

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"Love, work and knowledge are the well-springs of our life. They should also govern it."

—WILHELM REICH.

Vol. 18, No. 7

February 16th, 1957

Threepence

WHO TRICKED FORD WORKERS?

IF the Ford motor workers feel that they were tricked into going back to work last week, there is ample justification for it.

The issue of the dispute, as we discussed last week, was the dismissal of a shop steward, John McLoughlin, because he rang a hand-bell to call his shop out on strike in protest against the suspension of three other stewards for attending a union meeting without permission.

This was in the works of Briggs Motor Bodies, a neighbouring subsidiary of Ford's, who took it over a year ago. Seven thousand workers in Briggs came out in support of McLoughlin and that brought the main plant of 15,000 workers to a standstill also.

The strike was of course unofficial and the union officials hurried on down to persuade the men to go back to work so that negotiations could proceed. McLoughlin had been first suspended, then dismissed when the strike spread, but the union got an agreement from the management to withdraw the dismissal, leaving McLoughlin suspended while negotiations began. The strikers, it will be remembered, went back to work on the condition that McLoughlin's reinstatement be negotiated within 48 hours.

Now who was kidding whom is a little difficult to discover. Was the management fooling the union leaders, or were the leaders fooling the strikers, when it was announced that McLoughlin's dismissal had been withdrawn?

They Want Discipline

For the one and only concrete decision that has come out of the union-management talks has been that McLoughlin is sacked and is going to remain sacked—as far as the management is concerned. The first announcement of this, made by the management, backed up their decision by saying that Ford's were determined to 'maintain industrial discipline in their plants'.

It seems unlikely, in view of this intransigent attitude, that Ford's agreed to withdraw McLoughlin's dismissal in the first place. Did they agree to let the union make the announcement simply in order to get the men back to work? Did both

the management and the union officials hope that once the men had all gone back the initiative would be lost, tempers would calm, the issue be forgotten if negotiation dragged on?

If this is so, then the union leaders are guilty of a very shabby trick upon their own members. Such a trick the workers should expect from the employers, but were probably not expecting from their 'own' officials.

The Real Organisation

The fact of the matter is, however, that the trade union officials are jealous of the influence of the shop stewards at shop level. This is the real organisation for industrial workers. It is on the workshop floor that the strength of the workers is concentrated and all that the union hierarchy can do is to reflect that strength in their 'top-level' discussions. But the shop stewards are the moulders—and the wielders—of that strength directly at the point of production, where it matters most.

And inasmuch as here is frequent division of opinion between the rank-and-file and the leadership, the shop stewards' organisation, being the voice of the rank-and-file, frequently comes into conflict with the 'higher interests' of the union bosses. This is also the case with those political parties who set out to 'lead' the working class.

Labourites, Stalinists and Trotskyists alike have found it difficult to do as much as they would like within the workshop organisations. Always the political interests of the theoreticians have conflicted with the organisational interests of the militant workers. After all, leaders with political interests set out to use the workers' organisations to further their own ends—but the workers on the spot—according to the clarity with which they can see they are being used—think otherwise.

A Channel for Top Policy

Similarly the trade union hierarchy want the shop stewards simply to be a channel through which policy decided upon from above can filter through to the membership below. Unfortunately for the hier-

archy the operation in fact goes the opposite way—the workers make their demands known to the stewards and—if necessary—they pass it on 'upwards'.

Nine times out of ten, however, issues raised by the workers at the bench are dealt with at shop level by the stewards, who speak to the management not with the badge of office, but with the strength of the workers right behind them.

It is precisely this strength which Ford's are now challenging and seem determined to crush. And perhaps the workers of Ford's—and indeed throughout the whole of industry—will now see that their union leaders are not too much opposed to the idea themselves.

For in their arguments with the management over the dismissal of McLoughlin, the union leaders are not challenging the dismissal as such. They are not saying that the reason for his discharge was wrong, or that in any way he has been wrongfully dismissed.

They are asking for his reinstatement—in any one of the firm's other plants elsewhere in the country if necessary—only as a move to better industrial relations in the future.

Yearning for a Quiet Life

In other words, what these leaders of men are doing is begging of the employers not to make things difficult for the future. Yearning for the quiet life, these tough negotiators

have long ago left the clutter of the factory for a secure job with a comfortable salary—unaffected by slumps or disputes—with positions to maintain and expense accounts to help them maintain them.

They don't want any trouble—from either side. Although the dismissal of McLoughlin is a clear piece of victimisation (he has been a shop steward only a few weeks and it could easily have been another who rang that fateful hand-bell) and he has already been given a martyr's crown by one T.U. official, it is on no issue of principle that the leaders object. It is pure expediency.

For the rank and file, however, important principles are at stake. Ford's are setting out to crush the shop stewards' organisation in the great cause of establishing industrial discipline. 'Industrial discipline' in this sense means only that the boss has the right and the power to do what he likes—and the workers must put up with it.

Grim Days Ahead

Trouble has come late to Ford's. The redundancy battles which shook the Midlands last year left the Essex industries untouched—until now. But now the cumulative effects of falling sales and Suez are making themselves felt. Add to this the fact that Ford's are building a new automated plant alongside the old. There

are grim days ahead for Dagenham, and the bosses are going to try to take advantage of them to impose their power over the workers.

