

# Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"Blind obedience by the individual is neither moral nor desirable in a democracy."

—SEYMOUR EICHEL.

## TRADES-UNION SABOTAGE?

# THERE'LL BE NO SHOWDOWN

THE astute tactician in any kind of conflict knows fully well the trick of laying the blame at the door of the other side before taking action himself. Large-scale examples of this include the Anglo-French-Israeli adventure in Suez last year when the three countries were knocking the daylight out of Egypt before she hardly had any planes airborne, and the attempted Communist *coup* in Korea, when the aggressive South Koreans appeared to go into the attack by retreating before the peace-loving North Koreans.

On a smaller, shabbier, level, the Tories are attempting to pull the same trick. Knowing that their economic policies—such as they are—are bound to invite resistance from the workers, they are attempting to pin the blame on to the unions and the Opposition for any clash which may come.

Thus Lord Hailsham at Brighton on October 10 accused 'some of the more extreme leaders of the unions and some of the less scrupulous leaders of the Labour Party' of a conspiracy 'to sabotage our economic policy by irresponsible wage demands and then to claim that Conservative freedom has failed and must give place to Socialist tyranny and controls'.

### Preparing Public Opinion

Leaving aside Lord Hailsham's tendentious bleats about controls—for the Conservatives have never been loth to control their workers by financial (and physical) pressures as long as they were free to do the exploiting—we can see that this cry of his is in reality a fine piece of preparation of public opinion.

The Tories are out to control inflation by reducing demand. Although some of us may not have noticed it, the country's trouble at the moment is that too much money is chasing too few goods (they say) and so the Tory answer is to reduce the amount of money in circulation. This, it will be seen at once, does

not prevent *desire* for goods, it only prevents ability to gratify that desire.

That reduces demand in the only way capitalism can measure it—purchasing power—and can eventually lead to wider unemployment. Nor, in our opinion, is the Government against a modest, *controlled*, increase in unemployment. There are plenty of tame economists ready with statistics to show that an increase of unemployment by about 5 per cent.—giving a total of something over a million unemployed—would *stabilise* and *strengthen* the national economy. It's just too bad if you happen to be one in the million. You have to sustain yourself by patriotism and keep warm by the glow of self-denial.

### Playing With Fire

Now clearly policies whose effect may be to bring the misery of unemployment to a million workers and their families have to be resisted. In embarking on such policies the Government is certainly playing with fire; for the degree of control necessary to keep the pool of workers at the correct, manageable, size is considerable. It could easily get out of hand, but then Lord Keynes taught the capitalists a thing or two about how to manage the whole thing, and if the worst came to the worse the Tories could simply resign and let Labour come in to take over the mess.

It is precisely this latter possibility which rules out any likelihood of a showdown between the unions and the Government. Lord Hailsham's speech may have the intended effect, but he and everybody else knows that there just are not any 'extreme' leaders of the unions. One or two union bosses may boast and bluster, and for a time it looked as if Frank

Cousins was being built up as a bogey-man in the Tory Press, but if he is an example of the 'extremist' we have only to look at his sell-out of the Covent Garden strikers to see that the bosses have nothing to fear from that direction.

And the union leaders and the Labour Opposition are as one with the Tory Government in their desire to prevent the workers thinking in terms of direct action to combat unpopular government policies. If and when the Labour Party come back to administer British capitalism they have got to be able to control the British worker as well as, if not better than, the Tories have been able to.

### No Battle

The labour leaders, therefore, will not lead the workers into battle lest they learn how to fight. Having got them licked into shape and thoroughly supine, doing what they are told in the name of unity, security and don't-rock-th-boat, even the less scrupulous leaders of the Labour Party will work for restraint whatever they may say. After all, they won't want any boat-rocking when they are at the helm.

The fearful middle classes, then, need not worry. There will be no showdown. A few skirmishes here and there, perhaps, but if the national economy demands it, the workers' standards will be depressed with the blessing of well-paid officials. Any struggle that comes will have to come from the rank-and-file, acting unofficially and without their leaders. On the surface the workers look ill-prepared for that, organisationally or psychologically. But you never know what you can do till you try.

## The Government & Old Age Pensioners

# How Mean Can They Get?

IT is quite clear who is going to pay for the Government's new economic measures. The poor are going to pay—as usual.

The people who have not the slightest possible hope of being able to manipulate the money markets; the people for whom a leak is just something they have to put up with in the kitchen, not a means of making money on the Stock Exchange; the people who all their lives labour to provide the good things of life for others but never get any themselves; the people for whom Mr. Macmillan's pontifical 'You've never had it so good' was just a joke in bad taste; they are the ones who are always sacrificed to save the national economy. The poor, and in particular, the old and poor.

With a flourish the Government has announced an increase to come for Old Age Pensioners. The much-promised improvement amounts in fact to a mean little swindle wherein the Government actually stands to *gain*, not to give a thing.

In the first place the increased pension will not be paid until the end of January. This means that pensioners have to exist three more months—the bitter months of November, December and January—and celebrate Christmas on the magnificent pension they are drawing now—40s. a week for a single pensioner. When the festive season and

January are past, they will get the generous increase of 10s., making a grand total to face February snows and March winds on 50s. per week.

For married couples the figure now and until the end of January is 65s. for the two, and that is going up by 15s. to 80s. a week. Widows' pensions and unemployment and sickness benefits are the same as single pensions and will increase similarly and war widows' and war disabled persons' allowances are much the same and are going up by the same kind of proportion.

### Niggardly

Not even the Government could pretend that the scales are generous or that the increases are even adequate, but presumably the Government does try to justify the niggardly amounts by pretending it cannot afford to pay more.

The point is that the Government doesn't pay anyway—the people pay through direct and indirect taxation and through National Insurance contributions. The people pay for everything the Government does, whether it is producing and testing H-Bombs or organising Old Age Pensions. And just to demonstrate perfectly clearly the direct connection between the compulsory contributions taken from our wage packets before we ever see them each week and what is thrown back in

## Conditions in Mental Hospitals

# Cruelty at Home

WHILE the fate of one dog has stimulated hundreds of people into active protest against the use of animals for scientific experiments, thousands of humans throughout the world suffering indescribable cruelties cannot awaken the conscience of the "free world" to the extent of doing something to alleviate their misery.

Hunger in Asia, cruelty in Algeria, political repression in Eastern Europe, Cyprus and Kenya, Negro persecution in the Southern States of America and South Africa; all these might get a strong expression of disapproval or a pious tut-tut from people who are not directly affected. But memories are short and tomorrow a new headline catches the eye and mind, and with a shrug the horrors we read about yesterday are forgotten.

Nearer home, a document\* has just been published drawing attention to the 108,000 certified mental cases in this country (we will be discussing this in greater detail later on in FREEDOM). Paul Warr, who decided for reasons of principle to take a job caring for the mentally deficient, has produced evidence which it is hoped will start an enquiry to end the employment of people in asylums who are outrageously unsuited to the care of anyone, least of all mental cases.

He found that of all the recruits at the hospital to which he was sent, there was only one other student nurse "with a sense of vocation".

