

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"The strength of the old order lies not so much in political power as in the fact that it is generally approved. We must influence men so that this approval may cease."
—ALEXANDER HERZEN.

Vol. 17, No. 23

June 9th, 1956

Threepence

BRITAIN THE BULLY

'Bloody-minded' Tories do not Count the Cost

THROUGHOUT the world opinion is hardening against the British Government's policy in Cyprus. Not only those countries which might be expected to criticise such naked imperialism, but Britain's closest allies, including the Americans, are now voicing their uneasiness.

We do not expect governments to be concerned with human rights. We have seen in the antics of the United Nations that those very governments which have signed the Bill of Human Rights, refusing to allow it to be applied to their own territories. When attempts have been made to raise for international discussion matters of internal concern about the rights of non-Europeans in South Africa, for example, the South African Government walked out of the U.N. assembly.

South Africa has a more honest attitude in this matter, for at least the Nationalists have consistently made plain where they stand as regards civil liberties for Africans and 'Coloureds'. Britain, however, staunchly maintain her claim to be regarded as a champion of human rights, but that did not prevent her from refusing to allow Cyprus to be discussed in the assembly of the United Nations, either.

It seems that signing such a generalised document as the Bill of Rights gives a State the right to criticise others, and it is into this same hypocritical category that falls the criticism of Britain's Cyprus policy by the United States.

For the US showed clearly enough in its attitude towards Guatemala just where she stands with regard to the rights to self-determination of small states. No more than Britain

does America give a damn for the peoples of the world, and if we find her criticising British domination anywhere, then we have to look for reasons other than principle or love of liberty.

Defence Needs

The fact is that the British Government's brutal handling of the Cypriots is, far from strengthening her position in the Middle East, weakening it. The first result of Eden's get-tough policy has been to turn a friendly people into bitter enemies. The Cypriots had tolerated British occupation of their island, although for decades the Enosis had been a large question-mark in the background, until the arbitrary decision to make Cyprus the main British base in the East Mediterranean in place of Suez. This decision turned Cyprus into an armed camp, an atom-bomber base, and therefore an atom-bomb target.

It was time for the Cypriots to make an urgent issue of self-determination, but they were greeted instead with, at first, a stone wall of refusal ever to grant them freedom from British rule, and then a compromise half-promise so vague in its terms as to be quite meaningless.

So the battle was joined, and every week the crisis as deepened as action follows counter-action. Neither side can now give way without losing face, but as the British blunder on in their declared task of restoring 'law and order', they undermine the very purpose of their presence in Cyprus.

Defeating Own Ends

Suez was evacuated because, among other things, it was recognised that a military base would be practically useless in wartime in a country with a hostile population. This is now the position in Cyprus. Even supposing the British finally terrorise the Cypriots into submission (and having superior force they probably will eventually succeed) could they ever rely on their support in time of war? There would be every likelihood that the Cypriots would take immediate advantage of the situation and stage a revolt again—especially if Britain's enemy offered them their freedom.

Cyprus could be more of a liability than an asset if war came to Britain in the Middle East.

On top of this there is the deterioration of relationships between Greece and Britain and Greece and Turkey. These three powers have signed a defence pact, the ancient hostility between Turkey and Greece having been overcome by their mutual fear of Russia. But the anti-Turkish riots in Athens and the anti-Greek riots in Istanbul and the stirring up of inter-communal violence in Cyprus (four-fifths Greek-speaking, one-fifth Turkish) have led to a straining of relations between the nations which could seriously weaken Britain's defensive organisation in the Middle East. Yet it is the needs of defence which are recognised as the real interest of Britain in Cyprus. And it is because British policy is defeating its own ends that America is becoming concerned. Through NATO, the US is also interested in the defence of the Mediterranean and she does not wish to see the global chain of defence pacts which stretch from the Atlantic to the Pacific, through Europe, the Middle East

and South-East Asia, weakened by internal animosities.

Western Propaganda

Also, America's own experience with McCarthy has taught her that it weakens Western propaganda about the 'free nations of the world' to have its hypocrisy too blatantly demonstrated to the world.

Outside of the politically conscious minority, the world's governments are able to pull a considerable amount of wool over the peoples' eyes. But if the tyranny is too obvious, even the unconscious majority cannot avoid seeing it. This is happening now even in Britain, where the population in general can usually be relied upon to passively support its government's imperial adventures.

According to the Gallup Poll just published in the *News Chronicle*, among those interviewed opponents of the Eden Government's policy on Cyprus outnumbered its supporters by more than two to one. Even among Conservatives, its supporters

Continued on p. 4

THREE COMMENTS ON

The Twisted Mind of Politics

A FRONT page story in the *News Chronicle* last week deals with the claims made by the Cypriot terrorist organisation, Eoka, that two British soldiers had been hanged by them as a reprisal for the hanging by the British of two young Cypriots, one of whom had been found guilty of killing a policeman. The Cypriot organisation has again stated that its story was true and by way of proof gives some personal details about its alleged victims

which received confirmation by the father of one of them. The War Office and army spokesman in Cyprus however declare that Eoka has not produced conclusive evidence and even "ridicules Eoka claims".

These claims and counter-claims are, if one pauses for a moment to get some kind of perspective in all this, quite fantastic. In the normal course of events British authorities would be only too anxious to give the greatest publicity to "atrocity" stories which would help to work up "public opinion" in support of its policies (such was the case so far as Kenya was concerned, where the ritual murders, and initiation ceremonies carried out by Mau Mau were exploited to the full in Parliament and in the Press. And didn't the government "discover" the German concentration camps only after war had been declared?).

In the case of Cyprus it would seem that other considerations weighed more heavily in the balance: that any propaganda advantage that might be gained at home from the admission that two British soldiers had been hanged by the "terrorists" would be more than offset in increased prestige for the terrorists among Cypriots who had

viewed with horror the original British action of hanging two of their countrymen. The fact that the terrorists insist that they have done what they allege to have done, clearly indicates that they hope to win sympathy to their cause—in Cyprus, that is—by such reprisals, and in the circumstances therefore, the British find it expedient to deny and to "ridicule" the claim rather than to condemn it as an act of barbarism.

★

WHATEVER else one might say of the French terrorists, or of the terrorists in Tsarist Russia their intended victims were those who had the blood of innocent men and women on their hands. Their bombs were directed at the despots, their revolvers were pointed at the sadistic prison governors and chiefs of police never at those who were, at most, the powerless tools of governments and despots.

By claiming to have hanged two young British conscripts the spokesmen of Eoka reveal that they believe in violence as a means to their ends, and by so doing place themselves on the same level as the British government which has

Continued on p. 3

IN BRIEF

CENSORSHIP SIDEWAYS

HENRY MILLER'S books, which are not unknown to custom's officials, magistrates, postmasters and other censors, sell very well in Japan—Miller is the third most popular author—because they are (fairly) freely available. But the censors have taken exception to certain passages in *Sexus*. In the Japanese language edition the offending passages are printed in English: which means that the reader has to be bilingual and has to turn the book sideways to read the offending parts, since the Japanese sections are printed vertically and the English horizontally!

However, the latest news is that the Japanese edition has been banned entirely but the English edition can be bought without any trouble.

