

In this Issue :
Pictures on the Pavement - p. 2
Comments from America - p. 3
Poznan: Where is the Marxist Explanation? - p. 3

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

Only the individual can think, and thereby create new values for society.

ALBERT EINSTEIN

Vol. 17. No. 30

July 28th, 1956

Threepence

THE BMC STRIKE

A VOTE OF NO CONFIDENCE

BATTLE was joined last Monday between the British Motor Corporation and the fourteen unions of the Confederation of Shipbuilding & Engineering Unions.

Unfortunately nobody seems particularly clear as to what the strike is about, and never was battle joined with such little enthusiasm among the rank and file. First day's figures for the numbers of workers on strike at the numerous plants of the BMC showed considerable confusion, claim and counter-claim by management and unions showing only one thing: that the workers who still remained on the payroll after the initial sacking of 6,000 last month were concerned first and foremost with hanging on to their jobs.

Now this is hardly surprising. The official union leadership is now reaping the harvest of all its long years of sowing the seeds of class collaboration, of the rejection of direct action.

This is the first attempt at a widespread official strike since the outbreak of the war. Virtually ever since 1926 the Trade Union Congress has given up the direct struggle against the employers and, of course, for long before that they had had no idea of a struggle against the capitalist system.

The trade union movement throughout is devoid of any revolutionary inspiration. At the most, parts of it could be called reformist, seeking nothing more than the right to bargain for wages, and at its worst it is frankly reactionary, prepared always to submerge the inter-

ests of its own members to those of the employers or the State.

Consultation Before Dismissal

Now, the Confederation of Shipbuilding & Engineering Unions has decided to call an official strike. For what? For the right to be consulted before workers are sacked as redundant. And providing leadership in this strike is the Transport and General Workers' Union, the biggest in the Confederation (indeed, biggest in the whole union movement), which has consistently shown itself rigidly against direct action.

Why is it leading a strike now? Well it seems that nothing angers union leaders more than a blow to their pride. Their members can be shoved around—and they will assist in the shoving. If the rank and file decide a strike is necessary, the officials' first reaction is to bully them back to work so that they can get together with the bosses. But when the bosses take a decision contemptuously ignoring the officials (as the officials frequently ignore their members), then the men must be pulled out on strike.

By their action in the past the union leaders have given up the right to enjoy the confidence of their members. It is then by no means surprising to us that when they do, belatedly and to defend their own jobs, call the workers out on strike,

they get a relatively poor response.

Over the BMC network as a whole, hardly 50 per cent. of the workers obeyed the strike call. The unions claim that most of those going to work were non-unionists anyway, but it seems a suspiciously high proportion, in these days of the closed shop!

No Confidence

The poor response is in reality a vote of no confidence in the union leadership. And on wonder. Not only have they provided no inspiration in the past, but they have no policy for the present or the future. They have no alternative to redundancy. All they are asking is that before workers are sacked, the management and union officials get together and talk about it. Presumably to establish the principle on which workers are sacked. It's a great consolation, when you get your cards, to know that your union boss has agreed with the management and that you are being declared redundant according to a principle!

The fact is that the trade union leaders want capitalism but don't like its rougher aspects to make them uncomfortable. As long as there is full employment they have nothing to do but keep the workers in order. During all the years of labour shortage the workers were

Continued on p. 4

Letter from France

THE SOCIALISTS & ALGERIA

OPINION in this country is quite aware that the present policy of the French government can only result in greater bloodshed in Algeria, in intensifying a war which seems cruel and meaningless to all but the most ferocious chauvinists. This awareness accounts for the keen (and unusual!) interest shown by the public for the debates in the recent congress of the Socialist Party in Lille: it was hoped that, however paralyzed they might be by the fear of appearing too revolutionary, the socialist delegates would at least express the country's discontent, and oblige the socialist-led government to change its attitude to the Algerian problem.

In fact, the congress, including MM. Mollet and Lacoste, passed a resolution enjoining the government to wage a struggle on "two fronts"—against the colonialists as well as the rebels—and, more important still, to do its utmost in order to negotiate a cease-fire with those who fight.

Now, to anybody naïve enough to believe that, in politics, words mean actions, such a resolution might have raised hopes as to the possibility of a change for the better in Algeria. But the French Socialists have always been great "talkers": when it comes to the point, however, the game of politics (the interest of the Party) has without exception proved more important to them than their humanitarian, internationalistic principles; the sincerity of their pacifism was put to the test twice, in 1914 and 1939, and both times their reaction was one of sheer patriotic fanaticism; in 1936, the socialist Spaniards called for help from the socialist government of Leon Blum, and they are still waiting for the answer... To-day the French Socialists are true to their tradition of noble speeches and cowardly apathy: no sooner had the congress come to an end than M. Robert Lacoste, socialist minister for Algeria, who had voted for the final resolution, thought fit to reassure those patriots whom it could have disturbed, and declared to the Press: "These resolutions, seen from Algiers, are not all that important. They may well carry whatever votes they like. In Algeria, I

apply my own policy." Thus he showed not only that he was a master in the well-known political game of saying one thing and doing another, but also that the Socialist Party had no intention of interfering with this game; for although M. Lacoste openly stated that he would not conform to the wishes of his party, there is as yet no sign that the party might consider this as a serious offence and expel M. Lacoste!

Thanks to the socialist political-mindedness and passivity, the Algerian war will go on as before, and M. Lacoste's "own policy" will continue to be nothing but a one-sided, systematic repression, not only against the rebel Moslems, but against all the European elements (teachers, doctors, journalists or priests) who seek to keep in friendly contact with the Moslem population (only to be suspected of treason, and sent to jail or expelled). While the colonialist press keeps on fomenting hatred, vengeance and war, and the capitalists in Algeria manage to hinder the implementation of the already insufficient reforms intended to better the living conditions of the fellahs (whose average income reaches about £20 a year). M. Lacoste, who is supposed to "struggle on two fronts" has done nothing to reduce colonialist influence in Algeria, and it would be putting things mildly to say that he has done nothing to bring about a truce between the army and the rebels: on his return to Algeria after the congress, he stated once again his refusal to negotiate a cease-fire with the rebel leaders, who, in his eyes, are nothing but murderers. (It does not seem to occur to M. Lacoste that wars would never come to an end if the murderers on one side refused to make peace with the murderers on the other side...)

Mr. Lacoste's policy of "pacification" means in fact the pursuance of an extermination war to which we can see no end. Such was surely not the wish of the Socialist congress, but such is the result of their purely wishful thinking. The socialist government will be remembered in French history for having once again done "the dirty work" of the Right, and the Socialist Party for having, as usual, done nothing about it. C.D.

CAMPAIGN TO LIMIT SECRET POLICE POWERS

THE state, at any time, because it has the power to back up decisions, can violate the liberty of the individual if it is considered that he is against the interest of the state.

State control is seen at its most blatant in totalitarian countries, but in the countries claiming to have a democracy, measures taken against the individual are either covered up completely, if they run counter to 'democratic' procedure, or the usual excuses, such as, in the 'national interest', are put forward as justification.

