

The I.L.P. Should Know Better!

Nonsense About Neutrality

THE YUGOSLAV ELECTIONS

(from our Balkan correspondent)

PARLIAMENTARY elections were held in Yugoslavia on the 27th March, after several weeks of monster meetings and mammoth speeches by Tito and his henchmen, in which they blamed the Cominform, the "selfish" peasants, and the high rate of absenteeism among the workers, for the country's very difficult economic situation and called on their audiences to make fresh efforts and new sacrifices to fulfil the Five-Year Plan and protect the independence of the State. All the 620 candidates belonged to the Communist-dominated People's Front and were therefore certain to be returned. These "sole representatives of the toiling masses" included no less than 282 intellectuals forming the upper layer of the ruling class, 54 army and secret police officers, while the peasantry comprising over 70% of the entire population was represented by only 92 peasant supporters of Tito.

The press in this country considered the record poll (over 90%) as a vote of confidence for Marshal Tito's policy and as a sign of resistance to Moscow, while the B.B.C. Balkan correspondent declared that he saw "no signs of pressure" on the voters! What both the press and the B.B.C. failed to mention was the fact that Tito and his gang, whose rise to power was helped by the Tommy-guns supplied by Mr. Churchill and Comrade Stalin, had complete control of all aspects of Yugoslav life, whose chief characteristics are to-day appalling poverty, senseless ordering about and great apathy. Consequently, the person who encourages others to abstain or who even does not vote himself, can and does often lose his job, his permit to work and his ration book, finds a few strangers suddenly billeted in his already overcrowded flat while his children may be faced by bureaucratic obstruction if they want to proceed to the university. If he is a peasant who has not yet joined a collective farm, life can be made more unpleasant by the State withholding fertilisers, seeds and loans while he may be asked to hand over to the Government a higher proportion of his agricultural produce. On top of everything, the secret police, led by "People's Hero" Rankovich and the public prosecutors may, whenever they like it, charge him with having been a Fascist during the war and a black marketeer afterwards, and send him for a few months to some "voluntary labour brigade" or to prison.

Under these circumstances it is not surprising that on the 27th March the peoples of Yugoslavia, lacking many sincere friends in the West and knowing that their future will not be decided at elections run by scoundrels like Tito, had no alternative but to vote for the totalitarian government just as in another bastion of Western democracy Spaniards had to vote for Generalissimo Franco.

I.A.

ANTI-MILITARISTS MUST THINK MORE CLEARLY THAN THIS

DURING the last war, anarchists had many occasions for pointing out that the end of the war would not mean the end of war itself, and not even the war leaders tried to pretend that it was a war to end war. Of course, public figures speak now of the necessity to outlaw war, but however devoutly they may desire to achieve this, there are few indeed among their hearers and readers who regard such statements as more than empty and wishful gesturing. Less than five years after the technical end of the war in Europe, the threat of war is as dark as ever. It is the problem from which we never escape, from which we seldom to-day even have respite. For anarchists and other anti-militarists, disenchanted with the gloss and glory of fighting, it is a problem of unrelieved bitterness and pain. Readers of this journal may well desire to turn away from it and seek relief in some positive and rewarding activity until such time as the new war renews its devastation and makes a mock of positive aspirations.

But war is the central problem of our time. It is the leading symptom of our social system, the outstanding product of our economics. Its roots lie in our whole moral fabric, our whole attitude to life. There is no sidestepping it. The attempt to understand and completely comprehend war is the most burning and urgent task that confronts revolutionary social movements.

Can Britain Remain Neutral?

Anarchists have made their own stand plain. Whether we understand the causes and functions of war or not, we can have no doubt about its utterly

baleful effects. Hence, as individuals, we refuse to have anything to do with its conduct, and are resistant to the blandishments of the "lesser evil" type. Refusal of participation is a practical step that any individual can decide to take; but is it a practical step for a 'nation'? The Independent Labour Party, with their strong though inconstant and unequal anti-war tradition, evidently think it is, for at their annual conference at Whitley Bay they passed a resolution calling on the Government to declare that Britain would be neutral in any future world war.

Now resolutions are comforting things; not seldom that is all they are. It is not, however, only futile to pass empty but comforting resolutions. As we had to point out again and again during the last war to both the pacifists and the I.L.P., such "activity" harms

the anti-war cause. To feel that you have done something when you have passed a pious resolution, allows you to relax your efforts. In effect such activity withdraws effort and energy from the struggle. And that is not all. To encourage the resolution-passing type of anti-militarism, discourages that probing into the causes and roots of war which is more than ever urgent. No doubt it is nice to feel that good-hearted people share one's abhorrence for an evil thing; it is infuriating to

find that that's as far as it goes, and that they content themselves with idle gestures.

