes in Europe were alienated from the Russian cause. Referring to later times Deutscher undermines his point and lends support to the opposite view when he openly admits that it was the constant policy of Stalin to use all com-

Continued on p. 4

Problems of Integration in U.S. Schools

PUPILS in Washington and Baltimore have attributed the recent demonstrations against integration of Negro and white children in the public schools to adult "ruffians" and "agitators". This was the opinion expressed by ten white boys and girls from those cities who were invited to New Rochelle to see for themselves how the integration of 1,200 white and 400 Negro children had been successfully carried through at New Rochelle High School.

"Don't blame the pupils for demonstrations against nonsegregation," Robert E. Rodgers, 23-year-old Korean War veteran and a student at Southern High School of Baltimore, told the New Rochelle principal, Willis Thomson. He added:

"A few parents started agitating, so pupils stayed away from school. It was as simple as shooting off a gun to start a herd of cattle running."

Other visitors from the South told of being called "chicken" and threatened by adults and by anonymous telephone callers if they "dared go to school the next day" with Negroes.

They related that Southern High School had 1,700 pupils, thirty-four of them Negro, and only 150 children went to school one day.

Some visitors said the integration should not have been attempted overnight but instead over the years, as New Rochelle has done. But, they explained,

outmoded Negro school buildings had to be abandoned at once or be rebuilt.

Betty Harris, 18, of Anacostia, said she could understand how Negroes played football, went to classes and shared the lunchroom here with white students, but she wondered how they fared at school dances.

Robert L. Forbes, human relations teacher, said Negro and white students did not dance together, although they attended the same parties and collaborated in managing clubs and the interracial Phi Sigma Beta fraternity. He said two Negroes had been president of the General Organization.

Mr. Bowles beats a different drum Now!

WE do not know how seriously most Americans treat Bryant W. Bowles, 34-year-old former drummer in a United States Marine Corps band who now beats the big drum for white supremacy in the United States through his organisation quaintly called the National Association for the Advancement of White People. One of his principal objectives at present is to defeat attempts to put into operation the anti-segregation ruling of the Courts and to this end he advocates an economic boycott of those who believe in integration in the public schools. Though he is at present out on bail on charges of

disrupting the education system in two counties, Mr. Bowles appears to be holding large meetings, with what success the newspaper report we have seen do not indicate.

His views however do not strike us as being anything like as original as the name of his organisation which, depending on one's approach to the status of the white American can be considered eccentric, funny or even very sensible. Many will feel that a lot of Americans do need some association to help in their mental development or "advancement", and none less than Mr. Bowles himself when he utters such views as the following:

"There is no need in this country for any organisation to advance the Negro.

"If they need to be advanced," he said, "the road is open in the jungles of Africa."

He repeated that his group was not "against Negroes."

"But those people who are trying to shove the Negro down our throats, we're going to boot them out of the United States if we can," he said.

But then of course such phenomena as Mr. Bowles are not to be found only in America. We have more than a sprinkling of them in this country too in spite of the smallness of the colour problem as compared with the United States.

Reflections on the First International

Continued from p. 2

fact. To refuse to use it when one has the chance and the opportunity is tantamount to refusing to use the weapon which lays most readily to hand. The greater one's condemnation of the existing order of society, the greater is the temptation to use it—unless one is aware that it is not only a two-edged weapon but also a weapon whose use will destroy the very things one sets out to achieve. Even so, one's capacity to resist the fatal temptation largely depends on one's belief that other, perhaps even more powerful though less easily adaptable, weapons exist in the revolutionary arsenal. Bakunin had such a belief—a belief in the creative and revolutionary potentialities of the workers.

We shall have occasion to refer to that again later but for illustrative purposes let us take another case which does not directly affect the anarchists. The voluntary co-operative movement occupied a good deal of attention in discussions in the International. Although, under the initial inspiration of Owen and William Thompson, the co-operative movement had developed on essentially libertarian lines, asking no more of the State than that it should be left alone, by the 'sixties it had lost a good deal of its social idealism and had been taken under the patronage of bourgeois philanthropists and economists who saw in it a useful means of inculcating into the workers the Victorian virtues of thrift and self-help.

The Internationalists were, therefore, called upon to define their attitude towards the movement. Some, like the Proudhonists, insisted on maintaining the voluntary character of the movement; others, like the Lassalleans, urged that the State should undertake the task of initiating co-operatives; and others should again, like Marx, urged that co-operation by itself could not free the masses and that, consequently, 'co-operative labour ought to be developed to national dimensions'—a disguised way of saying that it should be replaced by a system of State ownership.

