

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"I believe in the value of the minority. The world will be saved by the few."

—ANDRE GIDE.

INTERNATIONAL ANARCHIST CONGRESS

THE International Anarchist Congress which was held in London during the last week of July was the fourth such Congress to be held. It followed the Congresses of Amsterdam 1907, Berlin 1922, Paris 1949, and took place with the direct or indirect participation of at least twenty different branches or movements.

The Congress worked through a crowded agenda of historical, theoretical, practical and organisational items discussed in three languages: English, French and German.

The Congress itself was preceded by several years of preparation. In fact the 1949 meeting in Paris had put into the hands of a Parisian committee, the C.R.I.A., the task of collecting proposals and documents from all countries without giving them any power to reject any single proposal made by a federation, a group or an individual member of the movement.

The result was a mass of questions embracing (1) according to personal, local and general points of view the study of the social milieu and the libertarian movement during the first half of the 20th century; (2) the great problems of the coming second half of the century in the light of the conflict between the State and human society; and (3) the case of libertarianism versus totalitarianism in our day.

This part of the agenda, of course, was not and could not be, exhausted; it could not be and was not concluded by decisions of an authoritative character. It merely provided the opportunity for anybody in the movement to take part in the

exchange of papers and to discuss his favourite ideas with comrades abroad, through the channel of the CRIA Bulletin and other libertarian publications the world over.

The practical part of the Congress was restricted to more simple and internal affairs. Firstly there was the report of each branch or movement connected with CRIA and represented in the Congress, and the report of CRIA itself on its own activities and on behalf of those groups whose members could not be present for reasons of isolation, distance or lack of resources.

Secondly, there was the practical examination of the tasks presented to the international anarchist movement by the present situation and by the necessity for building, elsewhere than in Paris, an organism of relation, information and solidarity among anarchists. The tasks were the object of a complete survey, then the means, then the working structures and lastly the method of co-ordination between the functional organs involved by an international secretariat which would be centred in London.

It was found that a harmonisation of tendencies, currents and groups, on a pluralistic and voluntary basis, was perfectly possible without a formal declaration of principles, without a programme, without a representative body and without any exclusion or imposition whatsoever. In fact the organisational work of the Congress culminated very smoothly in the designation of an International Anarchist Commission (CIA) with its secretariat in London and its members in Western Europe to be respectively appointed by the London Anarchist Group, the libertarian comrades of Hamburg and Brussels, the Italian movement and the Spanish movement in exile.

As for connections between the Secretariat and continents other than Europe, they are to be insured by the respective Continental Commissions of America, Asia and Africa. A great amount of decentralisation will result in Europe itself from the initiatives of comrades in every country taking part in the collection and distribution of news, proposals, publications, funds and so on for international purposes.

The Middle East Muddle

The Power of Propaganda

THE power of propaganda, in this age of propaganda, cannot be underestimated. It has been brought to a pitch which makes it possible, without any particular effort, to prove that dictatorship is democracy or that might is not only right but entirely beneficial to all concerned.

Thus in some indefinable way, the great mass of fair-minded, straight-thinking people of Great Britain have been persuaded that the régime of King Hussein of Jordan is quite admirable and altogether fit for democrats. It is quite an achievement when it is considered that not so long ago, when Glubb Pasha was thrown out of Jordan by Hussein, a very jaundiced eye was cast upon that little kingdom.

However all is now forgotten and glowing commentaries of the courageous and jaunty 23-year-old king are now the order of the day. The "popular" little chap attended a demonstration by the British Army and R.A.F. last week (guarded by 60 sub-machine-guns in Bren carriers and on motor-cycles along the route from palace to airfield, and watched from roof-tops by other reliable troops), because a

show of power was presumably considered necessary to ensure his continued popularity!

Democracy in Jordan is symbolised by those two old favourites, censorship and martial law. It is now necessary for journalists who are interested in reporting the truth to fly to Cyprus in order that they may cable their stories home. John Dickie of the *News Chronicle* had this to say:

"At 9000 feet over Amman on my way out of Jordan I am finally free from the censors."

Jordan's prisons are now crammed with political 'criminals'. Nightly raids by security forces deplete more and more families of their menfolk—even of children.

Only the other day 30 boys were led away to jail from a school near Zurga...

Jordan is a frightened country, whose Government is not certain of anyone's allegiance."

And from Cyril Ray of the *Observer*:

"... Western diplomats believe some 150 officers and senior N.C.O.'s of the Jordan Arab Army to be in prison suspected (our italics) of complicity in or sympathy with the abortive plot of July 17th."

The total of political prisoners, military and civilian is said to be higher to-day than ever because of the arrests that followed the attempted general strike and demonstration of a week ago."

In case it should be thought the Iraq uprising had a monopoly on violent death, or that the Jordan Government was confining itself to arrests only, the *News Chronicle* reported an event which followed numerous bomb explosions in Amman:

"A chase from one explosion at a bank official's home in Amman led to a Moslem Brotherhood settlement, where three 'culprits' were dragged out and executed."

Such is the régime which the British and Americans choose to support—militarily and financially for the fact of the matter is that the West will support any régime which it considers to be of use politically, economically or strategically.

But Hussein is not yet out of the wood despite the reassuring presence of British troops. He must be worried for the future, since he cannot fail to have noticed that this has been a bad decade for Middle Eastern kings. Although Farouk of Egypt is still alive, Hussein must have observed a change in the climate of opinion against those in his exalted position, and the treatment which may come their way. His murdered cousin the ex-king of Iraq will have served as a grim reminder of the possibilities.

The causes for his anxiety are growing daily; both Britain and the

Continued on p. 4

Lesson of the Walton Prison Report End the Censorship!

THE report on allegations of ill-treatment of prisoners by prison officers at Walton Prison, Liverpool, which was ordered by the Home Office after Mrs. Braddock had raised the matter in the Commons

more than two years ago, was published last week. Sir Godfrey Russell Vick, Q.C., who conducted the inquiry says in his report that he found a *prima facie* case of assault, accompanied by varying degrees of violence, being made on prisoners by prison officers. The allegations which emerged from the evidence of the prisoners and ex-prisoners, he states, could be grouped in this way:

1. Allegations of grave personal violence, sometimes an isolated blow and sometimes a thorough "beating up" by several officers;
2. Physical violence less than this, amounting to rough handling and unnecessary restraint or necessary restraint with unnecessary force;
3. What might be described as ill-conceived practical jokes by the officers;
4. Provocative conduct by the officers designed to tempt a prisoner into attacking an officer or committing some other breach of the regulations;
5. The consistent use of obscene language by the officers;
6. The tormenting of prisoners who were already mentally unbalanced in such a way that their illnesses were aggravated and they eventually became completely insane; and
7. The denial of proper medical treatment.

Sir Godfrey comments:

"I found no evidence which will support the last two of these allegations and I reject them, but it is otherwise with the five other groups and in each I find that some complaints were justified and action is clearly shown to be necessary."

