Post-Election

Conversation Piece - p. 4



"The ballot is nothing more than a paper representative of the bayonet, the billy, and the bullet. It is a labour-saving device for ascertaining on which side force lies, and bowing to the inevitable."

-BENJAMIN TUCKER,

("Instead of a Book")

Vol. 16, No. 23

June 4th, 1955

Threepence

# CRICIS IN THE UNIONS

THE two major strikes of the moment —of railwaymen and dockers—has focussed attention on arguments and differences between unions in the same industry.

In the docks, the small blue union is striking to win the right to negotiate on behalf of its 10,000 new members in the provinces just as it already does in London. On the railways the footplate men are striking to increase the difference between their wages and those of 'unskilled' grades of railway workers.

And in both cases the opposition, both to the strikes and to the motives behind them, comes more from the other unions in the industries than from the employers.

In the docks, the employers are quite willing to make agreements with the National Amalgamated Stevedores' & Dockers' union, but are being prevented by the Transport & General Workers' union, which has agreements with the employers giving them sole rights to negotiation. The TGWU is demanding the return of its 10,000 ex-members who have voluntarily gone over to the NASD and of all the dues money they have paid to the NASD since joining last autumn.

On the railways the National Union of Railwaymen, with nearly half a million members, has announced that if the Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers & Firemen wins the increased pay for which it is striking, then the NUR will bang in another claim for its members. And the British Transport Commission has shown its willingness to negotiate an increase with the ASLEF, but maintains that it cannot afford another rise for the NUR, whose members had an increase (after a strike threat) last winter.

The ASLEF is basing its claim for its members, not on need, but on the differential between its craft workers and the industrial mass in the NUR. The hierarchy within the industry, as expressed through the pay packet, must be main-

tained. We cannot feel sympathy for this point of view, for differentials only create and maintain disunity among the workers.

The dockers, we think, have a much stronger case. It is simply the principle at stake that a worker should be free to belong to the union of his choice, and that union should have the right to represent him before the employers.

#### Inter-Union Struggle

The tragedy of the existing situation is not that there are strikes, that the nation's export trade will suffer, or that workers will not be able to get to work. The great pity is that workers are being set against each other instead of realising their common interests within the same industry.

This, however, is inevitable under the craft organisation of present trade unionism. We are continually being presented with situations where workers within an industry are engaged in struggles while fellow workers in the same industry—in the same workplace—not only do not support them, but actively oppose them, because they belong to a different craft union.

In the case of the TGWU, there is no cohesive quality at all throughout its whole 1,300,000 members. They are a completely disorganised army of workers in a multitude of trades spread through many industries. There is no unity, no common purpose, no solidarity. There is only plenty of money and power for the men at the top.

And these men are jealous of their power and positions, so that when, inevitably, some of their members become dissatisfied with the situation and turn to an organisation which they think will suit them better, worker is set against worker in the traditional pattern of divide and rule.

As we see it, the present situation is indicative of a deep-seated uneasiness within the trades union movement. It

will probably be a long time yet before any constructive alternative begins to emerge, but the signs are there—in the railways, docks and mines particularly—that there is a growing realisation of the limitations of trades unions.

### The Anarcho-Syndicalist Way

We think we have the constructive alternative in anarcho-syndicalism. This method of organisation is based on the need for solidarity within a whole industry, and to that end urges organisation by industry and not by craft.

In the railways there are three separate organisations, the footplate men, the salaried staff's (clerks, etc.) and the large general NUR. This last more nearly approaches an industrial union, but unfortunately is a leadership organisation dominated by officials and with no aim other than operation within capitalist Britain along authoritarian lines.

A railway workers' syndicate would gather together all the workers in the industry—those at present in the three unions mentioned as well as all those in engineering, electrical, building or constructional trades in other unions but working for the railways—and clearly state its aim to be workers' control of the railways.

With that common aim, and undivided by craft unionism, railway-workers of every occupation could practice solidarity in their common interest. Since anarcho-syndicalism aims at the abolition of the wage system, workers organised on those lines would not struggle among themselves for the extra shilling, but would recognise that they were all essential parts of the same public service. They would co-operate, not compete, and would thereby find the necessary strength to carry on their struggle.

Having that strength they would be able to defend and extend their standards of living far more effectively than now, when, divided and competing, they are easy meat for boses and trade union careerists.

Whoever benefits from the existing setup in our industries, the workers always lose. The only true alternative is not an easy one: it is the revolutionary path to a complete change from all the values and methods of existing society to a libertarian and responsible assertion of the dignity of labour.

There is nothing more undignified than squabbling among ourselves. No wonder the bosses are still on top. They will stay there until we unite to take away their power and learn to run the world ourselves.

# THE CIRCUS IS OVER

THE circus is over and the clowns are back in office. The majority of the electorate, in the words of Lord Woolton, were not very interested in the "higher issues", but preferred to return a Government which they mistakenly believed was responsible for the "prosperity" in domestic affairs. The millions who voted for the Labour party appeared just as unconcerned with the wider issues; the ethics of social reform and H-Bomb diplomacy were subjects which were rarely discussed at the many meetings held before the election. The only occasion in the Central London area at least when the manufacture of the H-Bomb and rearmament was frankly discussed and condemned was when Dr. Donald Soper, Methodist Minister, embarrassed the Holborn candidate, Lena Jeger, and her platform supporters by making the only socialist speech that we heard in the whole election campaign.

The fact that rearmament and all that it implies was avoided by both the Tory and Labour politicians is not surprising, since they are agreed on this issue and the purpose of an election would have therefore appeared even more pointless, but one would have thought that the people would have been anxious to hear mention of the issue which might literally mean life or death to them. Such was not the case. We were struck by the similarity of the questions from supporters and hecklers on both sides, these being largely on housing, cheaper food and pensions. Even allowing for the fact that the various platforms set

the tone and only brought up questions which might get them votes, this lack of interest in the shape of the future indicates, either, that people are confident that the Government will manage things somehow or, they are so afraid of the consequences of another war that, like the proverbial ostrich, they prefer to turn their basksides on the truth, thus hoping that if they do not see what is coming to them it might never happen.

We are not suggesting that immediate issues like, housing, cheaper food and pensions are unimportant. Those people without these basic necessities will have little inclination to consider things so apparently remote as war, but the fact that so little interest was taken in the far-reaching effects of war on the scale which is possible shows as little understanding on the part of the electorate of the real nature of Governmental society as it high-lights the cunning of the politicians.

The supposedly traditional revolutionary class were well to the fore at both Tory and Labour meetings, and to see quite a proportion of the working class cheering a Tory candidate with obvious pride and satisfaction gives point to an editorial comment in the Observer (Sunday, May 29th) that "Once the proletariat had been given bourgeois tastes and standards . . . it is no use going on talking to them as though they had nothing to lose but their chains".

### Anarchist "Election Manifesto"

The reaction to the "election manifesto" issued by the London

Anarchist Group calling on people to vote for Joe Soap (i.e. to vote for themselves), was on the whole sympathetic, although pessimism was expressed about the ultimate success of our anarchist aims. The main criticisms came from Labour supporters who credited us with more strength than we, in our modesty, would claim for ourselves. They argued that we were "splitting the working-class vote" thereby giving support to the Tories on the assumption that those who were persuaded by Joe Soap's arguments would otherwise have voted Labour.