The co-operators themselves, of course, ignored this conflicting advice. In England, at least, they continued to believe that by their own unaided exertions the movement would eventually supersede the capitalist system, thereby inaugurating the Co-operative Commonwealth. However, despite considerable advances, by the end of the century the movement had done little more than win a firm foothold in the retail distributive trades; its productive enterprises in comparison with capitalist

production were negligible. Moreover, it was now beginning to face as competitors not small capitalists but capitalists organised in gigantic new trusts. In the light of these developments, the co-operators' vision of the Co-operative Commonwealth faded: it became a myth in which only a few cranks continued to believe. Bereft of faith in the Co-operative millenium, the way was thus opened for the State Socialists of the Fabian brand to take over the movement and to find a place for it, as one form of social ownership, in their own plans for a Socialist State. In this way a movement, which, whatever its shortcomings, had been basically libertarian in outlook, became to a large extent the vassal of the Statists. Ceasing to believe in their own capacity to oust the capitalist system, co-operators began to call upon the State to do for them what originally they would have been content, indeed determined, to do for themselves.

For somewhat different reasons that other great type of working-class organisation, the trade union, came to embrace the doctrines of the State Socialists. Like the co-operatives the British trade unions in their early days had been inspired by essentially libertarian ideas. Owen's Grand National was the precursor of modern syndicalism. But, although syndicalist ideas have at different periods and places enjoyed considerable vogue among trade unionists, trade unions are not naturally predisposed towards a libertarian strategy and ideology. For trade unions—and this applies equally to industrial unions—are primarily defensive organisations. They might, under tuition, persuade themselves that they are also the nuclei of the future society but at any given time, if they are doing their job, they must concentrate above all on their defensive functions. And the explanation for that is simple enough: the mass of their members have only their week's wages between them and the breadline. Unless the unions can safeguard the weekly pay packet, they will lose the support of their members.

As defensive organisations, their chief method of procedure is legislative: the laying down of general rules governing conditions of work and payment. Legislation to be effective requires sanctions behind it. The trade unions' own sanction, of course, is the strike. But it required no very great persuasion to convince the majority of trade unionists, once universal suffrage—that great counter-revolutionary instrument, as Proudhon so rightly called it—had been granted them, that they would

do better to supplement their own sanctions with the more powerful sanctions of the State. Failing to win the eight-hour day by their own efforts, the trade unions thus call upon the State to impose it by statute.

This, what one may call, natural predisposition of the trade unions towards political action and hence towards State Socialism—for the socialism of the Labour Party, in origin at least, is no more than a generalisation of orthodox trade union aims—is nowhere better illustrated than in the case of the 'new unions' of the 1880's. The new unionism was a reaction against the 'model' unionism of mid-Victorian capitalism which had been confined largely to the small minority of skilled workers. The new unionists endeavoured to organise the unskilled workers and for a time their leaders—Burns, Mann and Tillet—seemed ready to espouse libertarian tactics. Ideas of a general strike, of workers' control and the like were freely circulated, and it became pardonable to assume, as one writer in FREEDOM put it, that here were 'free spontaneous associations of working men waiting to do anarchistic work' (What's to be done? FREEDOM, Feb. 1892).

But, as events soon showed, the assumption was mistaken. Just because the new labour unions were weak, comparatively poorly endowed with funds, and composed of men whose labour power possessed little monopoly value, they soon abandoned their libertarian ideas in favour of State Socialist tactics. It was, indeed, the new unionists who formed the backbone of the movement which eventually led to the formation of the Labour Party and one need hardly recall the fact that the general unions, which date from this period, remain to-day the most solid supporters of the party their predecessors did so much to create.

It would be unwise to generalise too much from British experience but it provides, I am convinced, at least part of the answer to the question why working-class organisations generally have taken the State Socialist rather than the anarchist road. That it is a mistaken road, we are all agreed but we merely delude ourselves if we imagine that the mistake can be rectified without a full appreciation of why it was made in the first place. No greater service to the anarchist cause at the present juncture could be rendered than a serious and full-scale study, with this problem in mind, of the development of the international labour and socialist movement in the last three-quarters of a century. To date anarchists have been far too insular in their treatment of movements other than their own.

(To be concluded)

THE DOCKS

Some Perms Go Back

Continued from p. 1
with the Conservative Government in their attitude to the strike, the strikers, and the use of troops. The leaders of the small unions, officially leading the strike, are using the strength of the port workers to further the ends of their unions—which may or may not go the same way as the Transport & General in the future—and the Communist Party are hoping to make political capital out of their (vocal) support for the strike.

