

# Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"It is only by making the ruling few uneasy that the oppressed many can obtain a particle of relief."

—JEREMY BENTHAM.

## In this Issue :

- Gustav Landauer - p. 2
- Barcelona Diary - p. 3
- Letter from Paris - p. 4

Vol. 18, No. 8

February 23rd, 1957

Threepence

## THE FINANCIAL CRISIS

THE latest in the unending string of 'crises' that tax the ingenuity of the propagandists of doom and disaster in Fleet Street and Westminster is the "economic crisis". The Suez crisis has worn rather thin since America decided to fill the political vacuum in the Middle East, leaving Britain and France to cool their heels. So at home the economic crisis has been used to fill the vacuum created by the Suez fade-out. The present crisis is basically a financial one, and only insofar as it affects a large number of wage-earners can it be called economic. We are not attempting to split hairs, but to put the crisis in its proper perspective.

Balance of payments, dollar reserves, bank rates are problems of Finance; they are related to the economics of the nations of the world only because economics, that is production and distribution and material prosperity are at the mercy of High Finance.

Abolish the Stock Exchange, Wall Street, the Banks with all their symbols of power, and we still have the vital raw materials, the machinery, the human skill and the much derided brawn, which alone produce our daily bread, the roof over our heads and the clothing to protect us from the elements. It is a sad commentary on the mental conditioning

of modern man that it should be necessary to remind him that in fact, mankind managed to live on this planet a very long time without the Banks or the Stock Exchange, but that these institutions which to-day are in virtual control of the lives of millions of human beings not only contribute nothing to our material well-being, but are responsible for most of the crises, the widespread human misery, that beset the world.

Most people will agree that "money is the root of all evil" (and in agreeing they are thinking of both its international, political repercussions as well as the way it succeeds in poisoning personal relationships between friends and within the family circle). Yet then they go on to ask: "But where would we be without money?" It is a rhetorical question, a conversational gambit, since no one ever in fact answers it! What new worlds Man would open up if he took the trouble to answer this question for himself!

★

THE present "economic" crisis is explained in a number of ways none of which however recognises that such crises are part of the system. Yet until we question the system itself, we shall continue to have crises. The "boom" conditions enjoyed in the United States

and the industrial countries of Western Europe during the past twelve years have been achieved, let it not be forgotten, through the most destructive war in man's history, and at a cost of millions of human lives. That war has created what they call a "seller's market". Heavy industry's order books were filled for years ahead, and it seemed that there was no ceiling to world demand. Somehow in the twisted mind of high finance the destruction of so many millions of dwellings, of industrial potential and scorched earth was an asset, since it all created a demand for replacement. And workers saw this vast programme of reconstruction as a guarantee against the dole queues, slums and privations. They could not see that they were paying for all that was destroyed by war as well as for the means of destruction. And during the last twelve years they have been footing the bill for the reconstruction of a war-shattered world. (And we are not using the term "paying" in terms of their labour power but also in the language of finance). The working people of the world are living "beyond their means" not because they allow themselves the luxury of a few sticks of furniture or a television set on the never-never, but because the burden of paying for wars, the destruction as well as the reconstruction, has been dumped on their shoulders by governments and the finance market. By their toil they have created the profits (in effect they pay interest for the privilege of working for a Boss!), which then they, through their governments borrow to make wars, and again later to repair the ravages of war, and on every sordid transaction they pay interest. Money breeds more money. But whereas when a cow calves Mankind's larder is richer by one calf, when £1,000 becomes £1,500 mankind as a whole is £500 (or whatever can be commanded by the owner of that sum) worse off.

Let us quote a concrete example which affects some two million families in this country to-day who are purchasing houses on the instalment system. In last week's *Sunday Pictorial* a reader explains the financial intricacies involved. He borrowed £2,450 from a Building Society on a £2,700 house. He paid 4½% interest on the loan and by monthly repayments of £12 11s. 2d. the house will be his in 30 years. Thus, for

Continued on p. 2

who have sent a resolution to the President and Congress protesting curbs on "travel in any country with which the U.S. is not at war."

The U.S. press we are sure is not at all anxious to give China a boost, or to act as the benevolent dispensers of pro-Chinese propaganda; it is primarily concerned with sales and will fight to defend its interests against State pressure, but not because it loves freedom for its own sake.

We hope that the Americans languishing in Chinese gaols will feel proud that the U.S. Secretary of State is prepared to close what might be an open door to their escape because he petulantly refuses to come to terms.

We might add that we are the last to advocate compromise with any Government, but what has Dulles to lose (except face) compared to the loss of freedom of a number of human beings?

## Floating Voter Wins North Lewisham

IN a poll which was, at 70.89 per cent. of the electorate, a very high one for a by-election, the Labour Party has won a seat at North Lewisham from the Conservatives.

It was a marginal Tory seat, and now it's a marginal Labour seat, for the majority last week was 1,110 on a total poll of 37,409. The victorious candidate, Mr. Niall McDermot, won 49.49 per cent. of the votes, the losing Tory, Mr. Norman Farmer, gained 45.52, and 3.97 went to an 'Independent Loyalist', Miss Leslie Greene, who lost her deposit.

This event has been hailed as a great victory for the Labour Party, since it is the first time since 1945 that Labour has won a seat from the Conservatives. When Mr. McDermot took his place in the Commons last Tuesday, the Labour members gave him a resounding welcome, complete with cries of 'Resign' hurled at the Government benches. A good time was had by all on the Opposition side.

McDermot's win was, of course, not unexpected—indeed one Tory prophet had, well before polling day, put his majority at 1,000 votes, which was remarkably close to the eventual figure of 1,110. The recent collapse of the Eden Government, the circumstances of Macmillan's succession, the effects of the Suez misadventure, and above all the Rent Bill (see *FREEDOM* 9/2/57), were all gifts to the Labour Party. As long as people are prepared to vote for a choice between Tory and Labour, it was obvious that there would be a swing to the Opposition at Lewisham.

## THINGS THEY SAY - and how they say them

AFTER the Lewisham result was announced, Mr. R. A. Butler made a few remarks to try and revive Tory morale.

For the benefit of non-political readers unacquainted with Parliamentary language we translate some of his remarks in footnotes below.

Mr. Butler said: "I think that whenever there is the loss of a seat of this sort, it acts as a fillip to the whole party and I think it will mean that we shall see that it does not happen again."

"Very obviously there have been difficult problems<sup>2</sup> and we have taken courageous decisions, and we propose to take some more<sup>3</sup>. This is essentially a public relations problem, and a problem of explaining our policy<sup>4</sup>."

★

Mr. Nigel Birch, Economic Secretary to the Treasury has also made a speech, which for platitude and cliché sounds like Bonar Thompson at his satirical best.

He said that he believed the lesson the electorate wanted to teach was "to be more Conservative have the courage of your convictions stand up to difficulties, don't let yourselves be pushed about, go ahead, and do what you know to be right." Under Mr. Macmillan, that was exactly what the Government intended to do.

Well, you have been warned!

<sup>1</sup> 'For the next by-election we shall try some vote-catching stunt and shall swing the party machine into action at full strength.'

<sup>2</sup> 'We have made a mess of things.'

<sup>3</sup> 'We have had to do you, and will have to go on doing you.'

<sup>4</sup> 'It is all a matter of kidology, and we shall have to improve our techniques in kidding you in future.'

