

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

In this Issue :

Freud & His Achievement - p. 2

In Defence of Martin Buber - p. 3

Who shall Control the Robot Worker? - p. 3

Vol. 17, No. 20

May 19th, 1956

Threepence

EDEN CATCHES A CRAB

KHRUSHCHEV TO THE RESCUE

THERE must be many thousands of men and women of goodwill who have been profoundly upset by the disclosure of the antics of Frogman Crabb. Just what, they are asking, was a secret agent doing snooping around the hull of the Russian cruiser *Ordjonikidze*, as it lay at rest in Portsmouth harbour while Khrushchev and Bulganin were the guests of Sir Anthony Eden and the Queen? It is not exactly the done thing, they declare, for a host to go through the pockets of a guest's overcoat while he is at dinner. How then, could gentlemanly Sir Anthony have allowed such a thing to happen?

The people who ask such questions forget one thing; that governments do not act with anything like the morality or code of behaviour which governs most people in their relations one with the other. If individuals behaved towards each other with the same aggression and deceit which is practised by states, human society could not be said to exist at all.

Ordinary people, then, may be shocked by this whole fantastic business, but it is interesting to note how calmly it has been taken by the Russian Government. Being part of the stock-in-trade of government, spying is clearly acceptable to all rulers, and indignation is only worked up about it when there is some political advantage to be gained. One can imagine the howl that would have gone up from Moscow even as recently as a year ago—but now the men in the Kremlin are unwilling to embarrass their late hosts—although naturally in semi-official channels, such as the columns of *Izvestia*, some nattering is permitted. Even this, however, is used more to discredit the Labour Party than the Tory Government, and it is clear that Khrushchev and Co. will eagerly seize any stick with which to beat the Labourites and get their own back for those interruptions at That Dinner.

'Stupider, Dumber, Nastier'

The amazing thing about the Commander Crabb affair has been the extraordinarily ham-fisted way in which it has been handled.

As James Cameron said in the *News Chronicle* last week:

"The almost unbelievable confusion of the Commander Crabb story has now reached a climax of slip-witted folly that has made the Government of Great Britain look stupider, dumber and nastier than even the angriest of us could have believed possible, which

in these days is saying plenty. For boneheaded clumsiness, irresponsible casualness and sinister undertones it would be matchable only if John Buchan were scripting the *Goon Show*."

In the first place it seems almost incredible that whoever planned Crabb's cloak-and-dagger escapade should not have taken any precautions to keep the thing quiet in case of accident. In fact there seems to have been little real attempt at secrecy on his part, since he was reported to have told a friend that he was 'going for a dip' as he had done before. And it now transpires that when the Russian warship *Sverdlov* was in British waters for a courtesy visit during the Coronation, it was paid an under-water visit by Lionel Crabb—who seems not to have kept his mouth shut all that tight about it afterwards.

We may be fairly sure then that when the *Ordjonikidze* arrived at Portsmouth last month the Russians were waiting for him. Since frogmen are used by the Russian Navy as well as the British (and they probably had a good look underneath the British fleet which visited Leningrad last year) it stands to reason that they (like the British) have developed some under-water means of combatting them. They had a good chance to test out their equipment on Commander Crabb.

The Hotel Register

Little by little, pieces have been added to this fantastic story. We now learn, for example, that a frogman (presumably

Crabb) was spotted by Russian sailors on the surface for a few minutes between the two destroyers which escorted B. and K.'s cruiser. But the only satisfactory explanation as to why such an experienced diver as Crabb should have surfaced where he could be seen, which has so far been given, is that perhaps his equipment was faulty. It may well be however that he was already injured by whatever trap was set for him down below and that when he went down again he was not diving, to carry on his task of inspection, but sinking.

Then there is the story of the visit to his hotel by police who tore the page containing his name out of the hotel's register—and threatened the landlord with prosecution under the Official Secrets Act if he said anything.

When the story began to seep out, questions were naturally asked in Parliament. And then was played a fantastic performance by Sir Anthony Eden in which he denied that Crabb's action had any official sanction—but was prepared to take responsibility for it himself, although he would say nothing about it except that members were free to put what construction they liked on what he had said!

As James Cameron so ably put it:

"The Prime Minister chose not to keep quiet (as was his right) nor to say something, but to stumble onto an explanation of such tormented evasiveness that by now everyone believes the worst."

Continued on p. 4

Unrest in Spain

Outside Opinion

IN recent weeks more and more news of Spanish unrest has been finding its way into the newspapers of this country. Either the rigorous censorship of past years has been less effective due to increased contact with the rest of the world or suppression of the truth for outside consumption has eased. It may also be that the incidence of unrest has so increased as to make complete concealment impossible. Whatever the reasons, there is ample evidence for supposing that the veneer of "semi-benevolent dictatorship", put on for the benefit of the rest of the world, is wearing rather thin.

Even Lord Templewood (British Ambassador in Madrid, 1940-44; at that time Sir Samuel Hoare), has been forced to recognise that all is not quite well, though he appears not to understand why. Sample extracts of his views on the Franco dictatorship ("Is Franco on the way out."—*Sunday Express*, 29th April, 1956), make extraordinary reading, but it is not unreasonable to suppose that they are approximately the views held by the present British Government—and possibly the American Government also. For this reason we quote them at some length.

This ex-Ambassador to Spain wrote the following whilst referring to the fact that most of the same Ministers in office, and the generals holding military commands are the same men as in 1940:

"Is this absence of change the sign of stability, or does it merely show the effectiveness of the police measures for suppressing political opposition?"

"The reality of community must be roused, must be summoned out of the depths where it lies buried under the incrustations of the State."

—MARTIN BUBER.

"Many of my English friends would say that it proves the success of the present régime . . . they now return from their holidays with tributes to a régime that has made Spain a world fit for British tourists.

"I do not underrate Franco's achievements. I have always said that he is the cleverest politician in Spain.

"He has done a successful deal with the U.S.A., he has made a concordat with the Vatican, he has piloted his country into U.N.O., and he has built many thousands of houses and restored many churches and monuments.

"In view of this record, the wonder is that any serious criticism should be gathering strength against a régime that has so much to its credit.

"And yet certain recent events have clearly shown that beneath a surface that looks stable, cracks are spreading that sooner or later will lead to a subsidence."

And he ended his article on this note:

"I can only hope that Franco will not end a career that many admired by leaving Spain at the mercy of the Communists whom he so signally defeated in the civil war."

One may guess who Lord Templewood's "English friends" are, and cannot be surprised that he has no desire to "underrate Franco's achievements". The fact that they bear a marked resemblance to the achievements of another dictator against whom Britain was fighting whilst Templewood was in Madrid, is perhaps forgotten. Mussolini also controlled a corporate state with labour contracts, official trade unions, wages fixed by decree, secret police, complete press censorship and all the rest.

The Facts

Also forgotten by Templewood are the facts of the Spanish revolution. He implies that Franco defended Spain from the Communists, and conveniently pays lip-service to the Franco-myth of "the Communist Revolution of 1936". The reality being that the generals rebelled, with assistance from Hitler against the legal Government of their country, which at that time was trying to effect a programme (however slowly), of land reform and social-democracy in general.

None of these facts are forgotten by those who were the victims of the Fascist revolt, with its record of violence and terror, and the subsequent era of repression which continues to this day. There are many men of liberal and democratic ideals in Spain, there are revolutionary syndicalists, socialists and anarchists, all of whom wish to see the downfall of the Franco régime and all its works.

