

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

Vol. 18, No. 24

June 15th, 1957

Threepence

AND NOW TELEPHONE TAPPING

"BRITISH democracy" our most valuable export, some democrats tell us, has surely lost some of its glitter during the past fortnight. First we had the revelation in the House of Lords that our political police have for some time been snooping in the Universities, expecting the staff to inform on their students as well as on each other. And last week we had some unsavoury details in the House of Commons about telephone-tapping which appeared to alarm some Members and which should shake at least the thinking section of the public out of the complacent and smug attitude of "this could not happen here." Anything can happen where one section of the community has power over the community as a whole; and since the organisation of society is on such a basis whether in Britain or Russia, the United States or Spain there is no reason to assume, as is so commonly done in the "Democracies", that what happens as a matter of course in Communist Russia or Fascist Spain cannot happen in a "democratic" country. To do so is to overlook the factor common to dictatorships and democracies: the power of the Executive!

formation which was obtained by the police in connection with "a notorious and self-confessed criminal" (to quote Mr. Butler's justification for telephone-tapping on that particular occasion), was passed on to an unofficial body, that is, the Bar Council, at their request, in connection with a "disciplinary matter" affecting the barrister with whom the "notorious and self-confessed" was engaged in conversation. What emerges from the facts of the case is that for the Bar Council to request the transcript of the tapped conversation ("request" is the word used by Mr. Butler) makes it quite clear that the Bar Council already had knowledge of the nature of the conversation, which means that they had received a "tip" from the police or someone in the Home Office or the office of the Director of Public Prosecutions. This kind of activity, we are sure, goes on every day. Officially it does not only because such information cannot be used in the courts as evidence. The importance of the case raised by Colonel Lipton rests on the fact that such information (a) has been officially passed on to an unofficial body, the Bar Council, and (b) that it is going

to be used by them as evidence in the "trial" of one of their members. The argument advanced by the Colonel and his supporters is that a precedent has been created, and they want to know the reason why.

★

WE can see the importance of the issues involved, and would even say that the outlook would be even bleaker than it is if the point had been reached in this country where no one raised their voice over such issues. But until the public realises that the disclosures and the parliamentary "row" are simply rearguard actions and not victories in the cause of individual freedom, no real progress will be made towards the free society in which the principles of co-operation will have replaced those of coercion.

In his statement to the House, the day after Colonel Lipton's bombshell, Mr. Butler (that "humane and progressive" Home Secretary, according to Mr. Gaitskell, who obviously recognises the political value of buttering-up the ego as a means of dividing the enemy camp!) pointed out that the Home Secretary

possesses the "prerogative power" to intercept telephone communications. Of course this, as he described it, "essential power" was used "solely in cases involving the security of the State or for the purpose of detecting serious crime".

It is significant that no member of the Commons questioned this prerogative power—this *privilege* which "could be used only by the personal authority of the Home Secretary", in spite of the fact that all the things they object to in his predecessor's action, stem from it. For not only does it grant to an individual overwhelming powers, but in the first place recognises the right of the authorities to obtain information by tapping telephones which is perhaps even more important!

To our minds, to recognise the "prerogative powers" of the police (with the authority of the Home Secretary himself) to tap telephones and at the same time to deny them the right to use any evidence so obtained officially, is sheer hypocrisy. But that is the essence of reformism and political reformists: they cannot see the wood for trees. They cannot see that the basic power structure of society remains how-

ever much they tinker with the surface frills. In fact of course, they do see it, but since they aim at occupying positions of power themselves at some time or other, their opposition cannot be directed to fundamentals without cutting the ground from under their feet. It is for this reason that we do not expect any government, Labour, Liberal or Conservative to voluntarily deny itself or refuse to use any powers which will implement its authority.

★

IN a society which is divided if only by economics it is obvious that to some certain laws are good, to others they are bad. Without coercion, the threat of punishment.

Continued on p. 3

NO ARGUMENTS

Mr. Bevan told miners at a Cardiff rally recently that the H-bomb had created a situation where the techniques of war had effectively destroyed democracy. They could not have argument and the H-bomb because the H-bomb destroyed the argument.

With the H-bomb Britain was as much a dictatorship as any dictatorship in the world. "We had 10 minutes' notice of war on Egypt. The next time we won't have a 10 minutes' notice. You just have a bomb and after that you won't worry any more."

★
TELEPHONE-TAPPING in this country is not a new manifestation of governmental, or police powers. It has been going on for years, under Labour governments as well as when Conservatives are in power. (Governments come and go, the police go on for ever, as it were!). Why then did some M.P.'s get hot under the collar last week? The reason emerges quite clearly from the question put by Colonel Lipton (Lab. Brixton) to the Home Secretary which started the parliamentary "row".

In what circumstances [did the Home Secretary] authorise the police to supply the Bar Council, in connection with a disciplinary matter affecting a barrister, transcripts of intercepted conversations in the London area.

In other words what concerns the Member for Brixton and most of his friends who followed him is that in-

POPULATION FACTS

NEW YORK, MAY 26.

Every minute an average of about 170 babies come into the world while only about 90 people leave it. These figures are given in the "Demographic Year Book," prepared by the statistical office of the United Nations and released today, which estimates that the world's population of some 2,700 millions is increasing by about 120,000 a day. If the growth continues at this rate, there will be twice as many people by the end of the century.

The main reason why man is multiplying so rapidly, it is stated, is that people are living longer. This in turn is mainly due to more efficient doctoring and sanitation. In one country, the Netherlands, the expectation of life is now over 70 years for both males and females. Twelve countries report the same figure for females only (women almost everywhere live longer than men).

The fastest rate of population growth is reported from Latin America, where 4,400,000 persons are added to the population every year. The biggest absolute increase (24 millions a year) takes place in Asia, which already has more than half the world's population.

The two biggest national populations are those of China (582,603,417) and India (356,879,394). The Soviet Union is estimated to come third, but there has been no census of the Russian people since 1939.—*Reuter*.

Will Nationalisation be Dropped?

THERE used to be a time when the advocates of nationalisation invested their arguments with a concept of social justice. It was held to be unjust for the means of life to be controlled by a few for their private profit; for the needs of the majority to be exploited by those who, by some means or another, had come into ownership of wealth.

As industry has developed it has brought with it more and more socialisation in the sense that it has involved whole communities and brought together large numbers of men and women in common activity.

And as technical progress continues each generation owes more and more to the preceding one, taking for granted knowledge and processes of applying it which are the accumulation of the achievements of many. It becomes increasingly difficult for any one person to say 'I made this, therefore I have a right to own it', since there are extremely few products which can be made by any individual from the very beginning—and even then it is doubtful if the tools used would be made or invented by the user.

We have all learned from the past and from the inventiveness of our predecessors, and it is this which makes it audacious, to say the least, for any person to claim sole proprietary right to any product. And when the rights of ownership are claimed, not for the product alone, but for the means of production, which depend upon the social co-operation of many persons for their productivity, the audacity of the defenders of private ownership becomes even more apparent.