This argument is false on two counts. Firstly, it assumes that the people who responded to our "refuse to vote" slogans had not already been thinking along such lines before. This we suggest is not the case. What they probably did was to give to those already disgusted with the antics of political parties a coherent argument on which to base their vague misgivings. Secondly, the argument that we are splitting the vote involves the whole question of the lesser evil. We have discussed this at length in FREEDOM over the last few weeks, and will merely underline again that, considering the similarities of Tory and Labour policies such a choice does not exist, even if the people had the remotest chance of shaping the policies which, on the main issues, are put into operation without even consulting them.

In conclusion, we would say to some of our sympathisers who understandably suggested that the satirical nature of some of the contents of the Joe Soap manifesto were negative and likely to get laughter rather than serious response, that apart from the merits or otherwise of satire as a means of propaganda, the main consideration when the matter was discussed by the London Anarchist Group was, that since our forces were so small and our chances of combating years of conditioning remote in such a short time, our best plan was to draw attention to the existence of anarchist groups in this country. In this way we hoped that people with similar ideas to our own might persue their interest and contact us, and in this we have had some measure of success.

We regret however, that the majority of people continue in their own foolish way and will have to take the responsibility for the lunatic policies of Government carried out in their name.

## "DIG, DIE OR GET OUT"

THE head of the Federal Civil Defence Administration has recently described the alternatives which American city-dwellers have in the event of a nuclear bombing attack; he says: "You do one of three things, dig, die or get out." The Administration has based its policy on this premise.

If we discount the second alternative as being too drastic, we may consider the remaining two. Dig deep shelters or evacuate the population. There are various factors implicit in both these schemes which seem to point to their invalidity.

Deep shelters are very expensive to build and are of course quite beyond the pockets of ordinary householders, so that if they are to be built it will have to be on a large scale by the authorities. The Times (30th May, 1955) makes the situation rather clear: "The F.C.D.A. while not building any shelters themselves, recommend that householders on the fringe of large towns should set about making their own . . ." One wonders what those who do not live on the fringe should do?

Evacuation however is a much cheaper proposition, and is probably more effective in terms of safety. The F.C.D.A. appear to have investigated the possibilities in more detail. Evactuation studies and experiments have been made. The Times informs us: "In Milwaukee, a city of just over a million people, it is estimated that the entire population could be moved to safety-25 miles away or more-in seven hours. Under ideal conditions during the day . . . 800,000 (could be moved) in three hours." When the Distant Early Warning line is completed (a line of radar stations from Hawaii to the Azores via Canada and Greenland), it is believed that the ninety largest cities in America should have at least four hours warning of the approaching enemy planes. This of course leaves the remaining 200,000 citizens of Milwallee

in a very doubtful position even in day time. Should it be during the night, one can only hope that the enemy planes are going somewhere else.

But supposing that a mass evacuation were carried out with success, the F.C.D.A. are (quite rightly) resigned to the complete disruption of the national economy. They take the view however, that if all the cities in the U.S. were destroyed, but the people still alive, there would be a chance of quick recovery. This attitude appears to us to be over-optimistic in the extreme, for there would be no supply lines or organisation of any sort, practically all industry torn to shreds, and a shocked and bewildered population wandering the countryside in search of uncontaminated food and shelter. Under these conditions one can hold out no hope of quick recovery; a far more likely result would be the early death of several millions (particularly in winter), and a very slow recovery, possibly over a period of decades, to a mere shadow of the present standard of life and culture.

But the main problem before the F.C.D.A. would seem to be of an entirely different nature; this is the apathy with which the American public view the position. It appears that they do not believe that civil defence can defend them effectively from attacks by nuclear weapons, and indeed we can do nothing but agree with them.

Here then we have the position (as in most countries of the world), where for all practical purposes it is admitted by the authorities, and undoubtedly believed by the people, that there is no hope of reasonable escape from H-bomb attacks, and yet there is still no really serious attempt at agreement between the great powers who make them, to cease development and experiments with them. One can only assume that the Governments concerned hold the lives of their peoples as of very little account.

H.F.W.

JOE SOAP INCREASES HIS VOTE!

OVER the whole country there was a drop of 6% from the 1951 polling figures. In the two constituencies in London where Anarchists were most active, the drop was much higher than that.

In Holborn & St. Pancras Sth., a marginal Labour seat, the poll was 14 per cent. lower than in 1951. In actual figures, 16,268 electors did not cast a vote. The victorious candidate won her seat with 17,126 votes! Less than 1,000 more than the non-voters in her constituency! Out of the total electorate of 51,282, therefore, only 34 per cent. voted for the member who will now represent them all in the House of Commons! And 32 per cent. did not vote for anybody to represent them.

In Hampstead, a safe Tory seat, the drop in votes equalled 12½ per cent, of the 1951 poll—6,400 fewer people voted as against 1951. The total of non-voters: 21,935 out of an electorate of

72,423. The successful candidate pulled in 28,226—just 39 per cent. of the electorate!

In Southwark, a solid Labour seat, the drop in the poll was 20 per cent. on 1951! Electorate: 66,592. Voted: 40,077. Non-voters: 26,515. In this Borough there was some direct Anarchist activity, but not very much. Many dockers live in this area, however, and they've had a raw deal from both Labour and Conservative governments, as have most workers. So why should they choose?

It seems experience is still the best teacher, but an active campaign can give encouragement and coherence to half-formulated ideas. To know that an organised body of opinion agrees with them is a source of creat comfort to unconnected individuals. There are thousands of people who, incoherently and instinctively, are anarchistic. It is up to us to put before them the alternatives they are groping for.

R.M.

#### SCIENCE EUGENICS? NOTES

THE hereditary characteristics, or genes, of an individual are contained in the germ cells where they are arranged in chains known as chromosomes. Changes in the genes are called mutations and occur spontaneously, possibly as a result of natural radiation such as cosmic rays. As all species have become closely adapted to their environment through mutations and natural selection over millions of years of evolutionary history it is not surprising that the great majority of mutations are harmful, and many are actually lethal.

With the artificial aids now available such disabilities as deafness, poor sight, defective limbs and teeth are not such great hindrances to normal life as they would be in a more ruthless physical environment and they are therefore likely to spread more widely through the population. More serious defects such as mongolism, cretinism, now survive as a result of the specialised care and attention available but are too handicapped to have other than a negligible reproductive rate.

Eugenists have often in the past advocated the sterilisation of the unfit in order to improve the stock and most people would agree that any measure that would eliminate such abnormalities as now occur is worthy of our attention. But the problem is complicated, as it is at present impossible to separate the effect of pre-natal, and post-natal environmental conditions and in addition most unfavourable genes are recessive and their effect is masked by more dominant genes so that they only produce an actual abnormality when a child inherits two such recessives, one from each parent.

#### Brave New World

Positive eugenics is concerned with improving the race by improving its genetic qualities. Julian Huxley (Uniqueness of Plan) suggests that humanity will ultimately destroy itself because the elimination of defects by natural selection is largely rendered inoperative by medicine, charity, and the social services. Because of this he predicts degeneration of the germ plasm and be-

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

Great French Revolution

The Political Philosophy of

Down and Out in Paris and

Homage to Catalonia

Nineteen Eighty-Four

Animal Farm

Penguins . . .

