

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"If the word law has ever meant one thing more than another, that thing has been the will of those in power."

—JOSIAH WARREN.

They're all Anti-Colonialists Now

MAC SEES THE RED LIGHT

MR. MACMILLAN'S tour of the African territories though, on the surface, it may appear to be another of those spectacular "good-will missions" à la Eisenhower is in fact a much more serious affair. We are witnessing the emergence of Black Africa and Mr. Macmillan in facing the *fait accompli* is nevertheless anxious to establish a foothold for Britain in the new economic set-up. In his address to the Nigerian Senate and House of Representatives he quoted from Lord Lugard who said that "Britain's business in Africa was to promote the moral and material welfare of the African people and to develop the natural resources of Africa not only for its peoples but for all mankind", and suggested that Britain had "tried to build on these principles". "We have worked well and honourably together—he concluded—and I am confident that in your new era of independence Nigeria and Great Britain will continue to work together for the common good", and the common good" is obviously a reference to the establishment of economic agreements between the two countries. Africa as an expanding market is as interesting a proposition to British industrialists as it has been so far as a source of cheap raw materials.

The white settlers far from being the vanguard of such a development are the main obstacle to it. Their privileged situation depends on Africa remaining a backward, undeveloped continent; hence the suspicion and hostility with which they view every move by Whitehall no less than by the people of Africa

themselves.

★
MR. MACMILLAN'S statement at his press conference in Lagos last week that "there was no question of forcing Nyasaland to remain in a fully independent Central African Federation" and that "when the time came it would be the people of Nyasaland themselves who would decide whether or not they wanted to stay in the Federation" was not only a recognition of the determination of African nationalism in all its manifestations, but a clear warning to the Walenskys, Whiteheads and the "colons" of S. Rhodesia and Kenya that their days as the master-race in Africa are numbered. The conference on Kenya's Constitution which is just starting as we write these lines, may well seal the fate of Kenya's 30,000 white settlers. For some time, in spite of the apparent success of anti-Mau Mau military operations, many of them have been trying to sell-up and get out, and according to a *Guardian* report from Nairobi

During the past three months or so there has been a disturbing decline of confidence among European farmers. There has been much talk of compensation and two or three schemes were submitted to the Secretary of State during his recent visit to Kenya. He at once and emphatically stated that any question of compensation was beyond the pale of practicable politics. On scores of farms capital development has ceased or been radically curtailed and too many of the younger generation of settlers, with young families for whom they see no tolerable future, would sell out if they could and leave the Colony.

In view of the government's present "enlightened" policy, we will be

excused if we appear smug and say "we told you so", by quoting what we wrote in *FREEDOM* more than five years ago when the repression in Kenya was in full swing—10,000 Kikuyu had been killed and over 800 hanged in the course of the military operations:

The roads to peace in Kenya are three: (1) equal rights for all who live and work in the country, black and white (2) the removal of all white settlers (3) the systematic extermination of militant Africans until there is peace by fear and exhaustion.

The new Colonial Secretary's visit to Kenya last week indicates that the third is the Government's present course, and the draconian measures he has announced, ostensibly to protect the "loyal" Kikuyu are in fact a recognition of the

Continued on p. 3

A 'Box on the Ears' for Swastika-Daubers Adenauer for Direct Action?

WE were very surprised—and sure that all good citizens were highly shocked—when Dr. Adenauer advised Germans to 'give a good thrashing' to anyone they caught swastika-daubing. Such a proposal, opening the door to the people taking the law into their own hands, is really not what we expect from a head of a Government.

Not that we altogether disagree with him. The anger of individuals is, in our opinion, usually healthier than the cold-blooded retribution of the law. But Dr. Adenauer, we feel, had different motives from our own in giving his advice. He wanted quick action, before the thing spread, and also no doubt wanted to demonstrate to the world that there are 'good' Germans as well as the teen-age idiots who scrawl the crooked cross on synagogues.

However, in spite of the criticism his words provoked, he is more or less sticking to his guns. A Reuter report from Essen (Jan. 18) said:

ESSEN, JANUARY 18.

Dr. Adenauer to-day recommended a "box on the ears" for swastika-daubers.

The Chancellor told a Christian Democratic party meeting here that he had been criticised for his earlier advice to Germans to give anti-Jewish hooligans a "good thrashing", and it had been said that he did not respect the law. He went on:

"Naturally I respect the law. But one must not be timid. I believe that if in Cologne they had got a good box on the ears, or had immediately been brought before a quickly summoned court and sentenced instead of being still held under arrest, then the silent march of 20,000 people in London to the German Embassy would not have taken place"

We wonder if he is in favour of direct action in other matters also?

WELCOME MAKARIOS!

IT seems far away in the past when we wrote in *FREEDOM*, at a time when violence in Cyprus claimed the headlines and we were assured that 'the public' wanted the head of Archbishop Makarios served up to it, that eventually Makarios would be brought to heel and not to trial.

The course of discussion at the five-party conference in London last week-end on the future of Cyprus and the nature of reporting may suggest that Makarios is truculent and uncompromising, but a look at the final agreements disclose that *Britain has got what she wanted all along, namely, military bases in Cyprus.*

It is reported that after 48 hours of 'give-and-take' at the London conference a compromise was taking shape:—

"Archbishop Makarios accepts defeat in his struggle to whittle down the size of the bases which Britain will keep after the island gets independence on February 9.

But he gains concessions which leave only the military control inside these sovereign areas in British hands and give him wide civil authority.

He also expects a guarantee that Britain will not lease the bases to any other Power, such as the U.S.—and that the sovereign areas will revert to Cyprus when their military

usefulness ends."

Many a lonely widow (Turkish, Cypriot and British), soldier and civilian fighter must be pondering over the nature of politics this weekend as they follow this conference of Greeks, Cypriots, Turks and Britons settling issues by discussion over which thousands lost their lives, now forgotten and buried under the soil over which their leaders fought for many harsh years.

True Britain has had to concede greater civilian power to Makarios than she originally intended, but since they are now in collaboration it does not really matter who is in charge of the population since Cyprus is, as Britain intended, a military base and Makarios will be expected to keep the people 'in order'.

Why did this conference of Turks, Cypriots and Britons not take place years ago? For the usual reasons, too many conflicting interests, too many groups seeking power; the 'show of strength' technique which often ends up with the two sides coming to terms after thousands have died.

Is this an inevitable part of the relationship between countries, from war to peace and peace to war? It is as long as political and economic power dominates society and motivates behaviour.



Hospitals from the Inside

BRITISH hospitals are in the forefront of the news just now. Both press and transmitter are busily presenting facts, figures and opinions on the conditions prevailing in this essential service. Opinions differ and, as the writer seeks to demonstrate, the facts are incomplete. A remarkable difference of opinion exists, for example, between the M.O.H. Recruitment Service, who advertise that Nursing offers good pay, good prospects and good conditions, and Dr. Horace Joules, a chest specialist, who claims that hospital standards are impossible to maintain owing to the type of staff who had to be engaged because of "pathetic" wages. Similarly, we find the Minister of Health, at the end of a television hospitals feature, smilingly whitewashing all the shocking criticisms of the doctors and the revealing evidence of the camera.