The 200 warder staff at Walton Prison are up in arms over the report and are pressing for an immediate special delegate conference of the Prison Officers' Association to consider the findings, and motions may be proposed calling for an appeal to the High Court and for a petition to be presented to the Queen! The Association in a press statement declared that it welcomed the inquiry in the first instance but had always objected to the procedure adopted by Sir Godfrey.

Consequently from the outset of the inquiry in December, 1956, the Home Secretary had to point out that the report could not be conclusive since "on counsel's advice the prison officers concerned withheld their answers to the allegations". This did not prevent their counsel, however, from cross-examining each complainant or addressing the inquiry.

The "general effect" of the evidence submitted to Sir Godfrey by the "Governor and his immediate subordinates and that of the members of the visiting committee, the chaplains and others who gave evidence" was that "nothing was amiss at Walton". And he comments:

"It does, however, mean that I am placed in the rather embarrassing position of having to say that the personal view I formed was that certain improper incidents took place and upon this view I am prepared to say that certain prison officers should formally be charged..."

★

THE objection of the Prison Officers' Association to "proceedure" was in the nature of the assurance which was given to prisoners, "which amounted to a virtual invitation for allegations to be made". In other words that for once a prisoner could make his allegations to an outside body without fear of punishment! The result, complains the Association, was that

when the terms of this assurance became generally known, prisoners and ex-prisoners literally flocked to give evidence to the inquiry, some from as far away as Dartmoor—and all at public expense.

What an admission this is of the absolute power normally enjoyed by warders to stifle any complaints against their management of the prison and individual treatment of prisoners!

In his report Sir Godfrey refers to "what might be considered independently of the results of this inquiry." If a prisoner wished to make any complaint

Continued on p. 3

FROM ALL PARTS

Messages of Solidarity

MESSAGES of solidarity and greeting reached the Congress from movements and groups around the world.

Below we reproduce only a few of those messages:

MEXICO

THE comrades of the Anarchist Federation of Mexico (FAM) extended to the Congress the following greetings:

"The TAM expresses to the delegates meeting at the International Anarchist Congress the desire that all their work will be crowned with success. We are conscious that it is only by the efforts of all men wanting a better future for mankind that mankind itself shall reach peace and liberty, through the exertion of all their will, intelligence and courage in favour of such a noble cause."

PERU

FROM the Anarchist Federation of Peru (FAP) the Congress received the warmest encouragement:

"Nothing could have been more welcome than your brotherly invitation, and we joyfully extend to you, through this meeting, our most effusive salute and our best wishes for a happy end to your deliberations, initiatives and actions. We hope that 1958 will be a year of unity between anarchists the whole world over in a common effort to make clear the outlines of the human revolution."

BRAZIL

THE Anarchist Union of Sao Paulo (Brazil) expressed their views to Congress in substantial letters, from which we take the liberty to quote at random:—

"We are in favour of the meeting of all elements from the Anarchist Movement, animated by constructive purpose, without any distinction of tendencies.

"We think that all efforts should be directed towards having in the Congress the most numerous participation possible, in order that in the present situation of crisis and social struggle they re-affirm and express the decision of anarchists to act in a vigorous and decisive manner as the catalytic element of the libertarian aspiration of mankind."

"We use this opportunity to convey our brotherly salute to the comrades charged with the organisation of the Congress and to extend them to all the comrades assembled."

JAPAN

THE Japanese Anarchist Federation (FAJ) in its message to Congress, insisted on four points: anti-atomic bomb campaign, anti-conscription resistance, support for the industrial struggle and the adoption of Esperanto. They stand for an all-comprehensive correspondence between anarchists, anti-militarists and pacifists from all countries and for mutual help in order to deprive the states of the flesh of human youth.

ISRAEL

THE Kropotkin Circle of Haifa greeted the Congress in these words:

"Unfortunately we cannot send any delegate to represent us at the Congress. We wish you a big success; may our anarchist ideals win over the proletarians of all the countries. We wish that Esperanto may also be considered and recognised as a means of international understanding."

"May the Congress send its hearty greetings to all prisoners in Russia, Spain and Portugal, and special regards may be sent to Zenzl Muehsam and Rudolf Rocker."

All our comrades are with you and salute you with Long Live Anarchism, Long Live the Congress!"

It's Urgent!

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT!

WEEK 31	
Deficit on Freedom	£620
Contributions received	£406
DEFICIT	£214

July 25 to July 31

Pleasanton: per Osmar, part proceeds	
Picnic, July 20 £20/6/0; London: W.F.* 2/-;	
London: J.S.* 3/-; Hitchin: H.E.H. 10/-;	
London: T.F.* 5/-; London: Anon. £24/5/0;	
Montreal: S.A. 1/-; London: D.A.* 10/-;	
TOTAL	46 2 0
Previously acknowledged	360 10 9
1958 TOTAL TO DATE	£406 12 9

Gifts of Books: London: P.; London: C.F.
*Indicates regular contributor.

BOOKS BY THE BILLION

IN spite of radio and television, or because of them, people are reading more than ever. 5,000 million books are published every year. Non-readers may gasp at that figure, but 5,000 million (and half of them are school-books) is only 2 books per person; even with a correction for the 700 million people who can't read, it works out at three and one third books per reader per year. In my teens, when time went in low gear, I used to average that weekly.

For the past decade Unesco has been gathering facts about books, and some interesting figures have been compiled. The greatest number of titles is published by the USSR, which, since 1917, has liquidated, among other things, its illiteracy. Next is Japan, followed by Great Britain. (But we produce more first editions.) Fourth, and ahead of USA, is Western Germany.

Of all subjects, most volumes in Czechoslovakia, Western Germany and Yugoslavia were devoted in 1955 to social science. In Poland, USSR, Eastern Germany and Portugal applied science was the chief interest, whereas literature predominated in Great Britain, USA and Japan. The major output of the Netherlands presses, for some reason, was philology.

A prodigious amount of translating is done nowadays, and a survey of authors translated at least 100 times between 1948 and 1955 is a useful guide to world taste in reading. Or is it? For the following pairs find themselves on adjacent rungs, as we go up the ladder of popularity:—Voltaire and St. Augustine, M. Brand and S. Freud, B. Russell and E. Blyton, W. Disney and A. France, G. Flaubert and V. Baum, E. Wallace and Homer, Stendhal and P. Cheyney, F. M. Dostoevski and H. C. Anderson, the Bible and V. I. Lenin!

In this list of 111 writers, Pearl Buck holds the double honour of most translated living author, and first woman, with 304 translations. Agatha Christie is close behind with 264. The first living male writer is Simenon, and there are 7 other detective-story writers listed. So professors and tired business men can't be the only readers of 'whodunits'!

