

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

Vol. 17, No. 38

September 22nd, 1956

Threepence

Man has no right to kill his brother. It is no excuse that he does so in uniform; he only adds the infamy of servitude to the crime of murder

P. B. SHELLEY
Declaration of Rights

Cyprus: On to the Bitter End

THE Cypriots have little to thank Gamal Nasser for. Although the Egyptian dictator is hailed in many quarters of the world as a leader of the anti-imperialist struggle, his action in siezing the Suez Canal has provided the British Government with exactly the justification they wanted for their Cyprus policy.

It is of course no justification at all in any principled sense; there is no excuse for the British policy in Cyprus. But in the world of power politics, in which we are ruled always by 'realists' who face facts and look at things as they are—in this world human freedom means nothing beside the interests of States.

Over the many months of this present Cypriot crisis, the British Government found itself isolated. With the exception of Turkey, because of its anti-Greek interests in Cyprus, and France, because of its comparable behaviour in Algeria, there were no powers—not even America—who looked with approval upon the British handling of the situation.

Naked Force

British policy in Cyprus is so obviously based upon naked force that it embarrassed Britain's friends—until Nasser provided Sir Anthony Eden and his Colonial Secretary Mr. Lennox-Boyd with the golden opportunity to say 'I told you so'. They now have a concrete example of how Britain's Middle East oil can be threatened and of how important a base like Cyprus is. In the kind of argument that States understand, the imperialist attitude to Cyprus has been justified.

And it is because of this that Lennox-Boyd's policy has in fact stiffened. In the debate in the House of Commons last Friday, the Colonial Secretary revealed that the new terms of reference now being used by Lord Radcliffe in his

attempt to work out a constitution which might bring self-government (but not self-determination!) to the Cypriots, were in fact *harsher* than those offered in the negotiations with Archbishop Makarios last February.

In fact the Government has now made it quite clear that it is going to rely on superior force to beat the Cypriots into submission and then to impose upon them what policy it thinks fit, finding what stooges it can among the population to collaborate with.

Unacceptable Terms

And it does not count the cost of its policy in human life and misery. Last month the leader of EOKA announced the suspension of their terrorist activities in order to provide a reasonable background to discussions. The British answer was to offer them terms of surrender which were quite obviously unacceptable (see FREEDOM 1/9/56), meaning, as they did, either exile or trial.

It is impossible to believe that either Lennox-Boyd or Anthony Eden really thought that men of the temper of the Cypriot terrorists would accept those terms. The British clearly do not want an end to the struggle except one in which they are left as undisputed masters of the island.

So the bloodshed continues. More foolish youngsters in khaki are dying to serve the stubborn pride of Lennox-Boyd and Anthony Eden, and the economic interests they represent.

Held Without Trial

And what else was the publication of the Dighenis diaries but another try at justifying the unjustifiable? There diaries created a stir because they are alleged to prove conclusively the connection which exiled Archbishop Makarios had with EOKA.

But the British Government is not

bringing Makarios to trial on this evidence. He is being held in exile in the Seychelles without trial although Lennox-Boyd is convinced of the genuineness of the discovered diaries. And neither will they consult with him any more. They will neither discuss with him, nor prove in open court the reason *why* they won't discuss with him.

We do not have to agree with either the aims, or the methods of EOKA, any more than we have to like Nasser, to be revolted by the antics of the British Government. And since its disgusting behaviour is perpetrated in our name we have a special reason for openly dissociating ourselves from it.

Other Ways to Maintain Our Standards

Whatever may be the effects in terms of economics, of standards of living, in this country, of the eventual downfall of the British Empire, anarchists will not lift a finger to save it. For empire inevitably means slavery and bloodshed, and in point of fact the end of the British Empire would lift a burden from the backs of the British people, for its cost—to us—far outweighs the advantages we get from exporting our fiercest exploitation to other lands.

The worker of Britain has achieved a relatively high standard of living—by driving down the workers of colonial countries. Now that they are refusing to remain in subjection under us (though they may tolerate it under new masters), we must look for other ways of maintaining and improving our standards of living.

Like coming into control of the means of production ourselves, for example.

ONLY A RUMOUR

HAVE you noticed how quiet the Commies are nowadays? No agitation in industry, no petitions on at the moment... it really looks as if "peaceful co-existence" is another way of spelling 'class collaboration'.

Such tranquillity is understandable when one remembers that, following that disastrous dinner party with the Labour leaders, Bulganin and Khrushchev made no bones about their preference for the Tories. It is now rumoured that, since 'Popular Front' is now the Party Line, but alliance with the Labour Party has been somewhat stymied, the Communists are actually preparing for a Popular Front with the Conservatives.

Since it doesn't really matter what they get up to in this country, for nobody takes them seriously any more, perhaps we need not waste space discussing the antics of the would-be commissars of King Street. Elsewhere, however, their power demands attention, and other rumours are rife.

One such rumour would appear to be substantial, inasmuch as it was announced over Moscow Radio. It is to the effect that the Soviet Union has established official relations with the Vatican.

The need to announce this is obvious. The East European satellites of the Soviet Union have strongly Catholic populations and it will help to prevent more outbreaks like that at Poznan if there can be friendlier relations between the old religion and the new. It will also help the Popular Front line in countries like France and Italy.

But it seems that Moscow Radio, in its eagerness to break the good news, was premature. All that in fact has happened is that the Russian chargé d'affaires in Rome, Dimitry Pogidaev, had been allowed to pay a 15-minute courtesy call on the papal nuncio to Italy, Monsignor Giuseppe Fietta.

As far as one can gather all that happened was that the two gents bombarded each other with their own propaganda. But then afterwards the Pope himself scotched the reconciliation rumours, saying that before any agreement could be considered the church in Communist countries must have full freedom 'to care for her faithful and freely to preach the message of Jesus Christ.'

Which presumably means that the Pope would demand the right to open Catholic hospitals and schools—a bitter pill for B. & K. to have to swallow. Still, if it suits them, they'll swallow it. And if it suits the interests of Mother Church, the Pope will play ball.

It is said that in the coffers of the Vatican there are some beautiful silver spoons. They have particularly long handles. They were specially made for supping with the Devil.

NOT ANARCHISTS—JUST HOUSEBREAKERS!

A stick of gelignite and three fuse detonators dropped to the floor when a young man was told to take his hat off in Edinburgh Central Police Office, said Mr. T. J. Cochrane, prosecuting, at Edinburgh Sheriff Court yesterday John Hay Campbell Barbour (29) pleaded guilty to being in possession of the gelignite and the detonators for an unlawful purpose.

Mr. Cochrane said that detectives had noted that Barbour, after being taken into custody, made no move to take off his hat in the police station. It was lucky that the gelignite dropped without any repercussions. Both men were caught on the roof of a building surrounded by police.

NEHRU & FREEDOM OF ASSEMBLY

CALCUTTA, SEPTEMBER 5.

The assembly of five or more people has been forbidden in the whole of the Naga hills district. The order also bans the carrying of unauthorised arms, the spreading of rumours leading to panic, and sheltering suspected members of armed gangs.

