

In this Issue:

- The Awkward Question - p. 2
The Myth of 'Good' Government - p. 3
Beyond the Wage System - p. 3

Freedom THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

'How small of all that human hearts endure. That part which laws or kings can cause or cure.' -OLIVER GOLDSMITH.

Vol. 18, No. 33

August 17th, 1957

Three pence

The Covent Garden Dispute

MARKET MEN SOLD OUT

WE have frequently maintained in these columns our view that rank and file trade unionists need feel no liability for agreements made in their name by leaders who do not trouble to get a mandate from their members before getting together with the bosses. Unfortunately, too often the members take no heed of the agreements signed by their leaders until it is too late. Perhaps months afterwards a dispute blows up and the workers find themselves out on a limb because their officials have done a deal with the employers which effectively sells them out. Then, unofficial strikers find themselves the target for abuse in the Press (recognising 'Anarchy' to be meant as a term of abuse!) to be responsibly repudiating the properly signed agreement of their own accredited representatives. In the current Covent Garden market dispute, however, the officials tried to get away with it in the full glare of dispute conditions—and it is they who are out on a limb to-day. If we did not recognise the class-collaborationist function of the trade union leader to-day, we would say that the behaviour of the Transport & General Workers' Union officials in this dispute has been nothing short of fantastic. Since, however, we do recognise that function, we

can only point out that they are running true to form, except for the particularly crude way in which they have so obviously gone against their members' wishes, presumably in the hope of bulldozing them back to work after presenting them with the accomplished fact. How it Began The dispute began when the employers attempted to introduce a radical change in working arrangements long established in Covent Garden, changes based upon an arbitration award stating that to make Covent Garden more efficient three grades of worker should be merged into one and that all market men should be available for any job. The award also transferred the control of labour in the market—hitherto completely in the hands of the union—to a labour office responsible to a conciliation board containing representatives of both the employers and the union. This body, under a system similar to that of the Dock Labour Board, would control the recruitment and deployment of all men in the market. The market workers are completely opposed to these changes—particularly to the merging of the three grades—the pitchers, who have so far been self-employed, and who unload the lorries; the warehousemen; and the porters, who load the

greengrocers' vans. The men claim that the pitchers would lose their independence, and that there will eventually be redundancy. And when, three weeks ago, the employers attempted to introduce these changes, the men refused to operate them—saying that they were prepared to go on working on the old terms while there were negotiations carried on between the employers and the union. The employers refused to accept this—and the dispute began with the men saying they were being locked out and the employers saying the men were out on strike. Officials Accept Then the union officials stepped in—and lo! and behold! they agreed with the employers on the very issues which the men rejected! They accepted the merging of the three types of worker and they agreed to a disciplinary code for the better government of the men—though they did somehow persuade the bosses to whittle down their original eight specific grounds on which a worker could have been dismissed to a vague but comprehensive phrase about 'industrial misconduct'. It is small wonder that when the officials reported back to a mass meeting there was uproar! What else could they expect? So now the union officials have done the very thing which they usually fear most—driven the strikers to organise themselves and to begin a more vigorous attempt to rally support outside the market. Sympathetic support had been forthcoming almost from the beginning from the workers of other markets—Spitalfields, Borough, Brentford, Stratford—and even before the officials' attempt to climb down 2,200 dockers had stopped work in defence of a gang which had been

Continued on p. 4

Summerhill in Danger

IN the Daily Mail for August 10 there were two news items that concerned education. One told of a 14-year-old pupil at a Special School (for delinquents?—the report did not say) who was thrashed six strokes with a regulation tawse—"an 18-inch long leather strap divided into 3 thongs"—by his headmaster. He had been caught smoking behind a shelter. Next day the boy's father came to the school and punched the headmaster on the jaw. The father also brought a summons for assault against the headmaster; the case was heard before the Nottingham magistrates, who, in spite of evidence given by the boy that his back had bled, ruled that the punishment was not excessive. (footnote: the headmaster was recently appointed to the magistrates' bench). The other report—under the headline "Kiss-and-Swear School in Danger"—told the sad news that A. S. Neill's great pioneer school of Summerhill is in danger of being closed. Under the 1944 Education Act all private schools have

to be registered and approved by the Ministry of Education and this section of the Act comes into force on Sept. 1 of this year. Summerhill recently received a visit from Her Majesty's Inspectors and they indicated that unless the quality of the teaching improved the school would have to close. Pessimists may see an omen in these two items of news, but the picture is not quite so gloomy as may at first be supposed. Neill has been well aware for some years that the academic side of his school could be improved (see, for instance, his last book—The Free Child), but he considers it to be unimportant beside his experiment in community living, his creation of the conditions in which the free child can develop, which Summerhill is. Although the Ministry takes a different view—it could scarcely do otherwise under the terms of the Act—it has been in the past, and no doubt still is, sympathetic to Neill's ideas and fully appreciates the value of their great influence. When HMIs visited the school in 1949 they gave a very fair report which Neill printed as an appendix to The Free Child.

But now sympathy is clearly not enough, if Summerhill is to survive. More and better teaching staff has to be found. As Neill pointed out in an article in a recent issue of The Times Educational Supplement, progressive schools cannot hope to continue unless they can afford to pay staff considerably more than the £10 a month, all found, which is all that he can afford to offer. Repeated advertisements have failed to find the staff that he wants.

What can be done? Fees cannot be raised without causing hardship to parents, few of whom are as well-to-do as those who send their children to more conventional private schools, and would probably result in loss of pupils.

As a first step towards preserving Summerhill it was recently decided by the parents that an association should be formed to find ways of raising money, publicising the school to attract more pupils, etc. Readers of FREEDOM can help Neill and Summerhill by supporting the Summerhill Society (annual subscription 2s. 6d.) whose secretary is:

MR. HOWARD W. CASE, 172 Sacombe Road, Hertford. M.G.W.

Moscow's Speakers' Corner (pro-tem?)

MOSCOW, JULY 31. A "speakers' corner", somewhat after the style of the Hyde Park one, is probably the most interesting by-product of the World Youth Festival in Moscow. Day and night in Gorki Street, which the Moscow "stiliagi" (or "Golden, idle youth") calls "Broadway", at the festival village, and in other principal thoroughfares the people of Moscow are seeing an exhibition of old-fashioned free-speech unprecedented in Moscow. Western observers who were opposed to Western participation in the festival originally are beginning to have second thoughts about it. The question is being asked: "Who is influencing whom?" For the first time since the Revolution Moscow appears to be wide open in many respects, including censorship. All dispatches connected with the festival are transmitted uncensored. Communist, anti-Communists, anarchists, atheists, nationalists, cosmopolitans, and others from many lands can be heard arguing.—British United Press.