The difficulties and dangers which exist for those who wish to take action against a totalitarian dictatorship are legion, and the results of an individual action may be infinitely small. Nevertheless there have been incidents over the years which have come to the notice of the rest of the world in spite of censorship. There have even been strikes in certain cities at various times, and small concessions have been made to the strikers.

Students' Revolt

Last February there was an open revolt of the students of Madrid University which spread across the city, causing three days of violent street rioting. More than three thousand students signed a petition asking for free election of delegates to a student congress. The Falange Party saw this as a threat to their subsidiary organisation, the *Sindicato Español Universitario* (S.E.U.), to which all students have to belong. They were correct in their assumption, for when the University Rector Dr. Pedro Laín Entralgo thought it policy to allow the free elections, class by class, the first two classes elected only three S.E.U. candidates out of forty. Before any more voting could take place an announcement from S.E.U. headquarters put the elections off.

This started the riot next day; the Falangists armed with truncheons and

Continued on p. 4

POLLITT'S ELEVATION—OR

A Teeny-Weeny Purge

NOT to be outdone by its big brothers in the East European 'Peoples' Democracies', the British Communist Party is having a teeny-weeny purge all of its own.

Not with any bitterness or denunciation, mark you, and most certainly not with any bloodshed. To talk of 'heads rolling' in King Street can be no more than a figure of speech. Adjustments in leadership there do not have to be preceded by the discovery of deep-laid plots by Trotskyite Fascist hyenas. They are politely attributed to the inevitable

progress of that arch-reactionary, Anno Domini (a cosmopolitan if ever there was one).

It is not quite true to say that there is a purge going on; it is really only a shuffle at the top. In Britain the rank-and-file of the Party never needs to be purged—it turns itself over too frequently ever to be the same rank-and-file for very long. And even at the top it amounts only to a gentle retirement of two old dogs too old to learn new tricks.

We pointed out some weeks back that Harry Pollitt was somewhat slow in jumping on the anti-Stalinist band-waggon. Compared with Ulbricht of East Germany, whose haste to smear Stalin's reputation was almost indecent, Pollitt was a very late starter, and even when he did tardily clamber on board, his denunciation of the old tyrant was little more than luke-warm. Harry probably realised what a fool he was making himself look.

Too tired to care any more, his colleague, Willie Gallacher, ex-M.P. for East Fife, would not climb down on his adulation for Stalin—which is, we suppose, to his credit in a perverted kind of way. Gallacher's last public statement included these defiant words: "The name of Joseph Stalin will be forever associated with the mighty achievements of the Soviet Union . . . When the tumult and dust subsides, make no doubt about it, the balance will be heavily on the side of Joseph Stalin."

Which ended Willie's usefulness to the Party.

So now both Pollitt and Gallacher are to be put out to grass. Pollitt has been moved from his 27-year job in the General Secretary's chair up to the more-or-less impotent position of Party Chairman. From there, such puppetry as his failing health will allow can be put at the Party's disposal, while his successor, John Gollan, carries on the real work of reviving the Party from its post-20th Congress doldrums.

Death of a Cypriot

August 28, 1955. At the Alhambra Hall, Nicosia, the "Old Trade Unions" held a political meeting. The meeting ended at about mid-day; half-an-hour later, a policeman on duty in plain-clothes, not far from the Hall, was surrounded by three men. One man fired three shots and the policeman fell dead.

The man who fired the shots picked up a bicycle from the pavement and rode away. A bicycle was thrown in his path which knocked him off. He abandoned his bicycle, ran down Kykho Avenue, and disappeared.

Later, Michalakis Karaolides was arrested and accused of the shooting.

October 28. The Assize Court of Nicosia, sitting without a jury, convicted Karaolides and sentenced him to death.

November 12. The Supreme Court of Cyprus dismisses Karaolides's appeal against his conviction.

April 10, 1956. The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council begins the hearing of Karaolides's final appeal against the sentence.

Mr. D. N. Pritt, Q.C. put the case for the appellant: the basis of this was to show that he had an alibi that proved he was at his uncle's house at the time of the shooting; to this there were five witnesses. Mr. Pritt claimed that the Court was prejudiced against full examination of this alibi because of the importance it attached to the fact that the bicycle which the murderer used was Karaolides's, and to the evidence that

EOKA was a terrorist organisation responsible for a number of shootings (since the evidence to show that Karaolides was a member of EOKA was unsubstantial, Mr. Pritt claimed this was irrelevant).

April 13. Lords Goddard, Oaksey, Tucker, Keith, and Somervell dismiss the appeal. Their reasons for so doing to be made public later.

May 1. Their Lordships gave their reasons. They relied on the identification of Karaolides as the murderer by two prosecution witnesses (out of four), of the shooting, and disbelieved the evidence of the witnesses for the alibi. They therefore dismissed the appeal.

May 8. The Executive Council of Cyprus, consisting of four Britons—including the Governor—and one Turk, decide that Karaolides shall hang: to be performed by a man who will remain un-named and unrecognisable. Another Cypriot, Demetriou, convicted under the emergency regulations is also to hang.

Appeals for a reprieve were sent by the Greek government, the Labour Party and many other organisations, and individuals.

May 9. Police opened fire in Athens on a crowd demonstrating in protest against the decision to hang. Seven people were reported dead and 190 wounded.

A British officer was killed in Cyprus as a reprisal.

May 10. At 3 a.m. Karaolides and Demetriou were hanged.

THE FREUD CENTENARY

FREUD & HIS ACHIEVEMENTS

FEW to-day would dispute that Sigmund Freud was a remarkable man: but it is doubtful—despite the adulation of the centenary articles of recent weeks—if there are many who estimate his greatness at its true value. A comparison with Karl Marx, also a German and a Jew, may serve to show this. The final volume of *Das Kapital* was published only seven years before *The Interpretation of Dreams*, yet Marx's ideas have had a far more universal acclaim than Freud's, and on the face of it the practical results of his teachings have been far more widespread.

In people's individual lives however, Marx's ideas have hardly any impact. Much of his teachings seems to have little relevance to-day, hardly any possesses profound originality. In the economic sphere his views have proved in many respects to be far from correct, while for the revolutionary movement his influence has been disastrous. By contrast, Freud within his own lifetime has achieved a kind of silent revolution, the more remarkable because in so far as it was perceived at all it aroused the most hostile opposition. His work concerned itself originally with investigating the unconscious mental processes (the very conception of such concealed processes we owe to Freud) if people suffering from neuroses. But the light he was able to shed on this seemingly narrow field has come to illuminate the whole field of the activity of "mind"—again using that word in the wider connotation which Freud's own work has given to it. Indeed these parentheses that one is forced to make when discussing Freud's work show how far-reaching has been his influence. It is difficult to conceive to-day what discussion of human conduct was like before Freud. Even those who are hardly conscious of his work, nevertheless, in their everyday judgments of their fellows' behaviour, employ automatically and without thinking further about it concepts of rationalisation, of repressions, of the influence of former experiences on present behaviour, which owe their currency almost solely to Freud's work.