CENSORS IN THE LAND OF THE FREE

In the towns of Wheeling and McMechen, Virginia, censorship boards have issued lists of hundreds of magazines and paperbacks that may not be sold. Among the authors banned are Saul Bellow, Michener, Steinbeck, Tennessee Williams, and D. H. Lawrence.

In New Hampshire, police chiefs are issuing to distributors lists of "disapproved" paperbacks. It is assumed that the books will be banned from sale though none of them have been held illegal by the New Hampshire courts.

South Carolina. The State Legislature has passed a resolution asking the State Library to screen books which are "antagonistic and inimical to the traditions and customs of this state". Only one book was singled out in the resolution: *Swimming Hole* by Jerrold Beim which describes children of different races playing together.

KENYA PRISONS

Miss Eileen Fletcher was, until recently, rehabilitation officer employed by

the Kenya Government. She has worked among women and girl prisoners in detention camps and prisons in Kenya.

On May 29, she spoke to the M.P.s and reporters about prison conditions in the colony. She said that children of 11 and 12 had been sentenced to life imprisonment, that girl prisoners worked at stone-breaking as a part of ordinary prison labour, and that they were sentenced to solitary confinement. She spoke of European women police officers who visited the compounds carrying canes and accompanied by dogs. In one prison women had only a blanket to wear while their clothes were being washed.

The Kenya Government has denied that any children were doing hard labour (which Eileen Fletcher had not alleged!) and that none was serving a life sentence. The British government was most evasive about the matter when questioned in the House of Commons on May 30.

NEWSPAPERS IN RUSSIA

The Russian newspaper, *Pravda*, has been attacking its colleagues. Editors are accused of "political phrase-mongering" and "talmudic writing in the cloud". It has warned journalists to eliminate drabness, triteness and "political blah-blah" and to "delve deeply" into real life. But of course they must remain truthful "helpers of the Party" and must reorientate themselves towards this rôle.

Criticism of the Press has also been heard recently in the satellite countries. A deputy in the Polish Sejm recently complained that the editor of his local newspaper was so afraid to report the storm which raged in their town that he waited for information from Warsaw. A day later he wrote: "It is reported from Warsaw that we had a storm and hail in our town a day ago."

Trains in Protest

NEARLY everyone will have read the recent reports about French reservist troops who, having received orders to go and fight in Algeria, protested by continually stopping the train which was taking them to St. Nazaire. Their principle method of doing this was to pull the communication cord and they eventually succeeded in missing the boat which was to have taken them to Algeria.

Trains are also used for protest purposes in India, and a few days ago the passengers in a train from Poona to a small village 45 minutes down the line, managed to stop it sufficiently often for the journey to take 5 hours. Their demand was that additional coaches should be added to relieve congestion.

Unfortunately trains are sometimes used in a far more irresponsible manner; generally by organised bodies. In Calcutta, the Communist-led railwaymen's union at Karagpur had staged a strike over the refusal of the nationalised railways to upgrade a hundred stencil-painters to skilled rates of pay. Eventually the men started to return to work by the thousand—on seeing this, the strike-leaders pulled the crew off a passing engine and sent the train full steam ahead, complete with passengers and no driver. The train hurtled into a station and crashed into one of the platforms, injuring 63 people.

In parliament, Mr. Nehru delivered an attack upon the Communist trade union, and declared the action monstrous and criminal. If a trade union was responsible for such monstrous tactics, he said, it had no business to exist—a sentiment with which some will disagree. (Mr. Nehru conveniently forgets the monstrous tactics used by governments—but presumably he sees reasons for their existence!)

Subscription Rates

THE increased postal charges which came into operation on June 1st mean that it will cost a further 2/2d. a year to send out FREEDOM to subscribers in this country. As we cannot meet the burden of this added charge out of the contributions to our deficit fund (it means at least an additional £100 a year), we are reluctantly obliged to increase our subscription rates to 19/- a year, 9/6 for six months, 5/- for 3 months. American and Canadian rates remain unchanged at \$3.00 a year.

These new rates apply to all new subscribers but the old rates will be maintained until the end of June for readers renewing their subscriptions. There are still a number of readers who have not replied to the reminder sent out in April (though we are glad to say that some 300, or 60 per cent, have done so—and of these many have taken the opportunity to add words of encouragement for which we are doubly

grateful) and we hope that this further reminder (and inducement?) will result in an avalanche of replies!

A word for those readers who have ordered Volume 5 of FREEDOM SELECTIONS and who may think we have forgotten them. The book is at the binders . . . and in their bottle-neck! But we continue to urge them on with all our powers of persuasion. And as an indication of our optimism in the future we would add that we have started on the printing of Volume 6. So those readers who didn't obtain copies of the first volumes of this series because they doubted that we would go on here is the evidence that our intentions are long-term! Order your copies now (all volumes available except Volume 1 which is in the binders' bottle-neck), at the special rate for FREEDOM readers of £1 for the set of 5 volumes (post free).

PEOPLE AND IDEAS

Alexander Herzen's Testament

"The strong tradition of libertarian humanism in Russian socialism, defeated only in October 1917, derives from his writings. His analysis of the forces at work in his day, of the individuals in whom they were embodied, of the moral presuppositions of their creeds and words, and of his own principles, remains to this day one of the most penetrating, moving, and morally formidable indictments of the great evils which have grown to maturity in our own time."

—ISAIAH BERLIN.

OF the great revolutionary thinkers of nineteenth-century Russia, who speaks most directly to us to-day? Some might say Bakunin, with his occasional clairvoyant insight into the history of the century which followed him, and whom events have vindicated in his dispute with Marx and the social-democrats in the First International, a dispute which marked a turning point in the history of socialism. But Bakunin's conspiratorial romanticism and his semi-nihilism put a gulf between him and us. Some might say Kropotkin whose pragmatic and experimental approach and whose emphasis on regionalism and the integration of industry and agriculture are of the greatest relevance to-day, but whose revolutionary optimism divides him from our disillusioned day. Some might say Tolstoy, but while we may love him for his two great novels, and while we may value his philosophy of non-violence, we cannot help being chilled by his ultimate rejection of the enjoyment of life. One must choose, as Orwell says, between this world and the next.

But people familiar with the writings of Alexander Herzen would probably say that it is he who, among his fellow-countrymen of the last century, speaks most intimately and immediately to our own day.

The work of Herzen's which you are most likely to come across is his autobiography *My Past and Thoughts*, in the six little green volumes of Constance Garnett's translation (Chatto & Windus 1924-27). But this book which Isaiah Berlin calls 'one of the great monuments to Russian literary and psychological genius, worthy to stand beside the great novels of Turgenev and Tolstoy', is hard to find, and most people know of Herzen through Mr. E. H. Carr's *The Romantic Exiles* which, while it gives a detailed account of the tragic comedy of Herzen's personal and family life, loses sight altogether of Herzen's importance in the history of Russia and the history of ideas. The inaccessibility of Herzen's works for English readers is soon to be partially remedied by the publication (promised in September by Weidenfeld & Nicolson) of his 'political testament' *From the Other Shore*, in a translation by Mr. Berlin (extracts from which were quoted in FREEDOM last week).