"Of the others the men were mainly Irish, straight from the country, more interested in drinking and sleeping with the young female nurses than in nursing; the women, mainly Continental, glad of a job while they learned English."

The sadism which seems to be a common feature in the treatment of

\**Brother Lunatic*, by Paul Warr. (Neville Spearman, 18/-).

patients by male nurses is reminiscent of Hitler's concentration camps and difficult to believe but for the evidence that such behaviour takes place every day right under our noses.

It is not surprising that lack of food and filthy hospital conditions are prevalent when we consider that only £5 10s. 0d. per week is allocated for the care of a mental patient, compared to 16 0s. 0d. for a general hospital patient. But even if the £5 10s. 0d. per week was actually spent on the *care* of each patient it would at least mean a material improvement for these pathetic people.

## Labour's Scheme Flops?

APATHY and the attraction of "the telly" are causing a few headaches in the political parties.

In spite of the publicity given to the recent by-election in Ipswich 20,000 people were too lazy or indifferent to walk to the polling booths (FREEDOM, November 2).

Our own experience at public meetings is that many people are completely disillusioned with all political parties to the extent that they are no longer interested in even voting "to keep the other party out". Whether this is leading to a greater interest in anarchism is a subject for another article!

One of the notable things about the Labour Party is its lack of outdoor propaganda meetings. One would have thought that a party "of the people" would be anxious to keep contact with the mass of supporters on whose vote they depend. Even the Conservatives manage to struggle through a hectic Sunday afternoon session every week at Hyde Park.

It does seem, however, that the Labour Party organisers are not so sure these days of the automatic vote of the industrial worker because they have initiated a scheme for winning more active political support among factory workers. According to reports this scheme has flopped. A full time industrial organiser was recruited six months ago in Essex to "improve liaison with union branches". Fewer than 100 trade unionists have been recruited as individual members of the party, and many workers argue that they will vote Labour in any case but since they belong to the party through their unions they see no need to join individually.

It is no consolation to us to learn that at one branch of a union with 5,000 members in the factory only 24 turned up for a meeting. It does not mean that the other 4,976 will not vote in the next General Election, but it does indicate that they are fairly indifferent to taking any part in the forming of policy or expressing their views. Apathy does not lead to anarchy but to chaos.

The Deficit on  
FREEDOM this year  
is the highest ever:  
nearly £300 (\$900)  
Can you help?

## Protestants on Segregation

EIGHTY leading Protestant ministers in Atlanta have at last decided to publicise the "Christian view of race relations" in a long statement which was released to the Press last week. The opinions expressed may go further than any collective statement by organised Protestant ministers in the South to date, but it is still a long way from expressing what we understand as Christianity.

It sounds progressive to say (considering who is saying it) that all Americans, whether black or white, have a right to the full privileges of first class citizenship. Consider their view however, on the feared consequences of desegregation, and we find a subtle insult to the Negro as well as an implied assurance to those white segregationists who will undoubtedly think their Church leaders have gone too far. The statement concludes:

"To suggest that a recognition of the rights of Negroes to the full privileges of American citizenship, and to such necessary contacts as might follow, would inevitably result in intermarriage, is to cast as serious and unjustified an aspersion upon the white race as upon the Negro race."



## IN MEMORIAM

## WILHELM REICH

THE most sensible way to accept the death of a great man is to survey his life's work and to outline where his work broke new ground.

Reich's work has left such a bulk of new ways of thinking and living that we can safely predict that generations of free people will be going over and over his writings to find valid sources of inspiration in their search for a better world.

In each epoch of his life there is a fundamental break-through into broader aspects of understanding the elements of our world, their natural and unnatural aspects, until finally a new basis of a functional insight into the phenomena of the living was evolved. Wilhelm Reich, as a young medical practitioner in Vienna in the early twenties, was soon found in the *avant garde* of psychoanalysts, who energetically worked on and enlarged Freud's concept under his guidance, but who also soon strained against the unsatisfactory methods of analytical theory and praxis.

Two major contributions were made by Reich to psychoanalysis, which however showed already the cleft between the orthodox school and himself, which developed to an open break and Reich's excommunication from the psychoanalytical organisation in 1934. Firstly, the elaboration of the function of the orgasm. Here Reich felt the restriction of Freudian theory and found a way out of the purely psychogenic connotation of analytical theory, which he knew to be only deepening further the dichotomy of mechanistic medical thinking. He saw that the total repressive and deforming influence of restrictive early upbringing inhibited sexual function as a natural rhythmical energy discharge. Thus was created a source of energy to feed secondary drives, and the clear result was the inability of the adult to experience full orgasm. He postulated the necessity to direct therapy towards the achievement of this goal. Secondly, he would not tolerate the self-effacing and passive rôle of the therapist, a mere inter-

preter of material produced by the patient, but insisted that the process of character-formation was determined on broad and general lines by identical cultural patterns. He formulated the character-types, and as their circumscribed characteristics could be understood and taken for granted, he pushed forward to a total analysis of the person, which included the whole behaviour of the patient, the deeply anchored symbolism in facial and postural expressions, the muscular tensions, visceral reactions. All that is now imbedded in the term, Character-armour, and is part and parcel of the therapeutic attempt. Reich's book *Character-Analysis* gives a full account of this revolutionary technique.

Wilhelm Reich discovered soon that analytical concept could not exist *in vacuo*. The political hot-house of Germany and Austria and, for all that, anywhere else, made him try to inter-relate Marxism and psychoanalysis. He adopted Hegel-Marx dialectical materialism and tried, quite in vain, to force a dialectical straightjacket on the psychoanalysts, and the esoteric dynamics

of psychoanalysis on to the Communists, needless to say that both sides discouraged the attempt. This magnificent failure, however, gave impetus to a reevaluation out of which grew Reich's concept of sex-economics. This is a concept of the basic illness of Western civilisation, coming from the life and sex negation, which he understood to be the sources from which, from the moment of conception, the life of every member of this pattern of society is undermined and conditioned. He explains the intrinsic weaknesses and aberrations in the pattern, and how it affects the individual, and how it is mirrored and expressed in all forms of mass activities. His two books *The Sexual Revolution* and *The Mass Psychology of Fascism* are the results of this new vista of the interrelation of man and his world. He shows the fatal inability of all of us to jump over our own shadow and to break through the layer of secondary armouring into natural spontaneous function.

The next step in Wilhelm Reich's work grew clearly from those roots.

The libido-theory of Freud, trapped in the realm of the merely psychical, was understood by Reich to be a basic life energy and he found by patient observation and experiment how such energetic processes underlie all living function. In his experiments with basic life processes he discovered the disintegration of organic matter into minute living units which he called Bions. The underlying energy was called Orgone by Reich and he found it to be all-pervading and omnipresent, a cosmic life-energy. Two works, *The Function of the Orgasm* and *Cancer Biopathy* record this aspect. In the last book, he is tracing the reaction of what one may call in lieu of a better word the total maladjustment into the very cells of the body, and shows the ways and means of cancer formation.