No-one Does it Alone

Nobody rises to the top in modern industry by his own efforts. There is no such thing as a self-made man. The man who has got to the top has done so by being able to enlist the services of other people and take advantage of their skills, knowledge and powers of co-operation as well as carrying on where others have left off.

Even this applies only to the working, or organising executive. But the bulk of capital invested is done so by individuals, or representatives of concerns like insurance companies, who haven't the foggiest notion about production as such. They know only how to invest money. How they came by that money is irrelevant; with it they can buy the profits from the work of others who have 'nothing to sell but their labour power' and so the profits from social production

goes into private pockets.

Now the whole of socialist thought stems from the understanding and (in great and ponderous detail) of this process of exploitation and its denunciation as socially unjust. And the idea of the nationalisation of industry is based upon the concept that industry should be run for the benefit of the community as a whole and that since the state is the executive power in the community, it should take over control of the means of production and distribution.

Our readers will be familiar with the anarchist arguments against the socialist's naive view of the State. We don't need to go into those here. Suffice it to say that it is our view that all the means of production and distribution should be operated in the interests of the community as a whole and that it is unjust that either labour or natural resources should be exploited for private gain.

Doctrinaire

However mistaken in the means, however ignorant of the nature of the State

and of power, nationalisation was the furthest that the Labour Party was prepared to go in the direction of public ownership, and it represented a different approach to society from that of the Conservatives and the Liberals. It seems that experience of the reality of nationalisation, however has made at least two leaders of the Party change their minds.

It is only a fortnight since Sir Hartley Shawcross spoke out against any further 'doctrinaire' nationalisation, and he was closely followed by Mr. R. R. Stokes, former Labour Minister of Works and Minister of Materials.

He said that he thought that those services and industries which 'of their nature' constituted monopolies were better under public rather than private ownership. But he went on: "Beyond that only those industries which it can be shown it would be to the public benefit to own should be nationalised."

"What we ought to do is to change the wording of the policy statement which now reads that we aim at 'the ownership and control of the means of production,

More Food Destroyed

IN any civilized society an abundance of food would be a matter for rejoicing, and in this hungry world one would suppose that the humane thing to do with surplus products which cannot find a money market would be to distribute them freely to those who need them.

The destruction of food under capitalism is a recognised practise when the regulated price is unobtainable, but giving it away is not, unless political expediency demands it. We have heard of wheat and coffee being destroyed in the United States and pigs being drowned in Germany; now Britain, where officially there are no starving people, throws away 9 million gallons of skim milk and destroys large quantities of potatoes—the only way it seems by which the seasonal 'surplus' can be dealt with.

The Milk Marketing Board, explaining the present 'surplus', said that "every spring more milk is produced than the public can drink or

processing factories can consume. But it would be uneconomical to build special plant to handle a seasonal surplus that can vary from year to year. So the surplus has to be wasted. . . . There is a similar difficulty with potatoes".

It is nonsense to suggest that more milk is being produced than the public can drink; it would be nearer the truth to say that many people cannot afford to purchase the amount of milk that they need.

Many old people and mothers of large families would welcome a free or a greatly reduced issue of milk and potatoes, the destruction of which will "cost the taxpayer £7,000,000."

When milk was reduced by a 4d. a pint early in the year welfare milk went up in price. Sales of milk did not increase with the reduction but judging from the reaction of the public much more milk would be bought if it were reduced to a price which people could afford.

An official from the Milk Market-

distribution and exchange' to 'the ownership or control', for I believe we can get pretty well all we want by control. It would be silly to nationalise anything for doctrinaire reasons. Two particular industries I have in mind, into both of which I made some investigations when Minister of Materials, are cement and Imperial Chemical Industries."

While it was true that Associated Portland Cement controlled about 65 per cent. of the cement production of the country, it was in no sense a monopoly.

"Here the solution would be to have a Government-owned cement factory run in competition but on equal terms," he said. "As for I.C.I., their arrangements with America are so complicated with regard to the use of American patents on which they very greatly depend that I do not believe it would be practical successfully to nationalise them. As long as the Government has control of what these big firms do, as they had in wartime, the question of ownership does not seem to me to matter very much. Mere transfer of ownership would of itself achieve nothing."

"Another industry I had something to

Continued on p. 4

ing Board, answering questions put to him on the B.B.C. said in reply to the suggestion that old age pensioners should be given a free supply, that since some old people lived with their families there would be no guarantees that they would actually get the milk! He claimed that while the idea had not been entirely ignored by the Board such a scheme would nevertheless cost them a fortune, presumably in distribution costs.

There is no satisfactory method under capitalism by which the problem can be solved since profit and not need is the main motivation for production. But even in this society with its competitive and greedy principles it seems more reasonable to sell goods at drastically reduced prices rather than destroy them. Why is it not done? Perhaps because this might set an undesirable precedent which would certainly be frowned upon by the price fixers whose job it is to keep prices and profits stable and high.

STUDIES IN REBELLION—3

(Continued from previous issue)

III.

BAKUNIN, I have suggested, is the revolutionary hero who appeals to rebellious and romantic youth. His contemporary, Alexander Herzen (1812-1870), on the other hand, is a figure who appeals to maturer minds. The young, it may be said, have, with rare exceptions, no sense of the tragic; for them, tragedy is merely one of the postures of adolescence: one has to have surmounted youth and inwardly to have experienced the inevitability of things to appreciate the finer points of tragedy. Herzen was, indeed, a tragic hero both in his public and in his private life. For details of the latter the reader may be referred to E. H. Carr's *The Romantic Exiles*; it is the tragedy of his public life that concerns us here.

From his youth until death Herzen remained faithful to the vow which, walking on the Sparrow Hills near Moscow, he had pledged with his lifelong friend, Nicolas Ogarev: "to sacrifice (our) lives to the struggle for freedom." The maturer Herzen would perhaps have withdrawn the word 'sacrifice', although in the eyes of the world his life was, and still appears, a sacrifice. Nurtured, like so many of his rebellious compatriots, in Tsarist prisons, he escaped from his beloved Russia in 1848 and for the next twenty years used his brilliant pen in the service of freedom. The paper *Kolokol* (The Bell), issued from London and Geneva between 1857 and 1867 and smuggled into Russia, became the principal inspiration of a whole generation of intellectuals hoping for a transformation of the Tsarist régime. In the end, however, it was the radical youth of

this same generation who turned against him. Playing out the tragedy of Fathers and Sons, they accused him of uttering hackneyed rhetorical phrases, commonplaces about 'Land and Liberty', 'witticisms sometimes clever but more often flat', and—such is the blindness of youth—of lack of integrity and courage. And yet Tolstoy's judgment of 1888 remains true: "What a prodigious writer! Russian life in the last twenty years would have been different if this writer had not remained concealed."

