平规 四 以 以 以 四 知 写

A page of Readers' Letters - p. 4



Destroy this opinion and the fabric which is built upon it falls to the ground. It follows therefore that all men are essentially independent.

"All government is founded in opinion.

One part indeed of a community or

empire may be held in subjection by

force, but this cannot be the personal

force of their despots it must be the

force of another part of the community.

who are of opinion that it is their

interest to support his authority.

-WILLIAM GODWIN

Threepence

Vol. 17, No. 9

March 3rd, 1956

Nazis and Socialists Unite in Germany

THE NAZIS AGAIN

IT is indicative of the interests of the British Press that the results of the recent elections in the German Land Parliament for North Rhine—Westphalia should be treated by their correspondents purely for its effect on the stability of Dr. Adenauer's government and hence Germany's foreign relations.

It does not seem to have occurred to them that the German people are likely to be affected—and affected adversely—by the re-emergence in office of politicians with Nazi records. For the spokesmen of the British Press, the German people (and for that matter the British people also) do not merit consideration when the more important matters of foreign policy are at stake.

What has happened in North Rhine—Westphalia is that a united front of the Social Democratic and Free Democratic Parties has defeated the Land Government of the Christian Democratic Union, Dr. Adenauer's Party. This will deprive Chancellor Adenauer of his twothirds majority in the Federal Upper House of Parliament in Bonn and can seriously upset his policies of alliance with the West and of rearmament within the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation.

We do not weep over this. The politicians of the West have foisted re-armament on West Germany entirely for their own ends and against the will of the majority of the people. Germans have had their fill of militarism and war, and the majority are quite happy to remain a de-militarised nation—even faced with the embryonic army of East Germany and behind that the might of the Russian divisions.

The German people know perfectly well that in the event of a major war their country will be another Korea—plus atom bombs. They would prefer to stay out of that if possible.

But the men who have ousted the Christian Democrats in Dusseldorf and threatened their power in Bonn are not anti-militarists. Their opposition to Adenauer's pro-Western policy has nothing to do with principled opposition to preparations for atomic war. These men are politicians and they are out to implement policies which they think will serve (a) their own interests and (b) the

interests of the German State with which they identify themselves.

In the first place the name 'Free Democrat' is a complete misnomer. The FDP certainly started off as a liberal party, but it has been gradually infiltrated by right-wing elements over the last three or four years until in North Rhine-Westphalia they dominate the party.

Once upon a time one would have been surprised that Socialists would make an alliance with such an organisation. But it is a sign of the times that to-day one barely lifts an eyebrow at the spectacle of Socialists uniting with ex-Nazis. After all they have a temporary common interest. Presumably each party thinks itself smart enough to be the first to stab the other in the back when their interests diverge.

Their common interest at the moment lies in their opposition to Adenauer and their desire for a reunified Germany. Only when that happens can ambitious politicians come into their own as leaders of the sovereign German nation-state. Only then can Germany become again a power in its own right, playing off East against West for its own advantage.

The West will look with dismay upon moves towards unification.

The present situation suits the Western powers very well, in spite of the uncertainty and misery it can cause millions of Germans. The Russians favour unification because they would rather deal with a Germany prised away from the West-and when it comes to the point we shall see the Kremlin quite prepared to abandon East Germany (for Gott-Wald's government would not stand a chance in a free election) for the opportunity to make closer ties with the whole-economically and mili-

To that end, however much the Communists here may scream about the Nazi re-emergence, we may be sure that their leaders in the Kremlin look with approval upon the results of last week's election results. And after all, they set the fashion for socialist-nazi friendship.

For all political groupings, power is the prize and people are only a means to that end. But the Germans have had some salutary lessons this century. It is time they drew a few conclusions and recognised that those who play the political game are not to be trusted. Since the up-and-coming politicians of North Rhine-Westphalia have the ugly records that they have, such warnings should be superfluous.

FOR THE RECORD

THESE are the young and ambitious politicians who are now tasting influence in the Land Government of North Rhine-Westphalia, with their records, according to a Manchester Guardian correspondent, (21/2/56):

1. Herr Willi Weyer. He is aged 39, and was a member of the Hitler Youth and of the Nazi party. He will be given a Cabinet post in the new Government.

2. Herr Wolfgang Döring. He is aged 37 and was a member of the Hitler Youth. For the past five years he has been secretary-general of the F.D.P. in Düsseldorf and has been mainly responsible for the careful "purging" of all genuine liberals in the party administra-

3. Herr Walter Scheel, aged 36, was a member of the Hitler Youth and the Nazi party. Like Herr Weyer and Herr Döring he has recently been to both the United States and Britain, and has been angered by the failure of people there to

realise that the F.D.P. had its own "mission" which was distinct from the policies of Dr. Adenauer's C.D.U. party.

4. Herr Hermann Kohlhase. He is aged 49 and was a member of the Nazi party. He was also a serior party Intelligence officer and served in the notorious Reichssicherheitsdienst (state security service). He is local chairman of the F.D.P.

5. Herr Siegfried Zogelmann. He is aged 42 and edits the F.D.P. and strongly Nationalist weekly, the Deutsche Zukunft. He was a "district leader" in the Hitler Youth and served the Nazi party as departmental head in the so-called "Protectorate" of Bohemia-Moravia where some of the worst war crimes were committed.

6. Herr Hans Lange, aged 41, was a member of the Nazi party and a leading functionary in the Hitler Youth. He is chairman of the Youth organisation, the "Jungdemokraten" of the F.D.P.

Behind these young men stands a group of older men who have equally sinister records. It is thought that they are in contact with Dr. Walter Naumann, who was arrested by the British for plotting against the Federal Democratic State. It was Naumann who instigated the infiltration of the F.D.P. by the neo-Nazis.

The four leading 'elder states-

men' are: 1. Dr. Ernst Achenbach: He defended Werner Naumann when the latter was tried by a British Control Commission Court in Bielefeld. A keen and apparently unrepentant supporter of nazism, Dr. Achenbach served under Herr Abetz during the German war-time occupation of France. Herr Abetz was sentenced to imprisonment as a war criminal.

2. Herr Rudolf Rahn. He was formerly Ambassador to Rome and is today a member of the Free Democratic Executive in North Rhine Westphalia. He has organised useful social connections for the Right wingers of the F.D.P. in this Land.

3. Dr. Lothar Steuer. He is at present vice-president of the Düsseldorf Parliament and was formerly secretary to Herr Hugenberg, the Nationalist "newspaper king" who helped Hitler into power.

4. Dr. Werner Best. He is a close friend of Dr. Achenbach and was formerly Nazi Reichs commissioner in occupied Denmark.

CONFLICT BETWEEN JUSTICE AND INJUSTICE

FOR nearly three months now a boycott of public transport by the Negro population of Montgomery, Alabama has been striking boycott was formerly organised as a protest against the arrest of a Negro woman who had refused to give up her seat to a white passen-

Frustrated in their attempts to intimidate the determined coloured population, the authorities have now arrested more than a hundred leaders on the indictment that to organise a mass boycott amounts to conspiracy. Under the 1921 Alabama law it is a 'misdemeanour for two or more persons to prevent others from carrying on their business'. Those accused will find it difficult in the courts to prove that the boycott was originally spontaneous and later organised and carried out in a most determined way. But it will be difficult to arrest all those taking part in the boycott. The arrests have brought forth a new passive resistance campaign which is expressed in the words of the Rev. Martin Luther King, a coloured minister addressing over two thousand Negroes after the arrests:

"This is not a war between the white and the Negro but a conflict between justice and injustice. We are seeking to improve not the Negro of Montgomery but the whole of Montgomery . . . If we are arrested every day, if we are exploited every day, if we are trampled ovr every day, don't let anyone pull you so low as to hate them. We must use the weapon of love.