The recent case of Mr. J. H. A. Lang, former assistant solicitor to Imperial Chemical Industries, who was dismissed because his wife was once a member of the Communist Party, revealed some astonishing facts about security methods. (Astounding that is to people who naïvely think that opening private letters, etc., only happens in totalitarian countries.)

It was this case which gave rise to the formation of a committee for the purpose of campaigning for the limitation of secret police powers. The 32-strong committee includes Fenner Brockway, Lord Faringdon, Ian Gilmour, Kingsley Martin, J. B. Priestley and Lord Stansgate.

At a meeting last Wednesday the committee suggested a five point plan 'to remedy what is regarded as present injustices'. The points are as follows:

1. Rules about employment on security work should be approved by Parliament and explained to everyone engaged upon it.
2. No one should be dismissed on a mendacious charge—for example if the real reason is security, he should not be told that it is inefficiency.

3. Every person suspected of being a security risk should be told in writing of the charges against him, of his right of appeal, and of his right to be represented.

4. Besides the "three advisers" (envisaged in the Government's regulations) three High Court judges sitting in camera should hear appeals, examine the security officer who may have brought charges, and the security officer's witnesses and their documents.

5. If these judges have evidence of misconduct in the administration of security organisations, they should report through the Lord Chancellor to the Privy Council.

The limiting of police powers is clearly as much as can be aimed at in any governmental society. Even this is only applicable when the state feels secure, either from internal dissension, or from a threat without. The nature of the national state is such that it cannot allow too much freedom, particularly to people who give their allegiance to another country or to an international concept.

That is why, although this committee is fulfilling an important function within the framework of a governmental society, its recommendations can only have a limited success. Parliament, which it is recommended should approve rules about employment on security work, is subservient to the state, and it is only in times of relative peace that anti-parliamentary or anti-state sentiments are allowed freedom of expression.

When the next crisis takes place, as in the last war, limited police powers will be forgotten when the battle cry of, "Defence for our country", the "National interest" and the "Christian way of life" rings out.

The Labour Party's Third Policy Pamphlet Equality Thro' Taxation?

THE third of the Labour Party's pamphlets to appear deals with "social justice" and is given the title "Towards Equality". And just as their policy pamphlet on "Personal Freedom" (see FREEDOM 14/7/56) told us very little about freedom and a great deal about how the Labour Party would operate the State machine for the good of the community, so their pamphlet on equality is a somewhat nebulous statement of how they propose to run the capitalist economic machine to ensure fair shares all round, revealing, in the process, that equality is much more a vote-catching slogan than a strongly-felt principle.

The Party's policy-makers in dealing with the subject of equality follow the same reasoning as they did earlier on the subject of personal freedom in that they are simply interested in sharing out the cake more equitably, but appear to be quite uninterested in the ingredients that go to make it or even how it has been made! Thus when the subject under discussion was personal freedom they in fact spent their time talking about Rights: the rights of the individual to sue the Crown and its agencies; the rights of everyone to have a job, or to share in those privileges which to-day were reserved for a minority of the community. There was no questioning the possibility that the real obstacle to personal freedom was the very structure of our present social organisation.

Now, in their statement on Equality (true it's "Towards Equality" that the L.P. have directed their unimaginative mind, though, as we hope to show, it leads to inequality!) in spite of a certain realism in the introduction in which they declare:

It would be foolish to assume that our objectives will be automatically achieved or that the injustices that still exist are no more than decaying relics of a bygone age. The truth is that there exists in a capitalist system a strong, persistent trend towards economic and social inequality.

But not only do they believe that this trend "can only be contained by deliberate and continuous State intervention"; they also (in the second part of their statement) make it quite clear that the classless, equalitarian society can function in a capitalist economy simply by applying certain financial curbs. In other words, they do not question the basic structure of the money and property-owning system but suggest that a financial curettage is all that is needed to remove the social injustices (which are outlined in Part One).

The remedies... lie firstly in making present taxes really effective; secondly, and even more important, in correcting the present unequal distribution of private wealth and the tendency for it to accumulate in too few hands. (p. 22).

★
NOW let us, for a moment, examine the validity of the idea. In the introduction we are told: Fifty years ago the Labour Party

Continued on p. 3

THE ARCHBISHOP AND GOD TO THE RESCUE

The Archbishop of Canterbury has wakened up sufficiently to the dehumanising aspects of modern industry to offer a solution to mass slavery to the machine "which produces a dreariness of spirit in and out of working hours".

Dr. Fisher* has little experience in factory slavery, but he does know a lot about spiritual slavery which he offers freely as an aid to man in overcoming the evils of the machine age.

The Church, claims the Archbishop, "is a branch factory of an industry whose products every other industry needs for its own help. Christ's religion specialises in producing happy communities and satisfied people. The Church, like any other industry, has its faults at every level from boardroom to shop floor, but, nonetheless, Christ's religion has proved itself without rival in producing just those people out of whom are made happy societies and satisfied individuals." Industrialists will welcome such a speech from Dr. Fisher. What better method could be used for keeping workers quiet and satisfied with their lot than the age-old combination of religious hope and economic control.

The advantage of "this industry of Christ's religion" over other industries is that: "Every worker has direct access to the head of the firm and can learn as much about God's purpose as he can understand. He does not have to go through shop stewards or foremen or managers, although there are the equivalent of all these in the ministries of the Church."

Dr. Fisher should be careful, he might talk himself out of a job. Direct liaison with God makes his own position superfluous.

*Preaching at a special service at the University Church of St. Mary The Virgin for the members of the Duke of Edinburgh's conference (another well known industrial worker), on the human problems of industry.

PEOPLE AND IDEAS

PICTURES ON THE PAVEMENT

"When I see a Rubens, Rembrandt, Correggio, I think of Crippled Harry and Slobbering Joe".
—WILLIAM BLAKE (1803).

IF you have ever been to Hyde Park Corner you must have noticed Joseph Lee the pavement artist, with his ruddy gypsy face, like Robert Newton, and his long curly black hair, drawing in coloured chalks on the flagstones, up against the park railings in between the coffee stall and the gentlemen's lavatory—a pitch with every convenience. He was there for longer than most people can remember: forty-two years, he says, and then a month or two ago he disappeared. I saw him again in the middle of Regent Street, lighting the lamps one night around a hole in the road, and asked him what had happened. "I've packed it in," he said, "They've been pinching my pennies". More than that he would not say, and he ambled off to his canvas watchman's hut. But I see that he has confirmed it in a newspaper interview in which he said:

"I didn't care if they laughed at my pictures, famous painters have stopped and told me I was a natural artist. I didn't care when they shouted 'Git your air cut!'—an artist is always a clown to a clerk. But when they started pinching the pennies out of my hat—and they did it regular—I gave it up.

"I can be rich if I want to. I can live in ridiculous comfort—but its not the money I care about. It was the lousy, rotten, dirty, filthy trick of pinching pennies out of a hat that turned me sour . . ."