As a basis from which we may sort out what is going wrong in a public service that has been justifiably described as among the worst in Europe, let us set in juxtaposition the salaries earned by the various members of the "medical teams" (a euphemism, as we shall shortly see) in the profession.

Since the general pay rise last March, when salary increases ranging from £12 p.a. for student nurses to £237 for certain matrons, came into effect, an ordinary common-or-bed-pan nurse received £550 p.a. This amount represents their lot; if nurses "live in" almost one-third of it

is paid back to the hospital for board and lodging. Male and female get virtually the same salary. Higher up—or further removed from the bed-pan—we have the Staff Nurses at £625 p.a., Charge Nurses (Sisters) at £800 p.a. and Nurse Tutors at £1,015 p.a. The maximum salary has been given in all cases: a Nurse Tutor, for instance, commences at £805 p.a. This does not represent the complete scale of pay for hospital workers. At rock bottom we find £6—£9 per week floor scrubbers, porters, etc., and on the highest plane we have £3,385 p.a. (£5,585 for maximum distinction award) consultants, £2,211 p.a. senior doctors, £1,601 p.a. registrars and £1,229 p.a. junior doctors. House physicians can get £825 p.a. but commence at a mere £486, about the same as a porter.

Thus we see that the acquisitive principle of our society has entered the wards and, inevitably, has seen to it that hospital buildings are as ancient as aspirin factories are modern. Now we shall see the effects of all this as we examine hospital conditions. We must never be afraid to show the worst because it is man's foolishness, not an innate lack of sympathy, that lowers his standard. Alas we know the foolishness of man: in war he murders babes for the sake of peace!

What are things really like in our hospitals? Was Dr. Joules going too far? First let us examine conditions in geriatric units where some of the worst

conditions prevail, perhaps due to the fact that nursing old people is less attractive than general nursing. No cures are expected in this side of the hospital and incontinency is the rule rather than the exception. Life in one of these wards, for an assistant nurse, is one long round of excreta, urine and mucus. Not everybody has the constitution to withstand this type of work—anyone who has sorted out old people's soiled underwear and handkerchiefs for the weekly wash will bear this out.

Often these units are to be found situated in awful old buildings—an old "workhouse" for instance—which are so inconvenient that nothing much can be done for the comfort of patient and nurse short of demolition.

These things seem to have been recognised in some official quarters. At the recent conference of Health Service employees an amendment was remitted to the Executive seeking a special allowance for geriatric nurses. One supporter of the amendment said the strain on nurses caring for the aged sick was greater than ever as more and more people lodged their parents or relatives in geriatric wards: he said "We are depending on older nurses who have not even the satisfaction of seeing their patients get well again. There is, for the majority of patients only one way out . . .". It is no simple task carrying

Continued on p. 2

Hospitals from the Inside

Continued from p. 1

them out of some of these institutions either—old workhouses are noted for their steep stone flights of steps.

The new £160,000 Downs Hospital in Sutton was unable to admit any of the 170 old people on its waiting list due to staff shortage. Four weeks after opening this luxurious 136-bed hospital had engaged only 8 staff out of the necessary 70.

The *Manchester Guardian*, as it then was, carried a series of articles on hospitals a few months ago. Nesta Roberts, the author, after reminding us that only one complete new hospital had been erected since the war, went on to paint a pretty grim picture: old, decrepit buildings, patched up time and again to no great purpose but huge expense; a temporary out-patients' department that was still in use after twelve years; lack of proper sterilising facilities; shockingly low lavatory/bed and bath/bed ratios; dark, draughty "institutional" conditions; primitive latrines; neglect of essential practice due to pressure of work, etc. . . . She also described a geriatric unit in the Home Counties, a 19th century three-storey building having such awful material conditions that student nurses may not work there. If, as the reporter said, this hospital enjoyed a happy staff-patient relationship it is to be marvelled at. Another *Manchester Guardian* writer, giving his experiences as a nurse in units which covered chronic and incurable cases, spoke of it as a "thankless task", a "delaying action against death". This is inevitable but he could also tell us about "the routine that tends to put a clean ward before the comfort of the patient", sly cigarettes in the bathroom and "furtive cups of tea in the kitchen".

The tendency for articles in the dailies is for restraint. "Letters to the Editor" columns are more useful for lifting the carpet. Thus a hospital porter, in a letter to the *Guardian* noted cases of "apparently wilful neglect" of elementary hygiene which will amaze most of us: a food bucket, crawling with maggots, which had stood in the kitchen of a polio ward for a week; a lorry used alternately for carrying urine-soaked sheets and food. Another nurse spoke of discipline as "like an extension of a girl's schooldays", of "petty tyrants" and

a serious "problem of human relations". A correspondent to *The Times* ended a long letter of protest at conditions in a L.C.C. Old People's Home with these words: "What is wanted is less petty discipline meted out under the guise of 'welfare' and more genuine loving kindness and imagination".

It is left to individual letter writers to expose the greatest deficiency in our hospitals. Editors, apparently, do not mind revealing the sorry material standards but jib at exposing the "problem of human relations". Perhaps they realise that this problem cannot be solved within the framework of our acquisitive society. Popular critics are certainly, on the face of it, untouched by the huge discrepancies in the salaries of nurses and senior staff. To give £12 rise to one category and £237 to another already earning ten times as much doesn't seem to raise any eyebrows in the editorial offices. They show concern at £1,000 p.a. industrial executives standing to lose a quarter of their salaries if they change to hospital work and seem to remain ignorant of the fact that the average manual worker has to keep his family on half that sum.

The "problem of human relations" in our hospitals is serious. Its foundation in the pay stratification and authoritarian discipline has produced the inevitable consequences. At a certain geriatric unit in this country, resembling structurally the unit described by Nesta Roberts of the *Manchester Guardian*, it is the relations between the staff and its consequent effects upon the patients that should cause the most concern. The fault does not lie solely with the matron or the nurses or the lavatory cleaners—or, indeed, with hospital personnel at all: every person of adult standing in the country who refuses to question the acquisitive structure of our society stands condemned.

Staff shortage is the first difficulty. For the lower paid work the hospital

authorities rely almost completely upon immigrant labour: Italian, Portuguese, German, Polish and Irish assistant nurses and "domestics" (cleaners) and West Indian porters are the rule. Almost certainly, the foreign immigrants leave the service just as soon as they complete the two years necessary for their continued stay in Britain. Some of them stay because of the accommodation. Most of these members of the hospital "team" are there under sufferance—which may be hard on patients. Many small difficulties arise. It is not easy to communicate orders or hear complaints; nationalist feelings arise; misunderstandings complicate affairs.