The Etruscans

The Unvanquished

A Room with a View.

The Origin of the Earth

The Problem Family A. S. Neill 4/-

A Dominie Abroad A. S. Neill 3/6

Selected Speeches of John Bright 2/6

Poetry and Truth J. W. Goethe

Letters from the Underworld

Twenty-Six Men and a Girl

Second-Hand . . .

The Free Child

The Odd Women

Heavens on Earth

Baudelaire

The Anarchist Prince

Periodicals . . .

Man! (Anglo-American)

Lean Men

London

Kant

Talks to Parents and Teachers

Hearts not Heads in the School

Peter Kropotkin (2 vols.) the set 12/6

That Dreadful School A. S. Neill 7/6

Homer Lane 8/6

A. S. Neill 7/6

George Orwell 10/6

George Orwell 10/6

George Orwell 12/6

George Orwell 6/-

William Faulkner 2/6

E. M. Forster 2/6

M. Pallottino 3/6

W. M. Smart 2/6

A. S. Neill 4/-

Ralph Bates

(2 vols.) the set 3/6

George Gissing 2/-

F. Dostoievsky 2/6

Maxim Gorki 2/6

Mark Holloway 5/-

J. P. Sartre 3/6

George Woodcock

& Ivan Avakumovic 5/-

Volume One, No. One 4d.

(Penguin, 2 vols.) the set 3/-

S. Komer 2/6

Bakunin 30/-

lieves we must be able to pick out the genetically inferior stock and set in motion counter forces making for faster reproduction of superior stock if we are to reverse or even arrest this trend.

It seems to us that natural selection must still be operating in any society, tending to ensure the survival of the types best fitted for life in that particular environment. Poor sight may be more widespread now that we do not usually hunt for our own food, and a keen sense of smell may even have become a handicap but the factors helping for the mutual adjustments necessary in complex urban society may be increasing.

The policies of the conservative eugenists involve a revival of the cult of the superman. They involve decisions as to what is inferior and superior stock. Such value judgments depend on the type of society envisaged and in an authoritarian society result in breeding for nationalism and war as with Hitler's theory of a super race of Aryans.

While a complete knowledge of the hereditary transmission of characteristics would be a terrible weapon in the hands of governments, in a free society and available to everyone, it could be used by individuals if they so wished to increase the variability of desirable characteristics, thus enriching their own lives and society in general, while eliminating those serious abnormalities which now occur. Such knowledge would increase man's power over his own life and his environment.

#### Intelligence and Class

Persons of low intelligence are often classed with the unfit, and the relationship between intelligence, class, and fertility is one which causes apprehension among many people. It is often claimed that people of low intelligence breed more than those of higher intelligence but the evidence is far from satisfactory.

Heredity only sets the limits of variation within which the influence of environment is felt. Living in an unsatisfactory environment must le as big a handicap to a child as the iradequate genes he is born with. While eugenists have overemphasised the hereditary factors, the sentimental environmentalists too often ignore them completely. The two factors cannot be isolated from each other and their interaction may be completely unpredictable as in the case of the fruit fly Drosophila which has a mutant which results in the development of an abnormal abdomen in a moist climate, but a normal abdomen in a dry climate.

Except possibly for temporary effects such as the spread of birth control knowledge the theory that the less intelligent breed more rapidly is as valid as the theories about racial superiorities. In a society with rigid hereditary class divisions, each class if large enough is likely to have similar intelligence distribution curves. In a society like our own where change of class can occur in one generation then insofar as intelligence is a perquisite of social and financial success the more successful classes may have a slightly higher proportion of the more intelligent. But remember that a higher proportion of the children of intelligent parents are less intelligent than their parents, and a higher proportion of parents of low in elligence are more intelligent than their parents so that the intelligence distribution curve remains the same from one generation to the

In addition it is worth remembering that there is a class bias in intelligencetesting and results obtained from different social groups are not strictly comparable. Intelligence is not measured directly but indirectly through the assessment of other qualities and the choice of these is to some extent influenced by the views of the ruling social group.

### THEATRE

# Everyman and Nobody and the Upper Ten

"THE Diary of a Nobody" (Duchess OPEN DAILY Theatre) from the book by George OPEN 10 e.m. to 6.30; 5.0 SATURDAYS and Weedon Grossmith is lovingly adap-Our latest list of second-hand and ted for the stage by Basil Dean and remaindered books is now ready. Let Richard Blake. The opening and closing us know if you want it. All books are of the play with Mr. Pooter at his desk now sent post free so please get your writing his diary, is a happy device books from us. We can supply any book which sets the tone firmly. We are required, including text-books. transported to the Pooter's parlour at The Laurels, Brickfield Terrace, North Lon-New Books . . . don in the year 1888.

> Here is none of the superiority and ridicule which usually accompanies comedies about the Victorians. Only a gentle sense of fun, a case of seeing ourselves, a step removed, but still faced by the same problems of financial embarrassment, the same strained emotions, of family relationships.

Mr. Pooter, by the time the play opens, has become a house-owner, and is faced by the responsibility all this entails . . the tyranny of keeping up appearances on an inadequate salary. This is the sort of genteel poverty known to many past and present. Mr. Pooter is handy with the paintbrush and brightens up the "home sweet home" with a deft touch here and there. To achieve a final sense of grandeur he nails a stag's head over the parlour door, picked up second-hand and made of plaster of Paris with a damaged horn!

There is nothing very startling or dramatic about the Pooters' lives. Just a record of everyday existence with its minor upheavals and tensions. There is the recurrent question of youth versus middle age, a go-ahead son, against a timid reactionary father. Our standards of behaviour may have changed. We have grown out of the family concert with everyone doing his or her partypiece, but the self-conscious anxiety and awful heartiness that attends Lupin's engagement party, is still reflected in our own gatherings, particularly when we are trying to impress! The halffrozen smile of the hostess, one eye cocked on the hired water, the impasse of conversation that dies on the lips, the awful strain of cheery joviality, haven't we all experienced this at some time or other? It is this echo of ourselves, faintly ridiculous, that makes the whole thing so endearing.

It is good to see that Mr. Basil Dean, the producer, has not lost his master touch. His is a delicate production with each character beautifully handled. The scene of Lupin's engagement party is a triumph. Not a subtle nuance is missed as we watch the guests congealed in

awed contemplation of each other, or deftly bringing out their own particular gem. Mr. Alan Macnaughtan as the amateur tragedian Burwin Fosselton giving his impersonation of Sir Henry Irving in "The Bells" is the highlight of the evening. This is almost surpassed by the preparations that lead up to it, the stealthy transformation, complete with wig, which has to be engineered from behind the piano during a musical item.

Miss Hermione Baddeley as Mrs. Pooter gives a restrained performance though her undertones are sometimes harsh. But Leslie Henson's Mr. Pooter, in awe of his boss, in terror of the antics of his son, and determined to bring out in his diary boldly that which might otherwise be repressed, is pathetic and extremely loveable. Rosemarie Hill sings sweetly. Peter Hammond as the young spark Lupin Pooter, Derek Tansley as an amateur cyclist, Willoughby Goddard as a over-hearty neighbour, and indeed everyone in the large cast adds to our enjoyment of the evening.

