

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"... Governments create nothing and have nothing to give except what they have first taken away."
 —WINSTON CHURCHILL,
 (Birmingham, 11/11/1903).

ALGERIA: GUILLOTINE AT WORK

UNLIKE the British in Kenya who have executed 1,071 persons since October, 1952, the French in Algeria, had until last week, avoided the guillotine as a weapon in their armed struggle against the Algerian resistance movement. In spite of the fact that more than a hundred Algerians have been condemned to death by the French military Tribunals since the outbreak of armed hostilities occurred 18 months ago.

Last February, the National Liberation Front promised to visit "terrible retribution" on European inhabitants if the order to execute the "condemned patriots" was given. It was later specified that two members of the French security forces would be killed for each "patriot" executed.

On Feb. 29, Robert Lacoste, Minister Residing in Algeria, said at a news conference that the Government was inclined to postpone the executions. The idea was to keep the atmosphere as favourable as possible pending a rebel reaction to the Government's appeal for a cease-fire.

This attitude angered the European inhabitants. On March 15, the Mayors of Algeria threatened to close their town halls unless the Government ordered the executions of terrorists sentenced to death in the courts.

Four days later, M. Lacoste managed to convince the Mayors of his determination to deal effectively with the rebellion and persuade them to withdraw their threat. Last Tuesday week two Arab "terrorists" were guillotined in the courtyard of the civil prison in Algiers. According to reports, other executions are expected to follow. In European circles in Algiers the new policy is described as "the end of the illusion that the rebels would respond to kindness" "Kindness" which in peace meant semi-

starvation for the majority of the Arab population and in the present "crisis" has already resulted in the killing of thousands of Arabs for the purpose of retaining some 800,000 *colons* in positions of power and privilege (the same white minority over whose economic and social privileges tens of thousands of Kenya Africans have been hanged, shot, beaten-up, tortured, deported, imprisoned, detained without trial and banished for life, by the British). Just as in Kenya the settlers' political and social hegemony has been guaranteed by British bayonets, so in Algeria 15,000 "rebels" are being dealt with by no less than 400,000 French troops (including unwilling conscripts from France), with the official promise that the numbers will be shortly increased to 500,000. Surely

an admission that there are a lot more than 15,000 "rebels" in Algeria to-day.

(Postscript: The Security Council of the United Nations was due to discuss last Thursday a request by thirteen African and Asian nations that it "examine the grave situation in Algeria". (Could a "request" be more spineless and less descriptive of the situation in Algeria?) France has warned the U.N. to keep out of French N. Africa's business. Reiterating that Algeria was a French internal affair, the Foreign Ministry said that the continuing strife there presented no threat to international peace. Which is probably quite true. The "request" has obviously been made to the wrong department or on the wrong floor of the U.N. sky-scraper).

MORE VICTIMS OF GOVERNMENT

THE Soviet Union's policy involving the mass deportation of whole nations in the interests of the State has been condemned throughout the West.

Less spectacular, but no less distressing to the 167 ex-inhabitants of Bikini is the news that they will probably never be allowed to return to their homes.

In 1946 the entire population was moved to Kili Atoll by the United States Government so that Bikini could be used as an atom test range. It is now disclosed that "conditions on Bikini preclude the people from returning there for many years, if ever". The Bikinis are naturally feeling annoyed because Kili has different soil and rainfall from Bikini and they are unable to grow their food plants.

The U.S. High Commissioner for the Pacific Trust Territories has promised the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations that compensation would be sent as soon as possible. Given money, time and skill no doubt the people can be taught how to adapt the soil for their purposes, but does this make up for moving them and changing their way of life so that the United States can compete in the race for supremacy in mass destruction?

When people are only considered in terms of their usefulness to a particular State, however small in numbers they may be, the State has no moral right to condemn the exploits of another, when in principle the actions are the same.

As far as we know the people of Bikini were not forced to move but were 'persuaded', on the promise, it seems, that eventually they would

be able to return (we wonder however, what the treatment would have been like had they refused to go). The authorities must have had some idea of the effects thermo-nuclear tests would have, but they had to get the inhabitants out somehow.

Still more disastrous is the plight of the radiation refugees from the atolls of Rongelap and Utrik who suffered unforeseen "ill-effects" resulting from thermo-nuclear tests" in 1954. They have already been paid full compensation, the United Nations report stated! In what possible way can people be compensated for loss of health, the extent of which we can only guess from the evidence from Hiroshima and Nagasaki? And these tragedies took place in the playful days before H-bombs had been tried out.

Reports have it that Britain is planning hydrogen bomb explosions in West Samoa next year. Another happy people may well be sacrificed in the interests of the nuclear-drunk nations.

The Fourteen-Day Ban

IT will be remembered that in August last year the extraordinary fourteen-day rule was introduced as an Order in Council. This measure, intended to defend the "primacy of Parliament" in the discussion of national affairs, prevented certain types of political broadcasts from taking place for the period of a fortnight before they were due to be debated in the House of Commons.

A Select Committee has just produced a report on this ruling, with the recommendation that "any restrictions should be reduced to the smallest extent that is practicable".

But it is no surprise to us that the committee was prevented by its terms of reference from recommending complete abolition; particularly since it had been set up immediately after a motion in the House, the result of which was acceptance of the principle of restriction.

The main recommendation of the committee is that the fourteen-day rule should be shortened to seven days or less. This would get over the absurd position which causes the B.B.C. to be given information on which issues are to be debated in Parliament before M.P.'s themselves are informed. But patently, if one may judge from reports of evidence given to the committee, the rule itself has now been found to be unpopular and more or less useless; partly because it is not working very well, but also due to the tardy realisation that there was little or no justification for it in the first place.

In the first place it is ridiculous to suppose that the "primacy of Parliament" should be a good enough reason for restrictions of any sort upon broadcasting. Secondly, it is impossible to maintain that Parliament is hindered in making its decisions by the existence of facilities for M.P.'s and others to give talks and have discussions over the air. Even the suggestion that broadcasting is different from the press no longer cuts much ice now that viewers can switch from one programme to another.

Mr. Gaitskell put forward an argument to the committee, that party political broadcasts should be exempted from the rule, but this was not accepted, on the grounds that it was not possible to

justify different treatment for such broadcasts. This recommendation constitutes an addition to the scope of the rule, and was also applied to Budget broadcasts.

For our part we regard the question of amendments to the fourteen-day rule as political shilly-shallying; the fact that the Select Committee was restricted by its particular terms of reference makes nonsense of its findings. We remain convinced that our comments in FREEDOM of 13th August, 1955, were correct:

"It is extremely hard to find reasons why Parliament should deem it necessary to forbid prejudgment of issues either by the public or its own members, when in fact it is upon prejudged issues that all members are elected . . .

"No reasonable case can be made for this directive, no valid justification put forward. Another freedom is forfeited—freedom to discuss or debate in the most public place of all, those questions which are the most important to all—for they may be law to-morrow."

