

THE B.M.C. STRIKE OFFICIAL UNION SELL-OUT

ONCE again an official union leadership has sold out its rank and file. Once again the courage and fighting spirit of workers prepared to strike for their rights has been insulted by the paltry agreements the union bosses have been prepared to make.

Discussing the strike led by the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions against the British Motor Corporation, we wrote on July 28th: "The poor response is in reality a vote of no confidence in the union leadership. And no wonder. Not only have they provided no inspiration in the past, but they have no policy for the present or the future."

It can now be seen how right we were. The strike against the BMC was mismanaged from the first and at no time were more than 50 per cent. of the Corporation's employees out on strike. The unions showed their weakness rather than their strength, and it was only by calling upon support from other industries that any inkling of the real power of organised labour was given.

The timing of the strike was ridiculous from the start. Saying that it was prepared for a long-drawn-out struggle, the union leadership started the strike a week before all the BMC factories closed down for a fort-

night's holiday! The leaders of the fifteen unions involved in this struggle must surely have known many months ago that redundancy was threatened in the car industry. They are always claiming to take the broad view of the problems facing their members—how is it that they know so little of what is going on in one of the country's most important industries that they were taken by surprise by Sir Leonard Lord? And if they were not taken by surprise—how could they so mis-time the action and misjudge the support they could expect from the men?

A Pitiful Settlement

The union leadership was clearly out of touch with the situation and with the rank-and-file. And when it came to a showdown also showed itself very much out of practise in the running of a strike. Which is not surprising, since there is thirty years of class collaboration between the last large-scale official union militancy and last month's effort.

And just as in 1926 the official leadership folded up in spite of the tremendous and growing support from a militant working class [most likely, *because of it!*] so in 1956 the leadership barely begins to tap

the resources upon which it could call in order to win a struggle, and at no time did the leaders match up to the militancy of those workers who did support the call to come out.

And now—after the determined picketing, the fights, the struggles with the police, the lying down in the road, the loss of wages and the bitterness to come—what have the unions settled for? They have agreed with BMC that all workers who are dismissed as redundant shall be compensated with *one week's pay (at time rates) if they have been with the firm for three years!*

If they have faithfully served the company for *ten years* or more continuous service, they will be compensated by *two weeks' pay* on being declared redundant!

In announcing this pitiful settlement, Mr. Jack Williams, chairman of the Central Disputes Committee in Birmingham said: "We are very pleased at the settlement. This struggle has been worthwhile for the whole of the engineering industry, because it has established a principle."

What principle? That after a man has given his sweat and skill to an

organisation for three years or more he can be brushed off with a week's wages? It is considered just that after a worker has dug in his roots in a place over ten years of his life, he can be slung out and told to be satisfied with two weeks' pay? What kind of principle is that?

BMC Can Avoid It

True, BMC have also agreed to 'full consultation' if men become redundant in future—but what does that mean? At the most it may mean that the management and the unions between them will decide *who* is to be sacked. The unions always ask for dismissals on the 'last in—first out' principle, and now BMC will have an interest in getting rid of workers before they have served three years—so they will now have common interest in sacking the short-time employees, so that in fact very little compensation need be paid by BMC from now on. They can always arrange their hiring and firing to avoid it.

This has already taken place in America, where in Detroit thousands of auto-workers were stood off last Spring in order for the companies to get round the Guaranteed Annual Wage agreement.

And in fact what has Mr. Williams and his colleagues done for the 6,000 sacked from BMC—which started the strike? By their agreement they actually gain one week's pay (at time rates, from £8 to £10!) for *one in three* of the sacked men! 4,000 of the 6,000 get *nothing!*

This then, is what has been cheered by the convenor of the Austin shop stewards, Mr. Dick Atheridge, as 'the best victory in fifty years in this area'. We can only ask Mr. Atheridge what all the other victories achieved if this is the best for 50 years?

This is what has been hailed by the *Daily Worker* as 'A partial victory'. How partial can you get? Far from making us adjust our

critical ideas on the trade unions, this attempt at industrial struggle has confirmed our views. The Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions boasts a membership of three million workers. What strength could be there to combat the capitalist system if they were enlightened and organised to do so!

But the trade unions of to-day are not opposed to capitalism and not opposed to the right of the boss to employ, exploit—to hire and fire. All they want is some say for themselves in the control of the labour force from above.

How different is the anarchist and the anarcho-syndicalist position. We want an end to the capitalist system, with its haves and have-nots, its division of society into those who own and control the means of life and those who only work for them. The factories, the mines, railways and mills, the land and all means of production and distribution should not be 'owned' by anybody. They should exist for the equal benefit of all and be run by workers' control on behalf of society as a whole.

When we have created an abundance of any one product, let its producers either enjoy the leisure they have earned or turn to other occupations of their choice—but freely, without insecurity, fear or economic coercion. What an insult it is to regard a man as 'redundant'!

BOYS IN BELGIAN PITS

THE Belgian pit disaster in which some 260 Belgian and Italian miners have perished is again a terrible reminder, especially for the middle-class grumblers who begrudge the miners their improved economic position, that there is still no security in coal-getting. It remains one of the most dangerous as well as unpleasant jobs in spite of improved safety measures and working conditions.

The Marcellene disaster has revealed among other things that the law still permits the employment of children underground; two 14-year-old boys are among the victims.

WHAT IS THE E.T.U. WAITING FOR?

IT was not so long ago that the mere mention of the Electrical Trades Union was enough to start exhibition and building contractors trembling in their shoes.

Now, however, militancy seems out of fashion. We don't remember much activity from the ETU in the BMC strike, for example, although the electricians are members of the Confederation of Shipbuilding & Engineering Unions. And our attention has been drawn to a struggle being carried on by some militant members of the ETU in defence of a union agreement which has been to date completely ignored by their leaders. And it's been going on now for six weeks.

The Edmundson Constructional Co. were operating a 5-day week at the Tattersall site, Knightsbridge, under an ETU-NFEA agreement. But on July 4th, without consulting the men or the union, the company arbitrarily demanded a 5½-day week—although the agreement specifies that such a change can be made only after mutual consent.

To electricians on the job, this action by Edmundson's seemed suspiciously like an attempt to discipline them for having previously made demands for better working conditions and for the employment of some of their unemployed brothers instead of working overtime (which the men had banned), so they refused to extend their week, sticking to the (agreed) 5-day, 44-hour week.

The firm's reply to this was to lock the men out. And they've been locked out ever since. Last week the 8 electricians involved were joined by 35 other workers on the site, who have struck in sympathy.

This is an official lock-out, but despite appeals to the ETU leadership to recognise the dispute and help the men with dispute pay, they have refused to step in. Why? Can it be the Stalinist (sorry—Khrushchev) leadership of the ETU is now more concerned with peaceful co-existence with the bosses than in defending their own members?

