

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

In this Issue :

The Relevance of
Pareto - p. 2

Is Revolution
Necessary? - p. 2

Students in
Opposition - p. 3

Vol. 17, No. 6

February 11th, 1956

Threepence

"By no process can coercion be made equitable. The freest form of government is only the least objectionable form. The rule of the many by the few, we call tyranny. The rule of the few by many (Democracy) is tyranny also, only of a less intense kind."

—HERBERT SPENCER.

COMMENTS ON

THE BEVAN BLAST

WHETHER Mr. Bevan, as some journalists say, is politically "finished" or not, his utterances are still front page news both for the *News of the World* and the *Manchester Guardian*. His speech at Manchester last Saturday shows that he has little to learn from his colleagues in the techniques of the politician, and that within the blinkered horizons of parliamentary "socialism" they probably have a lot to learn from him. But what does all Mr. Bevan's agitation boil down to if not that the leadership of the Labour Party is in the wrong hands? To one questioner he pointed out that to leave the Labour Party because it was in the hands of the most "reactionary members" was a "gospel of despair". "You never know what is going to happen in politics"—he continued, with a smile. "You are up to-day and out to-morrow, or out to-day and in to-morrow, and he instanced his own career: of being expelled from the party in 1939 and six years later finding himself a Cabinet Minister in the Labour Government. This is all very illuminating for those who, like Mr. Bevan, are "interested in being a leader", but what this has to do with socialism is difficult to fathom.

argument against party politics, for with few exceptions—which do not include Mr. Bevan—the aim of politicians is to win power for their party and a seat (with prospects) for themselves in the government. The Labour Party's six years in office (plus the war years in the coalition) has produced all the evils of which Mr. Bevan complains, and there is therefore something cynical in his reported statement that "It was only those who suffered under society who wanted to change it, and these people, in the main, were Labour's 'gathering grounds'." for obviously the leaders of the Party and of the Trades Unions can by no stretch of the imagination be described as the victims of society! What they are doing, in fact, is to use these people to further their careers as politicians. That there are ordinary workers to-day who vote conservative tells us less of the mentality of the voters than it does of the Socialist appeal of the Labour Party!

MR. BEVAN also said some hard things about the decadence of liberal journalism in this country: It was the first time in the history of Liberal thought that it had ranged itself on the side of what had come to be

known as the establishment—the accepted order of things: the vested interests; the big, all-powerful battalions. We expected liberalism to be astringent, questioning and, if necessary, rebellious. One of the reasons why political thinking in Great Britain was so bad—and bad it was—was because that Astringency had gone out.

But why single-out Liberal journalism for these attacks. What of Mr. Bevan's own journal, *Tribune* (whose editor, Mr. Edwards, very quietly, without a word in *Tribune*, has now joined Lord Beaverbrook's *Evening Standard*)? The only "astringency" one finds in the Bevanite organ is in its clipped journalism in the much-despised *Daily Mirror* style. It also shares with the *Daily Mirror* the boosting and damning of personalities and the sensational approach. But where is the "questioning", the "political thinking", the self-criticism that one might expect following Mr. Bevan's Manchester outburst? Indeed the front page article in last week's issue is by the great man himself and is full of smug self-satisfaction about the findings of the Committee of Inquiry which has reported favourably on the Health Service, inaugurated when Bevan was Minister

Continued on p. 3

MONARCHY MYTH DENOUNCED

THE British Press could be counted on to go berserk over the Royal tour of Nigeria, and it is difficult to assess whether there has been more black magic surrounding the wild dances of the natives or in Fleet Street over the "magnetism" of the Royal couple!

We cannot believe that such institutions as monarchy are opposed only by old-fashioned socialists and by anarchists, but that any vocal expression of opposition is stifled both by the national press which believes in the mumbo jumbo of royalty and by the opportunism of the Labour movement which fears that to take up such an issue will gain few votes and may lose many at election time.

Outspoken criticism it seems can only be expressed by Englishmen in the foreign Press. And curiously enough the example before us comes from a Swedish liberal newspaper, and was, apparently intended as a contribution to the Swedish debate on the *raison d'être* of monarchy. This, according to the *Manchester Guardian's* Stockholm correspondent is an "eternal issue" in Sweden, and this seems an interesting fact in a country which is reputed to have one of the most "democratic" monarchies in the world to-day.

WHO IS WINNING?

In a special operation against the passive wing of the Mau Mau and Kikuyu plotting an underground revival of Mau Mau, Kenya security forces last week arrested nearly 1,000 Africans in Nairobi and parts of the emergency zone.

The writer of the articles which appeared in *Dagens Nyheter* is a Dr. Brian Chapman, a lecturer at Manchester University, and his views are summarised as follows:

"The first article, a scrutiny of the argument put forward by the defenders of royalty is illustrated with Mr. Low's well-known cartoon 'The Day After.' Dr. Chapman gives an equally merciless picture in words of the British Coronation delirium: 'This mass orgasm can only partly be accounted for by the emotional sterility of the English in private. Its roots are deep in contemporary life.'

The author rejects the thesis that every country needs a figurehead to personify itself and provide stability and continuity. The more civilised a people become the more easily can they do without such personification, he says, pointing to the United States. The argument that the British monarchy gives stability to public life is called "historical rubbish." He says: "The strenuous efforts of King George V did not prevent the period before 1914 from being one continual savage crisis."

He finds it difficult to believe that the monarch can play the rôle of adviser, or that such a function is necessary in the modern State. The claim that the Crown is the symbol of the unity of the Commonwealth and holds the Dominions together seems to Dr. Chapman to be much too strong. "The reasons for the Commonwealth's hanging together are primarily financial.

What are the reasons, he asks in the second article, for the new magic of the monarchy, this new and primitive yearning to be dazzled by royalty, and he answers: "I suppose the Royal Family are, firstly, the direct beneficiaries of the English educational system. The perpetual adolescence of many Englishmen is one of the disturbing phenomena in contemporary England, and it is not adolescence of the uneducated but adolescence of the educated."

Dr. Chapman argues that the people's flight from religion played a part. "The beneficiaries of this hunger for a religious substitute are the Royal Family." He thinks the new middle class makes an important contribution to to-day's devotion to the monarchy. "They wish to be reassured that their dislike of culture and their satisfaction with trivial things does not damage their claim to social importance. This reassurance, it seems to me, is the function of contemporary royalty."

Dr. Chapman says that the present wave of monarchism was set off about 1947 under the Labour Government, and he suspects that the Labour party wanted to offset the popularity of Churchill during and after the war. "It made political sense, therefore, to push royalty into the limelight and spoil his act."

What is urgently needed is an organisation similar to the eminently successful National Campaign for the Abolition of Capital Punishment to campaign for the Abolition of the Monarchy. Indeed the same committee could do the job since so many of the moral arguments advanced against capital punishment could equally be used against monarchy!

