

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

Vol. 19, No. 40.

October 4th, 1958

Threepence

The 'Race Riots'

FAILURE OF THE LABOUR MOVEMENT

WHENEVER anything particularly distasteful or disgraceful happens in Britain lots of people start telling themselves that they had thought it couldn't happen here.

This is what followed the disclosure of the snooping that M.I.5 and the Special Branch get up to in the universities. Shocked Lib-labs, having suddenly had this unpleasant activity brought to their notice behaved just like the good German bourgeois when they were told about the concentration camps, or the leaders of the Communist Party when comrade Krushchev exposed for them what the rest of the world had known for years.

Labour members of Parliament felt moved to ask Questions when the Marrinan case brought to light the extent of telephone tapping in Britain. Indignant references to totalitarianism warmed up the air in the Mother of Parliaments for at least five days as our representatives went after the Home Secretary (incidentally, what ever happens to the people he is supposed to represent?) like toothless old dogs worrying a hard biscuit.

The mock indignation which greets all these disclosures is obviously thought of as the means by which our freedom is defended, but behind the attitude of surprise and shock lies some reality—a real misconception that the British Government is a different kind of government from all those wicked ones abroad.

Degree not Kind

Nothing could be further from the truth. The government of Britain does not differ in kind from that of, say, Spain or Russia, but it does differ in degree, and it differs from territory to territory within the areas under its control. Thus it can behave with the utmost ferocity in Malaya or Kenya or Cyprus, but wears kid gloves when dealing with the English in England—or even colonials in England for that matter.

It is only now and again that the glove slips and betrays the mailed fist within. Then there is horrified surprise from all those who thought it couldn't happen here.

It was this same sense of shock which greeted the 'race riots' in Notting Hill last month. Just as those who take a polite interest in civil liberties really believe that the British Government is so much more decent than any other, so they also

seem to believe that the British people are just not capable of the brutalities that other nations can perpetrate.

There are so many myths about Britain. The one about the British not being a militaristic people, for example, though how on earth a nation could have won so many wars down through the centuries while being anti- or non-militant is difficult to explain. Perhaps it is something to do with the fact that our leaders are always careful to present themselves as civilians (although not hiding their military service when their courage has to be established) and not since Cromwell have we had an obvious soldier at the helm. Other countries have their marshals and generals, but British premiers are always plain Mister (or sometimes Sir).

Too Busy

Far from making Britain anti-militarist however, the truth is probably that the British armed forces are always so busy defending or extending the Empire that the generals never have time to start dabbling in politics. Occasionally a 'safe' militarist, like Earl Mountbatten, is given a Governor-General's job but he is so much one of the establishment that he is a special case. There is certainly no room in the British hierarchy for a soldier up from the ranks like a Napoleon, a Hitler or a Peron, and those who, like Montgomery, do open their silly mouths to pontificate, usually get promptly slapped down by the politicians—the professional pontificators.

Clearly militarism, like so much of the machinery of government, is so integrated with society here in Britain that it draws no attention to itself. But that is not to say that it doesn't exist, nor that the British are not just as big suckers for the flag and the drum as the Germans. It is simply that in the British way of life everything is done calmly and legally and without hysteria.

Perhaps this is what really shocks the solid citizens when incidents like the 'race riots' occur: that they are un-British in their affront to the law and in their uncontrolled hysteria. Nothing upsets your true-blue Englishman like making a fuss.

Labour's Responsibility

Upsetting the true-blue types is one thing, however. What we are interested in is the responsibility of the Labour movement, as it is called.

We have always thought that one of the most important functions of a working-class movement should be the education for responsibility of its members—and indeed of the working class as a whole. One glance at the Labour movement in Britain is enough to tell how abysmally inadequate it is in this respect.

Oh certainly there is the Workers' Educational Association, and some trade unions run Summer Schools and courses at colleges, but these are all for the already interested, the already enlightened. What attempts do the trade unions or the Labour Party make to go out on the streets and speak to the people where they live?

When the riots gave the Lib-labs a slap in the face they hurried forward with their resolutions and immediately announced that they were going to organise educational meetings—in T.U. Clubs, in Co-op halls

and youth centres and other places where people like the rioters do not go. If the Labour Party wants to educate the young people of areas like Notting Hill, it has to go out to where they are, not imagine that they are going to suddenly find an interest in going to lectures.

Only the Fascists

But when do we ever see a Labour Party platform on a street corner? At election time only. When the Party is rounding up the floating voters and the jobs are in the balance—then its speakers come to the people. But the only organisation that has had anything to say to the people of Notting Hill, right there on the street corners of Notting Hill, has been the fascist Union Movement.

Unchallenged, this hateful little gang has been able to spew its poison while the Labour Party has been content to have television time. In exactly the same way as the trade unions fail to present ideas to the workers through which they could achieve dignity or more, however slowly, towards workers' control, so does the Labour Party fail abjectly

in what should be its foremost task—the spread of ideas about living in society.

The official labour movement ignores this aspect of its duties, chiefly, one suspects, because it does not want a working class with ideas of dignity or responsibility or living in society. The Labour Movement wants to provide the official opposition, or the Government. It wants votes, it plays power politics, it acts big brother. It is not concerned with educating the workers because educated workers (educated socially, that is) would have no time for the Labour Movement as it is.

The trade unions organise millions of wage slaves, and the Labour Party wants millions of voters. Neither wing is prepared to use its immense power to eliminate the mental squalor that threw up the riots in Notting Hill. Such organisations as would like to haven't the strength necessary, so it's a vicious circle with the law meeting Teddy Boy terror with policeman's terror, and the great powerful Labour Movement passing pious resolutions but doing nothing.

Power Politics and the Far East Beware of Press and Politician

WHEN we headed our editorial of a fortnight ago "Who's Threatening Who?" we were not trying to be funny, but simply attempting to draw attention to the virtual impossibility for the ordinary, albeit intelligent, man in the street, to establish either whether the present Far East "crisis" is just political bluff, or, if it is a real crisis, how it has developed and how the Powers will set about solving it.

As things are organised in the world to-day the public knows only that which the ruling circles wish them to know. The press at best is the link between the political leaders and the public, but it can do little more than retail what these leaders want us to know, and only very occasionally, through a "leak", what they do not want us to know. But otherwise, the political "experts" can do no more than interpret, or try to read between the lines of a

communiqué or a news item, partly because however "well-informed" they may be, no politician worth his salt will tell them what he thinks inexpedient for them to know, but also because there is not one "expert" to-day writing for the press or appearing on the air, who does not identify himself with the establishment, or whose outlook and political formation is not one of respect for the existing political institutions.

At worst, the Press can be used to foment trouble, to start "scares" and generally to create the kind of atmosphere through lying and deceit which will facilitate a government in passing laws, or initiating policies which might otherwise meet with considerable public opposition. (How much, for instance, does de Gaulle owe to the French Press and Radio-Television services for his overwhelming success in last Sunday's Referendum. His appointment of the notorious M. Soustelle as Minister of Information indicates that the General was not just relying on his personality to win the day, but needed the acquiescence of the organs of mass communications as well. M. Soustelle was most successful; and by all accounts Radio-Television Française was reduced to a de Gaullist mouthpiece!