You might think that Mr. Lee is exaggerating, but I was told the same thing about six years ago by Joe Mannix who draws ships and pastoral scenes outside St. Stephen's, Gloucester Road, a centre of gloomy Anglo-Catholicism, where Mr. T. S. Eliot is, appropriately, a churchwarden. Mr. Mannix had been left ten pounds in the will of a solicitor who lived in Emperor's Gate and was a patron of the arts. "What will you do with it?" I asked. "I'm going to buy a bike," he said, "so I can get back to my pitch quicker. The moment my back is turned, someone starts pinching the takings."

★

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 . . .

Studies in the Labour Theory of Value R. L. Meek 30/-
Pierre-Joseph Proudhon George Woodcock 28/-

Reprints . . .

Claudine at School Colette 12/6
The Desperate Hours Joseph Hayes 2/-
Reform or Revolution Rosa Luxemburg 3/-
Socialism and the Churches Rosa Luxemburg 6d.

Remainders . . .

The Jungle Upton Sinclair 3/6

Second-Hand . . .

Capital (Abridged by Strachey) Karl Marx 3/6

The Secret Agent Joseph Conrad 3/-

Mr. Tasker's Gods T. F. Powys 3/-

Apostate Forrest Reid 2/6

To Beg I Am Ashamed Sheila Cousins 3/6

They Die Young John Sommerfield 3/-

The Intelligent Man's Way to Prevent War ed. Leonard Woolf 3/-

A Guide to Modern Politics G. D. H. & M. Cole 3/-

Made Free in Prison E. W. Mason 3/-

Profits and Politics R. D. Cherques & A. H. Ewen 3/6

The Power House Alex Comfort 3/6

History of the Fabian Society Edward Pease 4/6

Above all Liberties Alec Craig 3/6

Woman's Life and Labour F. Zweig 3/6

Prophecy of Famine H. J. Massingham & Edward Hyams 3/6

Lorca: the Poet and his People Arturo Barea 3/6

Stalin Boris Souvarine 32/-

Periodicals . . .

Liberation, No. 5, July 1956 1/9

Postage free on all items

Obtainable from

27, RED LION STREET,

LONDON, W.C.1

WHAT strange and saddening revelations! One would have thought that petty larceny was the least of a pavement artist's occupational difficulties, compared with the trouble of getting and keeping a pitch, the expense of his colours and the vagaries of the weather. The essence of the pavement artist or screever is, of course, that he works *in situ*, like the fresco painter, working on the paving stones themselves, starting afresh every day, using powdered pigments which he works up into cakes with condensed milk or some other binding agent. The former incumbent of the pitch by St. Martin's used in addition to draw portraits in ink of passers-by which he sold to them at four bob a time, but those who bring out pictures every day to display on their pitch are not truly pavement artists, they are closer to the painters who exhibit each year in the open air art exhibitions on the Embankment Gardens and in Heath Street, Hampstead.

The difficulty about pitches is that they become fewer each year because of road-widening and municipal 'improvements' like the fussy little flower-beds which have been introduced to immobilise the area around the Irving statue, and because of the replacement of old York stone paving by concrete slabs whose gritty surface is hostile to chalk, although the man who draws animal heads outside the National Portrait Gallery, (working perhaps in the theory that his patrons will have got sick of the human face), manages very well on the smooth granolithic paving. The police, in the same way as they are wrinking out the orators from Lincoln's Inn Fields to make room for more car parking, are chivvying the pavement artists who, presumably, are less willing than the news-vendors to buy their pitches from the police by becoming coppers' marks. (Notice incidentally that while people are occasionally run in for 'causing an obstruction' by selling *Freedom* or *Peace News*, they are never prosecuted if they are selling the *Evening News*, *Star* or *Standard*).

The pavement artist's choice of subject is fairly constant. Often it is a copy, in glowing sombre colours of an Old Master portrait: Vermeer's *Head of a Girl*, Franz Hals' *Laughing Cavalier*, da Vinci's *Mona Lisa* or Hogarth's *Shrimp Girl*. Mr. Lee favoured Henry VIII after Holbein, or Mary, Queen of Scots in the style of Rembrandt, or, every day for years, an agonised Christ with a crown of thorns. Here there is a remarkable continuity, for Henry Mayhew in his fascinating compilation *London Labour and the London Poor* which ap-

peared in twopenny monthly parts in 1851, quotes an interview with a beggar who said:

"There is one man who draws Christ's heads with a crown of thorns, and mackerel, on the pavement in coloured chalks; this one often makes £1 a day now in three hours; indeed I have known him come home with 21s. besides what he drank on the way. A gentleman in Regent Street once gave him £5 and a suit of clothes to do Christ's heads with a crown of thorns and mackerel on the walls. His son does Napoleon's heads best, but makes nothing like so much as his father. The father draws cats' heads and salmon as well—but the others are far the best spec."

Ten years later, when Mayhew added a sixth volume to his great book, he included an interview with the artist himself who was a former school usher who had suffered a paralytic stroke. His pitches were in Euston Square and the Waterloo Bridge Road, and by this time he declared, "Of all my pictures the Christ's heads paid the best, but very little better than the Napoleons".

★

ONE of the memorable characters that George Orwell met when he was *Down and Out in Paris and London*, was Bozo, the terribly crippled screever, who was an authority on astronomy. He was the first man Orwell had encountered who thought that poverty didn't matter. "Isn't it very hard to take an interest in things—things like stars—living this life?" Orwell asked. "No, not necessarily," Bozo replied. "If you set yourself to it, you can live the same life, rich or poor. You can still keep on with your ideas." He was one of the most exceptional men Orwell met:

"He had managed to keep his brain intact and alert, and so nothing could make him succumb to poverty. He might be ragged and cold, or even starving, but so long as he could read, think

and watch for meteors, he was, as he said, free in his own mind."

He introduced Orwell to a 'real' artist who had studied in Paris and drew Old Master copies, who said:

"The worst thing in this life is the cold, and the next worst is the interference . . . At first, not knowing any better, I used sometimes to copy a nude on the pavement. The first I did was outside St. Martin's-in-the-Fields church. A fellow in black—I suppose he was a churchwarden or something—came out in a tearing rage. 'Do you think we can have that obscenity outside God's holy house?' he cried. So I had to wash it out. It was a copy of Botticelli's *Venus*. Another time I copied the same picture on the Embankment. A policeman passing looked at it, and then, without a word, walked on it and rubbed it out with his great flat feet."

Bozo himself scorned the copyists—"salmon platers" he called them, and his own line was topical cartoons—politics, cricket, the Boat Race, the Derby, and so on:

"I'm what they call a serious screever. I don't draw in blackboard chalks like these others, I use proper colours the same as what painters use. I use five bob's worth of colours in a long day. I have a different cartoon every day. For instance, when the Budget was on I had one of Winston trying to push an elephant marked 'Debt', and underneath I wrote, 'Will he budge it?' See? You can have cartoons about any of the parties, but you mustn't put anything in favour of Socialism, because the police won't stand it. Once I did a cartoon of a boa constrictor marked Capital, swallowing a rabbit marked Labour. The copper came along and saw it, and he says, 'You rub that out, and look sharp about it,' he says. I had to rub it out."

