

In this Issue:

- A Matter of Style - p. 2
- Soviet Ministries at Work - p. 3
- Ammunition - p. 4

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

Vol. 17, No. 40

October 6th, 1956

Threepence

THE LABOUR PARTY CONFERENCE

BLUFF AT BLACKPOOL

THE only person likely to be inspired by Hugh Gaitskell's address at the eve of conference rally of the Labour Party at Blackpool last Sunday is Hugh Gaitskell.

In spite of all the clichés and promises so evident on these occasions, the phoney struggle between the two major parties cannot be entirely concealed. But the politicians do their best, and Hugh Gaitskell is no exception. He is reputed to be a big brain in the Labour Party but he still has to resort to rhetoric and half truths in an attempt to gull the electorate into thinking they have a real choice between Labour and Tory in the farcical parliamentary elections.

He told the rally at Blackpool that the "dominant political fact of the day" was that Labour was winning the next general election now. He failed to substantiate the "fact" except to say that the Government had gone downhill ever since its election to power, a process which is not peculiar to the Conservative party but is the natural course followed by all parties after they have assumed power.

Labour may 'win' a number of middle-class votes from the Tories in the next election, but will they continue to get the vote of the 90,000 individual members who have dropped out of the Party? On September 26th, Morgan Phillips, secretary of the party, told a Press conference that the drop in membership was not due to any lack of ability to recruit new members; but members had been lost because of inability to collect subscriptions regularly!

It would be nearer the truth to say that many members of the Labour Party are bitterly disappointed with its Conservative-like policies, and are no longer prepared to support a party so much like the opposition. This was already evident in the last general election. Even the rebellious Nye Bevan, so penitent after Attlee pulled him smartly back into line when he ventured to stray, no longer has the following of some of the more militant socialists.

It was inevitable that the Leader of the Party would make reference to the Colonies, and in an atmos-

phere of hypocrisy and false sentiment James Griffiths and Wilfred Burke were congratulated on their work on Colonial problems; they would both now rejoice at the return to Africa of Seretse Khama.

We would not expect Gaitskell to remind the conference that the Labour Party was originally responsible for banning Seretse, but the implied claim that the executive was instrumental in initiating the return must have been too much even for the pundits. He said that: "The executive had taken the initiative in protesting to the Government and demanding a conference. Although the Government had at first refused, the conference had been held in the end, and Mr. Griffiths had been consulted."

The usual monotonous attack was made on the cost of living and it was

pointed out that since 1951 prices had risen by five shillings in the pound. Certainly the electorate have something to complain about and we are all duly grateful to Mr. Gaitskell for telling us what our pockets told us a long time ago. But our experience is that apart from a few minor alterations in policy, we are no better off economically under Labour than under Conservative. On the other political issues the two parties are almost identical.

Under any Government we either have to work hard in the national interest, or work hard for 'socialism', or fight to defend 'democracy', or fight 'our' interests in some remote part of the world. Whichever political party is in power the ordinary people will, sooner or later, get what Churchill promised them—Blood, sweat, toil and tears.

Notes on Reformism and the

YOUTH OF TODAY

IN his speech to the Liberal Assembly last week, the retiring leader, Mr. Clement Davies, revealed that he had been invited to join the board of a television company of Wales which was in the process of being formed, and it would appear that he proposes to accept the invitation though, as he himself recalled, he had opposed the setting up of an independent television service. The apparent contradiction was resolved with these words:

"But there it is. It exists, and one is anxious that it should be giving the best service. I would be interested, if I could help, in seeing that the proposed company gave a service that was right for Wales, and that nothing was done which would offend Wales."

We are interested in drawing attention to this attitude not in order to add our off-stage hisses as Mr. Clement Davies takes his bow

before a wildly cheering audience (who were probably nevertheless largely responsible for hastening his retirement. *Le roi est mort, vive le roi!*) but because it is such attitudes that account for the bankruptcy of the Left and the failure of the intellectuals to influence any body of opinion towards change.

The attitude expressed in Mr. Clement Davies' remarks is a cogent summing up of all that is contained in reformism, in parliamentary Democracy and party politics. Apart from the fact that Parliament Party and Union congresses do not necessarily represent public or majority opinion, the attitude of the reformist is based on the view that society can be modified (a few still even talk of *changing society*) only by using the methods and instruments available to society to-day, as if the passing of time had converted them into some kind of absolute principle, the standard by which all actions, all systems, must be measured and assessed.

We are certainly not opposed to agitation, legal or otherwise which results in improvements in the conditions of the people. We are born into a society already functioning and ossified; with its customs, its values and its injustices. We cannot be held responsible for society being what it is until we understand what it is and why it is as it is! The youth of to-day, we are told, take a cynical view because "everything is so uncertain" or that "there is no future in the Age of the Hydrogen Bomb". This is all a lot of nonsense! What certainty or economic security had the pioneers of the Trade Union movement or the revolutionary movements of the last century? Compare the attitude of the Tolpuddle martyrs in 1834 with the Birmingham busmen-racialists in 1954.* Compare the fate of the Conscientious Objector in 1914 with his counterpart in 1956. Compare the struggling young artist and writer of bygone days with his modern counterpart coddled by an Arts

*See *Selections from Freedom* 1954, Vol. 4, p. 33: "These Workers are very wrong".

Continued from p. 3

NEW YORK LETTER

The Problem of Segregation

BEFORE a decision upon the constitutionality of segregation in public schools was evoked last year from the Supreme Court, volumes of preparatory work had shown that "separate but equal" facilities caused an unbearable burden on the people being thus equalized. The schools and toilets built as a result of the Court's decision 50 years ago that separation into equally good glass and concrete did not confer unequal opportunity upon the group being ethnicated against are now in some districts of the South supposed to be structurally comparable with those built for Anglo-Saxon education and excretion, but in most places Negroes have to make do with much worse.

However, the Supreme Court Judges were not considering the physical structure or the material value of buildings. The brief prepared by the N.A.A.C.P. made such considerations irrelevant and the real grounds for what would seem to be an obvious judgment were that Negroes who live in the Southern States were subject to the same psychological reactions as other human beings and Americans and that a child learning from the behaviour of those around him that he is in their sight to be a perpetual discriminator will grow up with predictable psychological disadvantages. Such behaviour exercised through public func-

tion is therefore "unconstitutional" and hence are segregated classes in public schools.

Whites desire Negroes to be educated for ignorance, obedience and a lack of initiative while accepting the values of white society to be desirable but unattainable, the more desirable the more unattainable. They want to keep Negroes happy to accept and maintain their own inferiority. They do not want Negroes to see them too closely in a free situation like the third grade at school where some Negroes will be at the top as well as the bottom. Mary Williams explained herself better than anyone else in a widely quoted remark about her newly integrated school-mates: "I would rather grow up to be an idiot than go to school with niggers."