HERZEN was born in Moscow in 1812, the year of Napoleon's entry into the city, two years before the birth of Bakunin, sixteen years before Tolstoy, thirty years before Kropotkin. Like them he came from a rich aristocratic family, and though in fact, he was born out of wedlock, he inherited his father's wealth. The great event during his childhood was the revolt led by army officers and members of the nobility in December 1825, on the death of the Tsar Alexander I. The Decembrists had two factions, one led by N. Muraviev who sought a constitution, freedom of the press and emancipation of the serfs; and another, the radical wing, led by Pestel and Ryleyev, which went further and wanted the abolition of the monarchy, the liberation of Poland, and the distribution of the land to the peasantry and to all who wished to settle on it. The revolt was crushed on the accession of Nicholas I, and its leaders hanged, but as Herzen recalled, 'The cannons on Senate Place awakened a whole generation'.

In his fathers' library Herzen read the French rationalist philosophers of the eighteenth century and in the university and intellectual circles of Moscow he became acquainted with the philosophy of Hegel and Feuerbach and the French socialist thinkers Cabet and Fourier. In 1834 he and his lifelong friend the poet Ogarev were among other members of these circles, arrested and imprisoned and sent in the following year into exile at Vyatka. When he was permitted to return he spent a short while in St. Petersburg but was again exiled as a 'dangerous and passionate freethinker'. At the age of thirty, when he returned to Moscow he summed up his life as 'twelve years of childhood, four of school, six of adolescence, and eight of exile, persecutions and reprisals'.

The two main streams of Russian thought during the savage reign of Nicholas I were those of the Slavophiles and the Westernisers. The Slavophiles sought to preserve Slavic civilisation and the Orthodox faith. Their right wing regretted the reforms of Peter the Great and hated 'the contaminated breath of the West'; their left wing sought an 'Orthodox popular democracy' and a union of all the Slav countries. Of the Westernisers the right wing followed

the tradition of N. Muraviev and the moderate Decembrists, and the left wing, represented by Belinsky, Herzen and Bakunin, took up the threads of Pestel and the radical Decembrists. Herzen wrote: "All the talk about Russian humility and Orthodoxy is merely helping the reaction; the future of the country lies not in the resurrection of Byzantine prejudices or pseudo-national smugness, but in free thought, science, individual and collective liberty, and the transformation of the social and economic order".

★

IN 1846, when his father died, Herzen left Russia for Paris ('I entered it

with reverence, as men used to enter Jerusalem or Rome') where he re-encountered Bakunin and made the acquaintance of Proudhon. He moved on to Italy where he witnessed the struggle against the petty princes and against Austrian rule, hurrying back to France after the February revolution of 1848 in time to see the revolution destroyed, not by the reaction, but by itself. In June, Herzen and Turgenev, confined to their rooms by the police, listened to 'the rattle of the musketry' as the workers were crushed. In the confused months which followed he financed Proudhon's paper *Le Voix du Peuple* while Proudhon was in prison, and as the persecution of

foreign revolutionaries heightened, Herzen left Paris for Switzerland.

The spectacle of the failure of the European revolutions in France, Austria, Hungary, Germany and Italy, led to his questioning in *From the Other Shore*, the very idea of political revolution. The French revolution of 1789 he saw as 'the first awakening of mankind from the religious dream of the Catholic and feudal middle ages'. It was led by a minority which repudiated its principles as soon as it attained power.

"A bourgeois republic is worth just as much or just as little as a monarchy. The very men, the very bourgeois, who brought about the great revolution, hastened thereafter to set Napoleon and then the kings upon the throne. After the July revolution came Louis Philippe. After the February revolution, as early as June, and under the republican régime, the workers were shot down by

Continued on p. 4

CINEMA

MEXICAN STYLE

THE SHAWL (El Rebozo de Soledad).
Director: Roberto Gavaldon. (Cuzon Cinema).

WHEN faced with some of the Japanese films shown in this country in recent years one well known critic confessed herself incompetent to pass judgment upon them because they portrayed a way of life outside her ken. I am tempted to adopt a similar attitude to this Mexican film, but to do so would be to abdicate as a critic. The lives of the people in it are quite unlike our own, but the people themselves are not so unlike us that I need doubt our capacity to understand them and their motives.

The principal character is Dr. Albert Robles (Arturo de Cordova), who sets up his practice in the poverty-stricken little village of Santa Cruz. The people there are ignorant and superstitious, preferring the local witch doctor's magic to the physician's science. The village priest, Father Juan, regards him at first, though with good-humoured tolerance, as something of a nuisance, but as time goes on the two men become good friends.

Ignorant and superstitious they may be, but these simple peasants have a dignity and a humanity sadly lacking in our more urban society. They are not all admirable, however. There is, for instance, David, the mayor (Carlos Lopez Moctezuma), whose only concern in life is his own personal aggrandizement. He would, he tells us, see all the children in

the village die rather than kill his five valuable but tuberculous cows. By means of some municipal skulduggery he tries to seize the property of a young landowner, Roque Suazo (Pedro Armendariz). But Roque is not the sort of man to be cheated of his land without putting up a fight, and a little direct action soon disposes of David. The mayor, however, does not take his humiliation lightly: he will take the first opportunity for revenge.

Roque, meanwhile, has his eye on Soledad (Estela Inda), a girl who is so grateful to the doctor for saving her brother's infected arm that she insists upon undertaking his housekeeping in return. But Dr. Robles is a bachelor, and Father Juan can only shake his head at such an arrangement.

The doctor is rather slow off the mark, and it is a long time before he discovers that he is in love with the girl. By this time Roque, who knows how to wait for the right moment, has abandoned fruitless negotiation and resorted once more to direct action: Soledad is pregnant.

A woman's "virtue" may not matter a jot to us, but to these Catholic peons it is so important that its loss calls for immediate revenge on whoever is responsible. But Roque persuades himself that it is his duty to marry Soledad, and honour is saved. As she loves the doctor and the doctor loves her this seems a singularly unhappy arrangement; but the

extraordinary tangles that people get into when their passions go to work on "morality" and "honour" can lead to anything.

This, as you may have gathered by now, is a tragedy, and the catastrophe is not long delayed. Roque has killed one of David's henchmen in a quarrel and is shot down soon afterwards by the mayor's men. And in spite of the doctor's efforts Soledad dies in childbirth.

Dr. Robles decides to put his troubles behind him and seek an appointment at a clinic in Mexico City, where he reflects on his village career while waiting to be interviewed. Here fresh disillusion awaits him: the doctors at the clinic are more interested in exploiting their rich patients than in the practice of medicine. In disgust he returns to Santa Cruz.

Roberto Gavaldon has translated this story, from a novel by Xavier Lopez Ferrer, into a film that never lacks interest. His direction shows sensitiveness and feeling, and though his symbolism is hackneyed and too obviously a trick of the trade this is a minor blemish.

The emphasis is on the visual side, as it should be in a film, and there are a number of well composed scenes that remain in the mind long after the screen has gone blank.

The acting is consistently good, which in itself is enough to make this an unusual film. E.P.