★

BUT the most curious pavement artist that I have ever come across was a white-bearded old man in Glasgow, whose name, I think, was McAteer (a contemporary of another of that city's characters, The Clincher, who, wearing a silk hat, would go around waving his certificate of discharge from the asylum saying that he was the only man in Glas-

gow who could *prove* he was sane). McAteer, when the spirit moved him, would settle on the pavement and chalk didactic pictures, surrounded by children to whom he told stories. He refused the alms of people who passed by, saying, "Give it to the weans, it'll do them more good". He did it, he said, for company, to get some fresh air, and to amuse people. He was a disinterested philanthropist like the mild old gentleman with the white flowing beard who used to stand against a building in Leicester Square. He was known as 'old Hoar Frost', and used neither to beg nor to try and sell anything, but would talk softly in a well-modulated voice about the arts and sciences. McAteer reminds me too, of the two strange pedagogues recalled by Mr. Arturo Barea from his childhood in Madrid. One, the Penny Teacher lived in a hut made of petrol cans in the Barrio de las Injurias. A horde of ragged pupils squatted round him in the open to learn the ABC at ten centimos—a penny—a month. The other, the Saint with the Beard used to hold his classes in exchange for his pupils' collection of fag-ends, in the Plaza Mayor. The Penny Teacher was sent to prison as an anarchist and died there. The Saint with the Beard was warned off from his corner and disappeared. But he turned up again eventually and went on secretly lending tattered books to his pupils, for the love of reading.

C.W.

We need more
Readers . . .

Are you introducing
the paper to
potential Readers?

I Have a Song to Sing-o!

THERE are some who are apt to dismiss as "far fetched" such forecasts of future societies as are to be found in, say, *Nineteen Eighty-four* or *Brave New World*. I hope that they will all have noticed a recent news item from New York, where it is reported that next Sunday (July 15) a new songwriter is to make his television debut with a work entitled "Push-button Bertha". The composer, whose name is Datatron, is an

electronic "brain", built by the Burroughs Corporation.

It is not claimed that Datatron is endowed with the aesthetic gifts necessary for art, but "to the extent that popular music is a rearrangement of old themes Datatron can match anyone". Or so says the report. And as so much popular music seems to be little more than a rearrangement of existing themes the threat of redundancy now hangs over Tin Pan alley, where there has been some alarm at the news that Datatron can turn out 1,000 songs an hour and can produce more than 10,000 million different tunes without human intervention.

At the moment there is no electronic orchestra to play the new composer's tunes, and Datatron will have to be content with a performance by a human band; but I have no doubt that the advance of automation will soon dispose of this slight drawback.

The "far fetched" brigade will, of course, tell me that I am being unduly alarmist and assure me once again that machines will never be able to replace us entirely. "There will always be some things," runs this line of argument, "that no machine could possibly do."

As usual, these optimists will have missed the most important point. For many years now popular entertainment has been progressively mechanized: magazine stories, second-feature movies, radio plays, and even alleged "novels" have tended to become more and more mechanical and stereotyped. Plots are made to a formula, and the characters that creak their way through them have no more personality than puppets: Pinocchio was more human than some of the "real people" I have seen in certain "B" movies.

This is the inevitable result of applying mass-production techniques to popular entertainment. It is customary nowadays to speak of the entertainment "industry". There has been a shift in emphasis: entertainment is a commodity to be produced and sold as profitably as possible; and the conveyor-belt system ensures that it is as profitable as possible. The advice universally given to young writers to-day is "Study your market"—i.e. find out what sort of goods the public are buying and then mass produce as much as you can. This is one of the most vicious circles imaginable.

Now for mass production to be really successful, in the commercial sense, the more the product can be standardized the better. And that is exactly what has happened to mass-produced literature:

the forms are stereotyped, and the style it is written in has been reduced to an impersonal, mechanical process. There are occasional changes of fashion when the new season's models are introduced, but what little novelty there is in such changes soon wears off when it in turn is repeated *ad nauseam*.

No sensible person would object to mass production as such: a beautifully produced book is not a whit less beautiful because it is one of many identical copies to come from the press. What is sad to see is the application of this technique in fields where it is so manifestly unsuitable.

The optimists will no doubt point out that art is far from being dead. There are good films as well as tawdry ones; literature is still being written; there is the *Times* as well as the *Daily Mirror*; the theatre is still alive; and even the BBC has its Third Programme. All this is true. But we already have our "prolefeed"; there is already this invidious distinction between pap for the masses and something a little more worthwhile for those who can still discriminate. Unfortunately the pap is a much better commercial proposition, and anything more worthwhile is likely to become less and less profitable. And it is the profit that matters.

I do not feel the least bit indignant about Datatron. Nor would I regard a fiction-writing machine as an affront to human dignity. Much of the stuff that is being written now might just as well be written by machines. In fact, this is a prospect I rather look forward to: for then the human machines who now produce it would be released from their drudgery and might have a chance to find something creative to do.

There is one ray of hope in this story from New York. If it is possible to make a machine to write songs then it should also be possible to make machines to listen to them. This would solve the whole problem of mechanical entertainment. For I am sure that many people who now lavish their affections on dogs and cats could be persuaded to adopt mechanical pets. And if they are willing to buy vitaminized dog food for Fido there seems no reason why they should not buy a record of Datatron's newest song for their pet robot. There is a whole new field here for the advertiser and salesman to exploit. And I am sure they are quite capable of exploiting it.

But perhaps this is just a little *too* far-fetched?

EDWIN PEEKE.

EXHIBITIONS

SEXAGESIMAL

THE cinema is 60 years old this year, and to mark the occasion two exhibitions have been staged in London.

In Trafalgar Square there is the *Observer* Film Exhibition, where, in a wealth of fascinating detail, the film's meteoric progress has been plotted in a series of well staged displays ranging from the most primitive apparatus to a reproduction of a modern studio set.

The exhibition is more concerned with the artistic side of the cinema; but the technical aspect has not been overlooked, and the mechanics of making pictures move have been intelligently presented. There are working models of early stroboscopic devices for creating the illusion of movement—the first animated cartoons, in fact. And there are examples of the anamorphic drawings that used to amuse some of our forefathers: the artist made these distorted drawings (the forerunners of CinemaScope) while looking into a curved mirror; then, when the drawings themselves were viewed in a similar mirror, the distortion was corrected.

Perhaps the most impressive thing about the exhibition is the huge collection of still photographs that decorate each room. Every school of filmmaking is represented from a large number of countries. It is rather saddening to reflect on the number of films one has not seen and the number of films one will never see: somehow they promise to be more interesting than the ones we have seen. There is, for instance, a charming scene from a Japanese film in which a man and woman are holding an animated conversation while sharing a bath. It is discreetly photographed, but I cannot imagine the British Board of Film Censors regarding it with a kindly eye.