It is very impressive that among Negroes in the South there are appearing so many people who have the courage to take on what seems to be the most dangerous job to-day in America—that of a Negro who is necessarily exposed as a militant. Mr. Fleming, an undertaker from South Carolina is organizing a \$100,000 co-operative market where goods can be bought and sold without interference from the White Citizens' Councils. For this activity his murder has twice been attempted and the sheriff, true to the form of sheriffs told him that he must have arranged to have the shots fired himself to stir up trouble.

Mrs. James Gordon stood in the photographed crowd as a warm, smiling woman comforting her children who wept after being turned out of the high school at Clay, not one person in that crowd able to detach himself from hysteria.

It is unpleasant but not surprising to find the traditional intellectual ignorance and emotional perversions of the South manuring so many magnolias still. It is even more unpleasant to be aware of an insensitivity and absent imagination

in the rest of the country. There is little indignation in the Press. The majestic *Times* is able to find space among speech-making puerilities for what it calls the problems of integration. How emotionally difficult it would be for the Whites if they were pushed too hard. Moderation is urged upon Negroes as if character disorders were not every day being sown in their emotions.

Meanwhile a sub-committee in Congress run by Southern Democrats is eliciting statements from high-school principals in Washington such as the one about the increasing "sex-problems" in integrated schools. More school girls are becoming pregnant now, the Committee hears, and flashes the news to mobs trying to evict Negro children from newly integrated schools.

The opposition to Negroes has come in any terrorist way likely to work: murder, threats of attack, bombs thrown through the kitchen window, economic reprisal against relatives of "uppity niggers", leases terminated, jobs taken away, arrests for technical offences with maximum jail sentences; combined with "legal" evasions of the spirit of the law. The Supreme Court rules that exclusion of Negroes from public parks is unconstitutional; public parks are therefore sold to a private manager. Virginia will withhold public funds from any integrated school and will subsidize private schools instead.

Negroes are using legal means only, a decision that was evidently made years ago by the N.A.A.C.P. after a period when Communists were exhorting Negroes to return violence with violence, form a separate nation or act otherwise outside the framework of the law. By specializing in lawyers and not agitators the Negroes have avoided as much violence as possible and have put the government in the dilemma of having either to do the Negroes' violence for them or to talk ever more piously and ingeniously to justify their inactivity. There are sparks of action. Chandler as governor of Kentucky orders reserves of the National Guard to escort the Gordon children to school with tanks and machine guns, but he soon ran away after the State's legal officials found a suitable rabbit hole. Eisenhower has blessed everyone as usual and for the moment the pressure is off.

But the decision must soon be taken by the Federal Government, less soon if Stevenson, a trickier talker, is elected in November, as Negroes continue to chip off chunks of the no man's land where politicians live between the principle professed and the action carried out. Some time the law will have to be enforced.

What are the Negroes compelling the government to enforce? The right that they may live as other less pigmented Americans—an aim that is quite revolutionary and one not needing revolutionary methods.

Government Organises Chaos in Cyprus

THE house curfew which has been imposed upon the people of Nicosia for the purpose of keeping 'order' has as far as we can see, had precisely the opposite effect, and can only lead to further resentment on the part of the Cypriots against the British.

The curfew has been in force since Saturday with one hour's break, and on Monday the ban was lifted again for another hour, presumably to allow women to collect food, but it is reported that when women tried to enter the municipal market their way was barred by policemen and troops with fixed bayonets.

Nobody was allowed to cross the barrier of barbed wire dividing the Greek and Turkish sectors, although the hungry people could see plenty of food stacked in the market. The *Manchester Guardian* correspondent writes (Tuesday, October 2nd):—

"Bakeries within the curfewed zone were the main objectives for shoppers who have now been under curfew for 69 hours. Crush barriers were snapped and glass cases smashed as hundreds pressed into a tiny bakery. Half of them returned empty-handed. In the narrow

side streets people without bread were offering twice the normal price to the lucky few who hurried away with a loaf under each arm.

"A policeman told the crowds that food would be available at the women's market within the Greek sector, but when scores of people ran there they found none. Old men shook their fists and women shrieked until a food van appeared—bringing one basket of lemons and one basket of marrows.

"As minutes dragged by and no food appeared, people in the streets shouted that they would defy the curfew and continue searching for food for their families. The situation was so tense that the period had to be extended by an hour to allow more food to come into the hungry city."

It is difficult for an ordinary observer to see what can be gained from such an action. If it is intended to harass the people into denouncing the 'terrorists' the chances are that it will have the opposite effect. This being so the authorities might have the further embarrassment of an outraged population on their hands whose only wish is for food. There are no signs that the curfew is being accepted placidly.

We're Sinking!

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT! WEEK 38

Deficit on Freedom £780
Contributions received £608
DEFICIT £172

September 21 to September 27

London: W.F. 1/9; Parma: H.P. £2/9/5;
London: J.S.* 3/-; London: Hyde Park Sym-
pathiser, 2/6; Welwyn: Joxer* 10/-; London:
V.T. per V.R. £1; Hessele: G.T. 6d.; London:
D.R.* 10/-

Total ... 4 17 2
Previously acknowledged ... 603 11 10

1956 TOTAL TO DATE ... £608 9 0

*Indicates regular contributors.

OUT OF THE FIRE INTO THE FRYING-PAN?

AGENCY reports state that the first of four groups of Spanish repatriates from the Soviet Union arrived in Valencia last week. The Soviet ship arrived in that port from Odessa with 355 Spaniards, 31 Russian wives and a total of 146 children. Most of these repatriates are believed to have gone to the Soviet Union during the Spanish Civil War or during World War II.

The repatriation had been announced some weeks ago. It was interesting to read the *Reuter* announcement in the *Daily Worker*. No comment was published, yet it seems to us that many readers of the *D.W.* will have difficulty in understanding the meaning of it. For surely the fact that these Spaniards are prepared to abandon the workers' fatherland for Franco's hell indicates that it cannot be so good in Russia as some of the Comrades make out. Even assuming the repatriates were originally fascists, are we to believe that after more than ten years in the Soviet paradise they have not been converted to their way of life, at least to the extent of preferring the Russian régime to Franco's? If they were of the intractable types they must have wished to return to Spain a long time ago. Why then are they only returning now, eleven years after the cease fire? And how many are still left in the concentration camps in Russia?

PEOPLE AND IDEAS A MATTER OF STYLE

A NUMBER of American readers have sent us copies of *The Reporter* for June 28th. This is a fortnightly magazine of facts and ideas, published in New York, which has since come on sale in this country. Its advertisements tell us that "Applying a unique conception of journalism, *The Reporter* presents and analyses the news with a thoroughness usually reserved for specialists". The issue sent us contains a short story by Eugene Burdick called *She Knew Prince Kropotkin*. The narrator of the story had come to London just after the second world war. Missing his stop on the underground, he came out in an unfamiliar part of the city and found himself, in fog and rain, wandering down Red Lion Street: "I came to a bookstore. On the window 'Liberty Library' was lettered in black paint by an amateur hand. I opened the door and went in".