The Labour Party were clever in their choice of a candidate. North Lewisham is a Lower-Middle-to-Middle-Class neighbourhood. The new electoral list which was due to come into use *the day after* the by-election would have put the emphasis on the Lower Middle. The Tories therefore chose to fight on the old list (of which 7,000 voters no longer live in the constituency) feeling safer with the Middle Class.

## An Appealing Candidate

Unfortunately for such a manoeuvre, however, the Labour Party chose a candidate guaranteed to appeal to the Middle-Middle or even Upper-Middle (if any) as well as the Lower-Middle class voters of Lewisham. Niall McDermot is a barrister, from a wealthy Irish family, public school, Oxford and Cambridge (we were not informed how he managed to be *both!*), with a fine voice, charming manner, keen brain and handsome to boot.

The fact that he was completely unknown to the voters of Lewisham and had been a member of the Labour Party for only eight months counted for naught beside the above qualifications. In fact, being unknown to the electorate is probably a great advantage for a candidate! His opponent, Mr. Farmer, is a local manufacturer, who proudly boasts of having served the people of North Lewisham for thirty years on the local Council. He is well known in the neighbourhood for his three decades of public work. Perhaps that's why he didn't get in.

Apart from that, Mr. Farmer was stodgy, dull, not very good-looking, not a very good speaker, didn't know anything about Suez, didn't understand the Rent Bill, and all-in-all didn't stand an earthly against McDermot as far as the issues go which swing the electorate.

## Labour's Lack of Policy

But what are those issues? Given the tremendous amount of ammunition at Labour's disposal, one would have thought they would have won by many more votes than they did. Labour's weakness was in their lack of constructive policy, and North

Continued on p. 4

## Make it a Surplus!

### PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT! WEEK 7

Deficit on Freedom £140  
Contributions received £124  
DEFICIT £16

### February 8 to February 14

London: W.H.T. 2/6; Kirkcaldy: H.R. 1/1; London: E.P. 10/-; London: C.R.C. 2/6; Ilford: C.S. 10/-; Welwyn: W.A.W. 11/-; London: A.C. 1/3; London: H.M.\* 2/-; London: J.S.\* 3/-; London: K.L. 5/-; London: D.P. 1/-; London: Hyde Park Sympathiser 6d.; Hyde Park: H.M.J. 1/-; Newcastle-on-Tyne: I.H. 1/10; Wigan: E.H. 5/-; Harlow: D.L.D. 15/-; Sheffield: H.W. 5/-; Dundee: A.S.L.R. 1/-; Sheffield: G.P.\* 5/-; Harwich: W.W. 1/-; London: A.D. 1/-; Bromley: C.O.D. 1/-; Stevenage: J.W.P. 2/6; Glasgow: J.M. 6d.; Stranraer: T.H.N. 5/-; Miami: Comunicato 1/7/10/0; Miami: 8. 7/-; Providence: Il Circolo Libertario 1/5/5; London: L.T.R. 1/1; London: E.B. 6/-; London: A.F. 1/2/1/0; Paris: C.D. 1/1; London: W.C. 1/1; London: D.R.\* 1/1.

Total ... 39 1 6  
Previously acknowledged ... 85 14 10

1957 TOTAL TO DATE ... £124 16 4

## America's Press Curtain

ONE of the principal fears of the Soviet Government in relation to its citizens serving in the West is the effect which might come as a result of contact with reality as opposed to the myth perpetuated by the Soviet Government to its people about conditions, economic and social, which exist outside the U.S.S.R. Consequently diplomats and newspapermen are carefully watched, and this fact has always been used by Western powers in their own particular brand of propaganda to point to the limitations placed on Soviet State servants compared to the freedom "allowed" in the West.

Informed sources realise that freedom is a matter of degree and when circumstances demand it a similar policy is adapted by the West. This is particularly true of newspapermen who have access to a large public, and who are generally allowed to publish only that which is considered expedient.

At the moment United States' newspapermen are forbidden by the Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, to enter Communist China even in response to an invitation by the Government. The original reason given was that the United States would be unable to protect reporters once they were in China (few of us will be convinced by this argument). Now, however, the dispute between Dulles and the press is being intensified and new reasons are being put forward in the usual Dulles fashion which have brought another surprised comment from Eisenhower who is sometimes called upon to cover up for the impulsive Dulles.

At a press conference last week Dulles stated that for some time the Chinese Government had been anxious to get "picked" U.S. reporters into the country, and, he claims, "it has repeatedly tried to use the illegal

detention of Americans in Communist China as a means of pressure to accomplish its ends... This kind of blackmail I don't propose to satisfy." The implication is that the picked men, if allowed to go, would be those who were not entirely hostile (or might be objective!) to the Chinese Government. Considering that four of the eighteen reporters invited are on the staff of the *New York Times*, and invitations also cover *Look*, and *New York Post*, it seems unlikely that these journals would send Communist sympathisers to China.

There is no doubt a personal factor involved. Dulles, in his fierce opposition to Communism cannot bear to feel that he is satisfying what he describes as blackmail on the part of the Chinese Government. But is China all that anxious to exchange a few detained Americans for the visit of the U.S. Press? And is Dulles really more concerned that not too unfavourable reports should emerge as a result?

There is no doubt that the Communist Government in China is anxious to make favourable impressions and that facilities would be offered to the press which would enable them to see and report only that which the Government desired, but surely the "free" world has nothing to fear from this? The truth is that politically the U.S. wishes to continue with its opposition to China and any factor which might ease the tension is a threat to this policy.

Already two U.S. newspapermen have defied the ban and on returning to America have been threatened by the State Department with having their passports revoked. Their intention is to invoke open hearings to "embarrass the hell out of the State Department", a move which will no doubt be supported by the American Newspaper Publishers' Association

## PEOPLE AND IDEAS

## The Life and Death of Gustav Landauer

HOW little we know, through lack of translations, of Gustav Landauer and his ideas. Yet Erich Fromm in his new book *The Sane Society* calls him "one of the last great representatives of anarchist thought". Rudolf Rocker describes him as "a spiritual giant", Ernst Toller called him "one of the finest men, the greatest spirits", of the German revolution, and a friend of mine reading recently the two volumes of Landauer's study of Shakespeare, spoke of his extraordinary psychological insight and sensitive but robust intellect.

Landauer was born in 1870 in a middle-class Jewish family in South-West Germany, and became as a student a member of the German Social-Democratic Party (S.P.D.). He was one of the group known as the *Jungen* who were expelled from the party in 1891, and who started a weekly paper in Berlin, *Der Sozialist* which, beginning as a dissident Marxist organ, became under Landauer's editorship, a vehicle for anarchist ideas. This was the period when the SPD was seeking to impose its rigid parliamentary socialism on the whole European labour movement, and when an international congress was convened at Zurich in 1893, the anarchists, who had been expelled from the earlier Brussels Congress, returned to the attack. Explaining their intervention, Rocker remarks that:

"Had the Congresses of the Second International not concealed their true nature and acknowledged themselves for what they were, international conferences of Parliamentary Socialism and of Social Democratic Parties, the anarchists would have been the last to want to be represented. But as long as they called themselves International Socialist Labour Congresses it would be wrong to deny them admission. For the anarchists too were after all, Socialists, for they opposed economic monopoly, and worked for

a co-operative form of human labour, aiming to satisfy the needs of all and not the profits of the few. Nor could it be disputed that the great majority of the anarchists in the different countries belonged to the working class".