When a new nurse joins this hospital there are shocks in store. First, the attitude of the domestics seems unbearable. These workers have a fixed routine, including breaks for meals, which, because of its essential nature, and due to staff shortage and lack of co-operation, interferes with the equally essential but more pliable work of the nurse. It doesn't matter if a nurse is putting old Harry's pants on in an effort to have him ready for breakfast or if he is cleaning old Joe's back parts, everything has to be dropped—even the pot—in order to serve up the food for the domestics to fling on the tables. This is done at breakneck speed, the crockery is whisked from under the old men's noses almost before they have finished eating and you hover around them like impatient vultures urging them to finish their cups of over-stewed purple-looking tea. Then you get them to hell out of it so that the wash-up can be done before the domestics' break time comes round. The routine must be served! No time for "genuine loving kindness and imagination". The food was good but the old men had precious little time to enjoy it.

It wasn't the fault of the domestics, who had taken the job in order to enter this prosperous country. Domestics clean everything from saucepans to lavatory pans for precious little reward. They

can't take the odd hour off like the matron or sister to do some personal errand ("Keep an eye on things, nurse, I shan't be long"); they must go shopping, or to confession in their own time. Their conditions of work are like the factory hand—on the clock. They must be there on time so they go on time; there is a strong ban on overtime. They probably come from conditions abroad which are worse than those for patients in their hospital. Red tape surrounds them. Blame them? No.

The night nurse's job was not a nice one to put it mildly. Responsible for both men and women patients, she had to do a round of three blocks involving five flights of frightening stone steps and an open courtyard every "now and then" through the night—a most eerie experience in a hospital where prowlers have been reported.

Rules and regulations combined with inefficiency did not permit of a pleasant cup of tea for nursing staff. Of the limited alterations, the most satisfactory process was to brew up quietly and drink it secretly in the bathroom to the smell of dirty underwear. Of course in times of emergency rules would go overboard and common sense would reign—tea in the kitchen with the quiet assent of the matron. This relaxation of petty discipline is a common feature of emergencies: it happened in the Forces during the war.

Teamwork was not a speciality in this unit. A matron's work, it seems, is more to do with paper and files and phone calls than with patients. She is a victim of the bureaucrats, interviewing applicants, doing inventories, accounting for the patients' cash, permutating the nurses' time sheets, etc. Perhaps, too, she keeps out of the way as much as possible from a knowledge that nothing much can be done about the unsatisfactory state of affairs except lose half her staff and submit to umpteen more interviews for replacements.

Sometimes you get a sister who will work with the nurses but sometimes one who knows the routine but scares easily

at practical demonstration of such knowledge. If there are two sisters there is likely to be some bumping on the bend for seniority. The set-up is almost military in some ways and the petty tyrant is not absent.

A general meeting between all members of the staff, matron, sisters, nurses, domestics, porters, doctors, secretary, laundresses and, of course, patients, could have cleared up a lot of things, but perhaps the questions such a meeting might raise would be too profound for the shallow minds of administrators. There is some concession to this idea, for instance in Birmingham where they group all grades of staff—medical, nursing and ancillary, but it is to be doubted if a porter or a patient ever gets in. Nor can we be sure that Lord Astor entertained such an idea when, in the House of Lords, he claimed that there "should be far greater confidence and mutual knowledge than exists at present in what each side is trying to do." The value of co-operation at all levels is not generally acclaimed or recognised.

The real cause of our "National scandal" (Lord Stotham—House of Lords debate) is not being tackled. It will never be tackled by representatives of our "You've Never Had it so Good" society. Popular reforms take the form of bigger hospitals, higher pay for the higher paid staff, faster training schemes and more efficient use of available nurse-power (yes, the "work-study" merchants have got in the wards!), but—the biggest nursing job we are faced with is nursing our society back to health—almost a surgical operation. Some of the low paid hospital staff, especially those with large families to support, may well be in need of a pay increase but is the general call for increases justified? Is it so serious that a certain ward sister named Helen cannot afford to run a car on £800 p.a. (*Guardian* Oct. 28th)? Can doctors really find time to spend £3,000 p.a. enjoyably? If so many girls can nurse the sick as unpaid Nuns, is it impossible for a matron to live on £550 p.a.? There would be no point in doubling hospital salaries to compete with the industrial firms anyway: the aspirin factory would raise its stakes to win the nurses back. Greed and competition is responsible for many of the cases in old people's wards. Lots of these old people would be home with their children in different circumstances.

We had better do something about it before we all end up in hospital.

TEMPORARY MALE ATTENDANT.

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

OPEN DAILY

(Open 10 a.m.—6.30 p.m., 5 p.m. Sat.)

New Books . . .

Fiction of a Generation
Whit & Halie Burnett 18/-
Russia Robert Conquest 6/-
Fragrance of Hyacinths
Ethel Mannin 7/6
The Status Seekers
Vance Packard 21/-
India K. M. Pannikar 6/-
Africa Anthony Sampson 6/-
China Guy Wint 6/-
Rosa Luxemburg Tony Cliff 4/-
Memoirs, Vol. 3. J. Cananova 30/-
The Heptameron
Marguerite of Navarre 25/-
The Satyricon G. Petronius 21/-

Reprints and

Cheap Editions . . .

A Pocketful of Ribaldry
(ed.) Alec Brown 3/6
The Art of Love Ovid 3/6
Earth Emile Zola 3/6
Leaves of Grass Walt Whitman 4/-
Second-Hand . . .
Gael Delivery Mark Benney 3/-
My Eighty Years
Robert Blatchford 8/-
Recollections of the Assize Court
André Gide 4/6
The Wonderful Century (1899)
Alfred Russell Wallace 4/-
A Marriage Manual
Hannah & Abraham Stone 5/-
The Historical Christ
F. C. Conybeare 4/-
The Embezzlers Valentine Kataev 5/6
Michael, Brother of Jerry
Jack London 4/-
Cast a Cold Eye
Mary McCarthy 4/-
Rockets Galore
Compton Mackenzie 2/6

Periodicals . . .

World Labour News (I.W.M.A.)
Jan./Feb. 4d.
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

Revisionist Anarchism—A Comment

"The citizens of Chicago had to put up with Capone and Diamond fighting up and down their streets. One of these two gentlemen robbed you by blackmail, and the other shot you dead. Now they want us to take sides and to say whether we would rather be swindled by Diamond or shot by Capone."

from "The Power House,"
by ALEX COMFORT.

"The question is not whether we achieve anarchism today, tomorrow or in ten centuries, but that we walk towards anarchism today, tomorrow and always."

MALATESTA.

IN our time, and after all we have gone through, it is strange that Nicolas Walter should urge anarchists to try "to make the best of" Parliament. I can understand that, to someone living in the days of the 'divine right' of kings, the establishment of a parliamentary government might spell freedom, or at least appear to be a significant step towards it. Today, however, we can see that it spells nothing of the sort and that it serves to delude people with the fiction of 'political liberty' while denying them any genuine freedom. How anyone who calls himself an anarchist, and has experienced living under such a government, can believe that it has any connection with the anarchist conception of freedom, is beyond me.