Lying Policemen

STILL more cases involving perjury by policemen are coming to light. Closely following the Gliniski case, which received wide-spread publicity, and the release from jail of three men wrongly convicted—presumably on false police evidence—there were reported last week two cases in which policemen had given false evidence in attempts to get convictions on sexual charges.

In one case, a Chinese, Weng Kee Sam, living in London, brought and won a plea for damages against two London Transport policemen and the London Transport Executive for wrongful imprisonment and malicious prosecution. The hearing took four days and he was awarded £1,600 damages.

Mr. Weng was arrested in 1954 and charged with indecency in a London Underground station. There was another man involved in the case with him—and this man committed suicide. At his trial at London Sessions, Mr. Weng was acquitted, after the jury had seen a film reconstruction of what happened at the tube station and after a two-hour retirement had decided that Mr. Weng did not commit the offence, and that the two policemen did not in fact see what they said they saw.

Mr. Weng issued his writ, and now, after two years of uncertainty, and in which, presumably, the two policemen have been zealously carrying on with their business, they have been found to be liars.

Last week, the jury at London's High Court that awarded Mr. Weng £1,600 damages (£350 against the two cops, £1,250 against them and London Transport) decided that when the two policemen prosecuted Mr. Weng they:

Did not honestly believe he was guilty. Were actuated by malice and arranged together to give false evidence.

The two police perjurers are Police Constable George Cluney, of Compton Buildings, E.C., and Police Constable Arthur Moyler, of Trescow Gardens, Rayner's Lane, Harrow.

The other case is that of a man arrested and accused of homosexual offences in a public lavatory on a playing field. Police had made spy-holes in the wall of the lavatory, and in court gave evidence describing in detail what had happened.

They actually arrested three men that morning, and two of them were found

guilty and so far police evidence has not been challenged on these two cases. One wonders, however, how much this may be due simply to lack of evidence of innocence rather than real evidence of guilt.

For in the third case the man involved happened to have a cast-iron alibi. He works for a public utility and in the course of his work had to call at the local fire station. This visit had been recorded in the station log-book together with its time—three minutes past four in the afternoon. But the police in evidence, on oath, each said that the defendant had gone into the lavatory at 3.52 p.m. and come out at 4.30! And the fire station was a mile away from the lavatory!

It took the jury four minutes to bring a verdict of not guilty—and an innocent man was saved. But by what chance! In the first place the chance of having a "fixed visit" recorded in an official, unchallengeable document like the fire station log. In the second place, because the man involved was a member

of a trade union which put an able lawyer on the case for him.

If these two circumstances had not applied, what would have been the position? A bewildered worker in a court-room facing two lying policemen (with no apparent reason for not telling the truth). With the bias in magistrates' in favour of police evidence being what it is, he wouldn't have had a chance.

The question is: how many such incidents are there where the police are lying but there is no way of proving it? How many people are sent to jail, or fined, on false evidence, through malicious prosecution, because they are out of their depth in a court of law, can't express themselves, don't know what the procedure is for getting legal aid, or simply haven't any evidence that is irrefutable?

Where nobody has power over anybody else, the vices of individuals are of small consequence. But where power and authority govern, corruption, lies, trickery, deceit—all will flourish because advantage can be gained. If your fellow-worker is a liar it doesn't matter all that much in big ways. But a man with power, a policeman for instance—when he is a liar he can ruin your life.

Good Luck, Miss Lucy!

MISS AUTHERINE LUCY is the first Negro to be admitted to the University of Alabama, U.S.A. And she is getting the kind of welcome the gallant South can excel in organising. She has been pelted with eggs and stones, jeered at, sneered at and chanted at.

She is having to bear the concentrated hate which the prejudiced always feel for the pioneer, the one who is different, and to this is added the bitterness of the white Southerner subjected to pressure from the goddam Yankees to show at least the outward forms of the freedom and equality which the United States constitution is supposed to defend.

Miss Lucy was born to the poverty and prejudice of the Deep South and when she left her sharecropper father's humble tenant farm eight years ago to learn to be a teacher she knew what to expect.

Since then she, various anti-colour bar organisations, churches, whites and coloured people have fought a £6,000 legal campaign to have her admitted to the University.

She arrived last Thursday, at Alabama University, to find police blocking off streets before her class building and 300 chanting demonstrators awaiting her.

They formed up under her classroom windows and the lesson was drowned with their chants of, "Hey, hey, ho, ho, Autherine's gotta go."

An hour later, as police guards escorted her from a back door to a waiting car to take her to her next class, the mob spotted her and pelted her with eggs and stones as she got in the car.

The car, driven by a white woman teacher, was hit by several stones. One window was smashed. As it came up to the building where Miss

Lucy's second class was taking place, a barrage of stones was thrown.

Since then the demonstrations—not only by students but by scores of fathers—have been almost non-stop.

AS anarchists we have to admit to a feeling of sickened helplessness when faced with this sort of situation. What the hell can one do? For one of the most sickening aspects of the whole business of desegregation in the Southern States is that the 'progressive' attitude is that taken by the centralised State, and the hateful, violent, reactionary attitude is struck by the People.

With the hottest of anarchist fervour we cannot oppose in principle the desegregation laws being enforced by the federal government.

Continued on p. 4

HIS comments on personal success affecting individual judgment were interesting. He said:

If the Labour Party is not going to be a socialist party, I don't want to lead it. I don't believe you can measure the progress of society by the individual careers. I know of so many people who imagine a society has succeeded because they have succeeded in it."

But surely, this is the strongest

TRANSPORT

BOYCOTT HURTING

THE boycott of public transport by Negroes in Montgomery, Alabama, already reported in *FREEDOM* (7/1/56) is continuing—and is clearly beginning to worry the authorities.

Time (6/2/56) reports:

For more than 50 days the Negroes of Montgomery, Ala. have boycotted the city buses, protesting segregated transportation (*Time*, Jan. 16). Last week Montgomery's Mayor W. A. Gayle reacted in a way that showed how much the boycott—95% effective—was hurting. He first announced that he and his fellow members of the City Commission had joined the extremist White Citizens' Council. Then he announced a policy of no surrender on the boycott: "We have pussyfooted around on this boycott long enough and it has come time to be frank and honest. There seems to be a belief on the part of the Negroes that they have the white people hemmed up in a corner and they are not going to give an inch until they can force the white people of the community to submit to their demands—in fact, swallow them all." (The Negroes demand seating in buses on a first come, first seated basis, with whites seating from the front backward, Negroes from the back forward).

Mayor Gayle was specially vexed about the white families who gave car rides to their Negro help, or pay their taxi fare. He said that the cooks and maids who boycotted the buses "are fighting to destroy our social fabric just as much as the Negro radicals who are leading them. The Negroes are laughing at white people behind their backs. They think it's very funny and amusing that whites who are opposed to the Negro boycott will act as chauffeur to Negroes who are boycotting the buses. When a white person gives a Negro a single penny for transportation, or helps a Negro with his transportation, even if it's a block ride, he is helping the Negro radicals who lead the boycott. The Negroes have made their own bed, and the whites should let them sleep in it."