The final epoch of Wilhelm Reich's work and life is a real tragedy. His work in the United States, searching and finding evidence of the organotic basis of life, successful and encouraged by many friends and pupils, isolated him from the main body of scientists who were

intrinsically unable to understand or accept any of the Reichian premises. Political mongrels from the Right and Left found an easy prey in his ideas by distorting them. Orthodox psychoanalysts and psychiatrists joined in the chorus of denigrators, and what began as a mean little smear campaign ended up by the injunction against Reich's work by the American Government. Reich, with wonderful courage, defied the Food and Drug Administration by denying this body the right, ability and insight to judge or condemn his work. This defiance brought him a two-year prison sentence for contempt of court. He died in jail on the second of November 1957, in his 61st year of life.

If the word genius is used, as it should be, for a personality with a well-nigh superhuman drive, for a man whose work launches out into new regions, and whose discoveries will finally be interwoven into the matrix of the stuff out of which a better world may be built one day, then Reich was a genius and it will depend on the outcome of the struggle between good and evil whether or not his genius will be acknowledged.

"Love, work and knowledge are the well-springs of life. They should also govern it." (Motto of all Reich's books). R.O.

## BOOK REVIEW

## Marxism &amp; the Open Mind

MARXISM AND THE OPEN MIND by John Lewis. Routledge & Kegan Paul. 25s.

THIS volume is a collection of essays written over the last twenty years or so by the editor of the now defunct Stalinist journal, *Modern Quarterly*. The avowed object of their re-publication is two-fold: to win a better comprehension of Marxism as a system of thought and, also, to stimulate what the author believes to be a long overdue re-casting and reevaluation of Marxism in the light of contemporary thought. Dr. Lewis's title seems to have been designed to disarm the critic. Within its covers, it suggests, is to be found none of the dogmatism which we have come to associate with orthodox exponents of Marxism; here, at last, is a Marxist, free from prejudices and willing to meet the critics on their own ground. In his preface, Dr. Lewis pursues this tactic further. "Marxism", we are told, "makes no claim to present the world with a closed system. It is offered as a working hypothesis to be constantly modified as a result of its application to changing historical conditions." Further, it is admitted that Marxism has much to learn from non-Marxist thought. The philistine approach of the late unlamented Zhdanov, who castigated all non-Marxist thought as vile and depraved bourgeois ideology, is condemned. We have to recognise, argues Dr. Lewis, that there are 'progressive' as well as 'reactionary' tendencies in modern thought. The latter may well be dismissed as mere rationalizations of bourgeois class interests but the former are to be welcomed as supplementing and enlarging Marxist criticism of contemporary society.

Dr. Lewis must forgive the sceptical critic for pulling a wry face at all this. Lack of dogmatism and a willingness to deviate from Marxist orthodoxy were hardly the most distinguishing characteristics of the *Modern Quarterly* under his editorship. Why the new approach? The answer, of course, is to be found in the Twentieth Congress of the C.P.S.U. which passed a resolution admitting that "A certain dogmatism, rigidity, and sectarianism in our approach and thinking have created unnecessary obstacles to united work and discussion." In this country, Marxism, as a system of thought, has, except for a few die-hards like Dr. Lewis himself, ceased to appeal to the intellectuals. Something has to be done to win them back, a few concessions made. Marxism plus a little unorthodoxy is the answer—or rather, the hope. Dr. Lewis is not sticking his neck out or risking expulsion for deviationism: he is only following the new party line.

The chief interest of this book lies not in its exposition of the Marxist view on a variety of philosophical problems (Dr. Lewis's style is too opaque for this purpose) but in the concessions to 'progressive bourgeois thought' that the author is prepared to make. The two best essays in the book are on Sartre and Berdyaev which reveal a genuine attempt to understand and to appreciate the work of these thinkers. Sartre's flirtation with the French Communist Party,

of course, makes him a particularly suitable subject for the new 'open-minded' approach. His speech to the World Peace Council surely lifted him, declares Dr. Lewis, "right out of the ranks of the decadents, the reactionaries, the ideologists of dying capitalism". He can therefore be safely patronised: his thought "echoes or parallels many Marxist insights . . . it is open to Marxist development. It would benefit from a fresh study of Marxism." But also (and how right): "Marxism itself could derive much stimulus and refreshment from Sartre's genuine passion for the autonomous judgment, his flat refusal to become the slave of any dogma." Berdyaev is a less likely subject: his mysticism and transcendentalism naturally repel the Marxist. But in Dr. Lewis's hands he emerges on the right side. Typical of the lost Russian intelligentsia which dreamed of the revolution, his sort are irresponsible and maddening but—we are now assured—indispensable. "Can any society, and in particular any

socialist society," asks Dr. Lewis rhetorically, "do without its heretics, its critics, its impatient lovers of freedom?"

It is not that we object to Dr. Lewis's sentiments: only that he has taken so long in discovering them and that there are so few signs, even after the Twentieth Congress, that the Berdyaevs of this world are allowed to breathe under Marxist governments.

The essays on Sartre and Berdyaev are of recent date. For this reason, their evoking of the spirit of freedom appears less forced. Most of the other essays were composed in the Stalinist era and show signs of conscious revision to bring them more into harmony with the new approach. In making these revisions Dr. Lewis is not always as frank with his readers as we have a right to expect from someone who parades his open mind. The essay on "Human Rights", for example, is prefaced by the note that it was the Marxist contribution to the symposium prepared by UNESCO for the Human Rights Commission in 1947 and published in 1949. There is no indication that it has been revised. In reading it I was struck by the liberal tone of several passages. For a moment, I thought I had misjudged Dr. Lewis. Here

was a prominent C.P. intellectual who even in 1949 was prepared to admit that "one of the factors responsible for the disappearance of freedom and political liberty under the Stalin régime" was the tendency to dismiss human rights and democratic liberties as so many bourgeois prejudices. But my ingrained scepticism re-asserted itself. I looked up the original version published in *Human Rights* by Wingate, 1949. A comparison of the two texts confirms that Dr. Lewis's liberalism is a post-Stalin development. The liberal passages are all later additions. The main structure of the argument remains unaltered but the revised version is much more sympathetic towards the classical doctrine of rights formulated in the 18th century. In 1949 Dr. Lewis was concerned to stress the incompatibility between the individual rights claimed by the revolutionary bourgeoisie and the more recently formulated social and economic rights. On his theory that rights are essentially claims made by different classes in the course of their development, this incompatibility is understandable. One would expect the social and economic rights claimed by the working class to challenge the rights claimed by the bourgeoisie in its struggle

Continued on p. 3

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP  
OPEN DAILY

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

Reprints and  
Cheap Editions . . .