It is, therefore, to our minds, a healthy maxim to distrust the Press, and to distrust absolutely the gutter Press! But having said this, we can well imagine being asked: "Then how are we to know what is happening in the world and what decisions are being taken by the political leaders in our name?" And the straight, short answer is that there is no way at present, and there never will be, so long as the gulf which isolates the ruled from the rulers is maintained. But then there is no way of removing this man-made barrier without a radical change in

"Whenever government assumes to deliver us from the trouble of thinking for ourselves, the only consequences it produces are those of torpor and imbecility."

—WILLIAM GODWIN

Cyprus

Bevan & Co. Join Soldiers' Fan Club

THE Labour Party leaders' pathetic praise of "our gallant boys" in Cyprus comes as no great surprise to us, nor, we imagine, to any reader of FREEDOM. It is part of the current fashion originally set by Bevan's H-bomb clothing in an attempt to entice Britain's respectable floating voters. We have long since given up expecting expressions of socialism from the boys in office in the Labour Party, especially when a declaration of socialist principles might lead to loss of power. Mrs. Barbara Castle's statement on the brutal behaviour of British troops in Cyprus was therefore ill-timed, and as a good party member she ought to have known better. Her revolting colleagues have wasted no time in disassociating themselves from her rash accusations, however true they might be, and she herself has hastened to make clear that she was really attacking the policy of the authorities, and not the troops.

Pundits well versed in the dirty intrigues of internal politics, assure us that "the row over Cyprus" will strengthen the demand of those who wish to replace Mrs. Castle by Bevan as next year's chairman. It follows logically enough that Bevan was one of the four Shadow Cabinet members who disowned her remarks on the conduct of troops.

Mr. Bevan's urge to power is too strong to expect him to be halted in its pursuit by disclosures which might involve the conscience. We can be sure therefore that his views are those expressed by Mr. Jim Mathews, one of the lesser men of the Labour Party: "There is a danger that the lads may think twice about supporting us if we have a chairman shouting her head off like Mrs. Castle." "Mrs. Castle should realise that among members of the Forces there is tremendous support for the Labour Party," he said.

No confusion between politics and principles in the mind of this dreary little opportunist.

It is not new in the history of armies for soldiers to behave brutally towards civilians or other soldiers, and these are not the first reports to reach this country from Cyprus. For authorities to either affirm or deny the facts is largely a question of which troops are being brutal, and when.

Mrs. Castle's statement merely refers to one of the "milder" incidents in the history of Cyprus under British rule. But let it be noted that in interviews on the B.B.C. and I.T.V. she cited government sources in evidence:

"I have first of all the evidence of the Government's own communiqués. The incident which I myself followed up and examined was one in which the Government admitted that during the searches of certain villages 56 people had had to go to hospital for medical treatment, although the Government said it wasn't very severe. Now I found as a result of my inquiries that those figures were not complete. I also saw some of the injuries a week after they had been done and I believe the Government's picture was unnecessarily rosy about this."

Only 56 civilian Cypriots (which we have heard about), not very severely injured! Few people in this country think they are worth a second thought, but they will shed patriotic tears over the death of a

Black Tax

Every South African black man over the age of 18 must pay a "head tax" of £1 (\$2.80) per year. Since even a black industrial worker's average yearly wage is only \$369, more than 150,000 blacks are jailed every year for failure to pay. Last week South Africa's House of Assembly passed a bill that will nearly double the head tax on blacks this year.

South Africa's white men do not start paying taxes until they are 21, and half pay no taxes at all if they earn less than \$420 a year. But to Prime Minister Hendrik Verwoerd, it was merely a matter of "morality". In the next five years \$140 million would be needed for native schooling. The natives should pay for it. "What," cried Verwoerd, "would satisfy the highest demands of morality? Would it be to spoon-feed the natives constantly, allowing them to be beggars who go on their knees to the white man? All they have to do is to save 3½ pence (4 cents) by drinking half a pint less of Kaffir beer a week."

Time 29/9/58.

Who will Follow their Example?

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT! WEEK 39

Deficit on Freedom £780

Contributions received £509

DEFICIT £271

September 19 to September 25

Swansea: R.R. £3/15/6; Colemans Hatch: D.M. 15/-; London: Anon. 1/7; London: P.F.* £1/0/0; London: J.S.* 3/-; Sevenoaks: B.R. 15/-; Los Angeles: "Man" Group per A.R. £7/0/0; Preston: Freethinkers 6/-; Donaghadee: J.T. £2/0/0; London: O.C. £2/10/0; Oakland, Cal.: K.C. £1/1/0; Dovercourt: W.B.W. 10/6; Preston: W.A.L.M. £1/0/0; Tampa: A.C. £1/1/0; Tampa: A.B. £1/1/0; London: T.L. 10/-.

TOTAL ... 23 9 7

Previously acknowledged ... 486 8 4

1958 TOTAL TO DATE ... £509 17 11

*Indicates regular contributor.

Continued on p. 3

Continued on p. 4

REFLECTIONS ON AN 'AFFRAY'

FOR several weeks FREEDOM has discussed the problems created by the recent racial fighting in London. It will perhaps seem a particular instance of anarchist obstinacy to follow this by saying that we are opposed to the imprisonment of the people who were condemned during the week as having been responsible for the disturbances.

In the first place, it is impossible to accept the facile assumption, held by the press, members of the "justice" profession, and large sections of public opinion, that a person who commits a particular illegal act is wholly personally responsible. This is equally true whether the act is one which is merely an offence, against the law and not one which would merit condemnation by a rational person; whether as in the present case, the crime is also an outrage against the conception and practice of decent and happy social living; or whether it is in the nature of legalised violence by the recognised representatives of the State's coercive forces. In the last case of course, the attitude outlined is not found in the more usual newspapers or sectors of opinion, since they do not generally regard murder, violence or appropriation of property by soldiers and policemen of their own country as being criminal acts.

Speaking in general terms, the responsibility is a social one. Not only does the environment shape and incline the behaviour of each individual, and in the case of the violent varieties of "Teddy boy" the chief tendency seems to be towards the exercise of power of destruction, but it determines to what extent each person does actually retain the power of choice in his actions. The words of Mr. Justice Salmon to the court were certainly not indicative of a reasonable understanding of the problems with which West London finds itself confronted. If they had been, they would not have been welcomed so warmly by the daily press, and after all, judges are not appointed to understand social problems. His speech made it clear that he regarded the troubles as having been started by the nine youths before him at the Old Bailey. The procedure of judicial questioning, and public speeches from the Home Office have made it clear that even the government and the legal world are aware of the factors behind the outbreaks of violence, both from the point of view of physical conditions in the environment, and from that of the kind

of lives led by the section of the population involved. Yet they, and quiescent public opinion, think it reasonable, and expect, that of the thousands of people subjected to such living conditions; overcrowding, dreary work, blocking of all avenues of personal development and expression, that there will not be just a few dozen who will one day burst out with some violent act which will shock the country and fill all decent people with disgust, etc., etc. And when this does happen the only answer is brutal punishment.