Unfortunately, all through the years when the workers had the initiative they thought of nothing more than getting overtime and television. A few have started buying their own houses—in what may soon be slump towns. They have voted for social security in the form of hand-outs from the Government.

But nowhere have we seen attempts made to win the real security: control of the means of production and distribution. The workers of Britain have enjoyed a period of prosperity—but it was capitalist prosperity, built upon the shifting sands of money markets. And they have been content to remain hired hands in other people's factories.

If they accept the boss's right to hire and fire, they can hardly complain when he exercises it!

Land at £180,000 an Acre

Mr. C. W. Gibson (Lab., Clapham) asked the Minister of Housing and Local Government yesterday what was the estimated cost per acre of the acquisition of 24 acres of land in the City of London covered by the compulsory purchase order on the land between Aldersgate Street and Moorgate, south of Javin Street and Fore Street.

Mr. H. Brooke stated in a written reply that he understood from the City Corporation that the average cost of this land, only part of which was acquired by compulsory purchase, was about £180,000 an acre.

Reflections on a 'Manchester Guardian' Editorial Government and the People

WHEN Parliament was being asked to vote a Supplementary estimate of £39 millions, of which £30 millions was to pay for the Suez venture, it was pointed out by the Chairman that it was not "in order" for the House to discuss how far the armed conflict was the creation and responsibility of the Eden government. He ruled that the diplomacy that led to the spending of the £30 millions fell outside the limits of discussion. He suggested, however, that Members had enough ingenuity to discuss how this money was spent without trespassing in these forbidden technical and constitutional domains.

Such post-mortems are pretty futile—the debate over Suez was no exception—and the voting of the Supplementary Estimates was a formality, since the money in question had already been spent in any case. Presumably the government would have to resign if the vote went against it, but in the event of a new government being returned to power it would still have to meet the bills of its predecessor, just as happens in any business which changes hands! The only difference being that governments are spending the public's money and not their own, and clearly have powers to do this without consulting the public.

SUCH matters are not simply questions of cash. They involve the whole problem of governmental power in a "democracy". And this aspect of the question has been given particular emphasis by the Suez armed intervention. Many sincere democrats are perturbed by the lack of democracy in the parliamentary

system. In an editorial on the "Power to Decide", the *Manchester Guardian* (Jan. 29) asks:

How is it that a Government can go to war without first obtaining Parliament's approval and without even consulting the Opposition leaders? This aspect of the Suez venture still troubles many people.

As the *Manchester Guardian* points out, in the case of the Suez venture not only were these two conditions not satisfied, but the ultimatum to Egypt was "very much Sir Anthony Eden's personal responsibility", for even the Cabinet was divided. "Is it right that the Prime Minister should be able to override his senior colleagues and assume virtually dictatorial powers?" These are "important questions" declares the *M.G.* Indeed, the *Guardian* goes even further by suggesting that not only are there "obvious" dangers in concentrating "so much power" in the hands of one man but the danger is present even if the whole Cabinet is involved, "when it is subject to no immediate check". But—and here the Liberals reveal themselves in their true colours—"The dangers of dispersing responsibility may be greater". The *Guardian* then proceeds to expound on the benefits of one-man government:

The Prime Minister is the only person who is continuously in possession of all the information relevant to policy; the onus must fall on him.

That, surely, is just what Stalin, Hitler, Mussolini and their fellow dictators always maintain! And the *Guardian* does not convince us when it adds:

If any Minister disapproves of the action taken he is not bound by any doctrine of collective responsibility to

silence his doubts; he has the option of resigning. The same applies to members of the Government party in the Commons. That these checks to the Prime Minister's powers failed over Suez (at least until the stage when a ceasefire was agreed) is not the fault of the Constitution, but of the individuals involved. The Cabinet must be autocratic; but, as Lowell wrote nearly fifty years ago, it is

"an autocracy exerted with the utmost publicity under a constant fire of criticism, and tempered by the force of public opinion, the risk of a vote of lack of confidence and the prospects of the next election."

It would be difficult to concentrate more confused thinking in one

Continued on p. 3

Stalinism Stays in East Germany

THE disastrous results for the Kremlin of the half-hearted attempts at liberalisation in the satellites has made such attempts unlikely in East Germany.

Especially have recent events in Poland made it necessary for the Russians to maintain their grip on the seventeen million Germans east of the Oder-Niese line.

All through the turmoil Walter Ulbricht—as secretary of the Socialist Unity Party the effective ruler of East Germany—has taken his line from Moscow. The importance of the Soviet stake in his country being what it is, he was unlikely to be allowed to do anything else.

Therefore, although (somewhat belatedly) Ulbricht paid lip-service to the de-Stalinisation line laid down by Khrushchev (how long ago that seems!) not the slightest attempt was made to put any of its implications into practice.

Some sections of the population, however, are not quite satisfied with

this. Unrest was felt among the students at the time of the Hungarian rising—and still is. Several East German newspapers reported last Sunday that there were student disorders at Dresden, Halle and in East Berlin over the Hungarian situation.