Opposition to Freud's Ideas

Working with neurotic patients Freud showed that they repressed memories of experiences. "Everything that had been forgotten," he wrote, "had in some way or other been painful; it had been either alarming or disagreeable or shameful by the standards of the subject's personality." It was almost inevitable that his uncovering of the hidden world of the unconscious Freud should arouse imme-

diately, "instinctive", i.e. unconscious, opposition. But what was worse was his assertion that neuroses invariably arose from some sexual disturbance. This discovery is at the core of his teaching and is necessary, even now, to stress it as many of his admirers and some even of his followers have sought to diminish its importance. In 1925, in his *An Autobiographical Study*, Freud describes how his discovery of the rôle of sexuality in the neuroses alienated his fellow-worker, Breuer. "I now learned from my rapidly increasing experience that it was not any kind of emotional excitement that was in action behind the phenomena of the neurosis but habitually one of a sexual nature, whether it was a current sexual conflict or the effect of earlier sexual experiences." (p. 41). "There was a great deal of equivocation and mystery-making to be overcome, but, once that had been done, it turned out that in all of these patients grave abuses of the sexual function were present." (pp. 42-43). "I was thus led into regarding the neuroses as being without exception disturbances of the sexual function." (p. 44).

The investigation of these sexual disturbances led Freud to recognise the sexuality of children, and to formulate views which seemed to orthodox thought a revolting calumny on "the innocence of childhood". That orthodox thought has to some extent accepted his views shows how far his ideas have penetrated, but acceptance has been and is still unwilling and only partial.

If sexual conflicts and disturbances be at the root of all the neuroses (Freud showed that they were even more nakedly present in the psychoses also) then it seems an immediately rational step to seek prophylactic measures in so ordering life that the sexual function has a free and natural development. How far we have gone towards such a concept is shown by the fact that it was only a minority of the members of the recent Royal Commission on Divorce and Marriage who advocated divorce where both parties sought it, i.e. by consent.

It is sometimes stated that Freud himself contributed to the tendency to diminish the importance he originally attached to sexual factors. In some ways his concept of the sublimation of sexual drives as providing the energy for various cultural activities, and his postulation of a destructive death instinct (*Thanatos*) which worked against the life-giving instinct (*Eros*). But he describes (in *An Autobiographical Study*) the later books in which he elaborated such concepts as

works in which "I have given free rein to the inclination which I kept down for so long to speculation", and he cautiously remarks, "It remains to be seen whether this construction (the *Eros-Thanatos* opposition) will turn out to be serviceable". Such cautious speculations obviously did not reduce in his own mind the primary importance of sexual factors in human functioning. Yet it is true that Freud never seems to have lent any support to movements aiming at profound social change (His correspondence with Einstein on the question of war, published in the late nineteen thirties, makes most depressing reading). One of his books that has a very wide distribution, but which is open to more solidly-based criticism is *Totem and Taboo*. Its social implications are pessimistic and profoundly reactionary. His standpoint in this respect is the more surprising in that he resented as a student the prevailing anti-semitic attitude and at an early age "was made familiar with the fate of being in the opposition and of being put under the ban of the 'compact majority'". The foundations were thus laid for a certain degree of independence of judgment."

Of Freud's followers, the one who has attracted most sympathy in revolutionary circles, has been Wilhelm Reich, for the reason that he has accepted to the full the social implications of Freud's work, and set himself to attack conventional sexual concepts and provide a rational and humane attitude towards sexuality and the problems with which prevailing social conditions surround it. Inevitably Reich's work has met with the same hostility that Freud faced in his early years.

Breakdown of Conventional Moral Values

There can be no doubt that in Freud's lifetime conventional moral values have substantially broken down, and it is tempting to attribute this to the effect of the truths which he uncovered. That Freud's influence has been a factor in this breakdown is doubtless true: but it is likely that two world wars and the rapid social changes consequent upon them, and also the invisible influence of widely available contraceptive measures, have played a much larger part. Nevertheless, such changed moral attitudes provide scope for the development of

Freud's teachings in a practical way towards founding individual development on a sound basis. On such lines the sexual misery which prevails to-day could become a thing of the past.

The Individual and the Mass

It is perhaps significant that Freud's teachings are banned in only one world political grouping: the Soviet Empire and China (Franco Spain is hostile to Freud but does not positively ban his works). Here our earlier comparison with Marx arises again. Marxism concerns itself with masses and seeks to relegate the individual to a subsidiary status (concern about the individual and his happiness are regularly denounced as "bourgeois" in Marxist circles). Freud's work begins with the individual and is concerned with his happiness and proper functioning. It seeks to understand rather than to judge; is founded on sympathy, and is unconcerned about matters of expediency, the questions that interest politicians and national economists. It is in this attitude and the brilliant and profound results to which, in Freud's extraordinary hands, it led, that the real significance of his work lies. The revolution he has achieved is due to this, and the future lies with a still further understanding of the individual and his response to the problems of life.

J.H.

People and Ideas Continued from p. 3

So inarticulate. So disjointed, so indistinct, so lacking in coherent speech. The word and the concept bring us back to Buber and his philosophy of dialogue, of 'I and thou', of 'true conversation' from which his views of community and society emerge. Last week I went to King's College in the Strand to hear his two lectures on "That Which is Common". In the first lecture he took as his starting-point a line from the Greek poet Heraclitus, *Each one must follow that which is common*, a saying of Chang-Tzu the Taoist on the difference between the solitude of the dream and the reality of common experience, and a phrase

from the Upanishads of ancient India, *I accept you as you are*. In the second lecture he related these texts to what he terms the *I-Thou* of reciprocity, of meeting between man and man, and to the *We* of community.

He did this by reference to, of all things, Aldous Huxley's experiments with the drug mescaline, which became, in Buber's slow and emphatic English, a parable of the inarticulate, disjointed society of Western individualism. Huxley in his escape from the 'painful earthly world' avoided the eyes of those who were present. For, said Buber, to regard the eyes of the other is to recognise that which is common. And after this flight from selfhood and environment, Huxley 'met them with a deep mistrust'. Huxley regarded his mescaline intoxication as a mystical experience, but declared Buber, those who we call mystics, like those we call creative artists do not seek to escape from the human situation. They cling to the common world until they are torn from it. *Not as a man asleep must we act and speak*.

He who has sought flight from respon-

sible personal existence, said Buber, cannot really listen to the voice of another, for to him the other is only an object. Since he is unwilling to answer for the genuineness of his personal existence he has left 'the authentic world of speech in which a response is demanded'. In response is responsibility.

Against the irresponsibility of detachment, he opposed the concept of *We*, from the essential relationship between person and person, of 'communal speaking that begins at the moment of speaking to one another', of mutuality in 'the great stream of reciprocal sharing of knowledge'.

"In our age in which the true meaning of every word is encompassed by falsehood, it is of decisive importance to find again the genuineness of speech, and of the existence of 'we'."

This is not the language of sociology, but there are truths which are not susceptible to scientific analysis, and when Buber speaks of the necessity of "leaving the human race in all places with genuine community", it is because for him the idea that all real living is meeting, is the condition of being in our world. C.W.