Some of the more memorable films are represented by such things as the costumes worn by the actors, scripts, notes,

and sketches. That remarkable example of *poésie cinématographique*, *Les Enfants du Paradis*, is recalled by a manuscript page from the script, a number of sketches and notes, two oil paintings of settings, and other items associated with the production.

The cartoon has a room to itself, as is only proper. Here addicts can see actual cells from a number of cartoons. Disney, of course, is well represented. But it is clear that he has now been overtaken by the new favourites, Bugs Bunny, Tom and Jerry, and Mr. Magoo. McLaren has not been forgotten, and there are examples from Continental cartoonists.

This is one of the most interesting exhibitions in London, well worth the price of admission (2s. 9d.), and at least one hour is needed to see it all.

The Eastman Kodak Company also have an exhibition at their Kingsway showrooms. As might be expected, this is more concerned with the technical side. There are examples of ancient and modern apparatus and a formidable display of actual frames from different types of film. The 70 mm. film that King Vidor used in 1930 to get a wide screen effect can be compared with the 65 mm. film of the new Todd-AO process. Vista-Vision and the anamorphic processes are illustrated and explained, and so are the various methods of sound recording. The various colors can be seen side by side, and here partisans of one system can check their preference. Some of them may be tempted to think again. This exhibition is free.

What impressed me more than anything else in these exhibitions is the extraordinary amount of ingenuity that has been expended in the development of the movies. It seems a pity that similar ingenuity is lacking when it is a question of developing a society that will work properly. E.P.

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

Vol. 17, No. 30. July 28, 1956

Equality Thro' Taxation?

Continued from p. 1

Party brought to British politics a new and radical purpose. It determined to use the machinery of Parliamentary government not just to 'run the country' but to change the nature of society itself. Against the power of privilege and wealth, and the values of a capitalist society, it set the ideals of democratic socialism.

It proclaimed the need for a new and classless society based upon equal chances for the nation's youth, regardless of birth, sex and fortune; a fair division and a planned expansion of the nation's wealth; the right to work; the elimination of poverty; common ownership, control or dispersal of economic power; service, not greed, as the driving social purpose.

We are gratuitously informed that

To-day, these are no longer the aims of a small band of Socialist pioneers, but the conscious ideals of more than half the nation. Certainly much progress has been made. The reforms of the 1945-51 Labour Government, following the vast upheavals of war, had opened a new and better era in our national life. The Welfare State which we then created is an achievement of which Labour feels justly proud.

It is admitted nevertheless that we are far from the equalitarian State, privilege remains "strongly entrenched" and the division of the "nation's wealth is still arbitrary and unjust". And in essentials "ours is—and is felt to be—a class society".

To our minds it is sheer distortion of the facts to attribute the undoubted improvement in living conditions in this country to six years of Labour "rule", and far from "feeling proud" at the results, they should admit that so far as governments go they have proved that no fundamental changes are ever brought about through government. The Labour Party recognise this fact, without however admitting it, when they enumerate the gross inequality in education ("A major cause of inequality in British society is our educational system"), in work ("The treatment of employees at work has always been, and still is, one of the most potent sources of inequality in our society"), in incomes, power and wealth.

How far six years of Labour rule succeeded in leading us towards equality can be gauged from the following admission:

Half the nation own little more than their personal and household effects: one per cent. of the nation own something like half the nation's private wealth. Even this contrast does not fully illustrate the continuing concentration of wealth. Here is another illustration: a quarter of the nation's private wealth consists of large fortunes of £50,000 and over—and these are owned by one fifth of one per cent. of the nation.

The Labour Party assumed the reins of government at a moment more than favourable for far-reaching changes in the economic and social structure of the country. Almost every country in the world emerged from the war in a reformist mood. (Social democracy had little cause for self-congratulation on this score—for without them perhaps there would have been more of the revolutionary ferment that marked the last phases of the 1914-18 war). In this country Labour was swept into office as a result of the promises of pie-in-the-sky offered by Churchill (as the reward for more "blood, sweat and tears") which the workers and certain sections of the professional classes thought stood more chance of being implemented by Labour than by the Tories.

To say, however, that the Welfare State and Full Employment, are "achievements" of Labour rule is sheer nonsense.

In spite of the great post-war extension of the social services, we have no reason to be complacent. The Welfare State

has not, as some have optimistically claimed, abolished poverty everywhere—although it has greatly reduced what was, in the inter-war period, its most important and conspicuous cause: namely, unemployment.

Full-employment and prosperity have nothing to do with the Welfare State, and a great deal to do with a world at peace but on a war footing. Indeed, there is more general prosperity in free-for-all America than in this Welfare State of ours. And can any Labour policy-maker deny that without the vast armament programme and millions of potential producers uselessly absorbed in the armed forces, production would have long ago outstripped demand (not needs) and the "redundancy" which is making itself felt at present in the car industry would have long ago affected industry as a whole? If the Labour Party were in power, what measures would they take to guarantee full-employment, without lowering workers' living standards, or increasing expenditure on armaments? Their policy statement does not reveal any secret of how to square the (vicious) circle of capitalist economics. We suspect that their silence is a confession of their impotence.

★

THE Labour thinkers have a somewhat unoriginal concept of equality. If one understands them correctly they favour only equality of opportunity.

The point we wish to emphasise is not that competitive examinations are unfair, but the different types of schools are bound to give very unequal chances of success (p. 7).

And a few pages later, on the subject of Equality and Income, they conclude that "provided there is a decent minimum wage" they see no objection to a system of rewards which is related to the nature and difficulty of the work, the skills required and the responsibility borne.

Differences in earned income, based on these tests, makes sense. How wide the gap should eventually be between top and bottom, floor and ceiling, is something which cannot be decided in the abstract. Much depends upon the climate of opinion, upon what each generation is accustomed to and what it therefore expects.

It seems quite clear to us that what the Labour Party are out to achieve is the equal opportunity for all, irrespective of their social or economic background, to obtain key jobs in the political and industrial fields, that is, to become members of the ruling hierarchy. It is significant that these ardent advocates of the "classless society" should place so much importance on the "professions, the State service and managerial and technical posts" . . . and on the "highly competitive examinations for entrance to the Foreign Service and to the Administrative Class of the Home Civil Service". The fact that these posts may one day be open to the sons of humble workers as well as the sons of the "upper-classes" will not mean the end of the class system. The class structure will remain. At most a limited number of persons will feel that they have changed their status, their class.

★

IN the final analysis class consciousness is a feeling of inferiority—or superiority, and much less a question of the size of one's income or the "importance" of one's job, though of course it can be argued that these are the values that create the feelings of inferiority and superiority. Exactly. But only so long as we are stupid enough to accept these values!

The Labour Party recognise this when they refer to the shabby treatment of employees which, they point out is not "simply a question of the range of income and salaries . . . but also of the treatment and consideration shown to different classes of employees". But instead of stressing that all work which contributes to the welfare of the community is valuable, they betray their class

JUST how seriously should we take the shortage of scientists which educators in science and technology keep warning us about? What sort of disasters must we face if we enter the future with only half or a quarter enough atomic physicists?