The Tradition of Workers' Control - 7

Guild Socialism

PERHAPS the principal explanation of why the British syndicalist movement has been neglected by historians is that it was overshadowed by the Guild Socialist movement which flourished in this country between 1912 and 1924. It has now become customary to regard Guild Socialism as the adaptation of syndicalist theories to British conditions. The syndicalists themselves viewed the matter somewhat differently; "Middle-class of the middle-class, with all the shortcomings (we almost said 'stupidities') of the middle-class writ large across it," declared one syndicalist writer, "Guild Socialism" stands forth as the latest lubrication of the middle-class mind. It is a 'cool steal' of the leading ideas of Syndicalism and a deliberate perversion of them... We do protest against the 'State' idea... in Guild Socialism. Middle class people, even when they become socialists, cannot get rid of the idea that the working class is their 'inferior'; that the workers need to be 'educated', drilled, disciplined, and generally nursed for a long time before they will be able to walk by themselves. The very reverse is actually the truth..."³²

There is a good deal of truth in both these points of view, so far as they go, but both obscure certain aspects of the Guild Socialist movement which derived little or no inspiration from Syndicalism and both ignore the deep roots that the new movement had in the English radical and socialist tradition. It would perhaps be more true to say that Guild Socialism was the amalgam of very different and even diverse elements of which syndicalism was the most obvious if also the most important.

The Restoration of the Guild System

In its earliest manifestations the new movement had nothing whatever to do with either French syndicalism or American industrial unionism. As the title of the book which can be said to mark the formal beginning of the movement makes clear, it was at this nebulous stage a backward rather than a forward-looking movement. This book, *The Restoration of the Guild System* by A. J. Penty was published in 1906 but it had been 'on the stocks' since the turn of the century and its contents had been known to a small circle of Penty's friends who shared his dislike of current Fabianism. Penty's book, the preface to which

acknowledged the influence of Ruskin and Carpenter, was an attempt to give a practical direction to the artistic tradition in British socialism. In it can be found some of the leading ideas of later guildsmen together with many that remained largely his own. For Penty the great evil of modern society was not the private ownership of capital or the competition that went with it but commercialism and the control of industry by the financier in place of the master craftsman. Commercialism, he argued, led to the debasement of moral and aesthetic values and destroyed the craftsman's pride and joy in his work. Collectivism or State Socialism ignored these spiritual values and was, in effect, merely "State Commercialism". "The mere transference of the control of industry from the hands of the capitalists into those of the State can make no essential difference to the nature of the industry affected". Collectivism rested on the fallacy that Government should be conducted solely in the interests of man in his capacity as consumer: a true system would aim at a just balance between consumer and producer. The real reformer, concluded Penty, must therefore boldly set his face against the further evolution of society in the direction in which it was moving. Social salvation could only come with the re-introduction of the medieval guild system of organisation under which producers, working in their small and separate workshops, would be subject to the regulation of their appropriate guild.

The Rise of Guild Socialism

The publication of Penty's book was planned as the first move in the formation of a Guilds Restoration League, a statement of whose objects included: "The principle of the Guild System is true for all time. It is the principle that individual craftsmen should in all matters relating to his craft be subject to the control of the craft to which he belongs... The foundations of a restored Guild System have already been laid in the Trade Union and the Arts and Crafts movements. These two represent respectively an economic and an artistic revolt, the former seeking to emancipate the worker and the latter seeking to emancipate the craft, from the spirit of commercialism."³³

The ideas behind the abortive League were carried into the citadel of collectivism itself with the

formation in 1907, by A. R. Orage and Holbrook Jackson, of the Fabian Arts Group; but the group failed to flourish and speedily came to an end.

The New Age

In the same year, however, Orage and Jackson took over the editorship of *The New Age*, a weekly review which was to play an important part in the development of Guild Socialist thought. The new editors displayed a catholic taste, the review became the forum for a large number of gifted and independently minded writers of all political complexions, and it rapidly won for itself the reputation of being the most stimulating product in contemporary journalism. Articles on the arts and crafts movement received due place in its columns and Penty, for a time, continued his assaults on collectivism, large-scale organisation and modern industrialism. Of greater immediate influence, however, were the writings of Belloc and Chesterton who developed in its pages and elsewhere their distributivist theories and who sounded the alarm against the approach of the Servile State. Their distributivist ideals left no impression on guild theories but their anti-collectivism added point and vigour to Penty's attack. In his editorial Notes of the Week, Orage, with skill and subtlety, translated their hostility towards state action into socialist language. All the much vaunted reforms of the Liberals, which were supported by the Labour Party and the Fabians, were serving, he argued, only to make capitalism more endurable by rendering the working classes slightly more comfortable. Such provisions as the new conciliation and arbitration boards not only assumed an equality between the parties which did not exist—while at the same time restricting the freedom of trade union action—but they were based on the "insufferable hypothesis" that "the status of the wage-slave" was to be a permanent feature of society. The Webbs—"particularly efficient worryguts of the poor"—and Fabians generally might produce grand schemes for the amelioration of the working classes but they should not forget, he said, that there was "a group of socialists who have as yet found no convenient label, but who will have no curtailment of liberty, no coercion of the individual, although it come with material benefit."³⁴

The columns of *The New Age* in the years 1908-12 reflect another factor which was strongly to shape Guild doctrines—the steadily mounting

Continued on p. 2

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 Outsider Colin Wilson 21/-
The Negro Family in British Guiana R. T. Smith 28/-
Reason and Existenz

Karl Jaspers 14/-
Communism and Nationalism in the Middle East W. Z. Laquer 32/-
House on the Hill C. Pavese 14/6

Reprints . . .

Selected Poems P. B. Shelley (Penguin) 3/6

Second-Hand . . .

Coat of Many Colours

Herbert Read 4/6
The Golden Ass Apuleius 3/-
Instincts of the Herd in Peace and War W. Trotter 2/6
The Creedy Case

Edward Crankshaw 3/-

The Black Man's Burden

John Burger 2/6

The Little Golden Calf Ilya Ilf and Eugene Petrov 2/6

Mister Johnson Joyce Cary 3/-

Ballad of the Sad Café

Carson McCullers 3/6

Stalin's Kampf Joseph Stalin 5/6

Green-Belt Cities F. J. Osborn 3/-

The Unquiet Grave Polinurus 3/-

People Under Hitler

Wallace Deuel 3/-

Laxdale Hall Eric Linklater 3/6

The Goebbels Diaries 3/6

The Religion of Socialism

Ernest Belfort Cox 5/-

The Last Years of H. M.

Hyndman R. T. Hyndman 6/-

Sleepless Spain Victor Alba 3/6

Postage free on all items

Obtainable from

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

THE TWISTED MIND OF POLITICS

Continued from p. 1

shown, so blatantly, that it intends to retain its foothold in Cyprus (in furtherance of its present military and economic interests in the Middle-East) by every weapon of coercion at its disposal.

