

# Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

No class of men who have possessed authority have been able to avoid abusing it.

THOS. HENRY BUCKLE

Vol. 16, No. 24

June 11th, 1955

Threepence

## THE CASE FOR THE A.S.L.E.F.

FREEDOM has made clear its position on differentials. We are opposed to the wages system as one of the main instruments through which workers are robbed of the full value of their products, while at the same time given the appearance of a stake in their own exploitation. We maintain that there is no just way by which the social value of one man's work can be measured against another's in terms of money. Or is Johnny Ray really worth 200 engine drivers?

Nevertheless, the workers in the Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers & Firemen are engaged in a struggle in which clearly they feel very strongly. It is because we feel that their case has not been adequately put before the public that we print below a statement which shows just for how long the ASLEF has been endeavouring to get satisfaction, and with what delaying tactics and shifts of position on the part of the British Transport Commission it has had to contend.

### STATEMENT BY THE ASLEF

BECAUSE of the wide publicity given to the present rail dispute everybody knows that it is about footplate men's differentials. What is not so generally well known is that the ASLEF, whilst seeking an adjustment to rates of pay, are not seeking to improve differentials but to retain differentials established as recently as last November.

During the war period, in the Railway Industry as elsewhere, wage advances were conceded on a flat rate basis, the effect of which was to narrow the gap between the higher and lower paid men. This position was accepted by us in view of the national emergency, with the justifiable expectation that, as after the 1914-18 war, the position would be remedied after the cessation of hostilities. Such indeed was not the case but in 1947 an independent Court of Inquiry recognised the validity of our claim that relativity had been seriously distorted and in Paragraph 100 set out their views thereon:—

"... We are convinced that there is an urgent need for detailed and exhaustive reconsideration of the whole grading of the various classes, scales and categories which make up the complicated structure of the railway service... We think that the need for an inquiry to be held is paramount, both for the purpose

of ironing out obvious existing anomalies and in the interests of the general efficiency and contentment of this vital service in the future. The object of the inquiry should be, in our view, a comprehensive examination of the grading of railway workers with a view to a more accurate assessment of the relative value of the different types of work performed. A further vital need to which consideration should also be given is the re-arrangement of inter-grade margins, so that adequate incentive is given for the acceptance of higher responsibility consequent on promotion."

Although the principle was here recognised there was no effective application because of the Government White Paper on Personal Incomes, Prices and Profits, and the settlement accepted by us (under protest) because of prevailing circumstances, was 4/- additional for Drivers.

In view of the wages restraint policy which operated, no further wage advances were obtained until 1951, when two percentage wage increases were procured which broadly maintained the status quo on differentials. In fact the top-rated Driver received 8.3% as compared with an approximate increase of 7% to other staff, followed by a further overall 8%.

In 1953 the three Rail Unions submitted a joint application for a 15%

wage increase; this application proceeded through the constitutional machinery of negotiation to the Railway Staff National Tribunal who under Decision 15 awarded 4/- flat rate increase. This award was rejected by the three Unions, the NUR and ourselves declaring for strike action. The Minister of Labour intervened and in subsequent negotiations a settlement was arrived at in December 1953, in which the British Transport Commission said they were:

"prepared to examine with the trade unions their whole wage and salary structure. The British Transport Commission contemplate that this examination would be completely exhaustive, without conditions of any kind. Its pur-

poses would be:

to correct anomalies and give added incentives including differentials in desirable cases;

and to investigate all standard rates of pay."

It will be seen that [this] again emphasises the necessity for examining differentials. Protracted negotiations on the wages structure followed and eventually the two other Railway Unions effected settlement in direct negotiation with the BTC. We were dissatisfied with the offers made and submitted our claim through the Machinery of Negotiation to the Railway Staff National Tribunal. The Tribunal in their Decision No. 16 made an award which while not con-

ceding our claim in full made a considerable advance on the offer made by the BTC and established differentials in respect to the grades we represent, viz. Drivers, Firemen and Cleaners, which in a general measure were consistent with our application. This award was accepted by us because it went some way towards establishing a reasonable degree of relativity consistent with skill and responsibility.

Within 5 days of the termination of the Tribunal hearings which resulted in their Decision 16, the NUR repudiated their settlement of October 8th with the BTC, and subsequently gave strike notice. The Minister of Labour set up a Court of Inquiry following which direct negotiations between the NUR and the BTC resulted in the Agreement of 10th January, 1955, which broadly conceded to the NUR for all grades other than foot-

Continued on p. 4

## THE WORKERS' STRENGTH

A FORTNIGHT ago, many millions of workers voted for political representatives to go to Westminster in their name. Their act added nothing to their knowledge or experience and demonstrated only their weakness and lack of confidence in themselves.

Since then, however, we have seen a demonstration of the alternative form of activity which can be taken by workers to achieve their ends: direct action. And we have seen the effect upon society when only a tiny fraction of the number that voted fold their arms and refuse to go to work.

Less than 100,000 railwaymen, dockers and seamen have stopped work. Less than the number who go to Wembley every Spring for the Cup Final. But the smooth running of Britain's economy has been rudely disturbed and the lesson has been

once again sharply underlined: it is the workers who make society work. It is at the point of production that their strength really counts.

The effectiveness of the locomotives' stoppage is obvious to all. The distribution of all goods as well as the movement of passengers was affected from the very first hour. Unprofitable as they are said to be, the railways are clearly so essential that when they are halted for a day, the organised life of society begins to rock.

And this is the case with over a fifth of the country's footplate men still at work. Just as in the docks men in the T & GWU are still working while "blue" union men are striking, so on the railways 17,000 drivers and firemen in the NUR are working while their fellow workers in the ASLEF are on strike. How much stronger would be the effect of the stoppage in both industries if the workers were not divided by rival organisations and could all act together in the true spirit of solidarity!

Even so, the working class of this country is having a demonstration of where its strength really lies. And the fact that the Government has been able to take emergency measures to minimise the effects of the

stoppage means nothing. For the emergency measures are themselves being carried out by workers!

Everything that is useful and essential to the smooth running of human society is operated by the working classes of the world. Authorities may manipulate the wealth created, may benefit and become privileged, may play the game of divide and rule and consolidate their power through control of the means of power. States and governments and privileged minorities survive through the fears, the ignorance and the gullibility of the many. They are parasitical growths undermining the natural health of human society.

But society itself—the community—has survived and developed through the patience and mutual aid of the humble folk who do the work. The trouble is that they are too humble in the face of authority. Let us look at the effect upon society of a small number of us folding our arms and recognise that it is we who are important—we who are society and who make society work.

When the humble folk come together in militancy and solidarity, the power of the arrogant folk will be seen for what it is—the fruit of our own weakness and disunity. And that we can begin to remedy now.

## Mr. BATY & THE DAILY SKETCH

ONE is rarely under any misapprehension as to the class interests of the British Press. When the main body of it approves of an individual or a course of action, we can be sure that it is because it can see represented therein advantage for Britain's capitalist class.

The approval, therefore, that we have so often heard for the "responsible" leaders of the Trade Union movement, has told us only that these leaders serve capitalist interests rather than working class interests.

That we understand and expect. But even so, knowing the Press as we do, we cannot help being shocked by the violence and viciousness it can produce when it really decides to turn on the heat against anyone who becomes an object of its hatred.