. . . "not a single race-loving Negro to morrow will turn the key in his ignition or ride a taxi-cab, and we know that nobody will ride the buses."

The chief lawyer for the Negro leaders has been indicted by a grand jury for 'unlawful practice' of the law. It is reported that he is only twenty-five and due for drafting, and therefore, his case will probably not come up before the courts. This is one effective way of getting rid of opposition, by drafting into military service, and if this should fail we have seen that where the white man is supreme in the Southern States the law can be manipulated in his favour.

But no law is powerful enough to suppress an organised determined people. Ironically, in this issue it is

the local laws which act against the Negro and the higher courts which are in their favour. The Whites in Alabama who feel the economic at the city coffers in a most effective squeeze of this boycott are going to way (see Freedom 7/1/56). The have a tough time choosing between their prejudices and economic

THE BLACK HOLE OF KOSTI

A FTER any tragedy caused through negligence of those in authority which is followed by a public outcry, someone is invariably arrested as if to prove that justice is being done.

A case in point is the death of 194 Sudanese farm workers who were suffocated in an army barracks cell in the town of Kosti last week, where 334 of them were packed into a space of 65 feet by 20 feet. It must be a great consolation to the men's families to learn that several police officers and men have been arrested following the tragedy.

The arrest of the farm workers followed a clash with the police a week ago after workers had refused to deliver the season's cotton crop to the company employing them. The issue which led up to this has been obscured by the subsequent deaths, but it appears that the farmers were demanding a bigger share of the profits from their cotton. According to a report 638 workers were detained following the clash with the police in which two policemen, a village guard and 20 workers were killed. Knowing the revengeful nature of police generally after incidents involving the death of policemen, it can be put down as one of the reasons why the cries of the suffocating prisoners were ignored. According to a survivor from the prison cell there were only two small windows near the ceiling, and-

"The doors were covered with wooden shutters. We could not sit down. After two hours the heat seemed to make it impossible to breathe.

"We shouted and cried: Water, water!' and knocked on the doors. We begged to the policemen outside to bring us the water. We were suffocating. But the police ignored us."

Dr. Amin el Sayed, the Sudanese Minister for Health has stated that the cell where the men were detained had sixteen windows, but the farmers were too primitive to open them!

Thousands of students demonstrating in the streets of Khartoum have been joined by railway workers now out on strike as a protest. The police are now afraid to interfere with demonstrators in Kosti and Khartoum who are ignoring a Government ban on processions.

PENALTY

To be Debated in Canada and New Zealand

THE House of Commons vote to abolish hanging for murder has had repercussions in Canada and New Zea-

In Canada the Minister of Justice has declared that the Government would announce in due course whether it would suspend all hangings in Canada until a Parliamentary Committee studying capital punishment made its report.

The Committee has gathered evidence at public hearings during the last two sessions.

It will now prepare a report on capital and corporal punishment.

In New Zealand, where the re-introduction of hanging was one of the planks on which the National Party was returned to power in 1950 (following its abolition by the Labour Party in 1941 and its unofficial suspension during the previous six years), it is reported by the Observer's Wellington correspondent that the Commons vote will prompt a

debate on the death penalty there. "A strong demand for this is being made by the abolitionists, whose numbers appear to have increased since the death penalty was restored by the present National Party administration in

November, 1950, shortly after it came to power. If the Labour Party raises the issue again, it is probable that the Prime Minister, Mr. S. G. Holland, will allow a free vote, as he did in 1950.

On that occasion there were two divisions. The first produced a vote of 38 to 31 in favour of restoration, the second a majority of 37 to 28. One member of the present Cabinet, Mr. J. R. Hanan, now Minister of Health but then a back-bencher, crossed the floor to vote against the Bill with the Opposition.

The Prime Minister, who strongly supported the Bill, said that another Government member, Mr. E. P. Alderman, who was absent from the House, would have voted against the Bill had he been present."

Resigning before he is Sacked?

The Sunday Times reported last week

"Albert Pierrepoint, Britain's chief executioner, has resigned his office. Mr. Pierrepoint, who has been the public hangman for 25 years—an office held by his father and uncle before him-said last night that his decision had nothing to do with the present discussions about capital punishment."

RELIGIOUS EMPHASIS WEEK COMES UNSTUCK

A MIDST the lunacy rampant in the Southern States of America, a handful of people last week

took a stand against discrimination. The Rev. Alvin Kershaw, of Oxford, Ohio, was among the guest speakers billed to speak at the University of Mississippi during Religious Emphasis Week (!). A few months ago he won 32,000 dollars in TV's The 64,000 Dollar Question programme, part of which, it was disclosed, he intended handing over to the National Association for the Advancement of Coloured People. On hearing this, the Chancellor of the University cancelled the Rev. Kershaw's visit. A few days later all five out-of-state professors decided not to speak at the university. Then, Professor Morton B. King, chairman of the university's sociology department, resigned from the faculty. The university administration, he said, is no longer able to "defend the freedom of thought, inquiry and speech which are essential

for higher education to flourish". At Mississippi State College, another Professor followed his example.

The state house of representatives denounced the two men as misguided reformers and urged the heads of all state-supported colleges to "use every effort to prevent subversive influences from infiltrating

into our institutions". Since all the five speakers billed refused to turn up, the organising committee decided to replace them with five local clergymen, and the Editor, Jack Sullen of the Jackson Daily News wrote that "we may feel reasonably sure that local clergymen will not be spewing poison into the minds of our young people". The five local clergymen however, declined to perform and Time reports

that: "At week's end the committee on Emphasis Week into three days of mediarrangements decided to turn Religious tation and prayer-without any clergymen around who might have dangerous ideas."

GODWIN WILLIAM b. 1756

WO hundred years ago to-day, on March 3rd, 1756, William Godwin was born at Wisbech in the Cambridgeshire fenland. "It was Godwin," wrote Peter Kropotkin, "in his Enquiry Concerning Political Justice, (1793), who was the first to formulate the political and economical conceptions of anarchism, even though he did not give that name to the ideas developed in his remarkable work." In the ferment of political and social theorising which followed the French Revolution Godwin's thought moved ahead of his contemporaries in two ways, firstly instead of the abolition of particular forms of government he saw the necessity for the abolition of all government and, secondly, he realised the property basis of government and therefore saw that if the abolition of government were to be effective it must be accompanied by the destruction of the institution of accumulated property. "Based on these two ideas,"

comments George Woodcock, "his theory of society was in advance of that of any contemporary thinker, and of all the celebrated Victorian liberal theoreticians who followed him."

Inseparable from his attacks on governmental society was his criticism of organised religion in which he anticipated the rationalist controversies of the nineteenth century, and his educational philosophy anticipates the views of advanced teachers of our own day. Towards the end of his long life Godwin said, "It has been the main object of my days, since I attained to years of discretion, to do my part to free the human mind from slavery." It was a task he performed as faithfully and assiduously as lay in his power. He deserves to be remembered as one of the most patient and stubborn fighters for freedom in the long history of English rebellion.