The men locked out believe in being militant all the time, but they are now hard up. All financial assistance should be sent to R. Peek, 33 Pastor Street, St. George's Road, London, S.E.11.

SUEZ

Eden's Internationalism

IT has been suggested in the chatty "London Correspondence" columns of the *Manchester Guardian* that the reason Sir Anthony Eden chose television and not a radio broadcast for speaking to the nation last week, was that past experience shows that he is less effective as a broadcaster. This, concludes the *M.G.* "perhaps goes to show how much of the Eden charm lies in what one sees". Certainly there was very little in what he said in his TV broadcast to commend his brain or his intellectual honesty. Indeed, judging by the reactions of the press and the general absence of criticism of his arguments, it is difficult to decide who was stupid, Sir Anthony or the public that lapped up his words, or both. There is hardly a statement in his speech which is factually correct and his method of reasoning was at times almost surrealistic. Examine, for instance, the following extract from his talk:

We have come to rely more and more upon oil for power. Our industry and our exports depend upon it. Here is something that affects every home in this land, and not in this land alone. Now you may ask: "Is there no alternative to the canal?" Yes, there is an alternative—the alternative route round the Cape—but this would add enormously to the distance of the voyage and to the cost of transport. Nor would the world shipping reserve be enough to maintain supplies at the level we need. That is why the canal was built 90 years ago.

Can anything be more fantastic than that last sentence "that is why the canal was built 90 years ago"? What connection is there between the building of the canal ninety years ago with Middle East oil which has assumed importance only in the past twenty years or so (quite apart from the fact that most governments were not interested, or even, as in the case of the British government of

the time, were opposed to the building of the canal!)

★

BUT we do not propose to analyse Sir Anthony's charm-talk, paragraph by paragraph. Events during the past ten days have quite effectively demolished it. But there is one argument which we think deserves some attention. We refer to the "internationalism" of Sir Anthony and the British government. His argument is that the Suez canal is "the main artery to and from the Commonwealth" and is used by many other countries besides, and that since most of the oil for Europe's industries passes through it, control of the canal was, for these countries, a matter of "life and death". Whilst it was true that it ran through Egypt "it is not vital to Egypt" as it is to many other countries. For these reasons the purpose of the London conference (which met last Thursday), was to ensure that the Canal will be run efficiently and

be kept open, as it has always been in the past, as a free and international waterway for the ships of all nations. It must be run in the interests not of one

Continued on p. 3

Now available
SELECTIONS FROM
"FREEDOM"
Vol. 5, 1955
THE IMMORAL
MORALISTS

253 pages 7s. 6d.* paper

*The paper edition is available to readers of FREEDOM ordering direct from F.P. for 5s. post free.

The cloth edition at 10s. 6d. will be available shortly.

Wisdom, Justice and Moderation

Said the witness: "I was sitting there on the ledge watching them. They laid their legs across two stones. Three men came down the line with hammers breaking their legs. They were using 20-lb. hammers. I could hear the bones crack. They'd holler some, and turn aside, but they didn't holler too loud. The guard, he was a pretty good piece off, and he couldn't hear them. They asked me to join them, but I said no."

Before a Georgia legislative investigating committee, a lanky, 46-year-old Negro, serving his third term for robbery, was describing a desperate interlude at Georgia's Rock Quarry Prison near Bulford last week. Some of his details invited dispute. But beyond dispute was the fact that inmates of Rock Quarry had sunk so low on the scale of human hope that they had ducked out of the searing sun into the shadow of a rock pile, had smashed each other's legs in a despairing gesture of mass protest.

SLASHED TENDONS. Rock Quarry, Georgia's "Little Alcatraz" for incorrigible convicts, is a new (1950), clean but forbidding building guarded by two turreted towers. To Rock Quarry go the unruly convicts from other state prisons for twelve-month terms on the rock pile, a nearby granite quarry. From 6 a.m. to 6 p.m. (with three hours out for lunch and rest), under the eyes of hard-eyed guards armed with Winchesters and heavy sticks, they smash granite and push wheel-barrows. The discipline is as rough as the work. Five years ago

31 convicts staged a protest against both by slashing their heel tendons with razor blades.

Last week's self-mutilators told the investigators that they had been driven to their madness by the brutality of prison bosses. Some told of being blackjacked, beaten with sticks, thrown into solitary confinement for trivial offences. Said one wheel-chair prisoner, his eyes blazing with hate: "The onliest thing we ask for is that the beatings and cussing stop."

MODERATE FINDINGS. Prison officials flatly denied any wilful mistreatment or brutality. Said huge, knife-scarred Deputy Warden Doyle Smith, object of many of the charges: "I've never whipped a prisoner, but you have to be boss." He was backed to the hilt by wispy, sick-looking Hubert Smith (no relation), chief warden at Rock Quarry since 1951. Declared the warden: "This leg-breaking was planned by these men to get public sympathy to bring pressure on the state to abolish this camp."

At week's end the legislative committee released its findings. It gave the prison a clean bill of health, restricted its criticism to the fact that the guards used profanity and "on occasions" slapped the prisoners. It asked that these practices stop. But for all the moderate words, Georgia (the state motto: Wisdom, Justice and Moderation) and the U.S. would search a long time before they found evidence to outweigh the act of 41 desperate men.

PEOPLE AND IDEAS

21 YEARS ON PENGUIN ISLAND

"The Printing-press may be strictly denominated a Multiplication Table as applicable to the mind of man. The art of Printing is a multiplication of mind, and since the art is discovered, the next important thing is to make it applicable to the means of acquirement possessed by the humblest individual among mankind or him whose means are most scanty."

—RICHARD CARLILE, 1822.

CAN it really be twenty-one years since the brothers John, Allen and Richard Lane, with their capital of £100 and their dingy headquarters in the crypt of Holy Trinity Church, Euston Road, hopefully touted the first ten titles of Penguin Books round the booksellers? In one sense it seems a long time for so fresh and lively an enterprise, but on the other hand they have become so much a part of the furniture of our lives that it is not easy to imagine ourselves without them. And if this seems an exaggeration think of the books you would not have read and the knowledge and ideas which would not have come your way, had it not been for their existence.

There was nothing adventurous about the first Penguin titles, they were all books which had sold well in cloth-bound editions and could be expected to go on selling in paper-backed reprints. The remarkable thing was that a certain standard of production and design was to be combined with a very low price—sixpence, which necessitated huge sales. After eighteen months, by which time a hundred Penguin books had been issued, their success led to the initiation in May, 1937, of the Pelican Books, a series of reprints of 'educational' works like Halevy's *History of the English People*, Fabre's *Social Life in the Insect World* and Julian Huxley's *Essays in Popular Science*. In the same year the firm began the Penguin Classics, a series of specially commissioned books on international affairs, many of which, in the years immediately before the war reached a very wide public.