A Challenge

Canon L. J. Collins, Precentor of St. Paul's Cathedral, said in London recently that the British trade union movement could play a big part in breaking the present "racist set-up" in South Africa. "If they would spare the money and the personnel," he added, "they could do the job of organising African labour into efficient and effective trade unions—and a strong, well-organised non-European labour force would be a powerful weapon against racial discrimination."

The white South African trade unions would not do the job because the majority were reactionary and racist.

"Anyone in South Africa who openly works against racialism is dubbed a Communist. I am not a Communist . . . but if we withdraw our support from every person in South Africa who is called by the Government a Communist or a Communist sympathiser, we shall withdraw support from practically everyone there who is an anti-racist."

IN BRIEF

Sixteen Months Awaiting Trial

BERN, JUNE 10.
 Four Rumanian exiles will be tried here to-morrow for seizing the Rumanian Legation here for 38 hours, sixteen months ago. They have been in prison since they gave themselves up to the Swiss police after a siege which began in the early hours of February 15, 1955.

One of the Democracies (N.A.T.O.)

By a margin of about five to one the Government-controlled Turkish Parliament has adopted a Government-sponsored press law designed to silence all opposition. It provides jail sentences for the publication of "false" news that damages public confidence in the Government. It calls for imprisonment for foreign correspondents who send out "baseless and exaggerated" dispatches likely to hurt the prestige or influence of the Government.

(New York Times).

A Vietnam Makhno?

SAIGON, JUNE 11.
 General Ba Cut (32), leader of the Hoa Hao sect of rebels, who led a long bitter fight against the South Vietnam Government of Ngo Dinh Diem, was sentenced to death to-day by a criminal court at Cantho. He now faces the trial by a military court.

Ba Cut's trial lasted two days. As the prosecutor demanded the death sentence, he shouted: "I am innocent." He had denied giving his 1,500 rebel followers orders to kill and pillage at will, and claimed that he was not responsible for the actions of his men.

Ba Cut fought the French, the Vietnamese Communists, and the Vietnamese in turn. He was captured without a fight in an ambush on April 13. Since then his lieutenants have been killed or captured and his forces crushed.

Ba Cut, who cut off his left forefinger and refused to have his hair cut as a sign of mourning for partition of his country, refused to lay down arms when the country was divided by the Geneva armistice agreement. Until his second trial he will pass the time writing his memoirs, which will claim that he created an army of volunteers as the "only means of unifying the country."
 —British United Press.

Egyptian Election Deception

Vote for Nasser or — Nasser

More Effort Demanded

The Revolutionary Council has not so far shown any noticeable signs of improving the circumstances of very many people in Egypt, but it nevertheless has the respect and admiration of the majority—it may find it harder to retain this support when faced with difficulties and problems less easily solved than ending British occupation. Nasser remarked in his speech on the 19th June that the future would demand more and not less effort, but one cannot help speculating upon the lot of those who will be called on to produce the most effort, and the methods which are likely to be employed in producing it.

Egyptian economic difficulties have so far proved themselves to be sufficiently complex as to cause Nasser to turn to the far more rewarding fields of international endeavour; social problems have as yet been almost entirely ignored. On the doubtful assumption that his present intention is to improve the economic and social conditions, he will have to go a good deal further than proclaiming theoretical freedom for all, but actually improve the standard of life amongst the Egyptian people. Failure to do this will force him to continue the existing dictatorship, whatever it may be called, and in spite of his protestations of good will and greater liberty.
 H.F.W.

EGYPTIAN "liberation day" was celebrated last week with an air of satisfaction, and a considerable show of military strength. It was a day of triumph for Premier Nasser—for the final withdrawal of British troops from Egypt marks the completion of one of his principle aims since seizure of power by the Revolutionary Council.

Hundreds of thousands of the fellahin from upper Egypt were brought in by lorry to witness the march-past which took three and a half hours to trundle through Cairo. Over a hundred Czech medium tanks, twenty-eight Russian tanks (until recently known as Stalins), and of course, British Centurions . . . A notably international brigade. To complete the display of might, there were Russian MiG fighters—accompanied by British Vampire planes!

But there were additional reasons for the parade, and it was international in more than one sense. All the Arab states, excepting Iraq who is a member of the hated Bagdad Pact, sent contingents of troops to take part; a clear indication of Egypt's desire to show the rest of the world—and Israel in particular—the present strength of Arab unity.

Most important reason of all however, was the obvious intention to impress the Egyptian people themselves; the celebrations throughout Egypt represented the preliminaries

Have you renewed your Subscription to FREEDOM yet? And What About This!

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT! WEEK 25
 Deficit on Freedom £500
 Contributions received £493
 DEFICIT £7

June 15 to June 21

Paterson: D.V. 14/-; London: H.M.* 2/6;
 Toronto: Comrades per A.M. £3/10/0.
 Total ... 4 6 6
 Previously acknowledged ... 489 10 10

1956 TOTAL TO DATE ... £493 17 4

GIFTS OF BOOKS: London: M.C.; London: Anon.; London: A.M.; London: F.J.M.

PEOPLE AND IDEAS

HOUSING & HUMAN NEEDS

"Architecture is human skill and feeling shown in the great necessary activity of building . . . Wordly claims are often made for 'Architecture' that it is a 'Fine Art', and chief of all the arts. These two claims are indeed incompatible and contradictory. Any mastership in architecture depends on its universality and its service. It is only chief in the sense that he who serves is the greatest. But the 'Fine Arts' are by definition free from conditions of human need, and architecture was specially ruled out from among them by Aristotle . . .

"High utility and liberal convenience for noble life are enough for architecture. Consider any of the great forms of life activity—seamanship, farming, housekeeping—can anyone say where utility ends and style, order, clearness, precision begin? Up to a point, and indeed a long way on, 'style' is a utility. We have to begin again and look on architecture as an art of service from the communal point of view."

—W. R. LETHABY:
"Form in Civilisation"

IN a recent broadcast on *The Modern Movement in Italian Architecture*, Joseph Rykwert commented on the conflict in Italian architectural thought between what is signified in the catchwords 'rational' and 'organic', and he explained how 'organic', beginning as a stylistic description—oblique and curvilinear forms as opposed to rigidly rectilinear ones, came to imply, through the associations and overtones of the word, an approach to design "minimising all formal intention so as to give a total accommodation—physical, moral, and psychological—to the inhabitants of the building." As an example he took the new village of La Martella (discussed in *FREEDOM*, 28/4/56), which was built to rehouse inhabitants of the notorious caves of Matera. "The approach of the architects was not the usual one of simply housing the underprivileged. For these were people who had developed a new way of life which had a dignity, a coherent pattern ennobling even the squalor of the poorest". Of the result one of its architects wrote, "If you consider the village in purely formal terms you may well be disappointed and you will certainly miss the point." To which Mr. Rykwert replies, "Architecture, however, is an art, and those who practice it are in duty bound to use the terms of a formal language. The refusal therefore of the designers of La Martella to consider the formal problem with which

they were faced squarely must be considered as a shirking of responsibility".