We do not suggest that the people of Cyprus should submit to the British big-stick; we are not even suggesting that they should refrain from any form of violence in their defence (and in saying this we realise many anarchists will disagree with us, and argue that nothing positive is achieved by violence or counter-violence). What we are saying, however, is that the success of a cause depends as much on the spirit in which it is advanced as in the rightness, the justice of its ends. For then it will maintain its popular support as well as win-over an ever-growing world moral opinion which can manifest itself in many practical ways, from direct mutual aid to public agitation with its consequences (such as refusal of soldiers to embark, dockers to load ships destined for the trouble-spot, government crises over policies). The British government's policy in Cyprus can hardly be called "popular"; it is being attacked from all sides and it has few supporters among the "responsible" organs of the Press. The *Manchester Guardian* has referred to the "bloody-minded" policy of the government in Cyprus, and last Sunday's *Observer* deplores the Prime Minister's stand on "a kind of imperialism that is not merely impractical, but likely to ruin Britain's position in this most important area". The resistance movement in Cyprus in insisting that it is as bloody-minded as the British, is hardly advancing its cause; indeed it is probably doing it great harm.

The Cypriots could learn much from the armed struggle taking place at present in Algeria. The few reprisal-massacres carried out by the Algerian "rebels" have not only resulted in an intensification of the slaughter by the French army but have succeeded in dividing French opinion which was previously strongly hostile to government policy in Algeria, and has made more difficult the task of the friends and advocates of Algerian independence, in France.

There are no short-cuts to progress. A good cause can only succeed by methods which neither offend nor sully that cause.

This is not theoretical preaching but surely simply the experience of our own times as well as the lessons to be learned from the struggles of the past.

★

WHEN President Eisenhower signed the farm bill last week, he praised its "soil bank" feature as a "concept rich with promise for improving our agricultural situation". Only the twisted minds of politicians could refer to the soil bank in these terms, for while it is true that, as a result of the scheme, much land will be improved, the fact is that the scheme is designed primarily to cut surpluses without impairing the farmers' income. The soil bank provides \$1,250 million (more than £400 million) to pay farmers "for taking crop land out of production and placing the land into soil-building cover crops or trees" (*New York Times* 29/5/56). The Secretary of Agriculture declared that his department was "moving immediately to put the soil-bank programme into effect". And one way of doing this has been to put the soil-bank at the disposal of those farmers who are prepared to plough-in their growing

crops now. Some innocent may ask: why improve the soil so that it may be more productive if we cannot dispose of the crops we produce at present? He's got something there Mr. President, don't you think? But Mr. President is deaf to such innocent questions. He is much too busy rolling off such fine-sounding phrases as "a concept rich with promise for improving our agricultural situation" as an accompaniment to the ploughs as they uproot the tender shoots that might have grown into food to feed some of the world's starving millions.

★

IN a speech at Norwich last week-end the Prime Minister told his audience that "the more immediate threat to our country's existence was competition in export markets rather than a world war". So, if we understand him correctly, the wind has changed. Now the threat to our "existence" (and of course we understand what he means by the word) is no longer "Russian Communism" but in fact our dear allies Japan, Western Germany, the United States *et alia!* Now the risk of being "struck down swiftly on the battlefield" has been replaced by the much more terrible prospect of "dying slowly from strangulation of [the nation's] trade". To think that our new friends—and old—should be so ungrateful as to reserve such a fate for us, of all people, is enough to make one lose faith in human nature!

It is a pity that whichever official it is who reads *FREEDOM* at the Foreign Office (and unlike some of our readers, they renew their subscription promptly so as not to miss any words of wisdom that we may utter!) did not pass on his copy to Sir Anthony, for we have been forecasting for the last ten years that if there will be a third world war Britain's "enemies" will be the same old gang, a view based on the old-fashioned belief that wars are not Crusades over opposing ideologies but simply expressions of capitalist economics, the bursting point in a world of shrinking markets ("shrinking" only, as we pointed out last week, in financial terms, never so far as needs are concerned) and expanding industrial production. If Sir Anthony had read *FREEDOM* instead of the *Daily Telegraph* he would now be a wiser and perhaps less disappointed man! He might even have talked a little less nonsense at Norwich last week. For whilst we agree with his view that "competition in export markets" is the more immediate threat not only to "our country's" existence but to all industrial countries it is just this threat which in fact creates the situations which lead to world wars. In other words that far from the threat of world war now taking second place it has for the first time in the past ten years appeared on

disillusionment of the more militant socialists with Labour politics. Cecil Chesterton, for example, contributed a series of articles on "How the Rich Rule Us" from which Orage drew the conclusion that "politics, like capital, is an exclusive possession of the governing classes". The moral pointed was that Trade Unions should stick to their own field, concentrate on economics and leave politics to take care of itself—a foreshadowing of what was to become almost an axiom of Guild Socialist thinking that economic power precedes and dominates political power.

As befitted a journal of the *avant-garde*, *The New Age* was one of the first widely-read journals to take note of the new ideas of syndicalism that were developing rapidly in France. With a characteristic perversity, however, it refused to believe that syndicalism had taken roots in England. Nevertheless, it was quick to interpret the current "industrial unrest" in the light of the central idea of syndicalism—workers' control. Failing socialisation, it suggested, there should be established a "co-partnership" in which the unions as corporate bodies and guilds should be associated in joint responsibility with the owners of capital. The guild system, it went on to claim, was "a genuine Saxon invention, as native to our genius as our language. The true line of development of our trade unions

Anarchism, Sex and Society—3

WE will remember that Gorer's figures covered those in favour of pre-marital relationships. In the absence of figures in favour of extra-marital relationships it is difficult to gauge what the attitude is likely to be after marriage. One would suppose that those people with a freer attitude to sex before marriage might feel the same after marriage. This is rarely the case. The feeling of possession for things loved is strong, and even those who have condoned irregular pre-marital relationships often change once they have selected a permanent partner.

But what of those who have a genuinely free attitude to sex; are they also subject to the same feeling of possession and fear of losing the loved partner? In the view of this writer the same feelings invariably apply. But the difference is in the respect for the freedom of action which anarchists hold to be essential in all human relationships. This

the horizon. And automation far from providing a solution, adds to the problems which, in the past at least, have, failing economic solutions, been resolved (temporarily) by war.

THE importance, from the point of view of Western capitalism, to Russia's New Look is, to our minds, less her political tactics than her intended (economic) rôle in the world's markets. It seems to us possible that Russia will concentrate on creating new markets in those countries which, from the point of view of the industrial nations, do not exist (financially speaking), leaving the existing markets to be fought over by the competing nations of the West. In this way Russia might expect to kill two birds with one stone for she would at the same time build up her sphere of influence—her "rouble-area" as it were—and be the spectator at a struggle among the Western powers for markets which, as each year passes, are ever less able to absorb the ever growing production of agricultural and manufactured goods. The first signs that the thieves (pardon us, *the allies*) are falling out, is the obvious intention of this country to reduce its armament commitments for the same reasons that urge the United States to, if anything, increase hers. The allies are allies except where their economic interests are concerned, and then every man for himself! The Federation of British Industries through its mouthpiece Sir Anthony, has declared its policy: a declaration of economic war on its allies which is doomed to failure as similar declarations will be issued by all the other industrial powers (except the United States which will pursue its economic policy of declaring war on peace) since they are all in the same boat. We can only hope that the workers of the world will wake up in time to sink the lot!

does not mean to say that everyone is likely to act in the same way. For instance, many people hold that once the actual sexual interest between partners has faded the obvious thing to do is to bring the relationship to an end. Others consider that where the existing relationship is otherwise satisfactory, and a break is undesirable, then there is no reason why other sexual unions should be excluded. Another view is that it is possible to have more than one sexual relationship on the same level. Presumably all have been tried, and it would seem that where there is no moral persuasion, attitudes and actions will be decided by the personalities of the people involved.

