

In this Issue :

George Orwell—
the Humanist p. 2
Russia Re-Introduces
Capital Punishment p. 3
Some Thoughts on Rep-
resentative Goernment p. 4

Freedom

ANARCHIST FORTNIGHTLY

"Justice and Liberty! Those
are the words that have got
to ring like a bugle across
the world."

GEORGE ORWELL

(The Road to Wigan Pier)

Vol. 11, No. 3

February 4th, 1950

Threepence

Are ANY Governments Above Suspicion?

TYRANNY: The Fruit of

Government

£1,000,000
DOESN'T GO FAR!

EVERY month the Ministry of Labour issues its Gazette—a summary of statistics relating to employment, unemployment, wages, injuries at work—anything with which the Ministry is concerned.

The publication of the Gazette for January showed what most of the press mentioned—that during 1949 there had been wage increases for 54 millions workers totalling just over a million pounds per week. That is, approximately 25% of Britain's labour force received increases averaging 4/- each.

To this, of course, we can simply ask—so what? This amount of increase is little over one-half of the increases gained during 1948, and only one-third of those granted during

1947. Which means that the government's wage-freezing policy is gradually congealing the workers' pressure for more wages, for it must not be forgotten that many more workers pressed for increases during 1949 than actually received them. Those who were lucky included mainly cotton and wool textile workers, and farm workers, and those who were unlucky were the much more numerous miners, railwaymen and engineers, while dockers and other workers are pressing their unions to start claiming on their behalf.

Prices Going Up—As Usual

Because it is difficult for the average person to think in terms of millions of pounds, the thought of workers receiving an extra million pounds a week is very impressive—until we recognise the actual amount involved for the individual, as shown above.

The figures become even less impressive when we compare them with those of prices. The retail price index, which is the official measure of changes in the cost of living, stood at 109 in January last year and at 113 in December. The index as a whole is based on current prices for food, clothing, fuel and light, household goods, transport and other services, drink and tobacco, a collection of "miscellaneous goods" and rent and rates. There were wide variations of prices within these different groups.

The result of last year's Budget sharply affected food prices—the index rose from 108 to 120 during the year. Clothing (apart from footwear) and fuel prices went up, and so did household goods (apart from radio sets, which went down—but how many of those do you buy in a year?) The Budget took beer down slightly, but bus fares increased.

In other words, the Labour Government's promise to keep prices down if wage claims were restricted has—like all political promises (except those of blood, toil, etc.) been broken. And everybody knows that it cannot be otherwise. The most that wages can ever do is to try to catch up with prices up the everlasting spiral—and they never do.

Anarchists are uncompromisingly against the wage system. It remains the biggest swindle of all the swindles connected with government and capitalism. It is the means by which the producers are rationed in their ability to buy back the goods they produce; it is the façade behind which the reality of exploitation is hidden; it is the deceit by which we are made to think we are being repaid for our labours.

The wage system must go, to be replaced by free production and distribution according to need. But which party includes that in its programme? How can you vote for that?

P.S.

FOR many years now, politically conscious people have had in the forefront of their attention the inroads which have been made on the old liberal conceptions of individual freedom and civil liberty. Rights which had been won after years of determined struggle, and which seemed to have been absorbed into the social fabric of the west were broken down almost overnight by a process variously called "Fascism" or the "advance of totalitarianism" or some other phrase. The very widespread popular disquiet at this trend was deftly utilised to provide an ideological cover for the last war. But it is only too evident that the tendency to overturn the nineteenth century liberal attitude is still proceeding apace. Evidently it is not a process which can be reversed by an anti-Fascist war. Let us briefly glance at events in different parts of the world which illustrate the trend and indicate its widespread character.

On the Gold Coast, opposition leaders and newspaper editors have been charged under emergency regulations which forbid acts "likely to bring into hatred or contempt, or excite disaffection against, the government." The important thing here is that any charge could be so worded; for it is obvious that any serious criticism of the government, any questioning of its motives, or—even more clearly—any criticism of the institution of government itself will come under such a regulation. The power of government, and, worse still, of a particular government becomes inviolable, immune from criticism; flatterers, belly-crawlers and informers flourish. In short, such regulations are the corner stones of tyranny.

In Hanover last week, six members of the local Communist publishing outfit were charged with threatening "the prestige and security" of the Allied Forces in Germany. The magistrate ruled that a further charge that they had been guilty of "conduct disrespectful to the Allied Forces" had not been

made out, and it was accordingly dismissed.

In this case it is irrelevant that the accused are part of the Russian Fifth Column; irrelevant that the magistrate dismissed part of the charge. Once again the important point is that such a charge could be brought. It implies that the "Allied Forces" are beyond suspicion and above criticism, a Byzantine conception utterly foreign to the liberal tradition. It denies to the ruled the right to criticise their rulers.

Worldwide Trend

It will not do to shrug one's shoulders and dismiss such instances as exceptional cases, for the trend they represent is world-wide. In Australia, for example, the new Foreign Minister, Percy Spender, has openly declared that the new Conservative Government plans to destroy the Australian Communist Party, declaring it illegal and seizing its property. "We feel," he said, "it is a traitorous and subversive organisation, working in the interests of a foreign power." It is true that the actions of the Communist Parties make such action nearly inevitable; indeed, their rôle within the contemporary framework of affairs appears always to further repressive legislation whether they are in power or in opposition. The fact, however, remains that such actions on the part of a government are in fundamental opposition to funda-

mental civil liberties, and open the way to political discrimination of all kinds.

The fascist type race theories of Dr. Malan's Nationalist government in South Africa provide another disturbing manifestation of the general reactionary tendencies all over the world. The position of the coloured peoples of South Africa has always been a shameful side of white administration, but at least they had in the past some legal rights written into the constitution. Such "rights", even if they are in abeyance, at least provide a handle against reaction. Any abrogation of such rights opens the way to the same legalised tyranny to which we have drawn attention already. Smuts, attacking Malan, declared recently that the Apartheid policy was simply unworkable, and that the government's real intention was to "tamper with the rights of natives and coloured peoples in spite of the South African constitution."

Nearer Home

Freedom has had all too many occasions in recent years to call attention to the inroads on civil liberties and individual freedom which successive governments have steadily made—regardless of party. Government ministers now openly employ agents provocateur and informers—the latter being encouraged by promise of financial

(Continued on page 4)

NEW DOCKERS' CO-OPERATIVE

WE welcome the action taken recently by the dockers of Grimsby and Immingham, Lincolnshire. There, 600 out of the 750 workers at the docks have formed themselves into a producers' co-operative on a profit-sharing basis.

The co-operative will undertake work at present done by stevedoring firms and shipping agents, and will continue to work at trade-union rates, distributing profit on the jobs they take on equally to all members in the form of bonuses.

A typical remark by the general secretary of the Co-operative Productive Federation was that this society will make for "good industrial relations". We should have thought it much better than that. We think that this sort of thing could lead to the abolition of industrial relations as meant in this remark, i.e., the relationship between boss and worker.

