

In this Issue:

Utopia & Experiment - p. 2

Education in the
Kibbutz - p. 3The Cost of
Bolshevism - p. 4

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

Vol. 17, No. 10

March 10th, 1956

Threepence

U.S. POLITICS Versus CIVIL RIGHTS

AN Assembly for Civil Rights opened a three day conference on March 4th in Washington which was attended by 2,500 delegates from 35 States. The main speaker, Mr. Roy Wilkins, executive secretary of The National Association for the Advancement of Coloured People, laid before the Assembly the successes as well as the failures of integration in the Southern State schools.

He said that over a dozen Southern Universities have admitted over two thousand Negro students since 1950, and that more than a dozen universities have invited Miss Lucy to enter their classes. The principal offending States are Virginia, Alabama, Carolina, Georgia, Mississippi and Louisiana. It is in the State of Alabama where Miss Lucy, a Negro student, has been expelled from the university of Tuscaloosa and where the Negro boycott of public transport in Montgomery, has resulted in over a hundred Negroes being arrested on a conspiracy charge. It is also in Alabama that the State Legislature declared the Supreme Court's decision on desegregation "null, void and of no effect". (The case of Miss Lucy and the boycott have been discussed in recent issues of FREEDOM).

The economic pressure used by the white citizens' councils, which openly express their intention of defying the Supreme Court's ruling, was being adopted to prevent the exercise by citizens of their rights, Mr. Wilkins pointed out that the right of petition has been suppressed by means of denying the petitioners credit, employment, and consumer goods at retail stores. Signers of petitions to school boards have had their mortgages and other loans called in for immediate payment. Small farmers have been denied loans for crops. Workers have been discharged summarily from their jobs. The result was to terrorise citizens so that they dare not assert even their elementary rights.

He further drew attention to the fact that although the judicial and executive branches of Government

"have been responsible for great progress in civil rights, Congress has failed to pass any civil rights measures in 75 years". The connection between this failure and the dominance of Southern legislators in Congress was made abundantly clear. These men are able to make deals with their colleagues from other States, and the seniority rule gave Southern senators the chairmanship of important committees. They are thus in a position to have unlimited debates which "enables endless talks to kill all civil rights measures".

The recent appointment of Senator Eastland, Democrat, Mississippi, as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee does not look as if Congress is intending a re-appraisal of its civil rights law. Eastland is the Senator who said that all nine members of the Supreme Court should be taken before a tribunal because of their ruling on segregation. He is also a leading speaker for the White Citizens' Council, and it is pointed out that in his new post he will have great influence over civil rights and immigration legislation. And will be able to influence the appointment of Federal judges and district attorneys.

It is unlikely, even where deep-rooted prejudices do not exist, that Southern Senators will run the risk of losing precious votes by openly favouring a desegregation policy, or by supporting civil rights laws which could be used in favour of the Negro against the Whites.

But assuming that new laws ever managed to get through Congress, the question arises, are they going to be any more successful in encouraging a reasonable attitude in the prejudiced South, than the supreme court ruling? Or will such measures only add to the fury of the Whites?

The Supreme Court edict, which is a progressive step even although it springs from an authoritarian source, has so far only succeeded in inflaming anti-racial feelings in many of the Southern States. If however, we ignore that martyrdom of the Negroes, can it be said the legislation forced an issue which inevitably had to come about, and that hate and violence is a necessary part of the struggle? The alternative is a slow process of reasoning. But is rational argument possible with irrational people? The anarchists, more than any other group of people advocating social change, realise the sometimes impossible task of reaching prejudiced minds with a reasoned case.

The issues involved in the South are not only racial, but political and

Christianity in America Flourishes

According to *Life* magazine the United States assets in dollars of the various religious denominations in that country are: Roman Catholic \$2,000 million (£700 million), Methodists \$2,700 million (£950 million), Baptists \$1,500 million (£530 million).

World News in Brief

GENERAL STRIKE IN FINLAND

The first General Strike in Finland since 1917 was declared last week. It is being held in support of the unions' demand for a wage increase of more than 5 per cent. because of the higher prices of agricultural produce. The employers have refused to give the increase at present and the farmers have complicated the situation by stating that, if the wages go up, they, as compensation, must be allowed to increase prices.

According to the *Manchester Guardian's* Stockholm Correspondent: "The Social Democrats and Agrarians have tried in vain to intervene and will now, with the help of the new President, have to take up negotiations once more, knowing that the food situation will be critical if the strike goes on for more than a week."

OBJECTIVE ISRAELIS

A plea for justice for Palestine Arabs has been sent to the Secretary General of the United Nations, Mr. Hammarskjöld, by the Israeli Third Force group in Tel Aviv.

"We beg to express to you," say the Group, "our deep sorrow at the failure of the United Nations to fulfil its duty and do justice to the Arabs in Palestine."

"We demand (a) that the Arab refugees be allowed to return to their homes in Israel, and that adequate compensation be paid to those of them who will refuse to return, (b) that the military oppression of, and all discrimination against the Arabs be abolished forthwith, and (c) that all Arab property in Israel be returned to its owners."

The letter was signed by M. Stein, Chairman and A. Zichroni, Secretary.

The Third Force was founded in Tel Aviv in 1951. It aims to reconcile Jew and Arab so that each can cease to be pawns of the East-West struggle for power, and so that the Middle East may prosper.

Associated with the Third Force is IHLA, a group of intellectuals devoted to the solution of the Jewish-Arab problem, and the BUND, a branch of the Social Democratic Labour organisation.

The Israeli press and official circles snub these organisations for their lack of Zionist fervour, and for their fraternal attitude toward the Arab inhabitants of Israel and the Arab refugees over the border.

The Secretary of the Third Force, 25-year-old Amnon Zichroni, hit the world's headlines in the summer of 1954 by fasting 23 days rather than submit to military service.

(Peace News).

We should qualify our heading for this interesting item from a Peace News correspondent by saying that the heading refers to the attitude to the Arab refugees, not to their disappointment with the United Nations.

NEWSPAPER CIRCULATION UP IN U.S.

Newspaper circulation in the United States broke all records last year—according to the eighty-eighth annual edition of N. W. Ayer and Son's Directory of Newspapers and Periodicals. It said the combined circulation of all English language dailies reached 55,837,000 daily by the end of 1955. This was an increase of nearly a million copies daily over the previous year's figure. An analysis of circulation shows: American evening newspapers, 33,720,000 daily, an increase of more than eight hundred thousand copies.

Morning papers, 21,327,000 daily, a gain of 90,000, and Sunday papers, 46,044,000, an increase of more than 220,000 copies.

A slight drop in the number of daily newspapers was reported, "due to the merger trend." There are now, including both English language and foreign language papers, 1,498 evening papers (up 13); 336 morning papers (down 34); 549 Sunday papers (down 25); and seven all-day dailies (up 2).—*Reuter*.