The Pelicans gradually grew into a series in which new books as distinct from reprints became the rule rather than the exception, and within which entire sub-series are being built up: the

*THE PENGUIN STORY, 1935-1956, (Penguin Books, 1s. 0d.).

Pelican History of England, and of the World, the Pelican Philosophies and Psychologies, and the Guide to English Literature. In the booklet which Penguins have issued to celebrate their coming-of-age,* Sir W. E. Williams writes:

"When the first Pelicans were published the intention behind them was to provide the serious general reader with authoritative books on a wide range of intellectual interests. There was at that time no deliberate design of building up a library of modern knowledge at a moderate cost. Nevertheless, Pelicans have, in fact, become such a library; and one serving, moreover, not only the general reader of serious purpose, but also the great body of students pursuing courses in the Universities and institutions of higher education generally. . . Pelicans proved the basis of a vertebrate structure of creative publishing which was soon to include such other species as King Penguins, Puffins, Penguin Modern Painters, and, eventually, Penguin Classics, Penguin Scores, the Pelican History of Art, and many other series."

It is not often that books written for cheap paper-back series become standard works, and sometimes the best and even the only work on their subject. But this is what in some cases the publishers of Penguin and Pelican books have achieved. I can only speak of my own field in which I am sure that Nikolaus Pevsner's *Outline of European Architecture* shows more understanding and a broader appreciation than any comparable book, that J. M. Richards' *Introduction to Modern Architecture*, Lionel Brett's *Houses* (in the "Things We See" series), and Thomas Sharp's *Anatomy of the Village* are quite the best books for their purposes, (Mr. Sharp's book is alone in its field); and that Dr. Pevsner's series of architectural guides, *The Buildings of England*, of which eleven volumes have so far appeared and which I hope will grow to cover the whole country, is a unique attempt to apply the highest standards of critical evaluation to the whole of our built environment. Probably the same kind of thing is true in many of the innumerable subjects dealt with in the Penguin family.

Another successful Penguin enterprise has been the Penguin Classics, a collection of new translations, begun in 1946 in which the intention was to appeal to

"those many thousands of serious and adventurous readers whose knowledge of foreign languages is inadequate and who have found themselves frustrated in their explorations of foreign literature by the indifferent translations of scholars who lack an acceptable English style". This hope was vindicated, and of Dr. E. V. Rieu's translation of Homer's *Odyssey*, the first of this beautifully produced series (which now contains over sixty books), three-quarters of a million copies have now been produced.

The booklet on *The Penguin Story* contains some interesting information on the economic aspects of publishing on this scale. The firm is a private company with two shareholders, both working

directors, and has never paid a dividend. The net profit before taxation averages five per cent. of the turnover, all of which, after tax, is returned to the business. The average Penguin-to-day costs 2s. 6d. of which 10.63d. goes to the retailer and wholesaler, 2.25d. as the author's royalty, 3.75d. on paper, 7.25d. on printing and binding, 2.39d. on overheads, 2.56d. on publicity, 0.59d. on taxation and 0.58d. on profit. Since 1935 the firm has published 1,169 Penguins, 369 Pelicans, 165 Specials, and about 670 books in the various other series, apart from periodicals. Of these about a thousand are in print at the moment; 250 titles, new or reprints, are published each year; the stock at Harmondsworth is about 10 million books, which is also the annual sale, 5 million in Britain and 5 more abroad. Originally the majority of Penguin sales were of course the fiction reprints, "including mystery and detec-

tion, the bread-and-butter of all publishing", but now fiction accounts for less than half of the annual sales.

The most interesting of the problems arising from the phenomenal scale of the enterprise is that

"although there are more Penguin titles to pick from year by year, each title tends to sell fewer copies than when there were only 100 or 200 titles to pick from. The total sales of the full Penguin list keep increasing every year, but the sales of most individual volumes do not. So that instead of a first printing of, say, 60,000 copies, there has to be one of, say, 40,000 copies, a quantitative difference which sends up the cost of producing each copy, and therefore, its retail price."

THINKING about Penguin books suggests two questions to which no two Penguin readers would give the same answer. Which Penguins have given you greatest pleasure, and what books would you like to see Penguinised? Probably in answer to the first question most people would mention some of the first Penguins they read, before they began to take them for granted. I got great delight from the ten volumes of the pre-war Penguin Illustrated Classics which appeared when I was fourteen; especially Thoreau's *Walden* with Ethelbert White's wood-engravings, and Melville's *Typee*, with those of Robert Gibbings. I remember getting Kropotkin's *Mutual Aid* at Woolworth's in 1939 (gone are the days when Woolworth's sold Pelicans!). Incidentally the only other writing of Kropotkin's which has ever appeared in the series is his essay on "The Scientific Basis of Anarchy" which is included in the volume *Nineteenth-Century Opinion*. Two other Pelicans which I have continually re-read are G. D. H. Cole's *Persons and Periods* and Henry Nevinson's *Words and Deeds*. The Penguin fiction reprints which have meant most to me are Silone's *Fontamara*, Hasek's *Good Soldier Schweik* and Joyce Cary's *The Horse's Mouth*.

Continued on p. 3

valence in moral behaviour which has its relics in the taboos which persist even in our own 'enlightened' age.

If official historians have blanketed the evils of the period and magnified its meagre respectability into a false front of fine living, then it is to authors such as Mr. Pearl that we owe a glimpse of the gilded cesspools and swansdown seats of that elegant sewer—the Victorian age. J. GOUNDRY.

What was Victorianism?

THE GIRL WITH THE SWANSDOWN SEAT by Cyril Pearl. (Frederick Muller).

LET no prospective reader of this book assume that it is the autobiography of a freak with a certain anatomical peculiarity. But, let him be prepared to find that, after reading it, the word 'Victorian' has dropped out of his vocabulary because of its newly-emphasised ambiguity.

This little book, which in some respects may be qualified as a monograph of Nineteenth Century morals, debunks the widespread notion that the Victorian era was one of sobriety, piety and prudery. The reader who cherishes the notion that pornography in the Press is merely an ultra-modern vice will have to discard his illusions on reading some of the choice quotations presented from the most conservative and 'respectable' journals of the last century.

The accounts of high, middle and low grade prostitution with which the author enlightens us serve to explode the pseudo-truism that "the wages of sin are death"; it is clearly pointed out that death was more likely to result from an excess of virtue in the sweat-shops.

To those who have made no enquiry into the habits of the period, the revelation that nude bathing of both sexes in sight of one another was of common and universal occurrence (in England),

will come as a surprise. It is not without amusement that we observe how strenuous efforts to introduce bathing apparel were made by those who were impressed by the propriety of it, as witnessed by its use in *France*. Some of the strongest opponents of these clammy, clinging aids to chastity were to be found among the clergy!

