

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"The men of future generations will yet win many a liberty of which we do not even feel the want."
 —MAX STIRNER.

E.T.U. AT PANIC STATIONS

THERE is only one explanation for the measures taken by the leaders of the Electrical Trades Union over the last four weeks: panic.

The Communist leaders of this 230,000 strong union have seen the writing on the wall for the last eighteen months—since the 20th Congress of the Russian Communist Party shook the Stalinists rigid. And during the last year, since Hungary, the turmoil within the Communist Parties both sides of the Iron Curtain has loosened the grip of the Party leaders over their members and above all weakened the confidence of the leaders of Communist-dominated unions in the West in their ability to use the membership for Party purposes.

The Communists have always been in a cleft stick on the issue of dominated unions. Staunchly denying any behind-the-scenes activity in organising the job for their man, they have nevertheless been proud of their man in the job, and have insisted that he is there because he is a good trade-unionist, a militant champion of the workers' rights and freely and democratically elected by the rank-and-file in recognition of their regard and trust for him.

The Means

At the same time as being proud of what the comrade is doing for the workers in his union capacity, they have always sought to avoid publicity for Communist influence within a union since they know perfectly well the means by which it was achieved and the means by which it could be very quickly ended if the rank and file so chose.

It is impossible for Communists to get a majority in any union, except the tiniest craft unions in which they are not interested anyway. There just aren't enough of them in the country altogether, to say nothing of there being enough in any one union. They therefore have to get their men elected through the apathy of the bulk of the rank and file and through concentrating their forces in particular branches.

In the Name of the Branch

While it is impossible for them in any union to claim 60 per cent. of the membership as party-liners, it is by no means difficult for them to provide 60 per cent. of the 10 per cent. of a particular branch present when a vote of any significance to them is on the agenda. Their 6 per cent. of the membership of that branch having won the day, the nominee, or resolution, or whatever it was that was voted on, goes forward in the name of the entire branch.

Apartheid

"To exclude black students from a university is an insult to their human dignity; it is inhuman. To separate them in special university reserves under white supervision is an oppression. To pretend that it is done to preserve their native culture is intellectual dishonesty. To demand the participation of a university in a programme of inhumanity, oppression, and in intellectual dishonesty is a violation of academic freedom."

Prof. Michael Polanyi at a protest meeting against apartheid in South African universities, held at Caxton Hall, 2nd November, 1957.

This is democracy, as also practised in Parliament and the 'Right-wing' union leaders wielding their massive block votes at TUC level. Variations can be played, where the rules demand that an entire branch must be circulated on an issue, by half-a-dozen zealots armed with different coloured pencils and pens spending an evening filling in ballot papers on behalf of all the apathetic*—who don't want to be bothered anyway. This way a convincing majority is assured in a high poll—a highly satisfactory, undeniably democratic result on paper.

To build up union power in this way, however, is to build a hollow organisation which could be toppled over just whenever the rank and file so determined. It is a sad commentary on the awareness of trade-unionists to have to admit that they seem to be determined about nothing except to be taken for a ride by their leaders. And so their leaders get away with it.

Lying Low

The last eighteen months, however, have created such adverse publicity for the Communists that they have had to tread very warily and lie very low in the TU world. Which is in part why the ETU has lost its erstwhile militancy in this period. Remember the electricians' strikes of 2 and 3 years ago? The sparks were preventing exhibitions from opening on time at Olympia and Earl's Court and threatening to pull the switches and give the whole of London a black Christmas. They couldn't do it now, for the simple reason that the rank and file would not obey their Communist leadership to-day as they did then.

More than that. The 20th Congress and Hungary have taken their toll of the Party's militants in the

*As described by John Goldstein in his book on the Transport & General Workers' Union—*Democracy at Work*—(!!) Eds.]

union, who have now turned into anti-Communist militants. And it was the vote by the Mitcham Electronic Engineers' branch for an ex-Communist, Les Cannon, as ETU leader for South East England, in preference to party-liner Jack Fraser, that flashed the red light for Frank Haxell, the ETU's staunch Stalinist general secretary.

Making and Interpreting the Rules

Haxell swung into action, interpreting the rules he had laid down (no doubt with just such an emergency in mind) to show that Cannon's election was irregular, and to disqualify enough of Cannon's votes to be able to declare Comrade Fraser the winner.

Since then the union executive—bossed by Party members Haxell (secretary), Frank Foulkes (president), R. McLennan (assistant sec.), and now Jack Fraser (rank and file member—!!) have summoned to Headquarters for a disciplinary going-over, the secretary of the Mitcham branch which started the rumpus, and a member of the neighbouring Wimbledon branch.

And to make sure such jolts do not occur again, a special delegate conference has adjusted the rules. It was a closed conference of fifty delegates, more than thirty of whom were thought to be Communists, so conjecture on what was decided remains—conjecture. It is safe to bet, however, that the rules were adjusted to suit the book of the CP'ers at the top.

Topple Them Over!

It is action typical of those of totalitarian persuasion that they think in terms of tightening up the laws at the top instead of winning the freely-given loyalty of those at the bottom. These Stalinists have learned nothing from Hungary, and it may be easier to teach them a lesson here than there. Here, the rank and file cannot be silenced if they care to put up a fight. Messrs. Haxell and Company have, in desperation, attempted to find security on their pyramids of power, but it may yet be inverted, topple over and crush them.

The rank and file of the Electrical Trades Union have shown themselves bonny fighters against exploitation by the boss. Let then show the same spirit and ability against political exploitation by the union boss.

Who Will Protest Against Cat-and-Mouse Treatment? French C.O.'s. Nine Years in Goal

IN the list of war resisters in prisons throughout the world which has been compiled by the War Resisters' International and published in last week's *Peace News*, one is struck by the number of names in the French section, and on closer inspection one also discovers alongside some of them the added information that the prisoner has spent "7 years in prison", as in the case of one Robert Thierry, or as long as 9 years in the case of Edmond Schaguene. Of the other countries listed by the W.R.I. (all from the Western bloc) only one resister receives this special mention: Guido Valeriana, who has spent five years in Italian jails and lunatic asylums. But it is only fortuitous that the lists for countries such as Belgium, Italy and Switzerland do not contain many long-term victims, since in none of them is objection to military service legally recognised and there is there-

fore no reason why a man should not receive the cat-and-mouse treatment for the rest of his lifetime if he continues to resist.

We do not believe that the legal recognition of Conscientious Objection to military service, and the resulting farce of Tribunals such as we have had in this country for the past twenty years, in any way mitigates the horror of war or makes conscription any less objectionable. Just as we do not believe that the abolition of the death penalty would induce us to support the present methods of dealing with anti-social

behaviour, or change our attitude to the whole penal system. But this does not prevent us from campaigning for the abolition of the death penalty, and for the same reason, for agitating, protesting and demanding the abolition of cat-and-mouse treatment against those who resist the dictates of the State to military service or to any other forms of direction. Similarly we would support any agitation to remove the powers given to the Courts to imprison for an indefinite period those who are guilty of "contempt", that

Continued on p. 3

The Price of Freedom

This time last year FREEDOM Deficit Fund stood at £758, which is about £70 more than we have received so far this year. Still last year there was no Fire Fund to contend with, and but for it, it is reasonable to suppose that the deficit on FREEDOM would have been covered.