- Memoirs of a Sword Swallower  
Dan Mannix 2/6
- The Ignoble Art  
Edith Summerskill 2/-
- The Earth Abides  
George R. Stewart 3/6
- Second-Hand . . .
- Anarchism E. V. Zenker 30/-
- Adventures in Socialism  
Alex Cullen 10/-
- The Collected Prose Works of  
Boris Pasternak 3/-
- The Testament of Christian  
Civilization Joseph McCabe 8/6
- No Voice is Wholly Lost  
Harry Slochower 3/6
- I Was Stalin's Agent  
W. G. Krivitsky 8/6
- Quatrefoil James Barr 3/6
- Civilization Georges Duhamel 3/6
- Soviet Policy and its Critics  
J. R. Campbell 4/-
- Behind the Silken Curtain  
Bertley C. Crum 3/-
- But Who has Won?  
John Scanlon 3/-
- The Man Who Was Thursday  
G. K. Chesterton 3/6
- Tito's Plot Against Europe  
Derek Kartun 3/6
- The Labour Party in Perspective  
C. R. Attlee 2/6
- Soviet Democracy Pat Sloan 3/-
- What I Believe Leo Tolstoy 3/6
- The Call of the Wild  
Jack London 2/6
- Gods and Men W. J. Perry 2/6
- Walt Whitman: a Study  
J. A. Symonds 3/-

## Periodicals . . .

- The University Libertarian  
Autumn 1/-
- Views and Comments, No. 23 3d.

## Pamphlets . . .

- Abundance or Abundant Life  
Wilfred Wellock 1/6

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

## Pogrom

ON the 28th October, 1938 in Germany, the Gestapo was ordered to arrest 15,000 Polish Jews for the purpose of summarily deporting them to Poland. They were duly transported to the frontier with accustomed Nazi brutality and on the night of 28th-29th October were "pushed" across to the Polish side. The Poles (for whom the Allies so gallantly fought—eventually), did not want the Jews either and greeted them with barbed wire and machine guns. The Jews therefore were stranded in no-man's land—terrified outcasts.

At Zbonzsyn, on the border, conditions were worse than elsewhere; amongst the refugees were a middle-aged couple called Grünspan. They had lived and worked in Germany since 1914, but after 1933 their existence had steadily worsened as anti-Semitic measures were stepped up and Jew-baiting became accepted procedure. Fortunately the Grünspans had succeeded in getting their seventeen-year-old son to Paris on a forged passport.

When Herschel Grünspan heard of the treatment of his parents in a letter from his father on 7th November, he purchased a revolver. The same day he went to the German Embassy in Paris and asked to see one of the secretaries. The third secretary, Ernst Von Rath appeared and was the recipient of five shots from Grünspan's revolver. Two days later he died.

This event was used by the Nazis as a reason for instigating the first large-scale pogrom against German Jewry, and soon led to the deprivation of any last remaining rights (or illusions) which they might still possess. Lionel Kochan has written of the event and its consequences in his book: *Pogrom, November 10th, 1938*. It is a well-documented account of what took place before, during and after the pogrom, its effects upon the Jews in

\*Andre Deutsch: 13s. 6d.

Germany, and of world opinion afterwards.

Little is generally known of the event or of its importance for the world in the years which followed. It heralded the massacre of six million Jews in Europe and indicated quite clearly to those who wished to know, the real nature of German National Socialism. The fact that its portents were almost completely ignored by the democratic Governments is now part of the shabby fabric of European history.

By coincidence the 9th November was the annual celebration day of the 1923 Nazi attempt to seize power. In Munich almost the entire Nazi hierarchy was assembled to pay tribute to their fallen comrades. Hitler made a brief appearance and then departed, leaving the stage to Goebbels. The director of propaganda then made an inflammatory speech urging anti-Semitic action against "Von Rath's murderers"; though he did not specify precisely what action. That night, the pogrom, supposedly a spontaneous uprising of the German people in their anger against the loathsome Jews, took place. It was in fact carried out by the S.A. and Gestapo entirely.

About 20,000 Jews were arrested at random; nearly 100 were killed; 267 synagogues were set on fire or demolished, 815 shops destroyed, 29 warehouses and 174 houses were either set on fire or demolished. The arrested Jews were placed in three concentration camps, Dachau, Buchenwald or Sachsenhausen. There they were treated with the beginnings of that Nazi bestiality and inhumanity which later became standard practice.

Only Goering objected to the pogrom—but by no means on humanitarian grounds. He was in the throes of a vast rearmament programme and resented the waste of materials and property. He therefore instituted a fine of £100,000,000

on German Jewry and forced them to sell their property, investments and all their assets to Aryans at prices fixed by the Nazis—the Government to take the very considerable profit. All insurance money payable to Jews whose property had been destroyed during the pogrom was forfeited—to the Government also. Without status the Jews in Germany were forced into a hopeless, twilight existence, and economically they did not exist at all.

Reaction abroad was mostly of shock. The newspapers in the democracies declared their horror, all the "good work" carried through by Chamberlain and Hitler in their Munich agreement of friendship appeared to be lost. Roosevelt rebuked Germany, Russia used the event to show German weakness and the folly of appeasement; in France Bonnet "had little difficulty in persuading the majority of the press to 'play down' the Jewish pogroms . . ." For Britain Sir Samuel Hoare in a speech to the Cambridge University Conservative Association said: ". . . on no account must we fall from the height of exultation to which the world was lifted by the Munich peace to the slough of despond in which there is no hope."

Such governmental sympathies as were even remotely visible towards the Jews in Germany were smothered in reasons why existing policy towards Nazi Germany must remain one of friendship and understanding. In every country the reaction of the ordinary people was of revulsion and an awareness of what Nazism really was. But governments pretended that whilst pogroms were not quite nice, there was nothing to be done but put a good face on it.

Mr. Kochan's book is an invaluable documentary of facts, and some revelations. Even ardent government supporters may notice that something was amiss in 1938—which was the inevitable signpost to 1939 and thereafter.

H.F.W.



## Looking Beyond the Nearest Lamp-Post

THERE is trouble in Newton Road "an attractive backwater of Paddington"—over lamp-posts! The "case" for the residents was put by Mr. J. D. Scott, the novelist, who lives at No. 29, in these terms:

"We think it is a national issue. A local council should be prepared to go through the proper democratic procedure of hearing complaints from groups of ratepayers and then if necessary reconsidering its decision. Months ago we objected to the modern concrete lamp-standards which the council has now started to erect in our road and we even offered to pay the extra money involved if we were given modern standards of a better design. But the council has refused to discuss this with us—apart from one preliminary meeting—and has not even acknowledged some of our letters."

The Council, however, also has a case. It points out that imitation "period" lamp standards as an alternative to the "emasculated gibbets" have been used in some of the Victorian squares near Hyde Park. But Newton Road they argue is a road of mixed character, part Victorian, part modern and does not therefore qualify for the more expensive "period" lamp-posts. To make an exception for Newton Road, would result in demands from the residents of other "mixed roads" in the borough. To which Newton Road replies that the extra cost of £150 involved would be paid by the residents themselves. Such a suggestion, said Mr. Uzielli, chairman of the works committee, fills him and the committee "with alarm". And he goes on to explain why he considers the Newton Road solution "a frightful proposition":

"We must have a certain uniformity of action, and it is against all democratic principles for ratepayers to be able to 'buy themselves out' of council decisions they don't like. They elect a council to do a job of work, and if they don't approve they have their redress at the local elections. If we make exceptions you would have every quaint little street in London wanting to do things its own way."