The shop was filled with "used books" and magazines. "copies of *Liberté* and *Industrial Solidarity*, and a whole array of Spanish, Dutch, and French newspapers, all of them small and old. Everything in the place was dusty". At the back, a woman who was having tea invited him to look around. He picks up a book called *The Syndicalist Revolution*, a fictional account (presumably the book by Pataud and Pouget), of a revolution to take place in Paris. "All workers would simply put down their tools and declare to the bourgeois state that the price of their resuming work was to end the state. No trains would run, electricity would go off, sewers would back up and discharge filth into the houses of the bourgeoisie, communications would not exist, no buses (sic) would run. The whole novel drew an eerie picture of a whole complicated society faltering, grinding to a stop, and then starting to decompose".

But what really interested him was that the margins were filled with notes in a neat copperplate writing in red ink. "I deciphered the handwriting slowly and as I did the hair rose slowly on my neck. I could not believe my eyes". The book had said that the first task of the workers was to capture the bakeries in order to control the supply of food. But the marginal note declared:

"A mistaken and sentimental concept. The revolutionaries must at once destroy all of the bakeries. No one must eat in the first days of the revolution. Star-

vation will deepen the hatred of the masses; draw them together; unite them as no act can. Allow the masses, or the revolutionaries, to eat and drink their fill and they will at once become complacent. Everything must go without food... even if this means that large numbers of revolutionary comrades die".

Another marginal note read: "What is necessary is to dump twenty pounds of arsenic into the reservoirs of Tuilly and Grand Armée. The bourgeois will have diarrhoea so bad that they will not wander more than twenty steps from their water closets for a week".

While her visitor was reading these extraordinary notes the woman had finished her tea and asked if she could help him. "I had a quick impression that she was an upper-class lady come on hard times. I sensed how identical and drab her days must be, how repetitious the teas, how strong the longing for a country house". He asked her who had written the marginal notes and she told him that she had.

HE visited the shop several times and got to know her. She was Miss Pansy Warren-Gorer whose only other visitor was an old revolutionary "who had retired to a tobacco shop in Llandudno and promptly made a fortune from a chain of shops". Her father had been a wealthy man who had become a socialist through reading Fourier. A procession of socialists, anarchists and communists went through their home at Sevenoaks. Among them was Peter Kropotkin and she recalled that he had "a very gentle face and a soft black beard... By the time she was thirteen she had read every book and article Kropotkin had written. She went to anarchist meetings in London instead of going to matinees. She saw Kropotkin several times and he was very considerate and interested".

She believed it all until she really saw a revolution:

"Just before the first world war I went to Italy, to the little towns of the Romagna where the anarcho-syndicalists were making small local revolutions. I saw the peasants come marching in from the country armed with scythes, axes, sticks, and pitch-forks, a red flag flying at the head of the column. It was a sight to see".

But then it all fell apart. One third of the workers got drunk, another third went back to their farms and the rest started to set up a government. Then a platoon of cavalry came and finished

off the revolution. So then she took up Lenin:

"I saw Lenin arrive and heard his magnificent April Thesis and saw him take up the sodden mass of people and shape them into a revolution... And then it got out of Lenin's hands. He was surrounded by the power-seekers, the counter-revolutionaries, the scum. And then one day they killed Prince Kropotkin. He had come to Russia to see the successful revolution and they kept him under house arrest and he finally died of a broken heart... Since then I believe only in the revolution... the real and final revolution".

When her visitor declared that there wouldn't be a revolution in the United States, she turned on him. "Get out," she said. "I thought you were a revolutionary—someone to be taken seriously. Get out."

Later, in Llandudno, he discussed Kropotkin with the tobacconist.

"Ugly as sin he was," he said, "Black teeth, a bad breath, sallow complexion, and a runt for size."

"But his beard was beautiful."

"Awful it was. A scrubby thing, stiff little hairs like charged wires and all greasy. One of the worst I've ever seen."

YOU will have seen by now why American readers have sent us this story. It describes the "Liberty Library" in Red Lion Street, run by a woman who knew Kropotkin. Now Freedom Bookshop is in Red Lion Street and is run by a woman who knew Kropotkin. There the resemblance ends of course, but we cannot expect our readers and customers 6,000 miles away to realise that the Liberty Library with its dusty old newspapers is not Freedom Bookshop, and that the fanatical down-at-heel aristocrat with her ruthless ideas is not our bookshop's warm-hearted manager. The story is in fact what libel-chasers would call actionable. For us of course this is not important. It is a matter not of legality but of morality. What is important and regrettable is what the story reveals of its author and his standards of behaviour. *The Reporter* says that "Eugene Burdick is the author of *The Ninth Wave*, a current Book-of-the-Month choice novel. He writes about unexpected memories left in London by the extraordinary but remote Russian anarchist Prince Kropotkin". What his readers learn about Kropotkin certainly is unexpected. Mr. Burdick has chosen to give him a repellent physical appearance,

which is belied by all the memoirs of people who knew him, and by photographs. It doesn't matter tuppence what the poor chap's beard was like of course, but to describe him in these repulsive terms, merely in order to give the right twist to the end of a story, which the publishers treat as *reportage*, is a triumph of petty meanness.

Now the real Mr. Burdick didn't stumble into Freedom Bookshop in a fog. He came there after writing to ask for information for a Ph.D. thesis on syndicalism. He was given every possible assistance, files of papers were combed for him, introductions were given, rare books and pamphlets were lent to him freely for a considerable time by Freedom Press and by the editors of this newspaper. Nobody told him, like the intransigent Miss Warren-Gorer, to get out because he wasn't a revolutionary. It never occurred to anyone to ask. It was sufficient that he was a student seeking information.

Mr. Burdick knows all about us, all about syndicalism, and all about Kropotkin. And yet six years later, as a best-selling novelist who, presumably, doesn't

have to scrape together a story to earn a few miserable dollars, he writes of Kropotkin in a way which he knows will give offence to those who cherish his memory, he writes of revolutionaries in a pitiable rehash of the stuff spread around by *agents-provocateurs* of the French and Russian governments in the eighteen-nineties, and although he knows that *The Reporter* is bound to come our way, he has so little regard for our susceptibilities and our reputation that he invests the manageress of his bookshop in Red Lion Street with notions about putting arsenic in reservoirs, and so on.

The article following Mr. Burdick's in *The Reporter* is called "A Matter of Style". And that's really what it is. According to Mary McCarthy you can take university degrees in short-story writing in America. Too bad they don't include ethics. C.W.

Postscript for the Editor of *The Reporter*: You call Kropotkin 'extraordinary but now remote'. Your friend Lewis Mumford on the other hand, in a book just published, writes that Kropotkin's thought "will probably guide the future".

FREEDOM PRESS

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.