At Zurich on the first day, the Germans who had been expelled from the SPD appeared and demanded admission, with the unexpected support of the British trade union delegation. Bebel, the SPD leader attacked them abusively and got a motion carried limiting membership to trade unions and to parties and groups who accepted political action. "There was incredible commotion: Werner and Landauer were hustled from the room shouting 'We protest!'"<sup>1</sup> and on the following day fifteen other delegates including Rosa Luxemburg were excluded. They were joined by Amilcare Cipriani who resigned his mandate saying, "I go with those you have banished; with the victims of your intolerance and brutality".

IN 1896 the International Socialist Labour Congress was held in London at the Queen's Hall, and there were many anarchists among the 750 delegates, including Landauer and Malatesta (who had come armed with mandates from trade unions in Spain, France and Italy). Once again the SPD sought to exclude the anarchists.

"The Germans tried to steamroller the Congress on this question so ruthlessly that it infuriated a great many delegates. The Chairman on the second day was Paul Singer, a member of the Reichstag. He tried to stop the discussion, and said he would take the vote on the question. But Keir Hardie of the ILP, who was deputy chairman of the session, got up and making himself heard above the uproar, told Singer that people didn't conduct meetings like that in England. Before the vote was taken both sides must be

given a hearing. So Malatesta and Landauer were allowed to speak."<sup>2</sup>

Landauer addressed a report to the Congress (which was published as a leaflet by Freedom Press), attacking the SPD in terms which its subsequent history showed to be correct. Only in Germany, he declared, could such a severely disciplined and pattern-cut labour party exist, exploiting in the most shameful way the imperialist and military spirit, the dependence and obedience of the masses "as the basis upon which an extremely strict party rule could be constructed, strong enough to crush on every occasion the rising germs of freedom and revolt."

"I, as a German revolutionist and anarchist, consider it my duty to-day, as three years ago at Zurich, to tear off this painted mask and solemnly declare that the apparent splendour of the labour movement in Germany is but skin-deep, whilst in reality the number of those who fully and conscientiously go in for a total regeneration of human society, who struggle to realise a free socialist society, is infinitely smaller than the number of Social Democratic voters. . . . The laws (at the elaboration of which the Social Democratic deputies work with great assiduity in parliament and in the various committees) merely strengthen the State and the power of the police—the German, Prussian, monarchist and capitalist State of to-day—and it becomes more and more a question whether our Social Democracy thinks that some mere finishing touches applied to our centralised, tutelary, ceaselessly interfering police state, are all that is necessary to transform the German Empire into the famous State of the future".

He appealed to the delegates to allow the anarchist case to be heard:

"What we fight is State socialism, levelling from above, bureaucracy; what we advocate is free association and union, the absence of authority, mind freed from all fetters, independence and

well-being of all. Before all others it is we who preach tolerance for all—whether we think their opinions right or wrong—we do not wish to crush them by force or otherwise. In the same way we claim tolerance towards us, and where revolutionary socialists, where working men of all countries meet, we want to be among them and to say what we have got to say. . . . If our ideas are wrong, let those who know better teach us better. . . ."<sup>3</sup>

But the anarchists were expelled. A protest meeting was addressed by Kropotkin, Louise Michel, Elisee Reclus, Landauer and Malatesta, and, among non-anarchists, by Tom Mann and Keir Hardie, who declared that:

"No one could prophesy whether the socialism of the future would shape itself in the image of the social democrats or of the anarchists. The crime of the anarchists in the eyes of the Congress majority appeared to be that they were a minority. If they agreed with that attitude then the Socialist movement as a whole had no right to exist, because it represented a minority".

AROUND this time Landauer was beset with a problem that always faces anarchist editors. He had made *Der Sozialist* a paper of a high intellectual standard but with little propaganda appeal and this caused continual argument. In the end he agreed to publish also a propaganda paper *Der Arme Konrad* edited by Albert Weidner, who, says Rocker,

"did his best. . . but it did not satisfy Landauer's opponents. They started a new larger paper, and Landauer's *Sozialist* slowly died. The new paper was poorly edited and badly written, and it was little consolation to plead that it was produced entirely by ordinary working men. For Landauer it was a tragedy. It deprived him of a valuable activity, for

Continued on p. 3

## FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

OPEN DAILY

## New Books . . .

The London Years . . . Rudolf Rocker 25/-  
From the Other Shore . . . Alexander Herzen 15/-  
Pierre-Joseph Proudhon . . . George Woodcock 18/-

## Second-Hand . . .

Spearhead . . . Nin, Rexroth, Miller, etc. 7/6  
The Interpreter . . . Geddes . . . Amelia Defries 4/-  
The Paradox of Oscar Wilde . . . George Woodcock 5/-  
World Within World . . . Stephen Spender 4/6  
Out of the Night . . . Jan Valtin 8/6  
Grey Eminence . . . Aldous Huxley 5/-  
The Autobiography of an Ex-Coloured Man . . . James Weldon Johnson 3/-  
Reminiscences of D. H. Lawrence . . . John Middleton Murry 5/6  
Aspects of Dialectical Materialism . . . Levy, Macmurray, Fox, etc. 3/6  
Soviet Spy Net . . . E. H. Cookridge 3/6  
Struggle for Africa . . . Vernon Bartlett 3/-  
Man Makes Himself . . . V. Gordon Childe 4/6  
William Godwin . . . George Woodcock 4/-  
Letters to a Young Poet . . . Rainer Maria Rilke 2/6  
Abide With Me . . . Cedric Belfrage 3/-  
General from the Jungle . . . B. Traven 3/6  
Manon Lescaut . . . Abbé Prevost 3/-  
The Flies and in Camera . . . Jean-Paul Sartre 4/6  
Crime Passionnel, etc. . . Jean-Paul Sartre 4/-  
Those Were the Days . . . Clarence Day 3/-  
Two-in-One . . . John Steinbeck 3/-

Postage free on all items

Obtainable from

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

## Some Factors Affecting Emotional Development in Children—2

(Continued from last week)

Most responsible adults are to-day agreed upon the necessity for sex education but no agreement seems to be reached as to how this should be given. Some suggest that it is the responsibility of the school, others that it is the task of the parents. Yet again, there are controversies as to the age at which such information should be given.

All this indicates great confusion of thought and very little understanding of the problem. The attempt to treat sex as a subject in itself which should be taught at certain times by certain people is completely wrong. Since sex influences the whole life, sex education should cover the total period of development. It is not the task of either parents or teachers but of both. It should be an unobtrusive background to all training for life. It has its place just as much in the home as in the school, just as much in the history class as the biology class<sup>8</sup>.

Much of the confusion arises from the idea that sex education involves only the imparting of biological information. But, important though it is, this is only a minor aspect of the subject. Sex education for life itself—the inculcation of correct emotional attitudes affecting all personal relationships. It starts at birth. Its success depends, as we said above, upon the outlook of those responsible for the child's up-bringing.

Unfortunately, many parents not only have an unhealthy guilt complex about sex but are, at the same time, so ignorant of the subject as to be incapable of dealing adequately with many of the situations which may arise. (It is a sad comment on this age that some courts in the USA interpret all sex instruction as contributing to the delinquency of minors<sup>9</sup>. There have, in that country, been penal commitments of adults who have undertaken sex education).