The judge and the press which welcomed his actions can certainly not have been thinking of reforming the people directly concerned. All of them were between 17 and 20 and no-one can entertain great hopes that after spending between 2½ to 4 years in prison they will feel disposed in a more friendly way towards coloured people. In fact the result is more likely to be that their hate will be even more deeply ingrained. Obviously the object of the sentences was deterrent, to try to prevent further violence and to safeguard other coloured people.

Most people feel that this is perfectly legitimate, and if the "tender-minded radical" opposes this view, he is accused of feeling more sympathy for the criminal than for the victim. It is in a way perfectly natural that the relative of a murdered person, the mother of a conscript killed in Cyprus or the parent of a child who has been assaulted should at least temporarily feel in a very irrational way about the questions raised by their misfortunes, and one cannot condemn them for feelings of revenge, or desires to get their own back on anyone resembling the attackers. In the same way it is not unreasonable that some people should feel in favour of a short-term policy of severe reprisals against the instigators of riots, resigned to make the streets relatively safe for anyone to walk through. Nevertheless, this policy is a

mistaken one, certainly from a long-term point of view, and it is more necessary than ever to press the radical alternative.

Suppose, and it is quite a plausible supposition, that the deterrent effect of a few sentences is that open violence is no longer seen on the streets of London. Mr. Salmon remarked "As far as the law is concerned you are entitled to think what you like, however vile your thoughts: to feel your emotions: to say what you like, providing you do not infringe the rights of others and imperil the Queen's peace. But once you translate your dark thoughts and brutal feelings into savage acts such as these, the law will be swift to punish you and to protect your victims."

This seems to imply that, much as one disapproves of the thoughts and feelings which lead to rioting and attacks on peaceful individuals, as much as one would like to see them disappear, there is a sense in which they are to be expected and perhaps in some people natural and unavoidable; but that society expects equally well that these feelings should be repressed within each individual, and provides the machinery for helping in this repression.

It has not so far been claimed that the repression of the physical acts of violence will do away with the thoughts and feelings which produce them. And unfortunately there are only too many ways in which such antagonistic feeling between people of different races can make themselves felt, as they have been doing over the years, without infringing the law, and in some cases even through application of the law. On the other hand it is too obvious to need elaborating that any solution, or even partial solution to the basic social problems which give rise to ill-feeling, and some of these have been mentioned in FREEDOM, will in the same degree reduce the danger of violent outbreaks.

Many people would still feel that this view is compatible with one of imme-

discipline, must realise that each social problem is linked closely with the entire basis of community life.

Similarly, the thousands of respectable members of the British public who have passively accepted discrimination, the middle-class who secretly feel that it is quite a good thing, the workers who are quite happy about the British treatment of Cypriots and Kenyans, will go their way feeling that the problem has been dealt with and finished at the Old Bailey. Organised justice is a method by which a few slightly guilty people can be punished to satisfy the feelings of the larger majority who share much more of the guilt, but who have the brains to avoid breaking the law.

The real responsibility lies with numerous people, on both sides of the law and unconcerned with it, and the solution can only be found by all of them thinking, not through the channels provided by the society which has given rise to violence and hatred as phenomena too common to be worth noticing, but as free persons. P.H.

Racial Discrimination at Work

RECENTLY we reported in FREEDOM the case of a white woman, Mrs. Rose Fletcher-Lowe, a middle-aged headmistress of a Southern Rhodesian girls' school, who was brought to trial on the charge of having "illicit" sexual intercourse with her young African cook. Both pleaded guilty to the "crime", since under the Immorality Act it is against the law for a white woman to sleep with a black man, although it is "legal" for a white man to sleep with a black woman.

The court has now sentenced Mrs. Fletcher-Lowe to six months' imprisonment and her cook to four months.

Quite apart from the fantastic injustice of the law in differentiating the two races in relation to one another, and the extraordinary idea that sexual intercourse between a man and woman should be regarded in law as a crime, it is horrifying to think of the irreparable damage which will have been wrought upon the unfortunate schoolmistress.

Southern Rhodesians regard their country as eminently democratic and Christian in outlook; they lift their heads to the north where England is and reflect with pride upon their English forbears. The traditions of the mother country are their own. Perhaps it would be truer to say that the incidents occurring in Notting Hill and Nottingham are more to their way of thinking—or truer still,

that which passes for civilisation in South Africa.

And what of the African, the colour of whose skin so offends. It may be presumed that he, when released from prison, will be quite unable to find employment within the vicinity of his white rulers, and possibly not at all. His "crime" will never be forgiven or forgotten, for it is that he has actually occupied a position of equality with a "white person". By some it will be thought, though never mentioned, that he has usurped the rightful place of the superior white man, and thereby proved him inferior.

Money and Morals

UMTALI, Southern Rhodesia. Sir Stephen Courtauld, the British textiles millionaire, and his wife have resigned from the board of the new £40,000 theatre here—for which they put up most of the money.

They resigned because the administrators of the theatre, the all-white Umtali Players, have barred Africans from the auditorium.

Sir Stephen, soon to be host to Mr. Butler, Britain's Home Secretary, gave £25,000 for the theatre and lent £6,000 more.

News Chronicle 27/9/58.

CINEMA

Pride and Prejudice

WHEN we see Stanley Kramer's name associated with a film we expect something out of the ordinary. His latest production, *The Defiant Ones*, now at the Odeon, Leicester Square, is unlikely to disappoint anyone on that score. It is about racial prejudice, and the story is set in one of the southern States of the American Union. The joint protagonists are two fugitives from the chain gang, one of them a negro (Sidney Poitier), the other a white man (Tony Curtis). They are chained together at the wrist with three feet of steel links.

When the truck carrying them and other convicts is wrecked in a collision they seize their chance to escape and set off, necessarily together, across rough country.

Both come from the same social level: the "Caucasian" qualifies as "poor white trash"; the negro is a peasant, who used to scratch some sort of living from a patch of ground before he was sent to jail. They are much of a muchness. Both are bitter and resentful of the society they were born into. The white man's frustration led him to armed robbery. He wants to be "Johnny Potatoes", the man with the money, the man who doesn't have to earn a living. He wants to be on top instead of underneath: those are the only alternatives that he can see. The negro's resentment led him to simple violence: he was jailed for "assault and battery with intent to murder". The white man has the traditional southern contempt for "niggers", the negro the southern hatred that his people have for the white folks.

So it is not surprising to find the cynical police chief remarking that the fugitives will kill each other before they have gone very far, thus saving the forces of law and order a lot of trouble. The forces of law and order are marshalled and ready for the pursuit: the police cars are there with their radio-telephones; the dog handler has arrived with bloodhounds and Dobermans; and a group of hunters who see no difference between hunting men and hunting rabbits are pressed into service as deputies. Only the sheriff (Theodore Bikel) can see a difference between hunting men and hunting rabbits.

The fugitives have to cross a river. As they are chained together it is literally a case of sinking or swimming together ("Man! I didn't pull you out; I stopped you from pulling me in"). They have to extricate themselves from a clay

pit. They have to find food and shelter. And they have to do everything together.