GEORGE WOODCOCK :

New Life to the Land 6d.
Homes orhovels? 6d.
Railways and Society 3d.
What is Anarchism? 1d.
The Basis of Communal Living 1s.

RUDOLF ROCKER :

Nationalism and Culture cloth 21s.

E. A. GUTKIND :

The Expanding Environment 8s. 6d.

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 SANSOM :

Syndicalism—The Workers' Next Step 1s.

TONY GIBSON :

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

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.

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

OPEN DAILY

OPEN 10 a.m. to 6.30; 5.0 SATURDAYS
All books sent post free, so please get your books from us. We can supply any book required, including text-books. Please supply publisher's name if possible, but if not, we can find it. Scarce and out-of-print books searched for.

New Books . . .

From the Other Shore
Alexander Herzen 15/-
J.-P. Proudhon
George Woodcock 28/-
The Post-War Condition of Britain G. D. H. Cole 35/-
The Notebooks of Simone Weil (2 vols.) the set 56/-
Must Men Starve? J. Oser 25/-
The Political Philosophy of Bakunin 30/-

Reprints . . .

The English, Are They Human? G. J. Renier 15/-
Cultural Patterns and Technical Change Margaret Mead, etc. 4/-
The Meaning of Evolution George G. Simpson 3/6
The Theory of the Leisure Class Thorstein Veblen 3/6

Second-Hand . . .

Ideal Marriage T. H. Van de Velde 15/-
The State Franz Oppenheimer 9/-
The State: Its Origin and Function William Paul 6/-
The Rise and Influence of Rationalism in Europe William Lecky (2 vols.) the set 6/-
Life and Letters of Robert Ingersoll 8/6
New Horizons J. T. Murphy 6/-
Aseff: the Russian Judas B. Nicolaievsky 5/6
It Can't Happen Here Sinclair Lewis 3/6
William Medium Edward Hyams 3/6
The Monk and the Hangman's Daughter A. de Castro and Ambrose Bierce 3/6
The Execution of Private Slovik William Bradford Huie 4/-
Cry, the Beloved Country Alan Paton 4/-
The Daring Young Men on the Flying Trapeze William Saroyan 3/-
The Yogi and the Commissar Arthur Koestler 7/6

Postage free on all items

Obtainable from

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

Anarchism and the Bourgeoisie-2

(Continued from last week)

There is only one aspect of anarchism which can be said to give even the flimsiest excuse for the Marxists' attempt to dub anarchists as 'bourgeois'. That is the anarchist distrust of 'bigness' in industrial undertakings and social units, with its inevitable centralisation of control.

For the Marxists, centralised planning by State organisations represents the only answer to the chaos of private competition. But anarchists maintain that from the point of view of what is best either for the workers or for society as a whole, State control has failed, where we have seen it in practise, to move in the directions we desire. For the workers in a nationalised industry, the change from private owners to State managers has meant nothing more than a change of masters. For the consumers, it has meant neither better service nor cheaper goods. For both, it has meant that authority and State monopoly have strengthened their grip on our lives.

It should be recognised that, although Marxists claim to have the same goal as anarchists—the free, classless society with the means of production and distribution held in common and operated for use and not for profit—the two approaches are fundamentally different. The Marxist is an historical determinist. He thinks in terms of historical processes, of immense, super-human forces inexorably unwinding the contradictions of human society as expressed through thesis, antithesis and synthesis in the class struggle, which is itself a reflection of economic progress. In this apocalyptic movement, man is a means to an end.

But for the anarchist man is himself the end. We want to see social forces serving human beings, not the other way round. For us, the person here and now is what matters and 'advances' do not impress us when they have to be bought by the suffering of even small numbers of people who are being cheerfully disregarded by those with their eyes fixed on the future. And when, as in Russia, millions of people are coerced into suffering for generations in the interests of the eventual millennium, we are not impressed because, at the cost of that suffering and indignity, great industrial plants are now churning out huge masses of products under State planning. Products, incidentally,

which, being planned by the State, are always produced and distributed to serve the interests of the State.

For the anarchist, the goal is the freedom and fulfilment of each and every individual. The bourgeoisie are quite happy to destroy the freedom and frustrate the fulfilment of those below them in the social and economic scale—by fixing their opportunities for educational and cultural development and condemning them to a restricted, exploited life. The bourgeoisie, whether it is the old-style *petit* bourgeoisie or the new bureaucratic middle class of managers, will fix, as far as they are able, all means of expression and development of those below them so that they continue to stay below them and serve the interests of the bourgeois. And it is very interesting to observe how the interests of the bourgeoisie are always put forward as the interests of the nation.

It is possible for them to do this because they do have control of the economic life of the nation. In old-style capitalist countries their purse-strings are the effective reins around the neck of society. In the new-style socialist-capitalist countries, the bureaucrats, through their control of the State machine, exert their power over society. Both kinds of bourgeoisie make the workers dance to their tune. If they introduce welfare schemes or educational facilities it is for their purposes, not out of philanthropic regard for the workers' welfare as such. Employers and managers need healthy workers who are sufficiently educated to work in an advanced technical society.

The old-style capitalist employer works as an individual, competing with his like and therefore demanding freedom of action in order to manoeuvre, the right to do what he likes with what he has won in the free-for-all. He resents interference with himself although he is quite prepared to restrict the freedom of those he employs. If he steps on the faces of those below him in his climb to the top and his efforts to stay there, well that's just too bad. But he needs individual freedom in order to operate as he does. And because he is an individualist he tends to keep his enterprises down to the size which he can control himself.

Competitive capitalism, however, is an expanding economy. He who stands still tends to start sliding downhill in the rat-race. The economy

itself makes for bigger and bigger units, for combines and eventually monopolies. The workers have long since ceased to count as persons and as enterprises expand so too do the founders of the business lose their identities and are replaced as providers of capital by relatively anonymous share holders and as administrators by managers, boards of directors and so on.

As undertakings get bigger, human relations count for less and less. The individual is swamped by the machinery of management. In opposing this process the anarchists are not trying to return to the rule of the *petit-bourgeoisie*—we are stressing the importance of the responsibility of the individual and of human relations to human beings.

We are not concerned with the impersonal movement of historical forces. We are concerned with the freedom and fulfilment of human beings. For this reason we advocate that industrial and social units should not swell to such monstrous proportions that individuals cease to count; that we should organise our productive processes so that workers are not made irresponsible cogs in a machine.

Now there is only one way in which this can be achieved. That is by the workers themselves asserting their responsibility right on the spot where they are responsible—at the point of production. It is there where the worker produces good or shoddy work, makes pots and pans or bayonets and bullets, is exploited and yet makes his contribution to society.

But this demand for devolution does not necessarily mean the rejection of modern technology. It means the de-centralisation of economic administration into the hands of the workers and the recognition that they should have the right to decide for themselves the techniques they adopt to deliver the goods. We can hardly believe that the workers in control will operate methods which are an affront to their dignity as human beings.