"A Russian Voltaire": that has been the majority judgment of posterity. There is truth enough in this description. Like Voltaire, he hated all office-holders; like Voltaire, he was 'a sceptic by habit and cast of mind and by temperament'; like Voltaire, 'he refused to take life at its face value'; and like Voltaire too, 'he attached value to precision' and used this trait to administer salutary shocks to his contemporaries. Dr. Lampert elaborates these similarities but also points out the differences. Herzen was intelligent, like Voltaire probably the most intelligent man of his generation, but he did not make the mistake made by so many intelligent men of thinking that evil was always the result of stupidity. Moreover, he loved human beings and his human beings, unlike Voltaire's, were solid men, not 'wraiths lacking flesh and bones.' His famous irony, too, masked something which Voltaire lacked: a passionate and violent nature which saved his barbs from ever being merely deprecating and flippancy. Above all, perhaps, he was endowed with that most un-Voltairean of qualities—of 'being saddened by what he knew'. He spoke often

of "the sickness of truth" and felt intensely what Dr. Lampert calls 'the sadness at the end and within all knowledge'.

In a fascinating chapter Dr. Lampert discusses Herzen's thought under the heading "A Philosophy of Existence". The title is correct. Herzen, like our contemporary existentialists, felt the stupidity of appealing to standards outside oneself: "the free man", he said, "creates his own mortality." Like our contemporaries, too, he had pondered deeply the meaninglessness of existence. "Believe me", he says to his questioner in a dialogue *From the Other Shore*, "men are not predestined to anything at all."—"Why then do they live?"—"For no other reason than they are born to live . . . Life is both ends and means, cause and effect: it is the perpetual disquiet of intense and active living in search of equilibrium, which it loses again whenever it has found it. It is ceaseless movement—the *ultima ratio*. There is no way beyond that . . . Life does not reach out to a goal, but realises all the possibilities and pursues all the actualities; it is always ready to step further, in order to live more intensely and, if possible, more fully. There is no other aim . . . And if we look to the limit, we find no other end save death."

But there is nothing in Herzen of the snivelling despair one sometimes finds in the modern existentialists: he strikes no postures in order to capture our sympathy or attention. "What he really demanded of man", observes Dr. Lampert, "was a heroic attitude that prevents man from attaching himself to something outside, instead of continuing the effort of being himself." It was this de-

mand, perhaps, which enabled him to rise above even anti-theism. To desire to kill God is explicable but it may easily become, like the desire to serve God, an obsession and yet another means of hiding ourselves from ourselves. He was aware, says Dr. Lampert, that 'neither belief nor unbelief are rationally grounded, that the one and the other are attitudes to life, ways of committing one's feelings and will, which are governed by other than mere rational considerations.' He was conscious, therefore, that religion has a logic of its own and, sceptic to the end, he yet remained incapable of opening the Gospels without being moved.

Readers of *From the Other Shore*, translated and published last year—his most enduring work, apart from the incomparable *Memoirs* (My Past and Thoughts)—will know something of Herzen, the rebel. It contains the most devastating critique ever written of the bourgeois spirit and reveals an historical insight unmatched by any other revolutionary before or since. Written shortly after the failure of the 1848 revolutions, it is Herzen at his most passionate. More characteristically, it is Herzen at his most courageous, for it represents a fearless attempt to revise his ideas in the light of the dismal outcome of that 'Year of Revolutions'.

Herzen was never afraid to face the truth and this essay is, above all, a proclamation of revolution for the sake of truth—a revolution—to quote Dr. Lampert—against the bourgeois-ridden revolutionaries as well as against the bourgeois-ridden world, against the "privileged liberators of humanity" as well as against the humanity they were intent on liberating. Herzen loved freedom and he wished men to be free, but he disliked and distrusted liberators: "If only people wanted, instead of liberating humanity, to liberate themselves, they would do a very great deal for human freedom."

As a man, Herzen was undoubtedly unfitted for the business of revolution; his life, therefore, does not compare with Bakunin's from the point of view of exhibiting the

union of theory and practice. But, instead, he had a more fundamental task to perform: to teach revolutionaries the limitations of revolutionism. "There is", he said, "a peculiar demon in me: doubt. I have not got that fanatic faith: there is conviction, but there is no faith." Such a man is clearly not to be trusted at the barricades: he deserves to be heard only after—or before—the smoke has cleared away from the muskets. This 'great incendiary of truth', as Strakhov called him, could not refrain from irony at the expense of the revolutionaries themselves. "Will you explain to me," he asked, "why it is ridiculous to believe in God, and not ridiculous to believe in mankind? Why it is stupid to believe in the kingdom of heaven and not stupid to believe in earthly utopias?" And again: "It is but a small matter to hate the crown: what is necessary is to give up revering the Phrygian cap. It is a small matter to see crime in an insult to majesty: what is necessary is to recognise *salus populi* as a crime. It is high time to bring to the bar republic, legislation, representations, all notions of citizenship and of the citizen's relations to others and to the State. There will be many executions; it will be necessary to sacrifice many familiar and cherished things. There is no virtue in sacrificing what one hates. The fact is that we must surrender the things we hold dear, whenever we have become convinced of their untruth. Therein lies our real task. We are not called upon to gather the fruit, but to be the executioners of the past—to discern it in all its guises, to pursue and to destroy it . . . in the name of the human spirit."

It is this single-minded pursuit of the truth wherever it might lead, this desire to see 'things as they are', which provides the clue to the proper understanding of his *Letters to an Old Comrade*, addressed to Bakunin in 1869. Marxist commentators, following Lenin, have interpreted these *Letters* as marking Herzen's break with Bakunin's

Continued on p. 3

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP OPEN DAILY

(Open 10 a.m.—6.30 p.m., 5 p.m. Sats.)

New Books . . .

- 1 Work in a Secondary Modern School R. M. T. Kneebone 12/6
Population Theories and the Economic Interpretation Sydney Coontz 21/-
The Trouble Makers A. J. P. Taylor 18/-
Men Against the State James Martin 16/-

Reprints . . .

- The Living Jefferson (ed.) James T. Adams 2/6
Shakespeare Ivor Brown 2/6
The Gold of their Bodies C. Gorham 3/6
Far from the Madding Crowd Thomas Hardy 4/-

Pamphlets . . .

- The Leicestershire Experiment Stewart C. Mason 1/9

Second-Hand . . .

- Shooting an Elephant George Orwell 4/-
My Old Man's a Dustman Wolf Mankowitz 3/-
If It Die . . . André Gide 4/-
The Romantic Exiles E. H. Carr 4/-
The Problem Family A. S. Neill 4/-
The Conquest of Bread Peter Kropotkin 6/6
Reconstruction by Way of the Soil G. T. Wrench 5/-
The Adventures of Wesley Jackson William Seroyan 2/6
Days of Contempt André Malraux 2/6
Godwin and the Age of Transition (ed.) A. E. Rodway 5/-
The Eighteenth Brumaire Karl Marx 3/-
The Marx Brothers Kyle Crichton 6/-
The Real Life of Sebastian Knight Vladimir Nabokov 3/-
Jim Larkin: the Rise of the Underman R. M. Fox 10/-
Phillip Massinger Plays (Mermaid Series) Unexpurgated 5/-
The Fifth Amendment To-day Erwin H. Griswold 5/-

We can supply ANY book required, including text-books. Please supply publisher's name if possible, but if not, we can find it. Scarce and out-of-print books searched for—and frequently found!