Mr. Jim Baty, secretary of the ASLEF, is not all that much of an enemy of the British capitalist class. He is an ordinary, typical Trade Union leader of a relatively small organisation. He normally does not hit the headlines one-tenth as much as either the official leaders of the big unions, like the late Arthur Deakin, or the unofficial leaders in times of dispute.

### A Scapegoat Needed

Baty is not a Communist. As can be easily seen by a cursory examination of the history of the footplate-men's dispute, he has been patient and moderate, always seeking a way of avoiding a real clash. Now that it has come, we can

be sure that it is not of his choosing. Nor is he any more responsible for the strike than any other of the ten-men executive of the ASLEF, the executive of the NUR, or the British Transport Commission itself.

But the Press, and in particular its lunatic fringe, has had to have a scapegoat, a target for its spleen, someone to blame for the railway strike and the fact that the newspapers have had to cut their size as a consequence. And Mr. Baty has been a very convenient figure.

In the first few days of the strike the hysteria was warming up, and fairly general. But quite shocking in its attack has been the *Daily Sketch*. This paper was until quite recently a dull and mousy little conservative paper, chiefly known for its comic characters 'Pop' and 'Pip, Squeak and Wilfred'. Then it was bought up by Lord Northcliffe's empire, Associated Newspapers, amalgamated with the *Daily Graphic* and turned into a modern, cartoon-plastered tabloid in competition with the *Daily Mirror*.

Competition with the *Mirror* means sensationalism, shriek headlines, scrapping the barrel for stunt-journalism at its lowest level. And how the *Sketch* is succeeding! We haven't available its latest figures for circulation, but the same tactics have brought the *Mirror* four and a half million readers a day—the greatest circulation in the world. The *Sketch* is doing its best to catch up.

Continued on p. 4

## Can the Comrades Swallow This?

ONE is prepared to believe that with the departure of Stalin the régime in Russia has undergone a number of changes which have made life a little easier for the average Russian. But the recent Yugoslav interlude makes it quite clear that the new leaders are as little concerned as were their predecessors with the feelings of, or the effects on, their allies which might result from their foreign policy. We mean by this that if at a particular time they consider it to their advantage to pursue certain policies they will do so even if it means sacrificing their followers in the process. They did it with China and Spain. Now, by their meeting with Tito, and their willingness to eat humble pie, they have undoubtedly seriously weakened (if only temporarily) what prestige the Communist parties outside Russia may have enjoyed among working people. After seven years in which Tito has been blackened with the kind of invective which is reserved for the worse "traitors" of the Soviet fatherland they are expected to declare that it was all a ghastly mistake for which Beria was responsible! Tito could well afford to give a wry smile when he heard Khrushchov offer his explanation but in Trieste the Italian communist leaders could not even keep silent, and a major crisis has blown up which is being gleefully exploited by the Italian national Press. Even in this country Harry Pollitt and his friends, who have swallowed more than one bitter pill and learned by now how two and two can sometimes make five, have clearly felt their intelligence offended by the new line. No editorials have welcomed Moscow's master stroke for lasting peace (but they will come when the omission is noted in Moscow), and indeed the first announcement in the *Daily Worker* of the meeting between the Russian and Yugoslav leaders that we have seen appeared in a three-inch news item on the front page in the May 19 issue. No further word appeared

until the May 27 issue when a front page 10-inch single column item announced the arrival of the Russian delegation, and reported Khrushchov's explanation for bad relations between the two countries. By the following day Jimmy Edwards and other comedians had driven Khrushchov and his friends into an inside page to re-emerge on page one when they were getting ready to return home. But above all the significant fact is that no editorial comment has up to the time of writing (June 6) appeared.

As to the real significance of the "reconciliation", as apart from any bargaining value it may have in the forthcoming four power meeting, it seems to us that it is still too early to judge, for whilst one cannot imagine it having any positive results on the régime in Yugoslavia it might have far reaching consequences in the satellite countries.

### Comrades and Friends . . .

DURING the seven years of estrangement between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia, the Comrades in the Kremlin left us in no doubt at all about their opinion of their apt pupil and erst-while colleague.

Among a host of other things they said:

#### On his Appearance:

"He has a flabby, effeminate face, a mask which conceals the wicked, cunning and egotistical soul of an artful sneak . . . A bloodthirsty dwarf and illiterate petit-bourgeois who dons golden uniforms and is suffering from megalomania." (*Literary Gazette, Moscow*).

#### On his War Record:

"It is well known that the coward Tito and his entourage were spending their time attending drinking parties with Randolph Churchill in the port of Bari while Soviet armies, after annihilating Hitler's divisions, were occupying Belgrade." (*Literary Gazette*).

#### On his Political Career:

"Judas Tito and his abettors have transformed Yugoslavia into a Gestapo prison. The whole of progressive mankind looks with loathing upon those despised traitors." (*Marshal Bulganin*). "Spies and provocateurs." (*Foreign Minister Molotov*). "The fascist Tito's hired spies and murderers . . . a despicable band of traitors and betrayers of their motherland." (*Nikita Khrushchov*). "The workers have long since discerned the vile and repulsive snout of the Belgrade deserter, hireling, spy and murderer, bankrupt fascist traitor." (*Literary Gazette*).

#### On his Methods:

"Wild rape and terrorizing . . . unabashed trading away of blood." (*Marshal Voroshilov*). "Oppression and exploitation . . . adventurism, leftist ravings, vile manoeuvres . . ." (*Cominform Journal*).

#### On his Personality:

"Bloody executioner, trusted slave." (*Marshal Sokolovsky*). "He is a babbling Belgrade parrot . . . a bad actor. Imitating that hypocrite and poseur Churchill, Tito wanted to be a hunter, writer and chess player, but like Churchill he is a bad shot, a still worse writer, and at chess he is beaten even by the lowbrow Pijade . . . Greedy and insatiable as Goering." (*Literary Gazette*).

#### On his Future:

"Judas Tito and his abettors . . . will not escape the terrible judgment of their people. They will have to account for their sanguinary crimes, for their repulsive betrayal." (*Marshal Bulganin*). "The time will come when the people of Yugoslavia will avenge themselves and get rid of Tito's clique." (*Khrushchov*). "History will give Tito the choice of poison, as was Hitler's case, or the rope, as was Mussolini's case." (*Literary Gazette*).



## Recent Trends in Psychotherapy—3

ALEXANDER and French are medical men with Freudian background but with sufficient imagination and courage to play ducks and drakes with the orthodox technique where it fails to get results. Instead of spending years on archeological excavation chasing a will-o'-the-wisp past by means of the aimless free-association process they concentrate on solving the problems as presented. Instead of meticulously trying to unearth some childhood horror, often existing only in the imaginations of the patient or therapist, there is an insistence on treating the here and now situation and finding real life solutions to real life problems. They frankly recognise that therapeutic gain takes place largely between and not during interviews. When the patient goes out and does some effective reality testing he convinces himself emotionally rather than intellectually that the world is not such a dangerous place for an adult as it must sometimes appear to a child. To this end instead of observing the ritual of the daily session the frequency of the interviews is manipulated to ensure the maximum opportunity for meeting everyday problems in a realistic way. Nor does the therapist refuse to advise the patient regarding his conduct in the real world if he is honestly at a loss to cope with it.

The actual transference neurosis, which may be loosely described as the patient's transference of attitudes that have been developed in earlier situations on to the therapist, is manipulated far more efficiently than the orthodox technique allows by restricting it to relevant areas in which a re-educative emotional experience is necessary and by breaking up the negative transference as rapidly as possible. The positive transference, that is the good-will of the patient towards the therapist whom he sees as a benevolent figure, is used to motivate the patient to face up to the less pleasant aspects of therapy, but dependence is kept to a minimum.