This dispute between formalists and functionalists is a perennial one—life would be poorer without it. I would reply in the words used years ago by Lethaby, which I have quoted at the head of this column. If formal considerations are the only criteria in evaluating architecture, a building becomes merely a piece of sculpture; a sculpture big enough for you to get inside, like the wooden horse of Troy. But architecture is not arbitrary: it is subject to more primary disciplines than the formal discipline for which Mr. Rykwert is asking. These are the structural discipline—stability, resistance to weather and decay, and a humane discipline—the accommodation of human needs. The last thing I want to suggest is that the aesthetic quality of a building does not matter: I am claiming that it grows out of its structural and functional qualities; the architect has to find those qualities of clarity, proportion, grouping, texture, relation of solids to voids, which most clearly emerge from the fulfilment of those needs which it is his responsibility to satisfy. "Great art," said Lethaby, "like great science, is the discovery of necessity."

BUT in planning to meet human needs how difficult it is not to formalise even them into preconceptions or statistical averages which do not meet the actual requirements of the individual

people who will occupy the building. Mr. Rykwert described how a Milanese architect, Giancarlo de Carlo, having built a block of flats at Sesto San Giovanni, spent one Sunday sitting in a café opposite, watching the way people were using the building. Of this experience the architect said:

"I suffered all the violence they generated in attacking the building to make it their home. The secluded balconies facing the south were covered with laundry out to dry and the people were all on the access galleries facing north. They had put out stools and chairs to watch and take part in the spectacle of each other and of the street. The very narrowness of the galleries excited the children who were running their bicycle races along them . . . It was then I understood how mistaken my approach had been, in spite of its apparently rational basis. Orientation matters, and so does a view of the landscape and light privacy; but what matters most is to be able to see each other, to be together. It is communication which counts most."

I find this anecdote interesting for several reasons. Firstly because the architect concerned is a sympathiser of ours who some years ago contributed an article to *FREEDOM* on this very problem: the question of 'building for human beings as they really are instead of the abstract men conceived by the State', which is itself an abstraction masquerading as something real, which, he wrote,

"can have no contact with the one concrete reality—man himself, whom it treats and manipulates as though he

were just an abstraction. The home is an organism in direct relationship to man. Thus the home cannot have any relationship to the State, which recognises man not as an individual but as a number, a fraction of a greater number."

(G. de Carlo: *The Housing Problem in Italy*, *FREEDOM*, 12 & 19/6/48).

It interested me too because I have had the opposite experience with flats in London, planned on the same principle, with an access balcony to the entrances and a private balcony big enough to sit around and grow flowers on, on the sunny side. For while we have provided a sort of parking bay, a widening of the access balcony opposite each entrance door to provide room for neighbourly gossip, it is little used, while the private balconies always are. A survey of the opinions of the occupants of balcony-access flats in England concludes that,

"Most people tend to be reserved in their social contacts, saying that it is not policy to be too friendly with neighbours, but they would like to know them sufficiently well to be able to ask for help if an emergency arose. Bearing this in mind, the access balcony and to a lesser extent the access staircase provide what could in time become a pleasant social grouping of people who, while not overtly very friendly, nevertheless class each other as 'nice people' and like being neighbours."

—(*Housing Centre Review*, No. 1, 1954).

But it isn't for architects or their clients to lay down the law on whether people should live in a communal manner or in glorious isolation. (In this country fifty years ago, planners were deploring the higger-mugger mateyness of the slums which made their occupants unwilling to move out to hygienic and dispersed housing estates. Now they deplore the semi-detached suburban sprawl

which has resulted, without reflecting that it is their ideas which have changed). What is needed is to plan with sufficient flexibility and ingenuity to satisfy the needs of every kind of tenant and to extend rather than limit the variety of ways in which he can choose to live.

★

TO-DAY in this and many other countries a large proportion of houses and flats are those built by local authorities with the aid of subsidies from the State. This arose, of course, from the fact that working-class housing for letting ceased to be an 'economic' proposition for private financial speculation. Housing by public authorities was not instituted by an all-embracing State seeking even greater control over its subjects, but by the efforts of nobly-intentioned people who were appalled by the squalor, disease and high mortality in overcrowded insanitary hovels; but as an institution, it leads continually to just that view of the occupants as numbers, as abstractions, as 'housing units', of which de Carlo complains. I used to keep a note of newspaper reports of the well-meant but insufferably inquisitive and inquisitorial attitude of local councils to their tenants. Here are some examples, relating not to flats but to housing estates. No washing on the line after 12 noon (Essex); compulsory to burn coke (Notts); no dogs (Middlesex); evicted for painting his house cream—all the rest were red (Warrington); forbidden to paint doorstep (Bardwell); evicted for keeping pigeons if tenant is not a member of National Homing Union (Staffs); tenants graded according to cleanliness—lowest grade must go (Ely); no trees to be planted in garden without permission (Lancs). Finally, Hastings Corporation issues its tenants with a handbook containing the following instructions:

"Keep your home clean and tidy. Endeavour to have some method of cleaning as you go along; do not try to clean the whole house in one day. Regular bed times for children and adults, except on special occasions. Sit down properly at the table. Hang up your pots and pans or put them on a shelf . . ."

How right Auden was when he wrote:

"Private faces in public places
Are wiser and nicer

Than public faces in private places!"

Some of these regulations are just the reflection of the school-ma'am mentality of petty officials, others reflect the feeling that for the comfort of all, the personal exuberance of each must be curbed. But this is where the architect's responsibility comes in. He has to find ways of planning that will give the tenant scope for the maximum of human vagaries with the least annoyance to his neighbour, rather than the minimum of accommodation that will comply with sanitary by-laws, and rather than an impressive monument to the genius and sense of formal composition of the architect.

He has to find, as Gropius says, "a common language of architecture and its individual variations, a humanised standard, fitting the whole of our community, but simultaneously satisfying also, by its modifications, the different desires of individuals . . ." De Carlo's expression about the people attacking his building to make it their home is very apt. The architect's task is both ubiquitous and humble; he has to use his skill in transform the physical environment in order that people may attack it to make it theirs. C.W.

REFLECTIONS ON

A AND NON-A

MOST of us, I suppose, have met the man who says "Of course, I'm the only real anarchist." Though we may suspect that he is not an anarchist at all we probably prefer to keep our suspicion to ourselves: for once we begin to think about what makes an anarchist we soon discover that comparisons can be very odious; and it is not easy to decide where to draw the line.

Some sort of rough and ready test would be very useful on these occasions. And once we have marked out the gulf between the anarchist and the non-anarchist we may be able to think more clearly about ways of diminishing it.

These reflections are the result of reading a little book I found recently in a second-hand shop. It is called *Psychologie de l'Anarchiste-Socialiste*, the author is A. Hamon, and it was published in 1895 in Paris by P.-V. Stock.

The author describes his book as a scientific monograph. "The impartiality of the man of science studying natural phenomena is generally accepted", he remarks, pointing out at some length his own impartiality. He is a determinist, holding that man is not responsible for his thoughts and actions. "This determinist conception makes impartiality easy for me," he adds. But in spite of Mr. Hamon's impartiality it appears that after parts of his work had appeared in periodical form some Rumanian and Russian papers accused him of being "the leader of international Anarchy". He found this rather amusing.