Let us admit that we would rather live in Britain than in Russia. Let us admit that we prefer to be able to state our views publicly (as long as we don't go too far) rather than have to distribute clandestine leaflets or to remain silent. Let us admit these things. But where does it get us? It still remains a fact that even under "the best form of government" the one freedom without which all others are emptied of substance—the right to determine our own lives, to exercise our individual sovereignty—is forbidden us and will ever be so long as we have to submit to a government. And it also

remains a fact that putting a cross on a ballot paper has precious little to do with the basic realities of life, in that the existence of parliamentary government in Italy no more fills the bellies of the poor in Sicily than the existence of Franco fills the bellies of the poor in Andalusia. To toy with the tinsel of the "progressive vote" versus the "reactionary vote" may be entertaining, but we have more fundamental work to do.

There are, however, other considerations.

One lesson that we should have learnt from the last hundred years of anarchist activity is that the means we use must be in keeping with the ends we desire. We can only achieve libertarian ends by using libertarian means, since means determine ends.

Now, we wish people to emancipate themselves from authority and we see that this can only be brought about if they act on their own initiative, if they are prepared to take responsibility for their own lives. To look to a government to obtain freedom for them would mean that their initiative would be stifled and their individual responsibility taken from them. It follows that the one means appropriate to the end we desire is that of direct action, of self-emancipation. Any other means may be suitable for achieving other ends, but these will not be anarchist ends—they will be ends which in one way or another still retain the sanction of an authority and suffer from the evils which such a sanction produces. In other words, we believe that freedom can only be realized by acting freely and that to depend on a government—whether monarchic, oligarchic or democratic—to do things for us is to go in the opposite direction to the one we want to go.

Again, by the very nature of our beliefs, we cannot compel people to accept our views on life. To give our support to a political group, no matter how 'progressive' it might seem, would in effect be a claim to

govern others, since politicians are concerned to get power in order to carry out their policies and thus compel other people to accept their views. We may well feel sympathetic towards certain aspects of such a group's programme (e.g. opposition to imperialism or nuclear weapons), but their means would not be our means and we have all of history behind us to show that even the best of programmes championed by the most sincere of men will be poisoned if it is sought to implement it by the exercise of authority. Surely it is not again necessary to dis-inter the melancholy list of those who have tried to reconcile anarchism with power and instead of being the reformers have become the 'reformed'?

I do not believe that the view I have put forward means that anarchists should adopt the attitude of the S.P.G.B. and remain outside day-to-day struggles against injustice. I believe with Luigi Galleani that we should try to be in the forefront of these struggles in order that we may bequeath to those who will come after us an environment as free as possible from domination and exploitation. And, indeed, anarchists in the past have made their contribution to the fight against such evils as fascism and conscription. But in fighting these things we should not renounce our identity and should fight in our own way and according to our own principles. This need not prevent us from co-operating with other radical groups on specific issues, so long as we do not have to use means contrary to our ends.

For example, I think we can play a part in helping to create an effective opposition to nuclear weapons by supporting acts of civil disobedience, and by making explicit and implicit struggle against the principle of authority that is already present in the demonstrations against rocket bases. But we can only make our own, anarchist, contribution if we make it quite clear that we consider that the abolition of nuclear weapons in itself can at best be only

Whers are those New Readers for FREEDOM ?

a symptomatic relief, a check to the genocidal schemes of delinquents in office, and that only fundamental changes in human relationships can provide any permanent solution to the threat and practice of war. And this, in turn, depends upon our ability to show the relevance of *libertarian methods* of struggle to contemporary problems. We cannot do this, however, by 'revising' ourselves into yet one more 'pressure group' of 'progressives'. To "go right on saying exactly what we think" and yet to accept the terms of reference of the power struggle, as Nicolas Walter's article implies we should, would place us in a contradictory and nonsensical position.

As I see it, then, nothing has happened which should make us 'revise' our basic attitude towards government. Our task remains that of opposing power and affirming freedom. I agree that we need to take "a long cool look" at those survivals of the optimistic revolutionism of the 19th century that remain in our thinking, but it does not follow from this that we should fall into the illusions of the type of 'revisionism' Nicolas Walter preaches. That, too, is an inheritance from the past. What we need to do is to prepare ourselves for a struggle without illusions, whether these illusions concern our inevitable victory, or the compatibility of our attitude with that of power-thinkers and power-wielders.

S. E. PARKER.

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

Vol. 21, No. 4. January 23, 1960

Mac Sees the Red Light

Continued from p. 1

settlers' overriding "rights". He declared that the "unredeemable" Mau Mau leaders would never be allowed to return to areas where loyal Kikuyu lived.

Such is the way the Government seeks peace in Kenya. Such is the way Stalin, Mussolini and Hitler brought "peace" and "unity" to their countries. But ultimately such is also the road to disaster.*

★

WHY was independence for Kenya unthinkable less than ten years ago and is now almost a certainty? Why was independence for Nyasaland impossible and economically disastrous for the Nyasas a year ago and now in the words of Mr. Macmillan is a matter which the Nyasas must decide for themselves? What has changed? What facilities have the people been given to learn how to "govern" themselves in the interim period? On the contrary their organisations have been proscribed, their leaders detained or banished, and their countries have been ruled by dictatorial Emergency Regulations. Nothing has changed so far as the "fitness" of the Africans to rule is concerned. Only the British government's policy has changed. They have seen the red light in Kenya and Nyasaland in spite of their apparent military successes. And on balance they see more economic advantages in recognising the hard facts of militant African nationalism than in seeking to stifle it in the interests of a few thousand white settlers.

★

FOR years the government has been rounding-up Africans, detaining them, screening and "rehabilitating" them. In view of its new approach, the government may well adopt the suggestion we made in FREEDOM in 1955:

The Commander-in-Chief should start by rounding up all the white population. They should be screened and classified as whites, greys, and blacks†. Those who were of the opinion that Kenya was a white man's country should be classified as whites, and ordered to pack their belongings and all available air transport should be put at their disposal to fly into "exile", giving them a choice between a smallholding in the Isle of Wight or a boarding house in Torquay. They might be offered a pension as well. Those who were whites but who declared themselves prepared to undertake a course in citizenship should be placed in the grey category. Finally those who were willing to remain in Kenya as citizens with the same rights as the Africans; who were prepared to work and not employ slave labour (which would also mean agreement to break up the large estates) would be the blacks and they would be released at once.

It sounded fantastic at the time. But is it so fantastic now?

★

AND one final reminder. When the government at some future date takes the credit for the independence of Kenya and Nyasaland, remember those 10,000 Kikuyu who were killed by British bullets; those 800 who were hanged; those tens of thousands who spent years in detention camps. Remember Hola and Kenyatta. Remember Banda and the Nyasa demonstrators shot down in cold blood by Sir Robert Armitage's security forces. Refresh your memory with that devastating document, the Devlin Report!