The real question is: are the Americans better informed or more intelligent as a result of the increased circulation? We doubt it.

"The wisdom of one generation will be the folly of the next, and . . . yet we persist in making preceding generations dictate to the succeeding ones."

—DR. PRIESTLEY.

Canon Collins on S. African Affairs

AN OUTSPOKEN CHURCHMAN

IT is not often that a member of the hierarchy of the Church of England takes a strong stand on social matters. Distinguishing himself in this way is Canon L. Collins, chairman of Christian Action and precentor of St. Paul's Cathedral.

He has been an outspoken advocate of the abolition of capital punishment, and for a long time has shown great interest in African affairs.

Last Sunday he called for a world protest against the South African Government's action in removing coloured voters in Cape Province from the common electoral roll. Canon Collins referred in a statement to "the abominable trick tactics of the bitter racist Strydom (the Prime Minister) and his henchmen," and added that it was to be hoped that the Supreme Court of Justice would once again stand firm against the encroachments of the Nationalist party upon its freedom and authority. It seemed, however, that the South African Government hoped "to corrupt the judiciary, as Hitler did in Germany."

"The Opposition [Canon Collins continued] has earned no credit in this sorry affair. This should cause us no surprise, for, with few exceptions, the Opposition members of the South African Parliament are also racials. They have not opposed the bill on principle, because they are without principle in this matter. They have opposed it only on grounds of political expediency, and, on the question of what is politically expedient, they are babes compared with the Nationalists."

"The United party and the Nationalist party are one in their determination to preserve white supremacy in South Africa and to safeguard a supply of cheap black labour. It is to be hoped that all who seek for racial equality in

their cause, and if they are prepared to force the whites by the methods they have adopted to finally accept the legal ruling, our sympathies are with them in their struggle. But we are convinced that no human relationship of any value can be brought about if one side is accepting the other merely on sufferance. It will be a long time before the herrenvolk in the South will accept the Negro as an equal. It will be the rising generation who, turning their backs on tradition, may forge the way with a new set of values.

the world will make the strongest possible protest in words and action against this unchristian legislation in South Africa."

Why not a shorter week?

SHORT-TIME working in the car industry is now estimated to be affecting more than twenty thousand workers in the Midlands.

But apart from paying a visit to No. 10 Downing Street, the TUC does not seem to have any ideas on what should be the answer from the workers' point of view.

At the Standard car works at Coventry, an attempt was made to rally the workers for a demand for a 36-hour week all round, instead of the company's scheme for standing off 250 men per day on a rota system. But the shop stewards' committee refused to support the attempt, made by the chairman of the committee, Bill Warman, a former Communist municipal candidate.

Warman is reported to have said:

"We do not accept short-time working. Production should be cut by a shorter working week and reduced efficiency for the same pay. We increased production by working harder and now we should just not work so hard. We have been advocating a 36-hour week at Standards."

We agree with Warman here. If the workers' efforts have filled the market's requirements as expressed in a money economy, then they should enjoy greater leisure without lowered standards of living.

Anarchist Comment on MOTOR CAR TESTS

THE government's proposed bill to make the testing of older cars compulsory could be interpreted politically in a number of different ways according to one's own particular little *bete noire*. Some might say that it is significant that the bill should be introduced at a time when the motor car industry is introducing short-time as a result of a falling-off in sales; others might point a finger at the traffic chaos on British roads and suggest that the government is trying to solve it by driving the old cars off the roads, penalising the poor man so that the rich may drive faster and more furiously! Or there are those of us who may see it all as a conspiracy with the garage proprietors and the makers of spare parts, or as the result of pressure from the Insurance Companies who complain that Motor Insurance is a dead loss!

We will be more charitable than these suspicious supporters of government (whose support so often wilts when they feel the hand of an official pickpocket reaching for their wallets), and assume that the reason for the Bill is an attempt to tackle

one aspect of the problem of the ever-growing toll of life and limb on the highways of this country. For the anarchist the problem, the measures proposed by the government, the public reaction to it, illustrate in a practical way our objections to the society we live in and, to our mind, confirm the validity of our contention that anarchy is not "utopia" but a way of life which, besides being conducive to happiness, is a common-sense way of finding solutions to the everyday problems of life.

★
IT seems to us quite clear that thousands of drivers on the roads to-day are aware of the fact that their vehicles are unsafe. Many of them if asked what they thought about the abolition of hanging would, with emotion in their voices, declare that it should be retained as we could not "risk" having murderers at large threatening their wives and children. Yet they would be the last to suggest that their dangerous cars should be removed to a car dump out of harm's way! In

Continued on p. 3

UTOPIA AND EXPERIMENT

TO-DAY, only the naive believe that the sole function of words is to communicate thought. Words have emotive as well as descriptive purposes and frequently the emotive content overshadows the descriptive. "Utopian" and "scientific" are two such words. Marx, cashing in on the prestige attached to the physical sciences of his day, labelled his own ideology "scientific" and that of his socialist predecessors "utopian"—and found fools ready to accept his implied evaluation. The practical application of so-called "scientific socialism" in the present century, however, has led to a questioning of the Marxist categories and to a revival of interest in the "utopians" who had been so contemptuously dismissed.

In a remarkable book, *Paths in Utopia* (1949), Martin Buber took up the theme of utopian versus scientific socialism and with a wealth of insights clarified the two concepts. In his view the contrast between the two, reduced to its simplest terms, could be expressed as follows: Scientific socialism was "necessitarian" and "apocalyptic"; Utopian socialism was "voluntaryistic" and "prophetic". Both were equally "utopian" so far as the final goal—a free society—was concerned, but the former held that the perfect society would arrive after the final revolution when the state had 'withered away' and humanity was in a position to "leap out of the realm of necessity into the realm of freedom". Utopian socialism, on the other hand, held that the perfect society, if it was ever to come, had to be prepared for by immediate attacks upon, and remedies for, the evils of existing society. The means advocated by Marxism were compulsion, centralisation, regimentation: the means advocated by utopian socialism were individual initiative, voluntary association, and communal autonomy.

Having cleared the ground, Buber proceeded to trace the concepts through a series of contrasting systems of thought: those of Marx, Lenin and Stalin on the one hand, and those of Proudhon, Kropotkin and Landauer, on the other. The

one set of systems was based primarily on political action, set all its hopes on revolution, and considered the centralised state an indispensable instrument: the other set of systems—those of Marx's antagonists—rested primarily on social action, pinned its hopes on restructuring of society, and insisted on the decentralized, autonomous community as the chief means of realizing its ultimate goal.