Now serious economic effects of the Polish change over are beginning to be felt. Poland has drastically reduced the supplies of coal she was forced to send to East Germany, which is going to create more and more difficulties for Ulbricht's state.

Industrial production has fallen by an estimated 5,000 million marks in 1956 and agricultural production is still so low that food rationing has to be maintained. 280,000 refugees crossed into West Germany last year.

With many other problems looming up, Ulbricht will try to continue to rule with an iron hand. Stalin's methods will remain until the people decide otherwise.

Don't Stop Now!

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT!

WEEK 6
 Deficit on Freedom £120
 Contributions received \$85
 DEFICIT £35

February 1 to February 7

Liverpool: H.H.J. £3/11/0; London: B.L. £2/5/0; Headcorn: H.K.H. 10/-; London: K.M. 1/5; London: Anon. 9d.; London: J.S.* 3/-; London: S.E.P. 5/-; Chicago: R.Z. 7/-; Sevenoaks: B.J.R. 2/-; Surbiton: F.N.F. 5/-; London: D.B. 1/-; Kingston: J.C. 3/-; Oxford: Anon.* 5/-; Leeds: M.F. £1/1/0; Glasgow: J.M. 3/-; London: H.F. £1/1/0; Uddington: M.S. 11/-; Belfast: Anon. 6/-; Nottingham: K.N. 1/-; Avening: N.H. 6d.; Birmingham: H.R.D. 11/-; Saffron Walden: A.R. 5s; Tonbridge: H.V.W. 1/-; London: M.P. 1s; Skegness: R.M. 2/-; Edinburgh: C.M. £1/1/0; Edinburgh: W.M.C. 1/-; Ipswich: W.D. 11/-.

Total ... 19 10 8
 Previously acknowledged ... 66 4 2
 1957 TOTAL TO DATE ... £85 14 10

GIFT OF BOOKS: London: F.W.L.

UNWILLINGLY TO SCHOOL

"And one of the tragedies of our day and age is the arts graduate trained in discrimination and taste who must go off to teach English in a secondary modern school in Bolton".

—MALCOLM BRADBURY in "The Twentieth Century", February, 1957.

"One of them, who was a good pianist, told me that life had first acquired a purpose for her when he (George Lukács) set her to tour the elementary schools of the capital, playing Beethoven's sonatas to the elder children".

—H. N. BRAILSFORD in "The New Statesman", February 9th, 1957.

THESE two sentences from current periodicals epitomise two opposite conceptions of the social rôle and responsibilities of the educated person. Mr. Bradbury's arts graduate acquired his discrimination and taste from scholarships and maintenance grants provided by the rates and taxes of his indiscriminating and tasteless fellow-citizens, but for him to have to take a job involving sharing his attainments with their children is a tragedy. Mr. Brailsford's dispossessed aristocrat who got her mastery of the piano because her family lived off the labour of others, found that her life had a purpose for the first time when she was encouraged to share her love of music.

How did the poor old Bachelor of Arts get that way? The new number of the *University Librarian** contains a partial answer in the form of a 'Cry from a Training College' by Monica Hall who asks, "Just how useless is a 2nd Class Arts degree to a young woman with no money?" When she failed to fulfil her parents' hope that she would find a wealthy husband at the university, she went on to a Teachers' Training Col-

*THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIAN No. 2, Winter 1957, (1/- by post from Freedom Bookshop or from the publisher, 13 Bannerman Avenue, Prestwich, Manchester. Annual Subscription 2/10d.).

lege to be turned into a 'professional person'. She found out that:

"We are not expected to educate the children in the schools, we are expected to train them, to force them into a state of anxiety to get on, to 'pass' the 11-plus examination, to despise and leave the ways of the class of their origins and to take on a ready-made set of values manufactured in the schoolroom by their 'betters'. I should know, for I have been through that mill myself, very successfully . . ."

"The system, it seems to me, is not designed to equalise the social classes, but to perpetuate them. The working class is to have the brains creamed off via the schools; but the workers as a class are not to be allowed to go their own sweet way. They are to be drilled into a pattern of subservience to values which people higher up the social scale openly mock at. In a word they are to be vulgarised, and the school-teacher is the agent of this process."

Similar reflections come from Tony Gibson in another article in the *University Librarian* on 'The Grey Generation', the present generation of students. The whole process through which the young go, he says, is one of successive screenings:

"They are screened at the age of 11 and then allotted to the appropriate types of schools. A few years later, the more academic types are again screened and those who pass through the sieve go to the university. All through their school lives various educational, social, hereditary, psychological, economic and imponderable factors are at work on each individual so that the one that ends up the right shape and size to pass through the university sieve is a very specialised product. In the course of children's development *docility* undoubtedly plays a very important part academically . . . It is no wonder that as a by-product of our version of free educational opportunity, coupled with the examination system, we have bred up a new student generation remarkable

for its docility and lack of independent thought."

But, he notes, the trend of social conformity and unthinking compliance with authority is only a trend. "A great deal depends upon the minority section both among students and in the senior common rooms, which the majority like to regard as the lunatic fringe".