The isolation of sex as a subject with special problems results, indeed, in an unhealthy emphasis, creating in the child's mind completely wrong attitudes even when such information as is given is imparted sanely and without embarrassment.

Emotional development starts when the new born baby first feels the warmth of the mother's body—possibly even before that: the gestalt of ante-natal sensations and the trauma of birth may have a lasting influence. The contemporary custom in some hospitals of removing the neonate from the vicinity of the mother for some time after birth seems to be a practice the danger of which many people are becoming aware. Even this short period during which the child is, usually quite unnecessarily, deprived of physical contact with the mother's body may contribute to later emotional disorders.

An increasing number of maternity hospitals, particularly in the USA, are wisely adopting the "rooming in" system. There is, however, much to be said in favour of having the baby at home, when circumstances permit.

The adverse effects on emotional development of separation from the parent by hospitalization of young children is now being recognized and the more progressive hospitals are encouraging frequent visits to the child patient by parents—a welcome advance over the more customary situation where humanity is sacrificed for administrative simplicity.

Some mothers seem unaware of the importance to the young child of the physical contact (essential for the satisfac-

tion of the infant's need for a sense of security) and even during feeding keep the baby clothed and isolated from all but the minimum of tactile experience. It seems that, such is the conditioning of our anti-sexual tradition, many women are so prejudiced against the human body that even contact with their own child is distasteful. The baby in, say, an African tribe has probably a firmer foundation for emotional stability than the infant in our society. Such a baby's early experience is of constant physical contact between his or her naked body and that of the mother, being carried on her back or side as she goes about her chores. A custom which does not, however, fit in with our social conditions.

Even where circumstances unfortunately prevent natural breast feeding the infant's need for a feeling of security must not be forgotten and the child, when being given the bottle, should be held close to her body by the mother.

To the baby the maximum of pleasurable sensation is obtained by sucking for which reason this primary stage of development is termed the oral stage. Later, as the child becomes aware of the elimination processes, the centre of pleasure shifts and the anal stage is entered to be followed in turn by the genital (or phallic) stage when the erogenous zones begin to develop. These stages may be themselves subdivided.

There is no sharp dividing line between the successive stages of development but a gradual transition and traces of the earlier stages remain usually throughout life. For example, vestiges of the oral stage possibly account in part for the pleasure to be derived from such adult activities as smoking.

Correct handling of the child is essential if there is to be no undue fixation at one of the earlier stages. Too early and too rigid toilet training may quite well unduly emphasize the pleasurable activities of the anal stage, for instance, and result in later incomplete orientation. Anal eroticism may well account for some adult male homosexuality where it is not due to genetic causes or fixation at a later stage. Partial fixation at the anal stage is more commonly manifest in such phenomena as the popularity of the ribald joke concerning defecation. Less obvious results of training in cleanliness not being adjusted to the self regulation of the child are such behaviour characteristics as an over zealous passion for tidiness or insistence upon rigid adherence to rules and regulations.

Ante-natal clinics to-day generally give prospective mothers sound advice on toilet training but so great is the influence of past generations that many mothers prefer to ignore such advice on the grounds that what their mothers did was best. And so the errors of the past are perpetuated.

The transition from the early to later stages is, as was said above, gradual and varies considerably from child to child. Children probably leave the oral stage in our society rather earlier than those in some other societies. Peoples living in conditions where food is obtainable only after a hard struggle with nature tend to wean their children much later than those in societies better provided. For example, a Bantu child as old as three years may leave his or her play to suck at the mother's breast<sup>10</sup>.

It is when the genital stage is reached that the anti-sexual conditioning of most adults becomes apparent, particularly in their attitude to such manifestations as childhood masturbation.

Whether parents like it or not their children are at some time going to masturbate and the future emotional orientation of the child is conditioned to a very great degree by parental attitudes towards the subject. Even some parents who consider themselves enlightened fail when it comes to handling this aspect of childhood sexuality and succeed in producing in their children severe guilt complexes. Also some physicians still hold old-fashioned ideas about the subject and contribute to the unhappiness of the children with whom they have to deal.

All sexual phenomena have suffered at the hands of obscurantists but, probably, none more than masturbation about which there have arisen more old wives' tales, misconceptions and irrational emotional attitudes than about any other aspect of life.

It is only some fifty years since the attitude towards masturbation was so puritanical that parents resorted to such revoltingly cruel practices as fixing wire chastity cages on their boys at night, having the prepuce perforated and a ring inserted to prevent its retraction (*infibulation*), unwarranted circumcision (still sometimes encountered), threats of amputation of the penis, excision of afferent nerves, cauterization or even excision of the clitoris in the case of girls and so on, to prevent their children from indulging in this quite normal activity<sup>11</sup>.

Even as late as 1914 parents' manuals were advocating, in the case of young children, such practices as tying the legs to the sides of the crib to prevent the child from rubbing his or her thighs together and pinning the youngster's arms to the bed to prevent the handling of the genitals (or thumb-sucking—which was a pleasurable activity equally condemned)<sup>12</sup>.

Fortunately a healthier outlook has been spreading during the past half century—mainly as a result of the work of Freud and his successors in the field of psychoanalysis coupled with the increase in the dissemination of factual sexual knowledge—but widespread ignorance of the underlying motivation and the part played by the practice in the normal development of the individual is still responsible for much childhood genital misery and a great deal of adolescent and adult neurosis. A.C.F.C.

(To be continued)

<sup>8</sup> An excellent survey of the question of sex education is Cyril Bibby's "Sex Education". Another useful little book is "Sex Problems in School" by Allendy and Lobstein.

<sup>9</sup> See: Karpman, "The Sexual Offender and His Offences".

<sup>10</sup> Late weaning appears in many societies; see: Laubscher: "Sex, Custom and Psychopathology", also Margaret Mead's books and her article on primitive children in "Manual of Child Psychology" edited by Carmichael. In some primitive peoples, living in conditions where food is scarce, when a new baby is born an elder child who has been weaned may temporarily return to the breast with his or her sibling.

<sup>11</sup> See: Taylor: "Sex in History"; Oliven: "Sexual Hygiene and Pathology"; Bloch: "Sexual Life of Our Time" (Rebman). Taylor also mentions a bizarre appliance which was fitted to boys at night and which rang a bell in the parents' room when the youngster had an erection.

For reference to a fantastic suggestion by Weinholt that compulsory infibulation of all males over the age of 14 be employed for population control see Norman Himes: "Medical History of Contraception".

<sup>12</sup> See: Mead & Wolfenstein (ed.): "Childhood in Contemporary Cultures".

## The Financial Crisis

Continued from p. 1

a £2,700 house he will have paid £4,500, that is the sum needed to build 1½ houses. (Actually when the interest rates went up to 6% he was informed by the society that his repayments would remain unaffected but instead of 30 years it would take him 56 years for the house to be his and have cost him £8,500 for his £2,700 house, that is he would have paid for nearly three houses). But during those 30 years in which the house purchaser is repaying his debt plus interest, the Building Society will be re-investing his repayments with other purchasers. Even assuming only one re-investment during those thirty years, at 4½% the return would be at least a further £1,200. Thus in the thirty years the Building Society's investment of £2,450 will have "appreciated" by £3,250 to £5,700 as a *minimum* (though we suggest that £7,000 would be nearer the mark). This process is being repeated 2 million times, without allowing for all the building by local authorities in which this interest is included as part of the rent. Add to this all the other finance that has to be raised for administrative and industrial building, bank loans for farmers, small businessmen, industrialists, and crown it all with the National Debt on which we pay more than £600 millions a year in interest, and then we agree with the government that we are living beyond our means: *for we are keeping an army of money-lenders!* Not only are we keeping them but what is worse also helping to increase their power over us!