The establishment of co-operatives like this one will obviously lead to the elimination of the boss altogether—if the Grimsby dockers take care not to let their co-op go the same way as the general co-op societies. But as it appears at present, it looks like a step in the direction of Workers' Control.

The Villagers' Bus

IN a free society, the inhabitants of a village would be able, through their local commune, to organise their own affairs according to their needs.

The commune, as conceived by anarchists, is simply an autonomous council of people living in a particular locality. Its meetings should be public and any inhabitant of the neighbourhood should be free to attend either as a delegate or as an individual with equal rights for all to take part in discussions on matters which are the concern of all.

In a free society there would be no State to send directives to every corner of the country and to stifle every popular or individual initiative by bureaucratic regulation, backed up by governmental coercion. In a free society, if villagers agreed that they

needed a bus service, they would be able to organise a bus service, with no one to natter about whether it was legal or not.

★

But they are not able to do so today in the village of Theydon Mount, Essex (1½ miles from the nearest bus-route), where three months ago the villagers organised a bus-club to hire a motor-coach to take them to the nearest shopping centre, the cinema and the doctor. But they have now been told by the Ministry of Transport that their club is illegal.

The situation is, that while during the war London Transport ran a

regular bus-service to Theydon Mount, now they cannot do so because the Licensing Authority will not pass the roads approaching the village as suitable. The point here is that during the war there were troops stationed in the vicinity, but to-day there are only civilians to be catered for.

The villagers have shown initiative in forming their own club, which cost each member only 1s. 1d. per week, and they seem prepared to put up a fight to defend their right to provide their own amenities. All power to them! Let them run their own affairs and get satisfaction from co-operating for the common good. In such action lies the seed of decentralisation and the justification for the belief in a society of free communes.

THE UNHOLY GHOST

Setting a teaser for ecclesiastical authorities, a Brislington ghost has found a weak spot in the armour of the Church.

Eighteen years ago a woman died in Brislington whose ghost, apparently content to live in a box-room, has terrorised the present tenants of her erstwhile earthly mansion. She has turned nasty, apparently, when, after many years, somebody opened the door of the box-room and let in the cold air of the world of the flesh.

And who wouldn't turn nasty? For when you come to think of it, life as a contented spirit in a box-room in Brislington must represent one of the more comfortable ways of keeping out of trouble in the world of 1950.

But what amuses us is that this disgruntled spectre has, all on her own, found that the authorities on the spirit, the guardians of our souls, the supporters of the Holy Ghost itself, have no set service through which to approach the earthbound spirit in Brislington and ask her, please, to be a good ghost and lie down again and go to sleep.

The man on the spot, the local vicar, has written to two high-ups, the Bishops of Bristol and Malmesbury, but they were, conveniently, away. The religious publishers, the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, have absolutely nothing on the subject.

Now, isn't it amazing? Here we have a body of people—a very strong body of people—who for centuries have been talking and writing millions of words about the Spirit; a body who worship a Trinity which includes a ghost, and yet they have no words for one poor little provincial spirit who is annoyed at being disturbed!

Can it be that they can only speak about spirits when they are safely out of this world? Can it be that they know all about ghosts in heaven and hell but nothing of spooks on earth? Or is it that they like to talk about things far enough away for no truth to be ascertainable?

The Church used to deal with ghosties with Bell, Book and Candle. But it seems that the Bell is cracked, the Candle has gone out, and they have lost their place in the Book.

ORWELL-The Humanist



George Orwell, writer and socialist, died in a London hospital on Saturday, 21st January, at the age of 46. Born into the upper middle class in India, he went to Eton, and later joined the Burma Police Force. But the honesty of the eye with which he saw the rôle of British Imperialism impelled his resignation—not only from the Burma Police, but from the class into which he had been born. His books tell of his poverty-stricken days of early struggle as a writer, and 1936 found him in Spain, where he was wounded in the Republican trenches. He had suffered from the tuberculosis which killed him, for many years.

cock's penetrating study on Orwell first published in the American journal *Politics*, and later included in his volume of essays, *The Writer and Politics*.*

THE principal reason why Orwell was never an anarchist seems to me to be that he thought of himself as a "realist", and that it was useless to talk of social revolution when its realisation seemed so remote; we had to face the the immediate problems. As a result, he found himself in the position of having continually to choose between the lesser and greater evils. George Woodcock has described Orwell's attitude as being "in a more general sense . . .

I FIRST learned of the death of George Orwell through an acquaintance who casually pointed to the bald announcement in an evening paper. To him the name George Orwell meant no more than what the national press had informed him: the author who had first become famous with the publication of a book entitled *Animal Farm*, which was followed by another entitled *1984*, neither of which he had read, but which he understood were anti-communist and anti-socialist; the dollar earner "who had died before the money could reach him", was the way the Labour Party's *Daily Herald* (23/1/50) put it.

To me, and to his many friends and readers in the anarchist movement throughout the world (his books were very widely reviewed in the international anarchist press), Orwell was, first and foremost, a humanist. He did not share our viewpoint, and sectarian anarchists must have raised their hands in horror at some of the ideas Orwell expressed in his writings. Yet, during the twelve years since the publication of *Homage to Catalonia*, I had felt a growing respect and friendship for him in spite of fundamental differences on such issues as the last war (and the coming one), conscription and parliamentary politics. I think that, by attempting to explain this apparent paradox there will be revealed Orwell the humanist, who will, I am certain, outlive the author of *Animal Farm* and *1984*. Orwell the writer, I leave to more competent hands, limiting myself to drawing attention to George Wood-

opportunist." This is true if one does not at the same time examine Orwell's motives. In my conversations with him, I always had the feeling that he was continually driven by an urge to do something, to take his share in the day-to-day struggle rather than to discuss in the abstract. This attitude seems at least in part to have been influenced by Orwell's contempt for average left-wing intellectual armchair philosophers. That some of them have not forgotten, or forgiven him for, the second part of *The Road to Wigan Pier*, appears clearly in the memoirs that have been written since his death. When I spoke to him the last time he was most bitter in his condemnation of those French intellectuals who are supporting Russia on the grounds that the Russian system is preferable to capitalist democracy. He said that he respected the anarchist position of opposition to both systems; that was a consistent position to take up. But for those French intellectuals, who lived a bourgeois life and enjoyed a relative freedom which they knew would be denied them in Russia, to support Russia was downright dishonesty.

But I think that Orwell's own limitations also contributed to his political attitude. His rôle was that of the "plain man" but, as Woodcock points out, "the 'plain man' always has limitations, and the greatest is his failure to penetrate below the surface of events and see the true cause of

* Porcupine Press, 1948.

social evils, the massive disorders in the very structure of society, of which individual evils are merely symptoms." And he adds, most significantly:

"I have never, for instance, seen or heard Orwell give any sound analysis of the political trends in England to-day, and on such important subjects as money, property and the State he seems to have little idea except the usual vague slogans which have inspired the Labour Party for many generations."