Whereas the Freudian pundits maintain as impersonal a relationship as possible with the patient on the pretext of being "objective", Alexander and French see that this leads an air of unreality to the therapeutic situation. The uselessness of the cold approach becomes particularly obvious when dealing with children, adolescents and schizophrenics.

There are many other subtle ways in which the briefer technique of Alexander and French deviates from the party line. As far as the patient is concerned the main difference is that he can reasonably hope to gain his mental health after only sixty hours of therapy instead

of staggering on for three hundred plus, desperately hoping for something to happen.

The justification for short circuiting the extended performance of an orthodox analysis is that whereas Freud had to start from scratch, not knowing what he might come up against, a modern therapist has the advantage of many thousands of reported cases to guide him. Instead of milling around among the tangled skeins of thought, which are the product of inconsequential free-association, he knows beforehand that our society, being what it is, all of us must inevitably have had to meet the two main problems of regulating sexual and aggressive behaviour in order to avoid social disapproval and escape the ensuing punishment.

Often enough it is sufficient merely to point out to the patient that the demand for co-operation in a highly competitive society must inevitably impose a problem, for him to find an adequate solution. His vague feelings of anxiety and helplessness dissolve as soon as the problem is crystallised in reality terms.

In the same way, pointing out the existence of the sexual double-standard often leads to a rapid therapeutic gain. The discrepancy between what is expected of us according to convention and what is tolerated provided certain other conditions are met, is one that the neurotic finds confusing in his quest for social acceptability. To talk about his relation to the social mores in a realistic manner helps him to sort out a highly complex issue and find a way of life that suits him personally.

So the therapist and patient are no longer committed to the tedious business of filling in the life history step by painful step in the hope of exposing some buried childhood trauma or repressed desire. No wonder the job takes so long. Looking for a special needle in a haystack is a particularly protracted affair if there happens to be no needle of that sort in it.

To complete this rapid sketch of the contemporary scene it remains to men-

tion Dollard and Miller of Yale. Dollard is a clinical psychologist reared in the Freudian tradition. Miller is essentially an experimental psychologist; a product of the modern Hullian school of behaviourism. These two got together and in 1950 published "Personality and Psychotherapy", a book that is rapidly becoming a classic. In it we find the Freudian mythology translated into the clear-cut scientific terminology of modern learning theory. The basic premise of the authors is that since all human social behaviour, including neurotic patterns, is learned it can be unlearned using the same principles by which it was acquired.

The concept of therapy as essentially a process of re-education is generally accepted nowadays, but here for the first time we have a detailed analysis of the way neurotic behaviour is learned in the first place, and then what is required of the therapeutic situation in order most efficiently to provide an opportunity for learning more adaptive behaviour.

It is impossible to summarise a book like this and do justice to it. Sufficient to say that it is forcing many of the coming generation of American psychotherapists seriously to question whether it is worth loading themselves with the dead-weight of the woolly entities of the Freudian melodrama. At last there is promise of a scientific framework within which to develop therapeutic techniques and orientate research programmes.

The era of the dilettante and downright charlatan in the field of psychotherapy is drawing to a close. Already the writing on the wall is clear enough for those with half an eye to see. Just as medicine got beyond the blood-letting stage and its attendant theories of humours of the body, so it is not unreasonable to hope that within the next decade or two we shall emerge from the age of shock "therapy" and Freudian claptrap. Anyone who attempts to hold back the tide which is running against the old order will get his feet wet and lay himself open to the suspicion that he has a vested interest in human misery.

BOB GREEN.

## BOOK REVIEW Anti-semitism

**WORKING - CLASS ANTI-SEMITISM**, by James H. Robb. Tavistock Publications, 15s.

MUCH has been written about anti-Semitism, though little on anti-Semites and little of that from a sociological standpoint. Dr. Robb has made a study of working-class anti-Semites in a working-class district of London—Bethnal Green. In his study of the causes of this attitude he gives equal emphasis both to the external social factors influencing the individual, and to his personality-structure—thus combining the socio- and psycho-logical approaches. It is, of course, self-evident that personality will be influenced by environment, and to a more limited extent, the opposite occurs: the pressure exerted for example by the established behaviour-pattern of the ethnic group on the personality, both directly and indirectly, can be considerable.

Such factors are particularly important when viewed in the light of Dr. Robb's conclusion that 'a pre-disposition to [anti-Semitism] is formed when early childhood, and later social, exper-

iences combine to produce an expectation of affection and security insufficient to meet the needs of the personality' and also that 'the characteristic attributed to the Jewish group . . . are likely to reflect some of the needs and repressed wishes of the hostile individual'.

These conclusions are, perhaps, unexceptionable but the study is also of value for the picture of social behaviour it gives of what Professor Spratt in the Foreword refers to as an 'English sub-culture', the working-class population of Bethnal Green. A particularly commendable aspect of this research, and one that increases the validity of its findings was the fact that Dr. Robb really got to grips with his subject by working as a barman in his field of study and by approaching individuals in their homes. So many such researches are carried out by merely circulating questionnaires among students or selected individuals, combined with a limited amount of interviewing, that Dr. Robb's approach is unfortunately more the exception than the rule. It is a book to be recommended, in fact, as much for its by-products as for its end-product.

M.G.W.

## Steinbeck on Juvenile Delinquency

THE great American novelist John Steinbeck, writing on juvenile delinquency in the *Saturday Review* says:

"The daily papers are full of it. Bad kids. Burglary. Rape. Murder. The kids run in gangs. The Scarlet Cavaliers. The Shining Knights. They manufacture pistols, carry switchknives and use them. They are loyal to nothing except the gang. They rarely tell on each other. The reason for all this might be larger than children. In feudal law everyone was responsible for something. Every member of the family was responsible for every other member. In the village this same responsibility obtained. If a child committed a crime his whole family

was affected, even punished, and even if his father and mother were not punished they were dishonoured. But the reverse was also true. The group took honour from an honourable deed of one of its members. Everyone belonged to something, something powerful.

Now we are prone to consider such mutual responsibilities as savage and barbaric. But what have we substituted? Perhaps we have a longing for it. Maybe delinquency stems from just exactly this. The kids, not finding it at home and apparently needing it, build gangs to which they give their loyalty and their courage. They fight for one another, lie for one another, even kill for one another. Could this not be because it is the only thing they have? The ends of a delinquent gang may be wrong but there are virtues too. Virtues which find no exercise anywhere else. There is a terrible need in people to be responsible. Certain units in the armed forces use this need to build heroic groups of which each member is a passionate unit. The member protects the gang. The family was once a thing like that. The kid gangs do dreadful things but the dreadful things require courage, sometimes pain, and a kind of dedication. The same virtues turned in another direction would be called heroic. The kid refusing to sing to the cops is a delinquent. The same kid refusing information to a military enemy is a hero. If this loss of inter-responsibility is one of the main causes of our difficulty, and if it is to be restored, it cannot be soft or tender. People need responsibility. They resist assuming it, but they cannot get along without it. Man is a double thing—a group animal and at the same time an individual. And he cannot successfully be the second until he has fulfilled the first."