CONTROVERSY

IS REVOLUTION NECESSARY?

IF the word revolution is used loosely enough, it can be said that there have been at least two just recently—one in Egypt and one in Argentina (or possibly two). The Oxford Dictionary gives the following definition of revolution: "... reversal of conditions, fundamental change, forcible substitution by subjects of new government or ruler for the old." If one refers to this definition then it is at least questionable whether the above-mentioned governmental changes have been revolutions.

Certainly there have not been reversals of conditions in Argentina or Egypt, nor any fundamental changes. Admittedly there have been forcible substitutions of new governments for old, but it seems to us that this is not really sufficient in itself to constitute a revolution, for implicit in the term one feels that there should be something of a fundamental change as applied to the majority of the population of the country or State involved.

At any rate one may reasonably accept this definition for the purposes of argument, and this article, for few (if any), anarchists would consider a revolution as being effectively so unless there were at least one or two fundamental changes!

It has been argued that there have been two real revolutions in this century. In Russia and Spain—entirely different from one another, and yet theoretically the same in that their objects were to free 'the people' from oppression by the State. From these two historical events one may learn a great deal, and see how completely different they were in character, although both have been labelled as revolutions of the people.

The event which took place in Russia in 1917 cannot be regarded as a revolution at all, except possibly at the very beginning. There was a revolutionary situation which could have been made to bring about a fundamental change for the majority of the Russian people, but the opportunity was lost almost immediately, and subsequently the Communist government became in essence equally as oppressive as the one which it replaced. One may say that enormous numbers amongst the population preferred the new form of authoritarianism, and welcomed it, but there is more than an element of doubt as to whether they realised how little difference it was going to make to their mode of existence; and it seems probable that by now there are just as many people who would as soon be ruled by the Tsars as by the Commissars.

Communists and their sympathisers would no doubt argue that the process of revolution is still going on, and that in due time the government will be discontinued—therefore, they might say, although there is as yet no fundamental change in the condition of the people

which can be called revolutionary, it is merely a question of waiting until the wheel has turned full circle, and there for all to see will be a complete revolution in its fullest sense.

At this point it becomes a matter of opinion whether one can believe that the Communist leaders will ever relinquish their power and allow the people to come into full control of their own lives; or whether one is certain, as are the anarchists, that a State machine will never permit itself to lose power. Only the most optimistic non-Communist can suppose that totalitarian Russia is not ruled by men who have fought, and are fighting for power; men who have no intention of relinquishing the power which they have spent their lives in attaining.

The events which took place in Spain in 1936, viewed from within the confines of the same definition, did not constitute a revolution either. One might enter into a lengthy discourse on the subject, and attempt to prove which of the two uprisings was the more revolutionary, but it hardly seems worth while, if only because there is no real comparison. It is perhaps fair to say however, that the Spanish insurgents had ideas which were much more likely to produce revolution. The Russians had ideas which were bound to fail in this particular end—and so they did—but this does not prove that the Spaniards would have succeeded if they had had better circumstances.

Naturally one is biased in the Spaniard's favour and it is only too easy to say that the anarchists would have brought about a revolution if they had been stronger and luckier—but no proof

can ever be forthcoming. Nevertheless, there were certain aspects of the uprising, in certain places and for limited periods, where many people enjoyed a fundamentally different way of life.

Most anarchists would deem this view to be over-cautious, but it is better so, for there is a good deal of evidence which suggests that caution is necessary—and one must remember that not all those who fought with the anarchists were imbued with quite the same ideals as the anarchists.

So far one has set out to prove that none of the events which have occurred in this century—loosely called revolutions—have in fact been so, by the definition first stated. At the very least, none of them have produced anything which an anarchist would regard as revolutionary in a good sense. All of them in fact, have produced on average a worsening of the State system in the country concerned. The deterioration has not always been due to the 'revolution' alone, there have been other factors as well, but the results of an uprising have usually contributed in great measure.

Assuming most of the foregoing to be correct, what may one reasonably deduce from it? It seems quite clear to us that the historical events of the past which have been regarded as revolutions by most people, have not been anything of the kind, and therefore should not be thought of as revolutions. For in thinking of them as such, the revolutionary also tends to think of a number of desirable results which might stem from revolutions, but never do.

Consequently the tendency must be regarded as wrong, and quite possibly harmful. There are so few people who

actually desire a revolution, that any proportion of that number which thinks of revolutions as having anything in common with the occurrences in Russia and Argentina is too high. Those who advocate the gospel of revolution in terms of 'the overthrow of something'—by force if necessary—are merely the advocates of something which will do little or no good, and can easily make a bad situation, worse. Old-style 'revolutions' are now *passé*, and should be disregarded.

What then must the revolutionary hope for—and to what ends should he devote his efforts? The answer to this question is by no means easy, and there are many variations on a number of themes. In effect all the answers amount to some form of gradualism—a generic term which covers a multitude of ideas and many varieties of politics.

The recent series of articles in FREEDOM by P.S., under the title "Anarchism and Gradualism" give one a very good idea of many of the defective features of gradualism in general, and anarchist-gradualism in particular. But in criticising the ideas of gradualists, P.S. has outlined the modes of thought, and possible fields of action which are open to revolutionaries who do not feel that very much can be expected from militant forms of action within industry. We do not agree with some of the ideas put forward by P.S., and the purpose of this article is not to criticise his views, but it is perhaps not out of place to suggest that readers of FREEDOM should peruse the series again, for in doing so they will no doubt see some of the very obvious aspects of over-optimism, and as a consequence be more inclined towards gradualism. H.F.W.

Letter

THE ONE-MAN REVOLUTION

DEAR COMRADES,

In answer to S.F. (FREEDOM, Jan. 14), who quotes Shaw: "Better a live coward than a dead hero", which someone else has put: "He who fights and runs away lives to fight another day". I would paraphrase it: "Who lives to run away another day". It is this lack of a fighting spirit, a postponing of action because it interferes with plans and pleasures that makes of the radical movement to-day a shadow of what it once was.

The essence of my one-man-revolution ideas is in being myself. I am not asking others to act just as I do. I am simply suggesting that they move away from their lethargic state of existence towards personal responsibility for the revolution that they talk about. It is suggested that I would not make a

wealthy business executive. Why should I? I have given up the bourgeois ideal a long time ago. I was however a salesman for a dozen years and always near the head of my division in sales. I was a social worker for 11 years, part of which time I held the most responsible position in my category, incidentally organizing the first union of social workers in the United States meanwhile.

S.F. is worried because I did not lead an "ordinary married existence". The following quotation from my Autobiography shows otherwise. I worked for 11 years also as a migrant labourer in order not to pay income taxes for war and thus helped my daughter get her degrees from a university in music.