And one feels Orwell identifying himself with the "genuine working-man" whom he thought never grasps the deeper implications of Socialism. "Often, in my opinion," he wrote in *The Road to Wigan Pier*, "he is a truer socialist than the orthodox Marxist, because he does remember, what the other so often forgets, that Socialism means justice and common decency."

THIS desire to do something whatever the limitations of the surroundings was both a quality as well as a weakness. I could not help feeling that in the event of a revolutionary situation presenting itself in this country, Orwell would have been wholeheartedly with the Anarchists, for, in such a situation, his ethical anarchism and his 'realism' would both find expression. Orwell was not afraid of revolution: quite the contrary. Just as he had no time for the wishful thinkers who always saw revolution round the corner, so he had nothing but contempt for those propagandists who tried to reduce the issue in Spain in 1936 to simply one of Democracy versus Fascism.

"The thing that had happened in Spain was, in fact, not merely a civil war, but the beginning of a revolution. It is this fact that the anti-Fascist press outside Spain has made its special business to obscure. The issue has been narrowed down to 'Fascism versus Democracy' and the revolutionary aspect concealed as much as possible."

I make no apology for quoting at length, from *Homage to Catalonia*,

a passage which sums up George Orwell's attitude more vividly than any speculations that I or others can make as to his position in a revolutionary situation:

"... I had dropped more or less by chance into the only community in Western Europe where political consciousness and disbelief in capitalism were more normal than their opposites. Up here in Aragon, one was among tens of thousands of people, mainly though not entirely of working-class origin, all living at the same level and mingling on terms of equality. In theory it was perfect equality, and even in practice it was not far from it. There is a sense in which it would be true to say that one was experiencing a foretaste of Socialism, by which I mean that the prevailing atmosphere was that of Socialism. Many of the normal motives of civilised life—snobbishness, money-grabbing, fear of the boss, etc.—had simply ceased to exist. The ordinary class-division of society had disappeared to an extent that is almost unthinkable in the money-tainted air of England; there was no one there except the peasants and ourselves, and no one owned anyone else as his master. Of course, such a state of affairs could not last. It was simply a temporary and local phase in an enormous game that is being played over the whole surface of the earth. But it lasted long enough to have its effect upon anyone who experienced it. However much one cursed at the time, one realised afterwards that one had been in contact with something strange and valuable. One had been in a community where hope was more normal than apathy and cynicism, where the word 'comrade' stood for comradeship and not, as in most countries, for humbug. One had breathed the air of equality. I am well aware that it is now the fashion to deny that Socialism has anything to do with equality. In every country in the world a huge tribe of party hacks and sleek little professors are busy 'proving' that Socialism means no more than a planned state-capitalism with the grab-motive left intact. But unfortunately there also exists a vision of Socialism quite different from this. The thing that attracts ordinary men to Socialism and makes them willing to risk their skins for it, the 'mystique' of Socialism, is the idea of equality; to the vast majority of people Socialism means a classless society, or it means nothing at all. And it was here that those few months in the militia were valuable to me. For the Spanish militias, while they lasted, were a sort of microcosm of a classless society. In that community where no man was on the make, where there was a shortage of everything but no privilege and no boot-licking, one got, perhaps a

crude forecast of what the opening stages of Socialism might be like. And after all, instead of disillusioning me it deeply attracted me. The effect was to make my desire to see Socialism established much more actual than it had been before. Partly, perhaps, this was due to the good luck of being among Spaniards, who, with their innate decency and their ever-present Anarchist tinge, would make even the opening stages of Socialism tolerable if they had the chance . . ."

IN spite of the growing world trend towards totalitarianism and the prospects of atomic warfare in the near future (though the last time I saw him he was less pessimistic about the possibility of an early war) which affected him deeply and brought Orwell the "realist" to the fore, he was, right up to the end, anxious to lend his name (his illness prevented him from doing more) to any initiative which defended human rights and liberties, and the cause of Spain, and its victims were always present in his thoughts. Since 1938 he had been associated with anarchists on a number of issues of this kind, commencing in 1938 when he became an active sponsor of the S.I.A. (International Anti-Fascist Solidarity) which was launched by the Spanish Anarchists and the English section of which was organised in London by Emma Goldman. And in spite of our fundamental differences over the late war, he was among the first to protest publicly against the police raids on the offices of Freedom Press, later becoming vice-chairman of the Freedom Press Defence Committee, which was formed to defend the four anarchists arrested under the Defence Regulations in force at the time. He continued his active support when the committee was transformed into the Freedom Defence Committee, and even made two of his rare appearances on a public platform when he spoke, firstly at a meeting in support of a general amnesty for wartime deserters, and later at a protest meeting organised by the F.D.C., on behalf of the Spanish anti-Fascists interned at Chorley, Lancs.

* Secker & Warburg, 1938

(Continued on page 3)

Building in New York and Nearer Home

NEW YORK is experiencing a building boom. Last week's *Time* (U.S.A.) illustrates several of the new office blocks which are springing up all over the city, indiscriminately replacing old Georgian houses, grim ornate Victorian mansions, and other buildings which though not obsolete, were not earning enough rent to please the real-estate magnates.

Now most of us in this country, at least, think of New York in terms of skyscrapers which may look picturesque in the back-shots which set the scene for so many films, but which, on a closer acquaintance (we are told), have grave disadvantages from a human point of view, in that they cause fantastic obstruction to traffic because of the congestion, and make many of the streets dark canyons which the sun cannot reach. But, of course, skyscrapers were not built for the sake of their architectural effect. They are the result of four factors. Firstly, and most important, the tremendous inflation of land values in central areas—the product of megalopolitan centralisation; secondly, the invention of the lift, or elevator (incidentally, a strike of lift-operators can paralyse New York); thirdly, the fact that New York has a rocky subsoil which can carry the foundations; and fourthly, the ideology of "rugged individualism" and the "super-colossal" which makes such achievements seem desirable.

The anti-social results of skyscraper building led the city authorities to introduce regulations which, in the interests of fire-fighting, and of daylighting of streets, set back the upper stories and restricted the height. The new "baby-skyscrapers" which average 25 storeys are, as *Time* points out, built for quick profits and occupy every possible square foot of the "building envelope" as the permissible area for building is known. In *Time*'s coy idiom "builders were packing the envelope as tight as a chorus girl's brassiere."

"The result was a squat, dumpy zigurat, tapering toward the top and crowned with a concrete blockhouse containing elevator and air-conditioning

equipment. High-minded architects referred to them scornfully as "wedding-cake modern". They were white and unadorned, faceless warrens comprised of layer upon layer of strip windows alternating with concrete, like stacked sandwiches. They looked appallingly alike."

Not Only In New York

There are similar tendencies, on a smaller scale in London. We have no skyscrapers here, partly because of the clay sub-soil, and partly (according to a not entirely true story popular amongst architects), because one morning Queen Victoria, looking out of her window, found that she was no longer able to see the Abbey since the view had suddenly been obscured by the towering Queen Anne's Mansions, in Westminster, and wrathfully demanded the restrictions on heights of building which enshrined in the London Building Act of 1894.