(British United Press)

HISTORY REPEATS ITSELF

From Abadan to Suez

THE two-day debate on the Government's policy on Suez was conducted in the only too-familiar manner of all parliamentary wangles. Both government and opposition benches were at pains to impress (who, incidentally, in view of the fact that all the patriotic preambles are not reported by the "popular" press? The record? Posterity?) that what they had to say was not motivated by party politics but in the national interest. Yet in spite of this concern, all the members who spoke in the Commons debate, with the exception of one conservative and one labour who took a position which was not quite the "party line", supported or attacked the Government's recent and future-policy over the Suez crisis.

It is said that all that one learns from history is that Man learns nothing from history. So far as the general public is concerned we suggest that it would be more accurate to say that he learns nothing from history because either he has never studied it (for most of us history taught at school seemed to come to an end with Queen Victoria), or that by the time he could put to use his knowledge of the past (and in politics to-day we refer even to the very recent past) in situations of the present he has forgotten the facts, the sordid twists and turns and the base hypocrisy of the leading actors.

In our assessment of the Suez "crisis" we must confess that we have been guided less by the 1888 convention or the ghost of Hitler

than by much more recent history, by one of the infinite number of "crises" that have been "threatening" our peace and prosperity during the past ten years: we refer to the nationalisation of Persia's oil industry by the "crazy" Dr. Moussadiq in 1951. At the time, the former Mr. Attlee's Labour government was in power and we note that Labour's reply to this threat to our vital interests was almost identical with that of the present government over the Canal. If we are to learn anything from "history" it will not be out of place to remind ourselves of some of the highlights of the Abadan crisis!

★

IN the Persian oil dispute there could be no doubt about the legal position. The sixty year agreement, from 1933 stated categorically that the position of the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company "shall never be altered by action of the Iranian government or even by Iranian legislation except as the result of an agreement between the company and the Iranian government". Legally speaking, therefore, Moussadiq hadn't a leg to stand on. The British government's Note to Persia naturally enough stressed the legal rights of the Company, pointing out that if the Persian government refused to go to arbitration or to negotiate they would have recourse to the International Court of Justice at the Hague. That was in May, 1951. By July of the same year the International Court had

given its ruling in favour of the Company and was acclaimed by the British Press and, for the same reasons, the Persian Press and government denounced it and repudiated the competence of the Court to give a ruling! With the experience of an earlier ruling by the International Court still fresh in their minds (Albania was ordered to pay reparations for British lives lost through the mining of the Corfu channel but did not pay a penny piece!) the Labour government realised that in spite of the body of International Law being on their side (*literally*, since the British government owned half the shares of Anglo-Iranian just as it owns nearly half the shares in the Suez Maritime Company!) it wouldn't cut much ice with Moussadiq since he refused to recognise the "competence" of the Court and therefore, for him, its ruling was neither binding nor carried any kind of "moral force" to which he was prepared to submit. The Labour government's next step was to dispatch gun-boats according to time-honoured imperial tradition. It's a kind of conditioned reflex for British governments, which persists in spite of the fact that all the evidence now goes to show that far from shelling the upstarts into submission these shows of armed force simply unite (if only temporarily) the resistance and impress nobody.

★
Politicians in opposition are generally the advocates of the truth not because they believe in it but because they believe in it but be-

Continued on p. 3

Russia's Teddy Boys

DUPES of the C.P.G.B. who read the novels (so-called) of Ehrenburg and the other hacks believe the legend that there is a new type of man in Soviet Russia, a newer puritan loyal to the Party and the all-powerful State it is building up. In fact, the new literature speaks constantly of "the new Soviet man," as if he already existed—a starry-eyed idealist concerned only for the Strengthening of the State and the Party, even if he be not a member of the Party.

This is so far from the truth, however, that from time to time the facts of prevalent hooliganism and all-too-ready violence have to be released to the Press. Pravda 239/13902 allots twenty inches of space to the true position in White Russia. To combat the terrorism of the streets, what are called brigades (in reality, small groups) have been formed to co-operate with the civil police. Men in industry, clerks, older students and others have taken on these police duties in addition to their daily work and studies. In Minsk (capital of White Russia) HQ's have been set up in all wards of the city by trusted members of the Young Communist League for the sole purpose of fighting hooliganism. Chief of the Minsk police force is Commissar of Militia A. Sergeyev, Chief Constable, in fact.

Speaking proudly of his new auxiliary force, active and unpaid, he says: "Day by day one may observe how our brigadmits people maintain public order on an active scale in the parks, public gardens, clubs, cinemas, tenement houses, and on the new housing estates belonging to the bigger factories.

"Only a year ago, for instance, the pleasure garden attached to the tractor-building plant enjoyed anything but a

savoury reputation. Fights used to take place there; there were drunken orgies in the open; cases occurred of tactless approaches towards women. However, workers in the plant came to the active assistance of my police. Daily patrols were established to see to things. Today, the same place is regarded as one of the safest in the town. Hooliganism there has gone, thanks to the aid of the auxiliary group led by lathe turner D. Krivososov."

High praise is given by the people of Minsk to the work of civil engineer N. Ruzinov who leads a group of 45 auxiliaries. Their daily rota maintains watch over one of the busiest parts of the city, the Yakub Kolas Square adjacent to the Komarovsky Market. Bus stops are carefully watched for the protection of passengers until late at night.

Pickpockets have also to be watched for, more especially on public transport.

Comrade Migura is traffic control policeman near the motor-cycle works and to help him in his work he has always one of a group of eight men on call.

In spite of all this vigilance it is admitted that cases still occur of wild rowdiness and law-breaking. Some of the townfolk do not show as much interest as they ought to in this scheme for a cheap police force. They are asked to come forward and do their bit to crush out hooliganism altogether, since there is still a great deal to do to clean up the city. No attempt, of course, is made to get at the underlying and true causes of this social sore. Brute force alone is to be used: the Soviet system with its deification of Statism is to remain. I.P.

A Writer and his Sources

"Clear writers, like fountains, do not seem so deep as they are."

—LANDOR.

ONE of Mr. Christopher Hollis's remarks, in his book about Orwell, which stuck in my gullet was his declaration that "An old Etonian is far more likely to 'dare to be a Daniel' than is a Non-conformist". English history belies the truth of this of course, but why, I wondered, had Mr. Hollis chosen that line from a salvationist hymn as a metaphor? Then I remembered that Orwell in a well-known essay had written:

"In the past, at any rate throughout the Protestant centuries, the idea of rebellion and the idea of intellectual integrity were mixed up. A heretic—political, moral, religious, or aesthetic—was one who refused to outrage his own conscience. His outlook was summed up in the words of the Revivalist hymn:

*Dare to be a Daniel,
Dare to stand alone;
Dare to have a purpose firm,
Dare to make it known.*

To bring this hymn up to date one would have to add a "Don't" at the beginning of each line."

These four lines were bound to be attractive to a character like Orwell who certainly dared to stand alone and to make known his "purpose firm", but where had he, with his conventional Church of England upbringing, picked them up? His essay *The Prevention of Literature* was written at the end of 1945. In September that year he had reviewed in *FREEDOM* the *French Cooks' Syndicate* by W. McCartney. It is a very good little pamphlet, vividly written by an old man who took part in the events he describes, about militant syndicalism in the union of cooks, kitchen workers and waiters in smart restaurants and big hotels in London in the years before the first world war. No wonder Orwell, who had written many years before that "Books... which come from genuine workers and present a genuine working-class outlook, are exceedingly rare and correspondingly important", was fascinated by Mr. McCartney's pamphlet, of which he wrote "his account of life below stairs, with its heat, dirt, quarrelling and turmoil, exactly agrees with my own experiences as a kitchen porter in Paris in 1929". But why I mention all this is because on the first page of his pamphlet Mr. McCartney quotes the four lines of 'Dare to be a Daniel', which his father had taught him as a philosophy of life.