They are caught when they break into a toolshed at a work camp and nearly lynched by the angry workmen, only to be set free by one of them, himself a former convict (Lon Chaney).

The pursuers are now hot on the trail, the bloodhounds snuffing along the ground, the police dragging their weary feet over the rough terrain, the moronic jazz addict listening perpetually to his portable radio, the sheriff looking as if he might be wondering what it was all about.

Eventually the fugitives reach a small farm inhabited only by a woman and her little boy. The woman, whose husband has left her, is somewhat man-hungry, and the white convict would suit her requirements admirably. She has a car, and more than anything else she wants to leave her dreary life on the farm. She and the white man agree to go away together, leaving the negro to go his own way on the freight train that is due to pass at two o'clock.

But although the chain has now been broken from the convicts' wrists another, invisible, bond has taken its place. But neither of them realizes it yet. However, I must not be a spoilsport and reveal the ending, which I am told is a reviewer's worst fault, even though you will probably guess what it will be before you reach it.

The direction is smooth and never drags. The black and white photography is sharp and workmanlike. For the most part the dialogue is credible and to the point: "Why should you object to being called a nigger? That's what you are. It's like calling a spade a spade... Call me a bohunk if you like, I don't mind."—"Did you ever hear of a bohunk in the woodpile, or 'Catch a bohunk by the toe'?" But there are weak moments that come near to mauling.

The chief honours, however, go to the actors. Tony Curtis admirably suggests the white man's burden of uneasiness, the desperate need to feel superior to somebody or something. Sidney Poitier will be remembered from *Blackboard Jungle* and *A Man is Ten Feet Tall*. His performance in this film shows an improvement even on those previous rôles. Theodore Bikel conveys very well the plight of a humane man trying to do an unpleasant job without compromising his principles. E.P.

EXHIBITION

Revolutionary Artist

Paintings by Arthur Moysé at the Woodstock Gallery, Woodstock Street, W.1. 29th September to 11th October, 1958.

I SUPPOSE Arthur Moysé would hate to be called an artist in the English tradition, but that is what he is. There is no strong tradition in English painting, but there is most definitely an English school of graphic illustration, with Hogarth, Rowlandson, Gillray, Cruikshank, Leech, Phil May, Giles, and Ronald Searle among its greatest members, and Arthur Moysé belongs to this school. Like Gillray, he paints bright, even garish, watercolours, loaded with grotesque comic-horrific figures; and like Gillray, he uses painting to convey some rather unpleasant ideas about people and their behaviour.

The fact that Moysé's figures are of arbitrary sizes, and afflicted with horrors beyond the scope of Gillray (like the rotting flesh of the surrealists) is a difference of detail only; and the fact that Gillray was the champion of orthodoxy and reaction, whereas Moysé is the champion of heresy and revolution, makes little difference to the appearance of the work. Gillray depicts what would happen if 'democracy' should come, and warns us to stand by the forces of law and order. Moysé depicts authoritarian society in symbolic form, and warns us to resist it. But they both paint torment and vileness, screams of agony and pools of blood.

I do not wish to be the arbiter of anyone else's taste, but I personally have no taste for agony and blood; and if Moysé's work had nothing but revolutionary fervour to commend it, I fear I should find it nasty. In fact, however, I find it really enjoyable. There is a lively sense of humour buried somewhere beneath all those corpses, and a sound, hardworking imagination which is something more than a feeling for the grotesque. D.R.

The few collages and paintings based on accidental effects are not typical of the exhibition, but they are the easiest place to see the imagination at work. One of the collages consists largely of black and grey textured surfaces; in the south-east corner is mounted a dead leaf, and out of the leaf an upside down eye is looking at you. One of the paintings is a nebulous random pattern of splattered colour, with somewhere in it a head of Christ, with a crown of thorns and a gilt halo.

The best, to my mind, of the typical paintings, also makes use of collage. *Private View* shows a great crowd of people in a picture gallery, with the ceiling melting into nauseating blobs. They are ugly people, many of them maimed or decrepit, all busy strangling each other, making love, dying or talking; but none of them appear to be taking anything too seriously. And the pictures they are ignoring are cuttings from *Chips*, mostly from the famous series "Weary Willy and Tired Tim".

A Rose is a Rose shows the same imagination without the same lack of seriousness. A band of white stretches horizontally across a black background. On it are skyscrapers and a luxurious gilded coach drawn by many horses; and in the gloom below, three emaciated men gaze fondly at a rose.

But these descriptions are misleading. Arthur Moysé is of the English tradition, but within that tradition he is unique. He paints in some respects like Gillray, but he is not an imitator of Gillray, any more than he is an imitator of Dali. His work must be seen, before either its ugliness or its beauty can be understood, and I warmly recommend every anarchist who has the chance to see it.

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

OPEN DAILY

[Open 10 a.m.—6.30 p.m., 5 p.m. Sats.]

New Books . . .

- Woman Eustace Chesser 10/6
- Character Analysis Wilhelm Reich 63/-
- The British Communist Party: a Historical Profile H. Pelling 18/-
- I Was a Savage Prince Modupe 21/-
- Nationalism and Culture Rudolf Rocker 21/-
- The London Years Rudolph Rocker 25/-

Penguins and Reprints . . .

- Selected Poems and Letters William Blake 3/6
- Gigi and the Cat Collette 2/6
- Selected Short Stories H. G. Wells 3/6
- Anglo-Saxon Attitudes Angus Wilson 3/6
- The Decameron Giovanni Boccaccio 3/6
- Bel-Ami Guy de Maupassant 3/6
- Second-Hand . . . Robert Flint 5/-
- Socialism My Father's House Pierrepoint Noyes 7/6
- Women and the Revolution Ethel Mannin 6/-
- Garibaldi and the Thousand G. M. Trevelyan 5/-
- The Life of William Blake Mona Wilson 4/6
- The Chrysanthemum and the Sword Ruth Benedict 4/-
- Above all Liberties Alec Craig 3/6
- The Seed Beneath the Snow Ignazio Silone 4/-
- Flight to Arras Antoine de Saint-Exupéry 5/-
- The Voyage Out Virginia Woolf 4/-

Pamphlets . . .

- Introduction to 'London Years' (Rocker) Joseph Leftwich and Herbert Read 1/-

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. 40. October 4th, 1958

Beware of Press and Politician

Continued from p. 1
social organisation at all levels first taking place.

After all, the government is the Executive which can claim that it has by right the powers to act in the way it thinks best in the interests of the nation, and is acting no differently than the industrialist or any other employer who by virtue of being entrusted with, or possessing capital, has the power to direct the working lives of others, or even deny them the means of livelihood, in the interests of shareholders or in his own personal interest. In their turn industrialists and employers are no worse than the "heads" of families who, by reason of their rôle as breadwinners, assert their "right" to decide, without prior consultation with the other members of that family, "what is best for them"! In other words, the gulf which divides the public from the ruling class is only one manifestation, at top level, of a society which is authoritarian through and through.