Mr. Scott and the residents of Newton Road are unimpressed by these arguments. "That is the reasoning of bureaucracy—they declare—and the very thing we are determined to fight". Kingsley Martin in his "London Diary" in last week's *New Statesman* lends his support to the rebel cause but perhaps unwittingly argues for the works committee's case when he describes its attitude as being that "the Town Hall knows best. It cannot let anarchy triumph in Paddington". But he is more realistic in his summing up than Mr. Scott and his friends who want to fight "the reasoning of bureaucracy". Either you believe in government—local or national—in which case you recognise the need for a bureaucracy and in so doing must also accept its peculiar way of reasoning; or you do not, in which case you believe in anarchy and are not only opposed to the reasoning of bureaucracy but to bureaucracy itself.

Mr. Uzielli obviously has a strong case, for however many enemies he may make among the professional aesthetes he will win many friends by his stand for "democratic principles" against "those ratepayers who would 'buy themselves out' of council decisions they don't like". In other words Mr. Uzielli is the champion of the underdog, of the residents of Paddington who cannot afford to have higher aesthetic standards in lamp-standards than the Council! Yes, of course it's all a lot of humbuggery, but no more so than the militancy of the Newton Road lamp-post anarchists, who will

obviously be quite content to live on an island of imitation "period" street lamps surrounded by a sea of sodium lights hoisted on hundreds of "emasculated gibbets"!

★  
ANARCHY—we are sure most residents of Newton Road would say—may well be an attractive philosophy but how can you run a country of 50 million people without a central authority. Anarchy might work for a few hundred people but not in the modern world, with its complex problems of mass production and its teeming millions to feed, clothe, house and even entertain in their leisure hours. How can you consult "the people" on every issue without wasting valuable time, etc.? These are, of course, excuses for not consulting the people.

As we have pointed out on other occasions, when elections take place some constituencies announce the results within a few hours of the closing of the polling booths, and within 24 hours the voting cards for the whole country have been sorted, counted, analysed and the results printed in the national Press. Indeed the football pool companies do ever more, every week, since they not only find that needle in the haystack, the £200,000 winner, but have at the same time done all the necessary financial calculations to determine the exact of his winnings. In this electronic age, in this age of mass communications, nothing would be simpler than nation-wide referendums on major as well as minor issues of public interest.

★  
THE obstacles to real democracy are not administrative but social. Democracy can only function in an equalitarian society, that is a society in which every human being has the same rights, in which all natural resources are Man's heritage (and not some men's monopoly) and in which no man shall be in a position to exploit the labour power of another. (This is not the 'equalitarian society' of Gaitskell and the Labour Party intellectuals. They advocate equality of opportunity, of letting the "best men" get on, irrespective of class. Their policy, however, does not eliminate classes in society; it simply would make it possible for more members of the exploited class to join the ranks of the exploiters!) It is often argued by our critics that such a society as we advocate would be dull, and discourage initiative and the ambition to "get on". Such criticism, coming as it invariably does from supporters of existing institutions, has always appeared to us unbelievably unimaginative, if not downright dishonest.

We live in a society which in spite of its social and economic differentials is dull because it is uniform. Mass communications do the people's thinking for them; governments legislate on every question affecting life and liberty whether we live in High Wycombe or the Highlands. Mass production geared to high pressure advertising determines our tastes in clothes, food and entertainment. The Church, the police, grandparents and the Jones', regulate our family and sex life; protect us from "obscene" literature and unorthodox ideas; and employers with the carrot of (tax-free) lunch vouchers, pension schemes, sports and social clubs, surround themselves with willing, season-ticketed slaves, whose lives are dominated by the clock, suburban railway time-tables, forms and routine.

Watch these objectors to "the dullness of the anarchist equalitarian society", as they surge across London Bridge and Hungerford Bridge at 9 a.m. and 5.30 p.m. like sheep being driven into their pens; look at the grotesque labyrinths in which they work and the sem-detached, colourless, dormitories in which they live. Is it not a case of the pot calling the kettle black?

Or is it perhaps that these critics have not understood, nor have they imagination to appreciate, the difference between an equalitarian society

THE rapid and accelerating changes that are taking place in people's lives and habits in this country are nowhere more noticeable than in Wales, where the society based on a different social and religious tradition, a different culture and a different language is, in Richard Hoggart's words, "feeling acutely the impact of the main movements towards industrial and cultural uniformity in Britain to-day". Evaluations of the change differ sharply. To Alexander Baron, "the colourless, cultureless, American-patterned life of the mid-twentieth century is on the way in, and the famous culture of the South Wales mining community is on the way out". But T. R. Fyvel sees it quite differently:

"No serious student of affairs could hold that the new cultural pattern has been imposed on Britain by American influences. . . . In the first half of the nineteenth century, it was the British middle classes who firmly staked their historic claim to a share in the running of the State and in its benefits. Similarly, in the first half of the twentieth century it is the British organised workers who have come forward to secure their share in running the British State and in participating in social and cultural life". It is possible for the same observer to have two different views of the same phenomena. For instance, Kenneth Harris, a well-known student of Welsh affairs, discussing the changes which the 'second industrial revolution' has brought to South Wales in the *Liverpool Daily Post* (3/8/53), wrote:

"Yet even though half a million Welshmen left Wales between the two World Wars, Welsh culture seems to hold its ground. . . . Then the strange paradox began to be revealed; the prosperity of the two-and-a-half millions who live in Wales to-day seems to corrode the nation's life as poverty never did".

But writing in *The Observer* (7/7/57), Mr. Harris puts the changes in a different light:

"The general impression . . . is of a community which has grown in real wealth, in confidence, skill, capacity for choice, the ability to generate industrial power. Socially, what strikes people most are the wearing down of the barriers between groups and classes, the decline in prejudice, the progress of economic and social understanding."

There is no contradiction between his two views, one is through the eyes of the old culture and the other through those of the new. Two studies of opposite ends of Wales, rural and urban, North-East and South-West, throw some light on the effect of the changes.

As you approach Dr. Frankenberg's village of 'Pentredrith' you pass dis-

★  
"VILLAGE ON THE BORDER" by Ronald Frankenberg. (Cohen & West, 18s.).

"SOCIAL CHANGE IN SOUTH-WEST WALES" by T. Brennan, E. W. Cooney and H. Pollins. (Watts, 21s.).

which however, is based on the recognition of the rich diversity of human personalities, and the free-for-all jungle of capitalist society which inhibits the many, through fear of insecurity, but also thwarts the development of the privileged few just because that privilege is based on money and power values. The result is uniformity with class distinctions, but with all that uniformity!

Government is the organisation of the many by the few. It is an attempt to adjust the lives of men, women and children to an impersonal economic and political machine by legislation. That 600 Members of Parliament feel able to legislate for 50 million must surely indicate that they look upon us spiritually, rather as the clothing manufacturers, who divide us into small, average, and outsize, do physically.

The human personality will only be able to thrive when we reorganise the possibilities of achieving social unity through individual diversity. This requires, in the first place, the removal of those antagonisms, artificially stimulated by the economic divisions of society, which prevent people from seeing beyond the tips of their noses (or beyond the nearest lamp-post); from understanding that their real "self-interest" is in fact linked to the real "self-interest" of all their fellow beings.

Newton Road may think it can survive as an oasis in the midst of a desert. We think not. It will only live and grow, humanly speaking, when the desert is made fertile.