In addition to his determinism the author also begins with the postulate that members of a particular group share a particular mentality peculiar to that group. He considers that there is, for instance, a national mentality: "Individuals of the same nationality present common psychological characteristics peculiar to their nationality . . . Heredity, certainly, plays a part in the formation of the national mentality, but it is much less than that played by physical and social environment." There is also, he maintains, a professional mentality characterizing the members of a particular profession. He has, indeed, examined the professional mentality at some length in an earlier book, *Psychologie du Militaire Professionnel*.

He then postulates a philosophic mentality common to all those individuals who hold the same body of theory, who will, he concludes, have the same psychological make-up. "They think in the same way, they see things in the same light . . . Having the same tendencies, they cannot not think alike, they cannot not appreciate things in the same way. If individuals have not common psychological characters they cannot have an identical way of looking at things."

So much for Mr Hamon's postulates. I shall postpone discussion of them until later in this article. His procedure is the familiar one of the questionnaire. This contained two questions:

1. Why are you an anarchist-socialist?
2. How did you become an anarchist-socialist?

The population sampled was about 170.

Some explanation of the term "anarchist-socialist" is needed. This denotes those who hold a certain body of doctrine, as expounded by such writers as "Proudhon, Reclus, Parsons, D. D. Lum, Bakunin, Kropotkin, Most, Spies, Malatesta, Merlino, etc." It excludes anarchist-individualists. It also excludes those who call themselves anarchists "simply in protest against the present social organization . . . These are simple rebels." Again: "To be an anarchist-socialist it is not enough to call yourself that. It is not enough to cry 'Long live Anarchy!'"

From a consideration of the replies to his questionnaire Mr. Hamon concludes that the mental characteristics that distinguish the anarchist-socialist are:

1. Spirit of revolt;
2. Love of freedom;
3. Self-love, or individualism;
4. Love of others, or altruism;
5. Sensibility;
6. A sense of justice;
7. A sense of logic;
8. Curiosity and a desire to know;
9. Spirit of proselytism.

Although non-anarchists may have some of these characteristic only anarchist-socialists have them all. (Readers with a partiality for the "Are you a considerate husband?" type of newspaper article may like to tot up their scores at this point.)

The anarchist, according to Mr. Hamon, is the reflective type, with a partiality for abstract theories, and an observer of social phenomena. He has, moreover, achieved a mental harmony. "There is a unity in the life of the anarchist, whose aim is really the expansion of what he calls Truth, of what he considers to be the Just, the Good, the Beautiful." What is more, "he does not arrive at conviction by faith, but he attains faith by conviction."

There is a good deal more, and it is all rather flattering, but I think we have had enough to gratify our egos. We seem to be very estimable people, and it is a pity there are not more of us. But before we start wondering about that we shall have to deal with Mr. Hamon's basic assumptions.

I do not propose to quarrel with the idea of a "philosophic mentality" common to a particular group. Readers will have noticed that this has something in common with the concept of the authoritarian personality, which G. discussed in a recent *FREEDOM* article. Such classifications can be very useful. But to regard them as anything more than classifications seems to me to be unwarranted.

Mr. Hamon, evidently, does not share this view. He maintains that those with common psychological characters "cannot not think alike . . . cannot not appreciate things in the same way." What justification is there for this assumption? Do we think alike because we have the same psychological characters, or have we the same psychological characters because we think alike? Since Mr. Hamon's method has been to derive our

mental characteristics from our thinking alike in some respects, it would seem that the second alternative is the more logical choice. We can think differently, but because we do not we can be classified in a particular way.

It is clear that Mr. Hamon's choice was influenced by his determinist bias: he has assumed that "a man is not responsible for his thoughts and actions." But this seems to be rather a dubious proposition. The ancient controversy about free will and determinism is probably as futile as most disputes about paradoxes; and perhaps the most sensible course is not to commit ourselves on either side but to try a different approach.

How does an individual acquire the particular characteristics that enable us to classify him as this or that? An analysis of the second part of Mr. Hamon's questionnaire (How you you become an anarchist-socialist?) would be useful, but unfortunately he has not undertaken one. He has, indeed, carefully picked and chosen the extracts he gives so as to lend support to his own views, and it would be a tedious business to rearrange them all in a different order. In any case there are far too many to quote in this article; but I will reproduce one, as it is fairly typical of one sort of answer.

"The son of a workman, I was brought up to fear God; and at the age of ten I was compelled to work for a living in a pottery for the magnificent sum of five shillings a week. I knew how my family had to struggle to keep the wolf from the door. Often, when I saw my mother

Continued on p. 4

Publications Received

Books

Pierre-Joseph Proudhon—A Biography by George Woodcock (Routledge 28/-).

Portrait in Grey, "being a full-length Portrait of Prison conditions and Administration and of the Philosophy which supports them together with some Proposals for their Reform" by Norman Howarth Hignett (Muller 18/-).

Pamphlets

Elisée Reclus (1830-1905) Savant et Anarchiste (Les Cahiers "Pensée et Action", Paris-Bruxelles 200 francs).

The Sociology of Co-operation, by Henrik F. Infield (Community Press, New Jersey \$1.00).

Einstein et son Pacifisme Relatif, by Hem Day (Cahiers "Pensée et Action").

Periodicals

Inferno Eleven. International issue (Box 5030 San Francisco, Cal., U.S.A. 50 cents).

Secular Life No. 1, March 1956 (Jill B. Warner, 214 Fitzstephen Road, Dagenham, Essex, 12/- per year).

The American Rationalist, Vol. 1, No. 1, May 1956 (Rationalist Publications, 2218 St. Louis Avenue, St. Louis 6, Mo., U.S.A.) bi-monthly \$2.00 per year.

Liberation, an Independent monthly, Vol. 1, No. 1, March 1956 (110 Christopher St., New York 14) Subs. \$3.00 per year.

La Raison, Organe d'action laïque et de propagande rationaliste No. 1, Janvier-Fevrier 1956 (M. Roumilhac 78, Rue Jean-Pierre-Timbaud, Paris XI) Subs. 300 francs per year.

The Needle, "A Libertarian Journal dedicated to a not too delicate probing into the foibles of this so-called modern society to which we all belong and contribute", Vol. 1, No. 1, April 1956 (216 Second Avenue, San Francisco, Cal.) Voluntary contributions.

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 . . .

Red, Black, Blond and Olive
Edmund Wilson 25/-
The Investigator Reuben Ship 8/6
Scope of Total Architecture
W. Gropius 15/-
The Guillotine at Work
G. P. Maximoff 17/6

Second-Hand . . .