The immediate inspiration of Buber's book was his contact with the Israeli *Kibbutzim*. To him, the experience of these Jewish co-operative settlements demonstrated that the assumptions of utopian socialism were correct: the *Kibbutz* was "the experiment that did not fail". Henrik Infield, the author of the book under review,* has also been inspired by the same events. But, as those who have read his account of them in *Co-operative Living in Palestine* will know, his approach is that of the sociologist rather than the social philosopher. In the essay which gives its name to the title of his latest book, he points to the inadequacies of Buber's approach. Buber, conscious of the fallacies of Marxism, contrasts the utopian and the scientific way of thinking and then proceeds to give a new turn to the issue between utopian and scientific socialism. The old argument is reversed. Since Marxism has proved itself wrong, therefore utopian socialism must be right. The conclusion is thus: return to Utopia.

Despite its plausibility, the argument fails to stand up to close ex-

*UTOPIA AND EXPERIMENT by Henrik Infield. Praeger, New York, 1955.

amination. Its main weakness lies in its "either-or" character. Such fundamental dichotomies, however, have little relevance to social facts. Social reality, as Infield points out, does not consist of absolute entities in logical juxtaposition but of continuous variables of one or another kind of behaviour. In this respect, Landauer comes nearer than Buber to the sociologist's approach when he defines the state as "a condition, a certain relationship between human beings, a mode of human behaviour; we destroy it by contracting other relationships, by behaving differently". Seen in this way, it is no longer helpful to be presented with the alternative: either utopian or scientific socialism. Buber himself, indeed, is dimly aware of this when he points out the "hidden" utopian elements in scientific socialism and it would be just as easy to show the scientific elements in utopianism. In these circumstances, it makes little sense to speak of science and utopia as mutually exclusive categories.

What Buber was in fact unconsciously trying to do was to remove the perjorative emotive associations attached to the word "utopian". But it is doubtful whether it is worthwhile to continue to use the term in this context at all. As Infield pertinently asks, why classify as "utopian" a community like the Hutterite which has existed now for 400 years and is still growing?

The distinguishing feature of the libertarian as opposed to the State socialist tradition (whether Marxist or Fabian) is not in fact its utopianism but its emphasis, particularly marked in communitarian socialism,

Continued on p. 4

THEATRE

'THE THREEPENNY OPERA'

"The Beggar's Opera" was written as a 'Newgate Pastoral'. It has the unreality and period charm of contemporary poems about nymphs and shepherds. "The Threepenny Opera" freely adapted from it by Bert Brecht and Kurt Weill transfers the scene to Soho at the turn of the century and contains such powerful social criticism that it is not surprising to learn that the original German production in the twenties met with violent opposition from the Nazis. In the present production at the Royal Court Theatre, some of the bitterness has been toned down though it has sufficient bite for us to find modern counterparts to the Soho parson and the corrupt Commissioner of Police.

A street-singer (Ewan MacColl) introduces the show with the seedy dignity of the lantern-lecturer, three musicians take their places in the band-stand at the back of the stage and the opera begins. Soon we see the shop of Mr. Peachum, where, like Fagin's house in "Oliver Twist", apprentices are enrolled and the poor are taught to get money from the rich. Here Peachum, a heavy Germanic figure, well played by Eric Pohlmann, shows how the consciences of the wealthy can be wrung by the clever beggar. Bill Owen, not so well cast as Mac the Knife, acts the part of a small criminal with competent assurance. His wedding reception in a warehouse speedily decked out with stolen goods by his henchmen provides some delightful clowning, a charming song by Polly Peachum (Daphne Anderson) and a duet between Mac and his friend the Police Commissioner in scarlet jacket, who sing of their past exploits together in the Army, mowing down the Indian natives. Mac earns the hatred of the Peachum parents who betray him through a discarded sweetheart when he is enjoying himself in a Wapping brothel. The action moves to the condemned cell where Mac caged and deserted passes his last hours. Then at the scaffold we get a 'grand opera' happy ending with the Commissioner riding in on a vast card-

board cut-out horse with a free pardon. "But life is not like that," says Mac, stepping down from the gallows. In real life the poor stay poor and the little criminals model themselves on the big criminals in power. Finally the crowd moves off, the stage-hands begin to dismantle the scenery and life goes on. F.T.

FREEDOM OF ASSEMBLY

A meeting to protest against the visit of Mr. Khrushchev and Marshal Bulganin to this country in April, which was to have been held in the Royal Albert Hall on March 25, has been cancelled by the management of the hall. After accepting the original booking, the management informed the organisers yesterday that, owing to changed circumstances, they would have to cancel it.

This was stated late last night by Mr. Horko, the editor of the *London Polish Daily*, who was one of the main sponsors of the meeting, at which Mr. Malcolm Muggeridge, Mr. Tufton Beamish, M.P., Mr. Christopher Hollis, Mr. Robert Willis, and Mr. Tom O'Brien, M.P., were invited to speak. It appears that the Albert Hall authorities consider that new circumstances have arisen which might involve the risk of damage being caused to the hall.

We are not concerned with the political views of the organisers (nor the curious assortment of speakers chosen for the occasion) in drawing attention to this ban which one cannot help feeling is government inspired. "Freedom of Assembly" is a basic tenet of democracy... except when it may be embarrassing to the government!

Have you introduced any new readers to FREEDOM this year?

'The Freest Society on Earth'?

ON Sunday, 12th February, a debate was held at the Malatesta Club on the motion 'That the Soviet Union is the freest society on Earth.'

In opposing, Donald Room gathered together material which we think will be of interest to the readers of FREEDOM, and to that end we publish below his notes for the debate.

WHEN anarchists wish to illustrate by examples their assertions about the behaviour of rulers, they usually choose the particular régime which governs themselves and their audiences. Generally speaking, this is most useful. The British anarchist has access to up-to-date and fairly accurate information about British affairs, which the listener can check at will; and if the listener believes in the essential rightness of any régime, it is most likely to be the British.

Not infrequently, though, in the revolutionary movement, one meets a person who has been more impressed by the propaganda of another particular régime, that of the USSR. Such a person will readily accept what one says about Western governments (if not one's right to say it), but will demand positive proof, that one's assertions about rulers apply equally to the particular rulers they choose to feel patriotic about.

Here one is faced with two problems of information. The first is that the anarchist is rarely as informed about Soviet affairs as his opponent appears to be. This would seem to be a matter merely of reading a few books on the subject; but which books?

This is the second problem. Practically all the literature on the USSR which is available to English readers can be classified under two heads: Soviet propaganda and Anti-Soviet propaganda. These classes wildly contradict each other on points of fact; each, on occasion, contradicts itself. Some of the information must be completely false; much of it is probably incorrect. All of it is liable to challenge.

To solve both these problems, close reference to the scholarly work of Professor W. W. Kulski is recommended. His particular method of observing the Soviet régime from outside is to study Soviet legal documents—edicts and statutes issued from time to time by the Soviet of People's Commissars and the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, directives issued by the Supreme Court for

the guidance of Judges, and textbooks and manuals of law published by the Ministry of Justice and the Academy of Sciences.