I'm no thriller-addict myself—one in two years, if it's by Raymond Chandler or Simenon, is enough for me—but there was one name I looked for in vain. A year ago I wouldn't have noticed the omission, for when I first saw it then in a gossip column the reference had no meaning for me. Then in a film "Sab-

rina Fair" there was a fast gag-line that assumed that everyone knew the name. But when, in "Marty", a solemn young man announced that he had read a book, and boy, was it good? and that it was by Mickey Spillane; and boy, could that guy write? yeah, that Mickey Spillane could sure write! well, I decided it was time I made some enquiries, even at the cost of displaying my ignorance. (And boy, was I ignorant!)

I didn't have to seek long or far. My neighbour, whose taste is for, westerns and thrillers, knew about Mickey Spillane, and lent me three of his books. Which I read, and so found how Mickey Spillane could write.

Perhaps it is common knowledge that his stories are full of vicious brutality and easy-going sex, and my ignorance was uncommon. Perhaps the lone Mike Hammer, triumphing over both cops and robbers with his feet, fists and guns, fascinates the cops and ciphers of modern mass industrialisation. A book that begins:—"The guy was dead as hell. He lay on the floor in his pyjamas with his brains scattered all over the rug and my gun was in his hand," is bound to seize the attention of sensation lovers, and attract many readers. Just how very many is not so commonly known. By 1955 three of these books had sold a total of 12½ million copies, and were among the 10 U.S. best-sellers of 60 years. (A first novel does well if it exceeds 5,000 copies; "I, The Jury", sold 4,441,837.)

It might be argued that this only reveals a trend of escapism peculiar to America, especially as no Spillane appears on the 1955 list of translated authors. But this only means that in 1955 he did not have 100 translations of his works; the list of 10 most translated authors of 1956 shows Spillane, M. in fifth place, with 104 translations published in that year alone!

This phenomenal rise in popularity is spread over the following countries, thus:—Denmark 1, Finland 2, Italy 1, Japan 5, Netherlands 2, Sweden 4, and Turkey 89.

Is this a good thing? Spillane treats

sex with an adolescent leer; his women wear nothing under their dresses; they divest quicker than excited Doukhobors, and throw themselves at the hero—who catches them. He specialises in descriptions of men, and women, being beaten into unconsciousness. Mike Hammer, a far from perfect or gentle knight, takes and gives the beatings in his stride, as a hazard of his job. He fells an attacker, and then—"I took a shorthalf-step and kicked that son of a bitch so hard in the face that his teeth came out in my shoe."

There is no pity ('The poetry is in the pity'), not even regret. The tough guy enjoys himself. He never turns the criminals over to the police. He kills them. In one book the hero vows to break a man's arm. He does. When they meet later the arm is in a plaster cast, and they fight again. "He kicked and screamed and punched at me as I carried him to the table, screamed again when I laid his good arm across the top and fainted when I leaned on it and snapped the bone clean in two. I waited until he came out of it, broke the cast on his arm with the butt of a gun, propped it against the table and snapped it all over again."

Were Belsen and Auschwitz not enough? Is sadism so deep in human nature that, as their memories fade, new horrors must be invented for us to thrill over? In Turkey, more than half of the population cannot read. While the educated minority enjoys the 89 translations, dedicated people, engaged in Unesco's world campaign against illiteracy, are teaching the rest. So that they, too, may read "My Gun Is Quick" and "The Big Kill"? It takes strong faith to believe that the effort is worthwhile. But with 5,000 million books coming from the world's presses every year, it is to be hoped that some of them will find something more edifying.

My last news of Mickey Spillane is of some interest in this respect. It is reported that he has been converted to one of the fundamentalist religious sects. As a result, he has renounced the writing of best-sellers.

Good news, if true.

G. GILFILLAN.

BOOK REVIEW

Picture of Cyprus

"BITTER LEMONS", by Lawrence Durrell (Faber & Faber, 16s.) is about as satisfactory as the turbulent state of the Cyprus about which it is written.

Torn by conflicting loyalties, and with most liberal sympathies, Mr. Durrell made the best he could of his recent three years in that island—a best that is not good enough.

This is partly due to his ambition to provide a lasting poetical testimony to his experience, and to be above the battle—which last he understandably found impossible, living as he did, first *en rapport* with the friendly and hospitable natives, and later with pukka sahibs as a Government press adviser.

The effort to keep up to date without dating this book has led to a romantic roaming in time. Its major blemish is an indulgence in the past coloured by a classical learning which blurs the author's judgment of the present and removes him absolutely from the orbit of the people he loved most and would serve best—the ordinary Cypriots, themselves bewildered under the duress of Greek, Turkish or British dominance, and now failed by their present historian and champion.

Recognising that politics is the art of frustrating the best aims of the common people, but feeling unable to renounce a reluctant allegiance to the vague promise of a political solution, Mr. Durrell has relied on an impressionistic study of the much-troubled atmosphere of Cyprus in the years 1953 to 1956, to convey a picture of Cypriots and British he hopes does justice to both, which study is seeped with pity for an all-embracing tragedy about which Mr. Durrell is not content only to sigh as he folds his tent and steals not silently away from its scene.

For, this pity being tinged with a sentimental regard for Greek Enosis, theoretically, and with no like feeling for Turkish sentiments (the still smaller minority of Armenian Cypriots is never

mentioned) and is easily swayed away from his practical recognition of the benefits bestowed by British tutelage, Mr. Durrell floats off on a spiritual magic carpet in the direction of Athens, to conjure up the vision all culturists seize upon to excuse a particular nationalism they favour.

The greater pity is that 1958 itself, with its bitter recurrence of the tragic happenings so movingly recited of earlier years in this book, is unlikely to convince folk that any particular nationalism, however poetically embraced by the evocative writer, is a curtain of the same stuff from behind which politicians and priests of all nations wrangle for power over the ordinary people everywhere.

SAM WALSH.

exists. Under this new socialisation policy the great private corporations will appear a little more like the existing public corporations; but none of the proposed measures is likely to achieve real public accountability. They will, in practice, be even less subject than existing public corporations to Parliamentary interference.

This interpretation would not, I suppose, be accepted by the authors of the U.L.R. pamphlet, *The Insiders*, the most intelligent criticism of Labour's new policy that has been published. Unlike most other critics, these authors have not accepted the analysis of the first part of *Industry and Society*. They reject the view that these super-firms are in fact controlled by their managers rather than by the shareholders. They do not deny the tendency for ownership to be divorced from control but they do deny that it has gone so far as alleged. It is true, they point out, that the thousands of small shareholders exercise no effective control of firms like I.C.I. but the same does not apply to the large shareholders. The latter are few in number and collectively may own as little as 20% of the total shares; but this proportion is sufficient to give them effective control. Quoting the results of Sargent Florence's researches—cited so misleadingly in *Industry and Society*—they conclude that what we have at present is not managerial control but oligarchic minority owners' control.