Perhaps Miss Hall is a representative of this minority. In her article she writes:

"What concerns me is just what we are doing with the knowledge we have and the intellectual power we wield. If I understand anarchism right, it is an attempt to investigate the validity of the claim made by the State to control and organise the whole field of social action; to question, in fact, the State's very justification to existence. I am myself the result of the State's incursion into the realm of education . . . But I think that now I will bite the hand that has fed me for so long—the Welfare State. I like the look of its schools even less from above than I did from below. Maybe there is a way round".

WELL, maybe there is. It consists in changing the school from within. If it is simply a question of 'the State's incursion into the realm of education', then working on the hypothesis that the State has usurped the function of the community, and that the State is weak by the degree in which the community is strong, the thing to do is to foster a different incursion, by for instance, Parent-Teacher Associations.

But the question isn't really as simple as that. I have met in the Ministry of Education's citadel in Curzon Street, people with ideas as enlightened as those of A. S. Neill, who complain that they cannot persuade those stick-in-the-mud teachers to adopt them. And down our street there are parents who complain

that their five-year-olds do nothing but play at school when they should be getting ready for the grammar-school exam.

Apart from this, it is very easy to exaggerate the effect of conscious State policy in schools. Such a variety of authorities, great and small, are concerned—the Ministry, implementing the series of Education Acts, the County Councils with their Education Committees and Directors, the HMI's the school managers or governors, and the individual teachers and head teachers—that it is crediting the State with an omniscience it hasn't got, to regard all this as a monolithic machine bent on churning out a standard product. As Tony Gibson remarks in talking about his conformist students, "Creeping fear of a nebulous THEY gives more substance to it; we run the risk of clothing the bogey with more power". The eleven-plus examination, for instance, is not a requirement of the State, and many education authorities have abandoned it. The LCC is pursuing an educational policy at variance with that of the Minister of Education. Again, think of the influence of head teachers. You might get a headmaster like Teddy O'Neil or the last Alex Bloom, or in the same area one of those who sends girls home for wearing ear-rings, or boys for not wearing ties. Finally think of the importance of individual teachers who are a much more potent influence on the child than most distant authorities.

IN another of the *University Librarian's* features (a broadcast address by Alex Comfort to the Northern Fifty-One Society and the discussion that followed it, on 'How Bad are Britain's Morals?'), a headmaster from Bolton (the place where Mr. Bradbury thinks it tragic to send a B.A.), declared that par-

Continued on p. 3

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

OPEN DAILY

- New Books . . .
- Counter Attack (to Subtopia) (ed.) Ian Nairn 12/6
 - The Hungarian Revolution George Mikes 12/6
 - From the Other Shore Alexander Herzen 15/-
 - P.-J. Proudhon George Woodcock 28/-
 - The London Years Rudolph Rocker 25/-
- Second-Hand . . .
- The Popes and Social Problems J. W. Poynter 2/6
 - The Skin Curzio Malaparte 3/-
 - A Short History of the English People J. R. Green 4/6
 - Prophecy of Famine H. J. Massingham and Edward Hyams 4/-
 - Sex in History Gordon Rattray Taylor 10/-
 - The Life of Lord Alfred Douglas William Freeman 5/-
 - Against the Law Peter Wildeblood 6/-
 - The True Voice of Feeling Herbert Read 6/6
 - Behind the Throne Paul H. Emden 5/-
 - The Royal Way André Malraux 4/-
 - Speaking for Myself Lady Robert Simon 2/-
 - The Fifth Column and the First Forty-nine Stories Ernest Hemingway 6/6
 - Tramping on Life Harry Kemp 4/6
 - What They Said at the Time Kathleen Freeman 3/-
 - From Cobbett to the Chartists (ed.) Max Morris 2/6
 - A Handful of Blackberries Ignazio Silone 3/6
 - In Tyranny (the Struggle against Tyranny in Germany) 3/6
 - Contemporary Portraits (Fourth Series) Frank Harris 5/-

Postage free on all items

Obtainable from

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

Some Factors Affecting Emotional Development in Children—I

In spite of the many books on Sex Education—some good, some bad—which are now available there is still much ignorance contributing to maladjustment and unhappiness in child and adult life. The writer has attempted in this essay to bring together some facts which he considers important in the hope that they may be of help to those who are, as is often the case even in these days of supposed enlightenment, groping in the dark. Within a short article selection and condensation are unavoidable, resulting in an apparent emphasis of a small part of a vast subject. The reader is asked to take this merely as an introduction. As a guide to further reading a bibliography is given at the end.

A FRIEND of mine once said: "I shall bring up my son to be a man." An admirable sentiment, most people will agree. But consider the implications of the statement. The nineteenth century attitude to child training, as typified by the fictional Mr. Fairchild¹, has almost vanished but there are still many parents who, without adopting the extreme repressive methods of the Victorians, regard their offspring as clay to be moulded to some preconceived shape.

Every child is an individual with his or her own personality and the aim of all parents should be to cultivate that personality, not to suppress it. The child should be treated with sympathy, tolerance, love and understanding, and those responsible for the youngster's up-bringing should realize that no two children develop at the same rate, so that training must be adjusted to suit the physical and mental growth of each individual boy or girl.