★

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

OPEN DAILY

New Books . . .

- | | | |
|---|---------------------------|------|
| That Devil Wilkes | R. Postgate | 25/- |
| The Beast in Man | Emile Zola | 18/- |
| The Cotton Pickers | B. Treven | 10/6 |
| Fama Gordeyev | Maxim Gorki | 12/6 |
| Utopia and Experiment | H. F. Infield | 21/- |
| People in Eijos | H. F. Infield & K. Freier | 15/- |
| The Guillotine at Work | G. P. Maximoff | 17/6 |
| Second-Hand . . . | | |
| Lamuel | Stendhal | 4/- |
| The Illiteracy of the Literate | H. R. Huse | 6/- |
| The Sexual Life of Man and Woman | Geo. Ryley Scott | 10/- |
| The Triple Challenge | Francis Williams | 3/6 |
| Russia In Flux | John Maynard | 3/6 |
| Sexual Ethics | Robert Michels | 5/- |
| The War in South Africa | J. A. Hobson | 3/6 |
| Human Folly: Disarm or Perish | Jules Moch | 4/- |
| The Passion of Sacco and Vanzetti | Howard Fast | 4/- |
| Commercialised Prostitution in New York City (1913) | George J. Kneeland | 5/- |
| Housing and the State 1919-44 | Marion Bowley | 3/6 |
| Franco's Rule | Max Nordau | 5/6 |
| Degeneration in Soviet Russia | J. G. Crowther | 2/6 |
| The End of Economic Man | Peter Drucker | 3/6 |
| Memoirs of a Bolshevik | O. Piatnitsky | 3/6 |
| Men, Medicine and Myself | S. Vera Pearson | 3/- |
| My Adventures as a Labour Leader | Frank Hodges | 3/- |
| The Autobiography of a Working Man | Alexander Somerville | 6/- |
| Periodicals . . . | | |
| Man, Vol. 1, No. 5 | | 4d. |

Postage free on all items

Obtainable from

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

IF you want to see the way a writer's mind works there is nothing more illuminating than tracing the multitudinous sources with which he works. It is not a question of plagiarism of course, we all live on what we borrow from others, from the past, from the enormous accumulation of printed words which comes our way in a lifetime. There is a continuous process of selection, rejection and assimilation. What is interesting, what is really us, so to speak, is what we assimilate. The Peckham biologists tell us that even the unborn child in the womb selects and rejects from the nutriment offered it, assimilating that which is required for its own particular development. The modern author whose literary nutriment has been most exhaustively studied is I suppose James Joyce, yet after acres had been written about his strange book *Finnegan's Wake*, somebody noticed for the first time a few years ago its intimate connection in phrases and direct quotations with Seeborn Rowntree's *Poverty*, the social survey of the city of York. Orwell is as plain and direct a writer as Joyce was obscure, but he was also one of those authors whose experiences, conversations and reading were continually drawn upon in their work. George Woodcock once wrote of him, "the connection between Orwell's work and even the minor events of his life is so close that, for those who are friendly with him, it is an interesting pastime to trace recent conversations reproduced with considerable faithfulness in his articles in periodicals."

When Mr. Muggeridge writes his biography of Orwell it is very much to be hoped that he will note the very interesting relationship between Orwell's reading and his writing. At least it will save him from the absurdities of Mr. Wyndham Lewis who in his essay on Orwell, having brusquely jeered at "people who spend their lives poking about in other

people's waste paper baskets", goes on to say that "Had Orwell been of German nationality who can doubt that he would have been an S.S. man." If Lewis had taken the slightest trouble to understand the man he was writing about, instead of simply using him as a peg on which to hang his own point of view, he could not have written such an absurdity.

★

THE best-known of Orwell's debts to other writers is the connection between *Nineteen-Eighty-four* and Zamyatin's *We*. Indeed, when the *News Chronicle* published an abridgment of Isaac Deutscher's essay on Orwell's book, it did so under the title *How Much of 1984 Was Borrowed?*, and condensed it in such a way as to suggest that Mr. Deutscher was uncovering a piece of literary plagiarism, which was far from his intention. Orwell greatly admired Zamyatin's book which he had read in French and tried without success both before and after the writing of "1984" to get it published in England. Gleb Struve writes that "Until his death, Orwell continued to show an unflagging interest in the book, corresponding with various publishers and with me from his sickbed. It is to be hoped that some enterprising British or American publisher will carry out Orwell's wish and re-issue Zamyatin's prophecy."

Orwell's borrowings from Zamyatin, like those of Huxley in *Brave New World* relate to the 'science-fiction' form of the book, rather than its central ideas, but these too can be traced though his journalism to their sources, while the furniture of the story is Orwell's sardonic picture of London at the end of the last war. Winston Smith moves through a London identical with Islington, where Orwell lived:

"... vistas of rotting nineteenth-century houses, their sides shored up with

WHY NOT GIVE IT UP, HERBERT?

ANARCHISTS are apt to remember Herbert Morrison as the man who was a conscientious objector in the first world war, but who in the second in his function as Home Secretary, jailed young men for being conscientious objectors. In political life he is a mediocrity unable to conceal the self-interest behind his words and actions. Lacking in the skill and rhetoric like Bevan and without even the bullying technique of the late Ernest Bevin he yaps his way through political life like a terrier in a kennel full of dogs.

His latest yap (suitably expressed in the *Daily Telegraph* 10/9/56) is at the heels of Colonel Nasser, whose thoughtless action over the Suez Canal necessitated the recall of Parliament, thus forcing some M.P.'s to cancel their holidays. The last occasion when trouble broke out were at "similarly inconvenient times"; two world wars, expediting actions by Hitler and Mussolini, the economic and financial crisis of 1931 and the balance of payments crises since.

These widely spaced blows at the holiday spirit of our representatives in Parliament, Herbert playfully suggests, "have been planned for such times deliberately by mischievous people".

Now, we are in favour of everyone having holidays with pay (even members of Parliament!), and we go as far as saying that in a free society Herbert Morrison would be offered a permanent holiday from the burden of Parliament and thus be free to do a useful job, but the price which has to be paid for the assumption of power is that it occasionally carries duties.

When Morrison petulently compares the "burden" carried by present-day politicians to those of the nineteenth century he omits to add that to-day the State has become more powerful, and although it "protects" us from the more obvious sufferings of the poor in the nineteenth century, as G. points out in his article *The Welfare State and I*, the price of protection is slavery. As the State increases its power, so more departments are created and civil servants employed to carry out its functions.

With the development of the idea that representatives in Parliament are there to carry out the wishes of the people, M.P.'s to-day have put up a greater show of representation than their nineteenth century counterparts. Thus when Morrison dispels the false assumption that the life of a Member is to be in attendance at Westminster only and gives a list of duties demanded of him—such as looking at factories, farms, etc., constituency visits, reading, and opening ceremonies—he is underlining our point that M.P.'s to-day must give the impres-

sion that they are constantly in touch with the people as well as being of them. The alternative is to assume that politicians are more conscientious to-day in their duties as representatives than they were in the earlier centuries; we see little evidence to support this view.