ITALIAN C.P.'S DECLINE L'UNITA IN THE RED

THE Italian Communist Party is no longer an especial source of pride and joy to the Kremlin as of yesteryear, and Palmiro Togliatti, its Leader, is no longer the powerful and popular figure he used to be in Italy. In fact the Party is but a shadow of its former self. In '52 and '53 it was sufficiently strong as to represent a real threat to any government in power—but many things have taken place inside and outside Italy since then, and many of the comrades have become finally and completely disillusioned. Further evidence of Communist declining power was forthcoming a few days ago when L'Unita, the world's biggest Communist newspaper this side of the iron curtain, ceased publication of its special editions in Turin and Genoa, and announced that its last remaining regional edition in Milan will have to serve all three cities. Furthermore, Togliatti was reduced to a page one appeal begging the party stalwarts to give of their hard-earned lire to save L'Unita from "extermination." The two principal reasons for L'Unita's enforced contraction are circulation trouble and, because of that, financial embarrassment. Circulation has fallen from 1,574,000, its peak in 1953, to lower than 300,000—a drop of more than 85 per cent. Apart from the fact that this in itself has caused a considerable fall in income, it has also produced a reaction in Moscow, which has heavily reduced its subsidies. The Russians have never supported failure for any length of time, and have a business-like attitude towards their investments. The gain must be easily identifiable—either in terms of readership or increasing membership of the party. (Economic gains are also regarded as useful, if un-

likely, in propaganda ventures of this kind). Meanwhile at meetings held to encourage support for a "stronger, better" paper, the party bosses got nowhere, but were howled down by ex-employees of L'Unita. One journalist put into words what many of his colleagues and readers must have been thinking for a long time: "We're all sick to death of being told what to write and what to think." This statement must also apply to a large section of the "free press" throughout the world, but we are happy to say that it does not apply to FREEDOM.

...So is FREEDOM for that Matter

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT! WEEK 32 Deficit on Freedom £640 Contributions received £435 DEFICIT £205

August 2 to August 8 Frieth: I.W.I. 4/-; London: Anon.\* 2/4; Oxford: Anon.\* 5/-; London: J.S.\* 3/-; Middlesbrough: H.D. 3/4; Bolton: R.T.S. 10/-.

Total ... 1 7 8 Previously acknowledged ... 434 7 1 1957 TOTAL TO DATE ... £435 14 9

\*Indicates regular contributor.

Fire Fund Millers: L.B. £1/15/0; Chicago: Anon. £1/8/0. Total ... 3 3 0 Previously received ... 362 0 3 TOTAL TO DATE ... £365 3 3

GIFTS OF BOOKS, Stroud: L.G.W.; Munich: A.A.-R.; Chilcompton: J.C.; London: H.S.

Mao Reverts to Type

IT has not taken Mao Tse-tung long to revert to his old methods in spite of his statement (of a few months ago) giving workers the right to riot and criticise government policy. It is reported that seven "counter-revolutionary" groups have been crushed in the last fortnight. Although there must be many elements in China opposed to any system which even pretends to establish social equality, there are also people now emerging from the Communist Party itself who are openly critical of the government. All will be lumped together as "counter-revolutionary", because in spite of the green light flashed by Mao to go ahead and criticise the bureaucrats in power, to actually do so means being labelled as a reactionary of some sort. Latest in line for attack is Madame Ting Ling who has been accused in Chinese Communist newspapers of "individualism and anti-party feeling". She is described in the British press as: "China's greatest living woman writer and a Communist veteran... After studying in the revolutionary cradle of Shanghai University she married another revolutionary writer, U Ye Ping, who was executed in 1931 by Chiang Kai-shek's security police."

It hardly seems likely that she has any desire to establish Chiang Kai-shek in power again, and her only crime may well be a critical approach (however belated) to Mao Tse-tung and his henchmen. The fact that there are groups of people led by students who have been rioting and putting up posters demanding the resignation of Mao and welcoming the return of Chiang Kai-shek can however be used as an excuse to smother any form of valid criticism. JAMES CAMERON, writing in the News Chronicle (Aug. 9th) suggests that since Peking has the monopoly of dispensing news from China she would have suppressed the news about the dissident intellectuals and plots being unearthed daily in remote provinces had she not wanted us to know. This seems quite a point but we are as much in the dark about the reasons as James Cameron. Cameron also points out that "intellectual" has never been a term of abuse in China and that "in the tightly stylised language of Marxism" one can be an individualist without necessarily being a "capitalist opportunist". Mao himself is a proclaimed intellectual, but Marxism allows for many variations

which can make a distinction between just plain "intellectual" and "bourgeois intellectual". The next step from "intellectual individualism" however is capitalism individualism into which category the present critics will eventually be placed if they fail to step quickly into line.

When Crooks Fall Out

MADRID, AUGUST 8. A former Catalan Communist leader, Juan Comorera, was to-day sentenced to 30 years' imprisonment by a Barcelona military court after being found guilty of responsibility for crimes committed during the Spanish civil war. The sentence is subject to approval by the Capitan-General of Cataluña. Comorera, now 62, was said to have returned from exile three years ago to escape "the vengeance of the Communist party". As secretary-general of the Catalan Socialist-Unity (Communist) party, he escaped into exile when General Franco's forces captured Barcelona in January, 1939. The prosecutor said during the trial that Comorera fled to France, whence he went to Moscow to "receive orders". Later he returned to Spain and ran a clandestine publication. He was arrested in 1945.—Reuter. [Comorera's crimes during the Spanish war were not against fascists but against the revolutionary workers—E.D.S.]



PEOPLE AND IDEAS  
**THE AWKWARD QUESTION**

TELL them as much of the truth as they need to know; never prevaricate, never deceive. Drilled in such terms by the high priests of child rearing, the conscientious adult is no longer at a loss when faced by the disconcerting questions children ask. Nor are these questions any longer the occasion for heavy humour among their elders. Don't bat an eyelid when asked "How did the baby get inside Mummy?" or "What is sodomy?" Just remember the words of the manual and let sweetness and light prevail.

So what should I have said yesterday morning when Alan, aged seven, demanded "What is war?" Never prevaricate, never deceive. But the truth was too untellable and the half-truth too contemptible. Would it not be pure deception to draw analogies from Cowboys and Indians, from the assortment of toy guns, bows and arrows that lie about the house, or the occasional domestic battles? What have these to do with the extermination campaigns that we know as war?

Should we consult the dictionary together? "Learning can be fun", says the manual. But the dictionary, though post-war, is hopelessly archaic: "War (from Old High German *Werra*: confusion): Hostile contention by means of armed forces carried on between nations, states or rulers". Out of date for a child of the nineteen-fifties. To make this clear I should perhaps explain to him the Rôle of the Child in Modern War ("Make him feel he has a place in the world", says the manual). Should I take him on my knee and tell him of the note left by a child at Auschwitz: "Nun heisst es *abshied nehmen*. Morgen kommt mütter in die gaskammer und ich werde in den brunnen geworfen. Now I must say good-bye. Tomorrow mother goes into the gas chamber, and I will be thrown into the well." Or tell him about the children of Hiroshima: "When picked up by the hand the skin slid off like a glove". Napoleon said that troops are made to let themselves be killed. Should I explain that in our day this privilege is not confined to the army, he shares it too? Shall I tell him of the ninety-nine ways of killing children devised in the last war, from Napalm to

starvation, from chopping them in half individually (SS at Yanov; Nuremberg Trial 59th Day), to roasting them *en masse* (RAF at Hamburg; no trial, several medals)?