The real strength behind them all, however, is that of the men at the point of production. When they decide to use that strength, and co-ordinate it with workers in all other industries, for a straight and honest revolutionary purpose, clearly understanding the nature of capitalism and political parties, then we can look forward to the day when not merely overtime, but human activity in all its fields will be freely undertaken for the benefit of all.

An Amazing Resolution

AS we go to press the first indications are appearing of a crack in the hitherto solid strike.

On Monday 940 permanent men (the regular Port of London Authority weekly wage men) returned to work. This is the result of a manoeuvre by the leaders of the Transport & General who, last Thursday called a meeting of representatives of the 'perms' and tried to bamboozle through a resolution to go back to work.

A clear resolution to do that was not properly taken, but the following amazing document has come into our hands, which represents an attempt (now seen

to be successful) to dissociate the perms from the main issue of the strike.

The document, which has not been issued to the Press, runs as follows:—

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY MEETING OF P.L.A. MEN'S REPRESENTATIVES ON THURSDAY, OCT. 14, 1954:

That we now find ourselves, arising out of the present dispute, in an untenable position and feel, having regard to the tension between man and man, that we must reluctantly withdraw the labour of the P.L.A. permanent men, but we do not ally ourselves with the dispute.

Where there are special circumstances in an emergency for the handling of cargoes we shall appeal to the men to act in a voluntary capacity.

This slimy resolution, taken at a small and quite clearly unrepresentative meeting, is a further step in the Transport & General's consistent attempts to make the perms limit their grievances to being only against the use of Lascar seamen as blacklegs on the *Chusan* and the *Uganda* and not to have them support the poolmen on the overtime issue.

The real danger to the strike of this action, however, is not in the number of men involved, which is small (and was almost counteracted by 500 men coming out at Manchester for the first time on Monday—the same day) but the fact that these perms are just the key men necessary to make it possible for troops to go in. This may have followed by the time FREEDOM is distributed and will have been rendered possible directly by the action of the Transport & General Workers' officials and the Permanent men.

The answer to the troops going in must be immediate. Those workers who have already promised support must not hesitate—and workers everywhere must show solidarity with the dockers in their struggle.

If the dockers—the most militant section of workers in this country to-day—are defeated, then the rest of the working class will be easy meat for the bosses.

Russia after Stalin

Continued from p. 3

minist parties to confuse every revolutionary situation, liquidate revolutionaries, and prevent the success of any mass-movement, such as the one in Spain, which might all too clearly have shown up how the cause of internationalism had been betrayed by those who still claimed before the workers of the world to be its sole defenders.

In the part of the book dealing with the present internal contradictions of the Soviet system the author shows a better handling of the dialectical method, critical acumen, and a fair amount of informative material from various sources. His praiseworthy aim is to help the student of Russian affairs not to lag behind the times, that is not to continue to pass judgments on the Russia of to-day which were correct for the Russia of five, ten or twenty years ago. The scene is rapidly changing, and I think the time is ripe for those following or caught in the Marxian tradition to develop a theory, a strategy, and tactics, which under the name of Post-Stalinism would supersede Stalinism in the same way as Stalinism superseded Leninism. Unfortunately Deutscher's book could only indirectly contribute to this enterprise because his way of looking at things is from without and not from within. While using the dialectical method he frustrates its efficacy by not embracing any of the thesis and anti-thesis at work. His heart, if anywhere, seems to be with results, and not with this or that particular force of the dialectical momentum. In one or two occasions he puts his finger right on the crux of the matter, but fails to see or to tell its tremendous implications for the future both of Russia and mankind. He is content with registering as the main feature of the Malenkov régime a strong trend towards democratic forms and ways, and, although he does not commit himself to forecast the triumph of this trend, he deals at greater length with this than with a relapse into Stalinism or a military dictatorship, which are for him the two other possible courses Russian history may take. The final impression he leaves with the reader is that if a democratic regeneration is what will actually take place, then, judging the tree according to its fruit, the three decades of Stalin's dictatorship will have to be reckoned as essentially a good thing, if not for those who perished in them, who, of course, do not matter, but for those who were born late enough to see its end.

GIOVANNI BALDELLI

THERE is a prevailing attitude currently held by many, that Science is the Saviour, and that the scientist is the personification of that salvation. The scientific strides of the last half century have been enormous and it would be foolhardy to delegate to it a secondary rôle. Unfortunately "science" has become a "faith" and "religion" to the many; so much so that inquiry into every field of knowledge has been left to the scientist, and every conclusion referred to the scientific attitude pertaining to that subject. We have delegated fields of enquiry to the specialist few.