"I had dug a cellar and carried beautiful rocks of all colours and had a mason build a huge fireplace. Here by the blazing wood, on the Navajo rug near Fritz, our police dog, and mother and child, with the wind whistling outside and June, the Jersey cow securely nestled in the small barn, was a feeling hardly to be improved upon. This house was at the top of a small hill surrounded by woods. I erected a long rope swing for Carmen and Sharon and when I ran under it full speed they would swing over the tree tops blow like over the top of the world with screeches of delight: 'Daddy, just one more swing' was a never-ending request. We called our place 'Bisanakee', from the local Indian (Wisconsin) 'Bisan' meaning 'quiet' and 'Akee' meaning 'place'."

I do not think that enjoying the good things of life is wrong. It is when these things prevent one from practising the ideals which they are supposed to believe that I think a person is a slave to these things. If we are to have virtue it obviously cannot be from conversation alone; especially if our actions belie our talk.

I spoke at the Libertarian Hall here in New York City recently and answered questions for several hours on the subject that there was no incompatibility between anarchism and Catholicism. In whatever opposition there has been to civil liberties and to preparation for war those of us who are religious anarchists have been to the forefront.

The article in the current issue of FREEDOM by P.S. on Anarchism and Gradualism seems to be a less heated discussion of this whole subject and I shall follow it with interest.

New York, Feb. 3. AMMON HENNACY.

The Relevance of Pareto

The Exponent of Scientific Analysis

VILFREDO PARETO has been alleged to be "the Karl Marx of Fascism". This statement is grossly misleading; its superficial resemblance to truth is due to the fact that just as the Russian Bolsheviks took what they wanted from Marx's writings and used them to do their own ends, so the Italian Fascists took what they wanted from the writings of Pareto and used them to their own ends. Moreover, as Pareto was still alive when Mussolini's party came to power, they played upon the old man's vanity in the last year of his life and offered to make him a Senator in the new régime. To his credit, Pareto declined. The scientific methodology of Pareto is utterly destructive to the illusions as 'pure' Marxism is utterly destructive to the illusions which the Bolsheviks have fostered. This is the extent of the similarity between the two writers.

Pareto was an engineer and natural scientist of remarkable intellectual ability. He came of a family which was both aristocratic and revolutionary, and which was exiled from Italy in 1848. The combination of aristocratic birth and revolutionary ideas, not infrequently gave rise to unique personalities in the 19th century, as in the case of Bakunin, Kropotkin, Hertz, Byron, Shelley and Cañero. Pareto was certainly somewhat in this tradition, but although a man of great intellect and a liberal, he was by no means in the humanist tradition. He was haughty and vain, and what we owe to him must be acknowledged in spite of his sardonic nature. His work on the creation of a railway system in Italy brought him into the complex network of chicanery and graft which made up Italian politics, and in this milieu he became thwarted and embittered. Later he became an economist, and in this field he made an international reputation for himself and created a unique branch of economics. But it is in the writings of the latter part of his life that he made so distinctive a contribution to the study of human society, and in his *Trattato di Sociologia Generale*, a four-volume treatise, there is a unique system of sociology.

It should be emphasised that what is important is not Pareto's personal opinions and prejudices. The value of his work lies in the method he sought to establish. As an engineer and natural scientist he first turned to using the methods of natural science to the study of human affairs in finance, production and business matters generally; the result was his distinctive system of economics. Later he used the methods of science to study human society itself, much as a biologist might study the social organization of ants. The importance of his method which he calls

the 'logico-experimental method' is that it is confined entirely to the study of facts and leaves value judgments out of consideration altogether.

The works of the naturalist Fabre read very strangely to-day because he was concerned with the ethical implications of the habits of the insects he studied. Fabre praised the dung-beetles for their monogamous and thrifty habits, blamed the Praying Mantis for its cruelty and lust, and investigated insect society from the point of view of a Christian moralist. Pareto saw that this was what putative social scientists did too, and in so far as they were emotionally involved with the issues they were studying, so they threw scientific method to the winds and simply set out to prove what men ought to do before they had acquainted themselves with what men actually do. Observing the play of cause and effect in human society necessitates as much cold-blooded detachment as a scientist cultivates in investigating the phenomena of the physical universe. As soon as we mix our human sympathies and desires with our observation of human social phenomena, then we are not capable of appreciating the mechanisms which are working in society. We are naturally too apt to see the 'good' being rewarded and the 'bad' bringing its own punishment in human affairs. In viewing the physical universe or the societies of lower animals, modern man is capable of thinking rationally and therefore scientifically. This was not so of Medieval man, who had to see God's moral purpose in every natural phenomenon, and so was incapable of true science. If modern man could extend his scientific thinking to the realm of human affairs then most of what has been said and written in philosophy, politics, religion and sociology will be seen to be irrational verbiage which is put out to cover half-conscious aspirations.

Most of Pareto's work is a study of irrationality, yet he entirely steers clear of psychology of the individual; he rigidly confines his method to the study of social phenomena. His method shows that most action is in fact non-logical and the popularly accepted reasons which are extant "explaining" social actions are created simply because society feels a need to account for its behaviour. These false-reasons he calls "derivations" (his terminology is often arbitrary and esoteric). Every social group produces "derivations" connected with the wars it fights, the forms of government it erects, the gods it bows down to, the sexual codes it supports, the property laws it submits to. The "derivations" are easily modified in the course of history, e.g. we no longer fight wars to the Greater Glory of God, or for 19th century jingoism—the "deriva-

tion" has changed to Democracy. But we still fight wars. Pareto calls the hard cores of the institutions which remain (e.g. war, government, religion, sex repression, property rights) "residues". He makes an elaborate classification of different types of "residues", and the "derivations" which derive from them. He points out that such a classification is simply a matter of convenience and is not essential to the use of them as conceptual tools in the interpretation of social phenomena.

A good deal of Pareto's work will not commend itself to the average reader and it is impossible to popularize it in the way that Marx has been popularized to vulgar-Marxism. Pareto wrote as a scientist and a degree of intellectual effort is necessary to master the intricacies of his conceptual schemes. The present writer admits to incomplete study of and mastery of some parts of Pareto's work. It seems worth while, however, thinking in Pareto's terms to gain mastery of a number of very useful concepts; all his writing is designed to give clarity to complex phenomena, in contrast to the writings of many theoreticians which seem designed to impress the reader of the importance of their views by the abstract complexity of their concepts. G.

(To be continued)

Death of CLARA COLE

CLARA COLE, one of the oldest comrades of the anarchist movement, died on Saturday, 4 February. She was 87, being born on 4 December, 1868. She came to hold anarchist views through two of the most abiding channels of anarchist thought—anti-militarism and anti-parliamentarism. She was, indeed, imprisoned for her anti-war activity during the first world war, and in the last war, while in her seventies, continued to write against the cruelty and hypocrisy of war in *War Commentary* (FREEDOM's predecessor), *Labour's Northern Voice* and *The World*. *Labour's Northern Voice* did not take an anti-war position, but gladly opened its columns to Clara Cole, whose fine record and absolute sincerity were recognized and admired by its editor.