IT seems to us that there is more likelihood of a libertarian society replacing the authoritarian through the education of Dad and the encouraging and fomenting of rebellion among his willing or unwilling dependents, than in seeking to convince capitalists big and small to hand over their money or politicians to come clean and play our—the public's—game.

The libertarian, the anarchist, approach at the individual, human level has so much to offer which is positive, and which can add to the stature of a human being if not to his bank balance. However much the latter may appear to override the former in the public mind the situation is not as hopeless as some among us appear to think. And for the reason that the ordinary person's preoccupation with money is based on a misunderstanding—that money is the open sesame to happiness—but not on the denial of happiness.

This, we believe, is not so in the case of the financial tycoons, and the dominating political figures of the world. For them there is no misunderstanding: they do not seek happiness. For them the accumulation of wealth, the "accumulation" of power are both the means and the ends of life, pursued in the full knowledge that the more "successful" they become the more isolated will they be from the warmth of genuine human contact which is, surely, the basic ingredient of happiness.

BUT apart from the doubtful possibility of killing the political game by starving it—through conversion—of its "stars", is it, as so many well-meaning people from pacifists to socialists seem to believe, possible to change the rules, so that the public may follow the game instead of, as at present, having to content themselves with being told the results. (And sometimes even the scores are faked!)

To believe that power politics can be conducted honestly and openly is the same as saying that football could be played without a ball! "Looking Back on Munich" in last Sunday's *Observer*, Sebastien Hafner writes:

The year 1937, a relatively quiet and stationary one in European politics, was a year of general stocktaking. During that year, the European Chancelleries (to give them their period name) everywhere charted their course anew. They were facing the accomplished fact of a shift in the European balance of power in favour of Germany, which had gradually

come about during the preceding four or five years.

It had not come as a profound surprise. The European settlement of 1919, from which America had at once withdrawn and of which Russia had never been a partner, had always left Germany, despite her defeat in the First World War and the irritations inflicted on her in the peace treaty, intrinsically the strongest Power on the Continent. For the past eighteen years, her preponderance in population and industry had been balanced by one fact only: she was disarmed while France maintained a big army.

Now Germany had, without meeting serious opposition, rearmed again and was making territorial demands backed by real power. Dealing with these demands was no longer a question of "calling Hitler's bluff." The question to be faced was whether to resist Germany at the very real risk of another war or whether to accept the new balance of power and adjust European frontiers and alliances accordingly, in favour of Germany and an agreement with her.

Some political innocent may surely be excused if after having read the foregoing he exclaims that he has not understood a word of what it's all about; that he would like to know what is the balance of power, who established it in the first place, and how any "shifts" in it are measured. Finally, do the people of the world benefit by the "balance of power", and if not what is the point of it.

The Concise Oxford Dictionary aptly gives as a definition of a politician: "One who makes a trade of politics". Clearly there would be no future for politicians in a world free from strife, and it is they who provoke or invent the "crises" which they then set themselves the task of solving, making certain that in doing so they leave a loophole through which a new crisis may emerge. That is not to say that power politics is not a deadly serious matter. Too many lives are sacrificed in the process for it to be treated lightly. But we believe that only when it is fully realised that most strife in the world is artificially created, sometimes for financial interests but generally as part of the power political struggle, or as a skirmish in the ever-changing alignments in the balance of power, but never in the real interests of the people—will politics and politicians be treated with healthy cynicism. Only then will people refuse to kill and be killed for "causes" which are as bogus as the traders in politics who concoct them in the "Chancelleries of Europe"—and America, and the "free" press which distorts and retails them.

DIPLOMACY is a sinister game in which success depends on persuading one's opponent to believe that the truth is a lie and to accept a lie as the truth. Nobody knows whether Eisenhower and Dulles really mean business in the Far East. All the military preparations and Dulles' "brinkmanship" are essential whether America intends to start another Korea or to just simply let things fizzle out as happened in 1955. Similarly the Chinese communists' shelling of the off-shore islands can mean something or nothing. Your guess is as good as ours since we are all in the dark—kept in the dark—as to the reasons for the present flare-up in the Formosa area and what advantages the politicians hope to reap from it. Whatever it may be, it is certain that any adjustments in the balance of power that take place will make not a scrap of difference to the welfare or happiness of the Chinese and American people.

Only a few hundred miserable victims caught by the shell-fire. But what a small price to pay for a glorious game which has kept the "Chancelleries" busy, the political experts chattering away for their suppers, the Press distorting and speculating and fanning the fears of the world's millions who will live to be grateful to their politicians for saving them by their statesmanship from annihilation at the hands of an irresponsible H-bomb-happy enemy! Friends, it's all a lot of bunkum!

Life is Real, Life is Earnest, Says Krushchev — SO THE KIDS GO OUT TO WORK

"The more cultured was a bourgeois State, the more subtly it deceived, asserting that the school can remain outside of politics and thus serve society as a whole. In reality the school was wholly an instrument of class domination in the hands of the bourgeoisie; it was throughout permeated with the spirit of caste; and its aim was to give to the capitalists obliging serfs and competent workers."

—LENIN.
"During the sixth five-year plan period (1956-1960) universal secondary (ten-year) education will be put into effect everywhere, in towns as well as in rural localities."

ONE of the features of the post-sputnik world has been a kind of grudging envy among the technocrats of the West for the achievements of Russia's allegedly planned economy and of her educational system. Unfortunately Krushchev himself, in his report to the Supreme Soviet on "The Further Improvement of Management in Industry and Construction in the U.S.S.R." described so many examples of wasteful duplication in manufacture and distribution and of senseless competition between rival ministries, that the real object of admiration should be the Russians rather than their system, for being ingenious enough to circumvent the strait-jacket of State planning, for keeping the economy moving in spite of the plan.

Krushchev's decentralisation decrees served two purposes: to eliminate some of the absurdities of central planning, and to curb the power of the private empire-builders in the managerial and administrative hierarchy which has been a growing threat to the dominance of the Party.

Now comes another disillusionment for those reluctant fellow-travellers whose concern over the defects of British and American technical education dates from the day when Laika, the Red Rover, became airborne. All those orgies of head-shaking admiration in the American press, all those moralising comparisons in *Life* are out of date. From Berlin to Peking the schools are going to change.

MR. K. GOES TO BERLIN

It began in East Germany. ("Try it on the dog" said Nikita). Last July at the fifth congress of the Socialist Unity Party in East Berlin, Krushchev told the Germans of the "peculiar and important" contribution the German Democratic Republic had to make—nothing short of a completely "socialist" economy by 1965. He was followed by his doormat, Herr Ulbricht, who declared that the time had come to take considerably more trouble in the schools to prepare the children for the part they will be called

upon to play in these far-reaching economic and political developments. They must not only, he implied, be equipped technically for the hard economic haul ahead, but also inoculated against the apathy, cynicism and discontent of so many of their elders.