A NARCHISM has suffered in England because it has been regarded by the general public as an exotic growth, a creed originating among Russians, Latins and other suspect races and therefore something to be avoided by good Englishmen. The anarchists themselves have tended to perpetuate this illusion by their continued reliance on foreign sources and their neglect of the English predecessors of anarchism, who should be studied not from any sense of racial loyalty, but for the fact that the writings of men like Winstanley and Godwin present a philosophical case for liberty in a more capable manner than many of the commonly read anarchist classics.

Gerrard Winstanley's ideas vanished quickly after the break-up of the Digger movement in the 17th century. Their influence, if it persisted, must be regarded as tenuous in the extreme, and it is with William Godwin, a century and a half later, that modern anarchism appeared in the wake of the French Revolution.

Godwin, a non-conformist minister, who had lost faith and discarded the cloth, was one of the leading figures of the literary circles of England during the Industrial Revolution and the romantic revival. Shelley married his daughter and became his most devoted disciple, Blake was his friend, and Byron seduced his step-daughter. His work had a profound—if in some cases transitory -effect on the ideas of such writers as Wordsworth, Coleridge, De Quincey and Hazlitt, and his arguments provoked Malthus to reply in his famous Essay on Population, which, by the irony of history, came to enjoy a greater fame than the book to which it replied so unconvincingly.

Godwin wrote many books, including school text books and novels, of which the most famous was Caleb Williams, but the work which expounded his social theory and on which his influence rested was the Enquiry Concerning Political Justice, published in 1793. It was a work of great scholarship and consummate argument, and remains one of the best philosophical expositions of anarchism that have yet been written.

Godwin held that all discussions of the form of the desirable government were irrelevant, because government itself was the cause of the principle social

evils. "All government corresponds in a certain degree to what the Greeks denominated a tyranny. The difference is, that in despotic countries mind is depressed by a uniform usurpation; while in republics it preserves a greater portion of its activity, and the usurpation more easily conforms itself to the fluctuations of opinion. By its very nature a positive institution has a tendency to suspend the elasticity and progress of mind. We should not forget that government is, abstractly taken, an evil, a usurpation upon private judgment and individual conscience of mankind."

He refuted the current Jacobin idea of government being based on a social con-

"We cannot renounce our moral independence; it is a property we can neither sell nor give away; and consequently no government can derive its authority from an original contract."

The majority of the faults in society, he taught, sprang from the repressions of the individual which were inseparable from the systematic, coercive and external rule of the State. Every human being had a fundamental will towards peace and freedom, and if authority

were removed, this tendency would assert itself in individuals and cause them to desire and live towards a society based on justice.

"Normal man seeks the light just as the flowers do. Man, if not too much interfered with, will make for himself the best possible environment, and create for his children right conditions, because the instinct for peace and liberty is deeply rooted in his nature. Control by another has led to revolt, and revolt has led to oppression, and oppression causes grief and deadness, and hence bruises and distortion follow. When we view humanity we behold not the true and natural man, but a deformed and pitiable product, undone by the vices of those who have sought to improve on nature by shaping his life to feed the vanity of a few and minister to their wantonness. In our plans for social betterment, let us hold in mind the healthy unfettered man, and not the cripple that interference and restrain have made."

Godwin repudiated the law, by which he meant the codified laws of organised states, and taught that in its place must be substituted natural justice, based on

the elemental rights of man. Perhaps the most important section of Godwin's treatise is the essay on Property. He realised, unlike the political radicals of his time, that men could only live together amicably if fair economic conditions prevailed and no man was subject to exploitation by another.

"However great and extensive are the evils that are produced by monarchies and courts, by the imposture of priests and the iniquity of criminal laws, all these are imbecile and impotent compared with the evils that arise out of the established system of property . . . Accumulated property treads the powers of thought in the dust, extinguishes the sparks of genius, and reduces the great mass of mankind to be immersed in sordid cares."

The only just means of the distribution of property, Godwin held, would be one that ensured that every man's needs were met, and that no man was idle in plenty while another toiled in poverty.

"If justice has any meaning, nothing can be more iniquitous than for one man to possess superfluities, while there is a

human being in existence that is not adequately supplied with these.

"Justice does not stop here. Every man is entitled, so far as the general stock will suffice, not only to the means of being, but of well-being. It is unjust if one man be deprived of leisure to cultivate his rational power while another man contributes not a single effort to add to the common stock. The faculties of one man are like the faculties of another man. Justice directs that each man, unless perhaps he be employed more beneficially to the public, should contribute to the cultivation of the common harvest, of which each man consumes a share."

Godwin, like Proudhon, looked to a society of small proprietors, linked by free contracts relating to the common functions of society. Unlike his predecessor Winstanley, he had evolved no scheme of full scale communism in production and distribution.

He looked to the dissolution of political government, "that brute engine which has been the only perennial cause of the vices of mankind". In its place he visualised a federalised system of decentralised administration by voluntary bodies rising spontaneously to organise in freedom any social functions that might be necessary. The revolution he thought could be achieved peacefully by education and example.

Political Justice had a great influence on the intellectual circles of Godwin's day and, in spite of Pitt's jibe that a threeguinea book would only be read by the well-to-do, it reached the advanced workers, who often formed groups for the express purpose of purchasing the book. There is no doubt that the liberation and anti-political character of the Owenite movements and the early trades unions was due in part to Godwin's influence. To him more than any other we must attribute the anti-authoritarian strain, which, in spite of betrayals, has existed in the British labour movement down to the present day.

GEORGE WOODCOCK.

GODWIN'S PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION

THE true object of education, like that of every other moral process, is the generation of happiness.

It is of less importance, generally speaking, that a child should acquire this or that species of knowledge, than that, through a medium of instruction he should acquire habits of intellectual activity . . . In a word, the first lesson of a judicious education is, Learn to think, to discriminate, to remember, and to enquire . . . Is it not possible to find something that will fulfil these conditions, the benefit of which a child shall understand, and the acquisition of which he may be taught to desire? Study with desire is real activity: without desire it is but the semblance and mockery of activity. Let us not, in the eagerness of our haste to educate, forget all the ends of education.

According to the received modes of education, the master goes first and the pupil follows. According to the method here recommended, it is probable that

the pupil would go first, and the master follow. If I learn nothing but what I desire to learn, what should hinder me from being my own preceptor? This plan is calculated entirely to change the face of education. The whole formidable apparatus which has hitherto attended it is swept away. Strictly speaking, no such characters are left upon the scene as either preceptor or pupil. The boy, like the man, studies because he desires it. He proceeds upon a plan of his own invention, or which, by adopting, he has made his own. Everything bespeaks independence and equality.

If we would have our children frank and sincere in their behaviour, we must take care that frankness and sincerity shall not be a source of evil to them . . . Punishment would find no share in a truly excellent system of education; even angry looks and words of rebuke would be wholly excluded. But upon every system it cannot fail to appear in the highest degree impolitic and mischievous, that young persons should have reason given them to repent of their sincerity . . . For this purpose it is not necessary that we should check the sallies of youth. Nothing is of worse effect in our treatment either of the young or the old, than a continual anxiety, and an ever-eager interference with their conduct. Every human being should be permitted, not only from a principle of benevolence, but because without this there can be no true improvement or excellence, to act for himself.