Throughout her very long life Clara Cole exercised great influence over children and there will be many among those who are sad at her death who knew her all their lives. When the present writer was staying with her in her very small cottage at Kirby-le-Soken, in Essex, in 1943, the village children would come in to talk to her and listen to her tales. (She wrote many verses and stories for children). They were fascinated by her simplicity and direct-

ness, qualities which children instantly appreciate and value. These qualities were enhanced by her love of life and of the Arts (her husband was an artist), which made her a most lively companion, the more so since she carried her views into every one of her activities. After a particularly stirring performance at the Queen's Hall, of Beethoven's Ninth Symphony ("the symphony with the Revolution in its finale"), she used to call it), she was appalled at the anticlimax when the conductor followed it with "God Save the King". In the silence between verses, the audience were electrified to hear Clara cry out from the gallery, "God save the People!"

She was also a most determined opponent of all established religion, firmly holding that belief in, and obeisance before God, was a detraction from the dignity of man. Many of her friends, including the writer, were therefore shocked when religious observances were included in her funeral on 6 February. This produced a most uncomfortable, jarring note, for it was absolutely contrary to the often expressed wishes of our comrade. The manifest affection of her many friends provided a much more sincere tribute to this remarkable, sincere, and much loved woman. J.H.

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

OPEN DAILY

OPEN 10 a.m. to 6.30; 5.0 SATURDAYS
All books sent post free, so please get your books from us. We can supply any book required, including text-books. Please supply publisher's name if possible, but if not, we can find it. Scarce and out-of-print books searched for.

Remainders . . .

Journey for Our Time
Marquis de Custine 5/-
Rebel Without a Cause
Robert M. Linder 6/-
German Journey Ethel Mannin...3/6
The Russo-German Alliance
(1939-41) A. Rossi 3/6
Second-Hand . . .
Three Tales F. Dostoevsky 2/6
News from Nowhere
William Morris 2/6
The Genius and the Goddess
Aldous Huxley 3/6
The Walnut Trees of Altenburg
Andre Malraux 3/6
End as a Man
Colder Willingham 3/-
Confessions of Zeno Italo Svevo 4/-
The Secret Army
T. Bor-Komorowski 4/6
Stalin—Czar of all the Russias
Eugene Lyons 2/6
Under Two Dictators
Margaret Buber 4/-
Soil and Civilization
Edward Hyams 7/6
Memoirs of a Secret
Revolutionary Charles Plisnier 4/-
Thinking: an Introduction to
its History and Science
Fred Casey 2/6

Periodicals . . .

Views and Comments (Libertarian League), No. 10, January 3d.

Postage free on all items

Obtainable from

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

*Translation published as *The Mind and Society*. Jonathan Cape, 1935.

THE BEVAN BLAST

Continued from p. 1

of Health. Without denying him his share in "This Famous Victory" (*Tribune's* title), is it not beating the drum a little too loudly to present him, as *Tribune* does this week in bold letters, as "Aneurin Bevan, the man who fought the opposition of the Rothermeres, the Kemsleys, the Dains, the Hills and all the others". Certainly it does not seem to be the best way to encourage the rank and file to act and think for themselves with such a David just waiting to be called to perform political miracles for them!

BUT what, apart from the direct issue of personal power, divides Bevan from the present leadership of the Labour Party? His attacks on the secrecy of the parliamentary party meetings, at which decisions are taken without consultation with the rank-and-file, are not over questions of principle but of tactics: "If it [the secrecy] goes on it is the end of parliamentary institutions", and Mr. Bevan ("I am not a Communist. I am a democratic Socialist") believes in "transforming society from institutions based upon private property and private exploitation into industries based on public service", presumably through the "parliamentary institutions" which he is so anxious to preserve! In other words a concentration of all power in the hands of the State.

Gaitskell's approach it would appear is to achieve some kind of "equality" by a wider distribution of capital and the creation of machinery to prevent the further accumulation of capital into a few hands as at present. This would be achieved by the State acquiring an increasing interest in industry and as a result, in managing the reinvestment of capital without, however, necessarily controlling the actual management of industry. From the point of view of an old-fashioned social-democrat such as Bevan ("I didn't join the Labour Party. I grew up in it") who sees nationalisation as the solution to all our troubles, Gaitskell's "re-thinking" is a move to the Right. But in fact neither is very much to the Left and both of them would run their "socialist" society with government and State capitalism.

OF course these "socialists" overlook what are the essentials from the point of view of social justice, and for very good reasons, since they are politicians ("I am not interested in being the leader of any party, but merely in being a leader"—Bevan at Manchester). Classes exist because a minority section of society has power over the lives of the majority. The evil of money is a real evil in capitalist society because it is the means by which today a relatively small number of individuals can determine the way millions of others shall live their lives. In other words the injustice as we see it is not that a few thousand families can afford to relieve the boredom of their lives with luxuries but the power which their wealth at present gives them to control or jeopardise our lives. For anarchists the distinction is fundamental; not so for the Labour Party "socialists".

Assuming they mean what they say when they talk about economic equality, they seek to achieve it nevertheless by concentrating more and more power in the hands of the State. Theoretically it would be possible in the circumstances to abolish the money system altogether, and yet there would still be classes

and with all our 'equality' we should be slaves! In practise, as "Soviet" Russia teaches, even where the economy is controlled by the State the money system continues as a means for creating classes within the ruled class, of dividing loyalties, of holding out the carrot of hope for the slaves with "ambition". For no ruling class can survive in a community united by a common and equal injustice (which explains why 500 united Smithfield 'bummarees' are more effective than 500,000 railway workers divided by differentials).

★
WHATEVER Bevan may say of the moral bases of socialism

Socialism was not merely an economic theory, but a way of life. Economists came into it when you were seeking means of carrying out your central purpose which must first of all be based on a moral decision, not merely on one arrived at by considering this and that and finding what was possible.

the instrument for its achievement is from above: the State, the politician, the government

Any statesman who concerned himself with what was possible never did anything. Statesmanship was an act of continuous creation, and creation meant bringing something new into life.

And this goes too for the theoreticians of the movement. Even such "rebels" as Professor G. D. H. Cole, in spite of being the leader of the newly created World Socialist Movement, offers nothing new. In the last of his series of articles on *What is Wrong with the Trade Unions?* (*Tribune* 3/2/56), he puts forward a hotch-potch of revolutionary ("to talk of Socialism without confiscation has always been nonsense"), Gaitskellian and Bevanite ideas which can only create despair as well as confusion in the minds of his readers. Thus:

All Socialists wish to expropriate the capitalists somehow: even those who wish to pay compensation have every intention of cancelling it in the long run.

Most Trade Union leaders, however, have not yet fully appreciated the logic of the situation: they see only that they cannot go all out for higher wages under capitalism, and have not seen that the remedy is to do away with capitalism now instead of allowing their aspirations to be stultified by its continuance.

Nor have most of their members seen this; for many of them still believe that wages and consumption could be increased at the expense of profits, whereas in practise high wages and high profits go together, as the Labour Government discovered while it was in office after 1945.