If more regard was paid by parents to the principles of self regulation² there would be less neuroses in later life than there is amongst the peoples of the Western World today. There is much that can be learnt from a study of methods of child training employed by less civilized societies.

A great amount of harm has resulted from the too literal interpretation of the work of those who have done much valuable investigation into the subject of child development. The published results of such research (which mostly emanate from the USA) have, as they reach the public, tended to reduce the findings to statistical norms, so that parents, who are acquainted with the popularized accounts of the work of such noted experts as Gesell, tend to take the information too literally and are inclined to worry unnecessarily should their child be apparently retarded or precocious in development.

Even parents unfamiliar with the writings of the various investigators often become anxious if their child's development lags on that of the youngster next door. Such unsophisticated parents are not helped by the tendency in parents of more precocious children to become rather smug about the progress of their own offspring.

All parents should be informed of the wide range of individual maturation³ and that unnecessary worry about the slower child's adaptation to social mores may have deleterious effects on the youngster. Children are quick to sense parental anxiety. It should also be pointed out that the Gesell research has been on children in the United States and cultural differences may invalidate some findings where European

children are concerned. For instance, the average age for the onset of puberty is lower in the USA than in Europe.

The minimum requirement of parental training and schooling is to produce an individual who is a useful member of society but, unfortunately, this minimum seems to be the sole aim of most who are concerned with the guidance of the child towards maturity. The complete objective should be to assist the youngster not merely to be a useful member of society but to be ultimately capable of leading a full and happy life.

This requires not only that the youngster should be made aware of, and helped to appreciate, the cultural background of the society in which he or she lives but that the child grows up with the emotional stability and freedom from anxiety which are necessary for the complete enjoyment of all that the world has to offer.

Here it is the intention to consider only a few of the many factors contributing towards ultimate complete and satisfactory orientation, but these factors are the most important of all, pervading the whole life and those which, more than any of the other aspects of living, can make or mar the ultimate happiness of the individual. These are the factors influencing the sexual life of the child.

Much adolescent and adult neurosis, maladjustment and many tendencies towards delinquency can be traced back to faulty handling of the manifestations of sexuality during the early years of life when the foundations of character are laid⁴.

Such emotional disorders quite frequently stem from deprivation in childhood. The deprived child is not necessarily the youngster who has the misfortune to be, for any of various reasons, the inmate of an institution. He or she may be the child of those who are considered by the community to be "good parents".

Many adults, even in this age of supposed enlightenment, take a restrictive view of childhood sexuality and the parent who severely suppresses any overt expression of the young child's libido is very likely to be repressive in other aspects also.

Repression in any form is a sign of antagonism and a denial of complete love. The child who is denied full parental love and affection is not being given the assistance needed for future complete and satisfactory orientation. Studies of deprived children show that such unfortunate youngsters often lack the ability in later years to express such emotions as love and affection for others⁵. They are, therefore, in their turn, less likely to be satisfactory partners in marriage or parents.

Restrictive parental attitudes, particularly towards sexuality, may not only adversely influence the future happiness of the individual but frequently result in noticeable character and physical traits in the child concerned. Often the emotional trauma is obvious even to the casual observer (for example, pronounced thumb sucking or enuresis) but less noticeable are such manifestations as muscular tension in the child. An otherwise apparently healthy child, subject to repression and partial emotional deprivation, may frequently be found to suffer from this physical tension with the consequent inability

to relax⁶. The difference between the rigidity of the deprived child and the lack of bodily tension in the youngster free from repression and given his or her full share of parental love can be observed by anyone who takes a young child into his arms. Those who are fortunate enough to visit those countries where love of children is traditional (Southern Italy, for example) cannot fail to be impressed by the lack of tension in the children there.

Emotionally deprived children are also, it might be mentioned in passing, very frequently backward in scholastic work and the impatient and unsympathetic teacher can contribute very greatly towards the unhappiness of such unfortunate youngsters. Punishment for lack of ability can be disastrous.

Later manifestations of incorrect parental sexual attitudes include the fear with which many young women approach childbirth. The subject is too great to be dealt with here but there seems to be in many cases a correlation between the pain experienced during delivery and previous childhood emotional training⁷. Besides its impact on childbearing, faulty sex education also accounts for much of the discomfort felt by some women during menstrual periods.

Satisfactory sexual orientation is, then, not just the result of correct and adequate sex education but is also influenced by the attitude towards sexuality of those with whom the child is in most intimate contact. Particularly damaging to the youngster's emotional development can be the realization of a double standard of morality in those responsible for his or her up-bringing. An attitude far too frequently adopted by those in charge of children is that which is summed up in the phrase: "Don't do as I do; do as I say." It cannot be too strongly condemned.

A.C.F.C.

(To be continued)

¹ "The Fairchild Family" by Mary Martha Sherwood (1847). Extracts appear in "Victorian Vista" by James Laver (Hulton). There is an excellent chapter on the Victorian era in "Sex In History" by G. Rattray Taylor.