The development of communication has destroyed a fine human capability, namely letter-writing. To-day, when we can send a half-a-dozen letters to the furthest corners of the globe and expect a reply within a week, letter writing is a minor affair as it is such a common occurrence, but when a letter took three to six months to reach its destination a hundred and fifty years ago, one had to write with so much more expression, description, and feeling that letter-writing was in fact an Art Specialisation. And the scientist has destroyed another very vital human quality, namely the ability to perceive, interpret, and understand our natural environment.

The five obvious senses which are in constant use are man's basic tools of perception, and experience has become the reference book by which we interpret what we perceive. Whether present-day limitations of our senses (colour-blindness, inability to see through solids or not hearing above a certain pitch, limitation in distance of picking up smells), are the ultimate limits of anthropological development, is yet to be established.

Taste and touch are more or less well developed, although a blind man is quite capable of developing touch sensitivity far beyond the normally accepted standard. The five senses recording fact, and interpreted by intelligence, have been the mechanism by which we perceive the world. Yet what degree a sixth sense,

namely intuition, plays, is something one hears little about. Intuitive perception has been so often linked with mysticism, that as a tool of perception and evaluation it has often been rejected by the materialistic philosophers or revolutionaries. An intuitive perception is often recorded via the emotions, and everyone in his daily life can recall instances where they have evaluated a situation or person intuitively. We either feel quite at home with someone we have just met and seem to know him before we get a chance to become really acquainted. Or we may feel averse to a person as soon as we meet him; or we may feel the truth of a statement long before we begin to analyse it to discover its "truthfulness". Truth can be intuitively felt almost as materially as a hot object to the touch. This can be verified in most people's daily experience. It also appears that if the emotion is the vehicle through which intuitive conclusions express themselves a greater emotional mobility suggests a more developed intuitive faculty.

It has been suggested, and it appears to be logical, that the intuitive conclusion is really the sum total of past experience momentarily brought to consciousness, triggered off by the situation one faces. The same as a machine can calculate data fed into it in the past to produce an answer. The human brain may operate on identical lines. Whereas the machine produces an answer in figures, the human can only externalise internal tension through the emotions. Even a bodily movement without obvious emotional connotation nevertheless has for its fuel an emotional need.

Stripped of its mystical qualities, which are the home of all pre-knowledge, it suggests a very vital tool in our perception of the world, and to what degree it may widen our horizons may surprise many.

This may explain the oft-encountered phenomenon where we find people who

INTUITION

are not well read displaying a startling amount of understanding and insight. The emotional revolutionary is far more of an asset to the revolutionary movement than the thinking one, as the former is in emotional and intuitive contact with his ideas whereas the latter is mostly the vessel of other people's ideas and experience. The parrot-like repetition from this or that authority is in a sense delegating the responsibility of utilising our faculties to acquire knowledge to others. Sociologically the emotions have a stunted growth, as most of bourgeois culture suppresses instinctive emotions and substitutes artificial ones which may explain why intuition as a developed faculty is so seldom encountered.

As most needs are supplied without one having a direct relationship to its production, we have mostly delegated thinking and feeling to the "experts" and "authorities", leaving our own perceptive faculties to lie dormant or at best, express themselves metaphysically.

The anarchist has consistently maintained that the root of all things is man and that any "perfect" system of production or state of society is meaningless if the "individual" does not benefit. We can perhaps widen the definition of "individual", not so much as a political animal, but also as an animal as such, which may help us to understand what sort of a society anarchy really is. It may also explain why, when "thinking revolutionaries" make revolutions they are bound to fail as, though the rationality or "thinking" may explain a situation, it does not express the motive power (emotion) that brought it about; hence so long as thinking lags behind emotion and intuition, no revolution can ever hope to achieve its aims. S.F.

LETTER TO THE EDITORS

Purpose and Beauty

Congratulations to C.W. and the Editors of FREEDOM for the article "The Glory of the Mediaeval City". Surely it was time the carping on 'Social Problems', Trade Union disputes and Colonial Exploitation was leavened by a little culture.

Not all anarchists go round brooding darkly on the problems that vex the world, and some of us even have the temerity to take a pleasure from the study of arts and institutions that were

not conceived anarchically! Yes, I know your Theatre critics are excellent and we once (only once) had a review of a music recital; but not all of us live in the 'Big City' so we cannot follow up a critic's views of a play by actual attendance.