The League on Trial Max Beer 4/6
The Content of Education 3/-
Living My Life Emma Goldman
(2 vols.) the set 35/-
The Importance of Living
Lin Yutang 3/6
Oil! Upton Sinclair 4/-
The Revolution in the Baltic
Provinces of Russia (1907)
E. O. F. Ames 5/-
The Prince, etc.
Niccolo Machiavelli 3/-
The Last Conquest of Ireland
(Perhaps) John Mitchel 2/6
The Socialism of Our Times
Laidler, Chase, Hillquit, etc. 6/-
The Artomov Business
Maxim Gorky 3/-
A Letter to My Son
Osbert Sitwell 2/6
Denmark, a Social Laboratory
Peter Manniche 2/6
The Road to Buenos Aires
Albert Londres 3/-
Verdict of Three Decades
(includes Berkman on 'Kronstadt') 32/6

Pamphlets . . .

The Dethronement of Stalin
(Report of Krushchev speech) 2/6

Periodicals . . .

Liberation, No. 4, June 1956 1/9
The American Rationalist,
May 1956 1/-

Postage free on all items

Obtainable from

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

The Freedom to be a 'Crank'

SOME might say that Lieut.-Cmdr. William Boaks who brought an action for wrongful arrest against the Bow Street magistrate, Mr. Reece, has a bee in his bonnet. But it would be more accurate to say, in the gallant gentleman's own words, that his car is "crazy" and agree with him when he submitted in his defence that it was not reasonable to draw the conclusion that he too was crazy. Yet this in effect was the attitude of the magistrate before whom he appeared on charges of "obstruction, using a noisy instrument and causing a crowd to collect", when he ordered that the Lieut.-Cmdr. should be remanded in custody for a week for a medical report. The more so since his alleged "crimes" could, at most, be punished by the imposition of fines. Yet for a week he "wore prison clothes and was kept with twenty other men in a hospital ward under the care of a psychologist". (A doctor's report after the remand said that he could not make a full report on Boaks whose behaviour in prison, however, was rational and did not suggest any serious mental illness).

★
THOSE of us who, daily, pass the Law Courts on our lawful business are familiar with the Lieut.-Cmdr.'s black and white striped car with its road safety slogans ("Cripples can't run. Don't cripple those who can" or "Women and Children first. No pedestrian in a vehicle has precedence over one on foot"), surmounted by a loudspeaker, that "noisy instrument" (a whisper compared to the accepted accelerating motor-cycle or diesel lorry), through which the Lieut.-Cmdr. offers his life-saving warnings and road-safety admonitions.

"It was quite clear," said the judge in his judgment, "that Lieut.-Cmdr. Boakes's conduct might well cause the magistrate to think that an enquiry into his mental health was desirable," and he added significantly "there was no doubt that the magistrate had power to remand him for enquiries and a report into his mental and physical health". Yet every day in London, as part of a road-safety and road-courtesy campaign dozens of police cars with loud-speakers are stationed at danger spots warning and advising pedestrians and motorists. They obstruct, they use "noisy instruments" (they might even "cause crowds to collect" if they were intelligent human beings instead of coppers). But no one suggests that their brains should be tested!

★
IT is because we live in a society in which it is presupposed that the initiative always comes from above, that individual initiative is suspect, and determination and perseverance are the symptoms of the "crank". The judge in his summing-up said that Boaks was a man of "good character".

"He had a good cause at heart—the safety of pedestrians. He was a man of courage who intended to pursue his campaign even if it involved him and his family in financial sacrifices and he had to appear at magistrates' courts.

It was perfectly clear that his mental equipment was in some respects sound. He might be excitable and maybe some people would call him a crank, or say that he had got a King Charles's Head or a hobby-horse and intended to pursue his campaign along the same lines as he had in the past, no matter what was done to him."

To pursue a "good cause" whatever the price, would appear, if we have read between the lines in the judge's summing-up, both foolish and a sure sign that the man's a "crank". Yet the good soldier is

(continued in next col.)

JUNE 17, 1953

West Germany Celebrates, for What?

THE hypocrisy of Government is boundless. In the name of the Fatherland, the Motherland or the Democratic Way of Life any situation will be exploited to boost a régime, cover up its defects or discredit the enemy of the moment, regardless of truth or ethics. The West no less than the East are skilled in this technique of rule by bluff, peppered with force when the situation demands it. Where the people are apathetic the task is easier. If patriotism is strong, people, blinded by messianic feelings for 'their' country, are even easier to manipulate.

There is however, in every country, a minority which does not fall into either category, prepared to stand out against

the majority and the exploits of Government. Occasionally even the apparently apathetic rise up in revolt against injustices; unstained maybe, but remembered by those who come afterwards.

Such an event took place in East Germany in June 17th, 1953, and is ironically being celebrated this week throughout the Federal Republic as the "Day of National Unity". "Fires of remembrance" were lit all along the 300 miles of inter-zonal frontier. Flags have been flying from all public buildings and President Eisenhower has sent a message to the Federal President, Professor Heuss, hoping that the unjust division of Germany would come to an end. Two important members of Adenauer's party, Doctors Gerstenmaier and Friedensburg, have spewed rhetoric in favour of German re-unification. Said Dr. Friedensburg, speaking in Frankfurt:

"We Germans must be prepared to sit at the same table as the Devil if the subject under discussion with him is German reunification."

We may ask why the third anniversary of June 17th has been picked for a nation wide celebration. We feel that the *Manchester Guardian* correspondent (June 18th) has put his finger on it when he writes:

"If nothing else, June 17th has reminded West German politicians that re-unification is getting no nearer, but next year's Federal election is. Salvation for Germany may be a long way off, but there are plenty of political evangelists with a keen sense of tactics and timing. Many of them were bound to have their say to-day."

The Real Reasons of June 17th

The uprising of June 17th had little to do with German re-unification. In spite of the East German Government's attempts to discredit the revolt by claiming that it was the work of provocateurs

from the West, there was so much evidence pointing to its spontaneity as to make the claim invalid. Not, as we pointed out at the time, that there had been any lack of propaganda and incitement from the West. The Western powers spent vast sums on paper and radio propaganda which permeated the Eastern Zone on behalf of the Western Way of Life. This may have played a part in "maintaining some independence of thought" among the East German workers, but fundamentally this revolt was a spontaneous protest against conditions existing in East Germany. This appeared to be a leaderless uprising and workers were quoted as saying:

"We don't want leaders, we have had enough of them" (FREEDOM 27 June, 1953).

Sebastian Haffner (*Observer*, June 21, 1953) likened the uprising to the spontaneous classical revolutionary style of 1789 or 1848. In parenthesis, the lesson to be learned from June 17th is that even under a ruthless totalitarianism it is impossible to keep the people completely cowed.

But there was no talk of German re-unification. The demands which were made and won were for economic concessions, and the dropping of the order, which had come from the Government, to work harder, together with demands for increases in old age pensions, sick leave to be treated separately from holidays and an improved supply of worker's clothes.

It is expediency which has made the West German powers, three years after the event, awaken the public to the martyrdom of the men who were killed by the East German police; and which prompts such a heartfelt message from President Eisenhower. Make no mistake, the ruling class have not suddenly

become revolutionaries. No Government really welcomes the sight of a determined revolutionary people, even when pitted against the enemy. But political expedients invariably demand a short-term policy, and an economic revolt of the working class is unlikely in view of the present day prosperity of Western Germany. So the potential enemies, the revolutionary workers of yesterday can be hailed as the martyrs of to-day.