# A Million Private Dreams - 4

used mills and hills of slate refuse, for the economy that was based on local material resources which formed the basis of the village community has now gone. "The villagers still reside together in their compact nuclear settlement, but many no longer work in the valley alongside their fellow-villagers". After a slow decline, the industries of the village died completely between 1946 and 1952. "One by one the quarries of slate and stone and the factories closed down. Many of the neighbouring farms were bought by Englishmen. The large estates finally dissolved. The men travelled daily to work in the nearby towns or to building sites". One of the effects of this has been to sharpen the undercurrents of hostility within the village by adding to them that between the men, whose interests are centred round the place of work in the town, and the women whose lives are still focussed around the village. In every society there is a division of sex roles, inside and outside the family, and this very division "forges the family into an organic unit because of the complementary nature of the male and female roles". But in Pentre, "this process has been extended outside the elementary family and created a real division which is felt and resented by Pentre people." The women's organisations flourish, while the men's struggle or have capsized altogether. Villagers attribute this to the fact that the men's daily journey leaves them too tired to organise their own activities when they return. At the same time,

"Even though the men are apathetic in the carrying on of their own organisations, they are vigilant against the encroachment of women into their own preserves. They both resent such attempts and act against them. In this they are aided by the other women. No sympathy is expressed for a woman working or managing a business without the help of a man, and her difficulties are magnified and ridiculed. . . . 'Lady doctors' are mistrusted. Women who turn up to public meetings on political affairs which are not considered to concern them are shamed by public and sarcastic reference to their presence. Pentre women rarely enter pubs and when they do all the men fall silent and stare".

★  
OLD hostilities—between Church and Chapel people, between English and Welsh speaking, still divide the village beneath the surface, and a very marked feature of social life is the attempt to avoid open conflicts. But the village feels the need to express itself as a unity in such activities as the brass band, the choir, the carnival and the football club. The life and death of these organisations is described very closely, emphasising the role of the 'stranger' as leader or scapegoat:

"Minutes of committees are kept in very little detail, if they are kept at all; no discussion is recorded and even the names of proposer and seconder are omitted from the record of decisions made. Committees of the village, like the village itself, must maintain an ap-

pearance of impersonal, unanimous, even leaderless unity."

For this reason 'strangers' are brought into an activity to "take the responsibility and withstand the unpopularity of leadership and the taking of decisions".

"Decisions are usually in fact taken by the villagers themselves. They only appear to be made by strangers who are forced to shoulder the responsibility for decisions when they prove unpopular with dissident groups of villagers. Such 'strangers' may be complete outsiders to the category of Pentre people, or they may be drawn from deviant individuals and groups within this category".

Dr. Frankenberg's conclusion about this changing village is that,

"In the past villagers worked together, played together and lived together. Their common history is a factor in their own continued cohesion. They pride themselves on being a group of kin and on being Welsh. Now only the women work together, and each successive failure of a social activity makes the next one more difficult to start. Improvements in public transport, television, radio and the cinema have already diminished the interest of the young people in the village and its affairs. Emigration in search of better economic and leisure opportunities is taking a toll. These developments decrease the number of cross-cutting ties which bind Pentre people into a community. As many of the older villages fear, the time may come, if these developments continue, when the village ceases to be a village community and becomes merely a collection of dwellings, housing some of the industrial workers of Great Britain".

★  
THE authors of *Social Change in South-West Wales* study the social and industrial history of their area, where, following years of depression in the mining, steel and tin-plating industries, a quite new industrial pattern is developing—the new light industrial and the great new steel and tin-plate works replacing the old small-scale and locally controlled plants. They discuss the pattern and content of associational life—the trade unions, religious organisations, parties, cultural and other groups. Organised religion in Wales has played in the past a role of much wider than religious importance. The Church in Wales (formerly the established Church of England) was an organ of conservatism, the landowners and the Anglicised middle-class, but the Non-conformist and Dissenting chapels (apart from those sects which served as a means of deflecting the attention of the down-trodden to the 'world to come') were, in alliance with the local trade union chapels, the vehicles of radicalism, "preaching in and out of season the meaning of civil and religious liberty" and "criticising the existing social order in an increasingly radical fashion". Today these influences have declined and "the supreme influence in political life" is the Labour Party, dominated in turn by the centralised trade unions.

In discussing the effect of this, the authors introduce the concept of "tuto-

Continued on p. 4

## Marxism and the Open Mind

Continued from p. 2

against feudal privileges. Now, however, the incompatibility is narrowed down: the conflict is only between modern social and economic rights and certain of the earlier allegedly 'inherent' rights—those of property. A reader of the 1949 version might well have been tempted to dismiss the famous 18th century natural rights as so many bourgeois prejudices. But the reader of the revised version is explicitly informed: "rights of free speech, freedom of person, freedom of association and political activity, while not absolute, are of enduring value. It is not sufficient to regard them as transitory and rightly to be swept away before the advance of the working class with their new social demands. . . . they remain first principles of human freedom and dignity. . . ."

Again, no one is going to quarrel with Dr. Lewis's new-found respect for individual rights. One regrets only that he did not have this respect, or at least voice it, in 1949. There is, however, a difficulty of a theoretical kind raised by these new admissions. If the 18th century rights, other than the rights of property, are now to be recognised as of 'enduring value', what becomes of the theory which explains their origin in class terms? Surely the implication of Dr. Lewis's concession is that there was a genuine element of universality in the 18th century doctrine and that rights are not merely claims advanced by classes in the course of their development.

Dr. Lewis should be warned. There are real dangers for him in trying to be open-minded. To attempt to bring

Marxism into line with other contemporary thought seems laudable enough but it may end in him ceasing to be a Marxist. He may incorporate so many 'bourgeois' elements into his thinking that it will cease to be a system of thought. If this prospect appals him, however, let me add a note of encouragement. His training in theology has made him adept at quoting scriptures that serve his purpose. The preface is sprinkled with texts from Marxist holy books which support the new approach. There is one text, however, which he does not quote: Marx's assertion that he himself was no Marxist. Dr. Lewis might perhaps ponder the thought and then set himself the task of composing a new essay on these lines: Marx, whatever else he may have been, was a great sociologist and one of the founders of the social sciences. But a true science does not develop in the way that Marxism has developed; it does not proceed by re-casting and revaluing every so often the theories of its founders in the light of contemporary thought; it does not stretch its concepts so that they can embrace every uncomfortable fact. That is the way of religion, not of science. A religion reveals its founders but not science. As Whitehead once put it: "A science that hesitates to forget its founders is lost." There is much in Marx's writings that is of enduring value in furthering the social sciences, together with much that is dross. "Marxism", whether of the old-fashioned closed or the new-fashioned open minded variety, only hinders the task of distinguishing the one from the other.



# How Mean Can They Get?

Continued from p. 1

Thus it is that the producers of wealth are the ones who keep the whole of society—the unproductive young, the unproductive old and the unproductive parasites alike. The difference between the three categories is that the unproductive young are potentially the producers of wealth in the future and therefore the keeping and nurturing of those is social insurance in its fullest sense; the unproductive old are those who have already served society, for something more or less than half-a-century, have provided wealth for all while they have been working and have earned a rest. The majority of these two categories are of the working class and will thus exist little above subsistence level most of their lives—even if we recognise the general rising standards of living—and thus have few resources to fall back upon in old age.