*FREEDOM, Oct. 16, 1954, reprinted in *Freedom Selections*, Vol. 4, pp. 205-6.

†Which was the classification used for the Kikuyu's rounded up at the time.

People and Ideas

Where History Ends & Legend Begins

As we went to press with our issue of Jan. 9th, we inserted two press despatches from Gerona published in the London morning and evening papers on Jan. 5th, reporting first the wounding and then the death of the Spanish anarchist guerrilla fighter Francisco Sabater. The incident was very widely reported in the press and radio throughout Europe, and on Jan. 6th the secretary of the C.N.T. Regional Commission in Paris issued the following statement:

"Following the publication of tendentious reports on the subject of our lamented comrade Francisco Sabater Llopert, we wish to announce that he was in fact an anarcho-syndicalist militant, and never a 'bandit' as certain press agencies and radio stations have let it be understood. Francisco Sabater was a gladiator of freedom. He fell, a victim of totalitarianism for the freedom of Spain."

★

THE story of Francisco Sabater, as we piece it together from the conflicting reports in the European press, has a character more like that of the desperate heroes of literature than of daily life in Western Europe. Revolutionary guerrilla fighters are always described as bandits by their enemies and as militants by their supporters. It was so with Makhno in the Ukraine, and with Zapata in Mexico. In some respects the career of Sabater fits the legendary pattern of the "social bandit", who "took from the rich to give to the poor and never killed but in self-defence or just revenge". The phrase might be used of Robin Hood in England, Janosik in Poland and Slovakia, Diego Corrientes in Andalusia, or of a host of Italian and Sicilian bandits. (It is actually quoted by Mr. Eric Hobsbawm from Ivan Olbracht's *The Robber Nikola Shuhaj*), for it epitomises the universal story of the intrepid rebel against the State who is the darling of the poor "who consequently protect the bandit, regard him as their champion, idealise him, and turn him into a myth." Or as Bakunin put it a century ago: "The bandit is always the hero, the defender, the avenger of the people, the irreconcilable enemy of every State, social or civil régime, the fighter in life and death against the civilisation of State, aristocracy, bureaucracy and clergy."

To those familiar with the history of Spanish anarchism this story will not come as a surprise. The long years before the revolution of 1936, when the C.N.T. (the anarcho-syndicalist trade union) and the F.A.I. (the anarchist federation) were banned or semi-legal organisations carrying on an underground struggle, or the early careers of Civil War heroes like Durruti and Ascaso, in an atmosphere of oppression, were a forcing-house for the kind of activity which the State regards as banditry, but which in the eyes of the oppressed, stood for the assertion of human dignity and the rights of the dispossessed.

Francisco Sabater Llopert was born in Barcelona 45 years ago, a plumber by trade, and the son of a municipal guard. He was 21 when the Civil War began in

1936 and took up arms with his two brothers. After the victory of the fascists in 1939 he took refuge, with thousands of others in France, where he was interned. A year later he went to Toulouse where he rejoined the C.N.T. "For men who were isolated and without means," writes a sympathetic account in *France-Soir* (8/1/60) "as were the remnants of the Spanish republican army, vengeance could only take one form, that of terrorism. Thus 'El Chico' began his life as a desperado. It was to last for twenty years."

"Formed into a sort of school of underground activities... Francisco soon became one of the toughest of saboteurs who, on moonless nights, crossed over the Pyrenees to make assaults on trains and on the police. In a short while El Chico became the Franco régime's Enemy Number One, since every time some anarchist action occurred in Spain, his hand could be detected in it. We are told that forty policemen fell at his hands. A price was put on his head, and his enemies tried to kill him, even on French soil, but he escaped their clutches.

"In France his revolutionary ideal made Francisco Sabater an enemy of the law. The Spanish anarchists, in order to fight, needed money. Where was it to come from? In spite of the orders of the C.N.T. which forbade the use of violence, Sabater attacked the safe of a chemical factory at Lyons. Near La Presie a whole arsenal which he had built up was discovered. The Court at Montpellier sentenced him to six months imprisonment for the retention of war materials and forbade him to reside in districts which had a large Spanish population. It was for this reason that he moved to Dijon where he found work as a boiler fitter. After a hold-up in 1951 at Lyon in which two policemen and a passer-by were killed, Sabater was suspected and hunted by the police. But he surrendered to the detectives and gave an alibi which was proved, and it was decided that there were no grounds for prosecuting him."

Sabater returned to Dijon in 1958 and went back to his former employer. After some time he was twice admitted to hospital with a stomach ulcer. To his employer and the various other people he knew at Dijon he never disclosed his activities. He confined himself to anti-

Franco sentiments and sometimes declared "I don't want my wife and children to come here. I prefer them to stay at Toulouse. They could never adapt themselves to the manner of life which I have to lead."

★

IT appears from the press reports that Sabater had secretly entered Spain on the night of Christmas with four companions; their reason, it is said, was to avenge the deaths of his two brothers, one of whom was shot by the police in the *Calle Trafalgar* in Barcelona in 1950 and the other executed in the same year for having taken up arms in the Catalan *maquis*. The group were encircled by the Civil Guards at a farm near Banolas on the night of Jan. 4th. The commander of the government forces and four of Sabater's companions were killed and another guard and Sabater himself were wounded. Sabater escaped and walked to Fornells, where he jumped onto a train and ordered the driver to go straight to Barcelona. The railwayman's lunch was his first meal for four days. The driver persuaded him that it would be madness not to make the regular stops, and at one of these, Massanet, he changed trains. At the following station, Caneloni (San Celonix?), he left the train and evaded the security forces who were waiting for him. But (*France-Soir* report from Perpignan 6/1/60) "Trapped in a street, Sabater had his back to the wall. He shot first, seriously wounding a sergeant of the Civil Guard and a corporal of the Somatens (Catalan reserve police). A door was open. He went to find shelter there, when a civil guard fired and killed him." According to the *Guardian* report (from Gerona 5/1/60) "Entering the town on foot, he went to the home of an old anarchist friend and asked for refuge. The friend refused. As Sabater tried to force his way into the house, the Civil Guard... spotted him. One civilian, a member of the Somaten vigilantes association (local defence volunteers) called on him at gun point to surrender. Sabater fired and the somaten fell to the ground. But the reports say that as he lay injured he raised his sub-machine gun and shot and killed the guerrilla leader."

His widow, Mme. Leonor Sabater, said to the reported of *La Dépêche*, (Toulouse), "Francisco had to die like this. I told him that I did not want him to continue so dangerous a struggle. But he replied that he suffered because he said there was so much misery in the world, above all in Spain. 'I have lost my two brothers,' he said, 'and most of my comrades are dead, and I feel ashamed to be still alive!'"

His two daughters, "whose whole childhood had been coloured by the epic and pitiable atmosphere of the Spanish resistance" are at school at Toulouse, where the eldest is a student of philosophy at the *Lycée*.