*Postage free on all items

Obtainable from

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

Argentina

SIXTY YEARS OF 'LA PROTESTA'

IN Buenos Aires this week one of the most celebrated of anarchist periodicals, *La Protesta* has been celebrating its sixtieth anniversary. On June 13th, 1897, a group of Argentinian workers published the first issue of the paper which they called *La Protesta Humana*. It answered a growing demand for a South American anarchist journal in the Spanish language; a demand which had been created very largely by the flow of European immigrants, amongst whom Errico Malatesta had played a leading rôle. It was in 1889 that Malatesta first published *La Questione Sociale*, an Italian anarchist paper in Buenos Aires, where he was also one of the founders of the radical groups among the bakers (in 1887) and among workers in other trades. *El Perseguido* was published in Spanish from 1890 to 1897, in which year it was taken over and transformed into *La Protesta Humana*.

This anarchist journal was to appear weekly during the next nine years. It was not an easy existence for a paper which was always the rallying point for the workers' struggle. By 1902-1903 the movement had established itself firmly and was responsible for the organisation of the most important strikes of the period, for example, that of the dockers. *La Protesta Humana* not only supported and encouraged these strikes, it was, as one writer put it, the 'soul' of the struggle. Government reaction was merciless; militants were arrested and immigrants deported. *La Protesta Humana* was seized, but with that determination and resourcefulness that ran right through its sixty years of existence, it appeared again within a few weeks.

And Dr. John Creaghe, the Irishman who had previously published the *Sheffield Anarchist* from his slum surgery in this country, and whom our Argentine comrades refer to as "the father of the *Protesta Humana*", because of his superhuman efforts during the early years of the paper, created a sensation throughout the country when he defied official attempts to prevent the paper being sold, by hiring a carriage which he filled with copies of the paper, and driving through the streets of Buenos Aires selling the paper with one hand, and brandishing a revolver in the other, ready to counteract any attempts at interference by the police!

In November 1903 the title of the paper was shortened to *La Protesta*, and in 1906 the weekly became a daily. But

the road was still difficult and dangerous, and in 1910 more reprisals resulted in more deportations, and culminated in the setting on fire of the *Protesta* offices and printing works, by mobs who then paraded the streets carrying parts of the destroyed printing machines as trophies. Then during the years 1911-12 the paper was published clandestinely, appearing legally once more in June 1912 as a weekly. Once more the anarchist movement and the revolutionary workers' organisation F.O.R.A. which was inspired by the anarchists, demonstrated their powers of recovery and within a few months *La Protesta* was appearing again as a daily, and continued as such until 1930. The editors of the paper were always exposed to reprisals by the hirelings of the reactionaries, and in fact, in 1928, Emilia Lopez Arango, one of the editors for sixteen years, was brutally murdered.

La Protesta has always been a paper with a large circulation among the militant workers. The fact that during the eight years 1922-29 a weekly literary supplement was published, is an effective answer to those who claim that it is not possible to produce a paper of a reasonable 'cultural' level for a working-class readership. During the eight years that the supplement was published, the works of the world's best radical thinkers and writers were made available to the people of Argentina in Spanish translation. A well-known Spanish anarchist, D. A. de Santillan, was responsible for the editing of this supplement and for the sheer physical effort of translating the greater part of it.

The publication of *La Protesta* as a daily came to a violent end in 1930 when it was suppressed after the *coup d'état* of General Uriburri and the bloody repression which lasted for eighteen months and took its toll of the anarchists and the militants of the F.O.R.A. Ever since then the paper has had a more or less clandestine existence, varying in degree with the particular régime in power. The most difficult period of all were the years following, first the military *coups d'état* of Generals Ramirez and Rawson in 1943, and then the régime of Peron. But no government has succeeded in completely silencing this voice of anarchism, and in October 1955, after years of underground and sporadic publication, the paper began once more to appear regularly and openly. "Our paper penetrates gradually", write the editors, "into circles of

the people to whom, during long years of enforced silence, anarchist ideas were completely unknown. We are sure that a publication of good quality can be of great importance at this moment in Argentina."

We send our greetings and congratulations to those who for so many years, in the face of suffering and danger have kept alive the spirit of this protesting voice.

CINEMA

MAKING LIFE ENDURABLE

GOOD satirical films are not common, and when a new one arrives it is a cause for rejoicing. And it is comforting to find that in spite of McCarthy and his followers the Americans can still hold their own with the rest of the world when it comes to poking fun at cherished institutions. *The Teahouse of the August Moon* (in Cinemascope and Metrocolor), at the Empire Cinema, is in the same class, though not from the same stable, as *Roxy Hart*.

The target here is the American occupation forces in Okinawa. Armed with "Plan B", Colonel Purdey (Paul Ford) is going to give the fortunate inhabitants of this Pacific island the inestimable benefits of Democracy.

The Okinawans have had plenty of experience of occupation, their island having been occupied successively by Chinese pirates, English missionaries, and the Japanese. With such a background they have little difficulty in coping with the Americans. Their philosophy is one of gracious acceptance. In the words of the wily interpreter Sakini (Marlon Brando), "Pain makes a man think; thinking makes him wise; and wisdom makes life endurable."

Brando dominates the film. His thoroughness is such that he becomes the character he is playing and there is nothing left of the actor himself. I got the impression that in this rôle he thoroughly enjoyed himself.

Do not imagine that gracious acceptance means mere passivity: it is more like judo, where you use your opponent's

strength to tie him into knots (or so I am told). This is what happens to the American authorities, who find themselves doing what the islanders want them to do, which is not at all what they originally intended.

Plan B calls for the erection of a pentagon-shaped schoolhouse at the village of Tobiki. In charge of the village is Captain Fisby (Glenn Ford), who has been posted from the psychological warfare department, where his propaganda, it seems, had had the effect of undermining American rather than Japanese morale. Captain Fisby is the first to admit that he was not cut out to be a soldier. He is certainly no match for the Okinawans. In the hands of Sakini and geisha girl Lotus Blossom (Machiko Kyo) he is left soft, squeezable wax. In no time at all he has "gone native", discarding his uniform for the comfort of a bath robe, wooden sandals, and a straw hat.

The villagers have no use for a schoolhouse, pentagonal or any other shape. What they do want, however, is a teahouse. Needless to say, they get it.

Tobiki's most interesting manufacture is seven-star "brandy" made from sweet potatoes (not a drop is sold till it's seven days old). The formation of the "Tobiki Co-operative Brewery" supplies the village with much-needed finance and thirsty marines with a much-needed beverage.