Documentation

Professor Kulski cannot claim impartiality, but he makes no statement not supported by a quotation from some document, and no quotation without the precise name, date and page reference of the document concerned. Such scholastic discipline results in certain difficulties of style; but it has the overriding advantage that all his facts can be checked. (He found his documents mainly in the Library of Congress, and they are presumably available in equivalent institutions in this country; and I am told the Society for Cultural Relations, 14 Kensington Square, makes translations from Russian).

In what follows, all references to works published in Russia are taken from Professor Kulski's book, with occasional words altered (e.g. "unlawful" for "illegitimate", "transport" for "transportation") to conform with British usage.

THE WORKER AND THE LAW

A sixpenny pamphlet published last year by the British Soviet Friendship Society, *What are these Soviet Trade Unions?* tells us that:

The standard working day is eight hours, six days a week*; night shift is seven hours, paid as eight. In arduous trades the working day is shorter².

Leaving special trades aside for the moment, let us investigate the legal position of the Standard Russian Worker, working the standard six-day week according to standard regulations.

Rule 10 of the *Standard Rules of the Internal Labour Order* summarizes the employee's obligations as follows:

- Workers and officials are bound:
- (1) to work honestly and conscientiously;
 - (2) to observe labour discipline and abide strictly by the rules... and to execute quickly and exactly the instructions of the management;
 - (3) to come to work punctually, observe exactly and without any infractions the established length of the

*Since this article was written, it has been announced to the All-Union Communist Party conference that the standard working week has been reduced to 41 hours.—D.R.

work day, use the whole work time exclusively for productive work, not to waste time on any outside matters or idle talk, not to loiter without purpose and not to distract others from their work;

(4) to execute promptly and exactly the given tasks, to fulfill the norms of output and try systematically to overfulfill these norms, to take care of the high quality of work and prevent defective output;

(5) to take care of the socialist property;

(6) to observe regulations of safety, hygiene and fire prevention, and to use protective devices;

(7) to clean up on time one's working stand and leave it to the next worker in exemplary condition.³

Possible Penalties

And Rule 20 summarizes the penalties which may be imposed by the management:

The following disciplinary penalties are imposed for infractions against labour discipline: (a) observation, (b) reprimand, (c) severe reprimand, (d) transfer to another lower paid job, for a period of up to three months, or demotion to a lower post.⁴

So far, it looks as if labour discipline in Russia is much the same as labour discipline anywhere. Of course, if one believes that people should work because they want to, and not because of coercion by their employers' representatives, works discipline anywhere is quite bad enough. But those who accept the rightness or necessity of labour discipline as it exists, say, in this country, cannot really complain about Russian labour discipline as set out in the *Standard Rules*. Given that the management can, as a last resort, move an employee to a lower-paid job, it is unlikely that the worker who turns up at work twenty minutes late, because he missed the bus, will get anything worse than a ticking off from the foreman.

However, this does not apply to the case of a worker turning up twenty-one minutes late. His case is not dealt with by the *Standard Rules* at all, but by an Edict issued by the Council of People's Commissars jointly with the Trade Unions, on June 26, 1940. According to this edict, "coming to work more than twenty minutes late" constitutes willful absence,⁵ and willful absence is "no longer... a disciplinary infraction, but a criminal offence with all the resulting consequences".⁶

The worker who is twenty-one minutes

late, in other words, is prosecuted; and the courts are empowered to award him "corrective labour at the place of employment for up to six months, with a reduction of wages of up to twenty-five per cent".⁷ Here again, it is not suggested that the maximum penalty for unlawful absence is usually awarded, especially not to the occasional bus-misser; but the fact remains it can be awarded at the courts discretion. And if any sentence is given, it entails loss of sick benefit for six months!

'Willful' Must be Proved

It must be added that "willful" is an operative word in the charge of "willful absence". As early as 1930, when absence was still a matter of days and punishable by the management, the People's Commissariat of Labour got out a list of six lawful reasons for absence from work (such as illness, sudden death of a close relative, and being called to serve as a People's Assessor),⁸ all of which still apply. And in the absence of lawful reasons for absence, it is a defence to show that the absence is not the absentee's fault.

A legal textbook gives this example:

Two workers have overslept and have been late to work by more than twenty minutes; both seem to have committed willful absence for unlawful reasons. One of them has overslept and been late through his own negligence, and must answer for the offence of willful absence.

But the other has overslept because of a hooligan act on the part of his neighbour (who, for instance, moved back the hands of the clock in the worker's bedroom) and been late through no fault of his own. He may not be prosecuted.⁹

(The courts, by the way, regard negligence as an extenuating circumstance, and the intention to be late as an aggravating circumstance). D.R.

(To be continued)

1. W. W. Kulski, *The Soviet Régime. Communism in Practice*. Syracuse University Press, 1954.
2. B.S.F.S., *What are these Soviet Trade Unions? A Pocket Cyclopaedia*. British Soviet Friendship Society, November 1955, p. 12.
3. *Standard Rules of the Internal Labour Order for Workers and Officials of State, Co-operative and Public Enterprises and Offices*. Enacted by the Council of People's Commissars, January 18, 1941. Rule 10.
4. *Ibid.*, Rule 20.
5. *Edict of the Council of People's Commissars and the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions*, June 26, 1940. Article 5, para 2, section 1.
6. N. G. Alexandrov, V. M. Dogadov, P. D. Kaminskaya and A. E. Pashernik *Voprosy Pravoosovetskogo Prava* Institute of Law of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR 1948, pp. 14.
7. *Edict of June 1940*.
8. *Edict of the People's Commissariat of Labour*, December 17, 1931.
9. Z. A. Vishinskaya *Prisutstveniya v oblasti trudovoykh otosheniy* All Union Institute of Juristic Sciences of the Ministry of Justice, 1949, p. 54.

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.

New Books . . .

Seven Fugues Giovanni Baldelli 7/6
New Handbook on Hanging Charles Duff 10/6
The Great French Revolution Peter Kropotkin (2 vols.) set 12/6

Reprint . . .

The Prince Niccolò Machiavelli 2/-

Special Offer . . .

Orgone Energy Bulletin, Vol. 5, Nos. 3 and 4, September 1953. Bibliography on Orgonomy 1920-1952. Published 20/- Our price 5/-

Second-Hand . . .

Instincts of the Herd in Peace and War W. Trotter 3/-
Martyrdom of Man Winwood Reade 2/6
Plato Clifton W. Collins 2/6
Totem and Taboo Sigmund Freud 2/6
Christianity, Slavery and Labour Chapman Cohen 3/-
Thus and Thus Henri Barbusse 4/-
Flight to Arras Antoine de Saint-Exupéry 4/6
Night Flight Antoine de Saint-Exupéry 3/6
Wind, Sand and Stars Antoine de Saint-Exupéry 3/-
I Was One of the Unemployed Max Cohen 2/6
The Acquisitive Society R. H. Tawney 3/-
Rudin Ivan Turgenev 2/6

Periodicals . . .