Unification

The arguments for the re-unification of Germany on both sides are partly political and partly economic. The East argues that a unified armed Germany would constitute a threat to the Soviet Union, and the West that the re-unification of Germany "in freedom" is an essential part of world peace.

Russia's armed strength, industrial potential, and man-power (Russia's aggregate and industrial capacity is now nearly three times as large as Germany's (FREEDOM, May 8th, 1954), would suggest that unified independent Germany hardly constitutes a threat. On the other hand talks of Russo-German trade pacts indicate that a divided Germany need not prevent the normal course of trade relations.

An extract from an article in the *Rheinische Post* is a pointer to the real attitude of the Federal Government to the plight of the people in the Eastern Zone: This paper, said the *Manchester Guardian*, wrote sadly of the "rows of shockingly empty seats" during the recent Bundestag debate on conditions in the Soviet zone, and compared the aimlessness of this debate with the "equivalent apathy in the remainder of the population."

Any boundary which divides people from one another, within a country, or between countries, leads to disunity. But unified or divided, the problem of Germany remains the same; it is a problem which is always with us; that of a capitalistic governmental society which divides people and creates war.

The Tradition of Workers' Control - 10

The Building Guilds

AT the same time as differences within the Guild Socialist movement were making themselves felt, the energies of a large number of guildsmen were diverted into what proved to be an unfortunate attempt at "propaganda by experimentation". In an effort to redeem its wartime promises of "homes fit for heroes", the Government, early in 1920, initiated a housing scheme under which the Treasury was to meet the residual cost of all houses built by local authorities with the aid of a fixed contribution from local rates. The first result of this scheme was to force up the price of houses to a record high level: the private builders and suppliers of builders' materials quickly realised that the local authorities had no incentive to economy and could pass on all losses to the national exchequer. In these circumstances, the local Federations of Building Trades Operatives in Manchester and London, inspired by Malcolm Sparkes, a former master builder and a Quaker socialist, offered to undertake housebuilding for the Government on a non-profit-making basis. They proposed that Building Guilds should be formed to undertake contracts on a cost-price basis plus a percentage to cover overhead expenses and a fixed allowance to enable them to grant the workers whom they employed "continuous pay". Working capital was to be borrowed on the security that the banks would receive the sums coming in from local authorities as the houses were built. In effect, the proposals amounted to a scheme for the establishment of Producer Co-operatives in the building industry, the main differences between the new guilds and the existing co-operative co-partnerships being that the former were to be more closely linked with the trade unions and that there was to be no form of profit-sharing.

National Guild Council

The scheme captured the imagination of many trade unionists in the building industry. A start was soon made and rapidly the Building Guild movement spread from Manchester and London to other parts of the country.⁵⁴ By December 1921 there were upwards of one hundred Building Guilds in existence and, in addition, a number of guilds in other industries—furnishing, clothing and engineering. At the suggestion of the trade unions, the local Building Guilds were later consolidated into one body, the National Building Guilds, which was registered as a limited company with a nominal capital of £100. Its headquarters were in Manchester and its leading personality was S. G. Hobson—the original National Guildsman. To facilitate the spread of the guild idea among trade unionists an offshoot of the League was formed—the National Guild Council—representative of the building and other guilds and a number of interested trade unions.

During the first 18 months of the experiment,

everything seemed to be going well. With the price of building so high and the output of labour in the building industry generally so low, the trade union workers employed by the Guild had little difficulty in providing the local authorities with better service than was being given by most private firms—at a lower cost. By the summer of 1921, however, the period of post-war inflation was coming to an end. The Government felt that in the new circumstances it could no longer afford the high prices it was paying for houses; the former method of subsidy was replaced by a fixed subsidy which left local authorities to meet a larger share of the bill for houses; and the "cost plus" contracts were abolished in favour of "maximum sum" contracts under which the contractors could charge costs and an overhead percentage only up to a fixed total. In addition, the conditions of interim payments to contractors for work in progress were revised so that, henceforth, a much larger working capital was needed to carry out the same amount of work.

Government Sabotage

These changes could hardly have been better designed if they had been intended—which, of course, the Government protested they were not—to sabotage the Building Guild. The Co-operative Wholesale Society's Bank which had hitherto provided the Guild's working capital refused further advances for what was now a highly speculative business. Desperately short of working capital, the Guild was forced to seek accommodation from a private bank and to entreat the building trade unions to help them by imposing a levy on their members. The National Federation of Building Trade Operatives did in fact agree to make such a levy but the response from its constituent unions was poor. The Federation was highly critical of the central management of the Guild and, when further pressed for aid, retorted that it was not a trading body but a trade union and as such could neither risk its members' money nor accept responsibility for the Guild's affairs. The Guild's finances went from bad to worse and by the end of 1922 the bank had foreclosed and the Guild was in the hands of the receivers.

The chronic shortage of working capital in its last year was undoubtedly a major cause in the collapse of the Building Guild movement but it was not the only one. In the slump conditions of 1921-2 many building trade operatives were thrown out of work and, not unnaturally, turned to the Guild for employment. There is evidence that many of the Guild jobs were over-manned and that contracts were undertaken at unduly low prices in order to keep members at work. The principle of "continuous pay"—the Guild's most striking modification of the wage-system—aggravated the situation and diminished the competitive

power of the Guild in a period of falling prices. In addition, the lack of trained managers and technicians which had not been so important during the boom years was sorely felt under the new conditions. Hobson was inclined to blame the Guild workers themselves for lack of discipline—"In one case," he alleged,⁵⁵ "a Guild committee barely begun on a public contract, authorised a full week's pay for men to attend the local race meeting"—and to insist on the need for greater central control over the local bodies. Others, with some show of justice, felt that Hobson himself could not be cleared of the charge of gross mismanagement. Staking everything on a sensational success, he was mainly responsible for the Guild taking on more work at a time when it would have been prudent to reduce the scale of operations. In retrospect, it seems clear that it was a mistake to apply to a Guild operating within the framework of a capitalist society the methods and organisation which had been proposed for a fully developed guild society. Guildsmen themselves had pointed out that the Building Guilds were not Guild Socialism and that for the workers involved they were only a partial escape from "wage-slavery". Had the local guilds not been absorbed in the National Guild, it would not have been possible to finance, by separate local action, the volume of work which central organisation made possible, but operations would have been placed on a sounder footing and it is probable that a number of them would have survived the slump. At it was, the more efficient local bodies were swamped in the disaster which overtook the national body.

The collapse of the Building Guild movement presaged the collapse of the wider movement. The initial success of the building guilds undoubtedly brought guild doctrines before a wider audience and had their success continued the Guild Socialist movement might have survived the schisms due to policy differences. In the event, their failure, which had resulted in many hundreds of operatives losing their savings, produced a reaction in the trade union movement against Guild Socialism itself. Some attempts were made to revive the building guilds on a local basis but without success. A final effort to rally the now scattered and diminished forces round the National Guild Council, into which the League had been merged in June 1923, met with the same fate. The Council declined rapidly and by the end of 1924 there was no longer a separate and organised guild socialist movement.