**Have you Renewed
your Subscription
to FREEDOM?**

The Tradition of Workers' Control - 4 BRITISH SYNDICALISM (continued)

The Industrial Syndicalist Education League

IN 1910, with the return to England of Tom Mann, the British syndicalist movement emerged from the half-light into the full glare of day. From his 8 years in Australia and New Zealand, Mann had acquired a knowledge of industrial unionism and a profound sense of disillusionment with regard to attempts to establish industrial peace. Shortly after his return, accompanied by Guy Bowman, a socialist journalist, he visited France and contacted the Confederation Générale du Travail. Filled with enthusiasm, they started, when they came back, the publication of *The Industrial Syndicalist*¹⁷ and later in the same year founded The Industrial Syndicalist Education League. The conscious adoption of the name 'syndicalist' heralded the development of a British form of syndicalism which, although it borrowed widely from the French and American movements, was to have a distinctive character of its own. Revolutionary as Mann was, he remained essentially of a practical turn of mind and the main activities of the new body, which quickly attracted to itself many of the 'syndicalists' of the other groups, were confined to educational propaganda on the subject of industrial unionism. Attempts were made by Mann and his associates to persuade the older unions to federate or to amalgamate on industrial lines and to give a revolutionary turn to the industrial unrest which, for a wide variety of reasons, swept the country in the year 1911. In the main these activities belong to social and trade union history but out of the welter of these years emerged, in 1912, what has now come to be regarded as the classic statement of British syndicalism: *The Miners' Next Step*¹⁸.

The Miners' Next Step

This pamphlet was not, however, intended as a definitive statement of syndicalist thought. Its subtitle: "A suggested scheme for the reorganisation of the Federation", and its foreword clearly indicated that it was to be taken as no more than an agenda for future discussions among the South Wales Miners. From our point of view, what is of chief interest about its plans for the immediate

reorganisation of the Miners' Federation is its insistence on the need for centralisation combined with measures designed to retain power in the hands of the rank and file. On the question of political action, it takes up the position of the S.L.P.: "complete independence of, and hostility to, all capitalist parties", while the long term objective of the authors is summed up in the words: Industrial Democracy. "The men who work in the mine," they argue, "are surely as competent to elect these (paid officials) as shareholders who may never have seen a colliery. To have a vote in deciding who shall be your fireman, manager, inspector, etc., is to have a vote in determining the conditions which shall rule your working life . . . To vote for a man to represent you in Parliament, to make rules for, and assist in appointing officials to rule you, is a different proposition altogether!" Nationalisation of the mines, they continue, is no step towards industrial democracy; it "simply makes a National Trust, with all the force of Government behind it, whose one concern will be to see that the industry is run in such a way, as to pay the interest on the bonds, with which the Coalowners are paid out, and to extract as much more profit as possible, in order to relieve the taxation of other landlords and capitalists."

The pamphlet concludes with a vision of the future society: "Every industry thoroughly organised, in the first place, to fight, to gain control of, and then to administer, that industry. The co-ordination of all industries on a Central Production Board, who, with a statistical department to ascertain the needs of the people, will issue demands to the different departments of industry, leaving to the men themselves to determine under what conditions and how, the work should be done. This would mean real democracy in real life, making for real manhood and womanhood. Any other form of democracy is a snare and a delusion."

It would be a mistake, however, to regard the ideas contained in this famous pamphlet as completely representative of the views of the British syndicalists of this period. Scattered among the

various articles and speeches on the subject of reorganising trade unionism are to be found numerous references to the future society which amplify and in some respects contradict the views of the South Wales miners' unofficial committee, and there exist several books and pamphlets which are directly concerned with theoretical problems. British syndicalism never found its Sorel. In this it was both fortunate and unfortunate. Fortunate in that it escaped that form of misrepresentation which the French movement suffered when intellectuals like Sorel, Berth and Lagardelle were accepted by the outside world as theorists of the new socialism; unfortunate in that it was unable to clarify some of its basic concepts or to answer effectively the criticisms of opponents, both socialist and anti-socialist, when they ignorantly and often perversely misread its intentions. The anti-intellectual tendencies of the French movement have been grossly exaggerated even by historians. In England, there is little or no trace of anti-intellectualism, although there is evidence of open hostility towards middle class theorists—a very different thing.

The Syndicalist Commonwealth

The men who paid most attention to the theoretical aspects of syndicalism and the future society were Tom Mann, Guy Bowman and Gaylord Wilshire. Mann in 1913 defined syndicalism in the following terms:

"A condition of society where industry will be controlled by those engaged therein, on the basis of free societies; these co-operate for the production of all requirements of life in the most efficient manner, and the distribution of the same with the truest equity; a Society in which Parliament and Governments will have disappeared, having served their purpose with the capitalist system."¹⁹

From Single Tax to Syndicalism contains Mann's developed views on syndicalist organisation and its chief interest, in this respect, lies in the place he assigns to the Trades Councils—the British equivalent to the French Bourses du Travail. In Mann's view, the Trades Councils were an essential element in syndicalist organisation, their function being to ascertain the needs

Continued on p. 3

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 . . .

The Dilemma of Being Modern
J. P. Hodin 25/-
The Sane Society
Erich Fromm 25/-
Sexual Behaviour in the Human Female
A. C. Kinsey 52/6

Reprints . . .

Liberty of Man
R. G. Ingersoll 2/6
Psychology for Everyman
A. E. Mander 2/6

The Age of Reason

Thomas Paine 2/6
Rights of Man
Thomas Paine 2/6

Special Offer . . .

The General Idea of the Revolution in the 19th Century
P. J. Proudhon (1st edition) 21/-

Second-Hand . . .

The Culture of Cities
Lewis Mumford 15/-
General B.O.
Roman Gul 3/6
Arrival and Departure
Arthur Koestler 3/6

From White Cross to Red Flag
Max Hoelz 3/6

Anna Karenina
Leo Tolstoy 3/6

Footsteps of Warfare
R. L. Worrall 3/-

John Burns
A. P. Grubb 2/6

The Gambler
Fyodor Dostoevsky 3/6

The Treasure of the Sierra Madre
B. Traven 3/6

A Chance for Everybody
Hyacinth Dubreuil 3/6

Of Fear and Freedom
Carlo Levi 2/-

This Pact Business
W. H. Edwards 2/-

Freedom from Want
Paul Einzig 2/6

9.15 to Freedom
Martin Fiala 3/-

The Idiocy of Idealism
Oscar Levy 10/-

Postage free on all items

Obtainable from

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

Who shall Control the Robot Worker?

WE must be wary of the argument that with Automation the capitalist class is forging the weapon for its self-destruction. We believe it to be a two-edged weapon; that it creates perhaps as many problems for the capitalist, class-divided, system as it solves. But then, the same could be said of so many "revolutionary" innovations that have taken place during the past century. And every time the "system" has managed to survive! Partly because the change has taken place by degrees, thus allowing for necessary adjustments to be made to neutralise, and safeguard against, possible ill-effects that might result. Partly too, because the manipulators of the system have few scruples regarding the means to be used to achieve their ends. But largely because they rely on the fact that there is no large, revolutionary body of opinion waiting to seize its chance when the system is in a period of crisis, and knowing what to put in its place.

When a government shows itself to be weak or incapable the only alternative offered is yet another government; when a leader loses his grip or follows the wrong "line" he is simply replaced by another leader; when "free enterprise" is up against it the only alternative offered is State control. No voice in the ranks of organised labour unequivocally declares that the alternative to weak, strong or corrupt government is no government; to leaders, no leaders, and to a bankrupt "free-enterprise" co-operation between producers and consumers.

★

THE advent of automation can be explained from the capitalist point of view as a new weapon in the international struggle for markets and in the national struggle between Capital and Labour. There is no evidence that the industrialists engaged in this "revolution" of production are in the least concerned with the social advantages (elimination of heavy and monotonous labour, shorter hours with more opportunities for leisure), that can result from the introduction of Automation, except perhaps as mere by-products. The workers' organisations for their part cherish the fond illusion that they will obtain conditions from the employers—also implying that they expect that these can be obtained within the framework of capitalism—which will result in higher wages, a shorter working week and in a general raising of the standard of living . . . in spite of the fact—if one is to judge by the example at Standards in Coventry recently—that their instinct tells them that Automation spells mass unemployment and the dole queue!