But even if it is admitted that Members are doing more 'work' than they did in Disraeli's time, the "average daily life of the Minister running a busy department" does not strike us as being too strenuous commensurate with the wages, power and privileges they enjoy relative to the wages of a manual worker for instance.

We quote the average daily life of the Minister running a busy department as seen by Herbert:

"He probably rises at 8 a.m. Bath, shave, breakfast, reaching the office at 9.30 or 10. If he is wise he will look through the newspapers and, if they are justifiably critical about something, call for a report or reports. Almost certainly the Private Secretary, the Permanent Secretary or other officers will have matters requiring decision or instruction. There may be minutes to deal with; possibly a Private Notice Question for the House.

He may have office conferences, a deputation or deputations to receive involving discussion. He may have to attend a Cabinet or a Cabinet Committee—and be there on time. Possibly an official or unofficial lunch after . . .

He may go back to his office if he can leave the House. Or he may have a function to attend. In due course he will reach home and, if his wife is still up, have a talk. Then probably there are Papers to read which have been delivered by the office. If lucky, he will finish at midnight, but more likely at 1 a.m. or 2 or 3 a.m. And probably he is up again at 8 o'clock.

Not every day may be like this—there may be easier ones. But there can be plenty of this order . . . Even at the week-end there will be much reading to do and sometimes a political meeting.

And now and again an opening ceremony or a visit to one of his department's "out-stations" may have to be fitted in. The Foreign and Colonial Secretaries are involved in visits or conferences abroad. They will usually travel by fast aircraft, thus missing the restful sea journeys enjoyed by their predecessors.

Heavy going. Can one stand it? It depends on the individual. I did for 11 years and was still ready for more. But it's a hard life."

So if it's a hard life, Herbert, why not give it up?

baulks of timber, their windows patched with cardboard and their roofs with corrugated iron, their crazy garden walls sagging in all directions. And the bombed sites where the plaster dust swirled in the air and the willow-herb straggled over the heaps of rubble . . ."

The Ministry of Truth is very like the University of London Senate House in Bloomsbury, the wartime Ministry of Information; and its canteen, where Winston drank his Victory Gin, was recognised by members of the BBC's Far-Eastern Service as the one at 200 Oxford Street.

Shreds and hints from a thousand sources, re-fashioned into something new, like a bird building its nest. For example, "1984" obviously owes something to the writings of James Burnham, but with how much more integrity the argument is presented. On an entirely different level, there is a bad book called *The Diary of a London Explorer* whose author, W. Margrie had said "Two Lovely Black Eyes is better art than a Bach oratorio because it contains more vitality". This is hardly a tenable point of view, but it is the kind of statement that appealed to Orwell, and from him it became a declaration that he would rather have written *Two Lovely Black Eyes* than *The Blessed Damozel* or *Love in a Valley*. In one man the thought is part of the usual 'anti-culture' line, in the other a recognition that "there is such a thing as sheer skill, or native grace, which may have more survival value than erudition or intellectual power".

★

THE book whose composition illustrates most clearly the creative processes of its author is *Animal Farm*. The mechanism doesn't creak, it is the only one of Orwell's books which is flawless in construction as a piece of writing, and yet it was, he said, "the only one of my books I really sweated over". John Atkins, in his study of Orwell has carefully paralleled the inci-

dents in the story with the accounts, in books on the history of the Soviet Union which Orwell had read, of the events which he satirised. Orwell himself wrote a preface for the Ukrainian edition of the book, in which he described its conception. He had become convinced, he said, "that the destruction of this Soviet myth was essential if we wanted a revival of the socialist movement".

"On my return from Spain I conceived this public denunciation of the Soviet myth in terms of a story that could be easily understood by almost any reader and easily translated into other languages. However, the actual details of the story did not come to me for some time until one day (I was then living in a little village), I saw a little boy, perhaps ten years old, driving a huge horse along a narrow path, whipping it whenever it tried to turn aside. It struck me that if only some animals became conscious of their strength we should have no power over them; and that ordinary people exploit animals in much the same way as the rich exploit the proletariat."

Having found the form that the story should take, he brought it to life in his fable of the revolt of the animals of Manor Farm. There are echoes of Swift and Aesop and of H. G. Wells' *The Island of Dr. Moreau*. But it could only have been put together by someone who loved farms and animals, by someone who said of himself, "So long as I remain alive and well I shall continue to feel strongly about prose style, to love the surface of the earth and to take a pleasure in solid objects and scraps of useless information", and by someone who dared to have a purpose firm and dared to make it known. Anybody with less integrity of purpose would succumb to the temptation to soften the bleak and tragic conclusion.

Orwell's borrowings from literature and life often occur where they are most obvious and least expected. If you look in Kelly's Directory for Hertfordshire you will find that the principal farm in his village is called Manor Farm.

C.W.

Troubles of a Christian Community . . .

THINGS were quiet at Koinonia Farm last week. Not many tourists stopped at the newly reopened roadside stand on U.S. 19 because all the signs advertising it had been stolen. The people of Americus, Ga. (pop. 12,000) would like to get rid of Koinonia Farm; it is an embarrassment to some, a scandal to others. For it is a Christian experiment in racial equality.

A couple of young ministers from Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in Louisville, Ky. started it in 1942. Clarence Jordan was 30 and specializing in city mission work, and Martin England was 36, taking a refresher course after missionary duty in Burma. With \$59 between them they took an option on a rundown 440-acre plot beside the highway in as prejudiced a part of Georgia as anyone could find. A Louisville builder donated the rest of the money they needed, and they called the place Koinonia (pronounced *coy-no-nee-ah*), Greek for fellowship. Now the fellowship farm is fighting for its life.

From 440 to 1,103

It was organized on three principles: (1) complete sharing of all things material and spiritual—"As we think of it," says Jordan, "each person receives a living while contributing a life"; (2) complete racial brotherhood; (3) complete pacifism. Husbands and wives work from 6.0 a.m. to evening worship at 6.0 p.m. Younger children attend nursery or kindergarten school on the farm; older children go to regular segregated classes in the county.

To-day there are 60 residents at Koinonia—45 whites and 15 Negroes. The 440 acres have grown to 1,103, with cash crops of peanuts, corn, cotton, cattle, hogs, goats and poultry.

Now there is another crop—trouble.

"Those Queer Nigger-Lovers"

For years the people of Americus took little notice of "those crazy race mixers." But after the Supreme Court desegregation decision in 1954 there began to be ugly rumours: "Communist spies" were harboured there; "sex mixing" was practiced. When Clarence Jordan endorsed the applications of two Negroes for admission to Georgia State College of Business Administration, things began to happen. There were anonymous phone calls; the roadside signs were ripped down at night; retailers turned down Koinonia produce.

This spring the county health department obtained an injunction against the farm's racially mixed camp for children. A construction company refused to

dredge the creek for swimming when they learned there was to be inter-racial bathing there; a crop-dusting firm refused to dust the farm's cotton. Then came dynamite—three sticks of it—which blew up the farm's roadside produce stand. After that there was an avalanche of insurance-policy cancellations.

Some people in Americus were shocked. Others said, "I'll bet those queer nigger-lovers did it themselves. We ought to run them out of the county."