★

ECONOMICALLY, as distinct from financially, the world has perhaps never been so well-off or at least potentially well-off. Productivity has increased everywhere in the world (and even if the wrong things are being produced, at least the "know-how" to produce the right things in the quantities required exists), and we are on the threshold of an industrial revolution in which the machine will technologically speaking become the servant of man, and as a result, of a revolution in thinking, since the application of automation will lay greatest stress on the problems of leisure as opposed to those of work. (A problem of greater complexity than one would imagine in spite of the much bandied accusation that all our present troubles can be explained by the fact that workers are work-shy!)

But in spite of all the evidence staring us in the face and because most commentators cannot distinguish between the problems of economics and those of finance, the present crisis is generally assessed as one of productivity. Woodrow Wyatt, one-time Labour politician, in a much publicised series of articles in the *News Chronicle*, tries to argue that everything would right itself if only we produced more. To do this we need a new spirit in industry at the top to begin with, for

if everyone would work enthusiastically and intelligently at the top there would be no trouble anywhere else down the line.

No one would fuss about profits, high salaries (or management or expense accounts). They would work as a team—not like opponents in a civil war, fed-up executives on one side and hostile workers on the other.

That will be the day when the bosses will not longer "fuss about profits"! And as to the hostility between executives and workers how this will be achieved through Mr. Wyatt's plea for the encourage-

6th January. The press announces that the electric current will be reduced and the use regulated. The current will be interrupted from 7 a.m. to 6 p.m. twice a week. On the four other working days it will be provided to firms according to a timetable changing every two weeks, from 5 a.m. to 11.15 a.m. then from 11.15 a.m. to 5.30 p.m. and finally 10 p.m. to 6 a.m.

8th January. The new fares on public transport are applied. The measure was approved by the government. It corresponds to a general rise of prices which absorbs and goes beyond the wage increases accorded in November 1956.

The popular discontent is lively. The fantastic working hours imposed by the sharing out of the electric current, and the increase in the price of transport (when the tramways and buses are delapidated and the fares higher than anywhere else), are added to the shortage of oil, a combustible largely used for

ment of even wider differentials than at present is difficult to understand. His argument is that the workers don't "pull their weight" because they have rotten managements. Managements are rotten because incentive is discouraged through high taxation. Indeed the atmosphere is such apparently that we suffer from "an upsidedown morality" which condemns the "enterprising man as immoral". And Mr. Wyatt in defending the morality of the enterprising man gives us Russia as an example to follow!

Yet they have none of that in Russia. There the head of a scientific research institute earns 40 times as much a month as an agricultural worker and pays very little tax.

In Britain a man with a salary of £12,000 pays around £8,000 tax.

In Russia a man with the same salary—and there are plenty of them—pays less than £2,000.

In Russia they believe in the system of differentials.

In that case, Mr. Wyatt, what the hell are your friends in Downing Street spending £1,500 millions a year on the armed forces to protect us from the Russian Bear? We are always being told it's to defend our way of life and nothing to do with power politics. Perhaps the anarchists are right after all and it is power politics they are "defending"! Mr. Wyatt also assures us that "It's true we don't work as hard as they do in America or in Germany or Japan". How he can be so sure is anyone's guess. But is it not significant that these countries are also experiencing the beginnings of "economic crises", and that in the most prosperous of the three, America, unemployment has increased in the past month by 1,600,000 to just under three million. In proportion unemployment in America is nearly three times as high as in this country.

★

WE do not quote Mr. Wyatt as an authority. His views are as pedestrian as those of the man-in-the-street whom he quotes with such obvious approval and which are also the hackneyed views of his bosses on the *News Chronicle*. We quote him as a warning, not as a guide, to the unthinking public. Intellectually the bosses, the technicians and the executives with the aid of the Wyatts, the Tories in Liberal's clothing and the New-Look Labour hierarchy, have convinced the workers that in the best of democratic worlds there must be those on top and those at the bottom. But in fact, on the factory floor these same workers find it harder to swallow. This is, however, only a negative attitude. It needs the deeper conviction, that all men are equal (in the sense that they are all brothers) to bring down the edifice of finance and to break down the national frontiers, both symbols as well as the reality of their economic enslavement. But the first step will have been taken only when they declare that they themselves will not be divided by differentials.

## The Transport Boycott

# BARCELONA DIARY

cooking and heating, and the increasing scarcity of olive oil. The official explanation is that the Suez business makes it difficult to get oil (but the public knows that it is imported from Venezuela, and that it is in fact exported to the United States).

11th January. The idea of the boycott has won the population. The fever of unrest mounts. The question is discussed of a movement that will go beyond the boycott as far as a general strike. Emissaries have visited the shops, warning the proprietors "in their own interests" not to open.

The authorities take precautions. Groups of police in jeeps, armed with rifles and sub-machine guns, take position in strategic places.

13th January. Sunday is calm. Football grounds, cinemas and cafés are full as usual.

14th January. The town is animated from the early hours. The workers and white collar workers set off to their jobs on foot. Trams and buses run empty, the drivers and conductors are generally the only persons in them. Sometimes there are one or two travellers. The vehicles are not guarded. Towards 9 a.m. there are a few more passengers, mostly white collar workers, but the total for each vehicle does not exceed half a dozen.

The police get into their cars. The precautionary measures are important but discreet. There are few policemen in the streets, but a large number are concentrated in the public buildings in the town centre.

Work is normal as far as the electricity permits. Shops and markets are almost empty. Where the big shops are holding sales the usual queues have not been formed.

Towards 1 p.m. University Square is occupied by the police. Some detachments have been forming there in the course of the morning. Some policemen carry rifles. Lorries and jeeps are stationed nearby.

At the end of the morning lectures

groups of students attack the rare users of the buses and trams. Among these travellers are plain-clothes police and Falangists. Some stones are thrown at the vehicles, and some windows are broken. A demonstration begins to form around the students of the Faculty of Medicine. When the head of the procession reaches Balmes Street several lorry-loads of police come up. The police leave their lorries and charge the demonstrators, clubbing them with truncheons and pistol butts.

By the afternoon the boycott is total. The vehicles run empty. As the afternoon advances they are returned to their depots. At the time when the factories shut down there are only a few trams. Despite a heavy fall of snow the workers return to their homes on foot. In the evening rumours of an imminent general strike continue to circulate, and housewives lay in abundant food supplies. Buying goes on, in the markets and shops, until 10.30 p.m.

15th January. The press announces that the incidents between police and students have involved seventeen arrests. Several students were wounded as well as a policeman and two civil guards. A conductor was arrested for having discouraged a woman from boarding his bus.

On the whole, the personnel of the public transport, traditionally not the most militant, sympathised with the popular protests.

The postmen, although loaded with heavy sacks, did their rounds on foot.

From 5 a.m. the streets are full of animation, and the working class crowds make their way to the factories, hurrying their steps because of the cold. The trams, buses and trolleybuses do not begin to appear until about 8 a.m. All are empty, with a few rare exceptions. The number of vehicles being reduced, the unemployed transport workers were put on board those in circulation, five or six to each. The precautions of the police are now more open. There are plain-clothes police on the platforms and uniformed police at the doors.