Labour's counter-measures to the threat of Automation should be, to quote Mr. Fred Lee, M.P., in last week's *Forward*, "a far wider degree of public ownership and more effective Government control of industry". (One must not, of course, be misled by the term "public ownership" when used by a member of the Labour Party for it simply means that the public pays the compensation and the interest, and the government controls). Now, the obvious fallacy in this argument, to our minds, is this. The introduction of automation in this country is of interest to the government in so far as it allows industry to compete successfully in foreign markets. It is not interested that goods should be produced more cheaply for the home market. Its policy at home is not to encourage, but on the contrary to discourage spending, which it does

both by appeals to Save (even by means of State lotteries), as well as by the application of a high purchase tax on particular manufactured goods. The government therefore while declaring itself the custodian of the nation's welfare is, in fact, simply the trustee of the capitalist system, of the *status quo*. For the workers to seek from the government the obvious advantages which should (in a rational society) accrue from the introduction of automation is, as Ammon Hennacy has put it in another context, "like expecting a butcher to put a vegetarian sign in his window!"

★

THE introduction of automation in the present state of world economy should be enough to make the motives suspect. From the point of view of markets (not of needs, of course!) the world has reached the point of over-production. Automation will therefore serve the ends of producing an article more cheaply, rather than of producing more articles, in the hope of successfully competing in the available markets. But when all the industrial countries will have sold themselves to the robot workers, what then? New crises, new patriotic appeals to austerity . . . and more war scares?

We do not believe that the interests of the people will be served by organised resistance to automation, which at the most simply accentuates the already existing unresolved economic problems of society. Unemployment is only a tragedy in a society in which the very means of life hinge on the availability of a job (except for the privileged minority who live on their unearned incomes). We see nothing immoral in the idea of machines providing the necessities of life, nor are we perturbed at the thought of Man enjoying, or of a society based on, leisure. Indeed, we believe that Automation developed in the interests of mankind will see a resurgence of the craftsman, the artist and the thinker.

To-day man is the automaton in the factory and in society. Tomorrow his place can be taken by the machine in the factory and he freed to take his rightful place in society as a responsible human being. That is the meaning of automation if on the threshold of this second industrial revolution Organised Labour can see beyond the Iron Curtain of capitalism and discount that insecure symbol of capitalist prosperity: the T.V. aerial!

People and Ideas In Defence of Martin Buber

I HAD intended this week to write about the social ideas of Martin Buber (who is at present on a visit to this country), ideas which seem to me to have great relevance to anarchists. But when I mentioned this to a friend she told me about the 'inadequacies of Buber's approach', which she had learned about from Geoffrey Ostergaard's review, in our issue of 10/3/56, of Dr. Henrik Infield's new book *Utopia and Experiment*. In this review he repeats Infield's criticism of Buber, although he goes on to criticise in Buber's terms what he regards as the classical anarchist approach!

Now I wouldn't wish to go into the dreary business of what X says Y says about Z, nor to try to score points off Infield, whose many years of study of co-operative communities have given us much to be grateful for, were it not for the fact that I have had this experience before. A few months ago I dined with two foreign professional 'experts' in co-operation, one of them employed in that capacity by the French government. When I mentioned the ideas expressed in Buber's *Paths in Utopia*, I was told that his views were unsound and unscientific. Had they read what Buber said? No, but they had learned this from an article by Dr. Infield in the review *Communauté*.

So it seems to me that instead of discussing Buber's social ideas, I should refer you back to two articles where I have summarised the content of his essay *Society & the State* and his book *Paths in Utopia*, *FREEDOM* for 24/9/55 and 1/10/55 respectively, and try to-day to clear up misconceptions which might discourage you from reading Buber's examination of the theories of Proudhon, Kropotkin and Landauer, misconceptions which are doubly regrettable since Infield is really on the same side as Buber, and uses arguments like Buber's to attack a position which Buber does not hold.

★

BUBER'S book is a defence of what Marx and the Marxists called "utopian socialism" against what Marx and the Marxists called "scientific socialism". Buber, Infield, Ostergaard and the reader all know that these labels are inaccurate and confusing, and consequently Infield's strictures on pp. 16 and 17 of his book should be directed against the Marxists, not against Buber's position. It is absurd to say that Buber's premise 'is the contrast between the utopian and the scientific way of thinking'.

Infield says:

"The main weakness of the argument is its either-or character. Recent social science research has taught us that such dichotomies, plausible as they may appear at first sight, have little relevance to social facts. What the social scientist encounters in social reality are not absolute entities in logical juxtaposition, but

continual variables of one or another kind of behaviour". And he remarks that Buber "seems to be aware of the scientist's approach" in quoting Landauer's definition of the state, but that,

"So far as his own argument goes, Buber largely ignores Landauer's anticipation of the approach of modern social psychology and sociology".

But what does Buber say? He specifically remarks that,

"Practically speaking, it is not a question of the abstract alternative 'State or No-State'. The Either-Or principle applies primarily to the moments of genuine decision by a person or a group; then everything intermediate, everything that interposes itself, is impure and unpurifying; it works confusion, obscurity, obstruction. But this same principle becomes an obstruction in its turn if, at any given stage in the execution of the decision reached, it does not permit less than the Absolute to take shape and so devalues the measures that are now possible."

Infield says that Buber's argument is that 'since Marxism proved itself wrong, therefore utopian socialism must be right', and that the solution he proposes is 'return to utopia'. But what Buber in fact says is,

"We see more or less from the Russian attempt at realisation that human relationships remain essentially unchanged when they are geared to a socialist-centralist hegemony which rules the life of individuals and the life of the natural social groups. Needless to say we cannot and do not want to go back to primitive agrarian communism or to the corporate State of the Christian Middle Ages. We must be quite unromantic, and living wholly in the present, out of the recalcitrant material of our own day in history, fashion a new community".

★

INFIELD asks, "Is it true, for example, that the achievement of a 'better society' is possible only by means of either utopian or scientific socialism? Are these really the only alternatives we may think of? . . . As for the 'better society', by what criteria do we judge better or worse? Good or better for whom, and under what conditions?" Now although Infield puts the words 'better society' in quotation marks, he is not quoting Buber, who in fact writes of a 'new society'. Why a new society? Because:

"The era of advanced Capitalism has broken down the structure of society. The society which preceded it was composed of different societies; it was complex, and pluralistic in its structure. This is what gave it its peculiar social vitality and enabled it to resist the totalitarian tendencies inherent in the pre-revolutionary centralistic State, though many elements were very much weakened in their autonomous life . . . Thereafter centralism in its new, capitalistic form succeeded where the old had failed;

in atomizing society. Exercising control over the machines and, with their help, over the whole society, Capitalism wants to deal only with individuals; and the modern State aids and abets it by progressively dispossessing groups of their autonomy".