The *Saturday Review* for June 2 has two articles concerned with the new importance of scientific knowledge, one revealing the dramatic rewards in dollars to the men who are presumed to know more about protons and electrons than the rest of us; the other an ingenious proposal for saving the time of these very busy men, enabling them to hold technical conferences by means of television—so that they won't have to go running about to get together for these important affairs.

Clare M. Cotton, who covers the "science beat" for the *Wall Street Journal*, reports in the *S.R.*:

Just as young people fresh out of science courses at college are starting careers on salaries undreamed of by yesterday's youth, established scientists are learning that their knowledge and judgment can be traded for cash in the stock market. Fourteen leading atomic physicists were snapped up on a consulting basis in one day by General Dynamics, maker of the hull of the atomic submarines.

The announcement of that coup was made on the morning of March 16, 1955. General Dynamics stock closed that afternoon in the big board 4½ points above the day before. Before the flurry quieted down 84,000 shares of the stock changed hands. One broker who wouldn't know a neutron if it trotted into a boardroom said afterwards: "You have to go with a crowd like that. There's no telling what they might come up with."

There's nothing bad, of course, about scientists making a little money—or even a lot. But we wonder a little about the fact that becoming a scientist, these days, is something like going into the Aladdin's Lamp business. Is the spirit of science going to be able to stand all this prosperity? If you have problems in your business, just consult the *Arabian Nights*. No, that's wrong. Consult the graduate lists of MIT and Cal Tech. Those are the *djinn* directories for our times.

Mr. John R. Pierce of the Bell Telephone Laboratories, who has thought up the television idea, makes his case by pointing out how much precious time is wasted when scientists need to confer:

Every day busy scientists shuttle here and there by plane and train to attend conferences. How inefficient this is! Attempts have been made to hold such meetings by telephone. But that is very confusing. Often one conferee can't identify the other conferees as he hears them speak. Then, too, it is difficult to explain complex technicalities when you can't even use your hands to illustrate a point. . . .

Could there be a special type of conference phone today, equipped for picture transmissions? This would enable conferees not only to identify each other instantly, but it would give them a chance to explain themselves clearly by showing charts or documents or even drawing sketches while they speak.

What are these sketches and explanations that can't wait? A new design for the hull of an atomic submarine maybe?

Obviously, we don't have the right attitude. We take the view that it is always the unimportant things that can't wait, while the important things can. On a dollars-and-cents basis, televised

consciousness by instead dealing at great length with the question of workers having opportunities for "rising" to executive posts. Which is not surprising when one considers that the Trade Union movement is as class-ridden as the society on whose survival its own survival depends, and that its leaders are offered, and invariably accept, the "honours" which are the very symbol of that class-society.

★

EQUALITY will not come about by legislation or by some cunning financial sleight of hand by the Labour Party economists. In the first place we need to agree what is meant by equality, and if it means what we think it means then the Labour Party will have to do a lot more re-thinking than it has done so far. But what is more important, the victims of our unequal society must start thinking for themselves. We feel sure it will help them to lose their feeling of inferiority and their fatalism!

Two Comments from America

How Important are the Scientists?

conferences among technical experts will probably be fine for the industries whose competitive life depends upon such conferences, but how does all this get so important as to deserve space in the *Saturday Review [of Literature]*?

Mr. Pierce may even enable someone to make a sale of a new TV system of inter-executive communications. After

all, he works for Bell Telephone Laboratories, which, for all we know, may be in this business. That will be fine for Mr. Pierce's or somebody else's company, and that company's customers. But do we need all this school spirit about the shortage of scientists and clean white space in the *SR* to celebrate such possibilities? Ho hum.

S. Dakota Smears the Hutterites

SOUTH DAKOTA, like every other state in the Union, is against Communism. But South Dakota, unlike states which have found loyalty oaths and similar protective devices sufficient to their security needs, has been obliged to enact special legislation to frustrate the progress of a local communist society which has not only dared to compete with the capitalist system on its own terms, but in a small way threatens to put capitalism out of business.

This is a curiously contradictory situation. A communal society of Hutterites, Christians who are determined to follow the Biblical injunction to have "all things common," by combining Christian austerity (no television, no fancy cars) with much hard work and group-buying at wholesale prices, has been expanding its agricultural operations at so fast a rate that the old-fashioned type free-enterprisers in the area feel outclassed. So,

last July a South Dakota law went into effect denying the Hutterites that right to buy more land. The issue is now in the courts.

A South Dakota legislator explained why the Big Brother Government had to interfere and slow down the all-too-free enterprise of the Hutterite Christians:

The people are nothing more or less than a Communist setup. The children grow up without anything but a communal attitude. It isn't the American way, certainly. They take over large areas. It's equivalent to what happens in a city when Negroes move into a neighbourhood. Others move out and the prices drop. Of course they're less prone to psychotic or neurotic troubles because they stay away from efforts to improve our way of life. (*Time*, June 4.)

We're working hard on this, but we haven't got it figured out, yet. Do you suppose a few ulcers would make the Hutterites true-blue Americans?

(From "Manas", Los Angeles.)

POZNAN: Where is the Marxist Explanation?

THE much-travelled Marshal Bulganin, accompanied by Marshal Zhukov, bulldozed his way into Warsaw last week. The official reason for his presence was to take part in the celebrations of Poland's National Day, but he lost no time in delivering a speech to several thousands, at a public meeting in the skyscraper Palace of Culture (a singularly grotesque title), in which he declared that it was all very well for different countries to approach Socialism by different paths, but this certainly did not allow her satellites to get out of control in this respect.

The Marshal pointed out that reactionary international forces were trying to weaken Socialist countries by exploiting national differences between them, in the hope that in this way they could detach one from another, and so create a disintegrating process. This, he said, was particularly so in regard to the recent disturbances in Poland and Hungary, and in these instances it most definitely could not be tolerated. Any attempts to break up international solidarity, on whatever pretext, would, he implied, be met with action of a most positive kind. Mr. Krushchev, however, had some heartening words to say for the benefit of the faithful. Speaking at Sverdlovsk on July 20th, he gave it as his opinion that "the reactionaries had suffered a crushing defeat in Poznaan" (*sic*). Socialist countries must draw an "essential lesson" from the riots there.

Strangely enough, the first Secretary of the Polish Communist Party, Mr. Ochab, divulged quite the reverse in a speech made at about the same time. He said, the Poznan riots should be taken as a "grave warning signal testifying to the existence of serious disturbances in the relations between the party and the various sections of the working class". He actually went so far as to admit that the "social roots" of the riots were of greater significance than

the alleged rôle of "provocateurs and agents of imperialism". (Imperialist agents are still terribly overworked nevertheless.)

Mr. Ochab continued in this highly liberal vein (remarkable enough for he used to be regarded as a staunch Stalinist), and his admissions were staggering when one considers the circumstances and background to his speech.

He said that living standards had been sharply depressed, many were worse off than in 1949, optimistic statements about improving standards had proved false. The material situation for the ordinary people had "sometimes been very difficult". The next five years would be a "grim struggle" to raise living standards.