At the beginning of the afternoon

## Gustav Landauer

Continued from p. 2

which he was supremely fitted, and in which he rendered splendid service."

In 1901 he edited with Max Nettlau, a volume of selections from Bakunin. "I have loved and admired Bakunin," he wrote, "from the first day I came across him, for there are few dissertations written as vividly as his—perhaps that is why they are as fragmentary as life itself." But in fact it was Proudhon and Kropotkin who influenced him more. In 1905, echoing Kropotkin's views on the integration of agriculture and industry, he wrote:

"The socialist village, with workshops and village factories, with fields and meadows and gardens . . . you proletarians of the big cities, accustom yourselves to this thought, strange and odd as it may seem at first, for that is the only beginning of true socialism, the only one that is left to us."

and two years later he declared that: "It will be recognised sooner or later that, as the greatest of all socialists—Proudhon—has declared in incomparable words, albeit forgotten to-day, social revolution bears no resemblance at all to political revolution . . ."

This was in his essay *Die Revolution*, written at the request of Martin Buber, who, after his death, was to edit his book on Shakespeare, and who, forty years later was to bring Landauer's ideas back into circulation.<sup>4</sup> In Buber's view, Landauer's step beyond Kropotkin consists in his insight into the nature of the State, which is not, as Kropotkin thought, an institution which can be destroyed by a revolution, but rather, Landauer says:

"The State is a condition, a certain relationship between human beings, a mode of human behaviour; we destroy it by contracting other relationships by behaving differently . . . One day it will be realised that socialism is not the invention of anything new but the discovery of something actually present, of something that has grown".

He wants to displace the State by uncovering, bringing to the surface, the ancient communal institutions of society, and the instinctive mutual aid which, rather than State organisation, makes social life possible, preserving, renewing, and expanding them, "releasing the spirit that lies captive behind the State".

"We want to bring the Co-operatives, which are socialist form without socialist content, and the trade unions, which are valour without avail, to socialist, to great experiments". All true socialism, he says, is relative and never absolute. "Com-

munist goes in search of the Absolute and can naturally find no beginning but that of the word. For the only absolute things, detached from all reality, are words."

"Everything comes in time, and every time after the revolution is a time before the revolution for all those whose lives have not got bogged in some great moment of the past".

★

EVERYTHING that Landauer thought and planned and said and wrote, declares Buber, was steeped in a great belief in revolution and will for it. But the struggle for revolution, Landauer insists, can only bear fruit when "we are seized by the spirit, not of revolution, but of regeneration". For the strength of revolution lies in rebellion and negation; it cannot solve social problems by political means. Studying the meaning of the French Revolution, he observed that:

"When a revolution ultimately gets into the terrible situation that this one did, with enemies all round it inside and out, then the forces of negation and destruction that still live on are bound to turn inwards and against themselves, fanaticism and passion turn to distrust and soon to bloodthirstiness, or at least to an indifference to the added terrors of killing, and before long killing becomes the sole possible means for the rulers of the day to keep themselves provisionally in power".

And ten years later, he wrote of the same events:

"Thus it happened that the most fervent representatives of the revolution thought and believed in their finest hours—no matter to what strange shores they were ultimately flung by the raging winds—that they were leading mankind to a rebirth; but somehow this birth miscarried and they got in each others way and blamed each other because the revolution had allied itself to war, to violence, to dictatorship and authoritarian oppression—in a word, to politics".

Soon afterwards Landauer was to find himself the victim of such a situation, a revolution wrecked in violence and politics.

C.W.

(To be concluded)

1. James Joll: *The Second International* (Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1955).
2. Rudolf Rocker: *The London Years* (Anscombe 1956).
3. Gustav Landauer: *Social Democracy in Germany* (Freedom Press, 1896).
4. Martin Buber: *Paths in Utopia* (Routledge, 1949).

scuffles break out at the University. The police charge, the students barricade themselves in the University buildings and ring the bells in the tower to summon aid. They take down the portraits of Franco and José Antonio, founder of the Falange, and trample on them before the public gaze.

The Falange mobilises a detachment and its members attack the students with truncheons. The police then compel the evacuation of the University, after the mounted police had cleared the neighbouring streets by a series of charges. Some arrests were made (34 according to the communique issued by the Governor of Barcelona).

In the afternoon, fifteen Falangists, with a police escort, come to repair the damage and restore the outraged portraits of the "caudillo" and the founder of the Falange.

16th January. Trams, buses and trolleybuses run in small numbers, but are empty. The Underground enjoys a feeble life. Entrances and corridors are guarded by police.

In the streets placards appear in Catalan. They read, "No Communism! And no Fascism either!" In the offices tracts are copied or duplicated.

In the businesses where employees arrive late a certain tolerance reigns. There is always the possibility of a general strike in the near future.

The doors of the University remain closed. The lectures of the Faculty of Medicine are suspended.

21st January. The boycott has been "functioning" for eight days now. The number of arrests is great, greater than the communiques of the governor let it be understood.

The movement has reached new sections of the population. In many businesses the order has been given not to deduct from the wage-packet the hours lost as result of delays. The tram men, at whose disposition the company had put the trams, to take them to the depot, refused to use them. On the other hand, the directors of the company concerned with the upkeep of the trams and buses ostentatiously took the trolleybuses when they in fact possessed a car.

The most diverse pressures are put upon the salaried workers to make them use the public transport. The employees in public services who possessed a season ticket were warned that it would be withdrawn if they did not use it. The civil servants are instructed to hand in their free passes duly stamped. A little war was carried on, some seeking to give the illusion of a certain amount of use, others to render the whole system useless. The tramcars tend to be increasingly without the second (trailer) car, and the "travellers" are composed of plain-clothes police, uniformed and armed guards, some white collar workers and some girls, always the same ones who soon become well known. At night the vehicles are escorted by motorcycle police armed with sub-machine guns.

CORRESPONDAL

(Translated by Arthur W. Uloth.)

## FREEDOM PRESS

- VOLINE :**  
*Nineteen-Seventeen (The Russian Revolution Betrayed)* cloth 12s. 6d.  
*The Unknown Revolution* (Kronstadt 1921, Ukraine 1918-21) cloth 12s. 6d.
- E. A. GUTKIND :**  
*The Expanding Environment* 8s. 6d.
- V. RICHARDS :**  
*Lessons of the Spanish Revolution* 6s.
- RUDOLF ROCKER :**  
*Nationalism and Culture* cloth 21s.
- HERBERT READ :**  
*Art and the Evolution of Man* 4s.  
*Existentialism, Marxism and Anarchism* 3s. 6d.  
*Poetry and Anarchism* cloth 5s., paper 2s. 6d.  
*The Philosophy of Anarchism* boards 2s. 6d., paper 1s.  
*The Education of Free Men* 1s.
- M. BAKUNIN :**  
*Marxism, Freedom and the State.* cloth 5s.
- PHILIP SANSOM :**  
*Syndicalism—The Workers' Next Step* 1s
- ★
- Marie-Louise Berneri Memorial Committee publications :**  
*Marie-Louise Berneri, 1918-1949: A Tribute* cloth 5s.  
*Journey Through Utopia* cloth 16s. (U.S.A. \$2.50)
- ★
- K. J. KENAFICK :**  
*Michael Bakunin and Karl Marx* paper 6s.