Views and Comments February, No. 11 3d.

Postage free on all items

Obtainable from

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

COMMENT ON MOTOR CAR TESTS

Continued from p. 1

neither case are they being very objective, and in both cases they show a marked lack of responsibility.

The driver of an "unsatisfactory" car is not in that position by choice. Obviously driving in these circumstances is more difficult and a greater nervous strain is imposed on him as a result. Apart from those who suffer from the disease of meanness, these drivers cannot afford the exorbitant charges made by garages for repairs and replacements; they are the victims both of their own impecuniosity and the garage racket. They are often also the victims of the second-hand car dealers who sell them "a pup". These are the motorists who will be driven off the roads by the Tests. They do not all have cars for pleasure; in country districts in particular, many small men in the distributive trades render valuable service to people who live in isolated areas, bringing milk, bread, meat, fish and coals to their doorsteps, in their dilapidated vans or in high-horse-powered saloons that have known better times! The fact that their vehicles are their livelihood carries greater weight in their judgment than the fact that it may be the cause of someone's death. A dilemma, we submit, which could only exist in a society based on competition, economic insecurity and the money system.

The government is the symbol of that society which creates, among others, the situation in which potential killer-cars are using the roads. It seeks a solution, which is only a partial one, penalises the weakest (which it always does because it cannot do otherwise in a society based on privilege) and creates new problems.

The proposed Bill once approved, will take anything from a year to eighteen months to be put into operation. So it can be assumed that it may be some two years before this road-safety measure will be showing any results. So much for the efficiency of centralised government.

Governments have stereotyped minds; so are their solutions. It makes no difference whether they are dealing with V.D. or cars, the answer is "periodic tests". The proposal is that old cars should obtain their test certificates once a year, just as French prostitutes obtain theirs every so many months, and just as it does not prevent them from catching the disease in between tests and passing it on, neither will it prevent all kinds of mechanical defects developing in tested vehicles in between tests which will render them dangers to human life ("within the meaning of the Act"!)). It is once more the palliative, the "better than nothing" attitude, the authoritarian approach which cannot (by definition) even consider the fostering of self-responsibility.

★

FURTHERMORE the authoritarian solution creates new problems as its by-products. The official Test system requires *Examiners*, men with the authority to let you drive off from the Test with a light heart, to drive you to the car's graveyard or into the clutches of the motor mechanics at your garage. The government in its bill proposes to give "any person aggrieved" with the verdict the right "to appeal to the Minister, who will cause another examination to be made". A democratic gesture perhaps, but surely also a reflection of the general distrust that exists in society to-day.

This is again evidenced in another provision in the bill which fixes that "the penalty for a person falsely representing himself to be or to be employed by an authorised examiner will be a fine not exceeding £100 or three months' imprisonment, or both". And what of the genuine examiner who for a consideration turns a blind eye to your defective headlights, or steers clear of your faulty steering?

One has only to use the roads to question the value of driving tests as a means of guaranteeing safe driving on the roads. The test at the most is a guarantee that at the time when it was taken the driver was able to perform certain manoeuvres and was familiar with the highway code (some male drivers question whether their sisters submit themselves to the same examination). But it does not ascertain whether psychologically he or she is a fit person to sit behind a steering wheel. The sense of power, the unbalancing effect produced on many people when they drive a car, a bus, or lorry is notorious. Again, has this not something to do with the kind of world we live in? Bad "road manners" are as much a part of the morality of competitive society, as big-business and differentials. All are concerned with the results. *How* they achieve them, *at whose expense*, is not their concern.

★

IN the anarchist society—that is the society in which government no longer functions, because initiative and responsibility have passed to the people; in which the money system has ceased to exist, because competition, production for profit and privileges have disappeared; where status is no longer measured by wage packets, and success by the bank balance—in the anarchist society, we were saying, there will be no problem of "dangerous" cars. No one will for economic reasons be obliged to drive an unroadworthy vehicle; there will be no garages waiting to fleece the innocent, or dealers to pull a fast one. It will be a routine matter to ensure that cars are frequently subjected to safety tests (just as it is even to-day in public services such as the railways, bus-services and airlines).

What is more in an anarchist society no one will be so obsessed or conditioned by economic insecurity and the pressure of time, to allow such considerations to override their awareness that the vehicle they are driving is a potential danger to *their own lives* as well as to the lives of others.

Finally, the anarchist society offers the only real solution to death on the roads through the possession of leisure. The cult of speed is to-day not only an important weapon in the competitive economic war but also a means to escape periodically from it. We believe that in a society in which there is sufficient leisure cars and aeroplanes will lose much of their "glamour". Our long-distance travelling will be by train, coach or boat but we shall do a lot more walking, at last feasting our eyes on the real beauty of nature, learning to hear instead of shutting out noise, and feeding our imagination with the realities of this planet instead of the escapist science-fiction of outer space.

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT! WEEK 9

Deficit on Freedom £180
Contributions received £226
SURPLUS £46

February 24th—March 1st

Northwood: E.H. £1; London: J.S.* 4/-;
London: N.B.T.* 1/9; Paterson: D.V. 14/-;
E. Boston: Aurora Club £5/5/8; Keithley:
S.B. 3/-; Sheffield: H.W. 2/6; Birkenhead:
G.H.W. 13/-; London: Anon. 1/3; Esher:
J.C.S.* 5/-; Tiffin: W.R. £1/3/6.

Total ... 9 13 8

Previously acknowledged ... 216 10 1

1956 TOTAL TO DATE ... £226 3 9

GIFTS OF BOOKS: London: A.U.; London: B.J.

*Indicates regular contributors.

Education and Child-Upbringing in the Kibbutz

DURING 1951-52 a research study of life in an Israeli Kibbutz was undertaken by an American Assistant Professor of Anthropology, Melford E. Spiro, aided by the Social Science Research Council. A paper, devoted to his findings in the field of education and child-upbringing there, appeared in the April 1955 issue of the *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*.

The value of this study lies in its objectivity. This is not in itself a prime virtue, but it is necessary to separate objective facts from personal opinions, even if only so that they can be re-synthesised more rationally. It should be noticed that the account reviewed below is only a description of one community, and that as has been pointed out in recent articles in *FREEDOM*, changes have taken place in the internal structures of the Kibbutzim and in their relevance to Israeli society, since 1952.