This conception of workers' dignity, while it stresses the importance of freedom for each individual, has in fact less in common with the *petit* bourgeois perversion of freedom than has the equally middle-class idea of State control. These are both expression of class rule. The anarchist idea is of the absence of rule by one class over another—even the mythical 'dictatorship of the proletariat'—in the establishment of a classless society. P.S.

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

Vol 17, No. 40. October 6, 1956

Notes on Reformism and Youth Today

Council or boosted by his publisher and the publicity machine to a ninth-edition (at the time of writing) at his first attempt. The youth of to-day have all the things that were denied their parents. They have all that the reformists and a war economy can provide. They enjoy a more enlightened educational system, conducted in better surroundings; the attitude to their sexual impulses is more tolerant and understanding on the whole; they have relative economic security (the pre-war dole queue has dropped from more than 3 million to less than 200 thousand); trades-unionism has become respectable—it's the non-union man who is liable to lose his job or be sent to Coventry; and last, but not least, the "bright boy" is now so much in demand that "class-background" is no barrier to advancement.

It behoves those who are the propagandists of the new society to understand why the youth of to-day is cynical and as the French put it *m'en foutiste* (don't care a damn). Most anarchists take the view that the higher the standards of education and living the greater are the chances of the anarchist social revolution succeeding. We cannot therefore share the view of the middle-class-shop-keeper class that youth is what it is to-day because "things are made too easy for them". Or if we do then we must be prepared to give-up our ideas and our activity!

We do not profess to know the answer to the problem and our gropings are only put forward as an incitement to discussion among our readers. We believe that Man is strongly influenced by his environment. But if we did not believe that he was (or at least that some people were) as likely to react against, as be moulded by, their environment, we could neither believe in progress nor the free society.

Whilst it can be said that at no time in the past hundred years have the material prospects of youth been brighter, never, we believe, have the "spiritual" influences been as weak and confusing as in this post-war decade. Politically the disintegration dates back to the Russian Revolution in which principles (based, incidentally, on solid experience and not on what latter-day 'progressives' derisively dismiss as dogma) were sacrificed to expediency. Intellectually even more serious than the capitulation of the intelligentsia at the outbreak of the "anti-fascist" war in 1939 was their impotence—where it was not a case of connivance—in the cold-war between the power blocs of East and West after 1945. Looking back over the past ten years one is forced to the conclusion that the lack of a McCarthy witch-hunt in this country is not so much the result of a vocal, militant intellectual *avant-garde* than the lack of any active, revolutionary opposition worthy of the name. (Welcome as may be a Bertrand Russell's second thoughts on the political struggle we cannot forget the damage created by his Atomic-war-mongering utterances in the early years of the cold war).

FOR those of us one generation removed from the present young generation, what is striking in our elders is that though we came to reject their political views and their morals we recognised that they had principles which governed their way of life; that whilst we could question their approach to the problems of life we could not but respect their integrity. To-day, we feel, youth not only questions the approach of their elders (as is nat-

ural) but—and this, we believe breeds their cynicism—also their integrity. We live in an age of double-think, in the age of reformism; in which wrong is right in the "best of causes"; in which right is wrong reformed by amendments and safeguards (or as Mr. Clement Davies suggests by having right people operating wrong causes!); an age in which right is obscured by wrangling over how wrong a wrong can be.

DONALD SOPER, who has for so long resisted our persuasive—and attractive—anarchist heckler at his Tower Hill meetings, appears to have suddenly seen the light, if one is to judge by his most interesting "Message to Blackpool" in last week's *Tribune*. Would the situation in this country change for the better—he asks—if the Tories were "kicked out" and Labour took over? Forgetting Labour policy over Persia, and Seretse Khama (that is the double-think of political parties—one way when they are in opposition and the opposite when in power) he optimistically asserts that

It is tolerably certain that more conciliatory actions would be taken in Cyprus and a larger appreciation of the economic needs of the Egyptian people would take precedence over prestige and gunboat ethics.

But then, he adds "is there enough real difference in principle between official Conservatism and official Labour?"

His answer is: "I fear not" and for the reason that

This crisis in the international arena can have a most distracting effect.

A man suffering from acute toothache tends to forget his chronic arthritis, but the arthritis still remains to be treated after the affected tooth has been pulled out.

Although bringing peace and democracy to Cyprus, and arriving at a peaceful and more or less just settlement with Nasser are as immediately imperative as pulling out a bad tooth, they will still leave this country afflicted with the political arthritis of capitalism, and in spirit and in temper we are a capitalist society yet.

Getting down to bedrock, no Labour Party can advance a programme which will be sufficiently different from the Tory programme unless that Labour programme is an out and out Socialist one.

The trouble, according to Donald Soper is that

We [the Labour Party] have been too attentive to the armchair theorists who have warned us of the improprieties of trying to set up Socialism in this country without possessing in advance a complete blueprint of the future.

We have got what we deserve—a decline of faith and a snuffing out of the spirit of adventure. Worst of all we have taken a too cynical view of human nature and refused to believe that the very effort to transform society does in fact transform men.

To those who say that we are not morally ready for such a revolutionary programme and such a new society, let me commend the oldest of all adages: "You never know what you can do till you try."

The trouble with Donald Soper is that he is not prepared to preach in the wilderness. For him it may be a dilemma (personal or political) to choose between speaking on a platform (the Labour Party) with which he is, if one is to judge by his utterances, in complete disagreement, and cutting himself adrift from political parties and advocating revolutionary socialism (which we think differs little from anarchism). But it seems to men "in the wilderness" such as J. B. Priestley, Bertrand Russell, Herbert Read *et alia*, he wants to eat his cake and have it, and as a result, though he may remain in the public eye, his impact on trends of thought is considerably reduced, or even non-existent.

THE thunder of the Left has been stolen by the showmen of Television, Radio and the Popular Press. so-called Socialists and Tories slang one another (though referring to each other by their christian names) on these programmes just as clowns in the circus hit each other over the

FROM THE RUSSIAN PRESS

Soviet Ministries at Work

FOR weeks now everything in Russia has been geared to the bringing in of the crops. Agitators have agitated; Communist leaders at town council level have appealed for more work from the men and women in the fields; the whole weight of the Party apparatus has been thrown into the drive for the biggest harvest ever. Nature interfering, the harvest has not turned out to be so good as was envisaged by the planners months in advance. But the bond peasants on the State and collective farms have done their best despite the bungling of the bureaucratic controllers at every level. Contempt for the working-man being so strong in present-day Russia, he has been told to get on with the job whether promised amenities of the very simplest kind were forthcoming or not. (Mobile shop services failed miserably and labourers on the land were all too often dying for a smoke for days. *Kvass* and rusks of black bread were in too many places staple diet while the harvest was being garnered, though field kitchens were supposed to operate where no other cooking facilities were to hand).