We glimpse too the 'double-think' of authors—among them Dickens—who pandered, through the circulating libraries, to the taste in certain sections of the community for novels depicting characteristics of the period which were purely fictional. Established and successful prostitutes wrote long, carefully-composed justifications of their way of life, published without reticence in the best contemporary newspapers: but the whore of fiction, having suffered a thousand fates worse than death, died in misery and degradation.

The Victorian era, as we see it in this book, was in part characterised by a clumsy upsurge of Puritanism aiming at suppressing licentiousness, but succeeding merely in whittling away the freedom of the individual in word and act, by legislation and censorship, never originally meant to cripple art, but ultimately to be invoked to falsify and obstruct creative geniuses such as D. H. Lawrence.

The rampant licentiousness of the times ultimately begot a dowdy reformism and almost incomprehensible ambi-

THE WELFARE STATE AND I (2)

Humanitarianism—in Parenthesis

HERE I anticipate the objection that in considering the important generic factors determining the evolution of the Welfare State in Britain, I have made no mention of humanitarianism as a factor in human progress. I have not because I do not really think that society has become any more humanitarian. This point of view requires enlargement. I know that we no longer permit half-starved vagrant children to sleep in the streets of London in their hundreds every night; no more are little girls sold into forced prostitution by their mothers; no more do the sweated trades use up human life as an expendable commodity; no more does sickness mean hunger for the labourer's family. We are now sensitive as to what goes on under our own noses in a way which was not so a century, and less, ago. But the problem of humanitarianism is wider than that. Humanitarianism exists in every age, and human suffering is met with whatever form compassion takes according to what is possible and appropriate to the age.

The priest and Levite no longer leave the wounded man upon the road to Jericho; they telephone for an ambulance and he receives efficient medical attention without being beholden to any Samaritan. But the ambulance is one of a fleet which waits, not for the brutality of thieves to produce casualties, but for the well-ordered pleasures of the 20th century to strew the roads with wounded men as part of an expected pattern of behaviour. Humanitarianism to-day does not depend upon a reaction of compassion to the shock of suffering, it is part of calculation which depends upon the mechanism of compensation. It is therefore quite immune to the impact of great and tragic events. To-day humanitarianism takes bizarre forms. Lengthy dispute goes in in the *Manchester Guardian* about the export of horses for slaughter; I will not bore the reader with a dreary litany of the contemporary human events to which this might be compared.

One school of thought has it that the amount of humanitarian feeling does not effectively alter, from age to age; it merely changes in the form of its expression. Thus a future age may regard mid-20th century Britain as a peculiarly callous and brutal society and contrast it with, say, the comparative humanity of the 18th century. Less

overt physical cruelty is practised to-day—but are we not so much better endowed with riches and advanced techniques than in the 18th century?

The Causes of Welfare Legislation

1. The evolution of statistical research.

When there was no reliable knowledge about social conditions it was simply a matter of opinion as to what causes had produced what effects. If a factory-owner in the early 19th century maintained that working people lived on a good meat diet, lived in tolerably comfortable dwellings and might by thrift become their own masters, very few people could prove him to be an utter liar. Where facts are in dispute, men may hold most utterly different opinions about social policy. The old ideas that the poor were poor because they were lazy, that working men could save for their old age, that slums were caused by love of dirt, that unemployment was a stimulus to industry, that social provision for child-welfare would encourage parental indifference—all such ideas flourished in an absence of clearly established facts. The ignorance of the British ruling class about the conditions of the working class in the 19th century, was truly amazing. They did not like the Great Unwashed and they had very peculiar notions as to what was going on in the working class. Slowly, very slowly, the accumulating mass of statistical evidence about health, housing, conditions of employment, trade unionism and the practical effects of poverty began to be established beyond reasonable doubts. Vested interests could still maintain the exact contrary of the truth in the newspapers, in parliament and elsewhere (as they still do), but to an increasing degree they knew that they were lying, and an honest liar is more amenable to social innovation than an illusioned reactionary.

2. Industrial development.

The earliest phase of industrialisation demands large numbers of unskilled workers with the fewer brains the better, working long hours. This was Marx's "proletariat" and he mistakenly envisaged that increasing industrialism would produce an ever-greater division and simplification of labour. Actually in Marx's lifetime the contrary process was occurring. The growing complexity of industry demanded more highly skilled and educated workers; already in the latter part of the 19th century some concern was expressed that

Britain, who had such a start on her industrial rivals, was falling behind them in the manufacture of articles which required the most complex skills. The fact that so large a proportion of the working class was uneducated, ill-fed, ill-housed, diseased, and subjected to crude overwork, did not augur well for Britain's industrial future. Business men who had yelled at every penny spent on education, public health and other welfare measures, began to see that although 'sweating' might show short-term profits in some industries, a healthy and skilled working class might be a sound industrial investment.

The present writer, a member of the *lumpen-intelligentsia*, has had considerable sums invested in him by the State. The object of such munificence is not that he should be decked like the lilies of the field in return for a comparable practical effort, but that in the concept of contemporary chattel slavery he shall be an efficient chattel. The Devil is said to look after his own, and so in anarchist daemonology we may expect such kindly care from the source we choose to label as the Devil. What is under dispute is what degree of allegiance may be expected, nay compelled, from recipients of the infernal benevolence.

The mainstay of the early industrial system was the Poor Law, which aimed to segregate the non-productive unit away from the ordinary operations of the labour market, confining him to a workhouse where the conditions should be "less eligible" than that of the lowest class of independent labourer. In the later form of the industrial system this process simply did not work. The Poor Law ruined men physically and mentally, and brought up children unfitted to be anything but paupers. As capitalist economy was found to be cyclical, that is alternating between periods of boom and depression, it was necessary to keep alive and comparatively fit, those who had to be laid off work during depression in order that they could be effectively re-employed in the next period of trade revival. The 1905/9 Royal Commission on the Poor Law effectively spelt the doom of the old system—it required a mere 40 years for parliament to get round to implementing its main recommendations. The Welfare State is the answer. It is not the creation of Beveridge, but the result of a process which has been operative ever since the invention of precision engineering. G.

(To be continued)

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.

Reprints . . .

Knock on any Door
The Magicians Willard Motley 3/6
J. B. Priestley 5/-

Some Penguins

and Pelicans . . .
The Penguin Story 1/-
Ethics P. H. Nowell-Smith 3/6
A History of Modern China
K. S. Latourette 3/6
A Farewell to Arms
Ernest Hemingway 2/6
Erewhon Samuel Butler 2/6
Juan in America Eric Linklater 3/6
One's Company Peter Fleming 2/6
Dubliners James Joyce 2/6
Winesburg, Ohio
Sherwood Anderson 2/6

The Romantic Exiles

E. H. Carr 2/6

Second-Hand . . .