BUT perhaps this would be merely sentimental. He might think that war had become 'child-centred' like education. Whereas in fact we are all equal in the eyes of the war. Gone are the days when it was a formal contest between professionals and mercenaries. Gone are the days of our fathers, when it was a kind of ritual slaughter of healthy young men at the behest of their elders. That resulted in an ecological unbalance—too many women and an ageing population. But now as the ultimate triumph of democracy, we're all in it, and like a Gallup poll it takes in a representative cross-section of the population. Yes, No, Don't Know, and Don't Care, they all have their place in the struggle for non-existence. And our new knowledge of fall-out will enable the unborn to fall in too.

Tell him as much of the truth as he needs to know. Well my dear boy, one of the things you need to know about war is contained in those two anarchistic aphorisms: "War is the trade of governments" and "War is the health of the state". But I can't say this to him, not because he must not be exposed to propaganda (except that of the government, the church, and the ad-men), but because, poor innocent, he doesn't know what the state is. And what is the state? "The State,"

said that poor twisted boy who defined war as its health.

"The State is the organisation of the herd to act offensively or defensively against another herd similarly organised. The more terrifying the occasion for defence, the closer will become the organisation and the more coercive the influence upon each member of the herd. War sends the current of purpose and activity flowing down to the lowest level of the herd, and to its most remote branches. All the activities of society are linked together as fast as possible to this central purpose of making a military offensive or a military defence, and the State becomes what in peacetime it has vainly struggled to become—the inexorable arbiter and determinant of men's businesses and attitudes and opinions. The slack is taken up, the cross-currents fade out, and the nation moves lumberingly and slowly, but with ever accelerated speed and integration, towards the great end, towards that peacefulness of being at war. . . ."

FOR what is peace? Peace is war carried on by other means, peace is the interval between the acts, peace is war in a minor key, peace is the social contract—and a bad bargain too. For the state has inoculated Alan, it teaches him to read and write, and gives him one-third of a pint of milk a day, all in return for his future subservience: a kind of indenture or mortgage which he has later to redeem.

War is not, as the dictionary says, "hostile contention . . . between nations, states or rulers", it is the hostile contention of nations, states or rulers against their populations. The great error of nearly all studies

of war, wrote Simone Weil, "has been to consider war as an episode in foreign politics, when it is especially an act of interior politics. . . ." For just as competitive industry, "knowing no other weapon than the exploitation of the workers, is transformed into a struggle of each employer against his own workmen, and hence, of the entire class of employers against their employees", so the struggle between states becomes in the end a war of states against their own peoples. There is a tacit agreement between states that this should be so. (Who can deny that the current London talks between powers, with their ridiculous proposals and counter-proposals about 'zones of inspection' in each other's territory, are an example of this unspoken accord. None of the proposals are meant to be accepted; they are the scenes of a comedy put on for our benefit to maintain that "latent external crisis" which as Buber says, gives the state its unifying power and enables it to get the upper hand in internal crises). The Permanent War of "1984" is carried on, not to lead to the victory of any of the three superstates, but because war conditions make the subjugation of their populations simpler. War is to the state what news is to the journalist. When none exists it has to be invented.

Never prevaricate, never deceive. War, my boy, is a device for keeping you under, and it ends by putting you underground.

How did I answer Alan? I said nothing. I was too ashamed.

\*Randolph Bourne: *The State* (1917).

C.W.

**ROUND THE BEND-2**

(Continued from previous issue)

III. THE MODERN SICKNESS

A psychiatrist remarked recently that his profession used to be an interesting one long ago, but now it was becoming increasingly dull. No longer are the patients interestingly mad and eccentric; nowadays they all seem to be just sadly and drearily depressed.

It is the constantly recurring parrotcry of Bishops, magistrates and other professional depressants that most of the ills of society are due to lack of self-restraint, religion and sense of duty, and here lies the key to the problem of mental ill-health. Generally speaking, this is a monstrous fallacy. The most common form of neurosis involves too severe a sense of duty and self-restraint; the wretched sufferer is the victim of too severe a conscience, too low an estimation of his own worth, too great a respect for ideals or figures of power. In the worst cases medical science has recourse to the operation of leucotomy, which severs the connections of the frontal part of the brain. This operation ends the patient's self-torture by greatly reducing his capacity for self-criticism, for thinking ahead or indeed for worrying much about anything. Its attendant danger is that the leucotomized patient will become a complete burden on society because he "just couldn't care less" in contrast to his previous over-anxious state. A less drastic form of treatment is electrotherapy, which is now used a good deal for schizophrenic patients as well as those suffering from anxiety. To date, over a million people in Britain have had the electric shock passed through their brains in the hope of alleviating their mental condition.

The group of people who do suffer from too little rather than too great a conscience are the true psychopaths. Their outstanding characteristic is that they are incapable of feeling real affection for anyone or anything. Not infrequently they become criminals of one sort or another, but perhaps the greater danger is, as pointed out by Alex Comfort,<sup>3</sup> that they may find a niche for the legalized exercise of their callous abuse of others in positions of authority which the power structure of the State makes possible.

Ordinarily psychopaths are a nuisance to others rather than to themselves, whereas neurotics and psychotics are their own chief victims. In tracing the development of the disordered personality Kate Friedlander<sup>4</sup> has tried to show that the child deals with unbearable tensions either by taking the woe into himself and becoming a neurotic personality, or by projecting all his troubles upon

the world and becoming a delinquent. This is perhaps an over-simple statement of Friedlander's theory, but it is pertinent to consider here how contemporary society manufactures neurosis in childhood, and how the prevalent types of mental illness are a direct reflection on the authoritarian structure of society and the invasiveness of the State into the upbringing of children.

The present writer attended the 1957 conference of the National Association for Mental Health. The topic of our conference was The Maladjusted Child. All the old ground was covered; neglectful mothers, weak fathers, delinquency areas, inadequate housing, overcrowded classes in schools were all given their due share of blame. And there we stopped. The schoolteachers who complained of the size of the classes they had to teach did not begin to consider that part of their essential function was to induce anxiety into the children, that the whole social structure for which children have to be moulded depends upon a degree of socialized anxiety which takes its toll of mental illness, of vague *ennui*, of passive subjection of the individual to the mass folly of war. If children are "maladjusted" to the society in which they find themselves they may be very unhappy and need help, but their very maladjustment is a symptom of the organism reacting to adverse conditions, like the fever in malaria. The organism strives for health.