"THE Reluctant Debutante" at the Cambridge Theatre is a picture of the awful trials and tribulations that beset the idle rich bent on bringing out their only daughter and coupling her with the right honourable eligible, with reputation as yet unsoiled. The first quarter of an hour of the play is entirely taken up by reading aloud a list of invitations to parties and dances that have to be attended by the distracted parents and the rigours and humiliations that accompany these gatherings. Papa, in the midst of this endurance test of his daughter's first season, suffers acutely through lack of adequate sleep and envies the horse able to do this standing up (even if necessarily at the bar). The whole structure of the play is built on this one single theme, and I must say that it has the ring of acutely boring authenticity! It is like an exercise on one note, this lightest of drawing-room comedies, but so deftly done that in spite of the transparently obvious plot and an unblushing repetition the evening seems only just too long by half.

The telephone plays its principal part as is usual in such cases. One wrong number, cunningly contrived, an unwelcome suitor, who persists in accepting an invitation to dinner mistakenly assigned to him and we are set on the inevitable course. The poor little debutante who has an engaging honest sim-

# Recent Trends Psychotherapy-2

(Continued from last week)

CETTING up on his own has its difficulties and dangers from the clinical psychologist too. Without a medical degree he is likely to be labelled "quack". Without official recognition he will find difficulty in obtaining patients. For remember, his pipe-line is the G.P's consulting room and the psychiatric clinic. Out on a limb he is readily classed along with nature-curers, astrologers, graphologists, palmists and other renegade freelance necromancers. Anyone can call himself a psychotherapist and set up a practice. Like dentistry not so long ago there is no legislation in this area and no generally recognised qualification or examining body. Which is not surprising. Quis custodiet custodes? To which anyone may add, Dans le royaume des aveugles les bornes sont rois.

"What difference?" you may ask, 'Since psychotherapy is useless anyway, does it matter who bleeds the patient to death?" The point is that therapy need not be useless. In America, where the battle royal between psychiatrists and clinical psychologists has raged with unparalleled ferocity of recent years each side has been eager to develop new ideas and techniques that will give them the edge in the race to produce genuine cures.

Perhaps the most exciting of these new developments is in the field of hypnotherapy. Freud abandoned hypnosis early on in his career, and of course for the orthodox there the matter rested. But now we are learning how hypnosis may be used as an effective tool in the therapeutic process. Freud's reasons for dropping it are largely derived from his inadequacy as a hypnotist and the restrictions imposed by his theories. More enterprising therapists, having outgrown Freud's theories were able to escape its limitations.

Using these new techniques Lindner. for instance, has been able to treat psychopaths successfully for the first time, and many others have made their reputations by the skilful use of hypnosis as an adjunct to briefer therapy. Recognising its inherent dangers they do not make the mistake of using it to remove symptoms indiscriminately or merely to resurrect a detailed biography. In the hands of the expert it becomes a subtle and versatile technique for speeding up the course of treatment.

In New York, 1949 saw the formation of The Society for Clinical and Experimental Hypnosis, an organisation embracing both psychiatrists and clinical psychologists. Like any professional body its standards of entrance are high and its members are regular contributors to the established journals. Most heartening of all is the sight of the medical and non-medical practitioners getting together in a spirit of co-operative enterprise. True, this is probably due in part to the fact that for the more traditionally-minded hypnosis is still not quite respectable, and therefore those who practise it will be less fastidious in their

plicity and is fond of country-life and dogs and would have been quite happy left alone, naturally finds in the frownedon cad the answer to her prayers. In the end of course our prince-charming turns out to be not only innocent of immoral behaviour in the past but fabulously rich and an Italian Duke into the bargain. So Mama, who has gone to unending trouble to keep them apart will be appeased at last.

The marvel is that Mr. William Douglas Home has been brutally honest, spared us none of the longeurs, and has written a deft social satire. The ball is glibly passed from one character to the other and in the expert hands of Mr. Wilfred Hyde White it is a joy to watch it bound. Miss Celia Johnson as a harrassed Mama worked up into a state of almost drugged determination is delightful. And Miss Anna Massey, a newcomer, is most refreshing, full of unusual charm attack, and a very pleasant downto-earth quality. She also has very unusual looks and carries them off with great aplomb.

The one fault I have to find with Mr. Home's comedy is that it is really a bit dated. I believe that the young of today have already dealt adequately with this immoral marriage-market, this refined white-slave traffic, as it is called in the play. I now wait anxiously for him to write his next social satire, the play that is asking to be written, about the grave, old-fashioned, young, looking askance at their immoral, frivolous

acceptance of allies. But respectable it will become, and if it also serves to heal the breach between the medical and nonmedical factions so much to the good.

In Britain a body with similar interests was formed around the same time. Unhappily it calls itself The British Society of Medical Hypnotists and restricts its membership accordingly.

Chicago has seen the birth of two new schools. One is attached to Chicago University and carries the benign imprint of the personality of Carl Rogers, a clinical psychologist.

Rogerian non-directive or client-centred techniques are burdened with next to no Freudian bric-a-brac. No theories are sold to the client, who is simply provided with a permissive atmosphere within which he learns to set in motion the natural healing process himself. The therapist simply accepts the client as an individual, accepts his statements and reflects their emotional tone without trying to expose any deep symbolic significance. He carefully avoids being thrust into a more active rôle and the nearest he comes to interfering is occasionally to express approval.

As you can imagine, this is a very safe method of therapy. There is no risk of forcing the patient into a theoretical framework that does not happen to fit his particular neurosis and increase his difficulties.

One of the mysteries that faces the newcomer to the psychotherapeutic jungle is that no matter how bizarre the theory or how much one system flatly contradicts another in both theoretical orientation and actual technique, they all claim patients who produce the material that fits the therapist's theory and all of them claim a small but steady proportion of cures. The Rankians remember their birth traumata and the Reichians learn to achieve bigger and better orgasms; the Adlerians discover their inferiority complexes and the Jungians immerse themselves in the Collective Unconscious; the Scientologists recall their earlier incarnations and the Freudians all remember to a man wanting to kill their fathers and seduce their mothers.

How is it that these diverse mélanges of hocus pocus all get results in a minority of cases? Do they have something in common despite their bellicose claims to a monopoly of the truth and dismissals of each other as monuments of ignorance and chicanery? Yes; they all use suggestion, direct and indirect, as a means to cure. Even if the patient is so innocent beforehand that he does not know what is expected of him he is soon tutored in his rôle. The Freudian victim learns to free associate knowing that all roads lead to sex, and the Jungian soul knows that certain types of dream indicate how far along the road to a psuedo-mystical release it has travelled. The reward for co-operating in this way is the approval of the all-important therapist and the belief that good must come of it. Occasionally, the theory may even happen to agree with the facts of the patient's disorder.

So it seems that the theory can largely be dispensed with as far as therapeutic results go. And that is just about what Rogers and his school have done. There is a possibility that the Rogerian approach is too superficial for the more acute disorders; that his success is due to a selection of the more trivial type of personal problem. The same criticism cannot be brought against the second Chicago school, that of Alexander and French.