However, encouraged as we are by the efforts of those comrades and sympathisers who have contributed to both these funds this year, we have to face the fact that we shall need a further £314 (\$900) between now and the end of the month if we are to meet the publishing losses on FREEDOM this year.

FREEDOM, whether one agrees with its "line" (or lack of one) or not, is a living example of what can be done by voluntary co-operation. For 18 years—and during the past 7 years, weekly—the paper has appeared regularly that is, something like 600 issues have been written, printed and dispatched to our readers in all parts of the world. This has been done without secret funds, without advertising revenue, without paid contributions or a paid staff. It has been possible because on the one hand there has always been a group of people ready to assume the responsibility of producing the paper, and on the other of readers who think it worthwhile to supply the funds required to cover the losses incurred in publication.

These losses—the difference between income from sales and subscriptions and the bare cost of printing—amount to £1,000 (\$3,000) a year. A lot of money for you and for us. But by present-day standards it's really very little. It is what an American magazine paid our Mr. Muggerridge for his 3,000 word article on the Monarchy; it is much less than the cost of a page advertisement in one of the daily newspapers; it is less than D...u Ders receives in a

week or than a hack journalist earns in a year.

That £1,000 however, makes it possible for us to go on publishing FREEDOM 52 times in a year, during which we do not provide 3,000 words but nearly 700,000. We "write as we please" and not to please either a boss, advertisers or even our readers—however appreciative we are of readers' support and encouragement!

All considered, is £1,000 a year a lot to pay for the survival of a small island of journalistic freedom in an ocean of sensationalism and press monopoly? As we write contributions to the Deficit Fund amount to £686. We still need £314 to start 1958 with a clean slate. If you are with us send your contributions now. Don't wait for others to start the ball rolling—there's not much time to December 31st . . . And on January 1st we have got to start collecting another £1,000!

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT!
 Deficit on Freedom £960
 Contributions received £674
 DEFICIT £286
 WEEK 47

November 22 to November 28

London: W.E.D.* £1; London: D.S. 2/6;
 London: S.B.* 1/9; London: Anon. 1/3; London: J.S.* 3/-; Glasgow: J.M. 2/6; London: W.M. £10; Donaghadee: J.T. £2; London: E.G. 1/-

*Indicates regular contributor.

Total ... 13 12 0
 Previously acknowledged ... 661 7 8
 1957 TOTAL TO DATE ... £674 19 8

Fire Fund
 TOTAL TO DATE ... £390 10 0

GIFTS OF BOOKS: London: C.W.; Glasgow: Anon.

Now They Need Him!

Oppenheimer to be Reinstated?

WE await with interest the reactions of Professor Robert Oppenheimer, the brilliant U.S. Physicist who was labelled a security risk in 1954 and whose case is now being "re-examined" in the light of Russia's missile development and the need for the U.S. to engage all the available brainpower to keep up.

Oppenheimer was the wartime director of the Los Alamos A-bomb laboratory and had obviously been thoroughly examined as a security risk, but this did not prevent him coming before McMarthy in 1954 on the basis of a statement which he had made in 1949 on the development of the hydrogen bomb. His views were known to the Atomic Energy Committee and so were those of his fellow scientists, a committee of which had *unanimously** stated opposition to the development of the hydrogen bomb in 1949. But his loyalty, or theirs, was never in question.

At the time of the investigation on Oppenheimer the Federation of American Scientists issued a statement in which they said that the charge that his continued public service threatened the security of the United States "has shocked the nation and the scientific community in particular". Vice-President Nixon,

and others, declared that Oppenheimer was a loyal American citizen. In fact it was obvious that Oppenheimer was a victim of the particular political climate of the time. The evidence against him, a part of which consisted of the 'offence' of having married a woman whose former husband had been killed on the anti-Franco side in Spain, was farcical. This, however, did not prevent his suspension.

This somersault by people who formerly condemned him does not make Oppenheimer more loyal or less loyal. It merely underlines their dishonesty of purpose and complete disregard for an individual who was the victim of a political rag-tag now blessedly dead.

We do not know what Oppenheimer's present views are on hydrogen bombs. He opposed the development in 1949 on, among other reasons, moral grounds. If anything the moral argument has grown stronger. This re-appraisal of his position gives him an excellent opportunity to tell the authorities to go to hell. If he does, we can expect the re-emergence of the smear tactics.

*FREEDOM, April 24th, 1954.

Bourgeois Proletarian Intellectuals

I. ANARCHIST DOGMATISTS

ONE of the healthiest features of the Anarchist movement is the ability of its members to question their own motives. Although at its highest level this demands the services of a psycho-analyst, this is, in any case, not something from which any anarchist could escape even if he wanted to, for there is nobody in the movement beyond criticism from his comrades and their analyses of his motives, behaviour, understanding, integrity and practically everything else are bound sooner or later to jolt him into applying to himself the same critical observation that he uses on others.

This is a most salutary process and there is nothing more calculated to prevent mental ossification. Of course, not all anarchists seek the stimulation of discussion or self-criticism. There are many who made up their minds years ago upon everything and have rigidly held to their attitudes in spite of the changing world around them, the ever-enlarging field of human knowledge and the changing relationship between the anarchist movement and society as a whole.

There are still others who are so eclectic and open to influence and suggestion that they change their attitudes with their underclothes, mistaking their ideological vacillations for vigorous open-mindedness. These comrades have their uses as continual stimuli for argument, discussion and assessment, but reliance upon them is a little difficult since one never knows quite what their attitude is this week.

Can You Assimilate New Ideas?

Your true libertarian, however, strikes the happy medium between rigidity and vapidity, between dogmatism and wooliness. He is a person who cannot help being consistent in his attitude because that attitude is so much part of him that any sort of divergence would take on the serious nature of a rupture. At the same time he is ready to assimilate new ideas and discard old ones when they no longer hold water or satisfy him with their strength or truth.

He would have one other quality, as well: tolerance. Now I know that it is argued that to profess tolerance is to adopt an attitude which is basically condescending. One is tolerant of a child or a fool; of one's equals one neither asks nor gives tolerance—only the candid truth. Nor should one be tolerant of error, which can have disastrous results for the cause. One must have a single-minded search for the revolutionary

truth, then, having found it, refuse all substitutes. And not only refuse substitutes but firmly and energetically stamp them out. Tolerance, this argument ends up, is weakness.

For me, it is just the reverse. Looking back I can see that the only times I have been intolerant were when I have been afraid. The governments which have been the most dictatorial—the least tolerant—have always been those which have been basically insecure. You have to stifle criticism, divergence, public opinion, if you are afraid of them, not otherwise.