★

THIS is the end of a whole period in the history of the Spanish resistance. Sabater was, one of the papers notes, "the only outstanding figure left of the guerrillas who between 1942 and 1949 committed acts of sabotage and violence aimed against the régime." It is now

many years since the Spanish members of the French *maquis* made raids at the end of the Second World War as far south as Lerida, in the belief that the victorious allies were going to end the fascist régime in Spain. Commenting on the death of Sabater, in its issue of 14/1/60, *Solidaridad Obrera*, the organ of the C.N.T. in exile, says:

"We can imagine the sadness of the Spanish workers, especially in the industrial region of Catalonia, from whom Sabater, one of themselves, would not be parted. For his daring, for his devotion to the proletarian cause, for so graphically interpreting the intimate wishes felt by the working masses, 'Quico' Sabater was a symbol of hope and of action, and was already a legend. None of his opponents, neither the police nor the army, could appear as such, nor seem so carelessly valiant as he, their eternal enemy.

"Eternal, for Sabater... could never reconcile himself to the idea of having lost the war in 1939. Among ourselves, we continue it in words from across the frontier, others continue it in playing politics. But the Sabaters have continued it in deeds..."

"Francisco Sabater, the last survivor of three brothers, carried on his attack on the régime during these twenty years when we have preferred the quiet of exile. We were amazed by his prowess. His sheer courage, face to face with those who had legal immunity and powerful armament..."

"For our part, the lives of the brave must be preserved. Moments more favourable and propitious will occur in which Spain will have need of brave men like him, whose lives have been so prodigally squandered in exile. Francisco Sabater might have become a new Durruti, capable of leading the liberation of his beloved Barcelona. Today, dead, there dies with him a chapter in the history of the Spanish resistance.

"We cannot hide our emotion at the death of this selfless man. In spite of the hatred, rancour and resentment felt towards him by the authorities, the police and the Civil Guard, they had to recognise that this *guerrillero* always attacked them face to face, not for any personal profit, not out of any desire for adventure, but simply for an ideal, because for him the cease-fire of April 1st, 1939 did not end the struggle against Fascism."

At the moment when his story passes from news into legend, and as the French and Spanish police close their dossiers with relief, it would be tedious to discuss the morality or expediency of 'banditry'. Perhaps this fragmentary account of Francisco Sabater may best be concluded with the words which Sir Peter Chalmers Mitchell used to introduce his translation of Ramón Sender's novel about the Spanish anarchists:

"Gone, possibly for ever, are the days when those in authority could believe with a clear conscience that in defending the State they were not merely defending their own privileges and interests, that in repelling disorder, they were also punishing the wicked. May it be worth while considering if what are certainly the legal crimes of the 'reds' are an inevitable reaction to the tremendous forces of repression with which science has armed authority, and that authority, no longer absolutely convinced of its own integrity, is more ready to use violence? And above all, is there not a flicker of hope for humanity, if it be the case that a selfless love and a generous purpose glow through the cloudy dreams of the 'criminals'?" C.W.

The Blackhurst Case

Just a year ago this month a tram-driver in the City of Glasgow lost his life in an accident. The tram which he was driving set ablaze when a lorry was being backed from a side street collided with the side of the tram. The fire spread so rapidly that the passengers were faced with a burning staircase before they could get off. Some escaped with slight burns, but the driver, in trying to save an elderly passenger was burned to death. Two others lost their lives.

David Blackhurst was to have been married to Helen Jackson, a tram-conductress, two weeks after the accident happened, they could and would have been married sooner, but for the fact that a year earlier, when he was seeking a divorce from his first wife, he was refused legal aid to pay the costs of the court proceedings, and so he was paying so much a week from his wages before he could be recognised by law as in a position to marry again.

Notice of their intention to marry was posted and displayed outside the Martha Street Registry Office. Having lived together for two years, being separated from his wife for a year before being divorced, there were two children born to David and Helen, so naturally Mrs. Blackhurst applied for a widow's pension from the Glasgow Corporation, which was refused on the grounds that she was not legally married. The Committee for Justice for Mrs. Blackhurst have for the past six months been seeking signatures for a petition which, when completed, will be forwarded to the Secretary of State for Scotland in an effort to bring the case to the court in Edinburgh to have the marriage recognised by law and to have a widow's pension granted to Mrs. Blackhurst on the grounds that

by Common Law in Scotland, which maintains that any couple living together in social harmony regardless of any official or legal ceremony shall be recognised as being married.

As there is no lawyer in Scotland with the inclination or courage to represent Mrs. Blackhurst, Guy Aldred, a Socialist and public speaker in the city, has declared his willingness to do so, and no doubt he will conduct a case for Social Justice better than any lawyer (who are it seems more concerned with position and reputation than with the administration of justice).

The Transport Workers' Union have refused to make a fight in this case according to *The Word*, because Religion is involved. If this is true does it mean the leaders are allowing their religious bias to interfere with the interests of their members, and the fight for better conditions on the job? If so it is time the rank and file were giving them the heave. The Committee for Justice for Mrs. Blackhurst, composed of a handful of socially-conscious working people have had to pay all expenses regarding Committee activities out of their own pockets and received no help from the Union.

The Committee have called upon the transport workers to stop work for five minutes in respect of the memory of a courageous fellow-worker, and as a reminder to the transport authorities that Mrs. Blackhurst should be recognised as David Blackhurst's widow, and benefit accordingly.

I would suggest that readers of FREEDOM should support this agitation in any way possible and should get into touch with the Justice for Blackhurst Committee at 473, Argyle Street, Glasgow. "An injury to one is an injury to all." Glasgow, January. R. MCKEAN.

FREEDOM PRESS

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

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

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

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

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

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*
Vol. 8, 1958, *Socialism in a Wheelchair*
each volume paper 7s. 6d.
cloth 10s. 6d.

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

VOLUME 1:
Nineteen-Seventeen (The Russian Revolution Betrayed) cloth 12s. 6d.
The Unknown Revolution
(Kronstadt 1921, Ukraine 1918-21)
cloth 12s. 6d.

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

A Page of Letters to the Editors

Pacifism

Sid Parker is grossly unfair in his review of *Towards a non-violent society* (FREEDOM 9/1/60). To start with he points out that the Pacifist Movement comprises a wide variety of trends, and then later typifies the pamphlet as an expression of Radical Pacifism. It was of course as stated in the heading written by Allen Skinner on behalf of a Working Party representing all organizations affiliated to the Standing Joint Pacifist Committee, and as such was not an expression of any one section of the Pacifist Movement but of the Common Mind of the whole; I suggest that considered as such it is a very real step in a Libertarian direction.

The term (swearword) *reformist* in the Anarchist and Left Marxist Vocabulary means one who in order to redress minor or peripheral ills in Society, makes partial changes which in the long run serve to bolster up the existing oppression, and thus make the job of the revolutionary harder not simpler, we do not use the term to describe such Gradualist Anarchists as Kropotkin or Libertarian Socialists of the William Morris stamp, since the partial changes they would have made would have weakened Government and Class Society and thus paved the way for the coming of the Free Society. Thus while this pamphlet describes a stage on the way towards a non-violent society and as such is evidence of a transition stage approach to the question, which we may criticize possibly on the grounds that most (definitely not all) Anarchists do not believe that it is possible to paint such a transition; it does not in any way advocate reforms that would impede the attainment of a Free Society.