But none of this is to the liking of the ambitious, humourless Colonel Purdey. It is mostly through him that authority makes an ass of itself—always an entertaining spectacle, and especially so here.

Glenn Ford has just the right comic touch for Captain Fisby, and Eddie Albert is delightful as a mixed-up psychiatrist. But the laurel wreath goes as usual to Marlon Brando for a performance that is likely to be remembered for a long time.

I enjoyed it all very much, and I recommend it without reservation.

E.P.

And Now Telephone Tapping

Continued from p. 1

Laws would be respected only by those who approved of them as serving their particular interests, and so far as they were concerned such laws would in fact be unnecessary! The purpose of force therefore is to ensure that everyone respects the laws. But if laws are in the interest of the majority then the need for them would indicate that the security of the majority is threatened by a minority, which to our minds is only possible when that minority in fact has real power while the majority has numbers but no power. The political reformist however noble his allegiance to the under-dog accepts the set-up as it is, and only seeks to round-off some of the rough edges of material existence, without, however, modifying the basic causes of the divisions in society. To challenge these latter cannot be done through Parliament*—in plain words it means expropriation, the social revolution, and can only take place in the "streets", or whatever is the present-day equivalent of the "barricades".

The foregoing we suggest is not off the point if we consider that even Labour Home Secretaries will admit to being just as much concerned with the "security of the State" and with "detecting serious crime" as was Mr. Butler last Friday. Allegiance to these—as distinct from allegiance to the commonwealth—means a recognition of the power of the State as well as a failure to admit that crime is a product of the society in which we live. As we see it the well-being and health of the community is actually impaired by the State through its "executive committee" and by the economic system, which create divisions between men, which create the criminal, and the "tensions" among nations. Criminals, "security" and telephone-tapping are only the by-products, the mere incidentals.

★

If all this is considered too remote from the subject at hand, we would conclude with this reflection. Mr. Butler is saying that the case under discussion would "not be treated as a precedent"† nevertheless supported the powers vested in his Office of Home Secretary:

"I must reserve this prerogative as my predecessors have done." He emphasised that it would only be used in defence of the security of the State or to detect serious crime.

What he is saying is that the means justifies the ends; that the security of the State and the detection of serious crime justify telephone-tapping. If the people of this country accept such arguments then why not third degree, concentration camps, torture and the firing squad or the hangman?

Either this or we say that there are certain things we are not prepared to do under any circumstances, whatever the provocation or the "justice" of our cause. The latter course will bring a new dignity to mankind as a whole and new social horizons. But to justify the means by the ends is to reduce humanity to the level of the gangster, the racketeer, the nark . . . and the gutter.

*Surely the nearest approach to revolutionary change through Parliamentary means was Leon Blum's Popular Front in France in 1936 which was crippled by the "200 families" simply by the expedient of the mass export of capital to America!

†And he added "In my opinion the general principle that this sort of information is not disclosed to persons outside the public service should be the line of conduct in the future."

AMERICAN LETTER ON BEING AGAINST THE ATOM-BOMB

I HEARD the beginning of a speech by Admiral Strauss, head of the Atomic Energy Commission in the United States, at about the time of the November Presidential election and had I stayed on there would have been material for an authentic report. As it is memory records only that the Admiral came not wearing a sailor's suit, that he was very much wearing a salesman's charm and that he had always been fascinated by the American Civil War. What he thought about the fission-fusion business I didn't stay to hear and regretted the negligence, because Mr. Strauss' temperament affects me very closely and I should like to have known him better.

You remember that one of the issues that fizzled out in the Presidential election was bomb-testing. Adlai Stevenson, the candidate for the Democratic party, said it was madness to continue and Eisenhower or Ike (you can't say Ike Eisenhower) who argued for the Republican party said that Stevenson didn't know what he was talking about.

A friend of mine was working in a restaurant on voting day. Among the restaurant help he found himself in a 25% minority. For voting against Stevenson the other three gave as reasons: 1. "He can't manage his own wife so how can he manage the country?" 2. "He's a queer." 3. "He's a jerk." My friend asked staunchly, "What about the H-bomb?" to be told, "What the hell does he know about that?"

Stevenson clearly had poor advisors on his public relations staff. Of his two main errors the first was to have a go at Ike for his heart attack, even to mention the unmentionable surmise of his death. One person I work with was so incensed at this that without fail upon hearing the name Stevenson he would hiss, "That bastard". This man's father suffered a heart attack last year and is doing very well so far. For many people I am sure that a vote for Ike was an act of faith in the health of themselves or of their family.

Stevenson's gravest error was to remind people of death in the air from fission and fusion. A vote for Ike then was also an act of faith that all was OK in the stratosphere.

★

THE Spring series is now due to begin in Nevada. It is expected that some 40 nuclear explosions will be arranged for this year—about 20 American, 15 Russian and 5 British. In future years this ratio may continue in effect, somewhat along the lines of naval parity that kept warship builders busy before the last war.

I believe that the person who feels passion for such modes of understanding and interpreting life and history and passion also for such thoughts and activities as can collectively be described as anarchist, arrives at a point of cynicism about the society he sees organized around him, but arrives at that point

only by the path of expedient lies to which he has himself at one time subscribed. If to be cynical is to deride the motives which people provide for what they do, then an anarchist is cynical. Such a person is no wiser or cleverer than anyone else but claims only greater insight into political and social events, a more critical discernment of what is significant and what is just routine in these events, and a justified cynicism regarding the motives of the people performing them. This is claimed not through any magical intuition but through the sad experience of having once believed the lies and loved the liars. It is a process of growing out of childhood.

When an "atomic" or a "hydrogen" bomb is exploded it goes off in the name of defending freedom or of guarding one half of the world against the other half. The murk that shrouds the relation between scientist and politician in these tests makes it impossible for a layman to know to what extent the explosions are being used to obtain information on atomic particles that has an enormous practical and theoretical importance, data which men deserve praise for determining as soon as possible. People who fear for the loss of sovereignty of "God" may deny, as they have always done under various disguises, the value of the quest for factual knowledge, but a person like myself would be unable to support the concept of an *a priori* limit beyond which Adam-like man should not meddle. So let us assume that some of the tests really are tests and not just a kind of scientific masturbation, that after some of the tests we have a more perfect knowledge of the material of the world than we had before, that we can approve of the purposes of some of the tests.

The last two series of explosions are indefensible (assuming that the latest series is the Nevada one at present being deferred for a few days because of the weather). The American group are exploding at least one bomb in the form of an exercise for marines to be landed an unprecedentedly short time afterwards. The British fusion bomb can surely have revealed no information not already uncovered by previous American tests. But I think we should be clear in stating that an uncritical condemnation of the H. and A., may be voiced as part of some political stunt itself anti-human, and it may also be the disguise for some irrational religious feeling. There probably are good objective reasons for this type of atomic experimentation although they are heavily outweighed by the dangers of it.