Continued on p. 3

## The 'New Statesman' on Orwell & Spain

A PARAGRAPH by "Critic" in his London Diary published in the *New Statesman and Nation* for May 21 refers to an article written by George Orwell for that journal, after the May Days in Barcelona in 1937, and which was rejected for reasons which "Critic" explains and seeks to justify in these terms:

"[Orwell] came back [from Spain] infuriated by the suppression of the anarchist organisation P.O.U.M. by the Spanish Government. His article was, in fact, a savage attack on Negrin and his Communist allies, who behaved, I am sure, with unscrupulous and unnecessary cruelty and violence towards the Anarchists. But I'm not surprised his article was rejected. For Orwell was not merely critical; this journal was always prepared to be extremely critical about the Negrin Coalition, as it was about the Churchill Government during the World War. The trouble was that the article was in effect pro-Franco. The P.O.U.M. were the most attractive group in Spain. They had high ideals, and were genuine fighters for liberty, which was not, by any means, always the case with those who supported Negrin. But the Anarchists, true to their name, could not accept the discipline or leadership without which no war can be fought. Faced with the dilemma of our times, they made the same decision that Orwell made. Rather than surrender any liberty, they preferred to lose the war and could not co-operate with less scrupulous men. Orwell's instincts were those of a man of the Left, but because he was a writer and a fastidious and sensitive man who could not bear compromise, he attacked those who accepted the necessity of the Soviet alliance without which Hitler and Mussolini could have conquered Europe."

In the correspondence columns of the *N.S.&N.* of the following week two letters appeared; one from a member of the P.O.U.M. drawing attention to the mistaken reference to the "anarchist P.O.U.M." and adding her own mistaken view as to the importance of the P.O.U.M. when she writes:

"P.O.U.M. realised earlier than the Anarchists that the Russian-inspired Communist line aimed at destroying all revolutionary achievements in Catalonia. I believe it had not been fully understood abroad in 1936-37 how far the revolution was advanced and that once it was destroyed and the P.O.U.M. leaders either assassinated or arrested, all the

fighting spirit had gone out of the masses in Catalonia."

A second letter from Julian Symons points out that "Critic's" discovery that the P.O.U.M. were "the most attractive group in Spain" would read strangely to "those who remember the *New Statesman's* editorial attitude to the P.O.U.M. during the Spanish Civil War. Surprising, also, is the casual assumption that an attack on Negrin and the Communist Party in Spain was of necessity 'in effect pro-Franco.' Critic seems to admit that much of what Orwell wrote was true. Must the telling of uncomfortable truth, then, be delayed (in the *New Statesman*) until years after the event? And would Critic condemn the publication of *Animal Farm* during the war, by the same logic, as 'in effect pro-Nazi'?"

"Critic" in his reply to these two letters apologises for the factual mistake and adds that he was not in any way defending the Communist treatment of their "less disciplined allies". Does "Critic" imply by this that the Communists murdered the revolutionary militants in the name of discipline? He obviously still cherishes the belief that it was Communist discipline in Spain that made resistance to Franco possible. Yet the more one studies the struggle in Spain objectively and in relation to the results achieved at the various stages of the struggle, the more does one come to the conclusion that "militarisation" was a policy disastrous both to the cause of the social revolution and to the armed struggle against Franco's forces. But this is a subject which needs a series of articles to elaborate.

To the second point raised by Julian Symons "Critic" replies:

"On the second point of principle, it would never have entered my head to suggest that *Animal Farm*, or any other book, should have been suppressed because it was objectively 'pro-Nazi' or 'pro-Franco.' This journal has been more often attacked than any other for its recklessness in criticising its allies and friends in war or, for that matter—in general elections. The point of my paragraph was to explain that, rightly or wrongly—and I am now inclined to think wrongly—Orwell's article seemed to demand a departure from our usual rule of 'publish and be damned'. The purest of anarchists hesitate to blurt out the facts which may lead to the destruction of their friends."—Ed., *N.S.&N.*

## FREEDOM BOOKSHOP OPEN DAILY

OPEN 10 a.m. to 6.30; 5.0 SATURDAYS  
All orders received during the Rail Strikewill be packed ready for dispatch as soon as postal restrictions are withdrawn.

### New Books . . .

Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy 3/-  
A. W. Gouldner 21/-  
Wildcat Strike A. W. Gouldner 16/-  
The Slaughterhouse Informer Edward Hyams 12/6

### Second-Hand . . .

The Pathetic Fallacy Llewellyn Powys 2/6  
Adventures in Socialism Alex Cullen 15/-  
Mutual Aid Peter Kropotkin 15/-  
Love's Comedy Henrik Ibsen 2/6  
The Coming Revolution Gerald Gould 2/6  
Defence of Madrid Geoffrey Cox 3/-  
The True Believer Eric Hoffer 4/-  
Comrade, O Comrade Ethel Mannin 2/6  
The God of His Fathers Jack London 2/6  
The Iron Heel Jack London 2/6  
Patriotism Prepaid (Veterans of Future Wars) Lewis J. Gorin 3/-  
Communist Manifesto: Socialist Landmark Harold J. Laski 2/6  
Political Economy: a Marxist Textbook John Easton 3/-  
Chosen Country John Dos Passos 3/-  
Under Western Eyes Joseph Conrad 3/-  
Why We Lost Singapore Dorothy Crisp 2/-  
Israel Kalisch W. L. George 3/-  
Fireman Flower William Sansom 3/-  
The World as I See It Albert Einstein 2/6  
Racism Magnus Hirschfeld 4/-

Postage free on all items

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

## MORE ABOUT SEX IN SWEDEN

A FEW weeks ago we drew attention to the enlightened attitude to sex prevalent in the Swedish educational system. The following example again underlines the anarchist contention that freedom in sexual matters, coupled with a responsible attitude, will not lead to "moral degeneracy", etc., as the moralists would have us believe.

We quote from *Time* for 6th June:  
"What should schools do when pupils have children?" asked Stockholm's *Svenska Dagbladet*. A Bible teacher in a school in southern Sweden had posed the question after two girls bore babies fathered by fellow students. Should they be expelled, or at least get bad-conduct marks on their final reports? The Bible teacher's view was that they should. Not so, said the principal, and handed out good-conduct marks. The school's teaching staff agreed, taking the position that "the schools should not punish, now that society no longer does." The outraged Bible teacher appealed to the school board, which simply referred him to the official handbook on sex education in public schools—"Established sex relations between youngsters may not be contrary to the general viewpoint in their circles . . ."—and upheld the principal. Then the Bible teacher appealed to

the government itself, protesting indignantly that "in this school, sexual relations between pupils are entirely consistent with the highest conduct marks." A fortnight ago, at a formal Cabinet meeting presided over by Prince Bertil, son of King Gustaf VI Adolf, the government formally backed the school principal over the Bible teacher.

Explained the vindicated principal: "The couples are good at school and exceptionally hard-working. They have been going steady for a long period . . . Nobody wanted to force them to get married, but they remained true to each other and did so. Now they have settled down happily and their 'doll marriages' are touchingly beautiful." Reported one of the young mothers, 19, preoccupied with both schoolbooks and a six-month-old boy: "Since the baby arrived, my husband and I have had no free time and have been forced to do all our homework at night. Marriage, pregnancy and diaper-changing cannot be combined with schoolwork. We regard the Scripture teacher as a fine and cultured person, but we definitely oppose his moral view. It belongs to another age." Both she and her husband, reported the girl, have decided to keep on studying. Their prospective careers: teaching.