This and every other harvest being so important for the Soviet and its system of State capitalism it might be expected that the harvesting of the nation's bread crop would have been treated almost like a military operation. But though they had at least nine months' time in which to plan every detail, the Ministries concerned fell down on the job.

Pravda Worried

As well it might be, *Pravda* was worried and set out a special correspondent, one D. Shumsky, to look into things.

NEW ARISTOCRACY

Hungary's Communist leaders have come under fire in a Budapest newspaper for being "more aristocratic than the Hapsburgs." An article in the weekly newspaper *Irodalmi Ujsag* complains that whereas even Archduke Josef's children used to attend an ordinary state school before the war, the Communist leaders' children were educated privately. "They do not shop with the workers, but have special well-stocked stores for themselves, and even on holiday at Lake Balaton they bathe behind barbed wire fences with police guards to keep the workers away," the article complains.

—Reuter.

Let us cite his short report from the paper of the Communist Party of the USSR (268/13931).

In these late September days every single collecting point for the ingathering of the harvest attached to the stations up and down the North Kazakhstan Line is packed out with grain. All in all, something like fourteen million (14,000,000) poods have been collected in this one corner of the Soviet. (A pood is a little over 16 kilos). There was an urgent need to get the stuff away as quickly as possible. Actually, it has been altogether a slow business.

Harvest Seen from the Desk

Work on the loading and despatching of all this wheat was so slow that the Cereal Products Ministry of Kazakhstan decided it would give a helping hand. But not in loading. Theirs was a simple task. All that was required was to increase the amount of grain due to be put on rail during September by an extra 100,000 tons. (Easily said from a desk!) To get the wheat moving it was therefore planned to transfer rolling-stock to the number of 14,583 cars from the Omsk, Karagandinsk, and South Urals railroads.

The Ministry was proud of its effort and asked the people on the spot if they were pleased or not. Naturally the reply was: "We sure are!"

But everybody had counted their chickens too soon. Being the nearest to the affected area, the Karagandinsk Line did send a certain number of rail-cars; but neither of the other two lines did so. On the contrary, the South Urals Line cut down their rolling-stock quota marked for extra duty in Kazakhstan by 2,300 cars. Omsk held back 600 cars.

Urgent queries went through to the management at Omsk: "Why are you holding us up on the harvest here in Kazakhstan?"

The Omsk rail people were astonished. They claimed that they had more than met their obligations to the harvesters away down to the south of their Siberia; had, indeed, "overfulfilled" their planned help. It finally emerged that they had not been informed of any proposals to swell the stream of cars to be sent south to carry the so urgently needed wheat. There was no real liaison between the Ministries controlling the same class of administration in the different "republics"!

At Petropavlovsk the folk responsible for the loading and despatching of the wheat cars flashed distress signals direct to the Cereal Products Ministry of the

USSR, getting in touch with Comrade Stepanov, deputy Minister for Cereal Products.

"Don't worry; we'll soon straighten this out," he assured them. "I'll contact the Rail Transport Ministry, wire the managements of the railroads concerned, and everything will be settled satisfactorily. You can rely on us to make this a top priority."

Like the other bureaucrats Comrade Stepanov also asked if this decision was satisfactory. But the days passed and no rolling-stock rolled in to whisk away the bounty of the fields.

Comrade Stepanov was approached once again, this time in person. The matter was really getting urgent. Asked the wheat collectors: "Where is this help we were promised?"

"Everything necessary has been done. We have issued the necessary instructions."

Meanwhile, Shumsky concludes, the railmen have to be guided by the previous plans based on a smaller number of cars and the wheat is being held up; and in the meantime the functionaries in the different Ministries conduct their negotiations.

Whether under Soviet State capitalism or the capitalism we know, bureaucracy is everywhere the same: dilatory and over-cautious, yet utterly careless of the interests of the common people over whom it lords it so contemptuously.

I.P.

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*
 each volume paper 7s. 6d.
 cloth 10s. 6d.

The paper edition of the Selections is available to readers of **FREEDOM** at 5/- a copy

Obtainable from
FREEDOM PRESS
 27 Red Lion Street,
 London, W.C.1

BIPARTISANSHIP

THERE are still a large number of people who claim that they can distinguish a difference between the Conservative and Labour parties. But they must find it more difficult every day, and I fancy that some of them must have been on the verge of giving up when they read a recent pronouncement from Sir Hartley Shawcross.

Speaking at West Bromwich, where he opened a new comprehensive school, on September 27, Sir Hartley said that he did not know of a single member of the Labour Party who could afford to do so who did not send his children to a public school.

"Much nonsense is talked about equality," said Sir Hartley. "There cannot, of course, be absolute equality; it would be a very dull, drab world if there were. The social and material advantages of a prime minister and a ploughman, of a brilliant man and a dullard, of a hard-working man and an idler will never be equal. Nor should they be. We do not want to level everybody down to mediocrity."

"The Communists have shown by experiment that absolute equality means absolute stagnation. (!)"

"There will always be an aristocracy. But it should be an aristocracy of merit, intellect, and achievement rather than of birth. And for that aristocracy all children, by equality in educational opportunity, should be enabled to compete."

It is possible, of course, that Sir Hartley, who has been absent from political life for some time, has forgotten which party he belongs to. But as things are, such forgetfulness would be unlikely to cause him any embarrassment.

Still, until recently it was the Conservatives who usually talked in such a muddled way about equality. Until recently they were the ones who profited most from inequality.

The trick in this line of argument is to confuse an exhortation with a statement of fact. Those of us who say that all men are equal are not asserting that everyone is the same in every respect.

What we are doing is to urge that no one should arrogate to himself privileges withheld from others merely because he is stronger or cleverer or because he was born in a particular country or to particular parents. Why should a genius be given special rights and privileges and a stupid man refused them? Surely the genius is fortunate enough in the gifts that nature has bestowed on him without needing man-made distinctions of class or rank? Just why should the "social and material advantages of a prime minister and a ploughman" never be equal?

It is a fiction of our judicial system that "all men are equal before the law". And a great deal of lip-service is paid to it. But would Sir Hartley and other advocates of inequality openly attack it and assert that a man of power and privilege should receive specially favourable treatment from the courts? Is it not monstrous that a man of eminence should be "levelled down to mediocrity" and fined as much as a common labourer? In practice, of course, the man of wealth and privilege is often let off more lightly than members of the common herd, but we are not supposed to notice this favouritism, having been assured that the courts dispense justice impartially to everyone.

Another thing Sir Hartley should tell us is just when did the Communists show "by experiment" that "absolute equality means absolute stagnation"? Which Communists? Where?

As for an "aristocracy of merit, intellect, and achievement", this is one of the hoariest superstitions of all. The aim of any aristocracy is to safeguard its own interests at the expense of others. As an intelligent aristocracy would be more likely to be successful in this I can see nothing to recommend it; for, not being a member of an aristocracy, my interests would be among those to suffer.