The dangers—the gravest danger is this worst-of-all match which the political children are playing with. If you lined up all the premiers and presidents, popes and what-not for the past hundred years and told each one to do his worst, each could devise his own catastrophe, but the worst gets worse with each decade. At no time has a resistance to politicians

and their subservient power-wielders been unfruitful, but in the decade of the 1950's resistance to the wishes of our leaders, the psychopathic or the merely dull-witted ones, has changed from a relative necessity to an absolute necessity.

★

IT is no longer excusable after their reactions to the Hungarian revolution to believe that "our leaders" are on "our side" and that for the sake of our family or our country or our anything else we should try to support them. Anarchists are those who have already freed themselves from this emotional drag and being thus in a privileged state of mind have the responsibility to induce an anti-political state of mind in everyone around them. If people "feel" themselves to be against the H. and A. bombs they must be helped to an awareness that opposition to the bombs through political movements is not effective opposition at all. To act effectively against the Bomb you must first act effectively against the State.

What are the reasons for the opposition people feel towards the bombs?

One, the valid enough fear of annihilation, the feeling that the bombs are too big for their owners. A few brains go off the ropes and continents will be destroyed. Here the motto must be, "Put not your trust in princes".

Two, the anti-scientific feeling that there is some sacred grove in the heart of nature into which one should not enter. Demonstrate the mysticism of the many statements that can express this feeling, and point out the unreliability of mysticism as a guide to effective action.

Three, fear of the physical but not necessarily lethal effects of the bomb. These effects should be openly examined and any hysterical exaggerations of them should be admitted. In another article I want to do this concerning take-up by the skeleton of radio-active strontium, the concentration by plants of radio-active strontium, radiation-induced cancers and leukaemia, and radiation-induced alteration of inheritance. It will be seen that frightful as are these hazards of bomb-testing, they are overshadowed by the existence of atomic weapons in the hands of the agents of the State. J.B.

FRANCE

Strikes and Wage Claims

THE relative prosperity that characterizes the French economy and the expansionist tendency that has been a feature of the greater part of the big industries in the course of these last years bring with them demands for better pay and conditions; but these are not, however, all of the same nature. Indeed, the wage-earners of the public services and those of private industry no longer have the same living conditions and no longer act in an identical fashion. To simplify matters, we could say that the strikes on the public section are designed to make up the delay that separates wages from prices, whereas in "classical" industry the aim is to make the workers benefit from its prosperity.

Let us take some examples to illustrate this schema. The post-office employee or the railwayman or the bus driver, who is sure of regular work where overtime is rare and where output bonuses are of secondary importance, is put in a position of inferiority in relation to the turner or the mason in the metal or building industry, who does not work the legal 40-hour week but "does" 50, 55, and sometimes 60 hours. As pay for overtime is at a higher rate than for normal hours one might say that what interests the worker in private industry is the overtime, whereas what is essential for the State employee is the basic wage.

In these conditions two distinct mentalities are rapidly being produced. The minor official or the agent of the public

services has to fight to raise his salary and compel the State-employer to grant an increase. But this is in sectors where the laws of supply and demand operate little or not at all and concerns an employer who is suffering more than ever from an acute financial crisis. When the prices of foodstuffs rise the State employee is directly hit, since his wage is fixed. Manipulations of the index of prices by government services can ensure a certain budgetary equilibrium or mask inflation, but the State employee is the immediate victim, and he has only one resource: the move for wage demands and the strike. Accordingly, the combined two-day stoppage of work in the post office, the railways, and public transport (on April 17 and 18 last) has furnished a demonstration of unanimity in discontent.

The resources of the "classic" worker are more numerous. In the metal and building industries there is a certain shortage of skilled labour. The dissatisfied wage-earner can change his job and look for a factory that pays better or get taken on in a new gang. He can also work more overtime or go on piece-work rates. This gives rise to a state of mind that is closer to individual "disengagement" than to collective bargaining. The unions can scarcely act when unionists are so few and non-unionists can do without the trade-union organization.

Here we are faced with an interesting phenomenon: a large proportion of the workers in the public services are trade unionists, whereas only 10 per cent. of the workers in private industry are organized. This is the chief fact that pushes to one side the problem of the unions' multiplicity. The unions' dispersal does not show itself solely in the number of their head offices but also in the existence of craft unions, some autonomous, others attached to a confederation. Often the struggles between the unions do nothing but camouflage the conflicts between the crafts (in the single administration of the Paris Métro there are quite a dozen unions, ranging from that of the stationmasters, through those of the electrical services, etc., to that of the motormen).

As for the unions concerned in the private industries, rare are those that put up a fight. After the great wave of strikes that sprang up to restore the balance between provincial wages and those of the Paris region, there was a general lull. The majority of the federations use their meagre forces to negotiate agreements on the basis of productivity. There is, however (and in this there is a comforting sign) an attempt by the metal workers' section of Force Ouvrière, especially in the aeronautical industry, to start a movement aimed at "organizing" the industry, abolishing excessive wage differentials, and establishing a national collective agreement.

The size of the problem is such that divergencies between militants of different confederal affiliations are wiped out. Thus it was that quite recently the Federation of Metal Workers of the CFTC (Christians) asked to join the FIOM (a professional international attached to the CISL), because its leaders considered that no working-class policy was possible without liaison at international level.

G.O.

S. PARANE.

Studies in Rebellion-3

Continued from p. 1

'petty-bourgeois anarchism' and conversion to 'the stern, inflexible, invincible class-war of the proletariat'; 'liberal' commentators, on the other hand, have interpreted them as a farewell to revolution and a greeting to gradualist evolution. Dr. Lampert is right, I think, in dismissing both these interpretations. While Marxism and liberalism appear so often to be at opposites, they share at least one thing in common: the supine belief in progress. This, Herzen was never guilty of. Material progress in some sense he was willing to acknowledge but of moral and political progress he remained sceptical. Progress in the 18th century rationalist sense he saw rather as a colossal secular illusion which had merely replaced the teleologies of religion. It was "the soulless city of a faceless future"; "the Moloch of brutal depersonalisation." "For Herzen", says Dr. Lampert, "there was but present joy with its present laughter, and present pain with its present tears, and man with his life on earth."

The break with Bakunin in 1869 was not a repudiation of his revolutionary principles but a questioning of his friend's "methods and practical measures" and of his sense of historical moment. "He objected", observes Dr. Lampert, "not to revolution but to playing with revolu-

tion' and he could not ignore the fact that revolutionary destruction 'not merely "makes space"—which he welcomed—but also spreads "religion and politics", establishes autocratic empires and indivisible republics"—which he abhorred.' A revolution, yet, but never forget: "You cannot liberate men in their outward life more than they are liberated *within*." His final attitude, concludes Dr. Lampert, appears to have been that of a revolutionary who could no longer believe in revolution; but what he desired at bottom was not less revolution, but more and better revolution—a revolution that goes beyond mere ideologies, beyond the nameless confessions of the future, beyond mere hatreds and knock-down blows, all of which seemed to him profoundly reactionary, trivial and commonplace, a revolution that is capable of effecting a change in the very structure of existence."