Sin and Sex Robert Briffault 6/-
Smoky Crusade R. M. Fox 4/-
Sailor on Horseback (Jack London)
Irving Stone 4/6
Mother Maxim Gorky 4/6
Modern Industrial Movements
Russell, Cole, etc. 5/-
The Strength of the Strong
Jack London 5/6
The Conflict Between Religion
& Science J. W. Draper 3/-
The Common People
G. D. H. Cole and
Raymond Postgate 7/6
Democracy and Industry
Constance Reaveley and
John Winnington 3/-
Archy and Mehitabel
Don Marquis 3/6
Prisoner of Grace Joyce Cary 3/-

Periodicals . . .

The Needle, No. 2, July 6d.

Postage free on all items

Obtainable from

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

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

Vol. 17, No. 33. August 18, 1956

Eden's Internationalism

Continued from p. 1

country but of them all. In our view, this can only be secured by an international body.

Now what Sir Anthony was saying is that something which is vital to a large number of countries should neither be privately owned nor nationalised, but *internationalised*. "The whole trend of the world to-day—he said—is against taking selfish action for purely national ends". (We confess we hadn't noticed this trend, and some might find it odd that the British government has come out in favour of international control of the Suez only now that British troops are no longer stationed in the canal zone) If the Suez canal is vital to the very existence of the industrial nations of Europe, how much more vital are the ships that use it! And how much more vital than the ships is the oil they transport! Clearly if, in Sir Anthony's words, "our machinery and much of our transport would grind to a halt" if the Suez were closed to the oil tankers from the Middle East, then it is not the Suez canal only that must be internationalised but the tankers and the Middle-East countries under which lie buried Europe's very life blood!

BUT man does not live by oil alone. The human machine without food would also "grind to a halt" but with this difference, compared with the oil-fed machine: that once it stops you can't start it up again. If therefore there is an argument for internationalising a waterway through which passes the oil which keeps the industries of Europe going, how much greater is the argument for internationalising food production and distribution. For here is something in which every one of the world's 2,600 million inhabitants is vitally interested, and the fact that nearly a half of that number are to-day virtually starving (according to official United Nations statistics) should surely convince Sir Anthony and his gallant band of internationalists that the Nasser's of this world are not only to be found lurking on the banks of the Suez Canal but threatening us on all sides!

THE government however, believes in free enterprise and a "property-owning democracy". Or should one now say *believed*, for one of the arguments used to justify relieving Egypt of the Suez canal is that: "True it runs through Egypt, but it is not vital to Egypt, as it is to many other countries in all parts of the world."

Equally the oil deposits of the world are more vital to the world as a whole than to the individual countries in which they are located; the under-developed and under-populated areas of Australia are vital to over-populated Japan, China and India but not vital to Australia; the uncultivated White Highlands of Kenya are vital to the land-starved Kikuyu but not vital to the white settlers; the millions of acres in the United States which are being put out of cultivation because of "over-production" are vital to the land-hungry (and hungry) peasants of Spain and Italy but not vital to America.

This is the logical development of the British government's arguments over the Suez "crisis", and if we believed them to be consistent in their arguments we would be prepared to suggest that Sir Anthony was the leader of a social revolution more far-reaching than any in recorded history. But just as he told us last week to "look at his [Nasser's] record" and decide whether we could trust him, so we say:

BULGARIAN NOTES Botyeff and Bakunin

FROM Paris there is issued by those Bulgarians who have escaped from the blessings of life in the now far-flung Soviet Empire a monthly called *Nash Pyt* or *Our Way*. Its July number is markedly anarchist in content. "From Berlin to Poznan" is the title of the leading article and is an anarchist interpretation of these two spontaneous revolts against the Bolshevik rulers. "Power and Freedom" is the second article; "Anti-militarism" a third. There is an historical article on "Bakunin and Botyeff". The Bulgarian Bolsheviks celebrated most solemnly the 80th anniversary of Christo Botyeff's death. They were careful, however (knowing their Moscow masters' pathological hatred of all anarchist thought), to hide the fact from the people that this outstanding Bulgarian was an anarchist, *bezvlastnik*, as we say in Bulgarian. Close friend of his teacher Bakunin, they died within a month of each other and are buried in Berne, their tombs not far apart.

Unemployment Under Socialism

"SOCIALISM" in Bulgaria has not prevented the emergence of unemployment, but no figures are to hand. For the past two years there has been no mention of the workless in the country's Party-controlled Press. It is a heresy and a deviation from Marxian orthodoxy to say that there can be unemployment under socialism. Soviet economics does not allow of any such thing. None the less, facts will, on occasion, stubbornly force themselves even on this most hide-bound of all political parties. And on the 22nd June last, the Party felt itself compelled to produce a statement on the matter. In it the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Bulgaria acknowledged that the CC had had to give consideration to the circumstances that in some towns a certain absence of work in industry had caused working hands to fall idle. Next day *Rabotnichesko Delo* explained soothingly that "an unnatural number of workers have been

look at the British government's record and not at Sir Anthony the TV star and decide whether their "internationalism" is simply imperialism in disguise.

It is, we think, significant that British policy has been, on the one hand nationalist and hostile to the Mollet plan (to create a European pool for such basic, such "vital", commodities as steel and coal), but internationalist in face of a militant and growing nationalism in the Middle-East, Africa and Asia.

IT is clear that British policy—and the policy of all governments for that matter (American "common sense" over the Suez crisis is just as suspect. Eisenhower at his recent press conference was all in favour of internationalising the canal which "by treaty was made an international waterway in 1888 and is exactly that". But . . . "It is completely unlike the Panama Canal, for example which was strictly a national undertaking carried out under bi-lateral treaty"), we were saying that British policy can only be shocking to those who believe that it is based on principles. Politics is as unscrupulous as it is opportunistic. And the United Nations is no more than a diplomatic Wall Street or Stock Exchange. Every nation is out to better itself at the expense of somebody or other; and when they vote, apparently against their interests, you can bet your bottom dollar that they have done so as part of a bargain to secure the necessary votes on another issue which matters much more to them. That's what they call diplomacy; outside diplomatic circles, as we have pointed out on other occasions, it's called a horse-deal. There will be a lot of that at the London conference over Suez. But don't let yourselves be bamboozled into believing that a life and death struggle is being waged on your behalf. The diplomatic boys are simply trying to justify their existence . . . at your expense. And so long as you go on paying them will go on talking and wrangling. After all a job's a job, isn't it, and who wants to lose a well-paid, cushy job (plus expenses tax-free), these days?

streaming into the towns from the countryside". And therein lies the true explanation. Forcible collectivization on the Soviet model has been driving the most energetic peasants and small-holders, those most capable of work, into the industrial centres in the search for jobs so that they may support somehow or other those of their families in the rural areas who have been roped in as members of the TKZS—"labour co-operative economic associations," which is the Bulgarian equivalent of the *kolkhoz*.