IV. PAIN, FEAR AND ANXIETY

Anxiety has here been mentioned as the prime symptom of contemporary civilized society. It forces the tempo of life; it calls for speed and efficiency to produce more speed for the sake of increased efficiency; it produces those stomach and duodenal ulcers; it necessitates the consumption of tobacco, alcohol and tranquilizers; it bumps up the suicide rate; it drives men to mental hospitals, churches and electrotherapy; it ruins our leisure; it promotes research into the hydrogen bomb; it keeps psychopaths in power.

The body has three levels of defence; pain, fear and anxiety. The very simplest animals rely solely on the mechanism of pain; if something pricks them they withdraw from it. Higher up the phylogenetic scale, animals are capable of fear; they learn what is dangerous to them and withdraw before they are hurt. The very highest types of animals are capable of anxiety. Anxiety is a most complex mechanism; expressed rather crudely, it is a fear of fear. The protected, civilized person may seldom experience real pain, and because of the elaborate precautions which surround his

life, he seldom knows common-or-garden fear. What he experiences is anxiety, the haunting uneasiness that somehow raw fear will break through the elaborate psychological shell which is built round his conscious personality. The physical symptoms of the real anxiety-state have been described as "fear spread thin"; the sufferer goes around like an animal in a state of fear. His digestion and appetite are poor and he may develop ulcers; he hates to be alone; he needs to smoke and consume tranquilizers; he sleeps badly; he is 'jumpy'; his sexual capacity is impaired; he is easily made to feel guilty. Some degree of anxiety-state is almost the norm for a huge proportion of the population, and this fact is well appreciated by all the big commercial interests who exploit it in their advertising. The science of totalitarian government depends upon stepping up the level of anxiety in the population. No group can govern by fear alone—the fear has to be introjected into the minds of the subjects so that they are ruled by their own anxiety.

On the outbreak of war in 1939 it was suggested that there might be a catastrophic increase in the amount of mental illness in the population due to the added strain of bombing, break up of families and other upheavals. The reverse was the case; the general level of mental health improved for people had got something real to fear and the prospect of crude physical pain to replace their nebulous anxieties. The study of "war neurosis" in soldiers (it used to be called "shell shock") reveals how the personality breaks down in battle. It is not pain or fear that precipitates the breakdown; a man may be rendered unconscious by the extremes of pain yet suffer no psychological harm. What causes the breakdown is the anxiety engendered by conflict: shall he be a hero and stick it out till his head is blown off, or decide that discretion is the better part of valour and beat a safe retreat? Oh God I'm a coward I can't take it—but I must show I'm not a coward and go on, and on! And so the poor wretch wrestles with his conscience until to his great surprise he develops a paralyzed arm which puts paid to his career as a fighting man. Such a hysterical paralysis is not under the conscious control of the soldier, nor can the army psychiatrist restore it to use until some change has taken place in the personality of the patient.

(To be continued)

<sup>3</sup> Alex Comfort, *Authority & Delinquency in the Modern State*, 1952.

<sup>4</sup> Kate Friedlander, *A Psychoanalytic Approach to Juvenile Delinquency*.

**How Green was Mr. Henry Brooke?**

IT was announced on Wednesday that Mr. Henry Brooke, the Minister for Welsh Affairs, would not be present at the Welsh National Eisteddfod which he had planned to attend (he had learned some Welsh too!). The official statement that the cancellation was "in view of the likelihood of disturbances of the harmony of the Royal National Eisteddfod" is no reflection on the possibility of Mr. Brooke's hastily acquired Welsh putting the choirs off the note, but refers to the intention of Plaid Cymru (the Welsh Nationalists) riding down from their conference and summer school at Bangor and demonstrating against the proposed flooding of Tryweryn.

Mr. Brooke has expressed his support of Liverpool City Council's scheme to flood Cwm Tryweryn and the Plaid Cymru is very militant; some of its members at one time blocked a road against British troops and (during the war) others set fire to a bombing school.

To quote Dr. Tudur Jones, the vice-president of the party at their annual conference, "The evil of the office (of Minister for Welsh Affairs) is in the office the Minister holds, for in fact the Minister is not a servant of the Welsh nation, not a Minister but a gauleiter. He is the man who gives the commands. He does not reflect the opinion of the Welsh nation. When a man thinks he knows better than a whole nation what its true interests are, it is time his office should be eliminated."

This outburst of near-anarchism was crowned by the Bardic fervour of Mr. Ivor Owen who said that Tryweryn was fast becoming a rock against which the English parties in Wales would dash themselves to pieces.

The conference went on to condemn Labour M.P.s for using Tryweryn as a political stunt and Dafydd Orwig Jones proclaimed the party's intention of clearing out the Labour Party in Merioneth at the next General Election.

It is difficult to understand just why Plaid Cymru does not learn the lesson of Henry Brooke and direct action. It proclaims no faith in English parties. It passed resolutions of dissatisfaction with radio and television programmes; resolutions for doubling old-age pensions; for better housing; for ending the H-bomb tests and manufacture; and finally called with a heartfelt call for a reduction of the proportion of votes necessary for saving candidates deposits. Plaid Cymru contributes handsomely to the English exchequer in forfeited deposits.

After the conference the party Summer School was held with a series of lectures on co-operation (which is a plank in Plaid Cymru's programme). As Alderman Cwynfor Evans said, the policy of industrial democracy which outlined how self-government in industry could work out in practice offered a creative way of advance from both private capitalism and the State capitalism of nationalisation. It took into account the need for recognising human dignity as well as material reward for those in industry.

We would say that this is the rock against which all parties would dash themselves to pieces.

Direct action and even the hint of direct action seem to have shaken Henry Brooke more than all the Welsh Nationalist election candidates could ever do.

J.R.

**Now Ready!**  
 SELECTIONS FROM  
**"FREEDOM"**  
 Volume 6, 1956  
**OIL AND TROUBLED WATERS**

312 pages paper 7/6, Cloth 10/6\*

★  
**VOLUMES 1-5**

Vol. 1, 1951, *Mankind is One*  
 Vol. 2, 1952, *Postscript to Posterity*  
 Vol. 3, 1953, *Colonialism on Trial*  
 Vol. 4, 1954, *Living on a Volcano*  
 Vol. 5, 1955, *The Immoral Moralists*  
 each volume paper 7s. 6d.  
 cloth 10s. 6d.