## The Unproductive

The third category, the unproductive parasites, is, if we think of it as consisting only of the idle rich, a dwindling class in our levelling-down economy. But if we include in the category all those who may work but in fact produce nothing, we have an increasing army of bureaucrats, officials, middle men and office women as managerialism spreads. At all levels these tend to identify themselves with their employers—companies or the State—but only in the higher grades could they be termed in the boss class. The lower grades, although they might hate to admit it, are workers and will never be anything else. They like to keep up appearances, however, of being in the middle class, so they, too, live up to their income. On retirement they may have some savings, perhaps their own house, and, having probably worked stodgily in a pensionable job all their lives, have something above the Old Age Pension to get along on.

Still, in an inflationary period like this, their position is not particularly secure, as a fixed pension dwindles in value. Let's face it, under capitalism old age is hardly inducive to serenity, tranquillity, with all passion spent and so forth, for the great majority of people. It

## SECOND ANNUAL DEBATING CONTEST

THE London debating competition, which last year was won by a team from the Malatesta Club, is commencing preliminary rounds for this year's contest, with a higher number of entries than last year.

First debate in which the Club takes part is as follows:

**THIS HOUSE PREFERS NO REPRESENTATION TO PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION**

Proposers: Malatesta Club

Opposers: Proportional Representation Society.

Friday, 22 November at 8 p.m. at the Malatesta Club 32 Percy St., W.1. Open to the Public.

## PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT! WEEK 45

Deficit on Freedom £900  
Contributions received £611  
DEFICIT £289

November 1 to November 7

Margate: T.L. 9/-; London: H. 1/-; London: S.B.\* 2/3; London: Anon.\* £1; London: J.S.\* 3/-; Shepton Mallet: E.H.S. 13/-; Hartford: M.G.A. 3/6; Oxford: Anon.\* 5/-; Tunbridge Wells: P.D. £1/0/3; London: W.H.T.\* 2/6; Bicester: R.S.M. 2/6.

\*Indicates regular contributor.

Total ... 4 2 0  
Previously acknowledged ... 607 3 4  
1957 TOTAL TO DATE ... £611 5 4

## Fire Fund

TOTAL TO DATE ... £382 19 6

GIFTS OF BOOKS: London: F.; London: S.E.P.

is much more often an embittering, frustrating and frightening period of loneliness and insecurity. The 'nuclear family' having disintegrated society, those who grow old without interests outside the home can, only too often, find sociality only in institutions—regimented, segregated, waiting to die.

## Why Not Free Access?

One can imagine plenty of ways in which the task of existing on a pittance could be made much easier without any real cost to the community. For instance, why cannot public transport and all municipal services be absolutely free to Old Age pensioners—even if only outside rush hours? Some local Councils have attempted to free transport for Pensioners, only to find that it is illegal for them to allow any special privileges for special categories of ratepayers! Bumbledom dies hard.

In one direction, however, there has been for a long time a 'special privilege' for the old. They have been able to buy tobacco duty-free on presentation of their pension books in the tobacconists. Simultaneously with the raising of the pension in January, this small advantage is to stop. Out of his 10s. increase—already inadequate in view of rising prices—the Old Age Pensioner will have to pay the State duty on tobacco from which hitherto he was exempt. How mean can the Government get?

## To Pay the Rent

Incidentally, one of the items which have increased sufficiently to make the old peoples' plight so desperate that even Macmillan noticed it was—rent. Thanks to the Tory Rent Act. In raising the workers' contributions to National Insurance to meet the increased pension to meet the increased rent, therefore, the Government has, in effect, arranged for the landlords to be paid more rent out of the pockets of the public at large.

The State, which is so necessary to save us from anarchy and chaos, certainly demonstrates its ability to order things most efficiently—in its own interest. The only advantages accruing from the generous increase in Pensions will be for the State and the landlords, certainly not for the

Old Age Pensioners.

But then, they have little voting power, they are not well organised, they can't go on strike nor can they practice a boycott since they live on subsistence level already. In a world where might is right, sections of the community as powerless as Old Age Pensioners have had it—unless they can find champions among the young and vigorous, the economically strong workers of to-day.

But probably the worker of to-day is simply looking forward to the wonderful prospect of his retirement thirty years hence when the Labour Party's splendid scheme will assure him a pension of one-half of his income at 65. It seems to be a question of 'I shall be alright, Jack'.

## 'Prisons Manufacture Criminals'

—Lord Goddard

DEAR COMRADES,

In the Nov. 5 issue of the *News Chronicle* there was reported the case of an ex-prisoner claiming compensation "for injuries received while he was doing a three-year stretch at Pentonville". During the course of the hearing the Lord Chief Justice is stated to have said:

"It seems impossible to say a prison can be a factory, except for the manufacture of criminals" (my emphasis).

For many years anarchists have been putting forward this point of view and have argued that prisons and punishment are no solution to the problem of crime. Has the Lord Chief Justice become converted to our ideas, or is it simply a case of brick-dropping?

Yours sincerely,  
S. E. PARKER.  
London, Nov. 6.

# More on Power Complexes

DEAR COMRADES,

It is impossible for me to hope to give any really adequate reply, in the space of a letter, to the queries raised by Peter Lee (FREEDOM, Nov. 9). All I can do is make a few brief comments.

Let me first make it quite clear that I did not write that man has "invariably chosen the way of power". What I wrote was that in "most cases" he has done so. Had human beings always chosen power, the idea of freedom would have been never conceived. It is because some men—albeit a minority—have chosen freedom (and have acted freely) that the libertarian tradition still exists. Power thinking and power acting have been the dominant pattern of thought and behaviour in all civilised societies of which we know, but there have always been a few who have opposed this pattern and sought its abolition.

Whether the "power complex" was characteristic of primitive man before the existence of institutionalized power is a question which can never, perhaps, be finally answered. A lot depends upon one's definition of primitive man and of power. The power institution, as we know it to-day, would seem to be of religio-economic origin. The belief in a god-man and the introduction of agriculture bringing about changes in social relationships which created economic privilege, appear to have been the main factors in the minority gaining power over the majority.

The psychological reasons for power have their source in the frustration of the need for love and creativity. This is the contention of Erich Fromm and Alex

## Productivity?

Lloyds Bank has announced a new pay award which makes some of its clerks four-figure men from January 1 next.

The Scales run from £285 a year at 17 to £1,000 at 39, compared with £275 and £949 now.