It seems to me that this line of criticism is valid up to a point. For their own good reasons, the authors of *Industry and Society* have exaggerated the tendency towards managerial control. They write as if capitalist control were virtually eliminated in the large corporations, whereas it is still an important force. If one confines one's attentions to these corporations alone, I think it is possible to make out a fair case that we are still a substantial way off from the managerial revolution—that we are still, if you like, at the stage of monopoly capitalism. Nevertheless, I think this view is misleading. One must look at the question from the point of view of the economy as a whole, taking into account the public as well as the private sector, and also in the light of the very pronounced development of a specifically managerial ideology during the last 30 years.

Looked at in this way, it seems to me that it is the managers, rather than the capitalists, large or small, who represent the growing social force. The managers are already in effective control of 20% of the economy—the section under public ownership—and as a class they are conscious of the fact that while a modern industrial society such as our own can dispense with capitalists, it cannot dispense with managers. As far as we can see, the future belongs to the managers rather than to the capitalists. Of course, there is overlapping between the capitalists and the managers; they are not two distinct groups with clear-cut and incompatible interests. To say that the managers are establishing themselves as a new ruling class and superseding the capitalist ruling class does not imply that a wholly new set of men is taking over control in society. Rather it is to say that the ruling class is shifting the basis of its social power. If the theory of the managerial revolution is correct, the future ruling class will be based, not on ownership of private capital but on control of the great corporations, whether ostensibly privately or publicly owned. The managerial ruling class will of course be recruited primarily from the old ruling class—just as the capitalist class was primarily recruited from the previous ruling class. In the 19th century when the industrial capitalists

Continued on p. 3

Industry and the Managerial Society

THE Labour Party's new policy statement on public ownership, *Industry and Society*, has been interpreted by many radicals as a proposal to bolster up the capitalist order. I believe this view to be mistaken and, as briefly as I can, I wish to advance a different—and more radical—interpretation.

Central to the whole argument of *Industry and Society* is the distinction between ownership and control. This distinction is popularly associated with Burnham's thesis of the managerial revolution but the distinction is older than Burnham. It was first popularised by syndicalists and guild socialists in the years before and during World War One when they demanded workers' control—irrespective of whether, as the guildsmen suggested, the State owned industry or, as the syndicalists (following the anarchists) suggested, nobody owned it.

More important in the context of the present discussion is the fact that this distinction underlay the notable report by the T.U.C. on *The Control of Industry*, 1932. It was this report which marked the acceptance by the T.U.C. of the public corporation form of nationalisation and the substitution of joint consultation for joint control in the management of public industries.

When the public corporation form of nationalisation was first mooted in Labour circles, there was some doubt as to whether it was a genuine form of socialisation rather than simply the creation of a capitalist trust. Left wing suspicion that the latter was the case was increased by the financial proposals associated with the setting up of the London Passenger Transport Board, 1934. Under this scheme, shareholders of the old London transport combine were given stock in the new public corporation by way of compensation, rather than Government stock. Left-Wingers, therefore, alleged that the L.P.T.B. would be privately owned. The T.U.C. in its report attempted to allay these suspicions. It insisted that the crux of socialisation lay in the transfer of control to the community, not in the transfer of ownership. It argued that in the past, according to traditional notions, control was automatically vested in the owners of property. But control had been successively limited by government regula-

tion with the result that there was at present (1932) hardly anything that could rightly be called complete private ownership. As undertakings grew in size, the divorce between ownership and control increased. In the large-scale joint stock companies, the shareholders were the legal owners and legal powers were vested in them but in practice they did not really control the undertakings. "For all practical purposes control passes out of the hands of the shareholders into those of the directors with comparatively small holdings of shares, or in many cases into the hands of salaried managers who are not even part owners." This development was an inevitable consequence of the tendency towards industrial consolidation. As industrial units grew larger, control became more and more a job for experts and at the same time the legal conception of ownership tended to change. The result was that ownership meant, not so much the ownership of tangible property as the right to receive an income in the shape of profits and interest. When dividend limitation was introduced, this process was carried a stage further. "When the process has been carried to its logical conclusion, private ownership of capital will seem almost meaningless (apart from the right to an annual income), if those private owners have no control over the undertaking in question and if the payments they receive by way of interest or dividend are fixed or limited." Hence, it was largely irrelevant whether former shareholders were given stock in the new public corporation or were given Government stock. For the problem of socialisation the important thing was not the financial basis of the compensation but the fact that the former owners as such would have no part in control and management.

All this, let me repeat, was written 26 years ago and 10 years before Burnham first published his book. Far from following Burnham in his analysis of contemporary industrial structure, the T.U.C. anticipated him. And all that the Labour party has done in its new document is to apply this sort of analysis afresh, singling out as of special importance the 500 or so super-firms which now dominate the private sector of the economy and proposing, instead of transforming them into public corpora-

tions on the model of the 1945-51 nationalisation measures, to leave them intact except for the State purchase of shares in these concerns.

Seen in this light, I believe an important conclusion follows: *The new policy is not a radical departure from the previous policy but a logical development of it.* Nationalisation by public corporation and the extension of public ownership through the State purchase of acquisition of shares in the great corporations like I.C.I. and Unilevers are not radically different policies: they are merely the application of the same basic principles to different circumstances. In the industries nationalised after 1945 there was a strong technical case for setting up new organisations, most of them with a legal monopoly in their respective industries. But there is not the same case with regard to other industries—especially when the great corporations like I.C.I. are spread over several industries.

I believe that *Industry and Society* does mark an important stage in the development of the managerial revolution in this country but it marks the *second*, not the first, stage. The first stage began in the early 'thirties with the policy of nationalisation by public corporation, combined as it was with the rejection of proposals for giving the workers any effective control in industry. The second stage of the managerial revolution will be distinguished from the first, not primarily by the fact that private shareholding will continue to exist alongside State shareholding in the great corporations; it will be distinguished by the fact that the directors and managers will have greater independence. Under the previous nationalisation policy there was still some pretence that the public corporations were accountable to the public through Parliament. In practice such control is mostly moonshine. In the new socialisation policy this pretence of public accountability has been largely dropped. *Industry and Society* does propose that the Companies Acts should be revised so that, e.g., companies will be required to publish their accounts in greater detail. They may also be required to adopt certain standards in labour relations practice, e.g. setting up joint consultation machinery where none

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

OPEN DAILY

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

New Books . . .

European Volunteer Workers in Britain J. A. Tannahill 18/-
The Tide Went Out C. E. Maine 12/6

Second-Hand . . .

The State and the Doctor Sidney & Beatrice Webb 10/6
War and Peace (Shabby) Leo Tolstoy 6/6
The Limits of Pure Democracy (damaged) W. H. Mallock 3/-
My Sister and I Friedrich Nietzsche? 8/-
The Labour Movement L. T. Hobhouse 4/-
Marxism and the Irrationalists John Lewis 5/6
Gulliver's Travels Jonathan Swift 3/-
Knock on Any Door Willard Motley 3/-
A New View of Society Robert Owen 3/-
Ploughman's Folly E. H. Faulkner 2/6
Not Like This Jane Walsh 2/6
Britain and the Beast Keynes, Massingham &c. 3/6
I Thought of Daisy Edmund Wilson 3/6
Science, Liberty and Peace Aldous Huxley 3/-
Thoughts of a Fool Evelyn Gladys 3/6
A Plea for Liberty George Bernard Shaw 2/6
Odd John Olaf Stapledon 3/-
The Lonely Ones William Steig 3/6
Nana Emile Zola 3/-
Marshal Tito (1944) Michael Padev 2/6

Periodicals . . .