Lenin's description of the Tsarist Empire as a prison-house of nations fits the Soviet Empire even more aptly today than it did when he was an exile. In his time escape to the Americas was actually possible. To no corner of the American continent can these hapless unemployed of the Bulgarian People's Democracy flee in the quest for a tolerable existence. They are hemmed in literally by barbed wire frontiers. To cross these involves the risk of death.

Bulgarian Bureaucracy

BUREAUCRATIC interference in Dimitrovgrad is holding up housing plans. A hospital, big tenement blocks, and so on were begun some time ago but building operations have come to a stop. Some 60,000 *levas* were overspent on these projects. Bricks and brickwork proved faulty. One way or another the men on the sites were held back and lost a total of 2,420 working hours. Light machinery employed on the job stood idle 7,600 hours during a mere four months. Heavier machines and equipment have been used to a fractional 20 per cent. of capacity.

Squanderers of the wealth created by the people, the Party Press doles out the soothing syrup which its Communist editors in their contempt for the workers consider suitable: "Measures have been taken, but work has not yet been restarted . . ." What a shameful admission of their utter bankruptcy as self-styled administrators!

IVAN POPOVICH.

£100 DOWN!

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT!

WEEK 32

Deficit on Freedom	£640
Contributions received	£533
DEFICIT	£107

August 3 to August 9

Tiffin: W.R. 11/-; London: H.M.* 2/3; Sheffield: G.P.* 5/-; Oxford: Anon.* 5/-; Blackpool: R.B. £1; Paterson: D.V. 7/-; Edinburgh: V.V. £1.

Total	3 10 3
Previously acknowledged	529 16 1
1956 TOTAL TO DATE	£533 6 4

GIFT OF BOOKS: London: E.B.

*Indicates regular contributors.

21 Years on Penguin Island

Continued from p. 2

What books would we like to see added to the series? Well of course, I would like an intelligent, modern book on anarchism. (They have already dealt with every kind of political belief from conservatism to communism). I would like to see a Pelican on the Peckham Experiment and another on the idea of workers' control in industry. I would like a Penguin edition of Marie-Louise Berneri's *Journey through Utopia*, which is a subject they have not yet touched, and one of Orwell's *Homage to Catalonia*. In fiction, I would like to see Penguin reprints of the later novels of Silone, of those of Jean Giono and of those of Edward Hyams. I suppose the sensible thing to do is to write and tell them so.

FINALLY we are left wondering, after thanking Penguins for educating and entertaining us and for raising the general standard of typography, what is left for them to achieve in the future. In his justifiable trumpet-blowing for the firm, Sir William Williams writes: "The Penguin appeal is one of great magnitude already, and it will be still further enlarged. But Darkest Africa is a vast continent. Some notion of its extent may be realized from the fact that the many million Penguin Books sold every year amount to the annual purchase by every tenth person in this country of one solitary volume". He means of course the Darkest Africa of our own illiteracy, but there are real Dark Continents which are perhaps the new worlds which Pen-

U.S. Marine Court Martial

THE reasons why men like Staff Sergeant Mather C. McKeon of the United States Marines take up disciplinary jobs involving the sadistic treatment of men under their command, can best be explained by the psychiatrist, but the reasons why some sections of the army carry on the literal torture of men in training are much less complex and more deplorable in that these reasons display an institutionalised disregard for human life in the interests of abstractions like the nation or state.

McKeon was charged in the United States with drinking on duty, oppression of troops and culpable negligence in the death of six recruits drowned while on a night disciplinary march under his command. His defence rested on the plea that his only concern had been for his troops who, if they failed to learn the need for discipline, might be unable to stand up to the rigours of combat.

It is notable that although the Court Martial sentenced him to nine months hard labour and discharge from the service he was found guilty only on the charges of drinking in barracks and "simple" negligence in respect of the six deaths; he was cleared on the more serious charges of oppression and culpable negligence.

Two top men from the Marines testified on McKeon's behalf, and what they had to say leaves little doubt as to the function and fate of the soldier in war whether he likes it or not.

General Pate, commandant of the Marine Corps, said that the punishment for a man guilty of such offences should be to remove a stripe and have him

transferred for stupidity and lack of judgment! Lieut.-General Puller was much more blunt in his defence of McKeon's action. He maintained that the only mission of the Marine in action is "success in battle" and, if "we are to win the next war" the youth of America must get a lot more training of the kind carried out by Sergeant McKeon. Both regret that this Sergeant was ever ordered to trial.

Most of us have been made romantically aware of the exploits of the United States Marines through Hollywood and Errol Flynn; a powerful factor in recruiting young and impressionable men into the service. But it is foolish to discount the tragic loss of life which actually occurred in the swamps of Burma. For such purposes are American youth being recruited into the army, and this trial has highlighted two important factors.

Men must not be discouraged from joining up by lurid tales of discipline which may lead to extreme discomfort, and sometimes death, before the battlefield is ever reached, and this helps to explain the outcome of the trial, which appears to have surprised everyone, although the sentence is comparatively light in view of the circumstances. The other important point was made by the hero of the marines, Lieut.-General Puller, "five times winner of the Navy Cross and a living legend of the corps", and is generally likely to carry more weight in the minds of the public, since few people who have been bred on the Hollywood hero can resist the appeal of the "strong man", the emotional call to duty, and the necessity for battles in which to be successful.

Rotting Away

WITH the papers full of the Suez affair some of the more interesting news items are inevitably squeezed out—though it is doubtful whether some of them would ever see print anyway, Fleet Street being what it is.

One such item comes to me from Hampshire. At Lymington on August 8, the British Council for Aid to Refugees appealed against their rating assessment to the local valuation panel. The ground of the appeal was that the council was a charitable body, and they felt that they should have sympathetic treatment in respect of rates on their home for refugees, Barton House, Barton-on-Sea.

The manager of the home, Mr. W. D. C. Crawley explained that the refugees there were all over 60. All of them had been in camps for displaced persons, some of them for ten years or more, "rotting away". They had nothing left in life and were unable to support themselves. Other countries would not admit them.

Mr. Crawley explained that the home was supported entirely by voluntary subscriptions, and to make it function at

all it had to be run without any except administrative staff. "From these old people," he said, "we make a rota of an hour or so of work a day, and we somehow keep the thing functioning. I am allowed £3 10s. a week per head for each resident, and from that I pay 7s. pocket money and we feed them on the very cut-cost basis of 22s. a week. Out of the rest we have to pay every single thing."

As it happened, the council found that they had applied to the wrong department. It was explained to them that the Inland Revenue were not in a position to give them sympathetic treatment, though they might obtain this from the local rating officer.

Such cases as this are an ironic comment on our civilization. If it is a question of saving the rotting hulk of Nelson's battleship or the decaying fabric of some of the more decrepit places of Christian worship the public appeals are made and large sums of money subscribed. But when it comes to human beings left to rot away, often in solitude, then there is no publicity. A blanket of silence shuts off these unfortunates from their fellow men. When some archbishop appeals for money to save some gothic monstrosity his picture is in every newspaper, and his appeal receives the widest publicity. But how many people have heard an appeal from the British Council for Aid to Refugees and similar bodies? E.P.