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

at  
**FIVE SHILLINGS**  
 each volume

(The complete set is offered at the Special Price of £1 post free)

**ORDER NOW**

**FREEDOM BOOKSHOP**  
 OPEN DAILY

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

- Secondhand . . .
- Mutual Aid Peter Kropotkin 15/-
  - The Problem of the Distressed Areas Wal Hannington 3/-
  - Assignment in Utopia Eugene Lyons 3/6
  - H. G. Wells Geoffrey West 3/6
  - Earliest Man F. W. H. Migoed 2/6
  - Socialism E. F. M. Burbin 3/6
  - The Politics of Democratic Action H. Levy 3/6
  - The Web of Thought and Action Edward Carpenter: an Appreciation (ed.) Gilbert Keith 3/6
  - The Seed Beneath the Snow Ignazio Silone 3/-
  - A Connecticut Yankee (Play) Twain and Fuller 2/-
  - In Youth is Pleasure Denton Welch 3/-
  - Let There be Bread Robert Brittain 2/6
  - The Invaders Leo Tolstoy 3/9
  - Strange Brother Blair Niles 3/6
  - The Devil's Net Otto Peitsch 3/-
  - Bigger and Better Murders Charles Merz 3/-
  - Between the Lines Denys Thompson 3/-
  - Quite Early One Morning Dylan Thomas 3/6
  - Three Tales F. M. Dostoevsky 2/6
  - The British Public and the General Strike Kingsley Martin 3/6
  - The Jungle Upton Sinclair 3/6
  - The Coming Race Lord Lytton 3/-
  - Plot Against Peace Ivor Montague 2/6
  - Conscience and Liberty Robert S. W. Pollard 2/6

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**



## Reflections on THE MYTH OF 'GOOD' GOVERNMENT

THE socialist advocates of "good" government as a practical and progressive alternative to "bad" government must surely admit that their theory that government can ever be anything but "bad" is receiving one set-back after the other these days. Their arguments for the "good" government theory are that while recognising that it is not an ideal form of social organisation (indeed their only serious disagreement with the anarchists is that they are "a thousand years before their time"!)) nevertheless, if only we could put good men with good ideas at the helm of the ship of State all would be well. The trouble to-day is that we are governed by "bad" men and equally "bad ideas".

Even if we forget the bad old pre-war years; close our eyes to the lessons to be learned from the revolutionary government of Russia or the Popular Front governments of France and Spain, and limit ourselves to a survey of these post-war years of "liberation" from the yoke of fascism and colonialism, is there honestly any evidence to support this "good government" theory? Israel, the brand new State, born of the persecution of a people for their minority (rather than their religious) status; India, liberated from humiliation and the rule of the pukka sahib by a resistance movement which made imperial government untenable; Ghana granted its independence through a combination of circumstances to which its reputation as the "white man's grave" played as active a part as the nationalist resistance movement... in these countries, leading the governments are "good" men; not cheap-jack professional politicians, but men who paid for their resistance with long terms of imprisonment. Educated men, men who, we are told, much more enjoy browsing in Mr. Blackwell's Oxford bookshop or spending their evenings with old friends, than shouldering the burdens of State. Has their background as "good" men, as intellectuals, in any way made their governments "good" governments?

Perhaps, to answer this question one needs to define the objectives of "good" government? Is it the raising of the standard of living or that of the nation to the status of a world power? Is a good government the one that succeeds in maintaining law and order... or a combination of all these? We are hard put to think of other "objectives", yet in considering the foregoing list we cannot point to any government whose objectives were in fact the lowering of the standards of living, of reducing the nation to that of a third rate power, or of abolishing law and order!

ALL governments hope for the acquiescence of the people just as they all surround themselves with the necessary force to impose their wishes should that acquiescence be absent. All governments respect the "rule of law", a meaningless phrase since it is the government which makes the laws, and breaks them, to suit its convenience.

The fact that to many of us the difference between the régimes in Spain and Russia and those in the "democratic" countries is tangible should not however lead us to confuse a subjective reaction with what should be an objective appraisal of government *per se*. It is surely significant that totalitarian régimes

I HAVE chosen the Wage System as the theme of this lecture not because I have anything startlingly original to say about it but because it poses the important problem of the organisation of work a satisfactory solution to which is, I believe, the most important single social problem of our time. In all societies the pattern of work greatly influences the social structure and a free society will be distinguished as much by its organisation of work as by anything else.

In this lecture I propose to analyse briefly the nature of the wage system, to discuss the modifications it has undergone in the past 150 years and to suggest a number of ways in which the system has been and might be transformed in a libertarian fashion.

In recent years our academic historians have been reacting against the picture of the Industrial Revolution drawn by such writers as the Hammonds in their classic works on *The Town Labourer* and *The Village Labourer*, especially with regard to what they consider to be the Hammonds' idyllic view of social conditions before the Industrial Revolution and their exaggerated notions of the conse-

quences of industrialisation. This reaction may in part be justified but there is no denying the fundamental changes brought about by the Industrial Revolution. The organisation of work may have been far from satisfactory in the pre-industrial era and may still be highly unsatisfactory in predominantly agrarian economies of the present day, but the problem has been greatly accentuated by industrialisation. Briefly and dogmatically, the Industrial Revolution while vastly increasing the productive powers of man and thereby enabling him to enjoy a hitherto undreamt of standard of material living, had the following major social consequences:

(1) It destroyed the prevailing domestic system of production under which the worker owned his own tools and replaced it by the factory system under which the means of production were owned by others.

(2) It thereby transformed the independent craftsman and peasant into an industrial proletarian who in order to live found himself compelled to sell his labour power to the owners of the new factories. In this way the wage system became the dominant form of organising work and the typical class conflicts of capitalist society were generated.

(3) It effectively undermined the local village and town community in which work was an integral part of the shared life of men and women. Henceforth, as the new industrial towns proliferated, the geographical and social separation of work and home became accentuated.

(4) The increasing division of labour and the mechanisation of production undermined craftsmanship and the pride of a man in his work. New skills replaced the old but more and more workers came to be employed on dull repetitive jobs requiring little, if any, initiative and providing very little satisfaction in their performance.

Of these four major social consequences, it is the second—the widespread adoption of the wage-system—which is central to our subject. What, then, do we understand by the wage system? In essence, the wage system obtains when one group of men—employers—purchase the labour of another set of men—employees. Under this system work, instead of being a person's vocation and an integral part of his personality and life, becomes commercialised: employees barter a fixed amount of their time for a fixed monetary reward; they trade a daily period of service in factory or office in exchange for a sum of money needed to provide the basic necessities of life, plus varying measures of luxury and entertainment.

More precisely, the wage system is distinguished by four leading characteristics:

(1) 'Labour power' is abstracted from the labourer so that one can be bought and sold without the other, in contrast to the systems of slavery and serfdom under which labour and the labourer are treated as inseparable.

(2) As a consequence of this abstraction, wages are paid to the labourer only when it is profitable to employ him.

(3) The wage worker, in accepting a wage, surrenders all control over the organisation of production. And,

(4) The wage worker, in accepting a wage, surrenders all claim upon the product of his labour.

Implicit in this system are a number of values:

(1) The receipt of wages is the mark of an inferior status. In its simplest form, the employer provides the capital and raw materials, organises production and merchants the produce: the employee merely provides labour power at the best price he can get. Since the class of employers is small and entry into it difficult to achieve, higher social prestige is attached to the position. The fact that the wages of middle class employees tend to be called salaries is a small indication of the inferiority attached to the relationship of being employed. According to the magic of words a new name can alter the substance of a thing, although economically wages and salaries are indistinguishable.