Organic Functionalism, July 2/6

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

Postage free on all items

Obtainable from

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

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

Vol. 19, No. 32. August 9, 1958

End the Censorship!

Continued from p. 1
against an officer, he had read to him a warning which the prisoners called the 'Riot Act'. Their evidence was unanimous to the effect that it deterred them from making genuine complaints."

He also states elsewhere in the report that most of the prisoners gave their evidence with fairness and moderation, and he never found any sign of a spirit of revenge, much less of deliberate conspiracy to make false accusations. Indeed:

"Most of them paid tribute, in many cases quite spontaneously to the overall decency and humanity of the majority of prison officers. Even more noticeable was the almost universal respect and admiration for the governor and his immediate subordinates. In consequence of this, it is my view that although irregularities have occurred at Walton Prison, the governor, deputy governor, assistant governors, and medical officers had no knowledge of them. . . .

"It is not possible to say that any of them know or ought to have known of any irregularities. I think that the prison officers would never have dared to ill-treat a prisoner when there was any likelihood of their superiors being about."

(These testimonials may exonerate the Governor from connivance at the abuses perpetrated by his subordinates; it does not clear him of responsibility. How many prisoners ever see the Governor alone, and not surrounded by a posse of Chief Officers or Principal Officers? How many surprise visits does he pay to the prison wing during "slopping-out" in the morning, or to the bath-house, or to the refectory when food is being doled-out? How often does he visit a prisoner in his cell and hear the "client's" point of view at first hand? In fact he doesn't, because he is as much a prisoner of the prison officers as the Queen is of Court circles.)

EXCEPT for a reference to "one occasion [when] I personally saw an officer address a group of prisoners in a tone of voice which I thought objectionable" Sir Godfrey bases his report on the testimony of prisoners and ex-prisoners, and the evidence of the Governor and his subordinates. The prison staff "on counsel's advice" said nothing then, but hotly deny everything now. We do not believe in the infallibility of official enquiries (what could have been more suspect than the inquiry into the Timothy Evans-Christie affair?). When we state that the present inquiry is an accurate summing-up of the situation in Walton Prison, it is not because we assume Sir Godfrey Russell Vick to be impartial, the prisoners truthful in their evidence or the prison officers guilty by their silence. That would rightly leave us open to the charge of opportunism, since on the other occasions we have attacked the partiality of Commissions of Inquiry, and have complained that a prisoner who exercises his legal right not to submit himself to examination in the witness box invariably creates in the minds of his judges the suspicion that he has something to hide.

No, Sir Godfrey's report is true because we know it to be true from our own first-hand knowledge as unwilling guests in H.M. Prisons, who neither closed our eyes to what was happening around us, nor feared to complain to all concerned, from warders to chaplains, from Governor to Home Secretary! And if Sir Godfrey had the time and interest he could find somewhere in the files at the Home Office two reports written by two members of FREEDOM's editorial board, one for our friends outside which we were less successful in smuggling out than the

We are very pleased to introduce below the first contribution of what we hope will be a regular feature in FREEDOM. Our contributor is well known in our movement for his consistent advocacy of communal living and his attempts to put his ideas into practice (as well as appearing briefly in the second (ITV) appearance of anarchists on television in this country).

Alan Albon is a farmer with many years experience behind him of work on smallholdings and larger farms—usually in responsible capacities. We feel sure that his 'Land Notes' will be of interest to all our readers and that they will deal with matters of special concern to those in country districts or engaged in rural industries.

Kenya prisoners were theirs, and which fell into the hands of our guardians, the other addressed to the then (it was in 1945) Labour Home Secretary, exposing serious irregularities by some warders in Wormwood Scrubs, which were not dissimilar from those brought to Sir Godfrey's notice at the Walton Prison inquiry in 1956.

THERE are obvious ways of reducing these irregularities in prisons, and without for one moment relenting our attacks on the prison system as inhuman and the breeding ground for criminals, we think anarchists should do all in their power to foster a much greater awareness of the fact that public disinterest in what goes on inside our prisons encourages the abuses by prison officers which the Vick inquiry so clearly reveals.

To abolish these irregularities is asking too much. To suggest as does the Manchester Guardian that one of the principle troubles is that the "quality of prison staffs falls a long way short of the ideal . . . [and is] largely the fault of Governments which have failed to provide the conditions in which better recruits might come forward," is to assume that any decent man or woman would be a prison warder (or warden) by choice. Without respect for the Prison Officers' Association we would say that no decent person can be a prison warder!

The proposal by Lord Pakenham that assistant governors should be appointed to prisons who would act not as gaolers but as welfare workers who could provide an outlet for prisoners' complaints misses the whole point. So long as the prison governor and the visiting magistrates are both prosecution, defence, judge and jury in matters affecting prison discipline and complaints by prisoners so long will existing abuses continue unchecked.

An assistant governor is yet another member of the prison administration and rightly, will be viewed as such by the prisoners. In any case even if he shows any independence, his life will soon be made impossible by the "gaolers" who, in the case of Walton Prison, would outnumber him by 200 to 1!

To keep the gaolers within bounds, prisoners must have the right to communicate with the outside world by letter or word of mouth without the prying eyes and ears of the prison censors. The prisoner must have this minimum of private contact with people in whom he has confidence and from whom he can hope for help and not punishment. It will of course be objected that without censorship of letters prisoners could more easily organise their escape with outside assistance. It is a pretty feeble argument since the experienced prisoner who wants to avoid the censorship knows who are the warders he can bribe to carry out (or bring in) whatever he likes.

Without censorship it may become less difficult to escape from prison, but it is a small price to pay if it also means that those walls which have so far kept out public scrutiny as effectively as they have held their human hostages within, are at last breached.

A NEW 'FREEDOM' FEATURE LAND NOTES

IT is a significant feature of progressive and left wing thought that the relevance of agriculture, and its place in the social arrangements of society are largely ignored. The Marxist tendency that regards industrialism and the industrial workers as the *avant garde* or spearhead of a revolution has also to some extent effected the libertarian movement. In spite of this there has always been a trend of agrarian influence running through the movement.

In countries in similar circumstances to India, where the standard of living is precariously balanced at about the subsistence level, it is inevitable that the need to secure an effective and efficient agriculture is constantly evident. It is in India that, significantly, a most revolutionary movement is gathering strength and support. The Vinoba Bhawe movement is revolutionary in its attitude to land ownership and its methods of agricultural organisation cut right across the socialist flavoured tendencies.