## SOME REFLECTIONS ON NATIONALISATION

NATIONALISATION, whatever the intentions of the Labour pioneers may have been, means neither workers' control nor public ownership, since those engaged in nationalised industries, as well as the consumers, have no say in their management.

In theory a nationalised industry should be one in which the best possible service for the public and conditions for those working in that industry are combined. In fact there is a centralisation, a depersonalisation at the top against which neither worker nor consumer has any redress. A footplate man with 36 years experience put it succinctly in an interview with the *News Chronicle* last week:

Frankly, many things are worse than before nationalisation: too much red tape and waste of money. Our contact with the Commission is remote. The only information we get about it is through its monthly magazine.

And users of public transport were baldly informed in the middle of the present strike that fares are going up to the tune of some £25 million in the next 12 months.

AN election issue was the Labour Party's proposed nationalisation of the Chemical Industry, including the I.C.I. empire (with sales figures in 1954 of £352 millions and net profits amounting to £21.7 millions). In a telegram to a Conservative candidate the Minister of Fuel & Power confirmed that

... as a consequence of the nationalisation of the gas industry, profit-sharing schemes for 50,000 employees came to an end. Some of these schemes dated back to 1889, and thus nearly seventy years of industrial progress were swept aside.

"The basis of nationalisation is non-profit-making state ownership. Since there are no profits, there cannot possibly be any profit-sharing. Thus, the nationalisation of the chemical industry must inevitably have the same effect as that in the gas industry."

One of the troubles with Nationalised industries is that they are run as profit-making concerns (the Labour leaders insist that they "must pay their way"); that in fact the five Nationalised industries made a profit in 1953 of £137 millions of which £109 million went into the pockets of former shareholders in the shape of interest and compensation.

NATIONALISED industries have not changed the status of workers engaged in them. The Boss has been replaced by the State. In the circumstances therefore the worker is in a weaker position for bargaining since the principal weapon at his disposal—the strike—has lost much of its force. An individual employer can hold out against the demands of striking workers for a limited time, the State indefinitely, apart from its power to introduce Emergency Measures (legalised blacklegging) in the name of the Community. Nationalisation without workers' control therefore, is a retrograde step as far as workers are concerned.

Private enterprise—or what is left of it by the Combines—by its competitive basis cannot ignore the consumer entirely (how foolish the public has been in not forming Consumers' Unions!) Nationalisation without the direct participation of the Consumer is uniformity and totalitarianism.

CAN Nationalisation—taken to mean public ownership in the fullest sense of the word—co-exist

Continued from p. 2

of the history of the Spanish Civil War". And he proceeds to discuss some of the facts regarding the P.O.U.M.

"Critic's" original paragraph was of interest both to supporters of the P.O.U.M. as well as to anarchists. Yet so far he has published three letters from POUMists or sympathisers, and one from a Stalinist and nothing from anarchist correspondents. As many readers of FREEDOM also read the *N.S. & N.*—and many wrote to us at the time drawing our attention to the paragraph in question, we think we should point out that a number of anarchists did write to the *New Statesman* without success. The following letter was addressed to the Editor by the *Freedom Press* on the 15th May and may be of interest to those of our readers who have been following the controversy in the columns of the *New Statesman*.

with free enterprise and the Conservative 'property-owning democracy'. We think not. Either free-enterprise is allowed to survive in which case Nationalisation will, as is the case to-day, be a large scale model of free-enterprise with all its defects and none of its advantages. Or if Nationalisation is really public ownership then free-enterprise faces complete bankruptcy. For apart from considerations of efficiency, Service and working conditions, it would mean the end of the profit motive in production, the *raison d'être* of "free-enterprise".

The pursuit of a thoroughgoing policy of Nationalisation must result either in an equalitarian society in which money, as we know it to-day, will have become redundant, or in the all powerful, totalitarian State with a new class structure, new inequalities and new injustices.\*

In either eventuality most of the privileged members of our society risk losing their power and private fortunes. Private enterprise's reply is to save what it can and consolidate what is left. Hence the growing number of mergers of companies (their own kind of nationalisation whilst paying lip-service to private enterprise!) and the development of profit-sharing schemes for employees (I.C.I. for instance last year credited 75,000 employees with a bonus equal to a shilling in the pound of their wages—that is a total of £2,500,000 which will be used to buy for the wage earners shares in the Company). The purpose of such schemes does not need elaborating, and if the workers fall for it the bosses kill three birds with one stone!

CAPITALISM, Trades Unionism, Socialism . . . all are at the cross-roads. Their spokesmen will seek to salvage what they can from the shambles they have created; a bit of nationalisation and a differential here and less taxation on profits and more productivity there. But none will admit that the only way of dealing with a shambles is to clear it away and start afresh with new ideas and values based on the commonweal.

\*To hear tell around Kazakhstan, some Soviet farmers are getting rich under the new order of agriculture instituted by the Communist party in 1953.

According to the regional government headquarters in Akmolinsk, fifteen members of collective farms in the region have made applications for Zim limousines. That is equivalent to saying that fifteen Kansas wheat farmers have placed orders for private yachts.

The Zim, a seven-passenger limousine, not conspicuously suitable for the dirt roads of the Akmolinsk countryside, is the second largest Soviet automobile. It costs 42,000 rubles, or nearly five times the annual average wage of a Soviet worker as calculated by foreign economists. [At the official rate of exchange, there are four rubles to the dollar.]

A few farmers in the Akmolinsk region, government authorities say, collected 70,000 to 75,000 rubles each last year, or eight to nine times the average wage. (*New York Times*, May 3).

†Business mergers in America are up 200% over 1949 according to the Federal Trade Commission.

# Our Reply to the 'New Statesman'

To The Editor,  
*New Statesman & Nation*,  
W.C.I.

"Critic" last week recalled an incident during the Spanish Civil War which, he says, "soured" Orwell's view of the *New Statesman & Nation*. His present comments are enough to make Orwell turn in his grave!

Firstly: his whole argument is invalidated when he refers to "the suppression of the Anarchist P.O.U.M." for the P.O.U.M. (*Partido Obrero de Unificación Marxista*) was an authoritarian Marxist Party which was strongly anti-anarchist as well as anti-Stalinist. Its suppression was not the result of its opposition to "the discipline of leadership without which no war can be fought" nor to its inability to "co-operate with less scrupulous men". Why, at one time there was even a P.O.U.M. Minister of Justice in the Catalan government! The suppression of the P.O.U.M. was carried out by the Communists and the Spanish Cheka on orders from the Kremlin. As early as December 16th, 1936, one read in the columns of *Pravda* that:

"As for Catalonia, the purging of the Trotskyists and the Anarcho-Syndicalists has begun; it will be conducted with the same energy with which it was conducted in the U.S.S.R."

Furthermore a first-hand account of how the "incriminating documents", "proving" the connection between the P.O.U.M. and Franco's Fifth Column were cooked, and how Andres Nin, leader of the P.O.U.M., was taken for a ride before his trial, is to be found in Jesus Hernandez's book *Yo Fui Ministro de Stalin (I was Stalin's Minister)* (Mexico, 1953). The importance of Hernandez's testimony lies in the fact that he was one of the leaders of the Spanish C.P., a Minister in the Negrin Government as well as a member of the Execu-

tive of the Comintern. His experience in the Spanish War and his subsequent sojourn in the Workers' Paradise apparently soured his view of the U.S.S.R.