There is nothing more contrary to true justice and enlightened morality, than the unsparing harshness with which the old frequently censure the extravagances of the young. Enamoured of black forebodings, and gorged with misanthropy, they pour out their ill-omened prophesyings with unpitying cruelty. The sober, the dull, the obedient lads that have no will and no understanding of their own, are the only themes of their eulogium. They may be compared to that tyrant of antiquity who, intending to convey a symbolic lesson upon the principles of despotism, passed through a field of corn, and struck off every ear that had the audacity to rear its head above the dull and insipid level of its fellows.

-THE ENQUIRER (1797).

THE mind of a child is essentially independent; he does not, until he has been formed to it by hard experience, frame to himself the ideas of authority and subjection. When he is rated by his nurse, he expresses his mutinous spirit by piercing cries; when he is first struck by her in anger, he is ready to fall into convulsions of rage; it almost never happens otherwise. It is a long while (unless he is unmercifully treated indeed) before a rebuke or a blow produces in him immediate symptoms of submission

consists in negatives: Stand still; Do not go there; Do not touch that . . .

Consider the subject in another light. Liberty is the school of understanding. Every boy learns more in the hours of play, than in the hours of labour. In school he lays in the materials of thinking, but in his sports he actually thinks: he whets his faculties and he opens his eyes. The child from the moment of his birth is an experimental philosopher; he essays his organs and his limbs, and learns the use of his muscles. Everyone who will attentively observe him, will find that this is his perpetual employment. But the whole process depends upon liberty. Put him in a mill and his understanding will improve no more than that of the horse which turns it.

—FLEETWOOD (1805).

THE injuries that result from a system of national education are, in the first place that all public establishments include in them the idea of permanence. They endeavour it may be to secure and diffuse whatever of advantageous to society is already known, but they forget that more remains to be known . . . public education has always expended its energies in the support of prejudice; it teaches its pupils not the fortitude that shall bring every proposition to the test of examination, but the art of vindicating such tenets as may chance to be previously established . . . All this is directly contrary to the true interest of mind. All this must be unlearned before we can begin to be wise . . . Refer them to reading, to conversation, to meditation, but teach them neither creeds nor catechisms, neither moral nor political.

Secondly, the idea of national education is founded in an inattention to the nature of mind. Whatever each man does for himself is done well; whatever his neighbours or his country undertake to do for him is done ill. It is our wisdom to incite men to act for themselves, not to retain them in a state of perpetual pupillage. He that learns because he desires will listen to the instructions he receives and apprehends their meaning. He that teaches because he desires to teach will discharge his occupation with

Continued on p. 3

Shelley on Godwinism

A ND behold, thrones were kingless, and men walked One with the other even as spirits do, None fawned, none trampled; hate, disdain, or fear, Self-love or self-contempt, on human brows No more inscribed, as o'er the gate of hell, 'All hope abandon ye who enter here;" None frowned, none trembled, none with eager fear Gazed on another's eye of cold command, Until the subject of a tyrant's will Became, worse fate, the abject of his own, Which spurred him, like an outspent horse, to death. None wrought his lips in truth-entangling lines Which smiled the lie his tongue disdained to speak; None, with firm sneer, trod out in his own heart The sparks of love and hope till there remained Those bitter ashes, a soul self-consumed, And the wretch crept a vampire among men, Infecting all with his own hideous ill; None talked that common, false, cold, hollow talk Which makes the heart deny the yes it breathes, Yet question that unmeant hypocrisy With such a self-mistrust as has no name.

The loathsome mask has fallen, the man remains Sceptreless, free, uncircumscribed, but man Equal, unclassed, tribeless, and nationless, Exempt from awe, worship, degree, the king Over himself; just, gentle, wise: but man Passionless?—no, yet free from guilt or pain, Which were, for his will made or suffered them, Nor yet exempt, though ruling them like slaves, From chance, and death, and mutability, The clogs of that which else might oversoar The loftiest star of unascended heaven, Pinnacled dim in the intense inane.

-PROM THEUS UNBOUND.

Godwin in Print

HE revival of interest in Godwin can be gauged from the fact that six books about him have been published in this country since the war. But, apart from fragments and selections, Political Justice is only available in a magnificent and expensive edition published in Canada.

No other work of Godwin's is in print. His novel Caleb Williams which continues to gain the admiration of literary critics was last reprinted over fifty years ago. Of the rest of Godwin's large and uneven output the only books which one could reasonably expect ever to see reprinted are The Enquirer (1797), the Memoirs of Mary Wollstonecraft (1798), the Thoughts on Man (1831), and possibly the Essays Never Before Published which did not appear until 1873, nearly forty years after his death.

But surely it is high time, as Mr. H. N. Brailsford and others have suggested, that Political Justice and Caleb Williams, were published in one of the standard editions like the "Everyman Library"?

We list below the works by or about Godwin which are now in print:

Selections from Political Justice, (Freedom Press 1943, 3d.).

On Law, (from Political Justice), (Freedom Press 1945, 1d.). An Enquiry Concerning Political Justice, ed. F. E. L. Priestley, 3 Vols. (Toronto University Press and O.U.P., 1946, £3 13. 6d.)

On Property, (from Political Justice), (Allen & Unwin, new imp. 1950, 6s. 0d.).

William Godwin: A biographical study, by George Woodcock, (Porcupine Press 1946, 12s. 6d.—obtainable from Freedom Press at 5s. 0d.). William Godwin: A study in liberalism, by David Fleisher, (Allen & Unwin

1951, 12s. 6d.). Shelley, Godwin & Their Circle, by H. N. Brailsford, (Home University Library, new edition 1951, 7s. 6d.). Godwin and the Age of Transition, by A. E. Rodway. (Harrap 1952,

10s. 6d.). William Godwin & His World, by R. Glynn Grylls, (Odhams Press 1953,

21s. Od.). Godwin and the Age of Transition, by A. E. Rodway, (Harrap 1952, 1953, 15s. 0d.).

. . . Almost all that any parent requires of a child of three or four years of age

Reflections on 'Double-Think'

A NARCHISTS were among the first in the radical movements of the world to expose the dangers of the Bolshevik seizure of power in Russia, as well as being among the régime's first victims. In the ensuing years the Russian régime has had a long queue of admirers as well as an almost equally long one of disillusioned admirers! If one were to analyse the reasons for these phenomena one would find that with very few exceptions the admirers were attracted by the myth and not the reality of the Bolshevik ideology. Sympathies were even won for reasons quite unconnected with any ideology, such as during the last war when the fighting qualities of the Red Army convinced many that there must be something in a régime whose soldiers could fight with such courage for their country (forgetting completely that a similar argument could be used regarding Nazi Germany). And even some diehard employers to our knowledge had a good word to say for the methods used by the Russians to increase production and to encourage the competitive spirit among workers! And of course for many of the millions of unemployed workers in Europe and America the "workers' fatherland" was a mirage in a desert of despair and despondency.

None of these admirers of the Soviet Union were concerned with the fact that it was built on an ideology that pain scant attention to the elementary liberties of man, and ruthlessly eliminated those who resisted whether from the extreme Left or from the Right. They ignored (or chose to ignore) the existence of forced labour camps, the Secret Police and the growth of a class system at least as vicious as anywhere in the "capitalist" world. This ideology has remained unchanged for more than a quarter of a century (whatever the declarations at the recent 20th Congress held in Moscow may mean so far as the future is concerned). Yet the queue of ex-comrades, ex-sympathisers and ex-sychopants are the admirers and sympathisers of yesterday.