And so, when the new school year began on September 1st, "polytechnical instruction" appeared on the menu of all East German schools. In the *Kindergarten* according to *The Economist*, "teachers are to be brought more strictly under central direction and the wayward individualists and cranks of the profession eliminated." The 7-10 age group are to have an hour or two's homework weekly in Pioneer clubs or in factory workshops. The 11-13's will have a bit more of it and the 14 and 15-year-olds are to put in one 'production day' a week. The 16-year-olds who are still at school will have a weekly lesson of 'Introduction to the principles of socialist production' and will spend a fortnight during the year on manual work in industry or agriculture. A "Polytechnical Council" has been set up to cope with the objections of teachers and parents who are asking about the effect on the work of the schools, and those of factory managers who fear that the presence of the children will slow down work and waste materials.

Meanwhile the flight to West Germany goes on. The *Manchester Guardian* indeed, interprets the "polytechnical instruction" as a means of overcoming the shortage of labour resulting from the rate at which young skilled workers have left the workers' state:

"It is, of course, grotesque that child labour should now become an instrument for the emancipation of the working class, but it is no more absurd than many other features of the régime. Naturally such intentions are denied by the Communist authorities but their own protests confirm the fact. The Mayor of East Berlin said: 'The tendencies which have occurred in some enterprises of calling for school children to meet their manpower requirements must in future be sternly combatted' . . ."

The Senate's Last Stand

MILITARY myths die hard. To one reared on a diet of Henty, Kipling and Sir Henry Newbolt, the military has a fascination about its traditions that appears to the juvenile in all of us. "The old guard dies but never surrenders" . . . "You may fire when you are ready Gridley" . . . "Don't fire till you see the whites of their eyes" . . . "Up guards and at 'em." . . . "Kismet, Hardy" (or was it "Kiss me Hardy"?).

The Americans, most juvenile of all nations, have the myth of "Remember the Maine", Teddy Roosevelt at San Juan, Barbara Fretchie ("Shoot if you must") and most memorable of all Custer's last stand, where an American frontiersman was massacred with all his company by the Indians rather than surrender.

The American senate fought a noble battle on August 15th last against the idea of America surrendering and won a noble paper victory of 88 votes to 2.

This was a vote not to allow funds to be allocated to the study of military problems of surrender. This last stand was fought to scuttle the idea that Americans (despite Korean prisoners) could ever surrender. Not only the idea, but the study of the idea was put out of mind. Not only the study of the idea but the money to study the idea of defeat was rejected. Not only the money but a vote for the money to study the idea of defeat was defeated. How much further away from defeat can you get?

Any disciple of Mary Baker Eddy, Dr. Coué or Norman Vincent Peale would endorse this valiant piece of positive thinking. "There will be no talk of defeat in this house. The possibilities of defeat do not exist for us." This, if I remember rightly, was Queen Victoria on the Crimean War . . . or was it the Boer War?

One of the treacherous two who voted against the amendment pointed out that the amendment implied that but for the

vigilance of the Senate the U.S. Army would surrender the United States. Hence the idea of defeat had already crept into their minds. However, the 88 patriots were down in the records as being against the possibility of defeat.

Any Freudian in the house could have shown them the error of their thinking, the haste with which they put the idea of defeat out of their minds showed the way it had crept in and filled them with guilty feelings. Any idea conscious of its eventual invincibility has no fear of temporary technical physical defeat. Such was the alarm and despondency with which the idea of the idea of defeat filled them that the White House issued a denial of the basis of all this brouhaha.

The military analyst of the *St. Louis Post Dispatch* had got hold of a story that the Rand Corporation was doing a research study for the Air Force on a similar situation but this did not, said the White House, mean that the interpretation the Senate had put upon it was worth taking seriously. Mr. Haggerty in fact said "The whole matter is too ridiculous for any further comment."

It was found during the Korean War that the possibility of capture was so far from the minds of American soldiers that when they did go to prison camps their morale cracked extensively. That 'surrender' is not in the vocabulary of the American is a ridiculous boast for as Senator Neuberger (from Oregon—one of the dissidents) points out in the *Saturday Review of Literature*, Robert E. Lee surrendered at Appomattox, ending the Civil War, and in the last war General Wainwright surrendered at Corregidor. Whether Americans think differently now is doubtful.

No nation should consider the idea of modern war without considering the idea of defeat. If they are not able to consider the idea of defeat, as obviously the American Senate are not, they had better forget the idea of solving power political problems by military means. J.R.

The changes in schools are reflected at the university level, and all institutes of higher learning will henceforth be completely controlled by the political authorities. "Hitherto," writes the Bonn correspondent of the *New Statesman* (13/9/58):

"Some of the older professors, because of their reputations or technical knowledge, were allowed to wander somewhat from the straight party line. This will no longer be possible. According to the new 'socialist reorganisation', the senate of each institution will be responsible for the education of the students on Marxist-Leninist lines. When doctorates or higher degrees are granted, or when appointments and preferments are made, care must be taken about the candidates' 'social consciousness'. Should any decrees of any educational institution contradict the aim of 'Socialist development' they can be cancelled by the Ministry of Education. All deliberations of any senate must be reported in writing, and a copy sent to the Ministry. University institutions must co-operate with the local SED, Communist trade union and the Communist youth organisation; and delegates from such organisations, as well as others from the nationalised undertakings, are to serve on all senate councils and faculty committees."

THE NEW CHINESE MAN

On Sunday, 21st September, the Central Party Committee and the State Council in China announced that Chinese children too were to combine productive work with school. The great task, it was announced, "is to train tens of millions of Socialist-minded and vocationally proficient intellectuals of the working class. The New Man of Communist society has both political awareness and is capable of manual labour. He is quite different from the old intellectual, divorced from productive labour."

Mr. R. H. S. Crossman, on his return from a visit to China writes:

"I was interested to learn in Peking University that all the first-year students of philosophy were to live for twelve months in a people's commune in order to relate their theory to manual labour."

Discussing this and the fact that "every intellectual, every official, every manager is now obliged to abase himself before the worker by two days a week of manual labour", Mr. Crossman writes:

"The Communists are obviously determined to prevent the mandarins taking over their revolution and recreating a China ruled by the intellectual elite. But, in rectifying the intelligentsia, they are scaring it out of its skin and inducing a terrifying degree of intellectual conformism."

ABOUT TURN IN RUSSIA

Simultaneously with the Peking announcement, Krushchev made his, in the form of a memorandum to the Central Committee of the Party, for 'nation-wide' discussion to be followed by legislative action.

Until now the Soviet school system has (in theory) steadily moved towards the "10-year school" (ages 7-17) for all. It had been intended (again, on paper) to make this universal by 1960. Now Mr. K. proposes to replace it by an 8-year

Continued on p. 4

"No Clear Lead From Lambeth"

Canon John Collins, preaching in St. Paul's Cathedral yesterday, said that the Lambeth Conference had failed to give a lead on the most vital issue to-day—the Church's attitude to nuclear weapons. If ever there was a time when the world required an uncompromising declaration from the churches that the way of Christ alone could save the world from its present torment of fear, it was now.

"But we listen in vain. Instead we hear the call to arm ourselves with H-bombs and other hideously evil weapons of destruction. Many hoped for a clear lead in this matter from the Lambeth Conference. They hoped in vain."