Secondly: it is quite untrue to say that the Anarchists "preferred to lose the war rather than surrender their liberty, etc." The contrary is in fact the case. Whether the struggle against Franco was advanced by the anarchists surrendering their principles to militarisation, the strengthening of the central government and the control of the war by the Communists, is a question which, fifteen years after the defeat is still the subject of heated arguments among the Spanish anarchists and cannot be usefully discussed here. But one thing is certain: that but for the anarchists (F.A.I.) and the anarcho-syndicalists (C.N.T.) of Spain (organisations representing more than 2 million workers, hardly a "group" however "attractive" "Critic" finds them!) there would have been no resistance to Franco's uprising. In support of this contention may I quote the words of Luis Companys, President of Catalonia, which he addressed to the anarchists following the defeat of Franco's forces in Catalonia:

"To-day you are the masters of the city and of Catalonia because you alone have defeated the fascist militarists . . . Persecuted until the day before yesterday, to-day you have defeated the military and the fascists . . . You have won and everything is in your hands . . ."

Thirdly: "Critic" tells us that Orwell's article was "in effect pro-Franco". One

can only assume (having read *Homage to Catalonia*) that Orwell's rejected article exposed the dangerous political situation in the anti-Franco camp as it appeared to him, stressing that the street fighting that had just taken place in Barcelona (in May, 1937, when some 500 workers were killed) was in fact Stalin's promised "purge" of the revolutionary elements. "I'm not surprised his article was rejected" writes "Critic" by which remark one must suppose that he is unconcerned with the truth when it conflicts with the "causes" he supports.

Fourthly: "Critic stresses that Orwell 'could not bear compromise'. To his anarchist friends it seemed instead that Orwell the self-proclaimed realist wasted a lot of time and energy choosing between the lesser- and greater- evils in politics. It led him, for instance, to attack those of the Left and pacifist movements who opposed the war as being in effect pro-Hitler (it is indeed poetic justice that "Critic" should now describe Orwell's stand over Spain as being "in effect pro-Franco"!); and in 1945 to support the Labour Party. But Orwell, at least, was courageous and honest enough to openly express his disillusionment when he discovered that one evil was as bad as the other. "Critic", on the other hand, is still repeating the politicians' clichés, and tagging onto people the same old labels. He must tread very carefully over the H-Bomb issue or someone, using "Critic's" arguments, may label him as being "in effect" pro-Russian!

## THE MALENESS OF MACARONI - OR SEX AND PROFIT

PSYCHOLOGY and its allied sciences have immensely increased man's knowledge of himself. The discovery of the vital importance of the early years in forming the personality, has helped to make the upbringing of many children much freer.

It has also shown certain people how to make more money: a superficial use is made of psychology in most advertisements, usually by appealing, with varying degrees of crudeness, to our emotions. However, advertisers are now beginning to realise that psychology can tell them a great deal about why people buy a particular brand of goods—not that research into people's buying habits is anything new in the advertising world but a novel technique for this is making a mushroom growth. The OK phrase for it is 'Motivation Research' and of course an American has produced a fat book on the subject (*Motivation and Research in Advertising and Marketing*, by G. H. Smith. McGraw-Hill).

*World's Press News*, in reviewing this book, quotes the following passage.

A French marketing consultant, Louis Adam, used a projective technique based

on Freudian dynamic psychology to find out why more women in France did not buy X brand of macaroni. The superficial rational answers given were: "It is not so good as other brands." Motivation study first discovered that the real reason why women were not buying X brand of macaroni was that it was softer and stickier than other brands when prepared. Deeper psychological research was then used to find out why this particular product-characteristic was objectionable. Among other things, the study revealed that everything soft recalls maternal criticism in certain circumstances. It discovered that macaroni which holds up well and does not stick suggests malelessness. That women tend to repress, for sexual reasons, all that is sticky, gluey, viscous. To nullify this, advantage was taken of masculine symbolism. "A young woman . . . will be shown holding a handful of macaroni upright . . . the feminine unconscious will be able to satisfy a deep-rooted tendency . . . will work for us, by launching itself, by objectifying itself on our macaroni . . . copy will emphasise that the macaroni in question, once cooked, is not sticky and gluey. . . ."

In a study of toilet soap, Adam's inquiries revealed the close association of latter in women's minds with sensuality, risk, coquetry, and eagerness to possess. Certain deeper significances, such as a weaning complex, were tapped. Women confessed the sensual pleasure they got from bathing, sliding into the lather, immersing their breasts in it, letting the lather in women's minds with sensuality, then "uncovering" the body, and so on.

Now who says psychology's a lot of nonsense?

## Democracy American Style

Bruce Rothwell, writing in the *News Chronicle* (May 20th), tells us of a shocking attempt by the Government to force loyalty oaths out of tenants occupying Government subsidised houses. He writes:—

"Thirty-thousand tenants of Government-subsidised, low-rent houses in New York to-day received notice that they must sign loyalty oaths or face eviction. The tenants were told they must swear that they, members of their families and any persons living with them, are not members of any of the 200 subversive organisations named in an attached list.

"If you fail to sign and return the certificate, we shall be compelled to start legal action for your removal," the notices said.

The notices explained that, as tenants of subsidised houses "you are particularly subject to Federal laws."

Legislation requiring oaths, sponsored by a Republican Congressman, was passed in 1952 and this is the second attempt by New York to enforce it.

An attempt in 1953 secured answers from about 15,000 of 16,000 tenants—then a Mrs. Rebecca Peters, of Brooklyn, won a court injunction.

She alleged that the loyalty pledge violated constitutional safeguards against self-incrimination. Brooklyn Supreme Court ruled that the measure deprived tenants of the "due process of law."

The Appeal Court upset the ruling and New York City Housing Authority decided to reissue the notices. Mrs. Peters' case is now before the Supreme Court.

Where does this differ from the totalitarianism of the Soviet Union?

## 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* 7s.
- 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.
- GEORGE WOODCOCK :**  
*Anarchy or Chaos* 2s. 6d.  
*New Life to the Land* 6d.  
*Homes orhovels?* 6d.  
*Railways and Society* 3d.  
*What is Anarchism?* 1d.  
*The Basis of Communal Living* 1s.
- JOHN HEWETSON :**  
*Sexual Freedom for the Young* 6d.  
*Ill-Health, Poverty and the State* cloth 2s. 6d., paper 1s.
- PHILIP SANSON :**  
*Syndicalism—The Workers' Next Step* 1s.
- ALEXANDER BERKMAN :**  
*ABC of Anarchism* 1s.
- M. BAKUNIN :**  
*Marxism, Freedom and the State.* cloth 5s.
- FERRICO MALATESTA :**  
*Anarchy* 6d.  
*Vote—What For?* 1d.
- RUDOLF ROCKER :**  
*Nationalism and Culture* cloth 21s.
- PETER KROPOTKIN :**  
*The State: Its Historic Role* 1s.  
*The Wage System* 3d.  
*Revolutionary Government* 3d.  
*Organised Vengeance Called Justice* 2d.
- TONY GIBSON :**  
*Youth for Freedom* paper 2s.  
*Food Production and Population* 6d.  
*Who will do the Dirty Work?* 2d.
- ★
- Marie-Louise Berneri Memorial Committee publications :**  
*Marie-Louise Berneri, 1918-1949: A Tribute* cloth 5s.  
*Journey Through Utopia* cloth 16s. (U.S.A. \$2.50)
- ★
- K. J. KENAFICK :**  
*Michael Bakunin and Karl Marx* paper 6s.
- F. A. RIDLEY :**  
*The Roman Catholic Church and the Modern Age* 2d.
- 27, Red Lion Street, London, W.C.I.**

Have you renewed your Subscription to FREEDOM?