No Resentment

Last week tall (6 ft. 1 in.) rugged Farmer Jordan shoved his hat back on his head and sighed. "The dealer who's been supplying gas and oil for our tractors just phoned and said he wouldn't be able to supply us any more," he said. "We have enough on hand for a few days, but we'll have to find another supply. The feed situation's worse than that. Our feed dealer isn't going to sell to us any more, and we have more than 3,500 laying hens and more than 300 hogs to feed. There's enough on hand for just a few days. We may have to find another dealer at a distance. We plan to meet each crisis as it arises. We have no intention of giving up."

But the pressure is growing on Koinonia Farm. A few weeks ago a Sunday-school teacher in a rural Methodist church was fired for suggesting, after a lesson on the persecution of the early Christians, that a collection be taken up to help repair Koinonia's dynamited roadside stand. "I bear no resentment to the people who are doing these things to us," says Clarence Jordan. "I was born and raised in this country, over near Talbotton, Georgia, and my brothers and sisters live there now. I know how these people feel. I would probably feel the same way if I had not seen some of the teachings of Jesus."

(Time 17/9/56).

. . . In a Church-going Country

Church membership in the U.S. reached a record of 100,162,529 in 1955—a gain of 2,679,918 over the previous year—according to the *Yearbook of American Churches*. Thus 60.9% of U.S. citizens are now affiliated with religious bodies as compared with 57% in 1950, 36% in 1900. Denominational breakdown: 58,448,567 Protestants, 33,396,647 Roman Catholics, 5,500,000 Jews, 2,386,945 Eastern Orthodox, 367,370 Old Catholics and Polish National Catholics, and 63,000 Buddhists.

(Time 17/9/56).

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

Vol. 17, No. 38. September 22, 1956

From Abadan to Suez

Continued from p. 1

cause they realise that it is the strongest weapon with which to smite their political opponents in power. From their own experience they realise that the government will not be influenced by the truth, but they feel that the public will be impressed. And after all it is only the opposition which is interested in impressing public opinion (with a view to getting their votes). Governments are busy bamboozling or suppressing public opinion. When the public will have an opinion of its own it will not let itself be governed. Even the Opposition is not interested in letting the people think for themselves. At most its aim is to convince the public that the government in office is behind the times, reactionary, sectarian, Blimp or Bolshevik (depending on which Party is in office) and that everything will be for the good if only the Opposition, which always speaks the truth, assumes power. But if we learn anything from history it is that for politicians truth is a political weapon never a principle.

Thus the Labour government's sabre rattling over Abadan was exposed by no less a personality than the leader of the Conservative opposition (Mr. Churchill), just as today's show of strength over Suez by the Eden government is denounced by every self-respecting member of the Labour opposition front bench. This is what Mr. Churchill said over the Abadan gun-boat diplomacy in a speech in Liverpool in October, 1951:

"He [Dr. Moussadiq] has penetrated the minds and measured accurately the will-power of the men he had to deal with in Whitehall. He knew that with all their cruisers, frigates, destroyers, tank-landing craft, troops, and paratroops sent at such great expense, and all their bold confident statements, they were only bluffing."

That was in 1951. But the name of the Rt. Hon. Sir Winston Churchill is to be found among those M.P.'s who voted in September 1956 in favour of the government's policy over Suez!

★

THUS far history repeats itself with the small (but significant) difference that whereas in 1951 the British government turned immediately to the International Court at the Hague before dispatching the gun-boats, in 1956 it is content to decide the "illegality" of Nasser's action itself without reference to a higher Court. It would be the height of political naïveté to draw the conclusion that the Labour government was more peace-loving than the Tories. In 1951 the legality of the British case was unquestioned; in 1956 on the other hand they knew they would lose. Indeed Mr. Selwyn-Lloyd pointed out to the House that in the White Paper, referring to Mr. Menzies' mission, it says on page 10 that "Egypt's ownership of the canal being recognised, it is to her great advantage to have the canal maintained and improved and made more profitable as the years go on (our italics). In spite of this "recognition" the extravagant language of "seizure", "aggression" "illegal act" continues to be bandied about by the government, because without maintaining this position their political and military actions would appear as unnecessary as in fact they are!

★

FOLLOWING the political deadlock in Persia, the technicians were evacuated and the oil-wells brought to a standstill. The policy of the government clearly was to

overthrow Moussadiq by starving Persia of the royalties which kept its ruling class in opulent idleness. The oil which was "vital" to our industries could suddenly be sacrificed for, as it turned out, nearly two years (without affecting industry!) for political and Big-Business reasons. Anglo-American big-business in the end won that battle for democracy.

(The British Government takes quite a different attitude to the problems of Persia in the present Suez crisis. The Prime Minister in his speech pointed out that the operation, maintenance and the freedom of navigation through the Canal "touched the lives and the prosperity" of every not only "in these islands" but also in Western Europe as a whole and in many Eastern lands . . . More than half of Western Europe's oil passes through the Canal. That concerns not only the consumer countries; it is vital to producers as well. "I give just one example. A large part, for instance, of Persian oil production, which is now steadily rising, and upon which Persia's prosperity largely depends, is shipped through the Canal . . .")

Five years ago in pursuit of its policies the British government was prepared to starve Persia. Now it attempts to disguise its power politics over Suez by posing as the champion of Persian economic prosperity in the hope that Persia will play Britain's dirty game in Egypt!)

Eden's Canal Users' Association is the final step in the political bluff, which started with the gun-boats, to force Nasser to submit. It is clear even before the scheme is put into operation that it will be resisted by Egypt. In spite of the fact that the public is assured that this Association is an Anglo-Franco-American brain-wave (or brain-storm?), Dulles was soon packing his bags (with dollars as well as pyjamas) to fly to London to get down to discussing practical schemes which might shift the Egyptians. As we write, it is reported that America's offer of a \$500 million loan to France and Britain is the signal that the Suez crisis enters a new phase. As the *News Chronicle* puts it (Sep. 17) "instead of a quick military push, the Western powers are now preparing for a long economic haul". (Incidentally it would appear that the United States considers the financing of an economic boycott of Egypt a safer investment than the part financing of the Aswan Dam!) It is estimated that a Users' boycott could hope to divert 60-70 per cent. of the traffic which normally passes through the Canal. Besides the dollars, American would release nearly fifty idle tankers as well as press into service some of its mothball fleet of several hundred Liberty ships so that the time, and therefore tanker space, lost in going round the Cape would be made up by additional ships. Such a boycott might last for years if not for all time, since such a situation would encourage the shipping companies to build super-tankers which would in any case be too large to use the Canal.

★

THE government's propaganda in the first month of the Suez "crisis" was that the Canal was "vital" to the very existence of Western Europe. Deprived of the Canal we were told we should literally starve, since our industries would be brought to a standstill. Yet less than two months later, steps are being taken by the Western powers (a) to disrupt the Canal by encouraging a breakdown in the technical and administrative organisation of the Canal and (b) to divert the bulk of shipping from the Canal thereby ensuring that eventually the Canal will fall into disuse. How long will the public go on lapping up this double-think?