Minimal statements naturally frustrate those of us who have a complete social-theory; and it is easy from the Anarchist point of view to put question marks to a merely Libertarian Statement. Granted for instance the pamphlet does not discuss for instance how the change in society will be achieved—surely a lack with such a name—and leaves it open to the interpretation that Parliament is going to decree these changes; obviously it is incumbent on Anarchists to explain that Parliament cannot bring about its own demise; but it is ridiculous to behave as if we shouldn't like such improvements as are described if they were brought about by non-Kosher means.

The Baskette Collection in the University of Michigan

THERE are several libraries in different parts of the world which contains specialised collections of material relating to the history of anarchism. The International Institute for Social History at Amsterdam, based on the library of Max Nettlau is one, and the Labadie Library in the University of Michigan, built around the collection of Jo Labadie is another.

Mrs. Elizabeth Baskette, widow of Ewing C. Baskette, has now placed her late husband's collection in the University of Illinois, where it is to be known as the Baskette Collection on Freedom of Expression.

Perhaps the best section in the collection is the one on anarchism—from several standpoints. First of all there is a vast amount of material concerning trials and many cases of persecution of anarchists when they were denied freedom of expression. The collection contains not only a great number of accounts and proceedings of such trials, but also the material for which the defendants were prosecuted.

The collection also contains the works of anarchist writers, biographies of anarchists and a great deal of miscellaneous material on anarchism in America and abroad. (For about 25 years or longer Ewing Baskette collected anarchist material from every source he could find). There are posters, leaflets, broadsides, photographs.

It includes as well, similar material on other aspects of the censorship of free expression—material relating to banned books, sex censorship, and the Labour movement in general.

Granted too that Society as described in the Pamphlet would not have cured every evil, and that since the powers of Government would have been rigidly curtailed, Governments and rulers would not be able to maintain themselves in face of the opposition; this surely is a state of affairs in which Anarchists should rejoice. (Sid is less than frank in his comment on regional parliaments for the danger inherent in too powerful local government is specifically stated).

If the pamphlet had been the personal views of Allen Skinner and as such, typical of Radical Pacifism then perhaps many of Sid's strictures would have been valid though only in so far as they can equally be made of many *soi-disant* Anarchists; but I cannot believe that any one who regularly reads both *Peace News* and *Liberation* can fail to see it in its proper context, and having so seen it fail to welcome it as a very encouraging sign.

London, E.3 LAURENS OTTER.

MONKEYS

Hanuman (see FREEDOM 9/1/60) may be an important figure in Hindu mythology, but sacredness has its disadvantages, too. Because the forests in India are rapidly disappearing, the monkeys, following human example, settle in the neighbourhood of towns where they have a chance of making a living by stealing. In some parts, when their depredations become unbearable, the humans catch them and cut off their hands. Then the monkeys have to beg, and eke out a miserable existence that way. Now the merciful Indians have discovered a more modern method of dealing with the pest. They export monkeys for vivisectional uses. It seems that in 1955 the *Times of India* estimated the year's export at a quarter of a million. The *News Chronicle* for November 15, 1954, estimated the yearly rate at 100,000, and even gave the name of the chief exporter, an Englishman. The numbers have probably increased since then, and if you want to have your stomach turned have a look at the *Animals' Defender*, the mouth-piece of the National Anti-Vivisection Society. Do you know that in 1955 only 13% of the experiments on living animals were performed under anaesthetics?

West Germany, Jan. 13. A.Z.

MARXISM

I FEEL I must spring to the defence of Karl Marx who must be stirring uneasily because of Nicolas Walter's article.

May I point out that Marx used terms about the 'rich becoming richer and the poor becoming poorer', etc., in a relative sense, and as such it is as true today as it was then.

Never in the history of the world has so much been produced, and never the producers receiving back so little from the fruits of their labour. Walter has only to glance at production and wages figures for say the last ten years to verify this.

What does create the illusion of prosperity is the small family with both adults wage-earning which most certainly is the trend today, at least in the most industrially advanced parts of the globe.

In regard to Walter's statement that rich nations get richer and poor nations poorer I am afraid that I am just not with him there. Perhaps he could enlarge on that, I for one would be most interested.

London, Jan. 3. E. GROVES.

Stakhanovite's Reincarnation

TOKIO, JANUARY 10.

Peking Radio says that Wei Koahou, aged 28, a mill machinist, finished a year's work in a single eight-hour shift on New Year's Day. His feat, it declared, astonished the nation.

But more was to come. Since then he has introduced 26 innovations in his work and at the end of the week he had completed the equivalent of eight years' work.

Wei, described as a nationally-known machine tool operator, had announced originally that he would complete nine years' work in one year. A former rickshaw boy in Chungking, he is now taking a course in mechanical engineering at a part-time school run by the factory. British United Press.

ANARCHISM: A REVISIONIST APPROACH

DEAR FRIENDS,

As a fairly 'new' reader of FREEDOM, may I say how much I agree with what Nicolas Walter has to say in your issue of Jan. 2nd (which I have only just seen).

"Political parties . . . aren't all the same". How true, but which party could any rational reader support? All have resorted to every one of the well-known—and many not so well-known—tricks which bedevil politics and so have forfeited the confidence of men who would try to live their lives on an honestly moral plane. I would like very much to hear the views of Nicolas Walter and your readers on the policy declaration of the new, to me, World Party, which aims first at world government, then nuclear and other disarmament, world economic co-operation and development, education for population regulation, abolition of travel restrictions, national freedoms, individual freedoms (these freedoms to be consistent with the welfare of humanity and the community), the reform of Parliament and the adoption of a written constitution, priority for education, promotion of family, social groupings and associations, co-ownership and co-responsibility in industry, promotion of sciences, arts, crafts in sports, cultivation of beauty and amenities of environment and encouragement of home-ownership.

Yours fraternally, BERT C. BEVIS. Southampton, Jan. 16.

ANARCHISM & GOVT.

DEAR SIR,

I too think Anarchism is the most desirable political set-up but in this complicated world I'm afraid it isn't possible—in the form of *no* government at all, that is. However, in the words of Lao Tse—"govern a country as you would fry a small fish" (i.e. very little) hence the minimum of government compatible with peace and harmony. Anarchism should be our aim in politics, especially when the circumstances tend towards greater totalitarianism as in East and West at present. Anarchism should not mean chaos or 'jungle law' but an easy-going, stable society bound together more by mutual goodwill than by legal coercion. Hence run-away capitalist monopoly and over-population should be curbed and co-operation and freedom of self-expression (*not* in economics but in art, sciences, sport, architecture, etc.), encouraged.