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

## Left-Wing Intellectuals and Hungary

It is difficult to assess the effect of Hungarian events on the French workers in the C.P.-dominated trade-union, C.G.T. The next elections will perhaps show whether French workers have a real interest in the fate of their Hungarian brothers.

On the other hand, the reactions of the "intellectuals" can be easily surveyed to-day: their positions have been widely publicized, as is always the case in France where a writer's political opinions are usually better known, and count more, than his work. Now that "order" is beginning to prevail again in Hungary, now that the news of the repression is no longer deemed important by the Press, it may be interesting to consider what general effect the events in Hungary and the Hungarian writers' desperate appeals have had up to now on Communist and "progressive" intellectuals.

Within the Communist party, the response was timid. Five writers condemned Soviet intervention: one of them was expelled, another temporarily expelled, the three others publicly blamed. A few intellectuals and artists, among them Picasso, who had sent an open letter to the Party, asking for more objective information in the Communist press, were mildly reproached for making their protest public—and that was about all. Most of the Communist artists, scientists and writers have remained faithful to the party. That was to be expected: Communist intellectuals will never be taxed with supersensitiveness.

The effect of the Hungarian events on the "progressive" circles, however, was that of a stone in a frog-pond: the protest was almost unanimous, and many fellow-travellers who had felt slightly uncomfortable since the XXth Congress or since Poznan seized this opportunity to break away from the Communist party. (It is true to add that some of them came back after a few days—after having had a breath of fresh air, and the illusion of independent thinking . . .) The first consequence of these defections was the splitting up of the C.N.E., a writers' association sprung from the Résistance, but which had long ago lost its impetus and significance owing to Communist domination of its executive board.

Another consequence, of greater importance perhaps, was that Jean-Paul Sartre broke his alliance with the C.P.—The Hungarian tragedy, according to Sartre, is the result of twelve years' terror and stupidity. In a brilliant, dogmatic and incisive article he pointed out the hypocrisy of those who find excuses for the Communist behaviour in Hungary, justifying the repression by the necessity of defending "socialism" at all costs. "No collaboration is possible, he wrote, with the Communist Party such as it stands."

\*The fact that there were so few exclusions points to a certain uneasiness on the part of the Communist leaders. However mild, this was the worst crisis they had to face since the war.

So far, so good. But it is worth inquiring further into the case of Sartre, because it is typical of the "progressive" intellectual's political uneasiness and illusions. Just after the war, Sartre proved in his articles and his famous play "Les Mains Sales" that he was one of the most lucid and ruthless critics of Communist amorality, while sincerely remaining "homme de gauche". With a few other writers and journalists, he founded the "Rassemblement Démocratique Révolutionnaire", a sort of neo-trotskyist political movement, which completely failed to conquer mass-support and soon had to be wound up. This failure probably convinced Sartre that the only way to influence the masses was to be reconciled with the Communist party: because it is the "party of the working-class", it is necessarily right from the "historical" point-of-view, whatever its shortcomings or excesses.

From 1952 onwards, Sartre consequently supported the Communists, went to Russia, and generally approved of the Communist line in the field of inner and foreign policy. Many aspects of the Communist methods probably went against his conscience, but he accepted everything—in the name of Socialism and Peace—until the last straw (the Hungarian revolution!) broke up this friendship, and left the public wondering why it had lasted so long in the first place . . . Sartre was never a member of the Communist Party, he did not believe in

its lies, he knew about the Russian concentration camps, rigged trials and political terror, yet he consciously chose to ignore them—again in the name of Socialism and Peace. If the Hungarian drama was the outcome of a twelve-year-long imbecile terror, why has Sartre remained silent about it for so long? The Communists are not the only ones with "dirty hands" to-day: all those who have condoned their lies and crimes share the responsibility in the murder of the Hungarian revolution. Is Sartre then really entitled to reproach Communists with their hypocrisy? Perhaps he is: after all, he knows what he is speaking about.

Yet, however suspect Sartre's belated righteousness may seem, it would be possible to let bygones be bygones, if they were really bygones. The point is, one cannot be sure that Sartre will always remain opposed to the Communist Party; the contrary is much more probable: true enough, no collaboration is possible with the C.P. such as it stands to-day, while it is controlled by a handful of staunch stalinists; but to-morrow, with a "de-stalinized" party, co-operation may again come to be considered. Sartre now shares this hope with a great many left-wing intellectuals, whose tendency is represented, for instance, by the weekly *France-Observateur*, and who remain fascinated by the myth of a "Front Populaire", of a United Left, including of course, the C.P. These people really

believe that a union of the Left around a renewed Communist Party would be the salvation of France.

This position shows a surprising ignorance of the fundamental nature of Communism, and the experience of the Russian revolution, then of the Spanish Civil War, and finally the evolution of the satellite countries after the war should have taught our intellectuals better than to trust the Communist Party, whose sole ambition is to seize and to keep power for itself. The hope of de-stalinizing the C.P. is a delusion: Stalinism was not created by Stalin; it is Stalin who was a product of the Stalinism inherent in Bolshevism itself, in the Marxian conception of the revolutionary struggle and the State. Whatever its leaders, the Communist Party remains in essence a totalitarian party: it may enter into temporary alliances with other tendencies, but its ambition is to absorb them and/or suppress them as soon as it is in power.

The deeper causes of this fascination for the C.P. probably lie in the fact that many intellectuals from the middle class have a guilt-feeling towards the working class. They are anxious to 'pay their debt' to it, and as they cannot organize a mass-movement themselves, the only way left seems to them to support the party which the workers support, i.e. the Communist Party. This was Sartre's attitude: as the workers vote for the C.P., the C.P. represents their interests; to be against the C.P. is thus to be

"objectively" against the working class; in order to be with the working-class, one has to back the C.P. (In England, presumably one would have to be a Labourite). This fallacy cannot be used as an argument now that the Hungarian revolution has shown that the interests of the workers and those of the Communists do not always coincide, and for the time being the conscience of the progressive intellectuals rebels against an association with the C.P. But their dearest wish is that it should one day be made possible. Instead of reconsidering the whole problem of the Social Revolution in the light of the Hungarian experiment, they prefer to hope for a "humanization" of Communism which would allow them to lend wholehearted support to the party of the working-class. Meanwhile they feel unbearably lonely. Their independence of thought seems to them a guilty privilege, a luxury which they cannot do without, but almost bordering on vice. They are forced by their moral scruples to be anti-communists, but are ashamed to be so.

This is why one is entitled to have misgivings about the progress of progressive intellectuals in France: it seems that only if there are more uprisings in the satellite countries, only if more blood is shed, will they start thinking in new terms—not of Marxian myths and Communist methods—but of natural human needs and tendencies. C.D.

## A Community College at Work

THE Ivanhoe Secondary Modern School and Community College is a descendant of the Cambridgeshire village colleges founded some thirty years ago by Henry Morris. Morris believed that English rural culture was decaying, but that it might be revived if communities had, as a unifying force, some institution which provided not only higher education, but also a satisfying social and recreational life. The nucleus of the village college was the local senior school. The building which housed it also had educational and recreational facilities for adults, and local libraries, health services, and voluntary organisations.

After the war, the Leicestershire County Council decided that further education in the county would be based on this system. Ivanhoe is the first fruits of this policy. Ashby itself has a population of about six thousand and there are many villages round it.