In this country since the war, agriculture has become a more important part of the general economy than at any time since the industrial revolution, except the durations of the two world wars. Agricultural production is 68% above the pre-war level and this increased production is largely absorbed by the increased standard of living. It does not seem to be the Government's intention to allow agriculture to become a derelict industry, as the agricultural community has become a valuable market for large industrial undertakings and the home market has become a basis for a considerable export market for agricultural machinery and chemicals. As the more backward countries proceed with their agricultural development this market is likely to expand for some time. The position of

agriculture in Britain is fairly sound but no doubt in the event of a slump the industry would grass down large areas of arable land and return to dog and stick farming.

Like every other activity within capitalist society, where useful activity is geared to the sterile task of making money, the fundamental needs and purposes of the activity suffer as a result. In spite of the fact that total world agricultural production does not meet the needs of the population, United States farmers are paid not to farm, and the ships that could carry this excessive production to where it is needed rust in the estuaries. In Britain there is a campaign to persuade the population to absorb the surplus milk quite regardless of whether the product is suitable to be a significant part of adult diet. Grass production is most suitable to British conditions and the by-products of this crop are the most important sector in the industry.

Although the agricultural population is relatively small it occupies a strategic position *vis-a-vis* the relative position of the political parties. The main parties are evenly balanced and marginal constituencies often contain a large agricultural element. The agricultural element however continues to regard the overtures of the political parties with suspicion, and one of the main agricultural journals concluded after studying the programmes of the three political parties on agriculture that there was very little to choose between them. The editorial then went on to say that the industry would be very foolish to rely on the promises of the political parties and should pin more faith in the efficiency of their industry and its marketing organisation in maintaining the industry in a

healthy condition.

There is of course the conflict of interests of the small farmers that rely on the labour power of their families and those who are concerned mainly in the management of large farms with employed labour and highly mechanised activities. The labour force on the land tends to become smaller with the more mechanically-minded operative tending to replace those with some of the older skills and generally commanding a higher wage than the minimum. Older workers on arable farms particularly are gradually being pushed right out of the industry. Production tends to become more intensive, as in the broiler industry when thousands of chickens are turned out every twelve weeks on an extremely small margin of profit—a similar activity to mass industrial production. Whether this type of activity produces a valuable article of foodstuff is another matter, but such operations require large capital outlay only possible for larger units.

Following the general pattern of capitalist development, the smaller farmer finds himself in an increasingly onerous position in which good husbandry is not necessarily synonymous with success in the financial sense. The opportunity that mechanisation has presented to remove the need for excessive toil in agricultural operations is harnessed to the futility of a monetary system which could more quickly destroy the very basis of fertility upon which food production is based.

Not many Anarchists I think are engaged on work in connection with agriculture. Therefore the writer hopes that these notes, to be written when rain or sunset stops work outside, will present an aspect of life that is not often represented in the paper.

ALAN ALBON.

Industry & the Managerial Society

Continued from p. 2
emerged as the dominant class, the feudal landowners did not simply abdicate: they became industrial capitalists themselves. Generally speaking, what happens in a social revolution is not the literal overthrow of the ruling class but the merging of the old with the new ruling class; or, if you prefer, a change in the character of the ruling class.

My own conclusion, therefore, is that one can accept as broadly correct the analysis of contemporary society contained in *Industry and Society*, with the qualification that the tendency towards managerial control in the super-firms has been exaggerated. I reject, however, the policy conclusions derived from the analysis. I oppose the policy of extending public ownership through State acquisition of shares, just as I oppose the previous socialist policies of bureaucratic nationalisation on the model of

the Post Office and nationalisation by public corporation. And I oppose it for the same fundamental reason: it will do nothing to bring nearer the classless society and (if I may use such old-fashioned language) the emancipation of labour from the wage-system.

Perhaps the most significant aspect of *Industry and Society* is the bland assumption that managerial control presents no real dangers. Its authors are clearly convinced that managerial control is not only inevitable but a good thing. They assert that the large corporations are "as a whole serving the nation well" and that therefore they have no intention of subjecting them to "persistent and detailed intervention from above." Elsewhere in the document, they mention the possibility that the managers may emerge as a new ruling caste. They point out that privileges in our society are increasingly financed from corporate

sources rather than from private savings. Increasingly the privileged don't themselves pay for their privileges—they get their companies to pay for them in the form of expense accounts, cars, meals, travel, holidays, pension schemes, provision of houses, interest-free loans, etc. It is pointed out that "from existing Board Room policies it is not difficult to envisage a managerial caste taking on the former rôle of the owners of wealth and using its economic power to buttress class privileges and institutions." But, having made this sensible point, they propose the most trivial measures to prevent this happening: a code of conduct for the managers, drawn up by negotiations between the Trade Union bosses and the employers, and, if necessary, given the force of law. The sheer puerility of this is almost unbelievable: it is on the same level as the notion that a law passed in 1800 might have prevented the rise of the industrial bourgeoisie! It assumes that State and Industry are two independent entities, that the State is the representative of the whole community, instead of being organised power which is subject to the pressure and manipulation of the dominant social forces in society at any given time. If we are emerging into a managerial society, then the State machine will largely reflect the interests of the managers and the idea of State control of the managers in the interests of 'the community as a whole' is so much eye-wash.

I am not a social determinist. I believe that a managerial revolution can be prevented; but not so long as the present structure of industry is accepted as sacrosanct. It can be prevented, not by attempts to impose controls on the managers from outside industry but by imposing controls inside industry. The only sure way of preventing the development of a new ruling class is to destroy the basis of its social power; and that implies, at the present time, the wresting of control within the corporations from the managers. The only real alternative to managerial control in our society is workers' control and this cannot too frequently be emphasised. How workers' control might be achieved and the whole strategy of the struggle against the managers is another and very large question. But on the main objective there cannot in my opinion be any disagreement among radicals who are alive to what is happening in the world about them. Far from being outmoded, as our fashionable "new socialists" would have it, the slogan 'Workers' Control of Industry', is more relevant to-day than when it was first voiced fifty years ago.

GEOFFREY OSTERGAARD.

(This article was first published in "Keele Left", an independent magazine of the University College of North Staffordshire.)

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*
 Vol. 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

E. A. GUTKIND:
The Expanding Environment 8s. 6d.

VOLINE:
Nineteen-Seventeen (The Russian Revolution Betrayed) cloth 12s. 6d.
(Kronstadt 1921, Ukraine 1918-21) The Unknown Revolution cloth 12s. 6d.

V. RICHARDS:
Lessons of the Spanish Revolution 6s.

RUDOLF ROCKER:
Nationalism and Culture cloth 21s.

MARIE-LOUISE BERNERI:
Neither East nor West paper 7s. 6d., cloth 10s. 6d.

PETER KROPOTKIN:
The State: Its Historic Role 1s.
The Wage System 3d.
Revolutionary Government 3d.
Organised Vengeance
Called Justice 2d.