² See: A. S. Neill: "The Free Child"; Ethel Manin: "Commonsense and the Child"; "International Journal of Sex-Economy and Orgone Research"; "Annals of the Orgone Institute, 1"; Jean & Paul Ritter: "Self Regulation"; B. Leunbach in "International Journal of Sexology, Vol. 1."

³ See: J. M. Tanner: "Growth at Adolescence"; R. W. B. Ellis (ed): "Child Health and Development"; Jolly: "Sexual Precocity".

⁴ See: Pearson: "Emotional Disorders in Children". For the particular case of sexual delinquency see Karpman: "The Sexual Offender and His Offences". Karpman points out that abnormal sex behaviour can derive from an unwholesome family and social atmosphere in which the child develops, parents who are themselves products of unhealthy repression being unable to be frank and open with the child. He also indicates that a good deal of the blame for later sexual neurosis can often be placed on the family physician.

⁵ See: Bowlby: "Child Care and the Growth of Love" (An abridgement of a larger work prepared for the WHO); R. W. B. Ellis (ed.): "Child Health and Development"; Ford: "The Deprived Child and the Community"; Burns: "Maladjusted Children".

⁶ See "Annals of the Orgone Institute, 1"; "International Journal of Sex-Economy and Orgone Research".

⁷ Grantly Dick Read has written on the topic of painless childbearing. See also: Jean & Paul Ritter: "Self Regulation" (part I and supplements).

Government and the People

Continued from p. 1

paragraph than is contained in the foregoing! In the first place, let us emphasise the passage in which the *Manchester Guardian* hands it on a plate to the anarchists. The failure over Suez is "not the fault of the Constitution but of the individuals involved". In this remark the voice of liberalism admits that many members of the Cabinet and of the Tory back-benchers were opposed to Eden's policy yet the corruption of power was such that they were not prepared to resign their posts or their seats as M.P.s. Why? We are not given an explanation. But neither is it explained how, if it can be shown that senior Cabinet Ministers were—and let us not mince words Mr. Editor of the *Manchester Guardian*—unprincipled in not resigning, it can be assumed that the Prime Minister is himself above such charges. Either the man chosen of the post is a fallible human being, like the rest of his Cabinet, or he is the superman—which leads us to the Stalin-, Hitler-, Pope-myth of infallibility! A dangerous proposition solely for a democrat?

We cannot but conclude that the problem is just the opposite of what the *Manchester Guardian* and such governmentalists (and lawyers, too) as Lowell maintain; the fault is not with individuals—who are fallible—but with Constitutions—which give them power on the assumption that as individuals they are infallible!

★

LET us examine the *Manchester Guardian's* quotation from Lowell for one moment: the Cabinet is referred to as an *autocracy*. The definition of autocracy is "absolute government"—surely a bad start for democracy! But what is absolute government "with the utmost publicity under a constant fire of criticism, etc.?" The answer is still absolute government. Lowell's safeguards are no more than a kind of Gallop Poll to see how far the government can go without risking open rebellion. To-day Lowell's safeguards are no more than a farce or just wishful thinking. "Utmost publicity"—why, not even the *Manchester Guardian* which quotes him (let alone the *Daily Express* which has only heard of Kipling and Livingstone) can think straight, for has it not told us that the Prime Minister is the only person who is continuously in possession of all the information relevant to policy? And has it not even quoted the Chairman of the Commons as saying that Members could not discuss the "diplomacy" that led to the spending of the £30 millions on the Suez venture? And if the *Manchester Guardian* is sincere, and cherishes its reputation, why does it not admit that more often than not the government "hand-outs" it publishes in its columns are meant to deceive the public and not to enlighten it.

(A case in point. When two months ago U.N.O. took over salvage operations in the Suez Canal, the British government which wanted to undertake the task itself—for reasons known only to Eden—declared that without British participation the Canal would not be cleared until sometime in late summer. Yet last week we learned, if we searched in the inside pages of our newspapers, than an Italian vessel was actually making its way through the Canal, and that by the end of March 10,000-ton ships could negotiate it. We were also told at the height of the anti-Nasser cam-

Bulgarian Students & the Regime

THE war over, in Bulgaria thousands of young folk left the army and entered the University. The government trumpeted abroad the liberty of advanced education, and the young people, avid of study, hastened to profit from the generosity of the "people's government". Entry to the University was free in fact during the first two years after the end of the war, and the number of students was considerable. In 1946 there were nearly 5,000 students enrolled in the first year course of medicine, and an equal number in the second year. The number was just as great in the other faculties, as well as at the newly-created polytechnic.

But the means which Bulgarian higher education had at its disposal were not sufficient to provide for the needs of this mass of students. There was a shortage of lecture rooms, and during 1946-1947

for example, the course of biology in the Faculty of Medicine took place in the Slaveikov Cinema. It became very soon necessary to restrict the number of students, and the selection was made in two ways.

In 1948 it started with the exclusion of hundreds of students of the Faculty of Medicine, of the University and of the Polytechnic. The sole crime of the excluded students was of having had for parents former business men, industrialists or officers—for most often these students were favourable to the idea of democracy or even of socialism.