The delusion is possible because few workers are investors in industry or realise the indispensability of high investment to the future prosperity and level of employment in this country. Here again, the only remedy is more and better Trade Union education to bring home the hard economic facts and prevent Trade Unionists from being deluded by over-optimistic false prophets.

This education is needed, not in order to persuade Trade Unionists to acquiesce in 'wage-restraint' in the interest of profit-making, but to bring home to them how indispensable it is to transfer these profits from the present owners to the public, and to get and sustain in power Governments that will ensure that the benefit of rising productivity accrues to the workers as fast as more can be spared from the requirements of public investment.

★
THE "re-thinking" which the last Labour Party conference undertook as its task between now and the next elections is for Bevan a sinister Gaitskellian conspiracy. "You would have thought that some of those men had only just arrived in the Socialist movement. You would have thought that the history of the Socialist Movement began when they came into it. The history of the Socialist movement looks as though it is beginning to end when they came into it."

One can understand Mr. Bevan's feelings in the matter. But he is behaving as a sentimentalist while Mr. Gaitskell is the realist. Social democracy in Europe which began its career in the Centre has, through

STUDENTS IN OPPOSITION

SPAIN

THE growing unrest and dissatisfaction with the régime recently disclosed among Spanish students, by the questionnaire the results of which Franco sought to suppress, have again come into the open.

Last week's *Observer* carried a report from its Special Correspondent on Spanish affairs which disclosed that Madrid University students have addressed an open letter to General Franco demanding permission for the immediate calling of a National Congress of Spanish students in order to examine "the present grave situation".

In their letter, copies of which have been sent to diplomatic representatives and foreign newspaper correspondents, the students criticised the activities of the Falangist-controlled *Sindicato Español Universitario*, lamented the absence of so many distinguished Spanish professors now living in exile and complained of their "humiliating moral position" compared with their fellow-students abroad.

The answer to this letter has been to forbid the publication of all students' magazines except those under direct control of the Church. Also under immediate threat of disappearing is *Insula*, the most important and widely read literary review now published in Spain.

The attention devoted by *Insula* to Western ideas and contemporary trends, and the interest it has shown in the works of the late Professors Unamuno and Ortega Y Gasset, as well as other Spanish orthodox authors, have been strongly resented by the Church and the party hierarchies.

RUSSIA

SPAIN, however, is not the only totalitarian régime to be worried about its students. In Russia there is evidence to make it clear that all the conditioning

powers of the party machine and its control of the means of expression are not enough to snuff out completely the desire for greater freedom and dignity.

We had the example of the uprising among the prisoners at the Vorkuta labour camps, and its vocal expression through students incarcerated there which showed that anarcho-syndicalist ideas were by no means dead among the post-revolution generations in Russia.

Now comes another report in the *Manchester Guardian* this time, of the clandestine circulation through Russian Universities of hand-written periodicals, which have now become so widespread as to merit denunciation in the Soviet press.

So far these periodicals are literary in content, but clearly they are expressing ideas and attitudes unpopular with the authorities (or why hand-write them and circulate them secretly?) and equally clearly if attempts are made by the authorities to suppress them, a more openly anti-régime character will be forced on the periodicals.

In any case, as the *M.G.'s* correspondent says—in the Soviet Union literature is regarded as the handmaiden of politics and the fact that the youth newspaper *Komsomolskaya Pravda* has on two occasions sternly rebuked those responsible for the publication and distribution of these periodicals indicates that the authorities may be concerned for political rather than literary reasons.

One of these journals is circulating in Leningrad and one in Vilnius University in Lithuania. The Vilnius periodical, called *Fig Leaf*, is said to contain "decadent verse"—which may mean anything from lyrical to epic poems, the ideological content of which must be the very opposite of what appears in official publications. The Leningrad University periodical, called *The Blue Flower Bud*, is said to publish stories as well as verse.

Publications

"LIBERATION"

LEWIS MUMFORD, Vera Brittain, Milton Mayer, Richard Gree, Kurt H. Wolff, Reginald Reynolds, George Woodcock, Norman Mailer, Waldo Frank, Dorothy Day, Pitrir Sorokin, Krishnalal Shridharani, and Frank Marquart are among the international contributors to a new monthly magazine which will be published in New York in March with the title *Liberation*,* the purpose of which is to "stimulate both thinking and action".

In the preamble to their prospectus announcing the new publication the initiating group declare:

"The decline of independent radicalism and the gradual falling into silence of prophetic and rebellious voices is an ominous feature of the mid-twentieth century.

"Power is everywhere openly or secretly idolised. Hopes and ideals have become propaganda devices. But those

the years, steadily shifted to the Right (Mr. Bevan with it), as was inevitable. And the Right has by the force of circumstances as well as in its own interests (with the guidance of the industrial psychologists and the pressures from the Unions) moved towards the Centre. Capitalism is still a powerful ruling force in society; social democracy is as dead as mutton. The only re-thinking the workers can profitably engage in must be based on a post-mortem on the corpse of social democracy and not on the assumption that it can be revived from the dead! Social democracy is dead because "government by-for-and-of-the people" has been proved once for all a myth; because power corrupts all who wield it; because the means are never justified by the ends (even assuming these to be noble and just); because the social revolution will never be achieved through the ballot box!

The re-thinking of the working classes must be as revolutionary in its particular sphere as is the present re-thinking in science and industry. The Gaitskell economists are seeking the formula which will inject capitalism with new masters as well as a new lease of life. The alternative is nothing less than economic and social freedom through freedom!

who should furnish vision and direction are silent or echoing old ideas in which they scarcely believe themselves.

"This failure of a new radicalism to emerge is an indication, it seems to us, that the stock of fundamental ideas on which the radical thinking of recent times has been predicated is badly in need of thorough reappraisal.

"The changes which are going on in the modern world—which call into doubt many assumptions which almost all nineteenth century revolutionists and reformers took for granted—require also changes in our deepest modes of thought."

The seven assumptions made by both editors of and contributors to *Liberation* are that:

1. The world can move decisively in our time towards the abolition of war and toward a society built on responsible freedom, mutuality, and peace.

2. Prevalent modes of thought from the 19th and early 20th centuries are insufficient for dealing with to-day's problems.

3. Human fulfilment cannot be achieved by the "co-existence" of the existing power States and social régimes in their present forms.

4. The "politics of the future" must develop from a creative synthesis of the insights of the great ethical and religious teachers and of the collective social concern of the great revolutionaries. The transformation of cultural and political structures and the transformation of the individual go hand in hand.

5. Withdrawal of support from the military preparations and activities of both the dominant power blocs and of any alternative third military power bloc is basic and indispensable for any effective movement for peace.

6. The quest for non-violent means is an integral part of the contemporary quest for human liberation and peace.

7. *Liberation* will seek to inspire its readers not only to fresh thinking but to action now: refusal to run away or to conform; concrete resistance in the communities in which they live to all the ways in which human beings are regimented and corrupted; experimentation in creative living by individuals, families, and groups; support of movements to abolish colonialism and racism or for the freedom of all individuals from domination, whether military, political, economic or cultural.