JOHN HEWETSON:
Ill-Health, Poverty and the State cloth 2s. 6d., paper 1s.

ERRICO MALATESTA:
Anarchy 6d.
Vote—What For? 1d.

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.
The Education of Free Men 1s.

TONY GIBSON:
Youth for Freedom paper 2s.
Who will do the Dirty Work? 2d.

K. J. KENAFICK:
Michael Bakunin and Karl Marx paper 6s.

F. A. RIDLEY:
The Roman Catholic Church and the Modern Age 2d.

ALEX COMFORT:
Delinquency 6d.

★

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.

After the International Congress

The London Anarchists Summer School

Monday, 5th August.

TO-DAY marked the end of our Annual Summer School which followed the International Anarchist Congress, a new and rewarding experience for most British Anarchists.

The organisers of this year's Summer School were wise to decide on a single theme—War & Peace—a method which allowed for a fairly extensive discussion throughout the week-end.

It is not surprising that most of the discussion was on war rather than peace and, as often happens in a gathering of anarchists, a variety of opinions were expressed on the causes of war, alternative methods to violence which could be adopted by revolutionaries, and the rôle of the anarchist living under war conditions. The presence of three comrades who had direct experience of occupied war-time Europe added considerably to our knowledge.

Giovanni Baldelli* opened the series of lectures by considering the classical concepts of war which were generally accepted by the majority of people the most important being:—instinct of pugnacity in man—war as a means of social evolution which destroyed the weak members of society, and war considered as a necessary 'social vitamin'. In the lives and habits of other animals he found no trace of organised war on the human scale, and accepted the picture of prehistoric society given by Freud in *Totem & Taboo*. He ascribed war to maleness, affirming that the human male found self fulfilment in 'daring'—especially daring to kill and being killed.

Jack Robinson was primarily interested in the non-violent methods of achieving, and defending, a social revolution. He developed his thesis on the lines that—"the question of violence and non-violence is outside the realm of morals in the ordinary sense". In this way he was able to make the distinction between personal violence and organised war, and on the very important subject of revolutionary uprisings, he elaborated the view held by Bart de Ligt—"the more violence the less revolution". His conclusions, if read by the upholders of democracy, might help to reduce some of the piety surrounding the idea of the justness of the democracies: Violence is a weapon that can be used by both sides. It has no reference to the justice of the cause; it is purely an application of technical efficiency or physical preponderancy. It places the victory firmly and squarely on the side of big battalions.

Middle East Muddle

Continued from p. 1

U.S. have already recognised the new Iraq Republic, and the American Marines are unlikely to remain in Beirut for very much longer. There are two reasons for this: the U.S. having accepted the Iraq Republic and its promises to uphold the United Nations Charter, has by implication committed itself to "friendship" with that country—this involves a two-way agreement of which Iraq's share will be to uphold the Bagdad Pact and maintain existing oil agreements, whilst the U.S. in its turn will remove troops from the Lebanon. The other reason must be the likelihood of summit talks with Russia, during which the U.S. will not wish to be the target of Eastern bloc accusations of imperialism and covert aggression in the Middle East.

Since these accusations may almost equally be levelled at Britain it is to be expected that British troops will not remain too long in Jordan. Of course, Hussein's army will be bolstered up as well as possible in the intervening period, with arms and, in all probability, a few selected British officers, but this will not alter the fact of his nationwide unpopularity. It is said in the market-place that "only two men in Jordan hate Nasser; Hussein and Samir Pasha (as Premier Rifai is known), but there are precious few who have any affection for the palace régime". Most of the affection in Jordan is reserved for President Nasser.

It may not be long before the Jordanese are also carried away by the tide of Arab Nationalism, which they look upon as Arab Unity, and yet another puppet king will fall from grace.

On Sunday night, Tony Gibson painted a grave and convincing picture of the insanity of people in power. He confessed to his own mistaken views (held by many people before the last war) that while the powerful cliques which ruled the world might be greedy, ruthless and dishonest at least they were not insane and therefore, international war was a thing of the past. Our mistake, he contended was in attributing sanity to men holding power. He disagreed with Giovanni Baldelli's view that one of the causes of war was 'maleness' finding expression in 'daring'. War took place between states and not peoples, and the men who fought in wars were distinguishable for their submissiveness rather than their aggressiveness.

On Monday morning Philip Sansom and Alan Albon led the discussion on some of the points raised in the three lectures.

With possibly two exceptions throughout the entire week-end the economic

causes of war was not raised. Tony Gibson did question the possibility of present-day economic gains if war broke out between the nation states, suggesting that nothing but total economic collapse would accompany the kind of war envisaged in the future.

On Sunday afternoon we held our usual weekly meeting at Hyde Park. Out of the 'pleasure seeking' Bank Holiday crowd we were glad to welcome some new friends who, on hearing anarchist ideas for the first time, expressed their approval.

This writer usually gets special pleasure from the Summer School discussions because they are generally limited to anarchists. Irrelevancies in the form of hobby horses which are so often ridden at our open weekly meetings are absent.

*For the benefit of all those readers unable to attend the Summer School, the three lectures will be published in FREEDOM—EDS.

Reports from the International Congress
Motion by the
Iserhorn (Germany) Group

ANARCHISM goes in search of a 'free society', a society for everybody, whether they come from the rich or poor sections of our present society, and whatever their occupation. Yet anarchism and the libertarian movement have adopted very different ways and means of attaining this object.

Revolutionary syndicalists have attempted it with the organisation of wage and salary workers and employees into syndicates which are supposed to be kernels of the future 'free society'. They hope to build the new society in the shell of the old. But they do not take into consideration that part of the present society which does not consist of wage or salary-earning employees, ignoring for instance farmers and other professions. Revolutionary syndicalism limits its work to a certain part of the population, and consequently its development into a 'free society' is not possible, not at least according to the anarchist conception of a free society.

Anarchism on the other hand, addresses its propaganda to the whole population, but it is almost exclusively a propaganda for anarchism and liberty. This is good enough in a way, but concrete plans about what we ought to do, and what preparations we should take to attain our aim, are hardly ever mentioned. We are generally satisfied with a somewhat nebulous propaganda and criticism of the conditions of the present society. Such propaganda naturally does not appeal to strangers who want to see some concrete aims worth struggling for before they think of associating themselves with our movement.

Many anarchists believe that after the abolition of authoritarian and exploitive institutions like the state, the church, capitalism, militarism, the police, and so forth, the people would turn spontaneously to anarchism, without the need for any preparation for a free society. They think that propaganda for anarchism is enough, because the attainment of anarchy would automatically be followed by that marvellous transformation scene known as 'comfort for everybody'.