But London too, has its miniature version of the "baby-skyscrapers". In the last few years in Holborn, a few minutes from *Freedom*'s office, there have sprung up what the *Architect's Journal* describes as "the Ministry-of-Works-cum-private-enterprise office blocks now disfiguring almost every corner of the Borough's main thoroughfares". These blocks are architecturally even more reprehensible than their gigantic counterpart in New York since they are not even in the "wedding-cake modern" style, but have a few genteel and timid fancy trimmings. Here again, the buildings have in fact been designed, not by their architects, but by the maximum permissible volume of building, regardless of appearance. This, however, is not all. Two of these London zigurats are alongside the new flats built by the Holborn Borough Council. These flats are, by to-day's standards, well-planned and pleasant in appearance, but because of the fantastic price of land in London, are extremely high. Mr. J. M. Richards, speaking on the radio last year described them as "packed close together, representing a quite terrifying density of population." Certainly it is a far greater

density than that recommended in the County of London Plan, but if the flats were surrounded by open space this would not matter. Since, however, they have been surrounded by the new office blocks, the density of building, the really important factor, is tremendous. These offices, are not, like those in New York, built for quick profits—they are for occupation by the Ministry of Labour and National Service!

Land Values

The reason for this anti-social over-building of central areas, is, as we have seen, the price of land. It has been found for years that a stumbling block in town planning schemes has been this very problem—"compensation and betterment" as it is known in the trade. The Town and Country Planning Act of 1947 sought to remove the difficulty by increasing the powers of local authorities for compulsory purchase and by attempting to prevent speculation in land by instituting a "development charge" whereby when the value of land is increased, that increase shall go to the State instead of to the landowner. In other words, having decided that the inflation of land values is morally wrong and that it prevents good planning (the whole argument is given in Kropotkin's *Conquest of Bread*), we don't abolish the unearned increase—we nationalise it, and continue to overcrowd building sites as before.

Practical Reformers

What is the moral of all this? Surely, that the "practical" people, the well-meaning reformists who think that we can solve our problems by legislation, are in fact hopeless idealists, who create as many new evils as they alleviate old ones, and that the so-called idealists and visionaries, who demand radical changes are in fact being nothing more than practical. A character in Winifred Holtby's novel *South Riding*, remarks that we begin by demanding revolution and finish up satisfied with a new drainage scheme. Let us not forget that we need both.

C.W.

... from our stock ...

The Einstein Theory of Relativity H. G. & L. R. Lieber 18/-
Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality Sigmund Freud 10/6
Ulysses James Joyce 18/-
On The Eve I. S. Turgenev 1/6
Menon Lescaut Abbé Prevost 1/6
The Writer & Politics George Woodcock 10/6
Ill-Health, Poverty & the State John Hewetson, cloth 2/6, paper 1/-

★ Porcupine Pamphlets, 1/- ea., 3 for 2/6 ...

Soul of Man under Socialism Oscar Wilde
Defence of Poetry P. B. Shelley
Slavery of our Time Leo Tolstoy

Wilhelm Reich's works ...

Function of the Orgasm 45/-
The Sexual Revolution 25/-
Character Analysis 45/-
Mass-Psychology of Fascism 33/6
(These new prices are caused by the new rate of dollar exchange, our old stocks being exhausted)

Some Periodicals ...

Resistance (New York) Dec. 1949 3d.;
The Adelphi, Spring 1950 2/6; Etudes
Anarchistes (Paris) No. 5 9d.; Clé
(Bulletin of Libertarian Students—Paris) 1/-

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

27 RED LION STREET LONDON W.C.1.

FRANCO: Diplomacy, Dynamite or Discovery?

A STATE Department spokesman has recently rejected Press statements that Secretary of State Dean Acheson's announcement that America favours full resumption of diplomatic relations with Franco's Spain had any "strategic or military connotations". The spokesman, however, was not very convincing, especially when he refused to comment when reporters pointed out that military leaders are usually consulted on important matters

of foreign policy, and asked whether the practice was abandoned on this occasion.

If America does not look to Spain as a base in a coming war or as an anti-Communist bastion, then what has happened to reverse American policy to Franco? We do not propose to seek an answer, since we believe in the "strategic and military" explanation. And for many months the policy of softening-up opinion in both Houses, by sending delegations of Congressmen to Spain (reported in these columns) has obviously shown results in the generally enthusiastic approval given in Congressional circles to Mr. Acheson's statement.

Certainly, American opinion has not changed as a result of a change of heart in Franco's regime, which continues its ruthless campaign of suppression of its political opponents. *Ruta* (Paris 22/1/50), for instance, reports that news has been received of the execution of five more anti-fascists in Madrid, amongst them an anarchist, José Sancho, who had recently been tried and condemned to death by a military tribunal. Comrade Sancho leaves behind a wife who is at present in prison and four young children.

Our contemporary reminds all lovers of justice that there are still six comrades under sentence of death and who may be executed at any moment unless pressure of world opinion obliges Franco to commute

GEORGE ORWELL

(Continued from page 2)

THE last time I saw him, a fortnight before his death, I found him cheerful, mentally active and obviously following current events as closely as ever. But writing of any kind was forbidden. He had worked out in his mind the theme for a novel, but in any case he wanted to "live with it" for a time and reckoned that by 1951 he would be ready to commit it to paper. It was typical of Orwell that he should have asked his medical advisers to tell him how long he had to live, for, as he put it, if it were a question of a year or so, then he would ignore their advice against writing; he would utilise the time to finish off a number of things he wanted to write before dying. We also spoke of his adopted son, Richard, and his thin, drawn face lighted up, and his eyes shone as he recounted Richard's recent visit to the Zoo as described to him by his boy. And at such moments one felt, to quote Arthur Koestler's words, "the radiations of this lonely man's great power of love."

IF, in the years to come, I should be asked where Orwell stood in humanity's struggle, I shall quote these words from *Homage to Catalonia*:

"The poorer classes in Barcelona [during the May Days] looked upon the Civil Guards as something resembling the Black and Tans, and it seemed to be taken for granted that they had started this attack on their own initiative. Once I had heard how things stood I felt easier in my mind. The issue was clear enough. On one side the C.N.T. [National Confederation of Labour] on the other side the police. I have no particular love for the idealised 'worker' as he appears in the bourgeois Communist's mind, but when I see an actual flesh-and-blood worker in conflict with his natural enemy, the policeman, I do not have to ask myself which side I am on."

V.R.

the sentence. The six men are José López, Gabriel Cruz, Basilio Luna, Juan Ortiz, Antonio and Juan Velasco.

WE referred some weeks ago to the gesture of a group of young anarchists in Genoa who stormed the Spanish Consulate to draw attention to the persecution of Spanish anarchists and others. Three were arrested and are still awaiting trial. Meanwhile, many meetings in support of their action have been held in Italy and funds collected for their defence.

We learn now that a second attempt, this time in Rome, has been made against the Spanish Embassy. A United Press report (22/1/50) states that the police identified the man, who was arrested outside the Embassy, as Giuseppe de Luisi, aged 63. He declared that: "I am an individual anarchist. It was my intention to blow up the Spanish Embassy in Rome to avenge the martyred heroic Spanish people."