At the head of the queue are those whose disillusionment resulted from the Moscow Trials; they are followed by those whose change of heart dates from the Spanish Civil War, closely followed by those who were caught on the wrong foot by the Stalin-Hitler Pact. A few years behind them are those of the bandages-for-Russia-brigade (1940-45) whose pink spectacles were dragged off their noses in the nick of time by their democratic politicians and Press, to find themselves confronted by an iron-curtain behind which the repentant ex-communist writers and journalists (and politicians turned writers) conducted them, sparing none of the spinechilling details in their outpourings . . . thereby admitting that they knew all along the totalitarian nature of the régime to which they had for so long given their allegiance!

NOW, our objective is not to start a witch-hunt; we are really not interested in exposing shady political careers for their own sake. We are much more interested, however, in trying to shed some light on the path which, we think, leads in the direction of human progress. The ex-communists are after all only the glaring examples of a human weakness to which we are all potential victims: that of subjectivity or wishful-thinking. Let us agree with Mr. Bevan when he said, last week in Birmingham, that the public is in "the grip of newspapers which no

longer even pretend to convey the facts [to them . . . and have] created in Britain a state of mind which makes the mass of the population permanently squint. The state of mind of the British population to-day concerning the political situation is one of bewilderment and perplexity. They just do not know what is happening to them."

and simply concentrate our attention on the "politically conscious" minority in society to-day. And even if we include only that section of it which is Labour and left of Labour it is numerically strong enough to make some impact on social thinking (and this is even more true in the rest of Europe). Yet such is not the case. Why? The answer, we think, is not far to seek. So-called radical thinking to-day is tainted with "double-think", which only those infected with it themselves are so bold as to declare is an exclusively Communist disease! To seek (as has the ex-Communist Armada in the main), refuge in the politics of the West as the alternative to years of worship at the shrine of Stalin is to jump out of the fire into the frying pan; it is to admit that one has not understood the real nature of one's error.

The opponents of the C.P. supporter rightly criticise him on the grounds that he has one set of values in criticising the democracies and quite another in his appraisal of the Soviet Union. What they do not realise however is that they are themselves guilty of the same shortcomings in reverse!

The fact of the matter is that the world we live in, guided by expediency and sectional interests has no principles (Note: the successful argument used for the abolition of the death penalty for murder to-day is the same as that used a hundred years ago for its abolition for stealing: that it is no deterrent—and not that judicial murder is immoral). War will never be banished from society so long as radicals accept it as a deterrent or as a defensive stance which offered him temporary weapon (on both sides of the Iron Curtain the same arguments are used; both sides are arming themselves against aggression; neither will use it as an aggressive weapon. Yet wars break out. Who is to determine who is the aggressor? Who is to say that attack is not a means of forestalling aggression? etc. . .).

Government is authority whether under the one, two or ten party system; it is government under Bevan, Butler or Bulganin. Concentration camps located at Vorkuta are never more right, more justifiable or moral than those into which more than 60,000 Kikuyu have been herded in Kenya, or vice versa. The denial of the rights of Jews in Nazi Germany is no more heinous a crime than the eviction of 600,000 Arabs from their homes by the Jews in Israel, however worthy one may consider the cause of a Jewish homeland in Palestine. And one could go on indefinitely repeating examples in which unprincipled thinking has reduced Left and Right to a common denominator and has brought social progress to a stand-

TO this double-think must be added the illusion of democratic gradualism (see Gaitskell in last week's Forward on Guild Socialism, which, he says, like Syndicalism is "anti-rational and emotional"!). More than three hundred years ago Jonathan Swift saw through this one when he wrote: "Of what use is freedom of thought, if it will not produce freedom of action", it sums up the position both in the totalitarian as well as the "democratic" countries to-day. In the totalitarian countries freedom of thought is rewarded with a place in a labour camp. In the democracies one is offered the alternatives of the wilderness or a seat in Parliament! But never a hearing or a chance to act!

Power is in the hands of those who cherish it for its own sake or for the privileges it confers on them as a class. Apart from the fact that freedom of thought has always been somewhat difficult to control or abolish (attempts have been made THE END OF THE STALIN MYTH

INDIVIDUALS & INSTITUTIONS

A T the twentieth congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, recently concluded, one of the criticisms laid at the door of the dead Stalin was that his policies had isolated the Soviet Union from the rest of the world.

This was somewhat of an understatement. The policies followed by the Russian Government during the long years of Stalin's domination did much more than isolate that country—they bred bitter hostility and hatred, disillusionment and despair among the peoples of other countries. And, no doubt. among the people of the Soviet Union itself.

It has always been the sly gambit of the Communists outside Russia to denounce those who criticise the Soviet Union as the mouthpieces of capitalism. In Britain at least, the critic of the régime must be an avid reader of the Daily Mail—it is thought sufficient answer to criticism to sneer that the same attitude has been expressed in right-wing papers.

In fact of course it is by no means only the right-winger who opposes the fruits of Stalinism in Russia and its effects on the working class throughout the world-every other variety of socialist, and indeed the true social revolutionary, must find in the Soviet Union so much that is reactionary and repulsive that opposition must be clearly stated at every turn of the Party Line.

A Policy for Power

What exactly was Stalin's policy? It has been described as 'anything which served the interests of the Soviet Union', but that is not an accurate description, for the isolation from the rest of the world, the revulsion felt by so many sincere socialists, certainly did not serve the interests of the Soviet Union.

Stalin's policy outside the Kremlin was in fact a series of policies—often contradictory-shifting all the time in accord with temporary circumstances. It can make sense only if one sees Stalin as concerned first and foremost with retaining personal power, and ready, willing and able to embrace any circumadvantage-at whatever cost to anybody else. Inside the Kremlin his attitude

clearly was that anything which enabled him to retain his grip on the apparatus of power was the policy of the moment.

At the beginning of his climb to power, his disagreement with Trotsky was said to be based on the latter's desire to spread the revolution internationally, while Stalin thought in terms of 'building socialism in one country' and if indeed this was his idea then one can only say that he failed abjectly at that, in spite of having complete power for more than twenty years. And in the course of failing at home, dug the grave for socialism in other countries as well.

More perhaps than any other single person was Stalin responsible for the failure of socialism since 1920, and for the general decline in revolutionary consciousness during the last thirty years. The antics of the Communist Parties of the world, faithfully following the instructions which flowed down to them from above, have so corrupted socialist thought and behaviour that it is unlikely that it will ever recover.

Socialists Aim at Power

And indeed, why should it? After all, Stalinism is only socialism writ large. It is a corruption, certainly, but a corruption which grew fairly logically from certain stock. And that stock is common to all brands of socialism-the belief in political power, in the establishment of a socialist society through use of the State apparatus. All socialists aim at getting their party in control of the machinery of the State-i.e. of achieving political power by some means or an-

The more democratic socialists will see that the end conditions the means. They will seek to use gentler methods, of persuasion, example and election. The totalitarian socialists will maintain that the end justifies the means, and they are prepared to use deception, brutality and seizures of power to further their aim. The former, however, still want power, and their chance of getting it improves the nearer they approximate to the latter. And having got power, the important thing becomes to hang on to it.