And then the comrades quote the examples of Spain, Mexico, and the Ukraine, and describe how the agricultural labourers from the big estates there lived in liberty with 'comfort for every-

body' once they had chased off the landowners in the revolution. This may certainly be true, and without a doubt was a triumph for our comrades in those countries. It is also a demonstration of the fact that people who lead a rural life need less exertion to attain a 'free society' than those who live far from the land. This was certainly the case in these peasant revolutions. After the owners of the estates had fled, the living conditions of the workers were improved, they had liberty because the dominion of the owners had gone, and they were economically better off because they could now use all the products of the estates.

However, the labourers on big estates are only a small part of mankind; their revolutionary experiences were extraordinary and could not apply to cities, and in particular to big cities, London, New York, Paris, Berlin. Grain does not grow on the asphalt, and neither do fruits and vegetables, and the city dwellers do not keep cattle to slaughter if necessary, nor are there forests in the cities which could provide firewood to keep the room warm and the pot boiling. These things are counted as unimportant, but if people in a revolutionary situation are denied them, they will certainly start a counter-revolution.

Why not organise for the necessities of the city dwellers in time? What will the hungry populations do with their hard-won liberty if they have to go hungry?

For us individual anarchists, human beings are neither good nor bad. And the whole history of humanity proves that its fundamental character has remained constant throughout the ages. It therefore seems a belief in miracles, to believe that after the attainment of liberty, 'comfort for all' is around the next corner.

In our propaganda in the future we should point out the practical ways and means of a libertarian economic system. We individual anarchists strive after an economic system adapted to the temperament and independence of the individual. Whatever they may be, we have to point out the practical ways and means of attaining anarchism, and these have to be practical for everybody, if we are to draw strangers into our movement.

English Comrade on a Functional Movement

TONY GIBSON first made it clear that he spoke as an individual and not as the representative of any group. He said that in his association with the Anarchist movement of Britain since 1938, there had been, in the later part of this period, a swing away from the tendency to organize the movement in a centralized manner. There had been at one time, towards the end of the war (1944) a real danger of an anarchist bureaucracy growing up. The later tendency had been towards the existence of anarchist groups which were entirely functional in character. He gave examples of the groups running the Malatesta Club, the Freedom Press group, the London Anarchist Group, and other local groups which existed for propaganda and discussion in their own way.

Tony Gibson stressed that he was not able to give a very informative account of the movement in Britain as there was

a good deal of activity of which he was not aware. In general the nucleus of all activity in the country was the Freedom Press although it was quite autonomous. Even those people who had criticised FREEDOM quite bitterly in the past did in fact depend upon it as the unifying thread in the movement. Again he stressed that he himself was not, and never had been, a member of the Freedom Press group, but he paid tribute to the continuous work which they had done for nearly 20 years.

He mentioned the effect of Marxism upon the Anarchist movement in Britain. Some anarchist theory was heavily contaminated with Marxism and this had had its effect upon organizational as well as theoretical matters. In general, those comrades who inclined towards a pseudo-Marxist position in Britain had after various "splits" drifted away from the anarchist movement.

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS

The 'Isis' Trial

COMRADES,

Now that the "Isis" trial has been concluded in a manner fit to pamper the vanity of the Establishment it may be safe to comment without fear of short-term victimisation.

As the judiciary invariably see fit to sanctify the law with moral censure on these occasions let us take their cue and ignore the legal fictions. We are then left with a rather peculiar ethical dilemma—at least peculiar to all but Anarchists and cynics.

Assuming that the contract between the State and the Individual can be entered into freely, then it is a contract not to disclose certain information about morally expedient acts. They may be acts which are intrinsically moral or which have a moral outcome. Now any act can only be judged by available information; if I subsequently learn more about the circumstances in which it was done, the intentions of the doer, or its outcome it may become more or less moral—by my own standards and by the professed standards of the doer, in this case the State. We must also note that we are not obliged to wait an infinite time before making a moral judgment on an event in any system of morality commonly accepted, hence the State cannot ask us to postpone criticism if our judgment tells us that this would be to suppress it for all time.

In the "Isis" episode we have the case of two individuals who in the light of subsequent information made a re-evalu-

ation of the moral significance of acts by the State to which they were parties, albeit at some time voluntary. These acts included the contract itself. That they also had political, i.e. non-moral, motives is largely irrelevant in this case. The result of their moral re-evaluation was a decision that effectively their contract with the State was no longer binding.

This moral dilemma is accepted in common law, if I make a contract with a person who subsequently becomes criminal or insane the contract is broken and indeed I may be liable to prosecution for not breaking it. But in the case of treason the State is saying that its moral judgment is infallible for I am not allowed to break the contract by appeal to higher moral principles, e.g. responsibility to humanity, nor can my judgment be correct if I brand the State as criminal or insane. The implicit ethics of the State, in this matter, are thus identical with those of any other State of any political colour, including those against whom our State lays the charge that none of their actions are morally defensible.

It is a pity that the defence of the Oxford Undergraduates took the form of a plea of juvenile enthusiasm and irresponsibility, and that Goddard was allowed to get away with spurious moralizations from his elevated position. Have we no longer the courage of Sacco and Vanzetti?

Yours,

London, July 20. ROBIN GREGSON.

THE ESSENCE OF
ANARCHISM

COMRADES,

I admire Arthur Uloth for his keen regard of origins. I have neither his education nor his learning; reason and imagination are my guides. Darwin gave us the origin of our species, but Man's structure has been more studied than his mind, and it is psychology that raises Man to his stature of a human being.

Brute intelligence has only a very dim awareness of self, and Man's expanding consciousness of self inevitably bred the selfishness that has played the very devil with him ever since. The only commandment worth anything at all is not in the Decalogue. It is THOU SHALT NOT BE SELFISH. Its place is at the very apex of ethics, but only experience can beget the knowledge that it does stand there. Primitive Man lacked experience, and when selfishness got tangled up with scarcity his damnation for millions of years became inevitable. Elaboration upon scarcity is needless. Every intelligent person knows how scarcity, even to-day, is exploited wherever it exists naturally and is artificially created wherever abundance obstructs profiteering.

We may be living now in the last millenium of selfishness, and we may not. But one can joyfully recall the monstrous mammals whose ponderosity literally shook the earth. These would look in their day to be the destined dominators of the world forever. Yet they have all departed, leaving only their bones for monuments and the whale their one living memorial. The social monsters, slavery, serfdom, feudalism, capitalism, private enterprise, will also wither away. These were, or are, the harbingers of anarchism, whose essence is self-control, the one essential and ultimate government.

Yours fraternally,

Bakewell, July 23. DAVID MACCONNELL.

MEETINGS AND
ANNOUNCEMENTSLONDON ANARCHIST
GROUP

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

LECTURE - DISCUSSIONS

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)

Trad Jazz
at the Malatesta

Every Friday and Saturday from 7.30

THE MALATESTA
JAZZ BAND

Members(1/6) and their guests (2/-) only.
MALATESTA CLUB
32 Percy Street
Tottenham Court Road W1
Jazz Men welcome

Every Wednesday at 7.30 (prompt)
BONAR THOMPSON speaks

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