On the other hand, numerous students, above all at the Faculty of Medicine, were not able to pass their examinations, and had abandoned their study or even changed to another faculty. So that at the end of the sixth year the 5,000 students at the beginning were no more than about 1,000.

Measures were also taken to limit the number of students accepted on entering the faculties. Entry to the University was forbidden to the children of all those considered to be "enemies of the people". All the others were compelled to take an entrance examination. About a tenth were accepted, theoretically according to their merits, but there were numerous exceptions to the rule, and certain students were accepted on orders from above.

In short, the students were picked out so as to represent an élite, faithful to the government, who counted on these future professors, doctors and engineers to aid it, not so much to serve as to enslave the people.

The enthusiasm of the early days did not last long. Since 1947-1948 there had already been some disappointments, for several reasons. On the one hand, at the University, the dictatorship had been prompt to take away the independence of the University Council, in order to create a servile administration, whose purpose was to suppress the liberty of the students. The students, on the other hand, bitterly resented the obligation of enrolling in the work-brigades which imposed heavy labour on them during almost all the holidays. The popular support of the brigades was nil, and their essential rôle was to mould the young people in the image of Communism. Finally, it was humiliating to be obliged to sacrifice all individuality on the altar of the collective deity.

The administration became more and more severe in regard to the students. It was absolutely obligatory to take part in the practical work and attend all the lectures; it was absolutely obligatory to submit to the examinations at the end of the year, only one further chance

being allowed for failures; it was absolutely obligatory for all students to study the Russian language and Marxism; also it was always obligatory to prepare the practical work in advance.

The students had to submit or abandon their studies. The youth organisations were in the hands of the régime, and served as intermediaries between the administration and the students. They had neither the right nor the courage to defend the students, and the latter had to submit. But submission does not mean obedience, and the discontent grew, betraying itself often by manifestations small in themselves but of great significance.

Certainly, it is obligatory to attend all the lectures, the students attend but do not listen to the lecturer. They speak, and often the noise is such that one hears indignant remarks between students, "Don't make so much noise, I can't hear what my friend says!" Many a time and oft the lecturer has been forced to break off his discourse. . . .

It is obligatory to study Marxism and Russian. In the case of Russian, the students learn it without conviction or application. As regards Marxism, resistance is a more dangerous and delicate business, but it is also perhaps more intense. First of all, students sought to avoid the study of it, but the holders of the chairs of Marxism (there was one in each faculty) and the Youth Organisations lent no support to this. If the recalcitrant was not convinced by their "process of persuasion" they had recourse to the administration, and in the end the obstinate student was reduced to failing the examination, and starting the year's course again, or to abandon his studies, according to the gravity of his case.

Besides this direct resistance to the teaching of Marxism there was another means which often was used, with a thousand precautions of course, which consisted of questioning the "fundamental truths" of Communism.

Those students who chose this means profited by the "free" discussions on the Marxist classics to put questions, or to hazard heretical ideas, in the most innocent manner in the world, and allowed themselves to be "convinced" by the Communist speaker, happy to be able, by his brilliant eloquence, to dissipate the doubt in these young souls. But the questions were put, the thoughts formulated, and once the "discussion" was finished, the students continued to discuss with each other, in little groups, between friends, treating the same questions in a different fashion, seeking the truth. And, as the different groups of students and the different faculties did not have their discussion sessions on the same day, a way was found to transmit the question to be asked to those who

were prepared to put them in the course of their "discussion". "Ask, and see what he'll say." And, as before, the questions were put, and the replies were given, but the real discussions only begun and continued, more or less in secret, after the session.

The organisation of the Communist Youth has been, since the beginning, used against the students as an instrument of oppression. The students replied by boycotting first all the enterprises of a cultural nature, then the political ones, which was trading on much more dangerous ground, succeeding at last in blocking all the life of the organisation. In its annual reunions it was often necessary to make great efforts to find someone who "desired" to speak.

The rôle of the students in the social life was very important, the State counted on them a great deal. The secretary of the Communist Party organisation in one faculty even had to say one day, "The students are the barometer of public opinion." But it is a long time since this barometer has been "set fair" for the Communist régime. The militia was the first to complain of the students. From 1953 the militiamen concerned with traffic control announced that they were going to impose fines systematically on all the students, because "they never conform to the rules of the road". Almost at the same time the services of State Security were up against still greater problem. They had much difficulty in recruiting among the students young folk who wished to serve as agents of the secret police. This reached such extent that their surveillance was insufficient in certain colleges, and the Faculty of Medicine and the drama college escaped them almost entirely.

The struggle that the students carry on, in their own way, is not directed by any organisation. The keeping up of relationships between anti-Communists is dangerous, and the very existence of an organisation of this sort is impossible. This spontaneous resistance is not the result of foreign propaganda—as the Communists would like us to believe—nor of the action of secret agents who have entered the country. All the population has been for years equally the victims of the Communist terror.

STEP.

(Translated by Arthur W. Uloth).

In Brief

Democracy at Work in the Middle East

ADEN, FEBRUARY 10.

Villagers of Danaba, in the Western Aden Protectorate, were warned to-day that their homes will be wiped out to-morrow morning unless dissident tribesmen are handed over to the authorities. A messenger was sent yesterday to tell them to leave. To-day's warning was given in leaflets dropped by R.A.F. planes. The pilots said the village appeared to be deserted.