If we regard the sexual appetite as not merely like the need we have for food and drink, which can be satisfied even with the dreariest of diets, but as a "function involving the whole personality" (*Sex & Society*, Kenneth Walker & Peter Fletcher), then it is likely that people will seek to fulfil this with one partner, and when he or she no longer satisfies, then another partner will be sought. An interesting analysis is made by Arthur Koestler (*Arrow In The Blue*) where he discusses fading illusions. He writes:—

"As the novelty of the relationship wore off the illusion of uniqueness faded, the normal neutralising effects of habituation would make itself felt... The fatal predictability of response produced a mood of detached observation... and to be actor and observer at the same time is the end of innocence. Helena, deprived of her magic and mystery, became depressingly familiar; a sister, fondly liked and tabooed by the senses—and that, for her, is the ultimate indignity. When that stage was reached, flight remained the only honourable solution."

To some extent this is experienced by most people, but few have Koestler's initial illusions and the effects are therefore less drastic. (Fewer still have the imagination to visualise the 'perfect' social system which may never be reach-

ed but which without an idea of 'Utopia' will not even be approximated).

The majority of the type we have been discussing do not think in absolutes like Mr. Koestler, and the case generally argued by anarchists is that extra 'marital' relationships need not affect the existing one. This is merely a plea for a more reasonable attitude to the sex act rather than the laying down of a pattern of behaviour. And although Mr. Koestler's phantom pursuits appeal to the sensibilities of some of us it is as well for the future stability of the race that we are in the minority.

Even people with highly reasonable theoretical views do not always find it easy to adjust themselves to the idea that their partner has other sexual interests. It may be caused through fear of losing them, or simply an inability to accept the 'blow to the ego' whatever the cause, in these circumstances reason rarely plays a dominant part. If the cause is rooted in our childhood attitude to our parents the ill effects on our relationships in adult life can only be minimised by consciously adopting a view which recognises the freedom of choice of each individual, however uncomfortable the result may be.

We have often discussed the social effects of sexual repression: how Church and State can more easily manipulate a frustrated people and induce them into patriotic or religious enthusiasm. The words of Julie in George Orwell's "1984" has meaning for us to-day:—

"When you make love you're using up energy; and afterwards you feel happy and don't give a damn for anything. They can't bear you to feel like that. They want you to be bursting with energy all the time. All this marching up and down and cheering and waving flags is simply sex gone sour."

For this reason, when discussing social change, anarchists have always stressed the need for personal freedom as a prerequisite for economic freedom.

R.M.

The Church Looks at Sex

The Church of England is repeatedly abandoning the view that prostitution is solely a female problem. Its Moral Welfare Council has just issued a book, *Sexual Offenders and Social Punishment*, that emphasises that "the modern cheapening and commercialisation of 'sex' for which certain sections of the Press, and the cinema and advertising industries... have a debasing influence" and "contribute to maintain upon the male sex a constant yet often imperceptible pressure of venereal stimulation which cannot but conduce to an unhealthy sex life".

The book also points how indefensible is the attitude of the average "responsible" male, an attitude which, ironically enough, the Church has frequently adopted itself. "In heaping scorn and abuse upon the prostitute, men have simply sought to relieve their own corporate sense of guilt as a sex by an unconvincing display of moral and social indignations against [prostitutes]... just as society has attempted to make the male homosexual offender a scapegoat for the general corruption of its sexual life".

These quotations show how far the Church has come from its nineteenth century view of prostitutes as fallen women in need of philanthropy and God. At least its appreciation of some of the causes that create the demand for prostitutes is a step in the right direction; but no doubt it will take a very long time to realise how big a part the traditional Christian morality plays in preventing sexual happiness.

BUSY CHAP

THE Duke of Edinburgh, with the aid of a helicopter, proved yesterday that there is almost no limit to the work he can get through in a day.

In the morning he watched a rock-climbing demonstration in Wales; in the afternoon he saw archery and other sports demonstrated in Berkshire; in the evening he watched wrestling championships at the Albert Hall.

News Chronicle 2/6/56.

GUILD SOCIALISM

Continued from p. 2

is, therefore, most certainly in the direction of the restoration of the essential features of the guild system—the responsibility for skilled work, the discipline of its members, the disposition of its collective forces, and the joint control with their clients (employers in this instance) of the whole range of industry."³⁵

National Guilds

With the publication on 25/4/1912 of an article, entitled "Emancipation and the Wage System", the guild movement entered a new phase in which the arts and crafts side and the Medievalism of Penty were to drop into the background and Marxian economics and industrial "politics" were to come to the fore. (The use of the less archaic form of spelling "guild" marked the new phase of the movement). The article, the first of a series, was the work of S. G. Hobson, a veteran socialist and journalist. In 1914 the articles were republished in book form under the title: *National Guilds: an inquiry into the wage system and the way out*. They mark the first definite formulation of the new school of socialist thought and the book soon became almost the standard text of the movement.

The fundamental fact of modern social and industrial organisation, argued Hobson, is the existence of the wage system by which the capitalist produces his wares and is enabled to sell them at

a profit. Under this system labour is assumed to be purely and simply a commodity to be bought and sold like any other commodity. In return for the sale of his labour power, the worker receives wages, i.e. the price of labour established in the market by the operation of the laws of supply and demand. These laws result in wages approximating to the cost of subsistence necessary to maintain and to reproduce labour power. When the worker sells his labour power to an employer, the labour becomes the property of the buyer, the producer loses all control over the products he makes, and he admits the right of the employer to dictate the conditions of his employment. This right allows the buyer to terminate employment at will, with the result that the seller has no security. The receipt of wages is thus the mark of a subject class. So long as the wage system remains, the status of the recipients of wages will be an inferior one and, in essentials, no different from that of the chattel slave. This system, continued Hobson, is based on two false assumptions, namely, that labour, having sold, has no kind of economic or social claim to the products of labour. There could be no emancipation of labour until these two assumptions were exposed and the wage system destroyed.

(To be continued)

³² *The Syndicalist*, Feb. 1914.

³³ Quoted in N. Carpenter: *Guild Socialism*, 1922, p. 91.

³⁴ *The New Age*, 30/12/1909.

³⁵ *The New Age*, 8/1/1912.

Britain the Bully

Continued from p. 1

only mustered two per cent. more than its opponents—40 per cent. against 38 per cent., with 22 per cent. uncertain.

Britons Ashamed

As far as one can judge these matters; as far as any attitude exists at all, it seems that the people of Britain are ashamed at what is going on in Cyprus. Memories of the heroic war-time resistance movements on the continents under Nazi occupation are too recent for the parallel not to be noted. The British people are embarrassed by having to admit that the very same measures of rebellion are being taken by Cypriot patriots against the British occupation, and the same measures of repression are being taken by the British—the mass punishments, the curfews, the shootings, the hangings—as were taken by the Nazis in Norway and France.

There is only one small puff of fresh air now blowing through this tragic situation. This is that the British Government spokesmen are now tending to give up pretence about their reasons for holding Cyprus.