(To be concluded)

#### PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT! WEEK 21

Deficit on Freedom Contributions received DEFICIT

€31

£315

£284

May 20 to May 26

Granite City: E.J.G. 14/-; Warrington: J.H. 5/-; Per M.M.: W. Somerville: D.C. 7/-; Providence: Circolo Libertario £3/10/0; Bronx: M. £1/1/0: Philadelphia: Circolo Emancipazione Sociale, £3/10/0; Youngstown: Uno, £3/10/0: Keele: C.F.M. 5/-: London: Anon. 1/-; Peterborough: A.W. 3/-; London: D.R.\* 5/-; London: J.S.\* 3/-: London: P.Q. 5/-; Birkenhead: G.H.W. 5/-; Hyde Park: Sympathiser, £1; Llanelly E.G.R. 2/-: Prescott: A.deT. £1/15/3: Hyde Park: Sympathisers, 1/6; Los Angeles: R.B.G. 14/-.

Previously acknowledged ... 266 18 10

1955 TOTAL TO DATE ... £284 15 7

### Obtainable from 27, RED LION STREET, LONDON, W.C.I

Postage free on all items

Individual Action, Vol. 3, No. 5. 3d.

Vol. 16, No. 23

June 4, 1955

### SOME REFLECTIONS ON STRIKES

CONTRARY to the impression created by the Press, recent strikes are neither an unusual phenomenon nor one limited to these islands. Neither are they the result of the Welfare-State, full-employment, "Bevanism", "Communist agitators", "extremists" or post-war "slackness" and "work-shyness" (the latter, a theory echoed with enthusiasm by many of the older generation who proudly link their success as "self-made" men to the sweatshops of their youth).

Strikes are at this very moment taking place throughout the world. More than 50,000 Italian schoolteachers have called a strike for better conditions; for months port workers in Genoa have also been idle, and this in a country depressed by unemployment where no one can afford the luxury of being idle. America, land of milk and honey and free enterprise is rarely free from strikes, including dockers and railway workers strikes. Only last month three Southern States, Tennessee, Georgia and Alabama had a strike of telephone and railway workers which lasted for more than two weeks and which threatened to spread to the entire United States. At the time of writing it is not certain whether a strike of the tens of thousands of workers of the Ford Motor Company can be averted. In France, last week, it was touch and go whether there would be a newspaper strike. Strikes are as much a part of capitalist society as is property. And, after all, was not the Tory battle-cry last week that we should become a "property-owning democracy"?

THE editorial columns of the Press defend, in principle, the right of workers to use the strike weapon (they must do, whether they like it or not, because in these days of ideological warfare to deny this right would place the democracies in the same category as the Iron Curtain countries!) But in practice they are opposed to its use since there is no need to have recourse to such "extreme action". The machinery exists, they tell us, to deal with disputes. If that is the case, then how can they defend the right to strike even "in principle"? One might expect the answer to be along these lines: one thing is a strike of workers in a factory turning out millions of tins of detergent, quite another that of workers engaged in public services. A lack of detergents for a few weeks will hardly paralyse the country. On the other hand, no railwaymen, no dockers nor dustmen affects the whole population. From which argument one must conclude that those workers engaged in public services are expected not only to do their jobs efficiently but also to have a stronger social conscience than any other member of the community. Why?

THE economic and social structure of our society is competitive not co-operative. "Time is money" is not just a slogan of the employer. Since to-day money provides the means of existence as well as the trimmings, the national preoccupation is with money. "Write for Profit", "Earn money in your spare time", "Make your hobby pay"these are some of the advertisements that daily greet us. "Promotion" means more money, as well as more status and more power. Is it surprising that even in those nationalised organisations from which the profit motive has been removed, at A FTER a short lull the cynical propaganda for Civil Defence recruits

picks up again. There can be no doubt that the aim is rather to soothe the citizens than to mitigate the horrors of atomic war. How long it will be before Civil Defence work is made compulsory it is difficult to say. Perhaps it never will be if it is after all a sort of propaganda stunt. It is compulsory in Sweden, and massive schemes of evacuating almost the entire population of Stockholm, the remainder to be housed in deep shelters, are being prepared, I believe. Such an attitude is more realistic than our own, but one hopes the enemy will give due notice of his intention to bomb, so that the evacuation to the country or the shelters may be carried out in good time!

I have in front of me a leastet produced by the Peace Pledge Union, entitled "Who Will Defend THEM?" It shows the extent of the damage that would be done to England and Wales if Manchester and London received direct hits by Hydrogen Bombs. It shows how far the damage would spread, by means of concentric circles on a map, but it conveys its message in too abstract a manner altogether.

least superficially, the attitude of the workers should be first and foremost to obtain the highest wages they can squeeze out of the Boards? Why should a bus driver look upon the speeding up of running schedules as anything other than an attempt to make him do more work for the same money? Who would expect a shopkeeper to sell tree articles for the price of two. Yet when the busmen strike in protest against the new schedules a great howl rises from the Business Men of England who are the originators of the slogan that "Time is Money"!

CERVICE to the community depends for its existence on a feeling, a sense of Community. Because society to-day is a competitive jungle, Man seeks refuge in the small family circle on which he concentrates his thoughts, his energies and his social feelings. In the circumstances it is a means of preserving his sanity, but by the sacrifice of those wider values without which work can never be satisfying nor social relations full and mutually rewarding.

The failure of strike action in our time is a measure of the failure of the sense of Community, of solidarity within a class, or even within an industry. The Trades Union movement far from being the instrument by which the class structure of society could eventually be abolished, in fact accentuates it by creating further distinctions within the working class itself. (It should be noted, for it is significant, that the Transport Commission like any private employer, is not opposed to differentials. On the contrary it is the basis of capitalist society and the disunity of mankind by which a ruling class can continue to govern. "Divide and Rule" is no outworn cliché.

The struggle for wages and conditions is a means for providing the immediate physical needs and leisure for the dispossessed without which they can neither think nor act for themselves. They are the weapons and the nourishment with which the struggle against privilege and the exploitation of man by man can be successfully waged. Once the means become the ends—which is the case with the Trades Unions -the workers' organisations simply become vast concentration camps of labour power in which each job has its price, not unlike the shopkeeper's shelves of goods each with its price ticket.

What essential difference is there, in fact, between the grocer who sells sausages by the pound (or the yard) with the arrangement made last week by the American National Mediation Board, with the railway companies, which it is said, has averted a possible nation-wide strike of railway ticket collectors, whereby in future these employees will be paid on a graduated scale based on the length of trains?

Let us try and visualise what would happen. One minute everyone is going about their daily business, the next minute the whole of Central London is wiped out. Millions of people just disappear quite painlessly, and without realising anything about it. Heat damage, which would probably mean almost as swift a death for most people, would extend almost to Watford. Reigate. Gravesend, and Brentwood. If you live in any of these places you will just escape being damaged by the heat. Congratulate yourselves. But wait. There is "blast damage" to be considered.

The "blast damage", houses being knocked flat, and all the usual effects of a hurricane, trees torn up, vehicles and people blown into the air, smashed and killed, would extend beyond Cambridge in the north, and out beyond the coast into the Channel in the south. It would include Bedfordshire. Hertfordshire. Buckinghamshire. Middlesex. Surrey. Sussex, most of Kent, and Essex, not to mention pieces of other counties.

In this area the death-roll and destruction would be as great as if this section of the land had been a battlefield for ten years or so, and this result would be achieved in the space of a few seconds. Possibly people in quarries, strongly built houses, ditches even, might escape (I write as a complete lavman), but it looks as if the whole of south-east England would become a desert, almost

uninhabited. The survivors, if left to themselves, would be reduced in a short time to the level of Bushmen.