(To be continued)

G.N.O.

⁵⁴ *The Guildsman*, Feb. 1920, published the following "announcement":

Birth—Jan. 1919, at Manchester, Building Trade Unionists and the National Guilds League, of a Guild. Parents and child are doing well.

Marriage—Jan. 1919, at Manchester, a marriage has been arranged between the labour power of the building workers and the credit of the public.

Death—Jan. 1919, at Manchester, the theory of the necessity of Capitalism passed painlessly away. No flowers by request.

⁵⁵ *The Guild Socialist*, Jan. 1923.

Comments on Judges

Lord Goddard in a New Role?

LORD GODDARD, this country's Lord Chief Justice, hit the headlines last week, not with one of his customary outbursts against the abolition of the rope or against the prisoner in the dock, but in a case of a 14-year-old schoolgirl who had been sent to a remand home by the Kingston Juvenile Court. He, and his fellow judges sitting in the Queen's Bench Divisional Court quashed the magistrates' order, Lord Goddard at one point in the hearing described the case as "bureaucracy gone mad".

As was to be expected, the popular press was moved to tears by Lord Goddard in this unfamiliar rôle, and the *Sunday Express* in one of those fifty-line editorials, so typical of the popular Press to-day, so dogmatic and so often expressing forceful opinions not even remotely connected with the facts, leapt to the defence of this man "who has been assailed for years on end by the professional do-gooders, by the self-appointed keepers of everyone else's conscience", this man Goddard "who has incurred the wrath of miserable little men" because "he has spoken out against soft treatment for murderers and thugs, they have represented him as a latter-day Judge Jeffreys, as a man in whom the milk of human kindness has long turned sour."

And how foolish these people must feel now, declares the *Sunday Express*.

"For look at the wealth of human understanding contained in Lord Goddard's judgment in the case of little Jean Callender—the 14-year-old girl who, for no offence at all, was sent to a remand home.

By the wisdom of his judgment he shows himself possessed of more humanity than all his critics put together.

Long may he continue as England's Lord Chief Justice."

This is not the first time Lord Goddard has given proof that he is a stickler so far as the law is concerned. He has released men sentenced to long terms of imprisonment, and about whose guilt he had no doubts, because of some error in the proceedings or on the grounds that the trial judges' summing-up omitted to inform the jury of certain vital matters. The law is the law and if it is to be sacrosanct it cannot be abused. There is nothing very human in that! If one can talk of humanity on the Bench it arises when a person has been found guilty and it rests entirely with the judge as to what punishment shall be awarded. And it is on his record both as a trial judge and as an appeal judge (would the *Sunday Express* care to check up on the number of appeals against sentence in which Lord Goddard has increased

sentences and compare them with those in which he has seen fit to reduce the term of imprisonment?) that the Lord Chief Justice has earned his title as a "latter-day Judge Jeffries".

IN the recent appeal over which the *Sunday Express* indulges in superlatives, a reading of the report shows quite clearly that the Court was much more concerned with the Law than with the liberty of the individual. In the course of the hearing Lord Goddard told Counsel for the County Council: "The question is whether she was properly before the justices—whether they had any jurisdiction to go into the matter at all . . ." And again, later he said: "We have to see whether the girl has been lawfully deprived of her liberty". Lord Goddard also revealed a kind of closed-shop mentality so far as the administration of the law is concerned when he declared at one stage:

"Why bring in the N.S.P.C.C.? There is no suggestion from start to finish that the child was being badly treated. These inspectors are nothing but paid servants of a voluntary society. People get frightened because they wear a uniform."

(But we are sure that the Lord Chief Justice who is a great—if sometimes the evidence obliges him to be a critical—admirer of the police, would wish us to be frightened by a uniform . . . when it is a policeman's?).

In his summing up he again expressed himself forcibly against these outsiders when he said:

"The mere fact that officials or doctors or anyone else think that it will be good for some person to have some particular treatment is no ground of itself for putting into force Mental Deficiency Acts, or any of the many acts which might be used."

It is true that a judge also interprets the Law. He had to determine in the present case, what is meant by "in need of care and protection", and who shall decide whether a child is in need of them. But one can hardly say that the Court gave a demonstration of its "humanity" in this case where the evidence showed quite clearly that the Law had been abused. The following exchange between judges and Counsel for the local authorities sums it all up:

Mr. Scarman: There were certain facts before the justices as to the conduct and demeanour of the mother.

Mr. Justice Ormerod: That she resented the interference by the officers.

Lord Goddard: The mother appeared to be not wholly polite to the officers. I think in similar circumstances I should have been even more rude to them.

Asked by Mr. Justice Donovan what ground there was for bringing the girl before the juvenile court, Mr. Scarman replied that she had not been to school for three weeks and the mother refused to tell the deputy children's officer where she was going. Although she was not legally obliged to answer, it was a reasonable request by the officer and from her refusal it might be inferred that the mother was not exercising proper care.

"There is the evidence of the absence from school and the conduct of the mother."

Lord Goddard: Is it because the mother was rude to the children's officer or was not polite to him?

Mr. Scarman: That was one factor.

Lord Goddard: Bureaucracy gone mad.

Mr. Justice Donovan said that the impression on his mind was that the mother was rude, the officer took offence, and the child was not taken because she was out of control but as some measure of retaliation.

Mr. Scarman: The officer would like to repudiate that suggestion. He is here and can be asked questions.

We shall need more than the evidence of this case to revise our opinions on this "latter-day Judge Jeffries"!

ANOTHER HANGING JUDGE FRUSTRATED?

A MURDER trial which took place in Sydney, Australia, last week ended with a verdict of manslaughter, a verdict which was contrary to the judge's directions to the jury. So incensed was the judge that he felt obliged to attack the jury for their "reckless disregard" of their oaths.

"In this case I directed the jury, as I felt bound to do, that in law they could not give any attention to any matter of alleged provocation. And I directed the jury that on the admitted facts unquestionably there was a case of punishable homicide.

"I said there was no circumstance of self-defence or accident and the only question was murder or manslaughter. Considering the weapon used and the force used, to return a verdict of manslaughter in my opinion was a reckless disregard of the juror's oath. If ever there was a case of murder in my opinion this was that case."

The actual justification for what he called his "comment" was its relevance "to the sentence I feel I must impose", which was fifteen years penal servitude. In other words that he based his sentence not on the jury's verdict but on his own. You may be tried "by your peers" but it would seem that it's the old judge who has the last word! (Incidentally it would be of considerable interest, and a sign of progress in public opinion, if the jury brought in a verdict of manslaughter, though convinced that it should have been one of murder, because they objected to the death penalty which is the only sentence the court can award for murder. After all it was this reluctance of juries to convict in cases which carried the death penalty which hastened the abolition of the death penalty for stealing).

JUDGE NOT THAT YE MAY NOT BE JUDGED

ACCORDING to agency reports from Nicosia last Monday, two young gunmen shot at Mr. Justice Bernard Shaw who has sentenced six "terrorists" to death and others to life imprisonment. Two bullets hit him in the neck as he was leaving the law courts with his bodyguard. He is, apparently in hospital and "on the danger list".