The conscious attitudes lying behind their formation along the fairly well-known lines, are stated by Spiro as follows:

"The founders of Kiryat Yedidim were E. E. Jews who had rebelled, among other things, against the differential status of the family structure of both their Jewish and European cultures. The traditional family, they felt, was characterized by the subjection of the wife to her husband and by the subservience of the child to the father. Moreover, they charged, the division of labour that characterized the family and which in turn, was a reflection of the broader social system, confined the woman to the home, relegated her to the rôle of housewife and precluded her participation in the economic, cultural and political life of the community. These 'evils' they proposed to exclude from their society the so-called 'double standard'; eliminating the marriage ceremony; creating communal institutions—a communal dining room, laundry, etc., which would free the woman from her rôle as housewife and enable her to work in the larger kibbutz economy; and by instituting a system of 'collective education' which would free the mother from the responsibility of child-rearing and at the same time would remove the mother from the patriarchal authority of the family."

The actual arrangement of the child's life is determined by the structure of the Kibbutz. During the first six months of a baby's life he is not taken into his parents' own rooms, but lives in an infants' dormitory in a group of sixteen babies of the same age, under the care of a head nurse and two assistants, who are all specially trained in child-care, but at the same time are themselves members of the Kibbutz. This fact appears at first sight to imply a separation of the infant from its mother, but this is not the case. The mother comes into the dormitory to feed it, six times a day at first, and while she is there plays with it and tucks it in bed. The father visits the child for an hour in the evenings, and on Saturdays and holidays the parents are free to visit it together and play together on the lawn and porch, as well as in the dormitory. The writer concluded through observation of this system at work, that:

"It is not unlikely that the kibbutz infant has as much opportunity for interaction with his mother as has the infant raised in a private home."

It would be interesting to investigate further the attitudes of the adults to this

matter, particularly in view of the seemingly fixed times which parents spend with their young. The dangers present in the relations between parents and a child are to some degree connected with the possibility of the adults taking out of the child the satisfaction that they fail to find in each other, and to interpose barriers of social organisation to minimise any possibility of this, appears to represent a self-conscious, and praiseworthy attempt to protect their children from their own weaknesses. The decisive experiment along these lines would be to do away with barriers of this type and see to what extent a spontaneous relationship developed which did not have any unhealthy ingredients. It is not specifically stated with what rigidity the hours of parental contact are enforced.

AT the age of six months the parents are allowed to take their child to their own room for an hour each day, and at one year he is transferred to the Toddler's Dormitory. Here the group is reduced to eight, and they learn to feed themselves efficiently, and are gradually toilet-trained (sinister phrase!). A nursery teacher joins the group and it moves into the kindergarten building. During this period the children live according to a loose time-table, eating communally and dividing their day between organized and free play and educational activities with the teacher.

Between the ages of six and twelve the group passes through a junior school, which contains such features of Western progressive education as the use of the project method, informal relations between children and teachers, the participation of the children in choice of the curriculum, and the absence of exams. During this time each child works for one hour each day in the economic life of the community, a feature which would probably be disapproved of among English progressive theorists.

On entering high school at twelve, a large change takes place in that for the first time children now meet male adults other than their father, and come into contact with "strangers" from outside their own community. They are now expected to do from 1½ to 3 hours' work daily for the kibbutz economy, and gain wide experience of different kinds of work. They are not regarded as members of the adult community (despite the fact that they work under its organisation, but instead have a "children's society" which has the power of organizing its social programme, plans the school curriculum, and takes its own measures against those of its members which it regards as anti-social.

A free attitude towards child sexuality is adopted by the nurses, and specific sex education takes place corresponding to the children's age group. For a rea-

Shopkeeper in Disguise?

We are told by apologists of Pougade that his is a movement of small-shopkeepers fighting the authorities. They may find it a little embarrassing to learn that the Pougadist deputy, M. Jean Dides, who was fined by a Paris court for slander last week, is himself a former police inspector!

CHILDREN IN HOSPITAL

A SICK child entering hospital has a double burden to bear, that of illness combined with new institutional surroundings and the sudden loss of mother and family. Yet at the end of 1954, 506 of the 1,362 hospitals in Gt. Britain admitting children did not allow daily visiting.

For eight years an Australian hospital children's ward has allowed unrestricted visiting at any time of the day or night (*Lancet*, Nov. 5, 1955). Parents and relatives of their own accord spread their visits over the day by arrangement between themselves. Usually there are one to five visitors present, seldom is there no visitor. On admission the child is settled in by the parent and the children are always told the truth.

As well as entertaining their own and other children, if parents are reliable they are encouraged to assist with simple treatment and to stay with the children during any unpleasant treatment. Although it was not expected, even the domestic staff encouraged their help with the children's dietary likes and dislikes.

The child benefits by a feeling of security in his new surroundings and the hospital staff gain knowledge of the family background. The parents gain

confidence in the hospital and are assured of no covering up. Their knowledge of nursing is increased and the nursing staff have found their criticisms mostly constructive. Essential hospital routine is prevented from unnecessary rigidity.

The feeling of camaraderie that springs up between parents and staff has even extended to mutual aid for a family in financial difficulties, and experience in maintaining personal relationship and handling of people invaluable to nurses and doctors alike.

A big disadvantage is that parents persist in asking nurses for information when they should ask the sister in charge; they telephone the doctor about minor matters and complain of small things, occasionally oblivious of life-saving treatment that is being given.

The success depends upon the human understanding, tact and personality of the sister in charge.

Having in the past been enraged by the apparent aloof and secretive attitude of hospital staffs I feel that the conclusion, unrestricted visiting, ministers to the emotional needs of the child, which should supplement the emotional needs of the parent as well.

son which is not explained pre-school children are not permitted to sleep with heterosexual friends. For a short period, round about 10-13 they go through a phase of unisexual gangs and hostility towards the opposite sex, a feature which it is sometimes held would disappear in a completely free society.

In discussing adolescence, Spiro writes: "By middle adolescence boys and girls display heterosexual interests. Kibbutz culture, it will be remembered, is entirely 'enlightened' concerning sexual matters. There is no taboo on premarital sexuality, and there is considerable experimentation before marriage. Nevertheless Kiryat Yedidim (the fictitious name used in this paper), frowns on adolescent sexuality not because of puritanical attitudes, but because it is felt that the encouragement of sexual relationships would serve to deflect the students' interests and energies from their (more important) intellectual, ideological and social activities. If a couple is obviously in love, however, the high school authorities do not interfere with their activities."

This attitude is one which one would equate theoretically with a group of adults who believed intellectually in sexual freedom, but who themselves had had a certain amount of trouble obtaining it in their own lives, and who consequently have a feeling lurking at the backs of their minds that things shouldn't be too easy for the next generation. Despite that, the atmosphere seems to be much freer than in societies more closely under the grip of some government or other, and one would think that if a young couple who wanted to make love were accosted by an adult with the words "Come on you two, don't waste time like that, come and join in our intellectual, ideological and social activities!" they would reply with an appropriate gesture. It is not surprising to read that adolescent culture does not include dating, social dancing, make up, smoking, drinking, expensive or fancy clothes.