The Necessity for Variety

Now anarchism is a philosophy of freedom. It seeks to provide the widest possible scope for divergence, for criticism, for differences, and thus it seems to me that a recognition of the necessity (not merely the desirability) for variety among anarchists should be one of the first attributes of the libertarian.

Anarchism is not a body of ideas which one can hold irrespective of the rest of life. It is not a theory which can be embraced intellectually without involving the emotions, the character, the behaviour of the professed anarchist. When I plead for tolerance, therefore, I plead for an understanding of the character, the background and the way of living of he who diverges from what the intolerant one considers the correct position. Indeed, I tend to look a little more closely at the person who protests too much of the correctness of his position, for I sense I am in the company of one who is not even a libertarian, let alone an anarchist, when I smell dogmatism among comrades.

In every religion the heretic is hated more than the infidel. While the infidel, the enemy, the opponent, is most certainly to be attacked and if possible destroyed, this is after all the very function for which the faithful gather together: the existence of the enemy becomes a source of strength. Their communion is a gathering of strength to vanquish the foe, and all the building of temporal power and all the perfecting of dogma is legitimately directed to that end.

The Horror of Heresy

Then, when a heretic appears, then the awful chasm of doubt and of collapse from within yawns before the eyes of the faithful. The heretic is the Trojan Horse, the Fifth Column, the unpredictable weak link in the chain. He is a stain upon the otherwise perfect body of ideas and as such must be rooted out so that the stock may be pure again.

This principle was clearly enough established by the Church in the Middle Ages, and it has been brought up to date by the Communist Parties in this century. From the very earliest days of Bolshevik power, the terror of the secret police was directed less against the remnants of the bourgeoisie (who barely existed in Russia until the Communists

created them) than against the non-Bolshevik revolutionaries. It was the latter who were jailed in their thousands because they represented revolutionary heresy—proof that the Bolsheviks were not the only organisation opposed to Czarism and capitalism.

Then when all opponents outside the Party had been liquidated, Stalin turned his wildest terror, his foulest character-assassination, upon the heretics in his own Party. He did not wage the fight against capitalism, fascism or Nazism with one-tenth of the fanatical vigour with which he tore his own Party to pieces to root out the heretics—i.e. all those who disagreed with him. When he decimated the Red Army in the purges of 1937 he virtually opened the door to the Nazis, being more concerned to

LETTER

The Purpose of Art

DEAR COMRADES,

It has become apparent that Milward Casey and I are arguing not about facts or theories, but largely about the definitions of words, such as for instance "purpose" and "art".

The poster, says comrade Casey, is "hardly a work of creative art, yet an article of great usefulness." Now I think a poster is most definitely a work of creative art, whose merit depends on the artistic and creative sensibility of its designer; and I think the best posters of Toulouse-Lautrec, Cassandre, McKnight Kauffer, Savignac, Abram Games and the Japanese masters are magnificent creations. What comrade Casey includes in the term "creative art" I do not know, but I am reminded of William Blake's justified complaint that the critics would not take him seriously as an artist because he did not paint in oils.

We seem "to agree that art has a purpose". Perhaps; but when I speak of the specific purpose of a particular work, I mean conscious intention: the purpose of a cartoon is to provoke laughter, the purpose of a poster to make propaganda, the purpose of a dress design to make women glamorous. The way I use the word, "It fulfills its purpose" means simply, "it does what it is meant to do." Whatever comrade Casey means by "purpose", it seems to be different from this.

I do not say I use words correctly and he uses them incorrectly; but I say we are using the same words with different meanings, and that because of this the real difference of opinion between us is obscured by a cloud of grotesque and ridiculous misunderstandings.

For this reason, I respectfully submit that it is not much use to continue this correspondence.

London.

D.R.

THEATRE

Sir Laurence in 'The Entertainer'

JOHN OSBORNE'S play "The Entertainer" returns to London for a season at the Palace Theatre after a brief visit to the provinces. The entertainer of the title is Archie Rice, a music-hall comedian acted by Laurence Olivier. He provides the cheap patter for a tatty nude show. The scene switches erratically between music-hall stage and his lodgings, where his family life can be seen. Archie is a repulsive little puppet sapped of all self-respect and manliness. He is portrayed as an oddly bisexual creature indulging in seedy affairs with the chorus-girls. In his home Phoebe, the wife, has taken to gin. Of the children Frank is a muddled Conscientious Objector working in a hospital (a poor piece of play writing this) and Jean, convincingly acted at Brighton by Joan Plowright, is equally unsure of herself and of what to do. She found meaning only in the Trafalgar Square demonstration against the Government's Suez adventure. Only his father, an Edwardian music-hall performer, retains his integrity.

The play is patchy and in achievement does not measure up to "Look Back in Anger". Most critics hailed the performance of Sir Laurence Olivier as great but here I must disagree. He acts competently but never entirely believes in what he is doing. His first tap-dancing reminds one of the theatrical stars clowning at a Royal Command Variety Show. He exhibits the hollowiness of Archie Rice but none of his bitterness and cynicism. The point of Osborne's play is the emptiness and hopeless contemporary man in a

exorcise his Church of heresy, than to fight the Devil without.

Dogmas Must have Heresy

And still it goes on. We have remarked before upon the salient feature of Khrushchev's denunciation of Stalin: that it was based almost entirely upon resentment of Stalin's treatment of his own comrades. Khrushchev had little to say of the dire effects of Stalinism upon the people of Russia at large—it was the terror that stalked within the Party (where Khrushchev was!) that he objected to.

Yet what does Nikita himself do in his turn? Hasn't he clambered up to the top on the shattered reputations (even if not the broken bodies) of Molotov, Malenkov, Shepilov, and now Zhukov? Has he not, in fact, got into Stalin's position by the same broad process of heresy-hunting?

So it must be with any dogmatism. A codified, rigid body of ideas must fear the heretic, the loose brick in the monolith. This is so basic that it was quite safe to put the analysis into reverse, and whenever we hear anything that smacks of the witch-hunt, or the denunciation of

heresy, we should look for the dogmatism which fears divergent ideas.

Now one would imagine that dogmatism and anarchism could not exist together; that the embracing of a libertarian philosophy such as anarchism would inevitably bring with it a libertarian attitude on the part of those embracing it. And if any readers have got as far as this, there may be some who are wondering what on earth I am going on about. What has all this to do with anarchism?

Just this: that the more we understand anarchism and all it implies the more shall we get out of it. And if we find attitudes among ourselves which preclude clear understanding of anarchism, it is as well to bring them into the open and examine them.

And if we find people embracing certain of the ideas of anarchism but with a sterile intellectualism which borders on the dogmatic and betrays no libertarian character within, we must admit that something is wrong, that confusion will follow and do our best to throw light upon it.

I will attempt to splash a little more light around next week.

(To be continued)

P.S.