## A Million Private Dreams - 4

nomy' which is at the root of our enquiry into the social possibilities of realising people's private dreams:

"Unorthodoxy in the Labour Movement . . . is strongly discouraged and everywhere on the retreat. The increasing complexity of organisation which is evident in industry, in the trade union movement, in the Labour Party, and in the machinery of government itself, militates against the power of the individual to govern his own life . . . The Labour Party and the trade unions have succeeded in rising to the position we have described because they took over some of the function of a local system of associations centred on the chapel . . . Now it forms part of the machinery of political authority and representation which gives it enormous power, not only locally, but also nationally and internationally. But in all this the individual has less to say, because in the conflict between efficiency of social organisation and the standard of living on the one hand, and personal autonomy and long-term aims on the other, the individual has consistently preferred the higher standard of living. We cannot conclude however, that this choice involves a decline of individual autonomy in all respects. The individual, in making his choice in favour of a higher material standard of living, becomes able to make the sort of life he wants for himself by means of the way in which he spends his extra wealth."

★  
AGAIN and again the authors try to evaluate different aspects of the social change that they see all around. Their final conclusion at the end of the book (compare it with Dr. Frankenberg's conclusion about his village, or Mr. Mogy's about the Oxford housing estate) is that:

"The characteristically Welsh way of life . . . appears to attach great importance to personal relations and the independence of the individual. On the other hand, the organisation of social life in small compact groups, although allowing the expression of certain differences, of which the multiplicity of religious sects is a good example, acts as a very strong social control against other deviations. Standards of behaviour in sexual matters, for example, are strict and the power of compulsion is strong . . . Although the pressure of public opinion is a valuable weapon against undesirable deviations of behaviour, it might also prove a serious restriction to the individual who wants to be adventurous or who is simply trying to solve his own problems in his own way. The weakening of the powers of the local system, which we have shown, draws its strength from small groups, implies a weakening of this kind of social control. It implies also a lowering of the intensity of personal relations generally by spreading the dependence of the individual over a wider field. This will have the effect of depriving the indi-

Comfort, in particular, and their works on this subject should be consulted. It is possible that when economic privilege and the belief in a god-man became established, the repressive structure of government which was needed for their maintenance was primarily responsible for that distortion and thwarting of human needs which is the basis for the desire to wield, or to submit to, power. I do not think that it is helpful to endeavour to find out the nature of man by studying the behaviour of animals. Mankind shares with the less complex forms of life certain physiological and instinctual attributes, but it is precisely to the human qualities of man (e.g. the ability to love, to think conceptually) that we must look for any efforts towards freedom. Even if primitive man behaved as Mr. Lee states he did, it would not follow that the nature of man prevents him from becoming free and responsible. We are no longer primitive and we can conceive of freedom. On the other hand, if primitive man lived, as certain anthropologists\* believe, in a sort of unconscious anarchy, it would be no answer to our problems to advocate a return to that condition. Mankind in general has been subjected to a process of 'civilization' which can only be transcended by a revolution more fundamental than any that has ever been known before. The question is not whether the 'innocence' of primitive man or the 'experience' of civilized man is the appropriate ground from which to attempt the 'leap into freedom', but whether we can effect a synthesis of the good aspects of primitive innocence and civilized experience into a new and different way of living.

When all has been said and read, however, on the economic, religious and psychological origins of power, I do not think that the core of the anarchist faith has been explained. In the final analysis, like all faiths, it is not susceptible to explanation in scientific terms, any more than it is possible to explain why a man erotically loves this woman and not that.

dual of certain satisfactions while increasing the scope for personal development."

But there is another aspect too: "It is arguable that the autonomy of the individual implies not only freedom from restrictions by his neighbours, but also freedom to help in the shaping of his own life by joining with his neighbours in running the community. We have no doubt that the effects of the changes which we have described have been undesirable, in that they have been associated with a reduction in the power of the individual to shape the life of his community. Even where extra machinery of representation or communication has been provided it has inspired no confidence. Many people interested in social affairs feel that the Swansea Area has lost what autonomy it possessed in industry, in politics, and in cultural affairs, and that, far from having an identity of its own, it is now a part, and an unimportant part, of a larger and less well understood unit."

These thoughtful reflections, instead of either denunciation of 'Admass' or vague nostalgia for the lost part, or mindless acceptance of everything that happens just because it happens, are based upon a philosophical assumption which almost everybody makes, and which the present authors set out in these terms:

"The unique nature of the individual personality means that the autonomy of the individual is often in conflict with the needs of social order. Harmonious living in groups involves compromise between individuals and between collections of individuals with differing interests and such compromise is a limitation of individual autonomy . . . It is reasonable to argue that a particular form of organisation of society is better or worse in proportion as it succeeds or fails in resolving this conflict. Similarly, a set of changes can be judged as more or less desirable in so far as they promote or hinder this reconciliation."

From our point of view, we might rephrase the argument to say that they are more or less desirable in so far as they promote or hinder the effort to make such a reconciliation unnecessary by making available such a variety of social patterns and groupings that the individual can pick and choose among them to find one attuned to his own temperament or his private dreams, so that the 'limitation of personal autonomy' does not arise.

Must we shake off one kind of conformity only to establish another? Can we not use the higher technological and material living standards to have our cake and eat it? To have both a wider social community and a wider personal autonomy?  
C.W.

We can elucidate our faith; we can employ reason to demonstrate its implications; and we can cite the scientific evidence which appears to support it—but it is really only in the act of living it that we can prove it. The anarchist believes that men and women are potentially capable of living in freedom and brotherhood without submitting to, or wielding, power. Our reasons are contained in our literature and expressed in our speeches, but our proof lies in our hearts and can only be shown in our lives.

Yours sincerely,  
S. E. PARKER.

\*G. Elliot Smith in his *Human History* and W. J. Perry in his *Growth of Civilization and The Primordial Ocean*. See also *The Heritage of Man* by H. J. Massingham, *In The Footsteps of Warfare* by R. L. Worrall, and *The Source of Civilization* by Gerald Heard. These depict primitive man in quite a different light to the nineteenth-century bogeyman in which Mr. Lee apparently believes.

For a discussion of the respective merits of primitive and civilized man in regard to the creation of a free society see the essay by Holley Cantine entitled "The Environment of Freedom", which FREEDOM reprinted some years ago.

## MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

### LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

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

### LECTURE - DISCUSSIONS

NOV. 17—Francis Tonks on VOLUNTARY WORK CAMPS  
NOV. 24—F. A. Ridley on GUY FAWKES—THE MAN AND HIS TIMES  
DEC. 1—Axel Hoch on AM I MY BROTHER'S EATER?  
DEC. 8—Bob Green on SOME SHIBBOLETHS OF ANARCHISM.  
Questions, Discussion and Admission all free.

### ★ Malatesta Club ★

SWARAJ HOUSE, 32 PERCY STREET, TOTTENHAM COURT ROAD, LONDON, W.1.

### ACTIVITIES

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

Every Wednesday at 8 p.m. BONAR THOMPSON speaks

NOV. 20—"THE WORK OF BONAR THOMPSON" ON TAPE RECORDINGS. A new selection from D.C.'s collection of Thompson records. Guaranteed brilliant.

### INTERNATIONAL ANARCHIST CENTRE MEETINGS

Discussion Meetings every Thursday at 8 p.m.

Every Friday and Saturday: SOCIAL EVENINGS

Saturday Night is Skiffle Night

Saturday, November 16th THE VIPERS from 8 p.m. till you drop. Admission and Coffee: Members 1/6 Non-members 2/-

## 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