The police allege that they found in his valise six tubes of dynamite with fuses, two hand grenades, six pipes full of pyric powder and another 200-gram bag with pyric powder. He carried in his pockets a loaded pistol and a hand grenade.

FREEDOM in the last issue, published information on the number of people in prison in Spain for political reasons. *The New York Herald Tribune* (23/1/50) gives additional information, on Spanish concentration camps, by a young German who spent several months in one located in the Alava Province in the north of Spain.

The camp is in an isolated spot and surrounded by a 10 ft. high wire barrier, 10 ft. thick, and a guard with machine gun, is posted every fifty yards. "The barracks are built of stone and are about eighty to 100 yards long. Inside, the beds are placed closely together so that about 300 to 400 men live in each barrack."

Conditions are insanitary and the food insufficient to maintain life. "It is impossible to live a long time on this diet. The prisoners are weak and there is much illness in the camp—tuberculosis, typhoid,

dysentery, etc. One man after another dies.

"The only medical aid is given by a local village doctor. He definitely is responsible for the deaths of hundreds of persons."

There are some 400 foreigners, representing 26 nationalities detained in this camp, some of whom have spent four and even five years in Spanish prisons. Inspection by the International Red Cross is denied by the authorities so that "the police are allowed to do as they like."

Anyone caught attempting to escape is severely punished by being "forced by brutal methods to work several weeks in the quarries. I tried to escape twice, was caught both times and punished. I worked several weeks in the quarries and once was hit so hard by one of the guards with a stick that spent several weeks in bed."

When will the Democracies discover Franco's concentration camps? On the basis that they only discovered the German camps when Germany was the enemy, and Russian camps when Russia ceased to be an ally and became a potential enemy, we suppose that Franco's camps will be dismissed as Red propaganda so long as Mr. Franco is *persona grata* with the State Department and "that lovable man" to blinkered American Senators.

LIBERTARIAN.

Italy's 'First C.O.' Faced A Third Court-Martial

PIETRO PINNA, a young man of military age who has been widely referred to as "Italy's first Conscientious Objector" has been twice court-martialled for refusing military service in the Italian army.

On the second occasion he was sentenced to six months imprisonment and has been serving his sentence in the military prison of San Elmo in Naples.

Our comrades in Naples, who publish *Volontà* have visited Pinna in prison and their report is published in *Il Libertario* (Milan 2/1/50), from which we quote:

"We were pleased to find him as firmly decided to carry on his struggle. He is simple and modest, and in a few words told us that his refusal to accept military service is simply actuated by commonsense. He is one of the few Italians who have learned something from the war. Having witnessed the horrors and destruction wrought by it, and the bitterness and evils it has left in its trail, it seems only natural to him to refuse to carry out service which is nothing more than preparation for another war. He builds no philosophical system around his action, nor does he seek the reason for his conscientious objection in high-sounding principles and theories. For him whoever really hates war and strongly desires to build the peace must take the first step, which is refusal to do military service." And our comrades point out that Pinna does not

suggest that he is guided by religious views in the matter. "In fact, it seems to us that he is the enemy of all Churches and if there is 'religiosity' in his action it can only be interpreted in terms of moral discipline and a consistence of thought and action. And nothing more than that."

Our Naples comrades report that following the amnesty granted for the Holy Year, Pinna was released, but two days after his release was sent to Bari under military escort. Our comrades foresaw a third court-martial, thus repeating the cat-and-mouse treatment of C.O.'s in this country during the first world war.

But instead, on going to Press, our Milan contemporary learns that Pinna has been unconditionally discharged from the Army. They suggest that the Government feared the public reaction to a third court-martial since the Pinna case had received wide (and sympathetic) publicity in the Italian and foreign press.

Freedom sends its greetings to "Italy's first C.O." on his release and their admiration for his uncompromising stand for what he considered to be right in the face of the powerful State machine, and for his example to Italian youth. And we might add that his example has already been followed by at least two other young men, one of whom is an anarchist comrade, Francesco Buraghi.

LEGAL SHOOTING IS ALLOWED

THOSE who are acquainted with British prison methods know of the "redband" system, wherein certain prisoners are given privileges in return for assisting in the administration of the prison. Getting their name from the fact that they wear red armbands to distinguish them from

ordinary prisoners, these "trusties" are allowed to go unsupervised within the prison walls, on messages for the officers. This is itself a privilege, and is usually supplemented by more time out of their cells in the evening, and possibly a few more coppers a week to buy the precious tobacco which is the real currency inside.

In America, however, as in other things, the prison authorities carry the method to far greater lengths. The State of Mississippi selects for the job of trustees at its Parchman Prison Farm the most ruthless type of criminal sent there, arms them, and rewards them for using those arms against fellow prisoners.

One such "shooter trusty" was released

after serving 7 years of a life sentence for murder, as a reward for killing a convict who was attacking a prison guard. Naturally he was not a reformed character, but eighteen months later went gunning again—and found his way back to the prison farm. There he was hailed by the guards as a right guy, and given charge of the prison bloodhounds. His chance to use them came when some Negro-baiters shot up a poor sharecropper's family, and the law, with the aid of our hero, armed with a sixshooter, tracked them down. The trusty, a handy man with a gun, shot them down.

What his reward will be, the report from which we take our facts could not say, but the facts themselves are revealing of the official attitude to criminality in at least one State in America—and

probably others have similar methods.

The difference between the "forces of law and order" and the force used by the criminal simply vanishes in such instances. It becomes merely a distinction of words—a matter of which side does the killing, of whether it is "legal" or "illegal".

Anarchists have always maintained that this is the case. We see it as no more moral for the State to kill an individual than for the individual to kill his victim. For a murder to be planned according to legal procedure, with Counsel debating whether their victim should die or not, and with the Judge legally condemning that victim to a particularly horrible death at the hands of a legal murderer, seems to us even more repulsive than the often unpremeditated violence of the illegal murderer.

But the American way of life as instanced above carries the business to its logical, obvious conclusion. Hardened criminals are used by the State of Mississippi to kill other criminals—and are rewarded for it, as authority always rewards its killers, though not always so obviously.

But where is the attempt to correct the wrong-doer, which is the alleged aim of the penal system in a democracy? Not in evidence, and the only thing that can be said for the American method is that it does not make the pretence at being reformative which, for instance, the more hypocritical defenders of prisons in this country do. The masters of Mississippi are Law enforcers, and if other gangsters help to do the enforcing, so what?

It is obviously all a question of who has the most force.

RUSSIA RE-INTRODUCES CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

THE publicity given by the Communists when the death penalty was abolished in Russia in 1947 may be remembered by some readers. Now, it has been reinstituted and, so far as one can ascertain, no mention is made of this fact in the *Daily Worker* (we are prepared to be corrected on this point). We can well understand that it is not easy to explain away after the fanfare of trumpets that greeted the abolition of the death penalty!