(2) The employee is regarded not so much as an individual as a thing, a commodity, a factor of production. Instead of being an end in himself, he becomes the means to achieve the economic interests of other men. Strictly speaking, in theory, it is the labour power which is the commodity, not the labourer. But the absurdity of abstracting 'labour' from the labourer has only to be stated to be seen. While land and capital may be abstracted and employed apart from either landlord or capitalist, no one can envisage labour being used without the labourer. Yet the whole system is predicated on the false assumption that labour is on a par with the other so-called factors of production.

(3) Capital is deemed superior to labour. Capital, in effect the stored up labour of the past, is treated as superior to the living vitality and power of present labour. Under the wage system, capital employs labour, not labour capital. Those who own capital command the persons of those who own only their life, skill and creative productivity. In short, as Erich Fromm puts it, things are regarded as higher than men and the world of things and their amassment is put above the world of life and its productivity.

If this analysis is correct, it is clear that the wage system is inconsistent with a society of free and responsible men

and women. The employer-employee relationship is basically an authoritarian relationship. It assumes that the employer has the right to command the employee; he hires the worker to perform certain services and implicit or explicit in the contract is the right to direct the worker in his work, as well as to appropriate the proceeds of his labour.

I shall be told of course, and quite rightly, that to-day in many spheres of work this authoritarian relationship has been modified. The worker to-day is not regarded merely as a commodity; he has rights, some of which are guaranteed by law, which limit the authority of the employer. Moreover, the effective power of employers *vis-à-vis* their employees has been severely circumscribed by the countervailing power of workers organised in trade unions. So much so, that in certain instances and under certain conditions, such as full employment, it is the trade union rather than the boss who determines who shall be hired and who shall be fired.

I have no wish to ignore such points or to minimise the importance of the changes that have taken place in industry over the last 150 years and particularly in the last 20 years. All I would insist is that these changes have succeeded only in modifying the worst and most obvious defects of the wage system. The status of the worker has improved but he still remains inferior; the authority of the employer has been limited but the master-servant relationship still obtains; the worker remains a means to someone else's end; and the values of capitalism still hold good and, indeed, in certain respects have taken firmer root.

These conclusions remain true even where schemes of joint consultation have been introduced. Joint consultation is frequently put forward as the final answer to the demand for workers' participation in management. Again, I have no wish to underestimate the value of these schemes. They represent a significant advance on the older attitude of employers which saw labour as so many 'hands' to be taken on or dismissed as economic circumstances warranted. But the very term 'joint consultation' implies the continuance of two sides—management and men—in the workplace. The idea of joint consultation was developed during the first world war as an *alternative* to the then current theories of syndicalism and guild socialism which sought to establish a self-governing brotherhood of producers. If one examines the practical working of these schemes, it becomes clear that joint consultation is no more than one of the techniques of modern management, a means of seeking to allay discontent and frustration among the workers. As such it is very much on a par with the older idea of profit-sharing. Capitalist profit-sharing is an attempt to induce a sense of harmony among employees on the basis of a continuance of the capitalist system of ownership. Joint consultation is similarly an attempt to create harmony on the basis of the continuance of the wage system.

(To be continued.)

G.N.O.

## BEYOND THE WAGE SYSTEM

arise in those countries where existing governments have or are on the point of losing control for a number of reasons: either as a result of popular discontent or from rebellion within their own ranks (generally among the hierarchy of the armed forces). Hitler, Mussolini and Lenin are not phenomena of particular countries. They can arise in any country in similar circumstances. In this context it is worth quoting once again Winston Churchill's 1935 summing up of Hitler:

"One may dislike Hitler's system and yet admire his patriotic achievement. If our country were defeated I hope we should find a champion as admirable to restore our courage and lead us back to our place among the nations."

Hitler's "patriotic achievement" was in fact to restore the power and prestige of government in a country in which previous governments were powerless to maintain "order" or solve the economic and political problems of the hour. Which of these governments was "good" and which "bad"? By Churchill's 1935 statement it is clear that he thought Hitler's government *good*, however much he disliked his "system", and the Bruening government, which had no power, *bad*. On the other hand if we accept Jefferson's view that "That government is best which governs least" then the definitions would be reversed!

THE fallacy of attempting to divide government into *bad* and *good* is surely exposed in the foregoing. Governments survive not because they are good or bad but because they are *strong*. Governments are strong in so far as there is a general public acceptance of the *principle* of government. They are weak where the resistance to government—not any particular government but the system itself—is strong. Thus it is in those countries in which a revolutionary situation is present which are also the potential victims of dictatorial government. It is obvious that this should be so. But reformist socialists dishonestly argue against revolution (and for "good government") on the grounds that revolution *inevitably* breeds dictatorship, which is in fact not true. The man who attempts to scale a mountain may well slip and be killed; but he may also reach the top. The man who forever stands at the bottom is sure not to slip and break his neck; neither, however, will he ever reach the top of the mountain!

The advocates of "good" government are either wishful-thinkers or politicians, and both believe in ruling élites of "good" men, in spite of the fact that Machiavelli warned us in *The Prince*, more than 400 years ago that "a ruler must learn to be other than good". And men like Nkrumah, Ben Gurion and Nehru in our time have confirmed the wisdom of these words.

## Problems Facing the New U.S. Secretary of Defence The Ultimate Detergent

FERVENT readers of our columns will recall an article concerning the nomination of a certain Mr. Gluck to be American Ambassador to Ceylon (FREEDOM Aug. 3, '57). It will be remembered that Mr. Gluck's only noticeable qualification for the job was his willingness

to contribute large sums of money to the Republican party at election time.

It must not be supposed that other types of qualification are not acceptable for Government posts in the United States, as is clearly proved by President Eisenhower's nomination of Mr. Neil McElroy for Secretary of Defence. This is a very important position which is at present held by Mr. Charles Wilson, who was the boss of General Motors before he took it on.

Mr. McElroy is not, surprisingly enough, the boss of a motor corporation, or for that matter of U.S. Steel or Standard Oil—he is in a much higher bracket as the highest-paid executive in America, president of Proctor and Gamble—the manufacturers of Dreet and Daz the well-known detergent powders. His salary: \$280,000 or £100,000 per year.

If Mr. McElroy gets the Defence job he will have to make a very considerable financial sacrifice, for he will only earn a miserable \$25,000 a year (less than £9,000). This will presumably keep him in cigarettes and pay the telephone bill—it is to be assumed that he already owns a TV set.

Since Mr. McElroy is obviously not taking on the job for the money

it is reasonable to suppose that he considers it presents the opportunity for him to serve his country. He will be called upon to resist the constant demands for finance which are made by U.S. Generals and Admirals, in deadly rivalry, for their own pet projects—he will have to decide between the relative merits of nuclear submarines, electronically driven tanks and air-to-air missiles. Shall it be two hundred and fifteen subs or only two hundred and ten? Decisions like this cannot be vastly different from present problems at Proctor and Gamble—shall it be two hundred and fifteen tons of Dreet this week or only two hundred and ten.