The ring of "minor damage" would include the following towns: Poole, Salisbury, Frome, Bath, Stroud, Gloucester, Worcester, part of Birmingham, Loughborough, Grantham, Boston (I am proceeding clockwise round the rim of the area), King's Lynn, Norwich, Yarmouth, and there the line goes off into the North Sea.

Do you live in any of these towns? Well, you will only be suffering from "minor damage", whatever that may mean. I suppose it will vary from small atomic burns to the loss of tiles off your roof. Of course, though damage might not extend beyond these limits as direct consequence of the explosion in far-away London, there would be an almost total breakdown of many of the services of civilisation. Food would also be short. Then there would probably be outbreaks of disease and so forth. On the whole, it may safely be said that, if left without help from the rest of the world (as might be the case if war was raging), the whole of England from Lincolnshire to Dorset would just cease to be civilised. The area immediately round London would not even be inhabited. London itself would be as desolate as the mountains of the moon.

But supposing a second bomb were dropped on Manchester. The regions of "minor damage" would overlap. The

whole of northern England, nearly to the Scottish border, would be involved. So would most of Wales, though Aberystwyth would be just outside it. Perhaps this is one of the safer towns in the British Isles, unless of course the enemy thought the industrial area of South Wales worthy of an H-bomb! - Even the east coast of the Isle of Man would be affected, and suffer "minor damage".

But all this does not include the danger to be anticipated from the fall of atomic ash from the skies. This will cover the whole of the British Isle, and will extend over France well to the south of Paris.

These weapons are so wholesale in their effects that they are not likely to be used. But it would be a good thing if people could be made to realise what the future perhaps holds in store. As long as these bombs exist there is always the possibility of their use, and as long as the present social system exists the bombs will continue to be made. The general apathy of the public in regard to Civil Defence shows that they have an idea that nothing can be done to protect themselves in the event of war, but on the other hand they seem to have little appreciation of how horrible such a war will be. Otherwise they would do more than just ignore Civil Defence. Perhaps they fear to face reality. If they faced it they would revolutionise society in order to get rid of war and the Bomb, if only out of sheer desperate desire to survive. A.W.U.

# Anarchists in the Elections

THROUGH making themselves vocal at meetings, through widespread distribution of the 'Vote for Joe Soap' leaflet, and through letters to the Press, Anarchists in London have managed to achieve more publicity in the last few weeks than at any time since 1945.

Since both Freedom Bookshop and the Malatesta Club are situated in the same Parliamentary constituency, Holborn & St. Pancras Sth., the London Anarchist Group concentrated most of its activity there. Meetings held by the three parties, Labour, Conservative and Liberal, were attended by our most vocal members, and the bulk of the Joe Soap leaflets were either distributed at these meetings or dropped through letter

Lesser activity was also carried on in other constituencies, and in at least one, Hampstead, we made our mark sufficiently to earn mention in both the local papers.

Copies of 'Vote for Joe Soap' were sent out to national newspapers and in particular to journalists or contributors known to be possibly sympathetic. First response came from Cassandra of the Daily Mirror, who informed his four million readers that the politicians' circulars were pretty sickening and he preferred what the Anarchists said-and went on to quote from the leaflet.

Then Marghanita Laski expresses similar entiments, mentioning the leaflet, though without quoting, in the News Chronicle. This was followed in the same paper by quite a good boost from Laurence Thompson, who quoted at length. We are still trying to make up

our minds as to whether Thompson was complimenting us or otherwise in speculating, at the end of his quote, on the authorship of the Joe Soap leaflet. He hazarded the guess that it might have been written by Malcolm Muggeridge, editor of Punch!

Then on the day before polling day the News Chronicle published a letter from one of our comrades expressing more seriously the Anarchist case against voting. The letter was cut almost in half, but even so was not ineffective. So that was three separate pieces of publicity in the Chronicle!

On the same day the London Evening News carried a large article on a centre page headed 'Look-No Bombs!' This was a result of a reporter following up a leaflet issued by the Man! Group, London, which stated the Anarchist case in more sober terms than Joe Soap. The reporter tracked down our comrade Leah Feldman who was at first reluctant to give him any information, being suspicious that he would distort whatever she told him. In the event, however, the article was as fair as could be expected -with the usual funny remarks about beards and bombs, of course, but stating the Anarchist position fairly clearlyuntil the end, when we were credited with being nothing more than oldfashioned Liberals! (How old-fashioned can you get?)

Altogether in four local papers we got publicity. As already stated, the two Hampstead papers, Hampstead & Highgate Express and Hampstead News, mentioned Anarchist activity, and earlier, at the very beginning of the election cam-

paign, a letter had appeared in the Hackney Gazette, a paper with a wide circulation in North and East London. from a comrade in which the Anarchist position against leadership as well as voting was expressed. Meanwhile the South London Press, which circulates very widely South of the Thames, had dealt very fully and sympathetically with Joe Soap, and given the Anarchists a good boost.

These all seem small incidents, but for a movement as small and as lacking in resources as ours such free publicity is very useful, bringing our ideas before a wider public than we can reach direct. And it shows very clearly just what can be achieved by a small number of people when they really set out to make themselves heard.

How much lasting effect our campaign had remains to be seen. We stepped up our own out-door meetings, opening up again at Tower Hill and Manette Street (Charing Cross Road) and quite a few new contacts have been made.

As to official reaction . . . well it was significant that it was after he had had a Joe Soap leaflet thrust upon him by one of our girl comrades that Aneurin Bevan announced that those who did not vote were 'traitors to the human race'!

And we obviously got the Conservatives worried in Hampstead. On the morning of polling day a Tory loudspeaker car was patrolling the respectible avenues of that salubrious borough urging the bourgeoisie to 'Vote against Anarchist tyranny! Vote early for your Conservative candidate!'

PS/LAG.

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

GEORGE WOODCOCK : Anarchy or Chaos 2s. 6d. New Life to the Land Homes or Hovels? Railways and Society What is Anarchism?

The Basis of Communal Living JOHN HEWETSON: Sexual Freedom for the Young 6d. Ill-Health, Poverty and the State cloth 2s. 6d., paper 1s.

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

# New Method in the Village School

THERE are two subjects on which I normally avoid discussion since both are dominated by 'experts' and both of which subjects everyone seems qualified to discuss at the slightest provocation. The subject under review is education. Beyond a personal boast of being educated I have no qualifications to write on the deeper technical problems roused by the new film at the Academy -whether it is "progressive" or "reactionary" in educational methods or whether it introduces the concept of selfregulation I leave to others.

All that I can say is that I enjoyed the film. The title is a little unfortunate to those to whom the title 'Master' is anathema. The original 'L'Ecole Buissonniere' was a little colourless.

It is the story of a village schoolmaster who moves into a new job in a small village. He introduces new educational methods of a progressive nature. He tries to find 'the character behind each face' and draw out the potentialities of each child. He works through a project method, breaking down their hostility by discussion on a bicycle race with its many ramifications. Later they work on the frog, each scholar being assigned his individual work.

His methods meet with hostility from the leading townsfolk but he wins them over by passing several pupils, including the town's 'problem child' through their examinations.