As to the alternatives, Buber writes that 'our choice lies between the two poles of Socialism', which, as a piece of linguistic shorthand he designates 'Moscow', (the centralised state) and 'Jerusalem', (the autonomous village communes in Palestine—he was writing in 1945 before the existence of a State of Israel). What is the nature of this choice? It is the decision as to who is the subject of a transformed economy and who is the owner of the social means of production:

"Is it to be the central authority in a highly centralised State, or the social units of urban and rural workers, living and producing on a communal basis, and their representative bodies? In the latter case the remodelled organs of the State will discharge the functions of adjustment and administration only . . . The essential point is to decide on the fundamentals: a restructuring of society as a League of Leagues, and a reduction of the State to its proper function, which is to maintain unity; or a devouring of an amorphous society by the omnipotent State; Socialist Pluralism or so-called Socialist Unitarism. The right proportion, tested anew every day according to changing conditions, between group-freedom and collective order; or absolute order imposed indefinitely for the sake of an era of freedom alleged to follow 'of its own accord'."

In other words the choice is between a static or closed society and a changing, fluid, open society.

★

INFIELD declares that Buber's generalisations "no doubt express some noble sentiments, but what can the critical investigator of societal phenomena profit from them?" But Buber is not addressing the critical investigators of societal phenomena. And it is not the social scientists who will change society. What will change society is as Malatesta said, "the aspiration to liberty, to the well-being of all, to love among all". Last week's editorial in *FREEDOM* remarked that:

"The 'scientific determinism' of the 19th century has been replaced by a kind of 'scientific intellectualism' in the 20th. We now live in a sociologist's and psycho-analyst's paradise. Every aspect of human behaviour and motivation, conscious and unconscious, individual and collective is being probed and explained . . . In a word, we know a great deal more about ourselves than those innocent 19th century revolutionists could ever have imagined to be possible. But neither could they have dreamed that with so much knowledge, twentieth century man would have been so inarticulate in advocating and applying it!"

Continued on p. 2

British Syndicalism - 4

Continued from p. 2

of people in their respective districts and to arrange distribution.

Bowman, too, emphasised the rôle of the Trades Councils. While differing from the French syndicalists in proposing amalgamation of existing trade unions to form industrial unions, in place of the French national federations which did not necessarily involve the establishment of unions along the line of industries, his main organisational proposals were modelled closely on those of the French C.G.T. as expounded by Pataud and Pouget in their book: *Syndicalism and the Co-operative Commonwealth*.²⁰ The Industrial Unions were to form a National Federation of Industrial Unions and the Trades Councils a National Federation of Trades Councils; then both of these federations were to be confederated in a General Confederation of Labour, which would thus include all producers and distributors. Since both producers and distributors were also consumers, there would be no need for special arrangements to represent the consumers as such. Production would be the task of the Industrial Unions, and the Trades Councils would provide the machinery for local distribution and administration. The Trades Councils, which since their exclusion from the T.U.C. in 1895 had become mere adjuncts of political advancement, would, according to Bowman, have to "stand against the municipal council, destroy it, and establish themselves in its place".²¹

Mann and Bowman were successful in pressing their views on the delegates to the syndicalist conferences held in Manchester and in London, November, 1912. These conferences were designed mainly to give a more definitive statement of the programme and aims of the British syndicalist movement, and resolutions embodying Bowman's proposals were adopted almost unanimously.²²

Syndicalism & Ownership

Gaylord Wilshire's main contribution to syndicalist thought was to emphasise its communistic basis and to rebut the charges brought against the syndicalists that ownership of industries by the workers employed in them would be as anti-social as ownership by capitalist syndicates. It is possible that certain syndicalists imagined that the adoption of the slogans, "The mine for the miners", "The railway for the railwaymen", and so on; meant that the workers of a particular industry would jointly become the "owners" of their industry and, as such, would share any "profits" that were made. The simplest way of grasping the syndicalist idea is to think of it as producers' co-operation organised under the auspices of industrial unions and enlarged to national dimensions. However, without qualification, this conception can be misleading. There is no evidence that syndicalists thought in terms of "co-ownership" and "profit-sharing" and, indeed, these notions were explicitly repudiated on several occasions.²³ The main tendency of syndicalist thought, it may be said, was to undermine the concept of ownership as it commonly understood. There is an implicit recognition of the fact that ownership as such is unimportant: what matters is control—who shall control industry and in whose interests shall that control be exercised. The syndicalists stood for control of industry by the workers in the interests of the workers. Although they often repeated the age-old demand that the workers had the right to the whole produce of their labour, they did not, in the main, interpret this to mean that each group of workers should receive the full fruits of its labours, or that each individual should be so rewarded. Behind the slogan was little more than the demand that

labour as a whole should enjoy what it had produced; in other words, that capitalist profit-makers, rentiers and interest receivers should be eliminated.

Bowman in this respect took up the position of the pure communist, "In the society we syndicalists wish to bring about", he said, "there shall be no value whatever attached to any commodity, so that every individual will be able to partake of all commodities in the full measure of his needs." Wilshire, more cautiously, thought that remuneration might be determined either by deeds or by needs "as may hereafter be decided". What would certainly not be the basis of remuneration was the importance of an individual's product to the community. That "would be merely changing the present system, with a myriad of exploiting workers."²⁴ Syndicalism, he insisted, meant that the control of the technical processes now exercised by the capitalists would pass to groups of organised workers of the various industries. The product, however, which was now the property of the capitalists would become, under syndicalism, the property of the community.

(To be continued)

17 It consisted of 12 monthly pamphlets and was followed in Sept. 1911 by *The Syndicalist Railwayman*, in its turn followed by *The Syndicalist*, Jan. 1912.

18 This celebrated pamphlet was issued by The Unofficial Reform Committee, Tonypanady, 1912. According to Burdick, it was the joint product of 6 authors: Charles Gibbons, Noah Rees, Noah Ahlett, W. F. Hay, George Dolling, and W. H. Mainwaring.

19 From *Single Tax to Syndicalism*, p. xiv.

20 This was the title of the English translation, published 1913, of their book: How we shall bring about the Revolution. One of the translators was Frederick Charles who had been concerned in the so-called anarchist 'bomb plot' at Walsall, 1892.

21 *Syndicalism: its basis, methods and ultimate aims*, 1913.

22 Apart from these two conferences the I.S.E.L. called an International Congress which was held in London, Sept.-Oct. 1913. It was mostly concerned with the question of trade union structure.

23 This repudiation sometimes went so far as a repudiation of the famous syndicalist slogan itself: "Syndicalism does not hold with the position of the mines for the miners, though Syndicalism would prefer even that to the present state of affairs . . . Syndicalism favours the administration of the mines for the miners on the theory that none knows as well as the miners themselves the various details connected with the mining industry."—*The Syndicalist*, June, 1912.

24 *Syndicalism: what is it?*, no date.

The Responsibility of the Scientists

dence which supports Mr. Mumford's charges (quoted above):

During the dark days of the world war I once spoke to a distinguished scientist of some major event in the course of the war and he looked up from his work and said sharply, "What war?" Concentration upon our various specialities is essential, but it should not cause us to lose our sense of orientation in the world.

But what seems specially pertinent, here, is a passage which lends force to Dr. Bronowski's account of the duties of the scientist. Speaking of the freedom of thought and criticism which are the lifeblood of science, Dr. Conklin said:

In spite of a few notable exceptions it must be confessed that scientists did not win the freedom they have generally enjoyed, and they have not been conspicuous in defending this freedom when it has been threatened. Perhaps they have lacked that confidence in absolute truth and that emotional exaltation that have led martyrs and heroes to welcome persecution and death in defence of their faith. Today as in former times it is the religious leaders who are most courageous in resisting tyranny. It was not science but religion and ethics that led Socrates to say to his accusers, "I will obey the god, rather than you." It was not science but religious conviction that led Milton to utter his noble defence of intellectual liberty, "Whoever knew truth put to the worst in a free and open encounter . . ." The spirit of science does not cultivate such heroism in the maintenance of freedom. . . .