It is reported that at least three big business men have turned down the job already, probably because of the money. Patently the American counterparts to Britain's men-in-office are harder to come by. Whoever heard of the post for Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries hawked from pillar to post—rather one seems to remember various over-eager maniacs, breaking their legs in the rush to 10 Downing Street—and all for £2,000 a year. But then is it not a fact that the British have always taken their civil responsibilities in a manner befitting... befitting what?

### 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.
- JOHN HEWETSON :**  
*Ill-Health, Poverty and the State* cloth 2s. 6d., paper 1s
- GEORGE WOODCOCK :**  
*New Life to the Land* 6d  
*Homes or Howels?* 6d  
*Railways and Society* 3d  
*What is Anarchism?* 1d  
*The Basis of Communal Living* 1s
- ALEX COMFORT :**  
*Delinquency* 6d
- 27, Red Lion Street,  
London, W.C.1.**



LETTERS TO THE EDITORS

# Is Government Necessary?

ONE of the most interesting aspects that has emerged from the 12th Annual Summer School is the Anarchists' attitude to change and which and how changes may be brought about. Five years ago, the tail end of Marxist influence was still very much in evidence; at that time Anarchists still pinned their hopes on the working class and Syndicalism was the Anarchists' industrial medium through which change in society was to be effected.

Various factors have contributed to this change in outlook, perhaps the most important being the realization that economic change, as has been effected in the Sovietised part of the world, is no guarantee for a happier existence. In fact the opposite is more the case. The second is a deeper inquiry into the "nature" of man and what makes him tick in the first place. Finally, the fantastic speed of technological progress and especially automation which will make a working class as we know it to-day quite redundant.

The Russian revolution which started off with all its idealistic flags flying took only eleven years to produce a one-man dictatorship and a state far more insensitive to the needs of the individual than most of the capitalist countries. Even the Marxist rationalization that the dictatorship of the proletariat was a temporary and necessary evil, reached the end of its tether when the Stalin myth

burst like a bubble on the unexpected world.

The numerous accusations, sometimes seemingly fantastic, levelled at the socialist sixth of the world by the capitalist states were all borne out by subsequent exposition when Stalin was finally buried. One wonders as to how such fine ideals that guided the creation of Socialist Russia should have degenerated into such a monster. The various rationalizations amongst them that Russia was surrounded by a hostile environment, just didn't hold much water after the final expositions were made public. Here was a situation where the economic background had undergone a change, where individual capitalism had been abolished, yet where was the happy life? Where was the promised happiness?

The economic change à la Marxism produced nothing as far as human happiness was concerned. Somehow and somewhere, the revolution had failed. Yet an inanimate object can neither be a success or a failure; only the human use of such an object or situation can thus be valued. It was, therefore, inevitable that the revolutionary was now suspect, but perhaps even more fundamental is the fact that the revolutionary is only just an individual shaped and conditioned by his Society, and one cannot help but suspect the motives that move him to revolutionary fervour. Hence the physical and psychological dissection of the human being was the next

logical step in trying to discover why ideals held by the best degenerate. In fact, why power will always corrupt.

Not so many years ago psychology amongst socialists and Marxists, and even Anarchists, was dismissed as a bourgeois innovation which every decent class-conscious person rejected as an intellectual toy, a diversion from the real issues of life. Freud and Reich were almost swear words and Malinowsky or Mead were people who were out looking for facts to fit their theories. The psychosomatic structure of the individual as a fertile field wherein to explore the real nature of man, his drives or basic fundamental tendencies which might give some real clue as to what man really wants and needs, was delegated to the occupation of cranks and vegetarians.

What was taken to be the actual nature of man; aggressiveness, possessiveness, power drives, race consciousness, mysticism, irrationality and cruelty can now be assigned to the waste-paper basket of all such nonsense. The destructive influence of our moralistic upbringing and the inculcation of values that belong to a cruel and decaying social system are nurtured throughout childhood and finally stabilised in adulthood. Even if one in adulthood, using one's critical faculties, abandons the more irrational aspects of early upbringing, the basic foundation has unfortunately been laid, and the conclusion one must come to is that only a sane and healthy individual can produce a sane and healthy society.

This, of course, may be re-stating an old truth, but whereas once faith and intuitive perception was all one really had to go by, to-day there is ample science and definite data available to show that repression goes with unhappiness and authority. While freedom goes with happiness and well-being. But here again, the yardstick is the individual. He is the creator of either good or evil; how he wields his tools and his knowledge has perhaps much to do with the way the world has treated him during his formative years. As things are it appears that those who profess to desire to change the world are sometimes the most dangerous. Change like education must be a slow process and taking all facts into account, it may not be such a far-fetched idea if Anarchists revise their ideas on total social change.

It may not perhaps be out of place for Anarchists to begin to criticise the acts of any government, not as a total body, but rather what aspect of government either tends towards greater freedom and happiness or detracts some aspect of freedom or happiness. It is perhaps well to remember that the oft quoted primitive societies that have no organized standing government are in fact governed by a strict set of rules that cover sexual, social and economic relationships. These are either observed as traditions or religion or by the direct dictates of some taboo. Social ostracism, physical punishment, banishment or death are all part of the primitive "government" and actual means of carrying out these punishments arise as the need dictates. Such societies have not changed much, hence the institutions have remained unchanged. But in the changing world of modern society, all these institutions have become permanent establishments as the need for their use appears to be constant. It is perhaps the greater insight into man and what makes him tick which makes these institutions redundant in their modern application. Yet government of some form seems to be necessary, as both primitive and modern society find a use for it. Hence one cannot help coming to the reluctant conclusion that it is far better to live with

a government that may alter its policy or institutions because of public opinion, than to live with a government that will shoot you for having an opinion at all.

The enigma to-day is that the alternative to capitalism is socialism and the socialist examples so far, can hardly help but make one a more convinced capitalist, and to those who reject both alternatives are only brought face to face with the reality that the greatest enemy of progress is the average man. A man who fears freedom and whose adventurous spirit is only derived from a bottle, who sits back lazily chewing his gum, guzzling his vodka or sipping his tea while his representatives organize his destruction over meaningless ideas which few practice and still less believe in. Besides with the rate of technological progress as is at present evident, plans laid to-day may be all nonsense to-morrow. Automation, if a large section of the world is not destroyed by the next war, may make idealistic conceptions of to-day as primitive as the stone axe. There is considerable evidence that to nurture the most progressive tendencies no matter from what section or institution they may spring, is worthy of more consideration. Contentment with what is possible is often a sign of maturity.

London.

S.F.

## CYPRUS

### Government Revokes (Some) Laws

THIRTY-THREE of a total of 76 regulations have been revoked by the Government in Cyprus which sounds sweeping but in fact means little substantial change.

The Detention of Persons Law—the equivalent of the British wartime 18B which also empowered detention without trial—means that persons still detained in camp in Cyprus will be held under this law. Cypriot legal authorities state that:

1. Revocation of the power to detain persons under the emergency laws was meaningless as long as the Detention of Persons Law was still in force.

2. The series of laws on censorship and communications which were revoked to-day were only invoked for a brief period during the Suez crisis in November. They had never been in force at other times during the emergency.