The story of the film is very simple. There is a love affair but it doesn't interfere with the development. The children are intensely human but not so 'cute' as to swamp the film's theme.

The film was made co-operatively by the Co-operative Generale du Cinema Français et Union Generale Cinematographique. The director. Jean-Paul le Chanois has had educational experience and has based the ideas of the film on those of Freinet. To those of us reared on A. S. Neill, Homer Lane and other more radical educationalists the ideas may now seem old-fashioned (the film itself is set in the twenties) but it is a sign that the ideas have percolated through when they are presented in such a convincing and human manner on the screen.

The 'Picasso' film by Luciano Emmer

### Ban Strikes? They

WHILE in full agreement with the Article 'Will They Ban Strikes?' (FREEDOM, 28/5/55), it is as well for us to remember that there are more ways for the capitalist class to deal with strikes than simply by anti-strike legislation.

Parliament, which unfortunately has the support of so many workers, can and does divert working-class struggle from revolutionary paths into futile constitutional argument, and could, as it has, back up anti-strike legislation with the use of scab labour and force. But l believe that capitalism has evolved for itself more cunning methods of oppression than this direct use of state power.

In America Big Business, with the aid of labour leaders, obtains anti-strike pacts in its labour agreements, making the system of labour relations in the U.S.A. akin to the Fascist corporate state. In this way the worker and the employer 'co-operate'-but the boss re-

mains the boss, and retains the cash also. The Hatter's Union of America recently lent an employer an enormous sum from the union kitty so that the boss could continue to exploit the workers. A good example of how workers can be led to believe that they have something in common with the capitalist class. Obviously the workers in that particular factory will not be striking for a while! In this country Moral Re-Armament, which has quite a footing among British Trade Union officials, gives a moral justification to capitalism, thereby making strikes immoral. The trades union leadership as a whole plays the farce of the round table, which is not in the interests of the workers, and then when the rank and file find expression in the only weapon they have—the strike—those who are paid to represent them betray them. It looks like a matter of who can pay the

In spite of the examples of officially led strikes by minority unions, in general it is true to say that the unions themselves at present make anti-strike legislation unnecessary.

It is time the workers stopped cooperating with their exploiters and started co-operating with each other. Capitalism has no moral justification, and the banning of strikes would mean the attempt to take away the worker's true weapon, which, if properly used and developed in all its aspects, could lead to the overthrow of capitalism.

As anarchists, we should encourage the use of direct action, and of solidarity, all the time. We should oppose and expose all compromise with capitalism, and if attempts are made to ban our means of expression, we should be in the forefront of the struggle to defend

London.

# A T this time our fellow-workers in the

National Amalgamated Stevedores & Dockers' Union are engaged in a struggle for recognition in their employment, but this struggle is being fermented by power factions so that one Union or the other can exert influence on its members. The Unions say on behalf of their members, but it means the same thing; a small group of people want power and they will continue to cause trouble to maintain that power and keep their nice salaried positions. The time is at present ripe to stop these futile struggles and initiate a system which will not divide worker against worker as at present.

The days of disruptive power factors and political juggling in the docks are past if society as a whole and dockers in particular are to benefit and be able to enjoy security.

The method best suited to give these results is for the port workers to form their own organization to deal direct with shipowners, contracting a price to either load or unload a ship. This money should be divided amongst the workers in proportion only to the number of hours worked on the job. The accounting could be done by a staff employed by the men as a whole and all administrative posts could be held by men appointed by the dockers themselves. These men should only be paid the average wage earned by the workers and their posts should be subjected to review every six months and in no circumstances last longer than three years, when they

should return to the tools. When appointed they should be subject to immediate recall and replacement in the event of opposing the will of the men and all political alliance should be banned from the organization as a whole although individually each member can make up his own mind.

is this a Way Out for the Dockers

To share the work available a roster of all dockers could be made and men required for work selected in strict rotation, thus removing any chance of corruption.

If the dockers care to give consideration they can no doubt work out what price to charge to allow for administrative costs and how much to lay aside for payments to those out of work temporarily, but if guidance is required a chartered accountant can do that job admirably.

I have here put down some ideas as to the method of obtaining peace in Dockland and prosperity for all concerned but of one thing dockers can be certain: No one will give it to them, they will have to make it come themselves. The Minister of Labour is very worried at present, and he can alter the Docks Act of 1947 to allow them freedom to work in the Docks without Dock Board control but under themselves-in other words, Workers' Control. The shipowners are worried because they are losing money and it is a trait of that class to do business where they will be able to make a profit so they will most certainly play ball if given no other alternative.

The unions will oppose the dockers, to conserve their power, but they don't need them, working for themselves. Start in London or anywhere and other workers throughout the country will soon wake up.

London.

S.C.

## Interpretation of PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE

PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE, by Andrew Rothstein. (Penguin Special, 2s.)

TN introducing this book, Mr. Rothstein asserts that whereas in the past, peaceful relations have been maintained over periods between societies with similar social structures, the problem facing us now is whether it is possible for societies having radically different social structures to do so.

The first part of his work deals with the development of the idea, both among Soviet leaders and capitalist politicians. Nothing is said of Trotsky's activities at the time, although Bukharin is mentioned later as an opponent of Lenin's policy. The discussion hinges on the possibilities and difficulties involved in relations between capitalism and a new state "in which the revolutionary newcomer had not been tamed and fitted out with a new set of rulers . . . but on the contrary, was more effectively revolutionary than four years before", but the net result is to show that, while making its peace with foreign capitalism, the Russian Revolution had been tamed and given a new set of rulers, and lost all its revolutionary effectiveness.

The objective difficulties facing a government attempting to carry through a revolution on authoritarian lines are clearly displayed. Either the Bolsheviks joined in the game of power politics with all the other governments, or else their power would disintegrate. Naturally, they chose to stabilise their régime, even though it meant sacrificing revolutionary potentialities in Germany and other parts of Europe, and the introduction of the N.E.P. in Russia to facilitate economic ties with the capitalist world. The policy of the Russian anarchists immediately after the revolution was, on the contrary, to draw the German army into the heart of Russia, harrassing it with guerilla warfare, so as to cause its disintegration, and thereby increase the possibilities of revolution in Germany.

In part two the author sets out to allay popular fears that the U.S.S.R. is not sincere in its desire for peace. The writings of Marx, Lenin and Stalin are quoted to the effect that it is impossible to force revolution on the workers of another country. This is surely quite irrelevant, since the Soviet government's policy is not based on Marxism, and wars are never fought for ideological reasons in any case. As further quotations from Russian leaders show, the economic interests of the U.S.S.R. may coincide with those of many capitalist states over long periods, but there is no guarantee that this situation will be permanent. A rather absurd section tries to show that the British C.P. is really independent of the Russian government. The old Comintern, to which all national parties were subordinate, was theoretically dissolved in 1943 (probably in the interests of co-existence!) but its structure remains, as the simultaneous changes of policy indicate. The plea that it was merely coincidence that Bolshevik régimes were installed in Eastern Europe

ARE YOU HELPING TO FIND NEW READERS FOR FREEDOM?

just at the time the Red Army happened to be there is equally unconvincing.