It is difficult to understand how two "Marxists" such as Mr. Krushchev and Mr. Ochab, can differ so profoundly in their "marxist interpretation" of the same events. One can only assume that Mr. Ochab's position as First Secretary may shortly be in doubt, or that Mr. Krushchev does not possess sufficient power to check the reactionary forces in their work of socialist disintegration.

A further pointer to the extent of the anxiety felt by Soviet leaders was given by the immediate visit to Budapest, of Mr. Mikoyan, Socialist Deputy Premier, following upon the resignation of the Hungarian party boss Rakosi. Mikoyan continued his journey onwards to Brioni in order to have discussions, presumably urgent, with President Tito.

All this follows upon little surges of excitement in the non-satellite Communist parties of Europe, notably in Italy.

Despite Bulganin's commanding words, and the trumpet-call for solidarity, the situation is a trifle out of control, and some awkwardness is beginning to show. Perhaps they will all regroup eventually, and then again, perhaps they won't.

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.

RUDOLF ROCKER :

Nationalism and Culture cloth 21s.

MARIE-LOUISE BERNERI :

Neither East nor West cloth 10s. 6d., paper 7s. 6d.
Workers in Stalin's Russia 1s.

K. J. KENAFICK :

Michael Bakunin and Karl Marx paper 6s.

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.

TONY GIBSON :

Youth for Freedom paper 2s.
Food Production and Population 6d.
Who will do the Dirty Work? 2d.

ALEX COMFORT :

Delinquency 6d.
Barbarism & Sexual Freedom boards 3s. 6d.

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.

TWO PROBLEMS—ONE SOLUTION

U.S.S.R. Shortages—U.S.A. Gluts—2

(Continued from last week)

The Vicious Circle

CAPITALISM has outlived its day in a great many respects and is no longer in a position to cope with all the tasks of everyday life. Even economic tasks are beyond its skill to deal with, not to mention questions of an ethical aspect. If farmers face disaster to-day because of surpluses while more than half the State's budget (61%) goes on defence (as a consequence of which many factories and huge works are producing all out), what is likely to happen when the armaments race is called off and these same factories slow down? (See FREEDOM, July 7th, 1956: "Will it be Depression?"). Then not merely the present surpluses but most likely a good half of our farm products will fail to find a market. This is the vicious circle: the deficiencies of private capitalism will drive folk towards bolshevism, while the like defects of State capitalism will make them look to the bourgeoisie for a way out.

Both systems, without a doubt, have their relative advantages. The Bolsheviks, for instance, can pride themselves on having no unemployed, whilst the bourgeoisie can claim that under them personal initiative flourishes. Be that as it may, in the long run it amounts to nothing at all. What gain is it for the common people of the USSR that there are no idle hands among them if they lack consumer goods, even the bare necessities? And what gain accrues to the American farmer from his freedom to display personal initiative if he cannot sell save at a loss those products which he has brought forth from the soil and his herds? Plainly, one wants something more than a right to personal initiative or to daily toil; yes, something else is needed. What is needed is a social order in which surpluses need not imply a break in steady work, whilst such work need not exclude the creation of surpluses.

The personal initiative of the American farmer is reduced to naught by the personal initiative of other persons, of those, that is to say, who buy up his products. They are, in fact, the people who control the market, fix prices that scarcely allow the farmer to make ends meet or even plunge him into debt. To start improving the farmer's position would mean first bringing these price fixers to heel. But nobody lifts a finger against these people, for most of them are big industrialists with their own supporters in all branches of government administration. Under the term "personal initiative" as it obtains in capitalist society is lumped both the honest activi-

ties of a decent man and the sharp practices of all sorts of speculators on the make. Even the exploits of gangsters are a form of "personal initiative". Is it any wonder, then, that on the bourgeois field of personal initiative the tares and thistles wax taller than the useful plants? Under the Bolsheviks personal initiative is enchained; under the bourgeoisie it grows weeds.

More Demands on Russian Workers

At the Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party of Russia (Bolsheviks) there was a great deal of talk about changes in external policy, but not a word was breathed about anything of the kind in home policy. On the internal front everything remains as it was. As in the past they will go on demanding of the people "more work", "greater output", and so on. [The forecast made by our Russian comrade in the States is borne out in A. Grigoryev's article "Pressing Problems of the Standardizing of Output and Payment of Labour in Industry" appearing in the May issue of *Kommunist*, Moscow, pp. 61-74.—I.P.] As previously, empty shelves will greet the customers as they swarm into the big shops or "universal stores" so-called (*univermag*). No five-year plans are going to provide any goods for the common folk. Whether Krushchov sets out for ceremonial receptions in London or Washington or just sits inside the Kremlin as Stalin did, nothing will change for the people. *Bolshevik and bourgeois have come to terms.* The Bolsheviks have repudiated their previous tactics aimed at seizing power by force. But they have not given up their brutal measures to exploit to the utmost the working men and women of Russia. On the pretext of pushing through the next five-year plan they will even strengthen their pressure on the people beneath them. They still need "to catch up with and outdistance America," a slogan now a quarter of a century old. It is as though this senseless effort to draw level with America held within itself some kind of miracle.

The Consumer Ignored

After all, the well-being of a country's people does not depend on the quantity of goods produced but on the system through which these goods are distributed. It is possible to produce and at the same time to experience privation. Indeed, in the USA this happens to be the prime "problem". The nub of the matter is to be seen, not in how much is turned out in the factories, but in the object of having all this enormous output. As we have said before, Soviet

national economy is geared exclusively to the end that Party objectives be advanced. The consumer is never taken into consideration. It can be assumed in Soviet economics that there is no consumer. Everything is planned by some supreme State body, quite irrespective of whether or not these plans meet the needs of the general populace. If the people, shall we say, require boots and the State requires saddles for its cavalry units, then it goes without saying that out of the leather available there shall be made saddles and certainly not boots.

Under the system of a privately-owned economy it looks as though the consumer does have a certain place. But even here the main lever is gain, not the consumer. Production is determined exclusively by considerations of profit. No profit, no production.

Herein lies the whole tragedy—that the consumer is ignored both under bourgeois capitalism and under State capitalism. In the USSR there is a dearth of goods, not because, as it might seem, there are no goods there whatsoever, but because the goods produced are not intended for the people but for completely different aims. In America we have over-production not because everybody's needs have been met but because goods are priced too high.

The conclusion therefore emerges of itself: production must be subordinated to the requirements of the people and not to Party objectives. Neither must they be subordinated to the avaricious appetites of profit-hunters. Then there will be neither surpluses nor scarcities in consumer goods anywhere. K.

(The above article is from a recent issue of *Dielo Truda* (Labour's Cause), organ of the United Federation of Russian Labour Organizations in the USA and Canada. It has been translated for FREEDOM by Ivan Popovich).