IN spite (or perhaps because) of the organised nature of early parent-child relations, and the rôle played by nurses, children have a tender and loving orientation towards their parents, and always look forward to seeing them. Probably the combination of care by the mother and efficiency in the nursing staff eliminate the necessity of the mother to deny attention to the child when he is calling for it, and certainly prevent him from being a great burden to the mother. By restricting the duration of their contacts, they greatly enrich the content.

Besides its nurses and parents the child's life is closely tied up with that of its age-group, to the extent in fact, where it is difficult for an individual to attain personal privacy. This seems an unfortunate fault, whether it is deliberate policy or caused by force of circumstance. The importance of the "peer group" relative to the parents was brought out by a series of tests, in the course of which the entire age range from 6-17, when asked what things they would be praised for or ashamed of, and who would do the praising, mentioned situations involving their fellow children or youths. Similarly, happiness and displeasure were brought about by the peer group rather than by adults.

As far as the internal structure of this system is concerned, it succeeds remarkably well. Although members of the Kibbutz have plenty of chances to learn of the outside world, and each high school student must live in the city for at least one year, every single child who has been educated in this way has chosen to stay in it afterwards. The survival of this kind of society depends on a character structure in which the accepted Western capitalist values play only a small part, and the upbringing experiences tend to produce such people without much obvious compensatory weakness. The social responsibility is assumed out of a feeling of identity with the rest of the group, and not from fear of organized unpleasant consequences.

The writer, in concluding his paper, remarks that the system of education described has proved to be successful within its own frames of reference, but declines to say, in effect, whether the characters produced are desirable.

A non-progressive person to whom a society such as the above were described would probably retort: "It would never work, and even if it did it would be immoral and un-Christian, and no one would be happy". The evidence, of which the paper reviewed above forms a valuable addition, refutes the first part of that statement, and readers of *FREEDOM* will probably subjectively refute the second. The next important step is to decide what relevance it has for us in England now, and to incorporate our conclusions into our activities. P.H.

J.S.

The End of the Stalin Myth The Cost of Bolshevism

WE discussed last week how, in our opinion, all Marxists have in their ideology the seed of corruption which Stalin cultivated to the extreme, in that they seek to establish a Libertarian society (they say) by authoritarian means.

When most socialists criticised Stalin's régime, then, there was a hint of 'holier than thou' hypocrisy because of the suspicion that, given the power, they could go the same way. And indeed we have only to make allowances for the different circumstances (economic development, political experience, etc.) to see in the British Labour Party, when it was in power, an attitude towards individual liberty, a calculated opportunism, and a preparedness to use violence in defence of the State's interest, that was different only in degree from the practice of Bolshevism. Given the necessity to establish totalitarianism here the Labour Party would not flinch from its duty.* Nor, of course, would any other Marxist party in similar circumstances.

What most socialists objected to in Stalin's régime was the utterly cynical manipulation of power, the falsification of history, the massive cruelties and ruthless repression. In other words, the extreme manifestations of the power-bug. They did not—could not—object to the authoritarian set-up as such; only that it had gone too far.

Now it is going to be very interesting to see how they react to the new Khrushchev and Bulganin line, and the dismantling of the Stalin Myth. The change of attitude by the Communist Party will be sickening enough to watch. To see a whole organisation turn from fawning and glorifying to denunciation, when one knows that they are doing it only on orders from above and not from personal conviction, is not going to make us feel any more kindly towards them—although now the official line on Stalin will largely coincide with what the anarchist attitude was during his lifetime.

We say 'largely' because there will be one vital difference. The Communists

will now lay all the shortcomings in the Soviet system at Stalin's door—in spite of their protests about his blaming individuals for manifestations of social forces. We, however, point to the authoritarian nature of Communist rule as the source of the faults in the Soviet system.

But it is among the non-Communist Party members that the effects of the new line will be most interesting to watch. Will they fall for the 'Popular Front' blandishments which K. & B. are now reportedly peddling? Will they say that now Stalinism has been thrown overboard, now an easing of tyranny is noticeable in the Soviet Union, things are not so bad and that closer working can be arranged?

Possibly many will—especially left-wingers in the Labour Party and the remnants of the Trotskyists—now, surely, in a flurry of re-appraisal and a flush of optimism for their future. The 'return to Lenin' will catch many a sincere but woolly-headed socialist, and revive the dreams of a socialist Russia that were obliterated by the Stalinist nightmare.

But these idealists would do well to remember that the rot set in in Russia long before Stalin gained control. The counter-revolution from inside began on that night of October 1917, when detachments of the Red Army surrounded the Kremlin, and Lenin and Co. kicked out the Kerensky ditherers and established themselves in power.

Lenin and Trotsky laid the foundation of tyranny in the Kremlin, and those Trotskyists who hope for something (what?) from the new line should not be allowed to forget Kronstadt, 1921. This was the last kick of the libertarian revolution in Russia (outside of the Ukraine), when the workers and soldiers and sailors of the port of Kronstadt rebelled against the Bolshevik government's dictatorial decrees. Already by that time the Bolsheviks had destroyed freedom of the press, of assembly, and free elections. It was their establishment of a graduated scale of rations, giving privileges to cer-

tain classes of Soviet citizens, that sparked off the Kronstadt revolt.

And significantly enough, the sailors of Kronstadt (referred to only a few months previously by the Bolshevik leaders as 'the cream of the Revolution') were among those who would have benefited from larger rations, but, true to the principles of equality for which they had fought the revolution, they rejected special privileges.

The answer from Lenin and Trotsky was to send the Red Army to Kronstadt with the famous instruction: 'Shoot them down like partridges'.

This happened three years after the Brest-Litovsk pact between the Bolshevik Government and Germany. The German armies of intervention were about to launch a great offensive against Russia in the spring of 1918. Lacking confidence in the ability of the revolution to defend itself, Lenin and Trotsky bought off the Germans with the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk in which they yielded considerable territory and let it be known that they had no intention of extending the revolution beyond Russia.

Whether that was honestly their intention or not, the fact remains that when a revolutionary situation developed in Germany in 1922 (when the commune was set up in Munich) the Russian Government did not lift a finger to help it. And Lenin and Trotsky were the men in power then.

Had the German masses been given the encouragement and help in making a revolution in 1922, the history of that unhappy country might have been very different. As it was, the revolutionary attempt was drowned in blood (the counter-revolution led by Noske, the Labour leader) and the foundation laid for the eventual appearance of Hitler. And most people are aware of the help given the Nazis in winning the 1933 election by the political tactics of the German Communists, by then thoroughly under the thumb of their master in Moscow.

on the experimentalist approach. Seen in this way, the issue ceases to be one between ideological systems and reduces itself to the more concrete question of why people behave in a way denoted by the term "utopian".