FREEDOM PRESS

SELECTIONS FROM 'FREEDOM'

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*
Volume 6, 1956, *Oil and Troubled Waters*

each volume paper 7s. 6d.
cloth 10s. 6d.

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

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.

HERBERT READ :

Art and the Evolution of Man 4s.
Existentialism, Marxism and Anarchism 3s. 6d.

Poetry and Anarchism

cloth 5s., paper 2s. 6d.

The Philosophy of Anarchism

boards 2s. 6d., paper 1s.

The Education of Free Men 1s. 2d.

F. A. RIDLEY :

The Roman Catholic Church and the Modern Age 2d.

K. J. KENAFICK :

Michael Bakunin and Karl Marx

paper 6s.

TONY GIBSON :

Youth for Freedom paper 2s.

Food Production and Population 6d.

Who will do the Dirty Work? 2d.

Marie-Louise Berneri Memorial

Committee publications :

Marie-Louise Berneri, 1918-1949 :

A Tribute cloth 5s.

Journey Through Utopia

cloth 18s. (U.S.A. \$3)

27, Red Lion Street,

London, W.C.1.

BOOK REVIEW

SLANTED NEWS

SLANTED NEWS, by Arthur Rowse. Beacon Press, Boston. \$3.95.

AT the height of the 1952 Presidential election campaign in America, the *New York Post* published a report that the Republican candidate for the Vice-Presidency, Senator Nixon, was receiving money from a secret fund. This fund was contributed to by many wealthy business men who considered Nixon to be a "first-class publicist for the American Way of Life" and they wanted to ensure that he did the maximum amount of publicising by providing him with plenty of the necessary. For a politician to use such a fund is against the rules of American politics and, in addition, Nixon's critics accused him of using the fund to buy his wife fur coats and such like.

This story became an issue in the election and accusations and counter-accusations (including a "Stevenson fund" story from the Republicans—Adlai Stevenson was the Democrat's candidate for President) flowed freely between the two camps.

Mr. Rowse, a liberally-minded newspaperman, was not satisfied that the story had been fairly presented to the American public by the newspapers. He therefore painstakingly examined 31 daily papers taken from various parts of the country and chosen because they had a good reputation for fair reporting, to find out whether the story had in fact received fair treatment. The total circulation of the papers represented 27% of the country's population and reflected the fact that the great majority of U.S. papers favour the Republicans rather than the Democrats.

After examining the evidence he concluded that there was no doubt that most newspapers were biased in the presentation they used. The methods adopted were various: some papers did not allow the story onto the front page until three days after it "broke", others gave all the prominence to the Republican denials—in some cases leaving their readers to imply from these what the original accusations were—and others displayed "opinion pieces" on their front pages consign-

ing the straight reporting to the inside pages.

To some Mr. Rowse's conclusions will seem only a statement of the obvious, for most of us have had, at some time or other, personal experience of newspaper misreporting. But the great virtue of this book is that it documents the way newspapers have treated a politically important issue; it is factual evidence of that semi-deliberate duplicity which is common to so many newspapers—unfortunately.

M.G.W.

William Blake

Continued from p. 3.

"The Human Dress is forged Iron,
The Human Form a fiery Forge,
The Human Face a Furnace seal'd,
The Human Heart its hungry Gorge."

How is the furnace to be unsealed? By casting off the iron cloak of secrecy, says Blake, "I was angry with my friend: I told my wrath, my wrath did end. I was angry with my foe: I told it not, my wrath did grow." By affirmation instead of abstinence, he declares in one of his most characteristic utterances: "Abstinence sows sand all over/The ruddy limbs and flaming hair-/But Desire Gratified/Plants fruits of life and beauty there."

In her *Life of William Blake*, Mona Wilson reminds us that "To recognise and assail the evils of repression, of law and morality, to perceive and denounce the errors of rulers, teachers, employers, and philanthropists, needs less insight and less boldness in our day than in his". And we might think that, situated like Blake, a self-employed craftsman at the beginning of the industrial revolution, to carry this burden of insight, this strength of moral imagination, and this compulsion "to speak one's mind" might lead to a life of bitter frustration and isolation.

But the painter Samuel Palmer, looking back years after Blake's death, declared, "If asked, whether I ever knew, among the intellectual, a happy man, Blake would be the only one who would immediately occur to me."

C.W.

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

OPEN DAILY

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

New Books . . .

Journals Jean Cocteau 30/-
Cup of Fury Upton Sinclair 12/6
The Kill Emile Zola 16/-
Nana Emile Zola 18/-

Cheap Editions

and Mentors . . .

Selected Essays Plutarch 4/-

Magnolia Street Louis Golding 3/6

The Sayings of Confucius 4/-

The Upanishads 4/-

The Way of Life Leo Tzu 4/-

Leaves of Grass Walt Whitman 4/-

The Nature of the Non-Western World Vera Michales Dean 4/-

Eight Great Tragedies Aeschylus, Sophocles, O'Neill, etc. Walden H. D. Thoreau 2/6

Second-Hand . . .

Science, Liberty and Peace Aldous Huxley 2/6

Revolver Republic G. E. R. Gedy 3/6

Nations Can Live at Home O. W. Willcox 4/-

Russia Against the Kremlin Alexandre Metaxas 6/-

Seeds of Treason Ralph de Toledano and Victor Lasky 4/-

Commonsense and the Child Ethel Mannin 4/-

The Heart is a Lonely Hunter Carson McCullers 3/6

All the King's Men Robert Penn Warren 3/6

Nietzsche in Outline and Aphorism A. R. Orage 3/6

WE DISTRIBUTE:

Socialist Leader, Peace News, Free-thinker, Industrial Worker, L'Adunata, Solidaridad Obrero, Umanita Nova, etc., etc.

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

French Persecute Their C.O's

Continued from p. 1

is persons who for one reason or another refuse to carry out an order made by the Court, or who refuse to co-operate when called to appear as witnesses. Such persons can only be released once they have "purged" their contempt. The powers given to the Courts implies that their decisions are invariably right and that the individual is invariably wrong. But again if limitations of this kind were imposed on the Courts it would not make us into upholders of the "rule of Law" or supporters of the juridical system.

★

CIVILISATION, the degree of social development of a people, is to-day measured by its scientific and technological achievements, by its literacy, by its governmental structure, by its outstanding men in the fields of "culture", sport, politics, industry, finance and military strategy. Whilst all these may contribute to a civilised society, to our minds they are not in themselves the basic ingredients of a civilised society.

There is no doubt that we are living in an age of great scientific and technological achievement, yet more than half the world's population is under-nourished and suffering from the diseases of malnutrition; literacy is growing throughout the world yet never was there less understanding and co-operation between people in the same community, let alone in the world as a whole. Never was the world more conscious of the differences between democratic and totalitarian forms of government than to-day, yet never have the destinies of mankind rested in the hands of so few.