These assumptions are to serve as starting points for exploration and controversy, rather than dogmas.

**Liberation*, 110 Christopher Street, New York 14, N.Y. Subscription rates \$3.00 per year.

Any clandestine activity of this kind in a totalitarian country is bound to be viewed most seriously by the authorities, which must fear the possible transformation of literary into political activities. It is a sign of the recent slackening of discipline that the publications should have assumed so widespread a character. By the same token, the denunciation of the periodicals in the official press is a sign of the intention to tighten up discipline.

Even more interesting is the revelation in *Komsomolskaya Pravda* that the Communist Youth League authorities at the universities were aware of the publications but, instead of denouncing them, "concealed" their existence, apparently because they were afraid to give publicity to the matter. They have now been guided by the fear that public denunciation would have made the periodicals even more popular, or that to reveal their existence would have drawn on them the wrath of even higher authorities.

Komsomolskaya Pravda believes that the best way to suppress the periodicals is to bring the fact of their existence into the light of day—perhaps because its editors realise that they will not be providing gratuitous publicity for something that is already generally known in student quarters.

BRITISH COLONIES

MEANWHILE in those semi-totalitarian states where Britain is holding down rebellious populations, the students are playing a lively part, and are incurring the wrath of the authorities.

A *Reuter* report from Kuala Lumpur tells us that students in the Federation of Malaya are to be forbidden to take part in trade union activities and disputes. Legislation to be introduced into the Federal Legislative Council on February 29 also forbids students to instigate or incite any person to strike, contribute money or food to strikers, or take part in any assembly of five persons called for that purpose.

Under the proposed legislation, students of over 18 may be expelled from school if convicted. No penalty has so far been made known for younger students.

In Cyprus the students are in the forefront of the open struggle against British occupation of the island, frequently going on strike and usually leading the riots and demonstrations against the military.

★
In Britain itself, however, the university students seem much readier to accept the régime, in spite of its domination by old men tied to the past, to out-worn traditions and careless of the problems of youth.

Perhaps some of our student-readers could find interest in the discussion of why it is that in Britain university students traditionally play so small a part in social movements. Is it because they are usually from a stratum of society well satisfied with things as they are? But doesn't that apply to all countries? Is it because they are themselves of the belief that democracy is the best of all possible systems? Is it because they just don't care about social problems? Is it because most of them depend upon grants from the government, and fear they may be stopped if they misbehave?

Why is it that the misbehaviour of British students is limited to 'rag days' when they can let off steam to a considerable extent in socially acceptable, pointless and safe hooliganism. Is this in fact the function of rag days—to provide a safety-valve for frustrations which otherwise might find expression through undesirable causes?

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT!

WEEK 4
Deficit on Freedom £100
Contributions received £122
SURPLUS £22

January 27 to February 2

Mitcham: F.S. £1; Stroud: L.G.W. £1;
London: N.B.T.* 1/3; London: C.F.* 4/8;
London: J.S.* 4/-; Glasgow: R.L. 1/-; Cape
Town: C.D.F. £3/3/0; Frieth: I.I. 1/6; London:
P.H.* 8/9; Westcott: M.G.W.* 10/-;
London: D.R.* 10/-; Summit: G.M. 14/-;
Providence, R.I.: Libertarian Group, per D.L.
£8/15/0; Bronx, N.Y.: M. per D.L. £1/15/0.
Total ... 18 8 2
Previously acknowledged ... 103 12 10

1956 TOTAL TO DATE ... £122 1 0

GIFT OF BOOK: London: C.F.

*Indicates regular contributors.

VIEWPOINT ON COMMUNITY

“One for All and All for One”

EVERY human being is entitled to what he needs, but in both Russia and America, people are entitled instead to what they can earn, though that may be less, or much more, than what they need.

The means of production in Russia are owned by the government; in America, by private business. But where are they owned by the people?

All around us it's "Every man for himself" and "Dog eat dog", but I believe in "One for all and all for one".

The sole gleam of light is marriage. Of course, not all marriages are ideal; but the economics of marriage as it should be, are in sharp contrast with all other major economic systems. It is love, not greed, that sets the pattern in the best marriages. Therefore, let us create a new economic system based on the old, old principle of love. Let there be a common purse for all; let each produce as he can, and consume as he will; let no one covet more riches than his brethren, nor stand for any of them to be in need while he is not. This is just as in the ideal marriage. Let us bend every effort to cure the mentally, physically, and morally sick among us, feed our hungry, clothe our ragged, and shelter our homeless, but not by authorizing politicians to do so and then washing our hands of the matter, or yet because the State would not function so well otherwise, or because it's "good business"; but because we are driven from WITHIN ourselves to do so, by love, just as the healthy members of a happy family lovingly pay the bills for the sick

ones. In short, let's all take a personal responsibility for each other's happiness. That's what I would call making LOVE in the world.

Aren't all the members of the same family on the same economic level? Very well then: We are all members of the human family. That means that every one of us is entitled to adequate food, clothing, shelter, education, and medical care; nor is anyone entitled to luxury while a single individual is poverty-stricken.

We can turn the world into one big happy family very simply: by gathering together to live it among ourselves, inviting everyone else to join us, and by quietly growing, becoming victorious. If this way of life really is better, it will provide more happiness and people will join us for that very reason.

By "live it among ourselves" I mean let's start a small boarding-house in which the guests, owners, managers, and employees are all the same people. That is, the guests would provide all the capital, but get all the profit; make all the decisions, but carry them out ourselves. Democratic? Man!! But furthermore, all our money would be in common.

As more people join, new groups would keep forming, and each one would stay small enough to practise pure democracy instead of just representative democracy. Each group would be completely self-governing, but there would be economic co-ordination between the groups. Modern social science, particularly group dynamics, have reached a point where it is no longer necessary

for groups such as these to have votes. Now, we can continue the discussion, and the investigation of the facts, until all agree on what to do. Unanimous decision can take the place of a vote every time. It's just a matter of reading a few books and practising for a few weeks.

Almost immediately the members will begin to quit their jobs, one by one, and go to work within the unit. For example, right from the start each group can use one of their number for cooking and housework, but a barber would have to wait until there were about 200 men. If there is any spare capital it could be used to finance someone as he studies a new craft or acquires a new skill for the group; or it could be used to start some sort of business for the members to own and run together, thus employing themselves. Policy would be directed towards a completely independent economy; in the meantime, each new member means a new talent available to the group.

Within these groups, all money could be dispensed with, along with any substitute for it, such as barter. What need of money anyway, if no one charges for their goods or services and everything is free? Do the members of a family buy and sell each other's services like businessmen? (or prostitutes?). As you see, money is much more suitable for a system of greed (profit motive) than one of love. Of course, we will continue to use money in dealings with the outside world; that is unavoidable. But within the network of groups everything will be free, with any scarce items going where they are needed the most. And as more people join, more will be able to be produced within the system, and less will have to be bought outside. Thus, as less cash comes in from those working outside, less will be needed anyway.