Actually neither of these schemes will necessarily succeed. In spite of Eden's protestations that the withdrawal of the pilots is not an Anglo-French conspiracy, and that the

SPEAKING some weeks ago in Hyde Park of his visit to one corner of the Soviet Empire, Dr. Soper said that he had seen more drunkenness in Poland in one day than he had seen in London in a whole year. This is no exaggeration. Under the State capitalism of the Soviet where wages are so low and goods so few, alcohol is readily obtainable at a price within the reach of all. And far too many workers grasp at it as a way of escape from Soviet reality. Nor are the Bolsheviks much concerned in dealing with this evil except by poster propaganda. Besides, both B. and K. are fond of their *rykovka*; why not emulate them as formerly children were told: "Be like Lenin!"?

Vodka is made either out of potatoes (which could go to feed the people if they enjoyed a higher standard of living and didn't feel the need for alcohol) or of different grains. (Note that all this vodka production amounts to a direct destruction of food. It is this senseless wastage of food that is one of the indictments against both Western free capitalism and Soviet State capitalism.)

State Capitalism Corrupt

But even in vodka production State capitalism under the control of the Communist Party is inefficient and corrupt.

A. Bezosikov is chief advisor to a big meat-packing plant in Ulan-Udeh in Buryat-Mongolia and by training a veterinary surgeon with a degree in zoology. Seemingly, he has not yet been roped in by the wide boys of the Party. Certain abuses which he came across and can at last lay bare now that Stalin is dead are cited in a letter of his to *Pravda* 247/13910. Its appearance in the organ of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party is surety that he is safe and alive and not likely to have his head chopped off by the local little Stalins. (There are still plenty of these lesser tin gods floating around in the Soviet.) This is what this representative of the emergent technocracy writes about the corruption going on in his distant outpost of Empire:

"For some years now there has been a stock farm linked with the Ulan-Udeh Spirits and Vodka Distillery. This special farm raises cattle and pigs on the spent grain from the distillery. So far the farm has given the country many thousands of tons of meat at comparatively low cost.

"It has been worked out that this vodka plant could provide for the feeding of a single herd of more than a thousand cattle and a like number of pigs. But certain difficulties have crept in.

"The State Planning Commission of the Buryat-Mongolian Autonomous Socialist Soviet Republic has decided that in allocating the waste products of the food industry, including the spent grain of this distillery, it can ignore the favourable results of the work of our farm specializing in rearing beef and pork on the hoof and has begun to make a practice of cutting down our entitlement of food waste. In the result there has been a sharp decline in the number of animals we are carrying on the farm.

pilots have voluntarily resigned because they simply refuse to work for the Egyptians, it takes a lot of believing that these men earning fantastic salaries of between £700 and £800 a month are throwing up their jobs without having first been offered some alternative employment with equally bright prospects. The Canal Users' Association can function, even only on paper, if it has on hand the personnel to take over. Obviously it has the staff which during the past week walked-out in Suez. What compensation has the Association offered these men in the event that the Association turns out to be a damp-squib? Someone should ask the Prime Minister. But apart from this detail, which is of political interest, what must be particularly annoying to the government and its "loyal" pilots is that in the first two days after the walk-out, all shipping has been cleared through the Canal by Egyptian pilots. As we foresaw in *FREEDOM* some weeks ago even the pilot myth would at some time or other be exploded!

As to a Users' boycott of the Canal, its success presupposes that Nasser has no support in the oil producing countries of the Middle East. Whilst it is true that any action which resulted in a reduction in the flow of oil would lose him support in those countries, it is presumption on the part of Western

PRAVDA NOTEBOOK

VODKA AND BEEF

"The official reduction in the amount of spent grain allotted to us has been explained as due to the fact that more has been issued to the collective farms. Now, if this were really the case no objection could be raised; but many *kolkhozes* do not take up their allotment of spent grain.

"Where does it all go, then?" "Acting contrary to the State's interests, the management of the distillery prefers—and this is done without any interference from the officials of the State Planning Commission of Buryat-Mongolia—to sell the spent grain left over to private cattle-owners. Many of these cattle-owners hold no job of work anywhere and have been depending for a living for a number of years past on the raising of cattle for sale" (to the State's purchasing commissions, we suppose).

"It is greatly to be regretted that although we have repeatedly applied to them for help in clearing up this matter the Soviet and Party organs of the Republic have done nothing whatsoever in response to our distress signals."

Technocracy versus Bureaucracy

Right under the noses of the "collective leadership" in the centre and away out on the edge of the empire this sort of thing is going on all the time. Officialdom once ensconced in cushy jobs under the Soviet are not going to upset the apple-cart and of course their opposite numbers in the Party apparatus must play ball and benefit personally from the arrangement. Meanwhile the labourers on the State and collective farms muck out the styes, wash and feed the pigs, look after the cattle, and fetch and carry and run at the behest of the planners who are always calling out for ever more work and are never satisfied. It will take years for the technocracy to clean up things from the standpoint of stark efficiency. Resistance to their efforts will come from two sides: from the State employees or civil servants—call them what you will—and the Party functionaries combined and on the other side from the workers sunk in apathy, suspecting everybody, trusting none, and drowning their sorrows in the drinking of cheap vodka and the smoking of the cheapest tobacco in the world, *makhorka*.

Only the workers secure in the true freedom of a libertarian form of human society can hope to do away completely with this kind of corruption.

Yugoslav Tourists

Thirty-two tourists left Belgrade at the beginning of this month for a visit to Kiev, Moscow, and Leningrad. Their seventeen days' tour has been organised by the Belgrade tourist bureau "Putnik" (The Wayfarer) and Intourist of Moscow. It is scarcely possible that any of these tourists will seek political asylum in the Soviet Union as some Polish tourists did recently in Sweden.

Arthur Horner in Pravda

In the same issue of *Pravda* (247/13910) Arthur Horner has an article on the immediate problems of the English working-class movement, his starting point being the Trades Union Congress

politicians to assume that a boycott of the Canal aimed at the overthrow of Nasser would not meet with some form of retaliation in the Middle East where the oil wells are so vulnerable to sabotage. As we have already said the struggle in the Middle East is based on political and economic blackmail all round. And for these reasons we believe that whatever Nasser or the Western politicians may say in public (and we would suggest that so far Nasser has shown more intelligence than the Western politicians) their actions must needs take into account all kinds of factors outside the immediate "crisis".

★

AT some later date it will be instructive to present a complete and detailed picture of the Suez crisis from its origins. But even with the bits and pieces available, and the day-to-day changes in government tactics, one is surely justified in describing the crisis as phoney. And the uncanny parallel with the earlier crisis in Persia gives us an indication of the outcome. In the end no one will lose very much; Nasser or his successors stand to gain from the struggle. The only real losers are the people in all countries . . . and yet they alone could put an end once for all to these costly crises manufactured and magnified by politicians and Press.

at Brighton. He writes quite informatively for his Soviet comrades though not so well for our Russian fellow-workers and is given 28 inches of space in which to do so.

The T.U.C. meetings have been covered by *Pravda's* own correspondent on the spot, V. Nekrasov.

Titov in Pravda

Another C.P. writes across 42 inches of space on the "Rôle of the Leader at Local Level and Party Discipline". He is V. Titov, Secretary of the Kharkov Area Committee of the C.P. of the Ukraine. If a Party man is bent on climbing the thing to do is to get into the Party press. (After all, the Soviet's Foreign Minister Shepilov came from *Pravda's* editorial desk, as Vicky in the *New Statesman* has been unkind enough to point out to Mr. Eden.) And, of course, unlike *FREEDOM*, that great paper *Pravda* pays, and well, for everything it prints.