Civilisation, as we understand it, can only be satisfactorily defined as a social relationship between men*, and the degree of civilisation the extent to which individual man can freely develop within a community of men. We would ask those who might jump to the conclusion that such a society would be intolerable because everybody would be armed with cutlasses and blunderbusses, if not to attack their neighbours, at least to protect themselves from their neighbours, that they read our "definition" a second time, for what we are saying is just the opposite. It is in existing society that men live in rivalry and conflict, not because some of us are born with power complexes while others have slave complexes which is, in any case, not true; nor, which is true, because our development is unequal physically, intellectually and so far as skills are concerned (even assuming that we all had equal opportunities and similar backgrounds). Rivalry and conflict exist because the society into which we are thrust willy-nilly is so organised economically and socially for some individuals to occupy positions of power (for reasons of ability, cunning, skill, or simply through

*We hasten to reassure our women readers that we use the term "men" not in any narrow, or exclusive sense, but collectively to mean "men and women". Far from distinguishing between the sexes—except where sex is concerned!—we feel strongly that no community can consider itself civilised which does not recognise the equal need for men and women to develop their individual personalities. The male argument that you cannot give women equality with men because biologically they are different (meaning of course inferior!) is as stupid as it would be to argue that all males are similar because they are males, or even that—men were inferior to women because they were unable to bear children!

family connections of influence or wealth). The power these individuals exercise over the lives of fellow beings is not the result of their intellectual superiority. Who will, for instance, deny that Einstein was the intellectual superior of Hitler. Yet Hitler had the power to drive Einstein into exile and not vice versa. Neither is their power the result of physical superiority; indeed the world is ruled and managed by sick men, neurotics and, even apparently, drunkards! The basis of the power structure of society is not, in fact, the "natural" manifestation of the supremacy of physique and intellect as envisaged by Plato for his Republic (which would have, in any case, been no less authoritarian!). It is "unnatural" in that it encourages the anti-social potentialities in human beings and not the love and mutual aid which Man has preached through the ages but only sometimes practised.

What is certain is that neither the Law nor government are true expressions of the will of the community. However impartially the judiciary administer "justice" the fact remains that they are administering Laws which are based on, and even owe their existence to, the division of society into the haves and the have-nots, landlords and tenants, employers and employees, and which are in

themselves unjust, and penalise a majority in the interests of a minority. However democratically elections are conducted, unless the people exercise direct control on the administration it cannot be said to represent them.

★

IMPORTANT as these issues are to the well-being of and the harmony in, human society, over-riding them in importance, because from it stems the whole social pattern, is the attitude of the community to those of its members who are the "misfits" either because of their unsocial behaviour or because of a deeply felt conviction which prevents them from co-operating on specific issues. It is possible that their conscience will bring them into conflict with Laws the breaking of which involves penalties.

Society to-day takes the view that the act of killing is anti-social when used as a solution to differences between individual members of that society, but is necessary and praiseworthy when sanctioned by the State in the name of society. We do not propose to argue for or against this particular system of morals. And if one does not recognise the sanctity of life such a position is obviously untenable. What is not, is that society should expect everybody to accept to do at the behest of another man

or group of men, and in cold blood, what they find impossible to do even in the greatest crises in their personal lives: kill another human being.

In this country and a few others there is some kind of recognition of the individual's right to refuse to violate his conscience in this respect. For most objectors it means either alternative service in non-combatant duties (an alternative which shows how crude and opportunistic is the government's "recognition") or a spell in prison which seems to convince most Tribunals that the appellant has a conscience. What is unusual is that the C.O. should go to prison more than once for the same offence, and it should be stressed that for this happy state of affairs one probably has to thank the C.O.'s of the 1914-18 war who in spite of cat-and-mouse treatment and forcible feeding, resisted to the bitter end, and left a very profound mark on enlightened opinion.

In France, in spite of a similar experience in the first world war, and of a strong pacifist and anti-militarist movement in the inter-war years, very few voices are raised on behalf of the young Resisters who, unless they capitulate may well serve life sentences for their refusal to kill. As *Peace News* points out, the cat-and-mouse system applied to C.O.s in France puts them at a disadvantage with murderers and violent criminals when amnesties are granted, since they are automatic-

ally re-arrested as soon as they are released. Which of the so-called Left Press in France ever mentions the fate of these young men growing old in prison? Which of the intellectuals so conscience stricken (on paper) over the Algerian events, or so active in their denunciations of the Russian régime, have taken any steps to denounce the inhuman, sadistic treatment in France, in the name of society and democracy, of those who refuse to kill?

★

WE return to our definition of civilisation. France, in spite of all her culture is not civilised for in her treatment of men who have no greater power than their anti-militarist convictions she has only the argument of prison to offer. The struggle with one of these youths has gone on for nine years. Society has neither persuaded nor coerced this man into abandoning his convictions. A civilised society must recognise the supremacy of the individual, or resort to methods which can only end in its own destruction. Imprisonment has obviously failed in the case of Edmond Schaguene. If society is so anxious to affirm its supremacy, then the next step must surely be the use of torture. And if that fails there is physical annihilation by the firing squad or the guillotine. That is the logic of cat-and-mouse treatment. The annihilation of the individual but also of civilised society.

PEOPLE AND IDEAS

The Apotheosis of William Blake

*The Strongest Poison ever known
Came from Caesar's Laurel Crown.
Nought can deform the Human Race
Like to the Armour's iron brace.*

THE unveiling last week of Jacob Epstein's bust of William Blake in Westminster Abbey in commemoration of the bicentenary of his birth, has all the irony that usually accompanies such acts of posthumous canonisation. Blake, the despised and rejected heretic, whose body is in an unmarked grave in the dissenters' burial ground at Bunhill Fields, is laid, metaphorically, to rest in the Abbey, along with all those admirals and Top Dosts. *The Vision of Christ that thou dost see/Is my Vision's Greatest Enemy*.

Blake, to whom "the gates of this Chapel were shut./And 'Thou shalt not' writ over the door"; Blake who, at his trial for sedition was charged with having said "Damn the King, damn all his subjects, damn the King, damn all his slaves"; Blake who declared that "Prisons are built with stones of Law, Brothels with bricks of Religion"; Blake the advocate of sexual freedom who taught that "Those who restrain desire do so because theirs is weak enough to be restrained"; is accepted into the national pantheon, while his lines beginning "And did those feet in ancient time/Walk upon England's mountains green?", have become a sort of patriotic hymn for Cup Final crowds and Womens' Institutes.

Blake, who lived and died a poor man, whose paintings were bought by friends out of charity and mouldered in attics for decades, whose books of engravings did not sell, and whose allegorical poems were regarded as the ravings of a madman until the scholars of our own day began to unravel them, is now a cultural export, described in the British Council's pamphlet on him as "one of the half-dozen greatest men of genius of the modern world".

There is a legend, carefully fostered, that the artistic and literary traditions of this country are a product of the aristocracy and landed gentry and their patronage, as though Bunyan and Defoe, Hogarth and Cobbett had never existed. It is in their tradition, that of radical dissent, that William Blake belongs. The son of a hosier in Broadwick Street, Soho, he was apprenticed at fourteen to an engraver, and worked at this trade all his life; his most prosaic jobs were the pictures of soup tureens in Wedgwood's catalogue, his finest, the illustrations to the *Book of Job*.