So we lesser brethren in the country turn our attention to more accessible studies and for those of us in comparatively unspoilt places architecture is a field that holds many joys. Turning to C.W.'s article I would say he is generally right in his conclusions. The great thing about Mediaeval building was the fact that everything was hand-made.

It is possible too that in spite of the existence of actual designs, the building of a church, etc., was more of a hit-and-miss affair that took shape as work progressed. After all, we have only the things that survived, the failures are gone. The North transept at the west end of Ely Cathedral being one example.

As to the reasons for the excellence and beauty of examples left to us, they are probably several. A study of prevailing social conditions, religious feelings (priests literally "put the fear of God" into people in those days) and a comparison of rates of pay can give a pointer.

Society then was far from anarchism, but the satisfaction of working for a purpose with one's hands can produce a beauty that the soulless machine age can never excel. Any anarchist "blue-prints" for the future must never be formulated without recognition of this vital fact. Offley, Oct. 18. H. E. HUTSON.

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT!

WEEK 42
Deficit on Freedom 43 x £15 = £630
Contributions received £664
SURPLUS £34

October 15 to October 21
Exeter: P.H. 3/-; San Francisco Committee to aid "Freedom" per A.G. £26/19/0; Los Angeles: H.W. 14/-; London: P.Q.* 2/6; Birmingham: H.G. 3/-; London: J.S.* 3/-; London: J.D. 2/6.
Total ... 28 7 0
Previously acknowledged ... 635 15 0
1954 TOTAL TO DATE ... £664 2 0

GIFTS OF BOOKS: Stroud: L.G.W.; London: C.W.; London: S.E.P.

LIFE IS CHEAP IN PRETORIA

PRETORIA, OCTOBER.

Two white farmers originally charged with murder were found guilty of common assault arising from the death after beating of an African convict farm-worker. Johan Snyman, 59, was sentenced to 18 months' imprisonment and his son Matthys, 29, to six months and six strokes of the cane.

Three Africans appeared with the Snymans when the trial opened. Of these one was discharged at the end of the Crown case, and yesterday the other two were found guilty of common assault. John Mkgadi, 50, was reprimanded and discharged, and Jantjie Thlome, 45, sentenced to three months' imprisonment suspended for two years.

The Crown alleged that the Snymans thrashed the convict, Elias Mpikwa, to death with a length of hosepipe. Mr. Pirow, Q.C., who appeared for all the accused, contended that the beating had nothing to do with the death of Mpikwa, who was admitted by the Crown to have fallen from a moving lorry on March 31, the day of his death. Medical witnesses disagreed on the cause of death.

Matthys Snyman admitted a previous conviction of assault with intent to do grievous bodily harm by striking an African on the head with a knobkerry. He was fined £30, with the alternative of three months' imprisonment for that offence.—*Reuter*.

Advertising for Millionaires

Mr. J. G. Wynne-William, managing director of Masius and Fergusson Ltd., advertising agents, said here to-day that he thought a minute of commercial television would cost advertisers about £750—of which about £250 would be the cost of production and £500 the rate charged by commercial television stations. (*Observer*, 24/10/54).

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.
- JOHN HEWETSON :
Sexual Freedom for the Young 6d.
Ill-Health, Poverty and the State cloth 2s. 6d., paper 1s.
- PHILIP SANSONM :
Syndicalism—The Workers' Next Step 1s.
- 27, Red Lion Street, London, W.C.1.

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.

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. 31—A Fleet Street Journalist PROFESSIONAL CONFESSIONS

NOV. 7—Philip Sansom on THE ANARCHIST REVOLUTION.

OPEN AIR MEETINGS

Weather Permitting
HYDE PARK
Sundays at 3.30 p.m.

ANARCHIST YOUTH GROUP

OCT. 30—SOCIAL FROM 9.30
At the Malatesta Club

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 McKecheon
Mark Kramrisch
Hugh McKeefery

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

FREEDOM

The Anarchist Weekly

Postal Subscription Rates :
12 months 17/- (U.S.A. \$3.00)
6 months 8/6 (U.S.A. \$1.50)
3 months 4/6 (U.S.A. \$0.75)

Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies
12 months 27/- (U.S.A. \$4.50)
6 months 13/6 (U.S.A. \$2.25)

Cheques, P.O.'s and Money Orders should be made out to FREEDOM PRESS, crossed a/c Payee, and addressed to the publishers:

FREEDOM PRESS
27 Red Lion Street
London, W.C.1 England
Tel.: Chancery 8364