No, socialists in general would do well to realise that Stalinism is not an aberration unconnected with Marxism. It

was not an accident that the Soviet Union developed as it did-it was almost inevitable that something like Stalin's régime should emerge from the moment the Bolsheviks seized power-in spite of the fact that the Bolsheviki of 1917 spoke and thought in a far more revolutionary way than they do now.

One of the speeches demolishing Stalin in the Kremlin last week referred to his errors in attributing to individuals failures in the system which were really due to class relationships. There can be little doubt that Stalin knew this, but was happy to have excuses for liquidating those who might be a threat to his personal power. But the point which should interest us here is that the new 'collective leadership' is now blaming Stalin for all that has gone wrong, just as he blamed Trotsky and his supporters. It seems therefore that in condemning 'the cult of the individual' as practised by Stalin, the new leaders of the Soviet Union are nevertheless admitting the power and influence that can be wielded by individuals-i.e. the importance of the individual.

The Class Nature of the Russian State

This is at variance with Marxist materialism which maintains that it is economic and class relationships which really influence society. Surely Marxists would explain Hitler not by his pathology but in terms of his rôle in the class struggle in Germany. Which of course did not explain him but explained why he was able to get into the position he did.

Similarly, Stalin's personality and character can only be discussed in psycho-pathological terms, but his position in the Russian State can be explained in terms of the class nature of that State. Stalin was the embodiment of the class nature of the Russian dictatorship—the foundation for which was laid down by Lenin and Trotsky before Stalin arrived at the top, and which is endemic in any system which relies upon power flowing from the top downwards.

If the apparatus of power is there, it will be used. And the chances are that it will be used by those whose addiction to power is for its own sake-in a word, the psychopaths. To prevent this happening it is useless to castigate the individuals, while leaving the institutions unchanged. Yet this is precisely what Khrushchev and Company are doingbecause of course they are now running the institutions, the class nature of which they are unlikely to tamper with since they are in the upper class.

The fact that there is now a collective leadership in the Kremlin is no guarantee that the Russian people will be any freer. It may mean simply that there are now three psychopaths in power instead of one.

'Pictures for Schools'

THE Pictures for Schools exhibition at the Whitechapel Gallery has become an annual event in the East End. Judging by the number of visitors who were looking at the pictures while I was there, the local interest must be very considerable. All the more regrettable therefore, that the exhibition this year is so disappointing.

Roughly, there are four equal sections -pottery, including sculpture and carving-prints, including lithographs, etchings, linocuts, etc.—oil and water colour paintings, and embroidery. The average level of all this seldom rises above a kind of mediocrity which one expects from some commercially sponsored show, where the rule is safety in numbers and sameness.

The general impression is that either the selectors had too little to choose from-and this may be the trouble since some of the works really do touch bottom, or there was no real agreement as to what the exhibition should be about.

to starve it), as Swift pointed out, it

is only dangerous if it results in

action. And this all governments

make sure is their preserve. All

action must be canalised through

the machine of the State, according

to its rules and the recognition of

its supremacy. Thus all action will

be circumscribed, limited and emas-

culated. What happens if our freed-

dom of thought leads us to question

the very foundations of the State, or

government and politics? Revolu-

tion? A word that sends a shudder

down Mr. Gaitskell's spine. For

him the general strike and the rise

of the Parliamentary Labour Party

have made it "seem more and more

absurd to think and talk in revolu-

thinking in "revolutionary terms" we

shall go on having international and

economic crises, and the struggles

within the Labour movement will

remain struggles as to who will rule

us, never as to who will free us from

the yoke of political servility.

Yet until the people do start

tionary terms".

The second-best of the known artists is so much in evidence here; familiar names in the catalogue sends one hopefully scurrying across the gallery to gaze and arrive at the irritating conclusion that the object, or picture, is far from being a good example of the artist's work. And this is painfully true of the pottery, where almost nothing emerges from the brown earthy obsession to excite one's fingers to touch. Among the oil paintings Bateson Mason, Alistair Grant, James Boswell and Kyffin Williams all raise themselves easily from the ruck. There are good paintings with nothing second-rate about them. Gertrude Hermes shows an extremely fine lino-cut entitled "Owls", but apart from that, there is little among the prints to enjoy, and the embroidery yields precisely nothing.

Briefly, this exhibition seems cheap; its aim may be altruistic but the organisers have, unfortunately but undeniably, only achieved a very second-rate show.

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-beoks. Please supply publisher's name if possible, but if not, we can find it. Scarce and out-of-print books searched for.

Second-Hand . . . Modern Rationalism

Joseph McCabe 5/-Native Son Richard Wright 3/6 Prefaces and Introductions Anatole France 2/6 The Valley of the Moon Jack London 4/-The Seagull and The Cherry

Orchard Anton Tchekov 2/6 Short Stories Guy de Maupassant 2/6 The Riddle of the Universe

Ernest Haeckel 3/-Early Sorrow Thomas Mann 34-The Man of Letters in the Modern World Allan Tate 3/-Darkness at Noon

Arthur Koestler 3/-Lenin and Britain Dead Man Over All Walter Allen 3/-

The Best Short Stories of O. Henry 4/-Low Notes on a High Level

J. B. Priestley 4/-History of Soviet Russia: The Interregnum E. H. Carr 12/6 The Faith of Men Jack London 4/-

Periodicals . . . Views and Comments (Libertarian League), No. 11, February 3d.

Postage free on all items Obtainable from RED LION STREET, LONDON, W.C.I

Godwin from p. 2

enthusiasm and energy. But the moment political institution undertakes to assign to every man his place, the functions of all will be discharged with supineness and indifference . . .

Thirdly, the project of a national education ought uniformly to be discouraged on account of its obvious alliance with national government. This is an alliance of a more formidable nature than the old and much contested alliance of church and state. Before we put so powerful a machine under the direction of so ambiguous an agent, it behoves us to consider well what it is that we do. Government will not fail to employ it to strengthen its hands and perpetuate its institutions . . . Their view as institutors of a system of education will not fail to be analogous to their views in their political capacity: the data upon which their conduct as statesmen is vindicated will be the data upon which their instructions are founded. It is not true that our youth ought to be instructed to venerate the constitution, however excellent; they should be instructed to venerate truth, and the constitution only so far as it corresponded with their inde-

pendent deductions of truth. -POLITICAL JUSTICE (1793).

to

Believers of Anarchy Only?

DEAR COMRADES,

In reply to comrade Hennacy's comment on my letter, FREEDOM Feb. 11th, I would like to refer the comrade to my reply to Holley Cantine's letter on the same subject. Wherein I stated that I have nothing against anyone who wants to conduct himself according to his own lights, only that that action should not be labelled Anarchism. Too many 'comrades' mistaking licence and irresponsibility for Anarchy and Freedom have abused the term. Particular marital set-ups and outright dishonesty have been called Anarchy. Anarchism is a kind of social organisation nowhere in existence and until that system comes into being we remain believers of Anarchy but not Anarchists. If by some miracle an Anarchist were to appear on the scene to-morrow he would probably have little to do with a great number of socalled 'Anarchists' the same as if by some miracle Jesus was resurrected he would have little to do with organised religion.