He lived in an age of change, repression and revolution. When he was born, the population of England was under seven million; it had almost doubled by

the time of his death in 1827. In the year of his birth there was a shortage of corn, the first of many. By the time of his death England had become a corn importer. During his lifetime industry moved from the village to the factory, coal and iron and the labour of factory children had become the basis of the economy, India had begun to yield its loot. Dr. Bronowski, in his *Man Without a Mask* sets the scene of Blake's life in these words:

"Blake was born in the Seven Years' War. He learned to think as a man during the American War. His years of promise were turned to defeat in the war against the French Revolution, from 1793 to 1802. Defeat deepened to poverty and bitterness in the war against Napoleon, from 1803 to 1815. And this war did not end at Waterloo. The Sedition Acts, the Combination Laws, the suspension of Habeas Corpus were still riding with the yeomanry against the Manchester suffrage meeting at St. Peter's Field in 1819. England knew what the wars had meant when she called this massacre Peterloo. In that year Cobbett, bringing Paine's bones home to England, found for welcome the Six Acts, more savage than Pitt's Sedition Acts. A year before Blake died, Lancashire had its worse slump, and starving mobs broke a thousand power looms in three days. Half a dozen years after he died, the Reform Bill, the Factory Act, and the new Poor Law had made the factory owners masters of England.

★

THE dreamer and mystic, who saw visions in Poland Street and at Hercules Buildings, Lambeth, and of whom it used to be said, quite without foundation, that he had "spent thirty years in a madhouse", was very close to these events. He was "among those at the head of the crowd which burned Newgate Prison on 6 June 1780". He was a member of the circle of radicals who used to meet at the home of the bookseller and publisher Joseph Johnson—Dr. Price the unitarian, Joseph Priestley, the discoverer of oxygen, Tom Paine, Thomas Holcroft, Mary Wollstonecraft and William Godwin. In 1791 Blake began a poem *The French Revolution* which Johnston intended to publish at one shilling. The type was set, but Johnson took fright, though he went on to print Mary Wollstonecraft's *Vindication of the Rights of Women* in 1792 and Godwin's *Political Justice*, the first systematic exposition of anarchism, in 1793. But these were expensive books, and Pitt the Prime Minister had said that "a three guinea book could never do much harm among those who had not three shillings to spare". Johnson's fears had, however, been justified, and in May 1792 after the Royal Proclamation against Divers Wicked Sedious Writings, Tom Paine was prosecuted for publishing the *Rights of Man*. In September another warrant was issued for Paine's arrest. Blake had seen the

constables searching for him, and packed him off to France from Johnson's house twenty minutes before the warrant followed him to Dover. Paine was convicted in his absence of high treason.

With these experiences, it is hardly surprising that Blake clothed what Bronowski calls the 'anarchism' of his prophetic books in allegory and symbolism. To those who have the temperament to work their way through the turgid and feverish versifying and obscure personalisations of these works, many meanings are revealed. Kathleen Raine sees them as a retelling of the universal myths of classical and Judaic legend. David Erdman reads him as a *Prophet Against Empire*, and Bronowski sees the prophetic books as Blake's interpretation, full of horror and pity of the sombre history of his own day.

*"What is the price of Experience? do men buy it for a song?
Or wisdom for a dance in the Street?
No, it is bought with the price
Of all that a man hath, his house, his wife, his children.
Wisdom is sold in the desolate market
where none come to buy,
And in the wither'd field where the farmer plows for bread in vain."*

★

WE patronise Blake, as we patronise Shelley, in regarding him as an unworldly creature of child-like simplicity, the author of those "Songs of Innocence" which we learned as children, but when these exquisite poems are read together with the "Songs of Experience", showing, as Blake wrote, "the two contrary states of the human soul", we are struck, not by their ingenuousness, but by their insight. Freud, when toasted as the discoverer of the unconscious, pointed out that not he but the poets had earned that title. Compare the poem *Infant Joy* in the first collection with *Infant Sorrow* in the second, and with the fullest version of the latter poem in the "Miscellaneous Poems". Compare the various poems on the *Little Boy Lost* theme, and *cellaneous Poems*". Compare the various *Lost* in the second book, with its comment: "Children of the future 'Age' Reading this indignant page./Know that in a future time/Love! sweet Love! was thought a crime." It is certainly not Blake's vision of childhood which is sentimental or insipid. "How wide the Gulf and Unpassable, between Simplicity and Insipidity".

Nor is Blake's 'innocence' a refuge from the world: "Is this thy soft Family-Love./Thy cruel Patriarchal pride./Planting thy Family alone./Destroying all the World beside? (One might set beside this quatrain Ellen Wilkinson's remark that the man who murdered Jarrow was a model husband and devoted father).

Blake recognised that the moral imagination must be wider than the domestic virtues. "Unorganiz'd Innocence: An Impossibility. Innocence dwells with wisdom, but never with Ignorance".

And so he parallels the poem about the Charity Children singing in St. Paul's in the "Songs of Innocence", "Twas on a Holy Thursday, their innocent faces clean./The children walking two by two, in red and blue and green" (the spectacle that so touched Haydn and Berlioz in different generations), with a wider reflection in *Holy Thursday* in the second book, "Is this a holy thing to see/In a rich and fruitful land,/ Babes reduc'd to misery./ Fed with cold and usurous hand?". And he sets against the picture of the chimney-sweeper in the first book, leaping and laughing in heaven, the poem of the same title in the second book, "And because I am happy and dance and sing./ They think they have done me no injury./ And are gone to praise God and his Priest and King./ Who make up a heaven of our misery." And the reader reflects on the generations of agitation and obstruction, documented in Mr. and Mrs. Hammond's *The Town Labourer*, before our ancestors could be persuaded to end the employment of children as human brushes.

It is indeed to the social history of the period, that we must go to find confirmation of Blake's picture of his age. The difference between the selective vision of those who picture it as The Age of Elegance, and the truth that Blake records, is precisely the difference between the sober citizen with his senses closed to anything disagreeable, and mad William Blake with his eyes and ears open, wandering through the streets of London, noting "... in every face I meet, marks of weakness, marks of woe."

"In every cry of every Man./In every Infants cry of fear./In every voice, in every ban./The mind-forg'd Manacles I hear."

"How the chimney-sweeper's cry/Every black'ning Church appalls;/And the hapless Soldier's sigh/Runs in blood down Palace walls."

"But most thro' midnight streets I hear/How the youthful Harlot's curse/Blasts the new-born Infants' tear,/And blights with plagues the Marriage hearse."