"On the issue of family planning, 50 years too late, the bishops now take a definite line. They have rubber-stamped what has been for many years the practice of the majority of Anglicans—including many of the bishops themselves."

Perhaps in another 50 years' time, if there are any bishops left, they might tell the world that to rely upon H-bombs against real or imagined threats to civilisation was wholly inconsistent with the Christian Gospel. The Christian was not free to use nuclear weapons against communism, any more than he was free to use torture against the heretic.

Manchester Guardian 29/9/58.

Russia's Educational System

Continued
from p. 3

school until 15, when almost all children will go to work in factories or farms. "In his first two or three years at a higher education establishment the student will have tuition only outside factory hours. From the third year he may study 2 or 3 days a week. Only in his last two years will he spend all his time at class".

At present, Krushchev observes, the 10-year schools prepare all youngsters along identical lines for admission to universities and other higher institutions. By preparing all pupils for higher education pressure was thus created among youngsters to apply for and expect admission, while "great influence is brought on teachers by certain parents, anxious to get for their children privileged entry into universities". He declared that one result of this has been that "the secondary school curriculum is divorced from life; these lads and girls have absolutely no knowledge of production. And society does not know how best to utilise these young and vigorous people. Hence a considerable section of youth and parents are dissatisfied with such a state of affairs."

Last year, he said, the universities were unable to accept more than a minority of the ten-year graduates, some 800,000 were turned away, and this process looked like growing with time instead of slowing down. The disappointed ones went to work in factories and farms reluctantly, regarding it as "insulting" and "beneath their dignity". Parents held out before their children the "bogy" that if they did not do well at school they would become "ordinary workers". But, to regard physical work as a "scarecrow", he said, was "an insult to workers in a socialist society".

The most important thing, Mr. K. declared, "is to issue a slogan—and make it sacred for all children entering school—that all children must prepare for useful work, for participation in building Communist society". An exception would be made for children especially gifted in certain fields; there would be special secondary schools in which they would be prepared for higher education. He deplored the fact that there are still few children of workers and peasants in the universities—in Moscow they form only 30 to 40 per cent. of the total. This he described as an "abnormal situation". Admission to the universities under the new policy would be not only on the basis of scholastic attainments but also on the recommendation of such organisations as the trade unions and the Young Communist League.

ANY REASON TO SNEER?

These changes in the educational machinery of the Soviet bloc have not had a good press here. "Educating for brain, not brawn" says one paper. "Triumph of the night-school mentality" says another, while the *Times Educational Supplement* sardonically remarks that Krushchev has discovered the secondary modern school.

It was certainly interesting to learn that (forty-one years after the Bolshevik revolution) only 30 to 40 per cent. of

Russian University students are the children of workers and peasants, and that (after forty years of glorification of the manual worker) parents hold out as a bogy to their children the prospect of becoming "ordinary workers". There is of course no reason why people in this country should gloat in a superior way over Mr. K. in this matter. Here after the 'silent social revolution' 29 per cent. of University places are held by 'public' school pupils who represent a minute proportion of the secondary school population. If Krushchev does his selection at 15-plus, we do ours at 10-plus which is much more questionable. The identical social attitudes which he deplores exist in our society, as daily observation and a dozen studies from *Social Mobility in Britain to Social Class and Educational Opportunity* will illustrate. It is all very well to complain about the harm to higher education of a two-year break for 'productive work', but do the people who moralise about this complain about the two years' 'national service' in this country? The 'triumph of the night-school mentality'—if this is meant as a sneer, exists here too—witness the long enrolment queues at LCC evening institutes and polytechnics a fortnight ago.

The educational ideology of 'productive work' which was not only Marx's conception, but also Kropotkin's and Gandhi's, has a long ancestry in Russia, and the so-called 'polytechnising of education' was one of the earliest of Bolshevik measures. Back in the twenties, A. P. Pinkevitch was emphasising "the tremendous social and political rôle of labour in the school" and declaring that "As long as labour is looked upon as something utilitarian or valuable from the point of view of motor training we shall not have a school which merits the name of socialistic or communistic. Our pupil must feel himself a member of and a worker in a labouring society".

THE PARTY'S MOTIVES

But the question is: Why at this particular stage in the industrial and educational evolution of Soviet society, are its masters again putting the emphasis on these ideas, at the very time when (for the most dubious reasons) even Russia's rivals are paying her education compliments? Under the shadow of the sputnik Senator Fulbright is expressing his surprise that a totalitarian country can offer such a good education to its young, and Marian B. Folsom, the U.S. Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, "had to admit that the Soviet schools had outstripped those of the United States in scientific education".

The answer is perhaps that Krushchev is merely recognising what exists in fact instead of talking about what exists on paper and in the imagination of the fellow-travelling education-mongers outside Russia. Alexander Korol, in his *Soviet Education for Science and Technology*, remarks that although in theory all Soviet children are at school from 7 to 17, hundreds of thousands are drained off for sub-professional education in 'technicums', or (at the age of fourteen) drafted into Labour Schools, "where, among other things, they have mined

2,000,000 tons of coal". He regards these schools as a reserve of cheap juvenile labour under the guise of an educational procedure. Andrew R. MacAndrew, (*The Reporter*, 20/2/58) remarks that:

"While we are constantly being told that the Soviets produce an impressive number of engineers, we are less aware of the constant clamour for specialised and skilled workers. Apparently a great many of the 87.5 per cent. who drop out of the ten-year school system do so even before they have reached the point at which they can be trained for a skilled trade."

The Soviet teachers' paper *Uchitelskaya Gazeta* mentions rural districts where "children have not even attended first-grade classes although long past school age", and in its issue of 17/10/57, under the title 'When Shall We Finally Receive Our Textbooks?' complains of science books being twenty years out of date and of the 'humanities' text books being "constantly snatched away from the schoolchildren to be rewritten".

Perhaps Krushchev has decided that it is going to be simpler to make the theory of education more like the actual practice, than to go on pretending that the actual schools work according to the theory.

But the explanation which most closely fits the tenor of the announcements in Berlin, Moscow and Peking, is that the Party sees its dominance threatened by the growth of an educated non-party intellectual class. A privileged class that identified itself with the party is one thing, a discontented intelligentsia which has other loyalties and which is bored with sanctimonious slogans is another. In the swinging of the Soviet pendulum we are back in one of those phases where the party is tightening, rather than relaxing, its control of education.

And the western stereotype of the Soviet sixth-former will go back from that of the bright young egg-head wallowing in physics and maths., to that of the indoctrinated youth of the *Komsomol* marching forward waving banners, hammers and sickles. Underneath it all the same old Boris and Sasha will be trying to get a bit of fun out of life.

C.W.

CYPRUS

Continued from p. 1

soldier who should know that when he submits himself to military service, being shot-at must be one of the risks of his trade. He is not in the armed forces to think, or to feel indignant because the people in the country which he occupies do not like him. He is in uniform to shoot and to be shot at, and our only message to any soldier who cannot accept the conditions is not to become a stooge of the government.