Party Steals Workers' Laurels

Freed now from the constant fear of being transported like caged animals to Siberia for the crime of being ten minutes late at work as was the rule under Stalin the Good, the workers have spontaneously gone to it in many places and stepped up production without the aid of the Party's professional agitators. Titov praises their work in the big industrial plants of Kharkov city; speaks, too, of the good work done in the countryside round about; claims that the most backward section of farming (cattle-raising) in this undefined area of Kharkovshchina has advanced considerably; and records that dairy-farming production has increased by 80%. But he then goes on to say, and here we quote direct:

"These and other economic successes have not of course appeared just so, spontaneously. They are the result of the insistent struggle of the Party organisations to carry into effect the historic decisions of the Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party of the USSR, a tightening of demand for higher quality in all our work, and a strengthening of Party discipline."

It's always the Party and the State which gets things done, never the workers. Much as a surly dog is praised he is indeed praised—to keep him quiet. That the Party has nothing but sheer contempt for the workers both within the "Socialist Fatherland of all the toilers" and elsewhere will be shown by our revelations in the next issue of *FREEDOM* when we deal with the position of the railroad workers under the Soviet.

Anarchism not Dead in Ukraine

Titov waxes expansive on the need for tighter discipline for Party members. "The training of Party replacements and of all Communists in the spirit of a high discipline constitutes one of the most important tasks facing us in the building up of our Party. It is essential to put up a determined fight against any and every shred of petty-bourgeois, anarchist views, slackness, laxity."

It really looks as though the Ukrainians have not forgotten Makhno; as though the teachings of Kropotkin may yet live on in the land where everything has been done administratively to crush all Anarchist thought out of existence. I.P.

BRAZIL & PRESS FREEDOM

The Brazilian Government has revealed that it plans to submit to Congress soon a draft of a new press law.

It thereby added fuel to the public debate in Rio de Janeiro on press freedom. The debate was set off by police seizure of the edition of an Opposition daily, *Tribuna de Imprensa*.

As quoted in Rio de Janeiro newspapers, Senator Vieira de Melo, Government leader in the Chamber of Deputies, said the new law would be "more rigorous and more rigid in penalties."

Last week, Administration spokesmen denied that the Government contemplated any measures to allow the closing or confiscating of newspapers that in the official view printed subversive material.

Senator Vieira de Melo did not explain what was meant by "more rigorous". He said only that the law would "shelter the nation from subversive propaganda, perturbation of the régime as well as licentiousness in attacks."

"We shall make publishing enterprises more responsible, arming the executive and the citizens with the means of defence that effectively they have not had until now," he added.

"Until now, nobody in this country has yet been condemned for a press crime."

Just what that meant was unclear to almost everyone here to-night, and many Brazilian editors appeared worried.

(New York Times)

The Plight of the Forestry Worker

IN his letter of 1st September, George Gilfillan, the forestry worker of Cardrona, Peebles, raised the whole question of social living in small isolated communities and asked what the trade unions have to offer the worker in that situation. He has just helped to form a branch of the Transport & General Workers' Union in Cardrona, but was depressed because he felt the unions were too limited in their interests.

Now this has always been one of our own many criticisms of the trades unions. They are content to remain mere wage-bargaining bodies and have no social ideology that presents any alternative to capitalism. Here and there one can find the odd TU official who will describe himself as a socialist, but his socialism usually stops short at nationalisation.

But the fairest way to approach anybody performing any kind of function is simply to accept that function as it is. We don't think the barber is falling down on his job if he doesn't sell meat, and once we recognise the limits of any function performed by anybody we can only accept their validity within those limits.

Now the trades unions don't claim to have any ideas about communal living. But some of the problems which our correspondent listed are strictly of the economic order, and could be alleviated by higher wages. His extra outlay on bus fares to the nearest town for any social entertainment assumes greater importance because the forestry worker's wages are £3 below the national minimum.

If that could be boosted, and this is precisely what the union exists for, some of these kind of problems will diminish.

But George Gilfillan is concerned with much more fundamental problems than that. He is more interested in human values than cash values. He is, however, doomed to disappointment if he expects the trade union to be able to—or even want to, do anything about that.

Indeed, who can do anything about it? Human values can only be expressed at the human level and can be applied only by those people who hold them dear. It is to his fellow-workers that George Gilfillan must appeal, or to the people among whom he lives. It is only they who can make a community, and only a community which can solve the problems of isolation, the tied cottage, retirement and security.

It may seem strange to him, but the problems which face him are not fundamentally different from those which confront people of like ideas anywhere. Here in London, for example, the individual who puts human values before cash values can be almost as isolated as if he lived in the Scottish highlands. The only difference is that there are opportunities for contact with people of like mind if one takes the trouble to seek them out.

New Opening Times for Malatesta Club

THE Malatesta Club is to re-organise its times of opening. For a variety of reasons the comrades responsible for the club have come to the conclusion that the present policy of opening every night of the week does not in fact serve the best interests of the club or of the movement.

It has been decided, therefore, to open only on evenings when there is some organised activity—with the exception of two social evenings per week, Friday and Saturday. On Saturday it is hoped that there will nearly always be some organised entertainment.

Should further activities be arranged (should the L.A.G. start its informal discussions again, for example), due notice will be given in FREEDOM, and the club will be opened again on those particular nights.

Regular nights of opening from now on will be:

- Last Tuesday in every month. African Forum meeting. Sept. 25—George Padmore (author of *Pan-Africanism or Communism?*) speaks on NATIONALISM & TRIBALISM IN AFRICA.
- Every Wednesday. Bonar Thompson at 8 p.m.
- Every Friday. Open.
- Every Saturday. Social & Entertainment Sept. 22—*Lemon Tease*.
- Every Sunday. London Anarchist Group meeting. See announcement column. Mondays, first three Tuesdays of month, and Thursdays—CLOSED.

But even then, community has got to be made by those with a common interest. The anarchists of London had to come together and work to create their own social centre, for example. Before they created the Malatesta Club, they could meet only in cafes or pubs or each others' homes and there was no place that could be regarded as a centre where strangers or new-comers could make contact. The answer was to make their own place. It was, of course, much easier from the start since there was sufficient strength to do it.

In the matter of living accommodation, the similarity with his own circumstances is nearer still. In cities workers don't live in dwellings tied to their jobs, true, but their dwellings are tied to their ability to pay an economic rent. And there are not many old age pensioners who die in the houses they've lived in all their lives.

What George Gilfillan is asking for is the security and the values of a free society. And he is quite right so to ask. But he can hardly expect to get it from reformist trade unions—or even get sympathetic understanding of his demands.

No, as we see it, his approach must be two-fold; on the purely economic plane the union can be useful. The struggle for better wages is the legitimate business of the TU and if G.G. can work up enough pressure from below, the union can be pushed into action. Better still if the action can come from below and the pressure exerted directly upon the Forestry Commission. But we realise this is difficult where smallish groups of workers are scattered over wide areas, and where victimisation can cost a man his home as well as his job. Still, this is the field in which the union has its function.

On the social plane George Gilfillan has got to start from scratch on his own. Without knowing his exact circumstances we don't know precisely what can be done, but are there no possibilities of communal life providing the amenities of the town?