We hear less now about "guarding the interests of minorities" and a bit more realism. Sir Anthony Eden, in his speech last Friday, made quite clear that the British intend to hold Cyprus in order to have a base for the defence of British oil interests in the Middle East. At a Tory rally, the Foreign Secretary, Selwyn Lloyd said: "We are an island dependent on our overseas trade and our overseas interests . . . It is essential that we should retain certain positions of strength at whatever cost."

He went on and specified not only Cyprus but also Aden and Singa-

pore, both places where trouble is brewing for the British.

Naked Imperialism

It would seem then that we are in for a period of naked imperial domination. The large nations of the Empire have been allowed to become Dominions—equals (almost) in the British Commonwealth of ("Free") Nations. The small nations, however, are to remain colonies. British Guiana, Malaya, Kenya, Cyprus—whatever the peoples there think and feel, they are to be held in position "at whatever cost".

Cost to whom? To the people themselves, reduced to subjects of a foreign power. To the soldiers sent to fight them, who die for causes they do not understand. To the taxpayers who pay for the equipment, transport and maintenance of those forces and all the apparatus of government behind them. To all of us who are shamed by what is done in our name.

For what? For the profits, the interests, of the oil, tin and rubber investors, for the power and glory of Empire and the sordid capitalist system it defends. For the exploitation and enslavement of smaller nations, less powerful, less technically advanced than the British.

Britain then, is back in the rôle of bully. As Aneurin Bevan so ably put it—"The Tories are getting bloody-minded. They are reverting to eighteenth-century type". And even the sober-sided *Manchester Guardian* agreed with that!

Undermine Their Power!

What can we do? We can do our best to undermine the power of the British Government to use the British people against those of other lands. It is the same government

Reducing Industrial Strife - at Three Farthings a Head!

WITHOUT question it is a good idea that playing fields and other facilities should be developed for the benefit of young people, but it is unfortunate that the officially recognised organisation to foster this work, the National Playing Fields Association, does not seem to make a great deal of progress.

The sort of attitude expressed by the Duke of Sutherland in the House of Lords recently, leaves one with certain misgivings as to the spirit in which the organisation may be approaching its work. He said that the provision of playing fields "would reduce industrial unrest and discontent by giving the workers something worthwhile to occupy their minds and bodies."

Although his "fellow debaters" did not adopt the same sort of tone, they approved the resolution to encourage the N.P.F.A. and the "satisfactory figure" of £142,000 which was spent by the Government last year on the project.

This figure may be represented in a variety of ways: 1. as 4d. per head of the population of the country, 2. as one hundredth of 1 per cent. of the total expenditure on defence, 3. as rather more than half the cost of a swimming bath. It is however, an advance of £136,000

exploiting us as represses them. Everything we can do that weakens the Government's ability to govern, indirectly helps our fellow-subjects overseas. If we take from the Government the right to hang Britons, we make it harder for it to justify hanging Cypriots. Each potential conscript who turns his back to the flag is one less to shoot at Cypriot school-girls.

We have a common cause alongside the peoples of the colonies. Let us join hands with them in a common struggle against an Empire that has lasted too long.

on the expenditure during the previous year!

A good deal of land has already been given privately to sports organisations, but it remains unused for lack of funds to develop it. Whilst it would be pointless to suppose that playing fields might banish "the pale thwarted figures of the Teddy boys" from the street corners, as piously hoped by the Duke of Sutherland, they would at least help many youngsters to fulfil their desire to play games in more suitable places than streets and back-alleys.

Have you renewed your Subscription to FREEDOM yet?

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT! WEEK 22

Deficit on Freedom	£440
Contributions received	£482
SURPLUS	£42

May 25 to May 31

London: N.B.T.* 3/6; London: A.N.G. 3/-;	
London: H.M.* 2/3; London: J.S. 4/-;	
Maidstone: J.T. 16/-; Bradford: F.R. 3/-;	
Dublin: J.M. 2/-; Seattle: R.P.H. 4/-;	
Reading: J.P.H. 8/-; Welwyn: Joxer* 10/-;	
Cardiff: M.G. 5/-; London: D.R.* 10/-; Per	
D.L., L'Adunata, New York: Mystic, Conn:	
S. £1/15/0; Toronto: R.B. £1/1/0; Mount	
Vernon: W.B. £1/1/0; San Francisco:	
L.Incaricato, £17/10/0.	
Total	24 17 9
Previously acknowledged	457 9 3
1956 TOTAL TO DATE	£482 7 0

GIFTS OF BOOKS: London: Anon; London: C.F.; London: J.L.

*Indicates regular contributors.

U.S. CONVICTS VOLUNTEER FOR CANCER RESEARCH

THE difficulties involved in obtaining volunteer human guinea-pigs for cancer research are quite obvious, particularly when the intention is to inject them with cancer cells in both arms. The mere mention of the word cancer is generally enough to put almost everyone off immediately.

A banner headline in the *Ohio Penitentiary News* (a newspaper with an even more restricted readership than FREEDOM), recently asked for "anyone interested in volunteering for research on our yet most baffling problem . . ."—cancer.

No less than 120 convicts volunteered, and 40 of them also gave their reasons for doing so. Most of them had members of their families who had died or were suffering from the disease. "Four or five", said the warden, "simply said they had been stinkers all their lives and wanted to do something worthwhile."

Ohio Penitentiary has long been "notorious for its toughness", (and the fact that O. Henry developed his talent for writing there—whilst serving a 5 year sentence for embezzlement), but it has not prevented the inmates from volunteering for tularemia (rabbit fever) experiments, and donating skin to victims of severe burns.

Although there is only very slight risk for the cancer guinea-pigs, the response to the appeal seems quite remarkable. It is hoped to prove that it is impossible to give cancer to a cancer-free subject, and also to learn why this is so by the study of removed tissue.

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.

JUNE 10—John Bishop on
THE CAUSE, MEANS AND
PRINCIPLES

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

JUNE 24—Kapitavaddho on
ANARCHISM & BUDDHISM

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 15—The Middle Eastern Situation.
June 22—The Relationship of the Family
to Society.

FREEDOM

The Anarchist Weekly

Postal Subscription Rates:
12 months 19/- (U.S.A. \$3.00)
6 months 9/6 (U.S.A. \$1.50)
3 months 5/- (U.S.A. \$0.75)

Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies
12 months 29/- (U.S.A. \$4.50)
6 months 14/6 (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

Cavaignac. The masquerade terminated with the accession of Napoleon III".

The sentiments of the European masses, he declared, remained monarchical and Christian (which for him meant authoritarian), and until this faith in authority among the people is destroyed, revolutions are just political scene-shifting:

"We call upon the masses to rise and crush the tyrants. The masses! The masses are indifferent to individual freedom . . . They want a government which will rule for them, not against them. But they do not dream of governing themselves . . . It is not enough to despise the Crown; one must not be filled with awe before the Phrygian cap either . . .

"Who will finish us off? The senile barbarism of the sceptre or the wild barbarism of communism; the bloody sabre, or the red flag? . . . Communism will sweep across the world in a violent tempest—dreadful, bloody, unjust, swift. Our institutions, as Proudhon so politely put it, will be liquidated. I am very sorry for the death of civilisation, but the masses are not sorry; the masses to whom it brings nothing but tears, ignorance, suffering, humiliation."