We think it safe to say that the majority of soldiers in Cyprus at this moment have no objections to the dirty job which has been given to them by their leaders. According to a report from John Osman of the *Daily Telegraph*, these men, nobly carrying out their duty, are really rather misunderstood; they are "sickened by the continuous propaganda against them." He writes that he has heard officers and men frequently saying: "Since we get slammed anyway, we might as well give them something to slam us for." A spirited attitude which could be usefully exploited by any commanding officer!

People who still feel slightly uneasy about troop behaviour in Cyprus will be assured by the words of Brig. Gleadwell who says that the security forces' attitude was summed up by "firmness with courtesy". "Violence," of course, "has inevitably to be treated with due firmness, and the security forces will be fully supported in the execution of their duty".

Duty may be defined in many ways. In a letter to Sir Hugh Foot from Mr. Deteriades, Greek Cypriot Mayor of Kyrenia on the behaviour of British troops in the "execution of their duty", he points out: "It was remarkable that not one of those admittedly ill-treated by the security forces in their pursuit of the murderers was actually arrested."

There are many instances of cruelty against civilians documented and proved which although forbid-

Parish Anarchists?

A Reply to Mr. Day

MR. DAY complains of my negative arguments against world government, but I notice that he makes no attempt to answer them. On the contrary, his own defence mechanism comes into play and he proceeds to rehash some of the old objections to anarchism in terms of the need for a world authority. His letter strays considerably from the theme of my article—nevertheless, I will try to reply to the points he makes.

It is a common fault of critics of anarchism that they often project human behaviour as it is into the hypotheses of a future free society. Mr. Day, for example, conjures up a vision of autonomous units using 'broken bottles and razors' to obtain or defend economic advantages. He also envisages the continuation of such insane practices as the destruction of food during a famine. It is obvious that people who behave in such a fashion would be incapable of living in a libertarian manner and that the society in which they lived would not be the community of free and responsible persons that is anarchism. To achieve the type of human relationships anarchists desire it is necessary, as Jean Grave once put it, "that each individual taken separately be able to govern himself, that he knows how to make his autonomy respected while respecting the autonomy of others." I made it clear in my article that I considered fundamental changes in human attitudes were needed to destroy the roots of war and I believe these changes cannot be brought about except by those who have undergone a 'one-man revolution' in their approach to life. The same applies to the problem of removing other obstacles to freedom.

Mr. Day appears to think that the human being is so constituted that without government aggression and envy would sow their poison between man and man. He therefore concludes that an 'over-riding authority' is needed to 'share out the fruits of the earth'. Governments, however, are composed of human beings (strange as that may appear to be at times!) and if human beings are condemned by their nature to be aggressive and envious then those in power are not exempt from these failings. On the contrary, by virtue of their possessing power they will have a far greater opportunity to give vent to such traits. To hope that a world government would be able to dispose of, or repress, aggression and envy is futile. What would happen, as has happened in all other authoritarian régimes, is that aggression and envy would not disappear, but would be expressed in legally-approved channels. The ultimate answer of government to anti-social acts is repression and the facts of history and the findings of modern psychologists demonstrate that repression provides no permanent cure for delinquent impulses.

Mr. Day asserts that in a free society "there will have to be some centralised control integrating the activities of each parish." It is clear from his letter that his idea of "integration" is really that of subjugation. If a society has centralised bodies determining the activities of its basic units then it is not a free society. It is evident that some method must exist whereby the multifarious tasks needed to maintain human life can be co-ordinated. But to achieve this co-ordination from above is to deny the autonomy of the groupings co-ordinated and the freedom of the individuals who compose them. As I see it, the organs

den by the Chief of Staff happen, as they did in Kenya and other parts of the colonies, because soldiers know that under certain conditions the authorities are reluctant to "punish" them.

Strictly speaking it is the individual soldier who, whether under orders or not, is finally responsible for his actions. When Barbara Castle and her socialist brothers try to wriggle out of this difficult situation by placing the entire blame on the shoulders of a Tory administration they are only being rather more dishonest than usual.

In return for joining the soldiers' Fan Club they may be gratefully rewarded with a few more votes. But they will also earn the disrespect of many Cypriots who naively supposed that socialism stood for freedom, internationalism and equality. If there are any rank and file socialists in this country who still cling to their battered faith in the Labour Party, maybe they will now have seen the light. But alas, we doubt it.

of co-ordination in an anarchist society would have no power of coercion—their rôle would be one of liaison, the transmission of information (statistics, wants, etc.) and the maintenance of communication. Even to-day firms transfer goods, supply services and exchange information between one another without the interference of an external authority. If this can take place under the distortions of the profit motive, then there is no reason to suppose that it could not be carried out—in a purified form—within the free agreements of anarchism.

Not being an adherent of the Hegelian dialectic, with its permutation of opposites into a synthesis, I cannot understand how it is possible to realise anarchist ends by the means of world government. It seems to me that one could just as logically argue that the way to remain alive is to commit suicide. Government is that man, or body of men, possessing the power to make laws and to enforce them; it is the political expression of the principle of authority. Anarchy, on the other hand, is a mode of living from which authority has been eliminated and affairs are arranged by the voluntary co-operation of sovereign individuals. To attempt to reconcile these two diametrically opposed conceptions of life is to attempt to reconcile the irreconcilable.

S. E. PARKER.

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

Owing to the expiry of lease at the Malatesta Club no L.A.G. meetings will be held till further notice. New premises are being sought for the winter series of Lecture-Discussions.

MALATESTA CLUB

32 PERCY STREET, TOTTENHAM COURT RD., LONDON, W.1.

We are sorry to announce that the Malatesta Club has been unable to secure a renewal of lease on its present premises, and cannot see any likelihood of obtaining other suitable premises in the near future. The Club will therefore discontinue all its activities, and cease to exist or function as a club or a group with effect from October 11, 1958, the date of expiry of the lease.

Catering equipment and furniture is being stored in various places, so that it will be available to any anarchist group which may start a similar club in future. It is hoped that all debts will be paid by October 11, but there are unlikely to be any funds left.

ACTIVITIES

Wednesday, October 8 at 8 p.m.

Farewell Meeting of the BONAR THOMPSON SPEAKS committee, with many attractions including the personal appearance of Bonar Thompson.

Every Wednesday until October 8
Bonar Thompson speaks.

CROYDON AREA

Will all comrades and sympathisers interested in libertarian activity in the Croydon area please communicate with:

S. E. PARKER,
228, Holmesdale Road, London, S.E.25

COMMUNAL LIVING SCHEME

Will those people, whether anarchists or not, who would like to contribute to social evolution and to their own enjoyment of life by trying out some form or other of community living please contact: J. D. COOPER, 54 Hillfield Road, N.W.6?

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

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*
Vol. 7, 1957, *Year One—Sputnik Era*
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.

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

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

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.

RUDOLF ROCKER:
Nationalism and Culture cloth 21s.

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

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.
Who will do the Dirty Work? 2d.

★
Marie-Louise Berneri Memorial Committee publications:

Marie-Louise Berneri, 1918-1949: A Tribute cloth 5s.

Neither East nor West: Journey Through Utopia cloth 18s. (U.S.A. \$3)

27, Red Lion Street,
London, W.C.1.