Comrade Hennacy takes me to task for quoting Shaw, 'Better a live coward than a dead hero', and suggests the same meaning for 'He who fights and runs away lives to fight another day' and goes on to paraphrase the last part of the quotation thus, 'Who lives to run away another day'. Personally I see a world of difference in the two sayings, the former is the human and biological recognition that life above all, without which nothing would have any meaning. The latter may be a good tactic under a particular situation and seems far more intelligent than to 'die fighting' when escape may be possible, because one has ideals. That in no way suggests that we do not fight, only that we should not be a "slave" to our ideals to the degree

Mankind & Property

COMRADES,

Some time ago, Mr. Uloth, in your columns, got published his claim that "for upwards of a million years Man lived in a propertyless, classless and warless society." I made three attempts at getting this preposterous proposition corrected or discussed. No notice (that I know of) was taken.

Man, in the beginning, was not even a half-wit. Inevitably, he had almost no wit at all, and the first act of his selfconsciousness was to pick up bright or colourful things and attach them to various parts of his body. Hence we get the "value" we give to "precious" things. Clothing came later, when men and women first took to hanging on themselves bits of the pelts and skins of animals killed for human food. Our "civilisation" is barely one step beyond this "barbarism", as is exemplified by pictures of the British "queen" strutting before semi-barbarians with "precious" trumpery strung all around her. This recent picture needed only a ring in the "queen's" nose to make its proof of the "brotherhood of man" complete and thorough.

Someone is permitted to ask, "Are we all sinners?" The answer is, we are. Not "sinful by nature", as the churches put it, but sinners against nature, in that none of our social values has any foundation in nature whatever. And our moral values are, thus, the most shocking of all. Nature is absolute, and there can be no abstract absolute-not even anarchy. There has to be some order of things, and nature is the arbiter. than futile criticism of persons to set mankind's feet on the true track? Bakewell, Feb. 13 DAVID MACCONNELL.

where they may determine between life and death.

Comrade Hennacy goes on to say 'the lack of fighting spirit, a postponement of action because it interferes with plans and pleasures, makes the radical movement a shadow of what it once was'. Is the radical movement a shadow of its former self or is it different conditions occasioning different responses? And is there such a strict division between "plans and pleasures" and our idealistic beliefs and actions?

One would think, and experience bears this out, that we make plans and derive pleasure because of our ideals, not in spite of them. Do we of necessity have to suffer to be idealistic? Is the "outcast" of the one of no "fixed abode" any more idealistic than many who are idealistic and still very much part of everyday life? There being no "royal road" to idealism each man finds his own way which may be valid for him only. This leaves idealism open to corruption and many avail themselves of the oppor-

Comrade Hennacy obviously thinks so for he commends the comrades to 'move away from their lethargic state of exinstence towards personal responsibility

for the revolution that they talk about'. Here in London I can think of dozens of comrades hardly lethargic making plans and deriving pleasure from speaking on Anarchism, editing a newspaper, writing articles, managing a club, living in a community, etc. All these things are done because they give pleasure and are the material manifestations of their idealism. I do not think this an Anarchism but rather that some aspects of what we think Anarchism will be like are introduced in these activities. In a small way these things help towards social change.

I for one would like to see the London comrades live together in one community and make many more aspects of Anarchy a reality, but if this venture were to result in the whole community being arrested by the State because of our anti-war stand or our free love unions I for one would consider such an adventure the height of folly and irresponsibility, in spite of the fact that it may all be done in the name of an ideal. That too does not suggest that individuals would go to jail rather than serve in the armed forces, or organise communities, but only to illustrate that to live one's odeals at all costs can so easily border on stupidity if not neurosis.

Hennacy later in his article says that he does not think that its is wrong 'to enjoy the good things in life' but adds that 'only when these things prevent one from practising the ideals that we be come a slave to these things'.

Here again one must ask why the 'good things in life' are so opposed to our ideals? I was always under the impression that it was the good things in life that enriched our ideals, that it was through our idealism that the good things would be more widely spread, that it was the good things in life that gave our idealism more meaning. Who the hell would be interested in idealism that offered only sorrow and suffering, perhaps Comrade Hennacy is demanding a certain action of all of us which he thinks right or Anarchist in spite of the fact that the essence of his one-man revolution 'is to be myself'.

I plead ignorance in so far as I do not see Anarchism and Catholicism as compatible, perhaps it does not matter whether one refuses to kill because he thinks it is sinful in the eyes of God Cannot Freedom do something better or whether because life is precious to those who enjoy it and that we are able to credit others with the same feelings. London, Feb. 27. S.F.

Publications Received

Books

Thomas Hodgskin by Elie Halevy (Benn 18/-).

Pamphlets

"Coleccion Radar" rublished by the Editorial Reconstruir, Casilla de Correo 320, Buenos Aires, Argentine. First nine titles: La Voluntad de Poder como Factor Historico by Rocker; Revivindicacion de la Libertad by G. Ernestan; Ni Victimas ni Verdugos by Albert Camus; Antes y Despues de Caseros by Luis Franco; Origen del Socialismo Moderno by Horacia Roqué; El Cooperativismo puede evitar la Guerra by James Warbasse; Capitalismo, Democracia y Socialismo Libertario by A. Souchy; Arte, Poesia, Anarquismo by Herbert Read; Alejandro Korn, Filosofo

de la Libertad by F. Romero. Periodicals

"Information" Anarchist bi-monthly in German (published by H. Freitag,

Hamburg 22, Beim alten Schützenhof 19, Germany). The same publishers also issue a German edition of the bulletins of the C.R.I.A.

"Von unten auf" Blätter für unmittelbare Demokratie Früher "Neues Beginnen" (Berlin SW 29 Postschliessfach).

"Mado" fortnightly in Japanese published by Meidai Higashiyama Branch of the Anti-War League of Japanese Students.

"La Protesta", Anarchist monthly in Spanish (Santander 408, Buenos Aires, Argentina).

"Dissent". A Quarterly of Socialist Opinion (509 Fifth Avenue, New York 17, N.Y. Subscription rates \$3.00 per annum). "Il Ponte", Rivista Mensile di Politica e

Florence, Italy. Subscription rates 4,200 lire per annum). "The World Socialist", Journal of the

Letteratura (Piazza Indipendenza 29.

World Socialist Movement. Monthly 6d.

Man's Responsibility

That Man Poujade!

ad lib.

DEAR COMRADES,

A recent article in FREEDOM besought us to believe in the essential goodness of man. However, it is a circular argument to apply a human value-judgment, such as the sense of good and evil to the human species as a whole. Man cannot be essentially good any more than he is essentially intelligent or stupid (except in comparison with other species, and here the analogy breaks down, because other species have no moral sense). To say that man is essentially good is somewhat analogous to say that more than half of a population have an I.Q. of over 100, since intelligence quotients are defined so that half are over 100, and half under, perhaps I sould mention that I have little faith in I.Q. "measurements", and that I do not carry the analogy so far as to think that half of us are good and half

Since we are inherently capable of distinguishing good from evil, we are also inherently capable of good and evil. Man can only be said to be essentially good, if we add that he is also essentially evil (original sin, if you like), and vice

This also means that a "perfect existence" is impossible. If all things were right and there was no wrong, how could one distinguish between right and wrong? And without being able to dis-

Although an English paper is not quite

the proper medium for venting a con-

troversy on French politics, I feel that

I cannot let S. Parane's sarcasm (Grocer's

France, Feb. 4th) about the Poujade

Poujade is so far the only politician

-or shall we say anti-politician-who

has had the courage to stand up against

the insolence of the tax collector and

the corruption of the parliamentary

As was only to be expected, the suc-

cess of his movement, which is spread-

ing well outside France, has attracted

him a good deal of jealousy, particu-

larly on the part of those softies whose

fight against authoritarian despotism is

confined to meek criticism and whining

In their bitter jealousy, some of these

so-called libertarians have taken to side

with the tax collector, man's most de-

testable enemy; worse than the sergeant

major, for the sergeant major worries

the recruit only during his 18 months'

service, whereas the tax collector tor-

ments the citizen all through his life,

They still believe, or pretend to be-

lieve, these sham libertarians, that the

State needs the taxpayers' money to keep

its machinery going. They apparently

have not yet grasped that the true object

of taxation is to keep the citizen in sub-

jection, to provide hordes of bureaucrats

with soft jobs, and incidentally to foster

mutual suspicion and rancour, on the

age-old principle of "divide and rule";

each taxpayer being made to feel that

his colleague is not paying his proper

share. It has not yet dawned on them

that we have by now reached the stage

where money is only represented by

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT!