3. Although the regulation empowering the imposition of curfews had been revoked there still existed a Curfew Law passed before the emergency regulations were published in November, 1955. Under it, curfews can still be imposed. All the curfews imposed during the emergency were under that law and not under the relevant section of the emergency regulations.

These Cypriot sources also pointed out that the section of the emergency regulations dealing with control of publications (under which one English-language newspaper was prosecuted and fined earlier this year) still remained in force. So did the laws empowering search of persons, houses, and vehicles and arrest without warrant.—*Reuter*.

## Is this the Class Struggle?

DEAR EDITORS,

In your August 3rd front page article "Is This The Class Struggle?" you seem to imply that the well-organised ambushes by pickets, who assaulted black-leg bus crews and passengers, broke windows and slashed tyres, were justified, because they succeeded when nine months of negotiation had failed.

Also, by adding the wrong of R.A.F. Venoms blasting rebel forts in Oman to the wrong of pickets assaulting members of the public (including children), you get the violence of the strikers to come out right.

True, you do say that five days of strike can achieve much more than nine months of talk; but you as good as say "Hooliganism will get you somewhere!"

Is this editorial opinion, and do you really think so? Are the issues so crystal clear to the writer of the article that he knows all the answers?

Suppose (not for the sake of argument, for the sake of understanding!) that I decide, on a Saturday afternoon of the bus-strike, to go to town:

- (a) I walk there and back, refusing all lifts, and it rains all the time. Does this help the strikers?
- (b) I accept a lift, because I have to get medicine for a sick child as quickly as possible. Am I justified?
- (c) I am refused a lift by a driver who is afraid of the pickets. When I explain my mission (b) he still refuses. Is he right?
- (d) I am merely going to the cinema. I get a lift from a driver who says "Pickets? Let them try to stop me!" Is he a fascist hyena?
- (e) Entering town, pickets stop the car, pull us out and beat us up. Does this convince us that they need an increase in wages?
- (f) Pickets stop the car, we get out and beat them up. Does this prove that they don't need bigger wages?

What does violence prove? The protagonists in any strike should be worker v. employer. If the public suffers, the Press plays it up to read "worker v. public," and the bus strike pickets gave it to them on a platter. If they had used their brains instead of their boots, they would have worked the

buses normally, but refused to collect any fares until they got their increase. That way they would have made the public happy and the bosses hurry.

Like the writer, I think strikes for workers' control are what is needed; but I can't understand why he sounds so happy when bus-men attack private motorists to squeeze a few shillings out of their bosses. I can't see any logic in it, let alone tactics.

Yours sincerely,  
Peebles, Aug. 5 G.G.

## The Right to Travel Freely

IN the article "Seasonal Reflections on Passports" (3/8/57) it is stated "In this country the passport has not been used as a means for denying 'freedom of movement.'" Although there have been only one or two cases of refusal of passports to U.K. citizens, the number of colonial citizens, resident in the U.K., who have been refused passports is much higher.

A number of such cases have at various times been reported to the National Council for Civil Liberties, who remark in their Annual Report 1954-5: "It appears that it is the invariable custom of the Colonial Office to consult the Governor of the applicant's colony of origin before prolonging his passport or issuing him with a new one. It does not matter how long the colonial has been living in this country."

This Report cites the case of a West African who arrived in this country at the age of 16. He married a U.K. citizen and settled down in this country, and after having lived here continuously for over 20 years he applied for a passport, and was told by the Passport Officer that they must consult the Governor of his colony. After considerable pressure he was issued with a limited passport made out for the journey he intended to take and specifying the route to be taken.

Under the Aliens Order (1953) every person over the age of 16 who wishes to land or embark and who can prove that he is a British subject, cannot be refused. It is not necessary for him to have a passport. Because a passport is not a legal necessity for a British subject wishing to enter or leave the U.K., no one in this country has a legal right to be issued with one. It is granted or withheld at the discretion of the Foreign Office. There is no right of appeal if it is refused, and by a recent change it bears an inscription that it "may be withdrawn at any time". And it is necessary for almost all travelling abroad.

Commenting on colonials who have been refused passports and thereby prevented from leaving their own country, the Report of the National Council for Civil Liberties previously quoted concludes "... the fact that they are citi-

zens of the U.K. and colonies and have the same kind of passport as we have in U.K. makes the situation potentially dangerous for people in this country; support should be given to their fight for the right to travel freely."

The right to travel freely—when we are not legally entitled to a passport which is at present a practical requirement for all journeys abroad, when the Government decides whether or not we possess such a document—can we be said to possess this right ourselves?

London. P.M.

## Market Men Sold Out

Continued from p. 1

reported back to the Dock Labour Board for refusing to unload vegetables they considered 'black'. The sympathy which the dockers feel for the market workers is clearly in part due to their own experiences under the Dock Labour Board (hailed as 'a good thing' by the union leaders when it was first set up) and their knowledge of how their independence and freedom have been curtailed since that disciplinary set-up 'integrated' them in order to provide a more efficient and mobile (and controlled) labour force.

Well, the market men are putting up a fight against the same thing happening to them. They are fighting to defend ways of working and protective conditions which they have won through countless struggles in the past.

### Defending Their Interests

In doing this they are fighting to keep labour costs high in the markets—and thereby, in part, to keep the price of fruit and vegetables high on our tables. But how can we grumble about that? Everybody wants to sell his labour as dear as possible—and to buy the products of others' labours as cheaply as possible. That is the market, the

money, economy.

The critics of the market men's 'restrictive practices' ('getting paid when they don't always handle the goods') are rarely prepared to get up at 2 a.m. summer and winter to ensure that London gets its fruit, vegetables and flowers—and if they were, would consider themselves worth a decent wage for doing it. This is how the pitchers and the porters feel now and are prepared to fight to defend it.

They have organised themselves well—and in this struggle have learned a salutary lesson about the reliability of union leaders. May they learn the supplementary lesson, too: that it is by their own efforts, by direct action at the place of work, by solidarity with other workers, that they will find the means to fight and win their battles.

And may they also give thought to the furtherance of the real struggle—the struggle for workers' control of industry altogether, when the dignity of labour expresses itself in responsibility and service to the community, when the final struggle against bossdom has sent the employers and the union careerists to join other useless species in extinction.

**We need many more  
NEW READERS  
and your help to  
reach them!**

## MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

### LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

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

### EVERY SUNDAY IN AUGUST OPEN DISCUSSIONS

Questions, Discussion and Admission  
all free.

### OPEN AIR MEETINGS

Weather Permitting  
HYDE PARK  
Sundays at 3.30 p.m.

### GLASGOW

OPEN AIR MEETINGS  
Maxwell Street  
Every Sunday at 7.30 p.m.

## ★ Malatesta Club ★

SWARAJ HOUSE,  
32 PERCY STREET,  
TOTTENHAM COURT ROAD, LONDON, W.1.  
(Tel.: MUSSEUM 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

## 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