In 1905 Tolstoy returned to the question of Herzen's influence and he noted in his Diary: "Our own intelligentsia has sunk so low that it is no longer fit to understand him. He . . . awaits his readers in the future. He imparts his thoughts far above the heads of the present crowd to those who are able to understand him."

The current revival of interest in

Herzen suggests that the future time that Tolstoy had in mind may at last have come. I know of no other revolutionary thinker, past or present, who has more to say to the present generation than has Herzen. His luminous intelligence, his sad detachment, his intellectual integrity and his passion to see 'things as they are' provide the indispensable beacons to help us find our own way in this lunatic twentieth century world. If we use those beacons, Herzen's tragedy may yet prove to have been our gain.

These sketches of Belinsky, Bakunin and Herzen are, I should make clear if it is not already obvious, based on the portraits by Dr. Lampert. My purpose has not been to provide FREEDOM readers with a 3d. substitute of something that costs 30/-. I shall have failed in my task if I have not made my readers eager to look at and, if they can afford it, acquire the originals. Some reviewers have singled out certain infelicities in Dr. Lampert's style: I hope my own quotations and paraphrases from him have shown that they are as nothing compared with the felicities. His is a book that I should like to have written myself and, if I ever do write one, I hope that I shall bring to it the insight, the sympathy and the understanding that its author has brought to *Studies in Rebellion*.

Are Industrial Unions Coming?

IF SO - WHY?

IT is always annoying to see the right moves being done for the wrong reasons, for that way they soon become the wrong moves as well.

Anarcho-syndicalists have consistently demonstrated the absurdities of craft unionism—the divisions, bickerings and competition it creates between people who should be united. And over the last few years inter-union rivalry has resulted in some stupid situations for the workers.

The last massive dock strike was an example. Then, fed up with the Transport and General Workers' Union—which is a ridiculous amalgam of workers in a hundred different occupations—dockers began to join in mass the long established but small National Amalgamated Stevedores' and Dockers' Union. This union has many faults but at least it consists of and is concerned with portworkers only. In the T&GWU the portworkers are an insignificant minority and the big boys on the executive clearly regard them as a bit of a nuisance.

Nuisance or not, however, card-holders must be held on to, and a most bitter argument sprang up between the T&GWU and the NASDU over the bodies of the dockers of Birkenhead and Hull.

And in the slanging match and invoking of past agreements that followed, nobody was considered less than the dockers themselves. They were important as card-holders only. As human beings their wishes and feelings were not considered.

On a more ridiculous level we had the recent rumpus—also at Birkenhead, incidentally—between metal workers and wood workers, over which union should provide men to bore holes in wood-and-metal material. The men were out on strike for weeks and other workers affected by this stupid squabble.

One Organisation

The answer to these miserable affairs, where the workers lose every time, is clearly the creation of industrial organisations covering all the workers in an industry. Instead of, as at present, twenty-six different craft unions being represented in one car factory, there should be one organisation in which all the workers join throughout the car industry. Then solidarity can be practised and niggling differences prevented.

The anarcho-syndicalist aim in this is precisely in order to bring workers together so that the first step is taken on the path towards workers' control of industry. There is small hope of achieving this goal when workers demonstrate that they cannot sensibly control their own relationships in industry.

And it is with this view in mind that we look with a jaundiced eye upon the news that moves towards industrial unionism may soon be seen in some quarters.

At last week's conference of the National Union of Public Employ-

ees, general secretary (turbulent 60-year-old Welsh leader) Bryn Roberts, made a plea for the creation of one union for each industry. He accused the TUC of playing "a pathetic and undignified part" in industrial affairs, and declared: "In truth the TUC has no role at all. A collection of Trappist monks would be more articulate."

He wants every industry to have a single union, like the miners. There should be a supra-national body, on the lines recommended by the recent courts of inquiry to investigate and advise on wages and profits.

"Trade union disorder is becoming one of the greatest barriers to the workers' own advancement. They will never get a square deal, nor shall we have industrial peace, while there are so many competing unions pulling different ways."

At the moment it is only in one industry that any serious demand for amalgamation is being put forward by anybody with any influence, and that is on the railways, where Jim Campbell, head of the National Union of Railwaymen, is urging the Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen and the Transport Salaried Staffs Association to join him in one big union.

His assistant, Syd Greene, last week-end called for a drive for amalgamations on the ground that "there are far too many unions in the engineering as well as the railway industry."

More significantly, Mr. Alan Birch, shop workers' leader and one of the youngest and ablest men on the TUC general council, recently said that he would like to see a smaller executive or "inner cabinet" to co-ordinate policy for the whole movement—and this would include wages planning.

Meanwhile a plan for a loose federation between the million-strong Amalgamated Engineering Union and smaller bodies is now in draft.

Centralisation

Now this is all very well, but might it not be, as we said at the beginning, doing the right thing for the wrong reason—and in the wrong way?

Our conception of the move from craft to industrial organisation is that it should stem from the workers themselves as a means to integrate their strength and express their desires at the point of production. It should represent their conscious will.

But what would the plans of the union leaders represent? Perhaps

the words used by Alan Birch might give us a hint. He thinks in terms of a smaller executive or an 'inner cabinet', to co-ordinate such things as wages planning for the whole movement.

This looks like fiercer centralisation than exists already. And it looks like taking participation farther away from the rank and file.

One of the reasons why amalgamation is being resisted on the railways is that the two smaller unions would lose their identities and be submerged beneath the much larger NUR. And in all industries the problem will arise of the small organisations being swallowed by the larger ones. Looking at things broadly and objectively the sweeping away of niggling little outfits might be hailed as progress—but the fact remains that the rank and file craftsmen can feel an identity with the small organisation in which he matters more than he will be able to do in a larger amalgamation.

Such moves as are being suggested by the trade union leaders are put forward in order to streamline and modernise their organisations for planning and discipline. We have yet to see any indication that they have any ideas behind them of enriching human relationships in industry, of developing responsibility or providing more say in administration for the workers. Or that there is any social attitude behind the tendency.

To create industrial amalgamations without a revolutionary ideology will simply enlarge the internal faults and magnify the shortcomings of the craft unions. Industrial unionism in itself will offer nothing to the worker except the disappearance of the causes of inter-craft conflict. This is all right, but the price will be a heavy one. Centralisation will give more power to the big boys at the top (could that be why the idea is gaining favour?) and unionism will become more and more a matter of top-level agreements being handed down for the members to obey.

Anarcho-syndicalists have long recognised this danger in industrial unionism, which is why they have always placed the emphasis upon organisation at the point of production. As long as the control of the organisation remains there decentralisation can be maintained, the works committee can be directly responsible to the workers and bureaucracy cannot emerge.

But when you hear talk about 'inner cabinets'—look out!

P.S.

Will Nationalisation be Dropped?