Like the Cambridgeshire village colleges, Ashby's Community College is based on the local secondary modern school. The headmaster of the school is also the warden of the college, whose two adult tutors teach, part-time, in the school. Both institutions share a large new building, all steel, glass, and right angles, as is the contemporary fashion.

The college has, so far, no rooms of its own, though when additional building is completed, it will have its own lecture and recreation rooms.

This link is thought to be essential, and is not primarily an economy. The school has 700 children, three-quarters of the town's population; in time, most of the townspeople will have passed through it. So it hopes to grow, like the village colleges, into a natural community centre, which everyone will know and accept. The warden, Mr. S. C. Western, says:

"Everyone must be worried about the commercialisation of entertainment and the imposition of tastes and habits on young people by the force of publicity. Something has to be done to encourage people to use their leisure properly. What is the use of fine new buildings like these if they are going to be deserted as soon as people reach school-leaving age?"

The college at present holds 37 vocational and recreational evening classes for about five hundred people, and runs another fourteen classes in the surrounding villages for another 100 people. Ten local societies, including the Red Cross, the dramatic society, and the National Farmers' Union, are affiliated to it, and hold their meetings there. Other organisations in the area, such as women's institutes, which cannot use the college regularly but occasionally want its help, are associated with it.

The policy and management of the college are directed by a council of representatives of the individual members, the affiliated societies, the staff, and the governors. From this is appointed a management committee, with members from each of the groups mentioned.

What the college actually means to the people of the district can be seen any night during the week. In spite of petrol

rationing, there may be fifty cars parked outside the building and about two hundred people inside, some of them brought from outlying villages by a special bus.

On the ground floor the pottery class, for which there is a waiting list of 118, is making ceramics; in their keep-fit class, the older women touch their toes valiantly; the amateur motorists find out why their cars have a differential. On the top floor, the Young Farmers' Club is meeting in one room off the landing; in the other, the local choir is in full voice.

The staple night school courses—short-hand and typing, bookkeeping and the like—are provided for, but it is thought that the real future of the college lies in its recreational courses—sculpture, physical training, discussion groups, woodwork, gardening, and so on.

The college is now in its third year, and is established as the model for the others which the County Council intends to establish. The auguries for the future are good, but the usual problem of any further education scheme remains: the people who are thought to need the college most use it least. Its members are mostly people who would, in any case, want to use their leisure purposefully.

(Manchester Guardian)

## Floating Voter Wins Lewisham

Continued from p. 1

Lewisham was won purely on criticism of the Tories. The floating voters are the people who win marginal seats, and they, the effective pendulum, have shown that they are fed up with the Tories.

The Labour platform had no constructive alternatives to offer which will solve the problems facing the people of this country—which is why this was the first seat they won from the Tories since their glorious victory of 1945. And Mr. McDermot would not have been the man to sincerely express the Labour Party's proposals anyway, for they are bound to be centralist, strengthening the grip of the State over society, and we know Mr. McDermot to believe in devolution, decentralisation, and to suspect most strongly the leviathans of power. Politically he believes in devolution, more regionalism; industrially for a policy akin to guild socialism, if not syndicalism; culturally for an enrichment of life at all levels which is certainly not likely under the dull, dead hand of the Labour Party. It is only twelve months ago that Mr. McDermot lectured in public most sympathetically on Kropotkin.

He is in no need of money; we

had not suspected him of power-hunger. Presumably he has the urge to do something, and the Labour Party represents the lesser evil. We should have thought he had learned that one before now. Or was his appreciation of Kropotkin only brief-deep?

### The Minority Decides

However, these are personal matters for Mr. McDermot to resolve during his political career. For students of democracy, the lessons of Lewisham demonstrate once again that the government of the people, by the people, for the people, is a myth. A swing of 2,000 votes in Lewisham has changed it from a Tory constituency to a Labour one. Throughout the whole country a swing of about 100,000 voters in marginal constituencies could change the British government from Conservative to 'Socialist'.

It is rarely the majority who choose the kind of government they want, still less the wishes of the majority which are expressed by any government. Our governments are chosen for us by a small handful of floating voters who vote this way one year, that way the next.

Democratic? Of course.

## Malatesta-I.A.C. Social NEW DATE

WILL comrades please note that the Social announced for Feb. 23 at the Malatesta Club has been postponed for one week. We now take the opportunity to make it an anniversary celebration, for the Club has now been at the Percy Street address for one year.

### SOCIAL

In aid of International Anarchist Centre and Malatesta Club  
SATURDAY, MARCH 2, 7.30—11 p.m.  
Entertainments ★ Rock'n' Roll Raffles

Admission 2/6d. inc. Refreshments

## LECTURES

### NEW YORK GROUP (Libertarian League)

announce a new series of Classes on

#### THE DEVELOPMENT OF LIBERTARIAN THEORY

These classes will be held at 813 Broadway, New York on Monday nights, starting promptly at 7 p.m., and ending no later than 10 p.m.

Feb. 18—Godwin.  
Feb. 25—Proudhon.  
Mar. 4—Stirner.  
Mar. 11—Bakunin.  
Mar. 18—Kropotkin.  
Mar. 25—The Libertarian League.

★

### LIBERTARIAN FORUM—FRIDAY NIGHTS AT 8.30—813 BROADWAY.

Feb. 22—The Internal Crisis in the Communist Party.  
Mar. 1—A Review of the Struggles in Alabama. (Speaker: Conrad Lynn, prominent civil-liberties attorney).  
Mar. 8—Pacifism and Social Change.  
Mar. 15—Paris 1871, Kronstadt 1921, Budapest 1956.  
Mar. 22—The People of the Paris Commune.  
Mar. 29—The World Government Movement.

## 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.

FEB. 24—R. G. Wrugh on  
THE LIFE AND WORK OF  
PATRICK GEDDES

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.

### SLOUGH

'WHY I AM AN ANARCHIST'

by PHILIP SANSOM

at the

SLOUGH PUBLIC LIBRARY  
(William Street)

at 7.30 p.m. on Wednesday, Feb. 27, 1957

Organised by the Slough & Eton Branch  
of the Workers' Educational Association.

Entrance fee 2s.

## ★ Malatesta Club ★

SWARAJ HOUSE,  
32 PERCY STREET,

TOTTENHAM COURT ROAD, LONDON, W.1.  
(Tel.: MUSEum 7277).

### ACTIVITIES

Every Sunday at 7.30 p.m.  
London Anarchist Group Meetings  
(see Announcements Column)

Every Wednesday at 8 p.m.  
BONAR THOMPSON Speaks.

Every Friday and Saturday:  
SOCIAL EVENINGS

### AFRICAN FORUM

TUES. FEB. 26—at 7 p.m.  
F. A. Ridley on  
THE SUEZ CRISIS AND THE  
EVOLUTION OF IMPERIALISM

## FREEDOM

The Anarchist Weekly

Postal Subscription Rates:  
12 months 19/- (U.S.A. \$3.00)  
6 months 9/6 (U.S.A. \$1.50)  
3 months 5/- (U.S.A. \$0.75)

Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies  
12 months 29/- (U.S.A. \$4.50)  
6 months 14/6 (U.S.A. \$2.25)

Cheques, P.O.'s and Money Orders should  
be made out to FREEDOM PRESS, crossed  
a/c Payee, and addressed to the publishers

FREEDOM PRESS

27 Red Lion Street

London, W.C.1. England

Tel.: Chancery 8364