Behind the social evils are the individual inadequacies, the "mind-forg'd manacles". The lines in the "Songs of Innocence", "For Mercy has a human heart./Pity a human face./And Love, the human form divine./And Peace, the human dress." are echoed with the voice of experience:

"Cruelty has a Human Heart./And Jealousy a Human Face;/Terror the Human Form Divine./And Secrecy the Human Dress."

Continued on p. 2

Freedom
THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

The Nuclear Arms Race

Why Not Twist the Tail of History?

LAST week in the House of Commons the Foreign Secretary was asked by Aneurin Bevan whether he did not think the time had come for a new diplomatic approach to the problem of maintaining peace to replace the present nuclear arms race. We would not of course have phrased the question in quite the same way, since we do not believe this kind of diplomacy is likely to produce anything very constructive, but we are not politicians and Mr. Bevan is. Nevertheless, the main point of the question is valid, recognising as it does the absurdity of current Western policy in trying to stockpile more nuclear weapons than the Communists.

Since the advent of Sputnik, the West's preoccupation with bigger (if not better) stocks of nuclear materials, enormous bombers, missiles of every variety, and in fact anything which might further the ability to achieve large explosions inside Russia, has turned from a mere preoccupation into a grotesque obsession. Mr. Bevan's suggestion of new diplomatic overtures is not necessarily the best alternative but at least it is an improvement on existing ideas within the political context.

The principal offender is quite clearly America; the men who are responsible for maintaining the Western end of the arms race are mainly Americans, the men who sit in the Pentagon, and the men who represent the government; most, if not all of them appear to be suffering from some form of hysteria. It was bad enough before Sputnik, when all that mattered was to beat the Russians to it, to stay ahead, to boast of superior achievements; now the balloon has been pricked and the blow to American pride and American superiority is unbearable. The effect has been almost chaotic, there is confusion in all quarters and now an agonising reappraisal. The decision is certain—America must catch up whatever the cost.

A correspondent in the *Manchester Guardian* dated 29th November has put the view that people are becoming aware of the futility of the arms race, and he states the reasons why; he is no doubt correct, but the people to whom he refers patently do not include the men who make the decisions: He writes:

"Certainly there is growing disillusionment with the theory that the greatest safety for the West lies in building up the greatest pile of nuclear weapons.

No doubt the clear evidence we have recently had of the present Soviet lead in missile research has been mainly responsible for helping people to see clearly that neither side can ever win the race for effective nuclear supremacy. The pattern is clear: the development of some super-weapon by one side is soon matched by the other which is already far advanced in the development of an effective counter-weapon. And so the hopeless race for supremacy goes on—absorbing an increasingly high percentage of the resources and the skill of all concerned."

What then do the men who make the decisions think—are they disillusioned with "the hopeless race for supremacy"? Not a bit of it. The newly constituted Senate Preparedness Sub-committee has already produced "revolutionary" reforms: the Secretary of Defence has appointed General Wade of Strategic Air Command to organise a new ballistic missile force to over-ride the separate Army and Navy missile commands; radical projects are immediately to be put in hand to reorganise the entire American radar system which stretches right around Russia from the Polar region to Europe; a chain of anti-aircraft missile launching sites is to be built all along the American shore line. The Senate committee decided all this without waiting for approval from Congress or the out-of-action President. Such is the answer to the Russian threat of the men who make the decisions. It is not a new policy, nor can it possibly be an effective one, but it is obviously the only one there is.

Much has recently been written in the Press upon what may roughly be

called "the challenge of our times." Most of what has been said has referred to the challenge presented to the West by Russian technology. Most of the writers have concluded that the best way to save the peace (and democracy as well) is for the West to retain or regain technical supremacy and thus defeat the rising star and prestige of Russia and the Spartans. Nothing less will suffice it seems—the Communists must be defeated on the battleground of technology, no sacrifice will be too great for the attainment of this end.

We of course disagree. It is precisely this attitude which will lose for us such freedom of action as we have, for the sacrifice will in the end be freedom itself. There can be no end to a race for supremacy, one side or the other must always be in front but cannot stop for fear of being overtaken.

Step by step it will apparently become necessary to impose greater and greater restrictions—in the national interest. Gradually as a nation gears itself up to a maximum effort materials become affected: vital materials for defence—movements are restricted: secret missile areas, factories, military establishments—manpower... Shades of "1984" and a vivid imagination? It has all happened in those other periods of crisis, past wars. The challenge of their particular times.

There is no war as yet but war is no longer necessary for the development of a crisis; the powers of propaganda are nowadays quite sufficient to induce the necessary feeling of alarm, the call to duty and national solidarity and finally the sacrifice of freedom for the sake of security.

Government Measure Increases

White Domination in Rhodesia

ALL the diplomatic language mustered by the Government's spokesman could not cover up the intention behind the Constitution Amendment Bill of the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyassaland passed by a majority in the House of Commons last Monday against the wishes of the African Affairs Board in the Federation—theoretically created to protect African interests. The case put by the Opposition against the motion was that the proposal would add substantially to the influence of Europeans in electing African members to the Assembly. Are they telling us!

The Bill allows the number of members of the Federal Assembly to be increased from 35 to 59, which gives the Africans an extra six seats bringing their number up to 12. Also the additional African seats are to be chosen by a mixed European-African electorate.

The Under Secretary for Commonwealth Relations concludes from the Bill:

"This represents an increase of equal proportions for Europeans and for Africans and I find it difficult to accept the argument advanced by the African Affairs Board that the increase in the difference between Africans and Europeans is necessarily differentiating. It can only be so if it was assumed that the Federal Parliament would be permanently divided into two racial blocks. This was never envisaged in the past and is not true to-day."

The implications of the argument are familiar. Some time in the unspecified future there will be equal franchise and equal representation but until then the white rulers have to keep civilized government from being controlled by blacks.

The hypocrisy of the Government on this issue is so obvious even if we consider one aspect of the franchise bill which categorises the voters into—general and special. The theory is that anyone is entitled to vote regardless of race, providing they have the necessary property and educational qualifications. Before

This kind of security is a false illusion for there always remains the certain fact that the other side can penetrate the defences, and the sacrifice becomes vain.

As to the real "challenge of our times", perhaps one aspect of it is contained in a recent letter to the Press from a gentleman who may well think of an anarchist as a little man with a little bomb and a large black cloak. He effectively covers a lot of ground in a short space of time and we could wish that we had written something very like the last paragraph:

"The sum of \$40,000 millions which the U.S. Defence Administration urged be spent on shelters remains at once starkly frightening and in a sense, a ridicule upon mankind.

May we not pray that Whitehall has set its mind against shelters on the simple grounds that we cannot, whatever else we do, behave like ostriches. If the H-bomb is not going to be used thousands of millions will have been wasted. Can there really be any doubt that if the H-bomb is used—why do we use the singular?—we shall still have but waste to our credit?

This catastrophic warfare cannot be prevented by universal digging operations. Nor can its consequences be avoided; we cannot take the water, the earth, and the very air we breathe, underground!