February 17 to February 23

London: H.P.S.* 1/6; Esher: J.C.S.* 3/-;

Bronx: J.P. 9/-; Esher: J.C.S.* 5/-; London:

J.S.* 4/-; London: N.B.T. 1/3; Per B.F.

Melbourne Anarchist Group £40; Birming-

Previously acknowledged ... 174 3 4

1956 TOTAL TO DATE ... £216 10

ham: V.S. £1/1/6; Sheffield: P.L. 1/6.

GIFT OF BOOKS: London: A.U.

£216

WEEK 8

SURPLUS

Deficit on Freedom

Contributions received

right up to his death bed.

movement go unchallenged.

DEAR COMRADES,

humbugs.

literature.

tinguish, what meaning would right (and wrong) then have? If one could choose between a "perfect existence" and the ability to distinguish right from wrong, which would be the right choice?

Incidentally, if few men "really" want to dominate or be dominated, if the lust for power is a desire for free-will, and freedom is what we (all) want, perhaps someone could explain to me why we haven't got it.

Although I deplore the attempts by some people to describe man as essentially evil, it is unwise to go to the other extreme and ascribe all his troubles to insane social organisations; to suppose that when these are swept away and/or re-formed, man's essential goodness will reveal itself. For after all, it is man who has set up our "social" organisations, and he must take the blame.

Yours sincerely, Cheltenham, Feb. 18. H. R. LEWIS.

[Surely if our correspondent would stop running round in philosophical circles he would feel less dizzy and would then be able to answer the questions in the penultimate paragraph of his letter himself. Or he might even have had second thoughts about putting the question. But if he insists on an answer, we would suggest that it all depends on what one means by freedom! - EDITORS.

worthless bits of paper which the State

(and the counterfeiters!!!) can turn out

man who was Poujade's first supporter,

but is there any other way of leading an

independent life, of escaping subser-

vience to boss or State? Sure enough

he is out to make as much money as

he can, but so does every individual in

a society where money is held to be the

supreme god. The manual worker is

out to get the highest wage, the white

It is easy to sneer at the small trades-

Active Under Totalitarianism

COMRADES,

Either I failed to make myself clear, or S.F. simply does not want to understand what I mean about seriousness. Assuming that the former is the case, I would like to elucidate my position further.

Let us suppose that the government in England (or the U.S.) were to become as oppressive as that of Franco, in Spain. All forms of anarchist acitivity are outlawed and anyone caught practising them, if not actually sentenced to death, stands a better than even chance of dying of starvation, disease or "accident" in prison. It is my contention that the serious anarchists would be the ones who continued to operate underground -taking whatever precautions possible to avoid arrest-but keeping up the publication and distribution of anarchist literature, proselytising, organizing strikes, etc. regardless of the risks entailed. Is my definition hopelessly old-fashioned? I would really like to know what course of action S.F. would advocate under such circumstances.

> Fraternally, HOLLEY CANTINE.

Bearsville, N.Y. Feb. 16.

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

LECTURE-DISCUSSIONS Every Sunday at 7.30 at

THE MALATESTA CLUB,

32 Percy Street, Tottenham Court Road, W.1. MARCH 4-Rita Milton on ROLE OF THE ANARCHIST IN THE 20th CENTURY

MARCH 11—Philip Sansom on THE CULT OF THE INDIVIDUAL

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

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

LECTURE:

PRINCE KROPOTKIN by Niall MacDermot FRIDAY, MAR. 9th at 8 p.m. at 21 Bedford Square, W.C.1. Organised the Renaissance Club.

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

Round-Table Youth Discussions Friday Evenings at 8.30

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.

Apr. 6. The Political and Social Significance of Science Fiction. Apr. 13. Fascist Trends in America

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 Payee, and addressed to the publishers

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

The Malatesta Club

*Indicates regular contributors.

A S announced last week, The Malatesta Club is re-opening in its new premises on Sunday, March 4th, when the London Anarchist Group recommences its Sunday evening meetings. (See announcements, page 4).

The new address is: SWARAJ HOUSE, 32 PERCY STREET, TOTTENHAM COURT ROAD, LONDON, W.1. and the Club will be open for members

as before from March 5th onwards.

collar man the highest salary! It is rumoured, rightly or wrongly, that Poujade is aiming at dictatorship. If he does, I wish him luck.

A true Anarchist can well direct his own behaviour; he does not want to interfere with anybody, nor anybody with him. But if a ruler is imposed on him against his will, he will certainly be better off with a dictator than with a bunch of some 600 impotent, dishonest parliamentarians, who are solely interested in fattening their bank accounts.

If a dictator does not give satisfaction, it is easy to liquidate him (vide Mussolini, Hitler, Peron). But how could we ever get rid of 600 leaches?

Yours truly, R. ANSAY.

Le Cannet, France, Feb. 20.

[We publish our correspondent's letter as a "collector's piece". It admirably illustrates the points made by Gaston Leval in an article published in translation in the February issue of our American contemporary Views & Comments (available at Freedom Bookshop). He writes:

"I consider it a grave error for us to have defined ourselves with a negation. Anarchy—the negation of 'archies', or hierarchies, of diverse social strata, of rich and of poor, of masters and slaves, government and governed; from which follows equality in law and in fact, in the political and economic spheres, in the pursuit of liberty and in £160 the possibilities of material, intellectual and moral satisfactions.

> Such is the theory. The point of departure remains a negation. And, unfortunately, this negation is what has been spiritually, intellectually and practically imprinted on the minds of everyone from the illiterate to the intellectual. It does not make any difference who declares himself to be an enemy of authority, of law, of government, of the boss, of all discipline and of all responsibility. It suffices to deny in order to be an anarchist. Consequently these negators have often distorted the profound ideas of our thinkers worthy of the name anarchist-Proudhon, Bakunin, Rocker, Kropotkin-or most often have ignored them . . . It can be said, citing Proudhon, that 'all negation implies a subsequent affirmation.' In fact, no such implication need exist in the minds of those who would make such a statement. One can theoretically or instinctively deny authority without conceiving of a nonauthoritarian society, feeling the need of such a society, or struggling for its realization."

Our "anarcho-poujadiste" of Le Cannet is to our minds one of Leval's "negators" who call themselves "anarchists' but who by their utterances have no positive feelings for the free society. -EDITORS].