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT!  
WEEK 22  
Deficit on Freedom £330  
Contributions received £287  
DEFICIT £43

May 26 to June 2  
Billingham: J.G. 3/-; New York: J.F.B. 14/-;  
London: W.E.D. 4/-; Glasgow: S.M. 2/6;  
Granite City: E.J.C. 10/-; San Francisco: F.S. 7/-; London: N.T. 2/-; London: J.S.\* 3/-; Kettering: E.A.N. 3/-.  
Total ... 2 8 6  
Previously acknowledged ... 284 15 7  
1955 TOTAL TO DATE ... £287 4 1  
GIFT OF BOOKS: London: S.L.



## ABOUT JOHNNY RAY

I AGREE that there is no such thing as a panacea, and that Christians make things too simple. But so do scientists. And so does anyone who is sure he has the answer, almost before he has looked at the trouble. So does anyone who says that this *must* be the cause—as people often do when they speak of juvenile delinquency—without bringing any evidence to show that in fact it is so.

When you are writing of Johnny's singing you say that "above all, his incredible sway must consist in the fact that his act amounts to a vast, communal release of emotional energy dammed up in the hearts of so many, many girls whose financial circumstances, drab tenement and factory-bound lives, and unintelligent upbringing have left only the back-row-of-the-stalls cuddle and participation in this theatrical orgy as socially permissible outlets". Now maybe it is that. But have you any reason for thinking so, in this case? Have you reason to think that all or most of those women (were they all girls?) who heard Johnny and yelled were poor, came from drab tenements and led factory-bound lives? Maybe they did. But I have heard this sort of thing so often that it seems pat unless there is some evidence to support it.

But suppose they did. Does a life in drab tenements and factories mean that an unusual amount of emotional energy is dammed up in the heart? Perhaps. But do not such girls often let their emotional energy flow in torrents? and in quite "normal" ways, too? Do they not let their emotions flow more freely than girls in the suburbs do? How

many of them really do feel stifled and frustrated? The complaint of social workers, I believe, has been just that the girls did not wish for any other environment than the one they had. Perhaps the social workers are mistaken; I do not know. But anyway, how many girls who live in tenements and work in factories have had no other sexual experience than the back stalls cuddle and excitement over Johnny's singing?

I believe the "bobby-soxers" in America used to swoon over Frank Sinatra and James Mason. I wonder what sort of lives they led. I had gathered that many were high-school girls.

You said that "the innocents who composed the crowd may not have known it, but they were exhibiting every (every?) symptom of an orgasm. And so was the hardly-audible singer." But if it was not really every symptom—and you cannot have meant that—then I suppose there must be lots of things people do that could be described in the same way. Marciano and Cockell may have been exhibiting many symptoms of an orgasm. But then it does not make much difference whether you say that the fight exhibits symptoms of an orgasm, or that the orgasm exhibits symptoms of aggression. In other words, you can find a lot in common between an orgasm and various other forms of excitement, but you have not yet any reason for regarding any one of them as especially fundamental.

What reason have we to think that the excitement of the girls in that crowd was a substitute for orgasmic excitement—in the sense that if they had been accus-

## IS IT SUPPRESSION?—2

IN your reply last week to Ken Milne's letter about your attitude to the work of Reich, and of Paul and Jean Ritter, you evade the important issue by falling back upon a personal smearing of the Ritters' journal, and their motives for publishing.

The important issue would still seem to be whether or not a person about whom you make unpleasant insinuations in your pages, should have the right to defend himself from your attacks.

You give as your reasons for suppressing his complaints about the article you published, in which his work was discussed, that he replied too "aggressively". Yet you have given your readers no opportunity to convince themselves of this "aggressiveness" by reading the Ritters' letter for themselves. Thus you seem eager to encourage prejudice against the Ritters' work. Your reply to Ken Milne, whether intended or not, certainly has

that effect. Since when has it been the function of FREEDOM to encourage prejudice, by allowing only one point of view to be heard?

The feeling that FREEDOM, in its periodic references to the work of Reich, is guilty of unfair presentation, was not based upon any "theory" of the Ritters, but upon what had appeared in your pages. Last week's issue of FREEDOM illustrated this very well by publishing without comment a long article by Bob Green, in which Reich's work is again referred to, but this time with a slick insensitivity and contemptuous ignorance, which would do credit to the extremest of cultural reactionaries. If this is not anti-Reich, what is? If Reich's work is not as vitally significant to the readers of FREEDOM as it is thought to be, then at least you might devote an article to explaining why, instead of opening your columns to cheap underhand disparagings of his work.

I might add that in your quotation from the May issue of *Organomic Functionalism*, in which the differences between healthy and unhealthy criticism are discussed at some length, you use a passage from Ritter's editorial against him, in a way which is possible only by depriving it completely of its original context, and giving it your own peculiar distortion of emphasis.

Finally as to the point of fact about "Communitas". Since five of its members, including the two original founders,

have decided to withdraw, the community, as it existed, clearly "flourishes" no longer. If those who remain behind wish to continue under the name "Communitas" it should at least be recognised that it is now two different families which are combining, and therefore a new group which is being formed. It is still too early for anyone to say whether this new community will flourish.

D. J. BOADELLA, B.A.

West Bridgford, June 1.

### NOTES TO MR. BOADELLA'S LETTER:

Para. 1. The "falling back upon a personal smearing of the Ritters' journal" presumably refers to our remarks about taking "Mr. Ritter seriously in his extraordinary editorial in the May issue of *Organomic Functionalism*" and to "the gossip of O.F.". For readers willing to check up on this editorial we provided the address of the Ritter Press and Freedom Bookshop advertised the journal.

Para. 2. What were "misleading and shallow interpretations" to correspondent Ken Milne have now become for Mr. Boadella "unpleasant insinuations".

Para. 3. We clearly explained our reasons for not publishing Mr. Ritter's letter. Mr. Boadella suggests that it is for our readers to decide whether the letter should have been published. Is it seriously suggested that everything that we receive for publication should first be submitted to all our readers; if so how? As for our eagerness "to encourage prejudice against the Ritters' work" up to last week the complaint was that we ignored the work of the Ritters!

Para. 4. As to our "unfair presentation" of the work of Reich we think Mr. Boadella confuses the views of some of our contributors with those of the editors. He should consult our files for the last ten years on the subject and not "illustrate" his prejudice with the references made by Bob Green in his articles to Reich. . . . and to Jung and Adler. Presumably "the slick insensitivity and contemptuous ignorance" of our contributor is only in the case of Reich, though Jung and Adler were included in the reference to which Mr. Boadella objects!

Para. 6. Because some of the original members of a group or Community withdraw does not indicate that the Community is "dissolving" as O.F. put it.—EDITORS.

## FREE SCHOOLS

PROGRESSIVE schools have misfired, become more or less respectable and lost their driving force. One reason is that State-schools and training-colleges have been converted to the use of progressive methods. Projects, learning by play and free activity all find a place in the orthodox curriculum. Punishment by beating is much rarer than it used to be. This is because the pernicious belief in Original Sin is on the decline. This change of attitude is only superficial and we know from the pronouncements of educational and political readers that their aim is still the same, to churn out obedient servants of the State.