I must leave it to readers to puzzle out why some newspapers refer to Sir Hartley as "the Socialist M.P. for St. Helens".

E.P.

LETTER FROM CALIFORNIA

The Problem of Power

MOST anarchists are familiar with the problem of social or political power: the enforced control of one individual or group by another individual or group. Many of us see that this socially coercive element is present in practically every phase of our daily lives—from womb to tomb. Whether it be in our education system, our housing, our work, our prison system; our relationships between each other, to the community or to the state—someone is in position to wield power for determining our appropriate behaviour. Libertarians are well aware of these forms of power; consistently, FREEDOM writers devote most of their copy to a discussion of the power motive. We want to know what influences create the authoritarian mentality, and how we can best implement the free-society here and now.

Inasmuch as the problems of social power has, and is being adequately covered elsewhere, I'll do no more here than indicate the presence of this issue. In my judgment power is not a specific condition local to human relations. It has a far greater implication: it is a basic attitude, a state of mind. As an illustration of this, observe sometimes the everyday reactions of a conscientious authoritarian personality. I know a few, and have had occasion to observe their behaviour over a period of years. They will purchase a particular type and model automobile and home; their personal outlook, even as regards choice of food and dress, is consistent with their attitudes towards others, towards their physical environment, and towards even the most minute detail in relation to work and recreational activities. Of course, it would not be possible to generalize this situation, and say for instance, that the power-orientated individual drives a Buick and plays golf, whereas the freedom-orientated individual rides a bicycle and plays the flute. No, the matter is not subtle and obvious in this respect, even though it is entirely possible to predict the behaviour of an authoritarian personality through sufficient insight into his existing life-pattern.

By establishing the power-motive as a state of mind, and consistently related to a definite pattern of living, it might prove valuable to our purposes to determine in what manner this motive becomes expressed in daily life. In this way, we as libertarians might avoid those areas of

living which contribute to the perpetuation of power-seekers. We might thus avoid being exploited in wage-slavery, or coerced by authority. Also, through sufficient comprehension of power-orientated machinations, we might better evolve a consistent pattern for the free-life.

I see the expression and exertion of power in three lights:

1. Social power in human relations.
2. Economic power in work activities.
3. Physical power in the environment.

In every phase of life we are challenged and confronted by power-seekers. The alternatives to conformity are becoming more and more limited, as our very lives become engulfed through a conspiracy of systematic pressures—from public opinion, through advertising, to out and out detention by the State. I see and read of instances every day, where the effect of power sources destroy and dehumanise. On the social level I read about a hundred odd prisoners in Georgia, voluntarily breaking their legs in a desperate attempt to minimize the power that is wielded over them; on the economic level I see thousands of workers herded into factories and offices—there to begrudgingly tend the machines of industry and progress; I see an instance of man's physical power over his environment as I write this. In the valley far below me, the local lumber mill belches a majestic pillar of smoke day and night throughout the year. Thousands of tons of sawdust are consumed, while in the forests, slashed waste is legion. Here, man overpowers his environment. With his efficient bulldozer and chainsaw he levels the earth, and lays it bare for erosion, drought, and fire. And in the valley below, the effect of man's power over the living elements—with his system of gang-ploughing and artificial fertilization—is seen in depleted soils and inferior, poisonous foodstuffs.

The problem of power is a comprehensive problem. This view is little appreciated—or at least little represented—by anarchist writers. We deceive ourselves into thinking that the free society hinges only on the elimination of the state and the authority it represents. True, the state symbolizes the prime-mover towards individual servitude, and with its elimination the individual may come to react accordingly, in a life-giving

and positive attitude. However, it is authoritarian personalities which constitute the state—from the petty district judge in our area to the top dictatorial echelons in Washington. Also, it is the power-motive that holds this system intact, and as we saw, this negative influence contaminates every aspect of our lives. So we would do better by working with original causes, the power motive itself—and let the symptoms of social disintegration disappear on their own accord.

★

It is therefore my contention that man's exercise of abnormal power sources—over his fellow man, over his economic livelihood, and over his physical environment—constitute the root cause of the inhuman, unjust, and irrational social complex that presently infects the world community. In remedy I feel that there is only one action to take—individually, as families and small communities, in demonstration and re-education for more normal living.

From the above presentation only, this argument would hardly suffice. Pointing out defects of our present power-orientated system can be done with much greater ease and faculty than the positive values which are intended as substitutes. In place of social power I would instil an attitude of co-operation and love; in place of economic power I would project an attitude of sympathy and enjoyment; in place of physical power I would encourage an attitude of inspired control and appreciation.

It might now be possible to bring this concept down to actual cases. I will point out one instance of a corrupting power source, and what I have personally done to eliminate it. During my weekly visit to the village not long ago, I was confronted by one of our leading citizens, a successful merchant and an extremely domineering, power-orientated personality. He seemed to take it as a personal affront, the fact that I was the only person in this area without electric service. His attitude reminded me of a time in Grammar school, when one boy failed to bring his dime to class for some worthless "drive", making it impossible for our group to achieve a perfect record. I remember how we were all up in arms over the matter, until one student loaned the boy a dime and there-

by saved the day. At any rate, I attempted to point out to this merchant clearly and exactly what my objections to electric power were. I tried to reach through to him by arguing on his own level of comprehension. Electricity, I said, is not economical. I have devised hand- and foot-powered equipment that will outperform his power-operated machines—in terms of less initial cost, less depreciation and maintenance, and with greater safety and personal satisfaction. A wind-powered electric home-generator will supply equivalent lighting at a fraction the commercial rate; my wind-mill will supply water with minimum upkeep. I have a hand operated washer (called the NEW ERA, and patented in 1909) which does a satisfactory job of washing clothes with minimum effort—and a clothes wringer, also hand operated, which is only slightly less efficient than a motorized outfit.

Needless to say, this sort of reasoning only creates an even more severe antagonism with the average materialist. I began to have the feeling that the basis of this antagonism was jealousy: I was freed from a substantial electric bill each month, and had no need to patronize his establishment for the gadgets and conveniences of modern living, whereas he was dependent upon the system for his daily welfare. There is nothing more worthless than an electric stove when the electricity is cut off!

With fervour, he accused me of "going backward", of denying myself the pleasures and conveniences of natural heritage. God, or man's inventive nature, or the State, or somebody gave us all these wonderful devices to use. You cannot stop Progress. Electricity has saved man time and labour. Women, for instance, can now engage themselves in intellectual and cultural pursuits, whereas before they were virtually domestic slaves. And so goes the argument. Of course, from my point of view, they are not founded on true fact, nor is the alternative between the "neo-technic" (completely motorized and modernized) and the "paleo-technic" (the traditional, primitive and laborious) fully understood. There is a middle way. It has been called by some the "bio-technic", the utilization of natural forces and resources to satisfy man's total physical and psychical need.