The *Evening Standard* (25/6/56) describes Mr. Justice Shaw as a senior judge of the special court "which handles the most serious terrorist crimes". He passed the death sentence on Michael Karaolis and Andreas Demetrou whose execution led to rioting in Cyprus and "strong protests by the Greek government".

ANARCHIST SUMMER SCHOOL 1956

AS already announced, the 1956 Anarchist Summer School will be held at the Malatesta Club, London, over the August Bank Holiday weekend, August 4-6.

The theme for the lectures is:

IS HISTORY ON OUR SIDE?

and the programme is as follows:

PROGRAMME

The following programme of events is still subject to confirmation, but little change is expected. Times are approximate.

Saturday, August 4.

- 2.00 p.m. Informal gathering.
- 2.30 p.m. Lecture: F. A. RIDLEY
- 5.30 p.m. High tea
- Social evening
- 8.00 p.m. Lunitas presents: *The Tuppenny Ha'penny Opera*

Sunday, August 5.

- 11.00 a.m. Lecture: ALEX COMFORT
- 1.30 p.m. Lunch

Letter from COVENTRY

SACKINGS at the Standard are proceeding and will continue, and the trades unions can do nothing about it. No-one, apart from the press (which is mostly stupid), is worried much. All will get jobs of a sort—many skilled men will relish the change—the unskilled will mostly lose financially.

The method of selecting the redundants is interesting. The management tried hard to get the trades unions to select those to go. This was emphatically refused. They next tried to pass it to the foremen and charge hands. They were not interested either! Higher up in the hierarchy of management there was a stampede of distaste away from "responsibility".

The selections were eventually made in a wildly haphazard way so that highly skilled men with years of service and unblemished personal reputations have gone or are going and complete ignoramuses are kept on. This is contemplated with sardonic amusement by the well-informed worker. Even key men, machine setters and electricians are going. The foremen and shop staff keep to their offices with a highly artificial air of unconcern. In brief, the whole set-up at the Standard, which has long been one of capitalism's most successful examples of using workers' co-operation for the general good, has been wilfully and stupidly destroyed.

We are wondering how the skeleton staff to be left inside will cope with the new installation. There are of course, some skilled men among them but many more are bound to be required eventually—and the name Standard is now mud! It seems therefore that unless a new management with progressive ideas in human relationships takes over that the real trouble is yet to come. No-one now will make an effort or display initiative—"Couldn't care less" is the dominant spirit. Now all this arises from an obsessive middle-class idea that "the whole thing can be organised from the top". Plans, schemes, punched-cards, electric and electronic devices will replace the human will. That is what they think. We shall see. The skilled engineering worker knows better. All this kind of thing has been tried before (automation is not new), and after ghastly failure the ordinary human qualities have to be called to the rescue. Attempts to eliminate skill only moves it elsewhere, engineers being infinitely adaptable beings. They are the basis of modern industry and their skill, ideas and example moves with them. The demonstration of socially useful co-operation worked out at the Standard will now begin to ferment in other places.

MIDLANDER.

"University Libertarian"

The Editor of the "University Libertarian" is anxious to recover about 5 copies of the first issue (Dec. 1955) as file copies. Even copies in only moderately good condition will be welcome, and will gladly be purchased at 1/- plus postage. Please send them to V. Mayes, 13 Bannerman Avenue, Prestwich, Lancs.

- 3.00 Open-air meeting in Hyde Park
- 7.30 p.m. Lecture: JACK ROBINSON
- Monday, August 6.
- 11.00 a.m. Lecture: PHILIP SANSOM
- 1.30 p.m. Lunch

COSTS

LECTURES. The charge for admission to the four lectures will be two shillings and sixpence, payable in advance. Admission to each lecture separately, one shilling.

MEALS. The price of each meal mentioned in the programme will be two shillings and sixpence. It will be necessary, of course, for meals to be ordered sufficiently in advance for food to be bought. On Saturday and Sunday evening, refreshments will be available from the Malatesta Club at their usual prices.

ACCOMMODATION. It is hoped that provincial and foreign comrades coming to the Summer School can all be accommodated in the homes of London comrades, and therefore no separate charge will be made for accommodation. But if, after all, it is necessary to put some comrades into hotels, all those attending the Summer School will be asked to contribute voluntarily.

Bookings for places in the Summer School (total amount payable in advance 10/-), offers of accommodation, and enquiries, should all be sent as soon as possible to Joan Sculthorpe, c/o Freedom Press. Donations will also be welcome. All cheques and postal orders should be made payable to Joan Sculthorpe.

ACCOMMODATION WANTED IN LONDON

THE attention of London comrades is drawn to our need of accommodation for the Summer School weekend.

Will comrades with beds available for the Saturday and Sunday nights please let Joan Sculthorpe know, stating single or double accommodation for how many?

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.

JULY 1—Philip Sansom on ANARCHISM & THE WORKERS

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

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

A and Non-A

Continued from p. 2

pay the rent with money we badly needed for food, I began to reflect on the injustice of such a state of affairs, where the class that produced the wealth was obliged to live always in misery." But it is one thing to realize the injustice of a capitalist society and quite another to decide what to do about it. This writer might have chosen any of the parties that are identified with the labour movement. He may, in fact, have done so: we are not told that he came straight to anarchism.

Another of those quizzed tells us baldly "I became an anarchist after having passed through various political movements, including Independent Labour and State socialism."

A study of other replies suggests that the reading of anarchist papers, books, and pamphlets had a great deal to do in influencing the choice made. I hope this will be some encouragement to our poor, overworked editors.

I can see nothing to suggest that there is a necessary predisposition to anarchism in any of those who answered Mr. Hamon's questionnaire: anarchists are made and not born. Anyone can become an anarchist: our problem is to see that everyone is given the opportunity and that nobody is left unaware of our existence and what we stand for.

EDWIN PEEKE.

FREEDOM PRESS

VOLINE:

Nineteen-Seventeen (The Russian Revolution Betrayed) cloth 12s. 6d. The Unknown Revolution (Kronstadt 1921, Ukraine 1918-21) cloth 12s. 6d.

E. A. GUTKIND: The Expanding Environment 8s. 6d.

V. RICHARDS: Lessons of the Spanish Revolution 6s.

V. RICHARDS: Lessons of the Spanish Revolution 6s.

MARIE-LOUISE BERNERI: Neither East nor West - cloth 10s. 6d., paper 7s. 6d. Workers in Stalin's Russia 1s.

JOHN HEWETSON:

Sexual Freedom for the Young 6d. Ill-Health, Poverty and the State cloth 2s. 6d., paper 1s.

PHILIP SANSOM: Syndicalism—The Workers' Next Step 1s.

K. J. KENAFICK: Michael Bakunin and Karl Marx paper 6s.

Marie-Louise Berneri Memorial Committee publications: Marie-Louise Berneri, 1918-1949: A Tribute cloth 5s. Journey Through Utopia cloth 16s. (U.S.A. \$2.50)

27, Red Lion Street, London, W.C.1.