A. S. Neill's work has been to operate and popularise progressive schools. To call it reactionary is an empty use of words. The weakness of this type of education is that it was a revolt against stuffy authority-ridden schools shut off from life outside their gates. The Victorian Daddy has lost his god-like whiskers and his cane but keeps tight hold

of the purse-strings and overawes by his bulk. To my mind the fault has been that progressive teachers have had little idea of a free society as Anarchists conceive it. Lacking a social aim their forcefulness either spent itself or was diverted into conventional channels. For example their pupils have gone into the armed services apparently quite happily. Also most of these teachers find it impossible to allow the free sexual behaviour of the young in which they believe.

Homer Lane and Neill have been the pioneers. Free schools of the future if they are to have lasting value should be staffed by people holding an Anarchist or libertarian view of life. They should be self-organising and as far as possible self-supporting. Activities, play and study, should develop mutual friendship, distrust of leaders and love of freedom. But above all they must be places where adults and children can lead happy and constructive lives. Bromley.

## The ASLEF'S Case Continued from p. 1

plate staff the 15% they originally sought in 1953.

That Agreement distorted yet again the relative rates of pay of the locomotive grades. At this stage this fact was recognised by the BTC who initiated discussions with us to agree necessary adjustments. These discussions proved abortive because, surprisingly, the adjustments proposed by the BTC, i.e., 6/- for cleaners, 6/6 and 5/6 for firemen and 2/6 for drivers, would have been seriously detrimental to the relative payment for the most responsible job, i.e. Driver. Our counterclaim was for 8/- for all our grades, based on the fact that men in the starting grades had in the January Agreement referred to above, received 8/- advance. If this were conceded the differential established by the RSNT Decision No. 16 would have been maintained.

Our claim was rejected by the Railway Staff National Tribunal in their Decision No. 17. That Decision was in contradiction of the differential position which had been established by Decision 16; and we therefore had no alternative but to reject it and give notice (on April 15th) of our intention to strike as from May 1st. In the intervening period, as a result of discussions, we arrived with the BTC at the following formula, which allowed of the suspension of the strike notice and the re-opening of negotiations:—

(1) The British Transport Commission confirm their acceptance of Award No. 17 of the Railway Staff National Tribunal of April 1955, and will implement it forthwith as the final resolution of the negotiations arising from the Agreement of December 1953. This position is accepted without prejudice by the ASLEF subject to paragraph (2); they will therefore instruct their members to continue at work.

(2) The Commission will consider forthwith any proposals which the Society desire to put to them on the question of differentials with a view to discussions proceeding with all the parties concerned. Whilst the Commission cannot enter into any prior commitments, every endeavour will be made to reach agreement. It is the intention that such discussions should be concluded at the earliest possible date.

(3) The Commission agree that neither of the recent Awards of the Railway Staff National Tribunal will be regarded as establishing principles which will preclude free and immediate discussion of any proposals which may be submitted. We could however secure no adequate consideration or recognition of differentials; in fact, despite Clause 2 of the formula, the BTC summarily rejected our proposals and we had perforce to re-impose the strike notice which has now become effective as from 28th May.

The BTC stated at the Ministry of Labour that they understood that any settlement which could be made for footplate staff at present would lead to counter-claims for other staff which they would be unwilling to accept. This attitude of the BTC precluded consideration of the principle of differentials on its merits because of the feared precipitation of further claims on behalf of other railway workers by the NUR; an attitude justified to some extent by the NUR declaring its intention to do just this. We have throughout made our attitude clear; we do not seek to trespass upon the rights of any Union to do what they think necessary to protect the interests of their members, but we say emphatically that the establishment of the principle of differentials with the Commission must obviously precede consequential adjustments for other grades.

## THE ABUSE OF 'ANARCHISM'

THE ranks of anarchism have had many unlikely people added to them during the last few weeks.

First of all Mr. Tiffin, successor to Deakin as leader of the T.G.W.U., announced that the activities of the Stevedores' and Dockers' Union would lead to Anarchy in the docks. The current strike for recognition on negotiating boards was cited as a particular example.

Subsequently, in a election broadcast Mr. Morrison (of the Labour Party) told listeners that the choice between them was either careful State socialist planning under the guidance of the Labour Party, or the lifting of controls and wholesale 'Anarchism' which would follow a Conservative victory. This means that we should be getting it any day now.

In his election diary in the *News Chronicle*, Laurence Thompson, commenting on the declared abstentionism of Malcolm Muggeridge, editor of *Punch*, drew attention to the L.A.G.'s leaflet, "Vote for Joe Soap", and after quoting from it, remarked that it might have been written by Muggeridge! Well, that proves that either Thompson doesn't read *Punch* or else doesn't read FREEDOM.

The last case arises out of a broadcast talk by John Maude in "Integrity", in which he approved of the idea that loyalty to oneself should come before loyalty to a group or society. For this, he was taken to task in the correspondence columns of *The Listener* by a writer who said that Maude's views put him in a position of being no more than an anarchist, and if carried to their logical conclusion, could only lead to anarchism.

## Mr. Baty and the 'Sketch' Continued from p. 1

And for this conservative paper, 'the best' means smear tactics of the vilest kind against anyone threatening the stability of the Conservative Government. At the moment this appears to the *Daily Sketch* to be—Jim Baty.

### A Personal Attack

It was not content to criticise the ASLEF strike policy—it launched a personal attack upon Baty himself, which was, not unnaturally, answered by a simple refusal on his part to give any more information to the *Sketch* reporter. According to the paper's own reporter his words were: 'I will not comment to you about anything. I have finished with the *Daily Sketch*'.

At this, the wretched rag went up in a blue light, with a front-page headline the next morning: BATY BANS THE SKETCH—which of course Mr. Baty could not and did not do. You cannot ban a newspaper by refusing to give its reporters statements for them to pervert. Nor is anyone, in the public eyes or out of it, under any obligation whatsoever to make statements to the Press.

But the *Sketch* produced a diatribe, badly written, hysterical and almost inciting to violence, in which the nicest thing it said was that it would not print the number of Mr. Baty's car in case people might recognise it 'and send their

heartfelt wishes after Mr. Baty as he rode by'.

The *Sketch* told us that many of the 50,000,000 people in this country 'positively hate Mr. Baty's guts'.

How does the *Daily Sketch* know? We suggest that the purveyors of this vicious rubbish neither know nor care about the 50,000,000 people in this country except that proportion of them who can be persuaded to buy the *Daily Sketch*. And by catering for the lowest-common-denominator, unthinking suckers for sensationalism the *Sketch* will be contributing nothing of value to the well being of the 50 million of this country. On the contrary, it is producing an outstanding example of gutter journalism of which those who produce it and those who see it circulating can be heartily ashamed.

Incidentally, although Jim Baty's private life is considered fair game for the *Sketch*, the writer who attacks him hides behind the pen-name of 'Candidus'. Is he afraid, or ashamed, to sign his real name?

Perhaps, after all, the *Sketch* should return to Pip, Squeak and Wilfred. They were not very funny, but at least they were neither pretentious nor vicious. P.S.

## 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)

June 12—Tony Turner on

WHAT MAKES MAN—HEREDITY OR ENVIRONMENT?

JUNE 19—Albert Grace on COMMUNIST ACTIVITY IN THE DOCKS

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

#### OUTDOORS

At Maxwell Street Every Sunday at 7.30 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