In Infield's words: "The motive power in all human activity is need. The need for a different or "utopian" kind of behaviour arises when dissatisfaction with a given social situation activates in the people concerned the desire not merely for partial changes—or "reforms"—but for a total change of the situation by non-violent means. Behaviour of this kind may be confined to the imaginary level alone. It may also extend beyond it into practical enactment. In the first case, the result would be "utopia" as literature. In the second, we would be witness to the attempts at realization of creeds, socio-reformistic blue-prints, etc., as exemplified by the various "utopian" communities. Both the imaginary as well as the active attempts at total social change are in the nature of sociological experiments. The blue-prints may be considered as mental models of such experiments, and the communities as actual experiments".

The classical anarchist movement has not always fully appreciated the wisdom of the experimentalist approach. In the 19th century, Anarchists too frequently took their cue from the Marxists and defined their position in relation to (and in opposition to) the protagonists of "scientific socialism". In this way, anarchism tended often to be seen as merely left-wing Marxism—a Marxism which denied the need to "wait on history" and believed that the way forward was a frontal attack on the State, leading to its abolition without the "intermediate" stage of a workers' State which would eventually 'wither away'. Apart from this difference about means, both Marxists and Anarchists believed in the possibility of a leap into freedom by way of a revolution which would break the chains of the oppressed.

Nothing that has happened in the 20th century, not even the abortive

Utopia & Experiment Continued from p. 2

social revolution in Spain, has demonstrated the plausibility of this belief. Men do not leap into freedom and the chains that bind them are not all forged by their masters. Freedom has to be won inch by inch and our own self-imposed chains have also to be removed before we

In 1924 Lenin introduced his 'New Economic Policy' (NEP) which was a withdrawal from a revolutionary economy, necessitated because of the mess centralised planning was making and by the resistance of the peasants to State dictatorship. NEP was a return to the profit motive, and its introduction was an admission by Lenin that his government did not have the support of the people.

Later, of course, Stalin introduced his plans for nationalisation of the land, in which collectivisation was enforced upon the peasants at terrible cost. Stalin proved what Lenin's NEP only hinted at—that State control of agriculture can only be imposed upon a revolutionary peasantry by the most ruthless methods of uninhibited violence. Lenin, who had shown at Kronstadt that he had no objections in principle to butchering Russian workers, clearly felt he hadn't sufficient power to bludgeon the peasantry into submission. Within a few years of his death, however, Stalin had perfected his machinery of oppression sufficiently to transport or liquidate millions of recalcitrant peasants by the most ruthless operation of governmental terrorism the world had ever seen.

Stalin went on, his paranoia driving him to fantastic lengths to maintain his dictatorship. In foreign policy he was always prepared to sacrifice workers—and even his own parties—for his immediate interests—as CP tactics in Germany 1933 and Spain '36-'39 show. At home, his colossal purges in 1936-'7 obliterated multitudes of opponents or potential opponents.

He went so far in 1937 as to liquidate some 60 per cent. of the officers of the Red Army, leaving him with no alternative but to make a pact with Hitler in 1939 in a desperate attempt to gain time to repair the damage he had done to his own defences.

Stalin was hardly less lunatic than Hitler, but both found millions of followers to shout their praises, to slavishly carry out their dictates to the death. Stalin is now being drowned by his erstwhile followers—because they are now following someone else.

Such people are not to be taken ser-

can act like responsible human beings. It is a sign not of disenchantment but of growing maturity that Anarchists are beginning to speak in terms of "gradualism" and to realize that the social revolution, pictured as a single cataclysmic event, is no more than a myth.

The danger in the anarchist "new thinking" lies, of course, in the possible confusion of this "gradualism" with Fabianism. Anarchist gradualism, it should be clear, has nothing in common with Fabian gradualism, except the term. In Buber's terminology, anarchism remains wedded to the social as distinct from the political principle. Fabianism amounts to nothing more than the simple extension of State activity until the State has swallowed society. Anarchist gradualism, in contrast, re-affirms the values of society and seeks to dispense with the State "by contracting other relationships, by behaving differently".

If anarchist "new thinking" is to take a more concrete shape, it would be as well to re-examine our position in the light of recent research in the sociology of Co-operation. In this respect, Infield's book should prove invaluable. He believes that, with the *Kibbutzim*, Co-operation has entered upon its most advanced phase. Consumers' Co-operation of the Rochdale type and its rival, producers' co-operation represented in this country by the Co-operative Co-partnerships, are merely segmental forms of Co-operation, prefiguring the development of comprehensive or integral Co-operation of the community type. With this schema in mind, he has therefore collected in this volume studies of various communitarian experiments, ranging from the Hutterites of Jamesville, South Dakota, to the work community of Boimondau in Valence, France. Along with *Democracy in Our Working Lives*, reviewed by Bob Green in FREEDOM 4/2/56, it is a book to wipe the bitter grin from the face of the Cheshire cat. G.N.O.

iously—except inasmuch as they present a serious problem to those of us concerned in effecting true social progress. Followers who will blow this way and that are a menace to our task of encouraging thinking and responsible individuals.

And so are those who grasp at straws, and who will now heave a sigh of relief that the embarrassing Stalin can be dumped, but will maintain that the Communist State is all right in itself—it was only the Berias and the Stalins who corrupted it.

This is too easy a simplification. The pattern of tyranny was laid down in Russia by Lenin and Trotsky. It was only developed and extended by Stalin. And even the former were only operating within a framework from which they could not escape even if they wished.

The more doctrinaire a State the more tyrannical it must be. But any State has in its own institutions the seed of tyranny. It is useless for socialists to think now we are going to have a demonstration of libertarianism in Russia. Liberty and the State just do not go together.

It is not the individual tyrants that have corrupted socialism. It is its own, fundamental authoritarian error—its statist, political ideology. The cost of Bolshevism is colossal, impossible to estimate in terms of the human suffering stemming directly or indirectly from its practice. But will the socialists learn the true lessons?

They cannot do so and honestly remain socialists. P.S.

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 11—Philip Sansom on
THE CULT OF THE INDIVIDUAL

MAR. 18—Jack Robinson on
ANARCHISM & LITERATURE

MAR. 25—Sam Fanaroff on
THE DILEMMA OF THE LAYMAN

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.

LIBERTARIAN FORUM

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

Round-Table Youth Discussions Friday Evenings at 8.30

- 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.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.
- PETER KROPOTKIN:**
The State: Its Historic Role 1s.
The Wage System 3d.
Revolutionary Government 3d.
Organised Vengeance Called Justice 2d.
- GEORGE WOODCOCK:**
Anarchy or Chaos 2s. 6d.
New Life to the Land 6d.
Homes or Hovels? 6d.
Railways and Society 3d.
What is Anarchism? 1d.
The Basis of Communal Living 1s.
- 27, Red Lion Street,
London, W.C.1.**