So, it is a mistake, perhaps, to argue that the scientist has special responsibilities. He has them, but he has them as a man, and they are not special, but belonging to us all.

(From MANAS, Los Angeles).

THE general public is naturally affected by the prestige of science. The February *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* has an article (a portion of a doctoral thesis in political science) by Harry S. Hall which illustrates the ambivalent attitude of ordinary people in the presence of the "wizards" of science. Mr. Hall presents dozens of quotations from the Congressional Record reflecting this view. After Hiroshima, says this writer, politicians, like everyone else, "looked upon scientists with considerable awe and deference." He continues:

Scientists appeared to them as superior beings who had gone far ahead of the human race in knowledge and power. Indeed, politicians seemed to regard scientists in much the same way that primitive people regard their magician-priests. That is to say, Congressmen perceived scientists as being in touch with a supernatural world of mysterious and awesome forces whose terrible power they alone could control. Their exclusive knowledge set scientists apart and made them tower far above other men.

The quotations presented in this article show that while, on the one hand, Washington legislators are awed by the knowledge of scientific specialists, they are irked by their inability to comprehend many of the scientists' reasons for what they say, and are troubled, also, by the internationalist bent of most research workers. Dr. Compton, for example, testified that not a single Japanese civilian scientist asked to do a war job by the Japanese government was told what he was working on meant—how it would be used in war. Dr. Oppenheimer testified before a committee concerning American scientists:

Most scientists, because they are scientists, are certainly not happy with the absolute national sovereignty that prevailed ten years ago. They were not happy with the war.

In a statement prepared for the National Science Foundation hearings, Harlow Shapley declared.

Our American scientists and technologists at the present time have been derived from the adventurous pioneering stock of practically all the nations of the world. We call ourselves American by citizenship, but our blood is cosmopolitan. The scientists should, as rapidly as possible, call themselves citizens of the world and not the citizens of individual countries.

Generalizing his conclusion, Hall says: Politicians were not only frustrated by their inability to challenge scientists but also by their dependence on scientists in the new atomic age. Whether Congressmen liked it or not, their survival depended to a large extent upon trusting the scientists and admitting them to the public policy-making process.

Or, as Senator Hickenlooper put it: We have got to the point where we have rubbed the lamp and the genie has come out and we cannot get him back into the lamp.

With these attitudes in mind, it is easy to see the force of Dr. J. Bronowski's observations in the January *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, in an article, "The Real Responsibilities of the Scientist." He speaks of the frightening "distance" between the scientist and the public—and even between scientists in different fields—and finds in these divisions a grave threat:

People hate scientists. There is no use beating the bush here. The scientist is in danger of becoming the scapegoat for the helplessness which the public feels. And if an immense revulsion of public feeling does lead to the destruction of the scientific tradition, then the world may enter a dark age as it did after the Goths destroyed Rome . . . But even if this danger

does not materialize, something as terrible could happen—and is happening. This is that the scientist is forced, by the hatred of public opinion, to side with established authority and government. He becomes a prisoner of the hatred of the lay public and by that becomes the tool of authority.

Dr. Bronowski draws some fine lines in his discussion of the scientist's responsibility in these circumstances. He admits, for one thing, the guilt of scientists in having "contrived weapons and policies with our public conscience, which each of us individually would never have undertaken with his private conscience." On the other hand, science, he says, has no right to attempt to become keeper of the public conscience:

We must explain to people that they are asking of scientists quite the wrong collective decision when they say, "you should not have invented this" or "you should not have disclosed that." This is asking us all to betray the public in the same way as Dr. Klaus Fuchs did, by asking scientists to make decisions which are for the nation to make. The only man who ever, on his own responsibility, was willing to shoulder public responsibility in this way, was Dr. Fuchs. But so far from being hailed as the only sane scientist, he was treated as quite the opposite—as, of course, he was, since scientists have no right to betray the will of the nation. Yet Fuchs did just what the public asks of every scientist—he decided what to do with a scientific invention.

Here Dr. Bronowski gives powerful illustration of the scientist's ability to think in terms of principle—a faculty seldom within the capacity of the politician!

He lists various duties or responsibilities:

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT! WEEK 19

Deficit on Freedom	£380
Contributions received	£444
SURPLUS	£64

May 4 to May 10

Germiston: V.D. 6/-; Preston: E.B. 3/-; Croydon: P.Q. 2/6; London: H.M. 5/-; London: J.S.* 5/-; London: N.B.T.* 2/3; Sheffield: G.P.* 5/-; Oxford: Anon.* 5/-; London: Hyde Park Sympathisers, 1/-; Shirley: A.W.H. 3/3; London: A.D. 1/-; Pittsburgh: L.D. 14/-; Oakland: K.C. 7/-; Leicester: C.M.M. 1/-; Northwood: E.H. 1/-; Warrington: J.H.(1) 5/-; Keele: C.F.M. 2/3; Aberdeen: G.B. 5/-; Warrington: J.H.(2) 5/-.	
Total	6 16 3
Previously acknowledged	437 8 0
1956 TOTAL TO DATE	£444 4 3

GIFT OF BOOKS London: Anon.

*Indicates regular contributors.

Eden Catches a Crab

Continued from p. 1

"We must now salute Sir Anthony Eden for a performance of such stunning maladroitness that it crowns a career dedicated to proving how scrupulously out of touch with public thought a statesman can be. Of Sir Anthony Eden's essay in anointed emptiness it can fairly be said that not even John Foster Dulles could have done better."

All this has, of course, been a gift from the Socialist heaven for the Labour Party. Still trying to cover up and at the same time defiantly justify their up-setting of B. & K. at the famous dinner party, Gaitskell has gleefully seized upon the untimely end of Lionel Crabb to really put Eden on the spot. And could hardly have failed to do so, for at every step Sir Anthony has put himself deeper and deeper in the mire. The storm that Crabb stirred up from the murky waters of Portsmouth Harbour has almost obliterated from the public mind the Labour Party's misdeeds at dinner. They might have asked their guests a few more questions—but at least they weren't spying on them.

Realpolitik

Were it not for two things the Labour Party could really shake the Government on this issue. The first is that the B. & K. visit ended with goodwill all round, so the Russians are not interested (at the moment) in stirring things for the Tory Government, and the second, arising out of that, is that the Russians are interested in stirring up trouble for the Labour Party. So they are keeping up the attack which Khrushchev started as soon as he landed back home, and are attacking, not the Tories for the frogman's antics, but the Labour Party for trying to make capital out of it.

Thus do we see the Communists coming to the Conservatives' rescue (although they have published texts of official notes, the exchange of which Eden had not even disclosed!) the better to attack the Labour Party.

Labour is, of course, trying to make capital out of the whole affair, and the only thing the Tories can do is to try and pass the blame on to the Secret Service. Which is very convenient since nobody knows who they are, where they hang out, how much they cost us, what they are up to or when they are going to land us in real trouble.

However, it all depends on realpolitik, doesn't it? People like Crabb are the tools of the governments. Their deaths can be used to advantage one way or the other. The political capital being made out of it would be more disgusting if it were not for the fact that the work he was up to was disgusting also.

"Let us not forget" says the *Observer's* Political Correspondent, that "a gallant ex-officer has presumably been killed". Spies are always gallant when they're on our side.