The domineering, power-lust, violent instincts should be played down and given harmless outlets for they are the source of the desire to rule and bully.

It is time the whole idea of "Progress" was given an overhaul—Bigger, Better, and More as the criterion of progress should be analysed and substituted by something else (Leisure, Culture, Adventure?) if they are found wanting.

My political ideas are a synthesis of many—aristocracy is needed (i.e. rule by the best trained), corporate, socialist state basically democratic with anarchism as its goal, etc.

D. J. HUMPHRIES.

KEEP IT UP!

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT! WEEK 2

Deficit on Freedom £40
Contributions received £41
SURPLUS £1

January 8 to January 14

Glasgow: M.W.K.* 5/-; Skegness: R.M. 2/-; London: Hyde Park Sympathisers, 2/6; Wollaton: R. & V.L. £2/1/0; Surrey: F.B.* 5/-; Tocsin: E.B. £3; London: K.A.B. 2/6; Newry: J.O'H 1/-; Chicago: P. di G. 14/-; Wolverhampton: J.G.L.* 2/6; Liverpool: J.C.R. 1/6; St. Louis: N.M. 7/6; London: Anon. 5/-; London: J.H. 4/-; London: J.S.* 3/-.

Total 7 16 6
Previously acknowledged 34 0 4

1960 TOTAL TO DATE £41 16 10

1959 ADDITIONAL CONTRIBUTION

Swansea: R.R. 10 0 0
Previously acknowledged 932 5 2

1959 TOTAL TO DATE £942 5 5

1959 DEFICIT £98 0 0
GIFTS OF BOOKS: London: P.H.; London: A.W.U.
*Indicates regular contributor.

The Rosenbergs

I've read certain comments recently, but do not have the date nor know the name for certainty of the paper they appeared in, however, I have been reading FREEDOM and *Selections from Freedom* for the past few weeks, and I believe the statements were made in it that the Rosenbergs were not guilty. I am familiar with the courts in only one State, and if Illinois is anything like the State of Texas I do not see how anyone can state definitely either one way or another that anyone is either guilty or not guilty with any degree of certainty (assuming one knows what either guilty or not guilty means). Unless one personally attended the trial and personally knows actually what went on during the trial how can that person who did not attend the trial make up his mind from newspapers or a court transcript on appeal. The court transcripts do not necessarily represent the truth of the matter that went on during the trial, because the prosecution combined with the court and the court reporter, who generally speaking is responsible to the court

for his job, on occasions "completely doctor" the records in the case to fit the law in order to sustain the case on appeal. Neither the court nor the prosecutor, usually elected officials, and certainly not the subordinate court reporter who does as he is told, welcome a reversal of any case on trial or one that has been tried.

ALL THESE THINGS EFFECT THEIR RECORDS BEFORE THE VOTERS, and the state must win if once it undertakes to prosecute even if it is necessary to lie or falsify records. If one is deciding the fate of the Rosenbergs by the newspapers he must accept the fact that newspapers do not always report the facts as they happen, but only as the varied interests of their particular papers or interests behind the papers want the facts to appear. I must admit that in some murder trials in which I have been associated the local papers accurately reported the facts, and I have used their accounts of the trial for reference purposes, and to otherwise aid in the defence of the party affected. It must be remembered however in this type case there was generally no public feeling involved nor a cause to support. In cases where national policy has been involved our newspapers do not accurately report the events, but report the events in such manner that best supports the policy of the paper, e.g. In my youth I was involved in a labour dispute in which my father and his two employees were involved, the news reporter did not accurately report the interviews with my father. He was not necessarily misquoted, but the questions asked were tricky, and when they were finally published I personally could not recognize the fact that the reporter had ever talked with my father. This does not necessarily say that I viewed the matter alone from the standpoint of my father, because I was in actual sympathy with the men who worked long hours. My father did too and so did I when I worked.

Certain facts in any controversy can be reported and other facts omitted, in case they are not actually distorted. This applies to transcripts of evidence and newspaper reporting equally. As time passes it becomes even more difficult to determine what transpired in the past. Records become lost, even from the court clerks' office! The human mind forgets.

Waco, Texas, Dec. 30. H.H.

DUTY

I HAVE been pondering on the ghastly realities expressed by the word "duty".

Think of it! The salesman smiling his hard, bright, commercial smile and lavishing sycophantic praise on his wares, not because he has an atom of genuine regard for the wretched things but because "duty" bids him push and plug the goods his firm handles.

The manager or overseer exuding phoney bonhomie towards his subordinates because it is policy "to have good labour morale".

Jones meets Brown and there ensues an orgy of hand-shaking, b'ack-slapping and drink-buying. Jones secretly loathes the sight of Brown, but Brown is a "useful contact" so the dismal charade must be got through somehow, time and time again. "Duty"! What a commentary on "our way of life"!

Sick, sick, sick! Southend, Jan 8. S. W. BROOKS.

UNDER THE ROCKET

IN the present spate of films about war and violence it is always pleasant to see the occasional one that induces a feeling of nothing but peace and contentment. At the moment there is a delightful little film going round the Rank circuits in association with a particularly bloody Western. We see a splendid example of constructive empire-building in the middle of the barren Australian outback. Bright bungalows in neat rows, nursery gardens, a well-stocked shop, a mission church, children walking in crocodiles, a primary school, an opal mine—these pass technicolorfully before our admiring eyes, and the spirit of the place is summed up by the commentator as follows: "Under the rocket, life is so easy and carefree."

Under the rocket? Yes, this brave outpost of western civilisation is at Woomera, and the last shots we see of the place with the highest birth-rate in the Commonwealth show us the most civilised toy of all—nuclear rockets streaking across the sky in search of fresh wastes and wildernesses new, one supposes, bringing the benefits of our easy and carefree way of life in their wake. It's nice to see that the British film industry is properly aware of its public responsibilities. Let us hope this is only the first of a series of films dealing with, say, the inculcation of civilisation in the Rhodesian copper-belt and at Hola camp, or the sort of life—not quite so easy and carefree perhaps—that is lived in Notting Hill, just across the Park from Buckingham Palace.

The Higher Learning

As a preliminary to Charities Day on January 30 two teams of Glasgow students will compete outside the universities as possible into a pre-war 18-h.p. Austin six-cylinder car. The winning team, which will receive a silver cup, will challenge all Scotland and later all Britain.

Guardian 9/1/60.

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP and MALATESTA DEBATING SOCIETY

IMPORTANT

CHANGE OF MEETING PLACE. THE LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP MEETINGS are now held at 5, CALEDONIAN ROAD, LONDON, N.1. (near Kings Cross Station) at 7.15 p.m.

ALL WELCOME

1960

JAN. 24—Jack Robinson on ANARCHISM IN 1960?

JAN. 31—Charles Humana PERSONALLY SPEAKING

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 &/c Payne, and addressed to the publishers

FREEDOM PRESS
27 Red Lion Street
London, W.C.1. England
Tel.: Chancery 8344