Union Moneylenders

The Derbyshire branch of the National Union of Mineworkers has made a second loan of £30,000 to help local authorities with capital works schemes. The first £30,000 was lent to the Alfreton Urban Council; now a further £30,000 has been lent from the branch's reserve funds to the Chesterfield Rural Council. This will be used for housing schemes and other projects which might have been delayed by the credit "squeeze".

The money is being lent at 5½ per cent. interest. An official of the N.U.M. said yesterday: "It is normal practice for trade unions to invest their capital, and in this way we are supporting our home towns that need money."

Mr. H. O. Hawkins, clerk to the Chesterfield Rural Council, said: "The money will help us tremendously, and I am sure it will give satisfaction to people to invest money profitably in the amenities of their own town."

U.S. Flood Control Bill Vetoed

WASHINGTON, AUGUST 10. President Eisenhower to-day vetoed a bill to authorise the expenditure of \$1,600 millions in a programme of flood control and river and harbour development in almost every part of the United States.

Reuter.

C.W.

CONTROVERSY

Suez: No Smoke Without Fire?

ON reading the editorial front page leader in FREEDOM last week, *There's No Honour Among Thieves*, I was fascinated by the delightful analogy of the fire-engine in the slot-machine, which automatically went through all the motions of putting out a fire as soon as a penny was inserted. This was likened to the seemingly automatic actions (or more accurately, reactions), of Press and Government to the Suez Canal crisis.

There is of course no smoke without fire, and in the case of Suez we have been liberally supplied with both. Nasser has started the latest fire by proclaiming the nationalisation of the Canal, and since then voluminous quantities of varying kinds of smoke have been visible from almost every corner of the globe. The difficulty is to judge the degree of importance contained in the different parts of the smoke screen.

The FREEDOM editorial has judged the whole affair as "phony", and urged us all to lose no sleep in consequence. It has said that there is "... no intention that they (governments) should put out the fire". It added that the remark was perhaps in need of qualification, but *in fact* there was no qualification *as such*.

I cannot accept such a view on these points, and am unable to agree that the policy of the government has been "phony" and not intended to deter Nasser from his course.

It seems much more likely that the British government under the invariably irresolute leadership of Eden, misjudged the situation in the first instance and decided the time had come for "stern and resolute" action. There are many reasons why this could be the case: 1. the assumption (incorrectly) that world opinion would be on "our" side; 2. the fear (probably warranted) that if Nasser is allowed to "get away with it" then other Arab countries might follow his lead with their oil companies; 3. the need for the Eden government to appear strong and capable for a change; 4. the conviction that British troops and warships on the move would frighten Nasser; 5. the belief that one must argue from strength, and in the event of losing the Suez argument, force would have to be used as the only means left; 6. the non-realisation that if force were used it might in fact lead to more trouble than if it were not used; 7. the chance to strengthen (and justify) the Cyprus position; 8. the necessity to save face.

In the panic-stricken moment all these arguments must have had considerable weight for Eden, backed up as he was, by the French and supported by the whole of Parliament.

However, second thoughts and new advice from the United States eventually made their mark and Britain was forced to reconsider the position. This is not to say that the present American attitude of diplomatic exploration and negotiation has been the same throughout, for their views have also undergone a considerable change since the crisis origin-

ated. But certainly they have acted as a steadying influence from the start, and in this instance have discarded the Dulles policy of "going to the brink of war".

Of course the U.S. has good reasons for her policy too, and not unconnected with her own interests, but it may also be that she has seen more clearly the possible results of forceful action in the Middle East, if for no other reason than that the Suez Canal has not such vital, immediate interest for her, and under these circumstances it is more easy to reason objectively.

A correspondent in *The Observer* of August 12th, has perhaps put his finger on the hard facts, and I may be forgiven for quoting from his article at some length, since he has written very clearly that which I would not have expressed nearly so well:

"The ineffectiveness of military action in our present circumstances becomes apparent when one considers how it could be brought to an end. Clearly, it would be insufficient to confine military action to seizing the Canal Zone only: we know by experience that the Zone is not self-sufficient and that military occupation of it leaves us open to endless guerrilla action and sabotage. Therefore we should have to occupy all Egypt. But as the other Arab States are politically in sympathy with Egypt, not only would they certainly harbour an Egyptian Government-in-exile which would endlessly incite the Egyptians to resistance: there would also undoubtedly be outbreaks of violence in those Arab States possessing the oilfields. This could be militarily countered only by the occupation of virtually the whole Middle East.

"Apart from the probable ineffectiveness of such occupation in preventing industrial sabotage, the resulting invitation to Russia to provide at least indirect support, open or secret, to all the Arab States could not, and would not, be refused. The most likely final outcome would be an Arabia as united and Communist as China, if not World War III."

Finally I should like to say that I do not disagree with the general conclusions drawn by FREEDOM's editorial, in that there is *no honour among thieves*, and governments play the game which they think suits them best at the time, for reasons of power and economics.

But in my view it would be a mistake to underestimate the potential danger in the Middle East, the ever-present risk of politicians committing themselves irretrievably to policies which lead to catastrophe.

Where there are vast sources of economic wealth and differences of opinion as to how that wealth should be carved up, and in addition there are waves of nationalism and racialism in the same area, there is always the chance of serious trouble, intentional or otherwise, and trouble sometimes leads to war if necessary H.F.W.

Better Late than Never?

Alderman John Augustus Tulk, of Roxbury, near Chertsey, a former chairman of the Surrey County Council, who died in May, aged 73, and who left £104,252 (duty £24,603), left a quarter of the residue of his estate for the provision of a community centre at Chertsey, a quarter to buy playing-fields, a quarter to Sir William Perkins's Secondary School for Girls, Chertsey, to provide university scholarships, a tenth to the Malvernian Society, and a tenth to Keble College (Oxford) Endowment Fund.

Manchester Guardian

£100 DOWN

(See page 3)

VIEWPOINT

SCIENCE AND SOCIETY

WRITING on progress Bernard Shaw says 'The reasonable man adapts himself to the world. The unreasonable one persists in trying to adapt the world to himself. Therefore all progress depends on the unreasonable man.' There are several ways of looking at this proposition, it may be said that if society is unreasonable, the reasonable man has to do unreasonable things to live in it.

The proposition expressed by Alex Comfort in his contribution to the Summer School series 'Is History on Our Side?' is that authority relying on specialists in various fields may find that the conclusions of the work will condemn authority itself. This activity unfortunately only touches a small fringe of the experts engaged on scientific work. Even in these fields of sociology and psychology there are two modes of approach, that of the mental surgeon, and that of the analyst, the analyst having the disadvantage that his methods take time and time is money.