The reinstitution of capital punishment was made in the form of exceptions to the abolition decree of May, 1947.

A decree of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet said the exceptions were made in response to "statements from National Republic Trade Unions, peasant organisations, as well as from cultural leaders".

The Presidium resolved:

1—"As an exception to the decree of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., dated May 26, 1947, on the abolition of the death penalty, to allow application of the death penalty as the highest measure of punishment for traitors to the homeland, spies and saboteurs.

2—"The present decree will go into effect from the date of publication."

The decree was signed by Nikolai M. Shvernik, president of the Presidium, and A. F. Gorkin, the Presidium's secretary.

Note that "traitors to the homeland" are included. The *New York Herald Tribune* suggests two reasons for this change of policy: (1) Russia

is getting ready for a big propaganda trial which may culminate in death penalties for alleged Titoists; (2) Defections inside Russia are becoming serious.

Tribune draws attention to the coincidence that this decree was issued almost simultaneously with the new election announcement in Russia. And adds: "In marked contrast to the self-confident comments published by the Soviet press in 1947, when capital punishment was solemnly abolished, the Soviet press preserved this time a conspicuous silence on the new decree which re-introduces it."

Tribune's explanation for the decree

only partly agrees with that of the *N.Y. Herald Tribune*. In their opinion, "Experience has shown that, under Communist rule, every conceivable offence (including wholly imaginary offences) can be forced under any of these three headings. The reintroduction of the death penalty does not therefore necessarily mean, as some comments have suggested, that Russia's security is actually threatened by a dangerous network of traitors, saboteurs and spies. It merely means that the Soviet regime can no more sustain itself without spectacular scapegoats than any other dictatorial regime."

THROUGH THE PRESS

BIRMINGHAM BEDEAUX

The Department of Engineering Production at Birmingham University has set up a work measurement research unit which will attempt to establish a scientific standard for determining the output of individual workers. The unit will investigate existing standards of time study rating in various firms and industries, and determine what allowances must be made for fatigue and other factors under differing working conditions.

Manchester Guardian, 23/1/50.

IGNORANCE IS NO EXCUSE

No-one fortunate enough to possess £65, and with time enough to read twenty-eight volumes, and the capacity to understand them, can now have the excuse of saying he does not know the law.

—Mr. Justice Stable in

Observer, 22/1/50.

MISTAKEN IDENTITY

Beside a poster which read, "People Under 16 Are Asked Not To Smoke or Drink Alcohol. It Frightens The Old Folks," lanky, bearded Robert Copping, "progressive" educationist, greeted friends who gathered for his thirtieth birthday party. The host, late headmaster of Horsley Hall, do-as-you-please co-ed school in Staffordshire, had pleaded poverty. Guests brought their own refreshments.

The party launched his latest project, a Child Guidance Clinic in sedate Kensington. There children can consult him about their problems.

Expecting opposition, he has found none. Sole demonstration came from a middle-aged woman who, sighting his beard and gentle eyes, accosted him in the street with: "Lord, will you chose me?"

Daily Mirror, 23/1/50.

Alex Comfort:	
BARBARISM AND SEXUAL FREEDOM	
Boards 3/6. Paper 2/6	
Alexander Berkman:	
A.B.C. OF ANARCHISM	1/-
George Woodcock:	
ANARCHY OR CHAOS 2/6, Cloth 4/6	
NEW LIFE TO THE LAND	6d.
RAILWAYS AND SOCIETY	3d.
HOMES OR HOVELS?	6d.
ANARCHISM AND MORALITY	2d.
WHAT IS ANARCHISM?	1d.
THE BASIS OF COMMUNAL	
LIVING	1/-
Rudolf Rocker:	
NATIONALISM & CULTURE	21/-
Herbert Read:	
POETRY AND ANARCHISM Cloth 5/-	
Paper 2/6	
THE PHILOSOPHY OF ANARCHISM	
Boards 2/6, Paper 1/-	
THE EDUCATION OF FREE MEN	1/-
John Hewston:	
ITALY AFTER MUSSOLINI	6d.
ILL-HEALTH, POVERTY AND THE STATE	
Cloth 2/6, Paper 1/-	
Peter Kropotkin:	
THE STATE: ITS HISTORIC ROLE	1/-
THE WAGE SYSTEM	3d.
REVOLUTIONARY GOVERNMENT	3d.
SELECTIONS FROM HIS WRITINGS	
(Chosen by Herbert Read)	3/6
ORGANISED VENGEANCE	
CALLED JUSTICE	2d.

★
FREEDOM PRESS
27, Red Lion Street,
London, W.C.1.

Some Thoughts on

SINCE the early Christian missionaries to these islands found themselves obliged to explain the new religion in terms of the prevalent paganism, I trust I may be excused if to-day I find it necessary to explain the principles of freedom in terms of the cinema.

A recent incident, however, perfectly explains the difference between the governmental creeds of dictatorship and democracy on the one hand, and the libertarian creed of anarchism on the other. The British Board of Film Censors refused to allow a certain Italian film to be shown. This Board is, of course, unrepresentative and unelected, and cannot possibly be even remotely believed to accede to public taste, since it is a well-known fact that if a banned film can be shown in spite of them, it will draw enormous audiences, and nothing can better satisfy the commercial film exhibitor, theatrical producer or book publisher than the demand that something should be banned. The London County Council, however, as an elected body which was doubtless quite proud to say that it was conscious of its responsibilities to those it represented, sent a lady member along to see it. On her report the matter was considered and after certain "offensive" parts had been deleted, it was licensed for showing in the London area.

The Incorruptibles

We are intrigued at the mentality behind this. Let us suppose, perhaps, that the lady who went to see it was a perfect wife and mother, conscious of her high responsibilities, who out of a sense of duty volunteered to be the guinea-pig.

Representative Government & Elections

Well, she saw the offensive part. Has it affected her adversely? Is she now going to be unfaithful to her husband, neglect her children, and in defiance of her public duties take bribes from contractors? Such a suggestion would indeed be most offensive to the councillor concerned. She, of course, is perfectly unaffected by anything she sees. She, of course, is one of the elite who are not influenced by what happens on the silver screen. She is not one of us. She belongs to that high order of Watch Committee-men, Censors, Purity Leaguers, aldermen, bigwigs, bumbles, jacks-in-offices, grand dames, dogooders, lay magistrates, City Fathers, clerics, banquet-guzzlers, who are perfectly able to go anywhere and see anything but who return with the depressing news that it far too sinful for anyone else to see.

The fact that in this particular instance this lady proved slightly more tolerant than is usually the case is beside the point. This is an instance of democracy as opposed to the dictatorship implicit in the high-handed attitude of the Film Censors. They are beyond the reach of popular representation; their backside are beyond the bounds of public kicking. Democracy on the other hand, allows a certain amount of latitude in the matter—our well-being or otherwise is in the hands of the class described above, some of whom are in that position because others care to make them so by virtue of political, religious or social activities.