Are there not a dozen among all the men who wanted G.G. to become their branch secretary who would join in a concerted attempt to create their own social life? Instead of a bus trip for a drink and a game of darts why could they not have the drink brought out to them and have special evenings in their own homes? Would it be impossible to start activities in which the women and children would be interested—like their own little film society, or dance or drama groups for example?

Then perhaps out of such small beginnings could grow a community association which could undertake more ambitious projects—building their own village hall, building or buying homes for the old folk, acquiring derelict crofts and doing them up to release a worker from a tied cottage—or simply clubbing together to buy a communal car, van or coach to make them more mobile. A community association could buy seeds and fertiliser in bulk, even mechanical tools, for its members to make their work in growing their own food cheaper and easier; could undertake the cultivation of gardens or allotments if the owners can no longer use them to the full ad-

New Look for the Russian Wage Slave?

THE Soviet Government has recently announced new laws governing minimum wages to come into effect on January 1st. These long-awaited measures, which have been promised for years, may constitute the first worthwhile revision of the highly complicated and unfair wages structure in the U.S.S.R.

Perhaps the most important part of the decree, which has still to be approved by the Supreme Soviet—the national legislature—is that for the first time there is to be a guaranteed minimum wage. It will establish a minimum of 300-350 roubles a month (£27-£31), as the lowest pay for workers in industry, construction, transport and communications. For other workers, including unskilled, it will be 300 roubles in cities and 270 roubles in rural districts.

The new laws represent a completely different approach to the wage system, and in theory at least will bring Soviet labour practice more into line with capitalist countries. In the past wages have been based on the principle of "norms", which establish a minimum production requirement from each worker. A man who is unable to fulfil his "norm" might well be in the position where he cannot support his family adequately unless another member of the family works also.

The system of "norms" is of course so inequitable and unreasonable that it is at first difficult to see why it should ever have been tolerated by the mass of Russian workers. It is inequitable for a variety of reasons, most of which are quite obvious, but in the U.S.S.R. it was made more so by the existence of the Stakhanovites.

As is well known this "movement" first came into prominence

when a coal-miner called Stakhanov set up a fantastic record (which has since been beaten) for hewing coal. As a consequence the "norms" for this type of work were immediately put up, which made it that much more difficult for miners to earn enough on which to live. Throughout all the industries men like Stakhanov appeared, and beat all records—up went the "norms". The men were rewarded with medals and were proud of their achievements, but were so heartily disliked by their fellow-workers that they often had to go elsewhere to work. This was not surprising because the "production record" was invariably a rigged affair, and the conditions under which it was carried out were not normal.

Why has this kind of thing been tolerated? It is not quite a sufficient answer to say that since Russia is a police state, the workers have no option but to do as they are told—for the police (G.P.U.) are paid the same sort of wages as everyone else—in theory. In reality however this is not true, for in Russia there are two kinds of money.

Certain groups (including of course the police, and other groups of workers of importance to the State for one reason or another), are able to purchase their requirements in special stores reserved for them, and their real wages can be worth five or even ten times as much as those of ordinary groups without the same facilities—but their wages are nominally the same. Thus it is possible for the government to retain the support of necessary groups through the medium of self-interest, but at the same time appear to be fair and "communitistic".

Thus one is brought to the essen-

tial factor contained in an absolute State economy. It is possible for a government which controls this type of economy to adjust prices and wages in such a way as to cause the standard of life to rise or fall, either in detail or completely, for certain groups amongst the population or for the whole population. And so it is. In this way the Russian government can starve a whole section of its people—as it has done—or create a hierarchy of privileged men—as it has also done.

We may perhaps be forgiven therefore if we view this latest Russian achievement (which has not yet come into force) with a certain amount of doubt. It may be that it is a sincere attempt by the "new-look administration" to alleviate one of the more obvious injustices within the Russian system. But on the other hand there are so many laws in the U.S.S.R. which are theoretical only, and have almost nothing to do with the facts.

For example it is decreed that all Russians have the right to freedom of speech and assembly, it is lawful for an opposition party to exist, it is permissible to leave the country... the trouble is that none of these things are *actually* possible. Now a minimum wage is decreed—but the economy could be so adjusted "if necessary", as to nullify its effect.

H.F.W.

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

LECTURE-DISCUSSIONS Every Sunday at 7.30 at THE MALATESTA CLUB, 32 Percy Street, Tottenham Court Road, W.1.

THE London Anarchist Group Sunday evening meetings, which have been suspended since the Summer School, begin a new series on September 23.

- The first four lectures are as follows: SEPT. 23—DEBATE MARXISM vs. ANARCHISM Speakers: Monty Johnson Editor, *Challenge* (Y.C.L.), Donald Room, L.A.G.
- SEPT. 30—John Smith on SWASTIKA IN SOUTH AFRICA
- OCT. 7—S. E. Parker on POWER & RESPONSIBILITY
- OCT. 14—Alec Craig on THE OBSCENITY LAWS & CENSORSHIP

Questions, Discussion and Admission all free.

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

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

VESTED INTEREST versus OBJECTIVITY

At last week's Trade Union Congress, there was a partisan, though respectful, debate on the relationship (if any) between smoking and lung cancer. Dr. A. Elliott, for the Medical Practitioners, recounted at length the statistical evidence for believing that there was without doubt a definite connection. He then asked the delegates to vote for his resolution.

Noting with alarm the fivefold increase in the number of deaths from lung cancer in the last fifteen years, and the accumulation of evidence that smoking is one of the principal causes, Congress calls on the Government to take all reasonable steps to discourage young people from smoking.

But in spite of the support of the Scientific Workers, this warning and advice went unheeded. Congress voted in favour of an alternative proposal from the Tobacco Workers which merely asked the Government to do all it could to further cancer research. Congress agreed with Mr. P. Belcher, of the Tobacco Workers, that medical experts had so far failed to agree about the causes of "this dread disease" and that the statistical evidence that cigarette smoking "caused cancer" proved nothing.

The delegates did not believe—even on the strength of Dr. Elliott's formidable statistics—that there was a case for asking the Government to start "anti-smoking" propaganda in schools. They were in favour of more research into smoking and other probable causes—air pollution, for example.

(Manchester Guardian)

FREEDOM PRESS

SELECTIONS FROM FREEDOM

- Vol. 1, 1951, *Mankind is One*
- Vol. 2, 1952, *Postscript to Posterity*
- Vol. 3, 1953, *Colonialism on Trial*
- Vol. 4, 1954, *Living on a Volcano*
- Vol. 5, 1955, *The Immoral Moralists*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- M. BAKUNIN :** *Marxism, Freedom and the State.* cloth 5s.

- 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.

- 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)

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

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT!

Deficit on Freedom	£740
Contributions received	£601
DEFICIT	£139
September 7 to September 13	
Leicester: C.M.M. 1/-; Radlett: D.S. 1/-;	
London: Hyde Park Sympathisers: 2/9;	
Bronx: F.F. 14/-; Nazeing: M.G.W.* 10/-;	
Oswestry: A.H. 8/-; Chicago: Free Society	
Group £3/10/0; St. Albans: Anon. 5/-;	
Total	5 11 9
Previously acknowledged	595 18 1
1956 TOTAL TO DATE	£601 9 10

*Indicates regular contributors.

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