As far as exchanges of accusations of diplomatic trickery are concerned, Rothstein states that "the Soviet Union can give as good as it gets" and proves the point very ably by exposing the basic antagonism of the British rulers towards Russia even during the war, and subsequent events in Western Germany.

A policy of peaceful trading would clearly be of material benefit to people on both sides of the iron curtain, but there are many factors involved besides the ones discussed in this book. For instance the breaking off of relations between the U.S.S.R. and Yugoslavia was caused purely by political rivalry.

Towards the end of the book it is suggested that co-existence might eventually ripen into co-operation, with everyone living happily together for ever. In

this case it would be interesting to know what would happen should a West European Communist Party ever become strong enough to challenge private capitalism. Perhaps the Soviet leaders do not even envisage such a possibility. If so it would not be inconsistent with the theme of the book, for Rothstein has gone a long way towards destroying his own introductory position, and showing that in fact we are not faced with a problem of mutually exclusive social systems, but with systems which, being based on authority and government, are fundamentally the same. When it suits them to live in peace they will do so, but if their interests should demand war or preparation for it, it will be engaged

Frequent reference is made to "the peoples' desires for peace". Left to themselves, people everywhere would live together in peaceful co-existence. It is only the activity of governments which provokes and sustains war, and in this respect there is little to choose between P.H. the two sides.

# Don't forget the DEFICIT!

(see page 2)

# Post-Election Conversation Piece

(with apologies to Malatesta)

CHARACTERS: Ardent Voter. Anarchist.

A. And now the election is over do

you feel much better? A.V. Of course—I've done my duty. A. I see. You conceive it to be your duty to vote for a political party which

will extract the maximum out of you, and give you back as little as possible? A.V. I wouldn't quite put it like that. After all we have to have a government to run the country and tell us what to

A. Did you say run or ruin? Don't you know what to do without being

told2

A.V. Well I know what to do naturally, but all the other people don't. If they weren't governed they would get into a terrible mess.

A. Do you realise that these people you are talking about think just the same about you? They think that if you were free to do is you wished you would murder and steal and never do any work.

A.V. But that's silly, I'm just an ordinary sort of chap. Why should I my work as long as I don't have to work spot and know just what is necessary. too many hours.

A. Quite so. The other people you are worried about are ordinary chaps too, they feel just the same as you. Maybe if you weren't quite so keen to be ruled you wouldn't have to work such long hours to support all those M.P's and other useless "organisers" who make you pay for their H-bombs and battle-

ships and armies. A.V. I don't see what you mean. We have to have those things to protect ourselves.

A. Protect yourselves from other governments you mean?

A.V. Yes, I suppose so. But we can't stop them from re-arming. A. That's what they say about us.

A.V. You may be right, but it's impossible to do away with all the governments, they wouldn't allow it. A. You do agree then that it would

be a good idea to abolish all governments if we could? A.V. Well . . . yes.

then? A.V. That's not quite fair-after all. nobody actually wants war, it's just that the political situation in the world is always so awkward hat we have to be

A. Why have you just voted for one

ready-anyway there are other things to be considered.

A. I agree that the political situation is always awkward-surely this is because there are so many politicians. What other things are we to consider?

A.V. Well obviously everything has to be controlled and organised or there would be absolute chaos.

A. Don't you think that the organisation to which you refer can best be handled by those who know the most about it?

A.V. Naturally—everyone knows that. A. In that case can you tell me why all the Ministers of this, that and the other have got their jobs? They usually know nothing about them and are just political figure-heads.

A.V. Even if that is so we still have to have the Civil Service—that's what costs the money.

A. The Civil Service is just a dictatorial administrative organisation. We still haven't got down to the people who actually do the work. They are quite capable of administering their own affairs, and would doubtless do it far want to murder and steal? I quite like more efficiently since they are on the

A.V. Ah! So you do admit that some form of organisation is necessary.

A. Of course—that's why there would be no chaos. But let those who know best do the job. None of these remote policy decisions from on high.

A.V. So you are suggesting that if we did away with all forms of authority and power everything would be alright and we should live happily ever after? It sounds very simple, and you seem to have a reasonable case for the main principles, but obviously it would not work in matters of detail. After all you can't change human nature!

A. Now you are falling back on sweeping statements, and vague generalisations. You must know that all theories are equal to the sum total of their parts, so that having established certain premises we must then analyse specific issues arising from them.

A.V. Now you are just trying to blind me with science, but it won't work because there are lots of things that I can mention which you can't possibly answer satisfactorily. For instance what would happen if people refused to work, and how could we possibly manage without a police force?

A. Well your first point brings out

one of the basic facts. It would be absurd to suppose that an anarchist society could exist without anarchists. Therefore one will have responsible people who accept that as it is essential to work in order to produce necessary goods, they must each do their share.

A.V. There are still bound to be some people who refuse to co-operate and will just live on the others.

A. Probably. But when the free society has existed for some time, it will become normal for everyone to work, simply because it will be the pattern of society and it is in everybody"s interests to do so.

A.V. Alright, what about the police force? Who will stop the thieves and murderers?

A. The police are necessary in this society principally because the ownership principle exists. If this were not so and everyone had sufficient for his needs there would be no point in stealing what one could have anyway. The rest of the criminal class, consisting of murderers and sexual criminals would hardly exist in a free society, for they are practically all products of an insane world, governed by false codes of moral and sexual behaviour. Either way the existing police system does not prevent these crimes, it merely catches some of the criminals after the event.

A.V. I see what you mean of course, but you know as well as I do that none of this will happen at the moment; it probably won't ever happen.

A. It will happen when a sufficient number of us want it, and when it is realised that the present system based on power and authority doesn't work in the interests of the people.

A.V. Meanwhile we must put up with what we have got and I shall have to vote for the best there is. After all life isn't too bad in between the wars!

A. The next war may be the end of the whole lot of us though, you can see that surely? A.V. Yes I can. That's why I vote

for the political party which wants to stop war. A. (feeling a trifle faint). But all poli-

A.V. No they don't-they keep talking about peace and prosperity.

tical parties exist on war or the threat

A. That's right—they talk about it, and you vote for them. . . .

## MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST CROUP

LECTURE-DISCUSSIONS

Every Sunday at 7.30 at THE MALATESTA CLUB 155 High Holbern, W.C.I.

(Nearly opposite Holborn Town Hall)

June 12-Tony Turner on WHAT MAKES MAN-HEREDITY OR ENVIRONMENT?

INFORMAL DISCUSSIONS

Every Thursday at 8.15. OPEN AIR MEETINGS Weather Permitting HYDE PARK

Sundays at 3.30 p.m. MANETTE STREET (Charing X Road)

Saturdays at 5.30 p.m.

**GLASGOW** 

INDOORS

at 260 Buchanan Street Every Friday at 7 p.m. **OUTDOORS** At Maxwell Street Every Sunday at 7.30 p.m.

155 HIGH HOLBORN, LONDON, W.C.1.

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

Informal Discussions Every Thursday, at 8.15 p.m.

Lecture-Discussions Every Sunday at 7.45 p.m.

(See Announcements Column) 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) be made out to FREEDOM PRESS, crassed a/c Payes, and addressed to the publishers

FREEDOM PRESS 27 Red Lion Street London, W.C.I. England

Tel.: Chancery 8364

Frused by Express Printers, London, E.1. Published by Estudion Press, 27 Red Lion Street, London, W.C.