However, it is not at all difficult for anyone to see what the libertarian attitude would be, for it is instanced in this case by every man and woman in the street, whose opinion is usually that nobody should be forced to go and see it if they didn't want to. Since this hardly came into the present circumstance, where the cinema proprietors undoubtedly intended to limit the presentation of the film to those who paid at the doors, it is hard to see how anybody could be forced to go to see it and it really seems that such protection exists for the type of curate who sits in the front row of the Windmill Theatre with a pair of binoculars glued to his eyes, crying "Disgusting!"

Is it only a Game?

Perhaps it may seem a far cry from such a parable to serious consideration of the General Election. But before one considers the policies of the parties and slogans that resound through the political arena, one should take into consideration the fact that perhaps it is all only a game. One cannot get really worked up about the fate of the victim of a melodrama when one bears in mind that when the show is over he will wipe off his grease paint and go off to the green room to have a drink with the villain one has been expected to hiss so violently. If politics is also such a game—if after the shouting and tumult in the Commons, the gentlemen go off to the smoking-room the best of friends—are we not perhaps taking the game a little too seriously when we stop speaking to the neighbour who voted the wrong ticket?

Until recent times, the British people saw politics in their correct proportion. When Dickens described the election at Eatonswill, when the candidates rivalled each other in providing a great beano for the electorate, there was no real difference between the parties. Naturally, they had certain points of doctrine and policy which were opposed, but it was primarily family ties and connections which determined for which party the rich young man should stand, and it was seldom that the hustle-and-bustle of elections touched upon anything vital.

Certain factors made the workers a power to be reckoned with; namely, the industrialisation of the country, which made the working-class important to a

degree an agricultural community could never be in a profit-making society; and the need to incorporate it into political life, which heretofore had been a prerogative of the bourgeoisie and aristocracy. Thus certain democratic theories passed into fact, but there was an obverse side of the medal. For even if the workers got the vote, they also got the full force of modern propaganda.

Such things as conscription and taxes were once regarded in their right manner; they were resented and opposed by whatever means lay to hand; the tax-collector and the militia-sergeant were enemies as much as any foreign invader. Until modern times, in the German states there were risings against the princes who imposed such shameful demands, but in England even a hundred years ago the democratic pretence was already making the Englishman pay far more in taxes without resistance than the most autocratic despot on the Continent could wring from his subjects.

The slogan might have been those familiar and ominous words, "No rights without duties". The rights we have been given are those to pick and choose among rulers. We can elect whomsoever we wish to reside in No. 10, Downing Street, at all events in theory, but in return for that doubtful privilege, we are not consulted at all about what the politicians we elect care to do with our lives. Those who voted in 1935 for a Government, largely on the issues of not imposing sanctions on Italy, cannot remotely be said to have elected the War Cabinet of 1940 far less to have any responsibility for the declaration of war in 1939. Mr. Chamberlain came to the microphone and said we were at war. Perhaps, and perhaps not, he might have got a referendum approving it afterwards—most certainly he would never have got it before. And who approved of anything that followed—war, conquest, privations, conscription, unconditional surrender, the atom bomb? Nobody was asked. The politicians considered themselves responsible.

In fact, of course, they were not primarily responsible. To some extent they were, but to some extent they were merely in the grip of superior forces, namely, their dependence on the capitalist system and subservience to the ruling-class if they are to survive. The "sovereign people" however, had their lives completely altered and in many cases ruined or ended, at one swipe, and they did not even have the pretence of a say in the matter. No petty princeling in the old German Empire could have done it without riots and bloodshed. No modern

dictator could do it without incessant sabotage and incipient revolt. But we were urged that we should remember that we were democratic, had some say in our government, and we went like lambs to the slaughter.

Is it Liberty?

Who is going to be bold enough to say what the next Parliament may be called upon to decide? For all we can possibly tell, it may be within the power of this or some shortly subsequent Parliament to determine questions affecting the very end of the civilised world. We shall never be consulted. We are asked now to decide merely which of a few candidates we prefer to represent us. We do not know that they will do so—perhaps (as happens many times) once in Parliament they will immediately cross the floor and claim that the constituents voted not for a "party caucus"—which will really mean the mugs who did the hard work—but for their good looks and personality, and there is no reason why they should go back and stand again. Practically every candidate will join the ranks of the "City Father" brigade and banqueting bigwigs, and tell us proudly what a worthy man he is to have the confidence of so many electors, completely ignoring the work that made it possible and the political ideas of the constituents which may possibly have had something to do with the election. Perhaps we shall have a repetition of one of those charming election fights as occurred in 1945, when in one borough the electors were faced with one man who stood for closing Sunday cinemas and one man who stood for conciliation with Stalin, and opponents of Stalin who wanted cinemas open stared blankly at Quakers who wanted their Sundays dismal as well as peaceful.

By and large, the election is a farce so far as it concerns the actual daily life of the community. If the Parliament that is elected is not going to represent the people, it is a fraud to pretend that liberty comes into the question; if it is going to represent them, it is not required, for quite obviously, in such a case they would not need a Government at all. A Government that allowed the people to do as they like could not exist; but in fact a democratic Government allows people certain political freedoms (which it grants willingly or in response to struggle) on the condition that it decides what is good for them and rules them accordingly. How could a Government submit a free choice to its subjects? It allows them to decide whether or not to vote, but imagine it allowing them to decide whether or not

to pay taxes! And yet what a satire it is on Government, as Emerson pointed out. Men will pay any debt more willingly than the taxes—they fancy they get their money's worth anywhere but from the State. But if they do not want to pay taxes and there is no despotic princeling to make them, why do they pay them? Why do not their representatives say that there will be no more taxes? Because these gentlemen are elected to be a Government. They know people would not willingly pay taxes, or any other form of compulsory charity such as is involved in paying rent to a man who did not even build the house, or paying an employer the difference in the profit one makes for him by one's labour and the wages he pays out. When people take it into their own hands to refuse to do these things, when they no longer keep a State or an employing class, when they no longer subsidise the landlord and the capitalist, they will have no need of a government. Government is for slaves, but the free man has no need of States or masters.

A.M.

INFORMATION, PLEASE

IN the preparation of a book on Syndicalism in England during the years 1910 to 1918, I am most anxious to establish as clearly as possible the relationship that existed in that period between Syndicalism and Anarchism. More specifically, I am interested in ascertaining the attitude of Kropotkin and Malatesta towards Syndicalism. I am also interested in learning the origin of the word "anarcho-syndicalism" and have several different theories to examine. Any correspondence, unpublished manuscripts, pamphlets or memoirs, or even the personal opinions of persons active during that period would be most helpful to me. I shall undertake to return all material in the same condition in which it reaches me.

EUGENE BURDICK,

Magdalen College, Oxford.

WHAT A COUNTRY!

THE Bishop of Lourdes has just returned from the United States and he just can't believe his eyes at some of the things he saw there. He told his goggling parishioners that in that wondrous country, why, they "count church contributions on an adding machine" and as to the extent of publicity, even undertakers joined in the fun. One sign read: "Die and we will do the rest," whilst yet another read: "From earth to Heaven for \$90." And even for the faithful of Lourdes it took some believing!