Letter to the Editors

ON PASSPORTS & PRINCIPLES

DEAR FRIENDS,

I feel I must make some comments on your "Passport" editorial (FREEDOM, July 7), I must confess I have often had the desire to create a rumpus at Newhaven or Tilbury, my usual jumping off places, but scrubbed round it "to save time and bother". But assuming we could get round the need to prove our identity (which would take a lot longer without a passport—what would you suggest using?) we would still "waste time" in a queue giving up tickets. Why have tickets at all? I suppose because of the scale on which we travel. All right say on a village scale when the local blacksmith rows you over the river and you remember to pay him back something by doing him a service in your particular line. But on the larger scale of the world in which we find ourselves, we produce paper money—and passports—to "save time". Then sooner or later the things take control of us, a process which Paul Jennings has satirically and Siegfried Giedion in *Mechanisation Takes Command* only too seriously documented. Can we have our cake and eat it? Most of us seem to think we can. I should like to see a census taken (I hope FREEDOM readers would agree that this would be scientific research and not on a par

with prying), to show how wide the gulf is between our actual living conditions and our aspirations. Pretty wide in most cases, I guess, even though we could very likely change it. Given a choice between the usual forty-hour week with a wage sufficient to buy the necessary drugs and an 80 hour week of hard work on beetroot soup in a community where one could "belong", what would most of us choose?

Lewis Mumford has written that we must be prepared to scrap all those parts of our technocracy which have taken control of us (in *The Condition of Man* I think). That is surely something we can all agree on. But where do we start? If millions want to cross the channel, we'll have to have a hell of a lot of rowing boats.

I may have not got my point home; I feel I should need many pages in which to expand. But what it does all boil down to is: how can we arrive at, and agree to, an optimum scale, and how are we to bring it about? This does seem a practical issue in which FREEDOM might like to devote some discussion time.

Yours fraternally,

Liverpool, July 7. CHARLES DAWSON.

Reply:

[Our columns are open to such a discussion and we hope readers will respond.

On the question our correspondent puts to us in his first paragraph as to how one can prove one's identity more simply than by the passport we would answer, without giving the matter much thought than probably the passport is the most simple document. But the point of our article was that the passport was in fact being used by the authorities for other purposes than that of simple identity. That though it was only necessary to establish one's identity when one returned to these shores it was being used by the Special Branch as a means of checking up on who left this country as well as well as by the Treasury Officials for implementing the currency regulations. And as we also pointed out in some countries such as America the withholding of passports was a means for preventing American citizens from leaving the country. In other words that a document issued ostensibly for the

purpose of facilitating the citizen in his travels to "foreign parts" could, by allowing officials to exceed their legal rights, become a means for hindering the citizen's freedom of movement.

We need hardly say that we hold no brief for the passport even in its simplest form. It is a document only of value to the international police and Immigration authorities for the purpose of excluding entry to all kinds of "undesirables" such as political refugees, unemployed workers seeking jobs in other lands, and a few petty crooks and smugglers. But, as the recent Messina trial in Belgium revealed, the big-time crooks get around, passport or no passport! As for keeping out spies well, they must think us very stupid to believe that one, when one considers that German agents were being landed in this country during the war when there was no passport control at Dover since there was no cross-channel service functioning!!!—EDS.]

Joke of the Week

"The Church has no political aspirations. It only wishes, according to its traditional responsibilities, to safeguard the feelings of its flock."

Bishop Anthimos of Kitium, the Acting Ethnarch in the absence of Archbishop Makarios.

EQUALITY

"Children who attend these (public) schools develop . . . unmistakably, a separate class outlook and behaviour. The broad effect is to heighten social barriers, to stimulate class consciousness, and to foster social snobbery."

Whence comes that striking quotation?

From the official Socialist pamphlet, "Towards Equality."

How do the Socialist leaders follow their own precept?

Mr. Gaitskell's stepson went to Oundle (fees: £315 per annum).

Sir Frank Soskice, former Attorney-General, has a son at Winchester (£342 per annum).

Mr. Douglas Jay, former Financial Secretary, has sent both his sons to Winchester too.

And Sir Lynn Ungood-Thomas, former Solicitor-General, has two boys at Eton (£360 per annum).

Sunday Express.

The BMC Strike Continued from p. 1

in a position of strength and could have pushed forward to greater industrial democracy. But the union leaders held them back. Now the boom period is ending, and the workers are going to see the bankruptcy of trade unionism and unfortunately it is they who will have to pay for it. By leading a strike at this stage the TU leaders are seeking to justify their existence and trying to make their members believe that everything possible has been done to defend them against the wicked bosses.

Press Hypocrites

Another faction of professional confusionists is also playing its usual rôle. The Fleet Street Bureau of Advice for Working Chaps is now singing another tune. Whenever in the past unofficial strikers have ignored their leaders' pleas to return to work, Fleet Street has demanded that they obey their proper representatives. The flouting of authority was strongly denounced as *anarchy*.

Now, however, the story is different. Those workers who this week have flouted their leaders' authority are staunch, responsible, cool-headed and *right*. How hypocritical can you get?

False Issues

For anarchists, the issues for which this strike is being fought are false issues. The immediate issue is the unions' demand for either reinstatement or compensation for the 6,000 workers sacked in such high-handed manner by Sir Leonard Lord.

This demand, however, implies

acceptance of the rights of companies to own and control the means of production, acceptance of employment for wages as long as it is not too abusive, of the rights of a small minority to hold the lives and well-being of the majority in its hands.

It is this which anarchists challenge. The means of production and distribution should be controlled by the workers for the benefit of all. There should be no authority with the right to hire and fire, but as long as workers support the kind of unions they do they can expect nothing more than, at most, a change of authority—and most likely not even that.

If this strike does bring the BMC to its knees it will be through one factor only—the strength of organised labour. When the motor-car workers get support from workers in allied industries they can teach Sir Leonard a lesson. But more important is to learn the lesson themselves—that it is their work which makes the wheels go round and that in their work lies their strength.

If the workers win this strike it will not be because of the generalship of their union leaders—it will be in spite of the feebleness, unpreparedness and lack of foresight of their leaders. It will be precisely due to the power of direct action and nothing else.

If they would only use this power in a constructive and revolutionary way to come into control of industry themselves, redundancy would be a meaningless word and automation could bring in well-being and leisure for all.

Summer School

To be held at the Malatesta Club, London, August Bank Holiday week-end (August 4—6).

This year's theme:

IS HISTORY ON OUR SIDE?

PROGRAMME

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
- 3.00 Open-air meeting in Hyde Park
- 7.30 p.m. Lecture: JACK ROBINSON

Monday, August 6.

- 11.00 a.m. Lecture: PHILIP SANSON
- 1.30 p.m. Lunch

COSTS

LECTURES: Admission 1s. per lecture, four for 2s. 6d.

MEALS: Must be ordered in advance. 2s. 6d. per meal.

Refreshments available at club prices on Saturday and Sunday evenings.

ACCOMMODATION: Free, unless hotels have to be used. *Must be booked in advance.*

All enquiries to Joan Sculthorpe, c/o Freedom Press.

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 29—Donald Rooum on ANARCHISM IN THE ENGLISH PROVINCES

AUGUST 5—SUMMER SCHOOL (see above)

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 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