With the abolition of money and barter, work would be done in teams instead of under hierarchies, and it would be for one's friends instead of some rich stranger; besides, people would be free to do whatever they are most suited for, not whatever they can make money at. Work would truly become "love made visible", free-loading would dwindle and vanish, and feelings of relaxation, security, and fellowship would begin expanding.

The Malatesta Club

THE Malatesta Club announces that at last suitable premises have been found for their long-expected move from High Holborn.

Arrangements are not yet complete and an announcement will be made next week. Meanwhile all members are reminded that subscriptions should be kept up and that additional expense will be incurred through moving. Cash contributions will therefore be particularly welcome during the next month.

A certain amount of work will also be necessary at the new place. Offers of assistance—decorating, carpentry, cleaning, etc.—will be most welcome.

Good Luck Miss Lucy! Continued from p. 1

And they will in fact be enforced, for the Governor of Alabama, James Folsom has taken steps to call out the Alabama National Guard if disorder at the University continues. Are we to oppose this? Is this an example of State tyranny? In a way, of course, it is. It is the imposition of government edict upon a population against its will. And to be true anarchists we should oppose this, even though we welcome the integration of coloured and white in schools and universities.

The alternative is the gradual enlightenment of the barbarians of the Deep South by evangelism, by education (?), by example. Unfortunately the seeds of enlightenment will be falling on very barren ground indeed, the gradualness of the progress will cause even the most severe gradualists to ask themselves—"How many people must suffer while the gradual trends are developing?"

THIS is not to say that we do not recognise the motives behind the US Government's actions. It cannot face the world—especially the Asiatic world—and pose as a

champion of freedom and equality, as opposed to Communist tyranny and privilege, while American citizens are discriminated against because of their non-European colour. There are very practical political reasons for the federal government's progressive stand. But we can hardly expect Miss Atherine Lucy to be deterred from her desire to be a teacher because of such considerations. In any case, when she set out on her chosen career, 'eight years ago', there were no desegregation laws to encourage her. She decided on the fight on the conditions of that time and in fact she has got as far as she has without much help from the Government at all. [It might even be argued that the Government has made things worse for her by stirring up feelings on the coloured question with its desegregation edicts.]

On any count and under any conditions, Miss Lucy is a determined and courageous young lady, and we extend to her our encouragement and heartfelt sympathy in her struggle. We are ashamed of the behaviour of our fellow-whites against our coloured brothers and sisters. Good luck, Miss Lucy!

Now, there are some things so radical, so startlingly different, that it is difficult if not impossible for even the best mind to imagine its implications without extended reflection. It's like building a new geometry: if you make a small, easily comprehensible change at the beginning, the differences multiply as you build until the completed structure is unrecognizable. Such, for example, is the concept of a moneyless, barterless world. Never in all history has such a thing existed; no one can know exactly what it would be like, say, 100 years after the changeover is complete and it has had a chance to work itself out.

Few people to-day own their own jobs as well as their own home; and all of us have so many legal and monetary constraints on our behaviour that we have long since grown used to them and don't even notice them. And yet, despite all that, people have told me that they cannot participate in this experiment because they're "too independent!" . . . Of course, this procedure increases independence, by starting the economy anew and keeping all ownership and control, including political, decentralised right "down" to the individual.

I have been told that this idea has been tried before, and has failed. But business failures are no proof that capitalism does not work. The non-sectarian Communities of Work in Western Europe are succeeding admirably, and the religious sects based on this idea which flourish on this day are further proof that the idea can work. We will have a unifying factor too: the desire to build a better way of life. Naturally, no one can say in advance that this plan will succeed—or that it will fail. But if you too are tired of competition, insecurity, and all the rest, come along!

Sex and family life need undergo no changes at all. Several families could form one unit. There could be special units for vegetarians, for students, for dating youngsters, and any other type of grouping desired.

Well, there you have it—a complete outline for replacing one way of life with another without violence, without having to go into politics, without even causing others any hardship.

Participate. If you can't participate, associate. If you can't associate, contribute for reprinting and postage. In any case, pass this around.

Address all communications to Richard Kern, care of Beck, 789 West End Av., New York 25, N.Y.

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)

DEBATE

FEB. 12—
SOVIET RUSSIA IS THE FREEST SOCIETY IN THE WORLD TODAY
Proposer: M. Cumino
Opposer: D. Room

INFORMAL DISCUSSIONS

Every Thursday at 8.15.
FEB. 16th at 8.30—Bonar Thompson on
THOUGHTS OUT OF SEASON

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

INDOOR MEETINGS
Friday evenings at 7 p.m. commencing
Friday, October 14th at 200 Buchanan
Street.

LIBERTARIAN FORUM

813 BROADWAY,
(Bet. 11 & 12 Sts.)
NEW YORK CITY

Round-Table Youth Discussions

Friday Evenings at 8.30
Feb. 17. The Great Powers and the Cold War.
Feb. 24. Modern Techniques of Brainwashing.
Mar. 2. The Hypocrisy of American Sex "Morality".
Mar. 9. The Decay of the American Radical Movement.
Mar. 16. The Stalinists and the Spanish Revolution.
Mar. 23. Religion and Ethics.
Mar. 30. Civil Liberties in the U.S. and in Russia.

SOCIAL-SUPPERS ARRANGED BY "CULTURA PROLETARIA" GROUP

SATURDAY NIGHTS AT 7.30
February 25th and March 24th.

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 Payne, and addressed to the publishers
FREEDOM PRESS
27 Red Lion Street
London, W.C.1. England
Tel.: Chancery 8364

FREEDOM PRESS

- VOLINE:
Nineteen-Seventeen (The Russian Revolution Betrayed) cloth 12s. 6d.
- E. A. GUTKIND:
The Expanding Environment 8s. 6d.
- V. RICHARDS:
Lessons of the Spanish Revolution 6s.
- MARIE-LOUISE BERNERI:
Neither East nor West cloth 10s. 6d., paper 7s. 6d.
Workers in Stalin's Russia 1s.
- ALEX COMFORT:
Delinquency 6d.
Barbarism & Sexual Freedom boards 3s. 6d.
- 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.
- JOHN HEWETSON:
Sexual Freedom for the Young 6d.
Ill-Health, Poverty and the State cloth 2s. 6d., paper 1s.
- M. BAKUNIN:
Marxism, Freedom and the State cloth 5s.

- 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.
- ERRICO MALATESTA:
Anarchy 6d.
Vote—What For? 1d.
- F. A. RIDLEY:
The Roman Catholic Church and the Modern Age 2d.
- RUDOLF ROCKER:
Nationalism and Culture cloth 21s.
- PHILIP SANSOM:
Syndicalism—The Workers' Next Step 1s.
- K. J. KENAFICK:
Michael Bakunin and Karl Marx paper 6s.
- 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)
- 27, Red Lion Street,
London, W.C.1.