APOLOGY

We regret having to hold over the continuation of the reports on the International Anarchist Congress, for lack of space. We hope to continue them next issue, which we are considering making a special anti-election number.—Eds.

Special Appeal

January 13th to 26th:

Gosport: F.G.* 5/-; Stockton-on-Tees: R.H.M. 1/6; Chichester: G.B.A. 1/6; Sale: E.R. 1/6; Colchester: W.G.P. 1/6; Colne: L.V.B.* 2/6; London: C.F. 1/6; Per V.R.: S.K. 10/-; New York: Resistance 1/-; Long Eaton: C.W.R.* 2/-; Addlestone: C.S. 5/-; Yardley, Penn.: W.S. 7/-; Leeds: P.M.M.H. 11/-; California: per M. £1/15/0; Providence, R.I.: Circ. Libertario £7; Vancouver: L.B. 7/-; San Francisco Group: £17/10/0; San Francisco Group: 14/-; Allentown, P.A.: W.S. 14/-; Needham, Mass.: Gruppo Libertario £3/10/0; Chicago: L.C. 7/-; Chicago: O.C. £1/15/0.

Total	£35 14 0
Previously Acknowledged	£11 8 5
1950 TOTAL TO DATE	£47 2 5

*After initials indicates contributors to the 5/- a month scheme proposed by a London reader.

FREEDOM

Anarchist Fortnightly
Price 3d.

Postal Subscription Rates
6 months 4/6 (U.S.A. \$1).
12 months 8/6 (U.S.A. \$2).
Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies
6 months 7/6 (\$1.50).
12 months 15/- (\$3).
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.

Meetings and Announcements

UNION OF ANARCHIST GROUPS: CENTRAL LONDON

INDOOR Lecture-Discussions every Sunday at 7.30 p.m. at the

Trade Union Club, Great Newport St., W.C.2 (near Leicester Square Station).

February 5th Speaker: S. E. Parker "DIRECT ACTION & THE INDIVIDUAL"

February 12th Speaker: Margery Mitchell "THE HISTORY OF GOVERNMENT"

February 19th Speaker: Albert Meltzer "THE FUTILITY OF ELECTIONS"

GLASGOW ANARCHIST GROUP

INDOOR MEETINGS every Sunday at 7 p.m. at the

CENTRAL HALLS, 25 BATH STREET, GLASGOW.

Frank Leech, John Gaffney, Eddie Shaw.

MERSEYSIDE ANARCHIST GROUP

OPEN DISCUSSION MEETINGS held fortnightly

PLEASE NOTE: NEXT MEETING

Sunday, February 11th, at 7.30 p.m.

Meetings fortnightly thereafter.

Enquiries: Ring Royal 4669

COLNE & NELSON DISTRICT

Discussion Group to be held fortnightly.

Sunday, February 11th, at 3.0 p.m.

at Twisters and Drawers Club, Cambridge Street, Colne (Lancs.)

HAMPSTEAD

Discussion Meetings are held every Tuesday, at 7.30 p.m. prompt at

5, Villas-on-the-Heath, Vale of Health, Hampstead, N.W.3

Tuesday, February 7th:

"ANARCHISM & INDUSTRY"

Discussion led by Michael Bass

DEBATE

on the motion that: "FREE LOVE IS DESIRABLE AND PRACTICABLE IN MODERN SOCIETY"

Proposers:

Rita Milton Philip Sansom (London Anarchist Group)

Opposers:

Speakers from the Marriage Guidance Council

at

YOUTH HOUSE, 250 Camden Rd., N.W.1 on Monday, 6th February, at 7 p.m.

ABC OF AUTHORITY

(Continued)

G is for Governmental Authority. It is usually suggested that if there were no laws, everyone would run amok, slitting throats, raping, snatching lollipops from babies, and so on. But would you? There are only three types of crime:

1. Crimes against property which would cease with the abolition of the idea of property.
2. Crimes against the State, which would cease with the abolition of the State.
3. Crimes which have a sexual origin, which would soon end if there were no sexual repression, and people were able, from birth onwards to have a properly adjusted sexual life.

H is for Household Authority. It is natural for children to admire, imitate and obey their elders during the biological "rearing period". But the experiments of free schools have shown that there is no need for children to be punished, or for them to continue to obey their parents once their natural inclination to do so has ended.

(To be continued)

D.R.

The Trend Towards Tyranny

(Continued from page 1)

rewards, something which would have bitterly shocked our grandfathers. And although those who have been most vigilant on behalf of civil liberty in the past have constantly struggled to limit the power of the police, we now see an inflated police force with inevitably increased powers. In Scotland last week an appeal judge quashed a conviction for safe blowing on the grounds that some of the police evidence had been obtained by taking part of the accused man's fingernails before he was arrested and without his consent. The whole basis of the subject's freedom depended, he declared, on the police respecting his rights, and that therefore, for this reason alone, the conviction must be quashed. Now, in this case, the evidence for the prosecution showed that it had been obtained in a questionable way, and the appeal was able to make skilful use of this fact. But on how many occasions do the police obtain their evidence in a no less questionable way without however being naive enough to reveal their methods in court.

There is little doubt that the basic freedoms are still defended in this country, perhaps more than anywhere

else in the world. But that should not shut our eyes to the fact that they are also exposed to the same threats as elsewhere; the same trend towards tyranny exists here as elsewhere—it is world-wide. The examples we have so far drawn upon may perhaps be regarded as sporadic. But when one looks to the Russian-dominated sections of the world one sees this trend in full development. The recent trials in the Balkan countries (and Yugoslavia can be regarded in the same light, the Tito-Cominform struggle notwithstanding), the burning of the books and the re-writing of history in Czechoslovakia, the development of a militarised police force in the Soviet sector of Germany—all these show the end of the road of reaction. As Stalin said, "Hitlers come and go—but in the Russian-dominated section of Germany the concentration camps, the secret police, the system of informers still remains, more efficient than ever."

What To Do?

The existence of this trend can scarcely be overlooked by anyone who maintains an open eye. Its very world-wide nature provides a safeguard against a certain kind of ineffective response.

Obviously, the Communists have now stepped into the shoes of the Nazis as the most openly declared enemies of freedom and liberal conceptions. But, equally obviously, the methods of the Australian Government only further the trend of which the Communist occupied states provide the fully developed example. To use repressive measures, to maintain the present trend, is to hasten the advent of world totalitarianism, to hasten the destruction of individual freedom with all its potentialities for future development of man.

Not merely it is necessary to recognise the trend of our time, and fight against it; it is also necessary to recognise that this trend is enshrined in the whole conception of government; is in fact, a manifestation of the development of government in our epoch. The liberties which were secured during the liberal heyday are not now to be safeguarded by harking back to the past; a more radical criticism is necessary—that of the destructive nature of the very institution of government itself. A war has been fought against Nazi totalitarianism (with what results to freedom we have seen)—and the trend still continues. It is time to assert the necessity for freedom from government.