If such wealth as you mention can indeed be made available would it not be far saner, or at the worse not more insane, for the West to indulge in a sort of revel or spree; to declare a sort of year of grace when it finances unlimited schemes of world-wide charity? Is it not possible that mankind might seize this as a sign! Is it really any more crazy than \$40,000 millions worth of digging? And might not the U.S. in particular thereby out-Sputnik, Sputnik, and twist the very tail of history!

anyone is allowed to vote for th nine African members it is necessary to have an income of £150 per year or ownership of property worth £500. How many Africans can meet these economic requirements?

But just in case they do manage to comply with the economic conditions there are other ways of preventing those people voting who may not be too anxious to support white policies. In Northern Rhodesia for example the "crucial territory", the number of Europeans and Africans eligible for the general roll is estimated at 37,000; the number of Africans eligible for the special roll in respect of income "might be as much as 48,000", but the literacy test would reduce these "possibly to about 21,000" (these are government figures).

The Under Secretary for Commonwealth Relations after studying these figures comes to the conclusion that for the specially elected African members there would be a balance between European and African electors, "broadly on a 50-50 basis". This character is not lacking in imagination even if his form of mathematics is in need of clarification.

The Labour Party voted against the Bill, and how relieved the leaders must have been to have found an issue on which they could, without any harm to themselves at the next election, oppose the Tories. And we were only saying last week, along with many other people, that there was nothing to choose between them! We hope to be proved wrong, but we will stick to our original opinion until after Labour has been in power for some time.

Meantime, thoughtful people might ponder on the words of two Labour members, Mr. James Johnson and Mr. James Griffiths when addressing the House on the Bill. Mr. Johnson said, according to *Tribune* (29/11/57):

"We as a party stand for ultimate universal franchise in the African

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS

More on Power Complexes

DEAR FRIENDS,

May I continue the discussion on Power Complexes? Taking S. E. Parker's reply step by step:

(1) In my statement "man has invariably chosen the way of power", the choice of adjectives was perhaps unfortunate—I stand corrected. Such hair-splitting, however, does not alter the argument concerning the majority of human beings. I have already suggested that libertarian ideas have emanated only from a minority and that the power pattern has been and is the main structure of society.

(2) The next two paragraphs (of S.E.P.'s letter) are devoted to the origin of the power pattern and man's relationship to it, of which there are many conflicting opinions put forward by people much more learned than Sid Parker or myself. Some findings support the anarchist philosophy, others do not. I am grateful for the list of works supplied by S.E.P. and shall take the earliest opportunity of studying them. However, I do not picture our primitive ancestors either as bogey-men or the wild, gormless creatures depicted by cartoonists. Not having read everything on the subject (has S.E.P.?) I can only base my opinions on previous material, but I shall be happy to modify such opinion in the light of fresh knowledge. It may or may not be beneficial to study other animals, though man seems to have acquired many of the characteristics of other species. There is, after all, a bit of the lion and the lamb in all of us, but Leo is more individualistic than his gentle relative.

S.E.P. states "We are no longer primitive [agreed] and we can conceive of freedom [I'm not so sure]". At a parish meeting where I recently defended my atheistic beliefs, I tried to introduce libertarian ideas and the audience just couldn't envisage a modern society without government. It wasn't a question of being pro-government, or insisting on the desirability for government, but that the complexity of modern society necessitated it. Like the weather, good or bad, it was here to stay. (I anticipate the retort that I can't have made a good case; maybe so, I ask pardon). This is a state of mind I find widespread.

(3) Sid Parker has not answered the two most important contentions in my letter:—(a) that society generally meekly accepts exploitation (b) the acceptance of authority by people reared in comparative freedom *viz*: Summerhill pupils. May I enlarge on this aspect? One of the essential differences between State school products and those of Summerhill-type schools seems to be that the former is both afraid of and accepts authority while the latter is not afraid but accepts some form of State supervision as necessary in a modern technical society. He does not necessarily seek power, but is prepared to submit to a degree of it. Ex-Summerhillians seem to have no desire to revolutionize society or "spread the gospel" *e.g.* very few—according to Neill—are inclined to teach. To be sure, they live freely—in their limited way—and will rear their children likewise, but I repeat, they accept the State.

It would seem, then, in order to bring about a new way of living, to counteract the effects of "civilisation" on the "admass mind", we have two methods of approach. Either we have the Neill and Reichian application of self-regulation and emotional liberation, *via* clinical teaching and Summerhill-type communities, manifesting—over numerous generations—in a refined attitude towards natural development with a corresponding decline in the repressive basis of authoritarian institutions. Or else we have the mode—approved by S.E.P.—of the continual spread of ideas by various means of propaganda which we hope will eventually penetrate the "civilized" crust covering normal function and release man from his restrictive environment. For this it will be necessary that not only must man have advanced (intellectually) sufficiently to be receptive to these ideas,

State, but at the moment we stand for a very qualified franchise. Hon. Members opposite have smeared the Labour Party by saying that we shall give a blank cheque to the African nationals. That is not so."

Mr. James Griffiths is also concerned about this "smear" on the Labour Party. The talk has been going about that "the Conservative Party is coming to be regarded as the protector of the whites and the Labour Party as the protector of the blacks." And he concedes that this allegation is "sometimes our responsibility and our fault."

but that economic and social conditions must be conducive to him putting them into operation. Considering both these methods, one will note that the former is an evolutionary process, while the latter is essentially revolutionary. It is impossible to predict that either of them will completely abolish the power pattern, as not enough is known of man's basic character, but a moderating influence is obviously desirable and the Neill and Reichian approach seems to have obtained the most practical results.

We must not forget the governmental institutions, of course, who doubtless have learned their lessons from the French, Russian and Spanish Revolutions, etc., and are endeavouring by diverse wily means (*e.g.* womb-to-tomb protection combined with fear-of-the-other-side) to lead us to that Orwellian state of mind whereby we not only accept Big Brother, we love him. At present they are leading by a mile.

Yours,
Sheffield, Nov. 21. PETER LEE.

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

DEC. 8—Bob Green on
SOME SHIBBOLETHS OF
ANARCHISM.

DEC. 15—Donovan Pedelty on
FREEDOM & ORGANISATION

Questions, Discussion and Admission
all free.

HAMPSTEAD LIBERTARIAN GROUP

Fortnightly public discussions are held on alternate Mondays at 7.45 p.m. in the basement of 12, Oak Hill Park (off Frognal) N.W.3. Nearest tube station: Hampstead (Northern Line).

"Right Livelihood and the Responsible Life"

December 16, 1957
Introduced by
S. E. PARKER.

LECTURE RELIGION & THE CLASS STRUGGLE

by Rita Milton
DEC. 8 at 7.15
Laurie Arms, Crawford Place, W.2
(National Secular Society)

★ 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

INTERNATIONAL ANARCHIST CENTRE MEETINGS

Discussion Meetings
every Thursday at 8 p.m.

Every Friday and Saturday:
SOCIAL EVENINGS
Saturday Night is Skiffle Night
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