Aden officials say that Danaba has been used as a base for raids by dissident tribesmen and has sheltered the ringleaders of an attack on a patrol last week in which two men of the Cameron Highlanders were killed.

A communiqué yesterday said that most of the villagers had been bribed by Yemeni authorities to stir up trouble against the Emir of Dhala, the lawful ruler of the area.—*Reuter*.

Egyptian Woman's Hunger Strike

CAIRO, FEBRUARY 8.

Mrs. Doria Chafik, the Egyptian suffragette leader, went into hospital to-day to carry on her hunger strike against "the dictatorial régime in Egypt" and for a solution of the Palestine problem. Her husband, Dr. Nurreddin Ragai, said she would continue under medical care the hunger strike she began in the Indian Embassy on Wednesday night when she surprised the Ambassador, Mr. Ali Java Jung, by asking for asylum.

It was learned later that Mrs. Chafik went to the Moro Hospital in Cairo, where she was released after an examination by doctors. "We do not know where she is now," hospital officials said. She left the hospital with her husband.—*Reuter*.

Legalised Barbarity

WEWAK (NEW GUINEA), FEBRUARY 10.

The Supreme Court here has sentenced to death 40 tribesmen on murder charges arising from the massacre of 29 members of another tribe at Upper Sepik River last August.

Evidence at a lower court hearing said that one tribe invited another for a meeting to settle old tribal differences. The tribesmen exchanged gifts and broke spears. Then, at a given signal, the hosts fell on the guests with spears.

Unwillingly to School

Continued from p. 2

ents must be brought far more into the life of the school, and he welcomed Dr. Comfort's remarks on the need for changed attitudes towards the sexual activities of children and adolescents.

Alex Comfort in his address points out that discussions of morality are usually about irrelevancies or things of little or no social importance, while they ignore the fact that "one of the most serious moral problems facing us to-day is the way that our country has been led to adopt unlimited war against civilians as a permanent military policy". It is more than a shift in morality, he declared:

"It represents an actual invasion of public policy by mental disorder. But this issue and the other big moral issue of to-day, our relation to the underdeveloped countries, are not usually on the agenda of the guardians of public morality. In many cases the evidence of degeneracy which they bring forward is not that our national policies are unworthy of our private manners, which is true, but that there isn't enough aggressive behaviour to-day—we don't flog children and criminals, or burn witches or torture heretics and pervers, nearly often enough."

This aggressiveness hasn't gone out of our society, he observed. "It won't, I think go, until there is a great deal more social purpose in our society, one of the things it almost entirely lacks". The discussion following his address ranged over such topics as delinquency, non-religious ethics, and adolescent sexuality, and he concluded:

"I think that the heirs of our dying morals, if you like to call them that, will be 'conditions of happiness' suited to the enormous diversity of human individuals, for whom I think no single code of conduct is ever likely to prove universally acceptable".

★

paign, that the Canal was the "vital" lifeline of this country and Europe. Yet without the Canal not only is petrol rationing at present non-existent in a number of European countries, but in this country, according to the responsible Minister, supplies are 80% of normal requirements. Obviously government and Press should be more careful in the use of adjectives such as "vital"—if they really intend that the public should be well-informed!

★

LOWELL'S "force of public opinion" which would temper the autocracy is a paradox, except, paradoxically enough, in a country where government is so unstable as to be at the mercy of a dictator. A strong public opinion is the breeding ground for dictatorship . . . or the social revolution (we do not need to refer to history books. Hungary 1956, is surely proof enough). Western democracy, from the point of view of genuine social progress is a sham, a dead-end. It is a society in which values have been deformed; in which progress is confused with competition and freedom with the maintenance of the *status quo*. Public opinion as we understand it, implies a ferment of new ideas jostling with the old; a continual questioning of all that is *tradition*—not only in industrial techniques, markets and economic theories—but of the larger and—from a human point of view—more vital issues of life itself. And either one blindly and patriotically declares that the "democracies" are the last word in progress or one admits that they are as dead as mutton!

Because we anarchists subscribe to the latter view, we are not, as some ill-informed readers might too hastily conclude, either advocates of dictatorship or enemies of those material reforms which lighten the burden of the "under-privileged" majority in society. It is simply that we refuse to accept the myth for the reality; of assuming that the choice between the lesser and greater evils is between right and wrong, and of hardening such a choice into a principle or an absolute standard.

To-day human potential is being mobilized and frittered away by governments on both sides of the "ideological" curtain for ends not even remotely connected with Man's eternal problem of material well-being coupled with a search after happiness. Every government, every group that aspires to rule, assure us that these in fact are their major concern. Yet all they satisfy is their lust for power, in the attainment of which they relegate the majority of their fellow-humans to the rôle of unthinking, servile pawns. But the real tragedy is that they apparently succeed in also convincing most of their victims that they are living in the best of worlds, for which they should be grateful and willing to sacrifice even their lives for its preservation.

So long as one articulate anarchist remains alive, a voice will be raised to proclaim that this is a LIE!