★

THE true bio-technic approach involves the means as well as the pattern. In some instances it becomes advantageous to adjust one's life-pattern so as to receive full benefit from the particular solution that is developed. Most of our desires—especially if we live in a large city—have no natural basis or relationship. We flit from one passing interest to another and are plagued with all manner of tastes and appetites, often conflicting and always uncertain. This is the state of affairs that develops when man becomes able to flick switches for light, warmth, coolness, or transport through space. He loses a close contact with the natural order of things. The human tempo is replaced by the artificial pace of constantly moving parts.

It so happens that convenience and labour-saving are the two aspects of electricity more often presented as major advantages for its use. They are also the two major disadvantages that I see in using electricity. The exertion of economic power in our work activity has certainly been as successfully devastating as the exertion of social power in human relations. Whereas in the latter event we have lost the capacity for love—and now end up on the brink of racial suicide—as regards the work experience we have lost the capacity for satisfaction and a joy-in-work expression. As a result of this power approach we employ any expedient means to "save" labour: from specialization to mechanized equipment. Now this isn't to advocate drudgery.

Malatesta Club

Regular nights of opening from now on will be:

Every Wednesday.
Bonar Thompson at 8 p.m.

Every Friday.
Open.

Every Saturday.
Social & Entertainment
OCT. 6: 9 p.m. LEMON TEASE.

Every Sunday.
London Anarchist Group meeting. See announcement column.
Mondays, first three Tuesdays of month, and Thursdays—CLOSED.

AFRICAN FORUM MEETING

Tuesday, October 16, at 7.30 p.m.
African Forum meeting: Joseph Murumbi (formerly Gen. Sec. Kenya African Union on

MULTIRACIALISM IN KENYA & CENTRAL AFRICA.

The Export Drive

Ammunition in Demand

A GREAT deal has been said in recent years about Britain's increasing inability to compete in foreign markets; now there comes a report from the British Productivity Council, full of praise and back-slapping which tells us of an industry which has been very successful in the export market, due to its high standard of efficiency and increased productivity. It is none other than the ammunition industry.

In a pamphlet published this week entitled, "Review of Ammunition", the Council falls over itself in congratulating the Royal Ordnance factories and private ammunition contractors on their magnificent achievements.

Sample extracts from the report reveal varying degrees of excitement; firstly there is controlled admiration:

"Some idea of the results of increasing productivity can be gained from the fact that prices of many types of ammunition have not risen in ratio with wages and costs of materials: of some types, indeed, prices have even fallen, during the past five years."

We need more
Readers...

Are you introducing
the paper to
potential Readers?

And to follow, gratification by comparison:

"It will be realised that largely to have absorbed these increases (rising costs of labour and materials) represents a considerable achievement—one which can be equalled by few other branches of manufacturing industry."

And furthermore there is restrained enthusiasm:

"One of the most striking impressions gained by the visitor to any Royal Ordnance factory is of the keen interest displayed by all grades of staff in attaining the utmost efficiency in the factory and the constant effort..."

But lastly a note of unreserved wonderment:

The ammunition industry's solution of seemingly insurmountable problems at the start of the war by work study "provides a classic example..." "Even to-day... such instances are rare in British industry."

★

The most interesting feature of this report is that it proves what everyone already knows, that if one is sufficiently experienced with a certain type of problem, and have had plenty of practice in trying to solve it, then there is every chance of success.

Britain has had more experience and practice than any other country in the manufacture for re-sale of armaments and ammunition. She has sold these goods to almost every country in the world at one time or another. This in addition to making them for home use more often than any other country. It is hardly surprising therefore that she has become so expert.

"Ammunition is a dollar-earning export, since most foreign sales have been

to N.A.T.O. countries under the United States 'off-shore' procurement programme. It may be said here, in parenthesis, that the success of Great Britain in this field is a further indication of the increases in productivity which have been secured."

★

There it seems one difficulty which faces the ammunition industry; neither of the two principle outlets for its production—Service requirement and exports—is sufficiently consistent from year to year to "permit long-term forecasting of requirements." It continues on a somewhat hilarious note: "Export orders cannot be forseen for obvious reasons."

To judge from the state of tension which constantly exists wherever Britain is maintaining a "strategic outpost of Empire" it seems to us that neither the Royal Ordnance factories nor the private ammunition contractors need worry too much about the grim possibilities of foreshortened contracts. They might not know who the next customer is going to be, but they may be certain that there always is one just around the corner.

The report ends on an "optimistic" note by saying that the process research now going on and in particular the interest maintained, should ensure that should "the need for expansion again arise" Britain will be in a far better position to meet it than in 1939.

If prices of goods which we need rise sky-high, and we can hardly afford to buy them, do not despair, there will always be a cheap source of ammunition. Probably we shall be able to get it for nothing—together with a rifle and khaki suit.

If a person's life were simplified there would be no occasion for distasteful labour. Every work experience would be latent with joyousness and self-fulfillment. Nor is this a romantic ideal, it is an actual fact and is being lived consistently by an increasing number of people (see Scott Nearing's *Living The Good Life*).

None of the art technics have been mechanized, except on a commercial scale. In dancing, painting, music or craft activities, the artist still retains control over his medium. It is not power that he wields over his canvas, it is control. Most painters even prefer a natural, northerly light exposure instead of the artificial tungsten lamp. Why should not every life-activity be permeated with the same esthetic quality as the artist creates in his specialized profession? As Eric Gill said, an artist is not a special kind of man but every man should be a special kind of artist.

All these thoughts and experiments in living have, in the final analysis, only one basis: the attainment of a more significant and abundant individual freedom. Great progress has been made in libertarian thinking during the past fifty years. The next logical step is to implement our thinking and form autonomous communities of non-authoritarian personalities. Through group demonstration and through the development of re-education centres, the full and effective impact of the free life may finally be appreciated by all. Power sources in these communities, as well as the human resources, should be autonomous, self-sufficient and decentralized. Absolute control should be vested in each community unit with sovereign individuals responding through voluntary co-operation.

KEN KERN.

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:

OCT. 7—S. E. Parker on
POWER & RESPONSIBILITY

OCT. 14—Alec Craig on
A RECENT BOOK BANNING

Questions, Discussion and Admission
all free.

OPEN AIR MEETINGS

Weather Permitting
HYDE PARK
Sundays at 3.30 p.m.

MANETTE STREET
(Charing X Road)
Saturdays at 5.30 p.m.

MEETINGS IN SHEFFIELD

Every Sunday at 3.30 p.m., outdoor meetings are held by the Sheffield Anarchist Group at BARKER'S POOL.
Speaker: George Peters.

Sunday, Oct. 7:

Guest Speaker: Philip Sansom

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 Freed, and addressed to the publishers

FREEDOM PRESS
27 Red Lion Street
London, W.C.1. England
Tel.: Chancery 8364