If the scientist starts working from a one-sided point of view and the wrong terms, or limited terms of reference, the tendency is likely to continue, particularly if the results of not taking all factors into consideration take time in having an effect. It must be remembered that research to-day starts from the economic standpoint of capitalist economy. Cost of production is the primary consideration. The long term view is often ignored, those that sound the warning are often laymen who outside the laboratory are able to take a wider view. The general attitude of the expert to the layman who dares to question his authority is not one that augers well for the libertarian basis of a future society in which scientists are to take increasing control.

Although man seems to be on the brink of unlimited power, this power carries with it dangerous potentialities which no other source of power does. Our present sources of power have not been sensibly used and it is questionable whether there is an abundance of food in spite of local surpluses. The area of cultivable land is decreasing and supplies of important raw materials are limited. The colossal rate of wastage under capitalism contributes largely to these dangers and the introduction of increased

power will accelerate these destructive processes.

Apart from these dangers do we really want a society in which all physical effort is unnecessary? The curse of society has been unremitting toil for the many and idleness for the few. It may be that a fully automated production will coincide with the free society, but personally I doubt it, this does not mean that we can or want to turn back the clock, but that a free society must be a more personal one rather than one based on massive productive organisations. As far as can be seen mass production has resulted, at least under capitalism in a decline in quality in industrial and particularly in agricultural production.

The line of thought initiated by Kropotkin in *Mutual Aid* has never really displaced 'the struggle for existence' sort of attitude in which crops are rescued from predators and animals from the attacks of predatory bacteria. It is reasonable to assume that the natural world in which we live has some sort of balance and any great divergence will result in disease of one sort or the other. It is the anarchist contention that an authoritative society is contrary to the nature of man and that the difficulties and anti-social tendencies are a direct result of this conflict.

In short, a large body of scientific work has been built up on insufficient data and from false premises, particularly in the fields of agriculture and medicine which are now bound to large and formidable vested interests. This needs to be replaced by a body of knowledge which is now in its infancy, but is wider in conception, a study of ecology and the interaction of man and his natural environment. Often what has been observed and discovered by centuries of practice and experience is more sound than conclusions come to in the limited confines of a laboratory. Indeed the apparatus of smell, touch, taste, and sight can often inform us where the apparatus of analysis cannot distinguish. Let us use them both with judgment.

Indeed a great experiment carried out in the context of social environment, the Peckham Experiment has done something to prove the validity of the Anarchist case and carries on the tradition and line of thought of Kropotkin in *Mutual Aid*.

ALAN ALBON.

Criticism

Anarchism a Dead End?

DEAR SIR,

It is with regret that, after over nine years as a reader of FREEDOM, I must inform you that I do not wish to renew by subscription.

The inescapable fact is that anarchism is at a dead end. For almost half a century there have been no developments in anarchist theory, while the anarchist "movement", consisting of mutually hostile splinter groups, perform no function other than repeating 19th century clichés *ad nauseam*.

Anarchists have always been noted for their naiveté and vagueness, their unwillingness to tackle such basic problems as the political structure of a post-revolutionary society and the nature of the transition to it.

It is significant that of the most important libertarian writers of recent times, Randolph Bourne, Bertrand Russell, G. D. H. Cole, George Orwell, Martin Buber, Dwight McDonald, none are or were anarchists. This shows that anarchism is now totally isolated from the main stream of libertarian socialist thought, and I feel that this situation can lead only to the extinction of anarchism.

The pitiful position of contemporary anarchism is certainly not the responsibility of men like Makhno or Durruti, who exercised considerable power with integrity. If any anarchists are to be blamed, it is those, and unfortunately the Freedom Press Group must be included among them, who are not libertarian socialists, but ultra-utopians. I refer to those who envisage, as a practical proposition, the abolition of money and the application of the "to each according to his needs" principle, and the abolition of the legal code. Such advances as these will require several centuries of continuous effort, and to regard them as being in anything but the remote future is as ludicrous as the Marxist theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat giving rise to the withering away of the State.

In spite of these criticisms, I respect the motives of most of those who are associated with anarchism, and only regret that their altruistic impulses do not find a more constructive and coherent expression.

Yours sincerely,
Horley, Aug. 3. BERNARD GELSTEIN.

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.
Lectures Suspended During August
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 Payne, and addressed to the publishers
FREEDOM PRESS
27 Red Lion Street
London, W.C.1. England
Tel.: Chancery 8364

FREEDOM PRESS

VOLINE :

Nineteen-Seventeen (The Russian Revolution Betrayed) cloth 12s. 6d.
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.

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

ALEX COMFORT :
Delinquency 6d.
Barbarism & Sexual Freedom boards 3s. 6d.

HERBERT READ :
Art and the Evolution of Man 4s.
Existentialism, Marxism and Anarchism 3s. 6d.
Poetry and Anarchism cloth 5s., paper 2s. 6d.
The Philosophy of Anarchism boards 2s. 6d., paper 1s.
The Education of Free Men 1s.

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

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

ERRICO MALATESTA :
Anarchy 6d.
Vote—What For? 1d.

GEORGE WOODCOCK :
Anarchy or Chaos 2s. 6d.
New Life to the Land 6d.
Homes or Hovels? 6d.
Railways and Society 3d.
What is Anarchism? 1d.
The Basis of Communal Living 1s.

PETER KROPOTKIN :
The State: Its Historic Role 1s.
The Wage System 3d.
Revolutionary Government 3d.
Organised Vengeance Called Justice 2d.

F. A. RIDLEY :
The Roman Catholic Church and the Modern Age 2d.

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

★
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)

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

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

23 Lives for 5 Policemen

DURBAN, AUGUST 9.

Twenty-three African tribesmen were sentenced to death in Durban to-day for murdering five policemen who took part in a raid in the Drakensberg mountains in Natal. Three other Africans were found not guilty.

In a three-hour address, the Judge described how the police stumbled on huge valleys filled with cultivated dagga (marijuana), a drug, and how, to try to prevent the discovery, Zulus charged the small police band with spears. Evidence given alleged that the tribesmen were summoned to a hilltop by a bugle call and were encouraged to attack by wildly dancing women. Two police officers and three African constables were battered to death.

The Judge told the condemned men: "We do not accept your version that the police opened fire before they attacked. The police had left their sten guns at home." One of the police officers, Sergeant de Lange, tried to reason with the Zulus rather than use force the Judge said. It was not until an African constable was felled by the natives that the policemen opened fire.

The 23 tribesmen, aged from 20 to 60, heard the death sentence passed without a murmur or change of expression. The Judge could find no extenuating circumstances, and declared that the spear charge was a planned attack carried to its conclusion. The Court was told that the tribe had been living in the Drakensbergs since the defeat of its supreme chief 120 years ago, and had never given any trouble.

Application for leave to appeal will be considered later this month.

British United Press.