A famous British spy, Lieut.-Colonel Scotland, writing in the *Sunday Express*,

puts the thing in practical terms:

"For Lionel Crabb was not on recall from the Navy. He was—I say this with certainty—a straightforward freelance spy."

"When Crabb waded out into deep water on that bright April morning he believed that he would bring back a haul of information that would be worth a lot to him in hard cash."

"Let this fact reflect no dishonour on Lionel Crabb. He was a hero, a man of splendid courage who was bent on using his talents as a frogman to carry out some valuable work for his country."

It is no dishonour, then, to go through your guest's pockets—if you are doing it for money.

Unrest inside Spain

Continued from p. 1

tyre chains attempted to quieten the students and there were bloody fights throughout the city. No word of this was printed in the Madrid press. Next day Franco ordered the Falangists confined to barracks and sent 1,400 armed plainclothesmen into the streets with orders to break up disturbances by "shooting if necessary". This time a notice appeared in the Falangist newspaper *Arriba* blaming: "... armed liberalism motivated by Communism."

Seven student ringleaders were later reported as being exiled to places two hundred miles from Madrid; Franco abrogated the theoretical "right" of Spaniards to move freely about Spain and suspended the law protecting them from summary arrest and imprisonment. The old tension was back again.

Last week four students were on trial for having printed and distributed propaganda leaflets demanding the release of the "exiled" student ringleaders. Amongst the charges were, causing "offence to the authorities" and referring to Minister of the Interior Blas Perez Gonzales as "Blas Himmler". The sentences were surprisingly light—six months to a year in prison and £50-£100 fines. But there may be reasons for this . . .

Fascist Democrat!

Surprisingly enough the man chosen to defend the four students was none other than the ex-Falangist leader and fascist, Gil Robles, who in 1933 had attacked the Republican government for "ultra-democratic" practices. Two years later, as Minister for War he appointed Major-General Franco to be chief of staff of the Spanish army, and with backing from millionaire banker Juan March and a private army attempted to set up a Fascist government in Spain. He was eventually beaten to it by the army and Franco, and exiled to Portugal, from where he has just returned after sixteen years.

In his defence of the accused Robles

obliquely attacked the government by pleading that it is "legitimate to criticize the authorities when these authorities reveal a tendency to cover up abuses." He spoke sarcastically of certain conditions prevailing in Spanish public life that had justified the defendants' resorting to any means of expression, since the obvious ones were denied them . . . Was this the authoritarian politician turning to a more liberal point of view by defying the totalitarian government? By no means—merely a suitable platform for gaining support for the Falangists, in the hope that one day he might succeed Franco as the dictator of Spain.

Franco's reply was contemptuous: "Because we are strong we can afford to be generous. This is why we pay no attention to the silly intrigues of a few dozen would-be politicians and their followers." And threatening: "If they should ever disturb the realization of our heroic destiny . . . we would throw them out."

Strike Wave

Perhaps the most difficult feat for a repressed people to accomplish is a strike. For workers without funds or strike-pay, without the help of mass communications and co-ordination, and above all workers who have been oppressed by a fascist domination for nearly twenty years, the wave of strikes which has recently broken out appears to be an almost impossible achievement.

The strikes were widespread and co-ordinated—they took place in a dozen undertakings—engineering works, textile factories, electricity plants and gas works—sufficient numbers of workers stayed away for places to be closed down. A formidable demonstration of solidarity in the face of reprisals which could have serious consequences for the strikers, since under a dictatorship a strike is a political act.

To find reasons why there should be strikes at this particular time is not too

difficult. With the new position in which Spain finds herself, as an ally of the Western powers, money has flowed into the country—mostly dollars—for military purposes, railways, mines, factories and other investment enterprises. The effect has been twofold: the standard of living has increased and (as usual, so has inflation).

But wages had been kept at absurd minimum levels bearing no relation to real buying power. Last February the Ministry of Labour was forced to raise the official scale by an average of one-fifth. This meant nothing in the cities where wages had of necessity already been raised by a fifth to meet rising prices. Not only did the "increase" have no effect in the towns, but it was taken as authority to peg wages and refuse all claims.

No word of the strikes was admitted in the Spanish press, and it is not known how they were dealt with. It may be that more strikes have taken place, despite the fact that all strikers have had their compulsory labour contracts cancelled. These documents prohibit workers from striking and absenteeism, but also prevent bosses giving them the sack. Now they no longer have even this protection.

For there is a moral contract between society and its individuals which allows individuals to be dissident; and if the state breaks this moral contract, then it leaves the individual no alternative but to become a terrorist.

Finally, there is the scientist's duty to be an intellectual heretic—even as Isaac Newton was, in religion as well as science:

... every scientist can teach men to resist all forms of acquiescence, of indifference, and all imposition of secrecy and denial . . . There is one thing above all others that the scientist has a duty to teach to the public and to governments: it is the duty of heresy.

The only trouble with all this is that it seems to restrict such high responsibilities to scientists, when the fact is that scientists will be quite unable to live up to these ideals unless they do it first, as men, along with others who feel the same responsibilities. There is value in speaking of the responsibilities of scientists, since the present is their time of trial, but no one has the right to ask of scientists what he does not ask of himself.

Some years ago, a retiring president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science—Edwin Grant Conklin, in 1937—chose the title, "Science and Ethics," for his farewell address, and at the outset he gave evi-

difficult. With the new position in which Spain finds herself, as an ally of the Western powers, money has flowed into the country—mostly dollars—for military purposes, railways, mines, factories and other investment enterprises. The effect has been twofold: the standard of living has increased and (as usual, so has inflation).

But wages had been kept at absurd minimum levels bearing no relation to real buying power. Last February the Ministry of Labour was forced to raise the official scale by an average of one-fifth. This meant nothing in the cities where wages had of necessity already been raised by a fifth to meet rising prices. Not only did the "increase" have no effect in the towns, but it was taken as authority to peg wages and refuse all claims.

No word of the strikes was admitted in the Spanish press, and it is not known how they were dealt with. It may be that more strikes have taken place, despite the fact that all strikers have had their compulsory labour contracts cancelled. These documents prohibit workers from striking and absenteeism, but also prevent bosses giving them the sack. Now they no longer have even this protection.

What Next?

One cannot tell what will happen next in Spain. Certainly the unrest will continue as more and more Spaniards feel the impact of the democracies upon the Franco régime—for Franco has the problem of how to remain strong and in control and at the same time create a "good impression" for the benefit of America and Britain. He is forced to take notice of the demands of the workers, which directly conflicts with the interests of the trinity of landowner, church and army, upon whom he relies for support. His power may well be on the wane, but he may only lose it to another Fascist group, in spite of the efforts of more enlightened men.

H.F.W.

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.

MAY 20—No meeting

MAY 27—Mani Obahagbon on TOWARDS THE DEFINITION OF FREEDOM

JUNE 3—To be announced

June 10—To be announced

JUNE 17—Alfred Reynolds on THE BRIDGE: A WAY TO ANARCHISM?

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

At 200 BUCHANAN STREET,

GLASGOW

OUTDOOR meetings at Maxwell Street, every Sunday, commencing April 1st at 7.30 p.m.

LIBERTARIAN FORUM

813 BROADWAY,

(Bet. 11 & 12 Sts.)

NEW YORK CITY

Round-Table Youth Discussions

Friday Evenings at 8.30

June 1—To Be Announced.

June 8—Civil Liberties and the Supreme Court.

June 15—The Middle Eastern Situation.

June 22—The Relationship of the Family to Society.

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