★

HIS experiences led to his repudiation, in *From the Other Shore*, of historical determinism, of belief in some inevitable progress to a blissful future which justifies present sacrifices and brutalities, of systems and formulae. He is terrified of the oppressors, says Mr. Berlin, but he is terrified of the liberators too:

"he is terrified of them because for him they are the secular heirs of the religious bigots of the ages of faith; because anybody who has a cut-and-dried scheme, a strait-jacket which he wishes to impose on humanity as the sole possible remedy for all human ills, is ultimately bound to create a situation impossible for free human beings, for men like himself who want to express themselves, and are prepared to respect the originality, the spontaneity, the natural impulse towards self-expression on the part of other human beings too."

They led him too, to look back towards Russia, for in his view (in his letters to Michelet on *The Russian People and Socialism*), the Russians were not going to replace Tsar Nicholas by a lot of little tsars, members of parliament, and judges and policemen. And he began to see in the ancient communal institutions of the Russian people, the *mir* or village commune and the *artel* or artisan's co-operative, not the mainstay of feudal tradition, as the Slavophiles saw them, but the basis of a popular revolution, more lasting, more rooted in reality instead of theory than the conspiracies of professional revolutionaries: "The life of the Russian peasantry has

Herzen's Testament

Continued from p. 2

hitherto been confined to the commune. It is only in relation to the commune and its members that the peasant recognises that he has rights and duties. Outside the commune everything seems to him to be based on violence . . . The peasant respects only those institutions which reflect his innate conception of law and right. An almost boundless good faith prevails among them; they know nothing of contracts and written agreements. The landowners and the Government eagerly seek an opportunity of interference, but that opportunity is not given them. Petty disputes are submitted to the judgment of the elders or of the commune, and the decision is unconditionally accepted by all. It is just the same in the artels. The artels are often made up of several hundred workmen, who form a union for a definite period . . . At the expiration of the year the workmen divide their wages by common agreement, in accordance with the work done by each. The police never have the satisfaction of meddling in their accounts. Almost always the artel makes itself responsible for every one of its members."

It is on this instinctive Russian socialism which we have to build, says Herzen, bringing from the West, not bourgeois revolutions and parliamentarism, but Western ideas of individual freedom and of advanced agricultural technique. "Work, active work", he cries, "on behalf of the Russian people, which has laboured enough on our behalf!" In these ideas he was anticipating not only the Populist or *Narodnik* movement, but the anarchism of Kropotkin, who wrote of his youthful reading of Herzen's *Polar Star*.

"The beauty of his style, the breadth of his ideas, and his love of Russia took possession of me, and I used to read and re-read those pages, even more full of heart than brain."

★

FOR Herzen the first thing to work for was the liberation of the serfs. "We are slaves because we are masters", he wrote, "we are servants because we are landowners. We are ourselves serfs because we keep our brothers in servitude". In 1852, after a series of family tragedies he settled in London and started the Russian Free Press, the first uncensored printing in the Russian language. The success of his pamphlets which were smuggled into Russia, led him to publish, first an annual *The Polar Star*, which bore on its cover the portraits of the Decembrists executed by Nicholas I, then, when Ogarev had joined him in London in 1856, his famous periodical *The Bell*, (Kolokol). "Between

1857 and 1861", wrote Prince Mirsky, *The Bell* was the principle political force in Russia. It was read by everyone and not least by those in power". And Marc Slonim too remarks that "for almost ten years *The Bell* was the accepted mouthpiece of Russian public opinion, and nobody saw anything paradoxical in the fact that it came from London and a group of émigrés". Kropotkin who was then a page at court, declared that even the Tsar and the empress were among its regular readers. *The Bell* was a vehicle for Herzen's views and for the exposure of abuses, but it had an immediate programme to appeal to all progressive opinion, demanding the emancipation of the serfs, the abolition of corporal punishment and the abolition of censorship. At length the new Tsar Alexander II signed, in 1861 the decree liberating the serfs. It was the crowning moment of Herzen's public life, and he held a celebration for all the Russian exiles at his house in Paddington, but on that very evening the news came that Russian troops were firing on rioters in Warsaw. "Only forty days!" wrote Herzen in *The Bell*, "Why did not this man die on the day when the liberation manifesto was published to the Russian people?"

The legal emancipation of the peasantry was not followed by measures for their liberation and the régime of Alexander hardened into the autocracy of his ancestors. Herzen's influence declined. He would not give up his support for the insurrectionary Poles, and those Russian liberals whose liberalism did not extend to subject peoples, turned away from *The Bell*. The new generation of revolutionaries also turned against him, for he offered no simple, clear-cut solutions. Bakunin had arrived at Paddington, escaping from Siberia after thirteen years of imprisonment, but he was speaking the language of 1848. Herzen, Bakunin and Ogarev moved their press to Geneva in an effort to influence the Russian revolutionaries there. With misgivings, Herzen supported the secret society *Land and Liberty*, but in 1867 he ceased to publish *The Bell* and three years later he died. "What an astonishing writer", Tolstoy said twenty years afterwards, "if his works were not forbidden to the young, our whole life of the last twenty years would have been different".

★

IN his last year, Herzen addressed to Bakunin his *Letters to an Old Comrade*. He agrees with Bakunin that the

goal is the transformation of the bourgeois state into a folk-state, but the attitude of the folk, the entire people cannot be changed by a *coup d'état*, nor by a *coup de rête*. Society evolves, it moves not in leaps but in steps. "Men can be outwardly enfranchised only in so far as they are inwardly free", said Herzen,

"The strength of the old order lies not so much in political power as in the fact that it is generally approved. We must influence men so that this approval may cease".

He was not a mere progressive, he declared, he was not looking for the new society to come from Western parliamentary democracy, but he didn't expect it to come from force or terrorism. "He who is unwilling that civilisation should be founded on the lash should not endeavour to secure liberty through the instrumentality of the guillotine".

"I think there is a certain basis of truth in the fear which the Russian Government is beginning to have of Communism: Communism is Russian autocracy turned upside down".

But it is not so much this prophetic insight that brings us close to Herzen, as his recognition that there are problems for which he will never find solutions, questions to which there are no answers. In his memoirs he writes:

"I was unhappy and perplexed when these thoughts began to haunt me. I tried by every means to run away from them. Like a lost traveller, like a beggar, I knocked at every door, stopped every one I met and asked my way. But every meeting and every event led to the same result—to humility in the face of the truth, to meek acceptance of it".

This discovery did not lead him, as it leads many, to resignation and inactivity. He did not believe that because no road leads to Utopia, no road leads anywhere. From his earliest youth (he wrote to Mazzini), he had been waging a guerrilla war against every oppressive power in the name of the absolute independence of the individual. He would carry on this partisan struggle, he affirmed, he would be a genuine Cossack, acting on his own initiative. "I am indeed attached to the great revolutionary army, but I will not enrol myself in its regular cadres until their character has been completely transformed". For, he declared, he puts his trust in men rather than in institutions, and considers that simply to spread enlightenment is in the long run, more important and in truth more revolutionary. Herzen did not win his partisan engagement, but men and institutions being what they are, it is not an engagement which can ever be broken off completely. C.W.