Continued from p. 1

do with when a Minister is the building trade. Many people would like to see it nationalised, but I do not think it is practical. When I was Minister of Works there were 121,000 building companies and only 99,000 bricklayers. The industry has been built up so as to service the small town areas, a group of two or three men forming a unit and providing every art in the trade—at least for service and repairs.

"True enough, there are the big civil engineering contractors, but an enormous proportion of their work is overseas, and they are best left alone to carry on a vital export. As for export as a whole, on which I have spent most of my life, I do not see how in the engineering trade, for example, we could conduct our affairs successfully if over-centralised."

Every market was different and required the intimate knowledge and contact of individual experienced men to maintain success. "You cannot nationalise the export trade—foreigners just won't play," he said.

Will They be Listened to?

Now Mr. Stokes is a successful business man—some say he is a millionaire—and there is no doubt that he will be listened to with respect in the Labour Party councils. In view of the fact that the Trade Union Congress has run out of ideas on nationalisation, we may be sure that there will be some response to his and Shawcross's remarks. Perhaps

Anarchism & Anarchists

DEAR COMRADES,

In my letter to FREEDOM which appeared on 18th May, I did endeavour to pose my personal struggles to mould my way of life according to anarchist precepts, although I find that I am open to accept and act upon any wholesome, beneficial ideas and thoughts.

Whereas I do still find the writings of Emma Goldman, Peter Kropotkin, Malatesta, to be a stimulant and antidote, I do not believe that the clock can now be turned back. One might as well try to abolish the wheel as sweep away the complex institutions with which we are enmeshed. One might have thought that anarchism would have found roots and flourished in countries like India and China—but, it has not.

I do not like the idea of any kind of compromise—we have seen what has happened to socialism in our time. I do not like the idea of revolution, and in any case, the British are not easily fired by enthusiasm for anything outside of sport. The curiously apathetic British people, in order to avoid being pinned down on a question will say one thing, mean another and act quite differently. We are a stubborn, slow-thinking crowd of individual eccentrics with a very strong streak of conservatism—even to the extent of putting up with that which we know to be wrong—and I think that is why anarchism has made no headway.

I see no reason to despair or moan because the number of supporters is few. But

*"Those who would take over the earth
And shape it to their will
Never, I notice, succeed."*

Let anarchism be a way of life, a personal achievement; let those who would, some together in labour or for study, to exchange, confirm, modify or enlarge their ideas, and let us who are seeking the way tell others—surprise them with the novelty and boldness of these revolutionary ideas. We can endeavour to keep true to the spirit of those ideas of the great innovators of anarchism whilst preparing to modify or adapt them to changing conditions.

*"Men of culture came, with their
grades and their distinctions;
And as soon as such differences had
been devised
No one knew where to end them."*

The world is suffering from bad government. Let us ridicule these "leaders" of men, the politicians, judges, lawyers, attorneys, popes and parsons, psychologists and psychiatrists—all those, in fact, who prey upon us.

*"If the sign of life is in your face
He who responds to it
Will feel secure and fit
As when, in a friendly place,*

There'll Always be a Dividend

I was extremely interested in the two millionaires who were interviewed by Jeanne Heal on BBC television, and was heartened by their divergent views on how to make money. The only point they seemed to agree upon is that Great Britain is still a land of opportunity and the finest country in the world to live in.

My sincere thanks to both of them for shattering the myth that this country is finished!—Lt.-Col. C. Farthing, Perivale, Middlesex.

Radio Times, May 31st.

but as a Labour socialist, Mr. Stokes should think of nationalised industry as existing primarily to serve the community and should have notions about the workers in the industries and their attitude to their work and the community they serve.

Now—Not Even a Change of Masters

We think nationalisation achieves nothing because it simply changes one set of masters for another. Mr. Stokes does not apparently give a moment's thought to that—the important aspect for him is trade, efficiency and profit. The original arguments for public ownership, as briefly outlined above, are dismissed as doctrinaire, and nothing should be done which will interfere with the sacred agreements that I.C.I. has with America and the fat profits which flow therefrom.

The Labour Party is badly in need of a policy for the next election. Sir Hartley and Mr. Stokes are doing their considerable best to influence that policy before it appears. The final result will be worth studying—in a morbid kind of way. For, whatever its faults, behind nationalisation was a bumping, ham-fisted and authoritarian attempt at replacing private greed by social service. Now even that is on its way out.

*See FREEDOM (May 25th).

*Sure of hearty care
A traveller gladly waits."*

Personal example and the expression of one's ideas with logic, sweet reasonableness and with a good humour may win many adherents to a splendid cause.

*"There is no need to run outside
For better seeing.
Nor to peer from a window. Rather
Abide
At the centre of your being;
For the more you leave it, the less
You learn."*

One may spread abroad the idea of anarchism and repeat the basic tenets in different forms without imposing upon others or meddling in their affairs. We do not have to reach or command. The word may spread from one man to his family and thence to the village, permeate a country and be realised in the world.

*"Men knowing the way of life
Do without acting.
Effect without enforcing.
Taste without consuming;
Through the many they find the few,
Through the humble the great."*

The letters in FREEDOM (June 1st) from George Gilfillan and Alan Albon—why, I find them friendly and cheering. I shall try to emulate the example set by these comrades and keep by me for permanent reference words which were not written in vain.

Sincerely,

London, June 3 FRANK LETCHFORD.
Quotations from Tao Teh Ching, trans.
Witter Byner.

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.

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP MEETINGS

JUNE 16—John Bishop on
SNOBBERY
JUNE 23—Donald Room on
ANARCHISM & RELIGION
JUNE 30—Max Patrick on
IS THERE A RULING CLASS
JULY 7.—Laurens Otter on
HISTORICAL DETERMINISM
REVISITED
JULY 14—Jack Robinson on
WORK.

Questions, Discussion and Admission
all free.

OPEN AIR MEETINGS

Weather Permitting
HYDE PARK
Sundays at 3.30 p.m.

★ 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 THOMSON speaks

Every Friday and Saturday:

SOCIAL EVENINGS

Saturday, 15th June
SPAGHETTI & CHIANTI
with entertainments

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

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT!

WEEK 23	
Deficit on Freedom	£460
Contributions received	£350
DEFICIT	£110

May 31 to June 6

London: S.B.* 2/-; London: Hyde Park Sympathisers 2/-; Holwell: H.E.H. 10/-;
Hereford: Anon. 5/-; Victoria, Australia: N.G. 18/6; New York: J.S. 10/6; Coleman's Hatch: D.M. 2/-; London: D.O. 10/6; St. Ninian's: R.A.B. 5/-; London: H.M.* 2/-;
London: Anon. £3/5/0; London: V.T. £1.
Total ... 7 12 6
Previously acknowledged ... 342 19 0
1957 TOTAL TO DATE ... £350 11 6

GIFT OF BOOKS: London: F.

*Indicates regular contributor.

Fire Fund

Holwell: H.E.H. 10/-; London: E.T. 10/6.
Total ... 1 0 6
Previously acknowledged ... 119 7 4
TOTAL TO DATE ... £120 7 10