Why do we denounce the I.L.P. resolution with such finality? It is because we have had two world wars to demonstrate to us that nations enter armed conflict as it were willy-nilly. No one wants it, yet we are all drawn in. But the most superficial study of the problem shows

PAGE FOUR

Somebody Else Finds Out!

ALEXANDER WERTH, a journalist once much quoted by the *Daily Worker*, but whose name is dirt with the Stalinists since he ceased to be an enthusiastic supporter of Russia, sends a report to the *Manchester Guardian* of the new Russian film—"The Great Soviet Film of 1949"—called "The Battle of Stalingrad" which is now being shown in Paris in which he shows how Russian historic films like their history books are brought up-to-date to fit in with the current Party political line. And, of course, Stalin always must figure as the "brain" behind every successful initiative. Thus: "The thing that struck me most was that the whole story had become completely dehumanised. They were not the people I had known at Stalingrad—they were robots instead. The officers and the men seemed to have only one full-time function: to carry out faithfully the orders of Comrade Stalin. The whole thing was earnest, without humour, without humanity. The heroics were purely mechanical."

Russian generals who are still in favour are given prominence in the film whereas "Marshal Zhukov, who in

Stalin's final Order of the Day on the Stalingrad victory is given the very first place among those who planned and carried out the operation, is not mentioned in the film at all. So is history rewritten, even history as recent as 1943."

And from the political point of view, the film is of further interest in that "the German generals, and especially Von Paulus, are not caricatured as they always were in earlier Russian films. Their behaviour is just about as mechanical as that of the Russian generals, but most of them look reasonably handsome and superficially human, and Paulus is, if anything, treated with a certain touch of sympathy—a good soldier betrayed by his maniac of a Führer."

And Alexander Werth concludes: "Altogether the film reveals a new attitude to Germany—and to the German Army."

But didn't Mr. Werth know that the Russians have been rewriting history for years now, and that at the time when he was one of their admirers they had already removed Trotsky's name from the official history of the Russian Revolution?

SATISFACTION IN SERVICE

FAMILIAR as we are with the blinkered left-wingers, we can still be astonished at some of the sheer muddle-headedness which they can betray at times.

In *The Plebs* (the organ of the National Council of Labour Colleges) a Labour supporter has been discussing the principles of Joint Management, making abundantly clear the vast gap that exists between the reformist's satisfaction at seeing the ex-workers rub shoulders with the boss, and the revolutionary's frustration at anything less than Workers' Control.

In the first place, of course, those who support political parties do so because their structures correspond in some way to the structures they wish to see applied to society as a whole. Party members are not slow in discovering the difference between the professions of democracy which their leaders make when facing outwards and the demands for discipline with which they face inwards. But since they recognise that the path of parliamentary reform is paved with compromise, and they accept the principle of leadership, they remain members and apologists, loyally putting over the party line whatever back-slidings that may entail—because they still conceive the leader-follower or manager-worker relationship as the only efficient one.

This is one of the reasons why political parties command such support, for it entails no different attitude to be a party member than to be a citizen in a class-divided society, while to be a member of an anarchist organisation entails an entirely different approach. The anarchist is completely autonomous within his group, his group is autonomous within the federation of groups, and there are no directives from above or appeals for discipline should either group or individual hold opinions on specific issues which are not shared by others. This makes the individual completely responsible for himself and to himself, free and equal among his fellows, and those who can only give

or take orders find themselves out of their depth.

It is small wonder, then, that the writer in *Plebs* (Mr. John Bright) finds nothing to quarrel with in the principle of centralised management, and is only concerned to prove that workers can be found who have the necessary qualifications to become managers, and that under nationalisation the class conflict is solved by putting workers on the managerial boards.

As a very short term policy, this is probably effective. Already the conflict which once existed between Trade Unions and managements has been resolved—by such measures as Whitley Councils and other means by which T.U. officials are brought into collaboration with managements. Again, it may be possible for managements to buy off militant workers or spokesmen who could serve their class well, simply by lifting them out of that class by the offer of managerial jobs.

— at £5,000 a year!

But these are short-term measures: there are limits to the number of managerial jobs and to the concessions employers can make to workers—and the State is in a position here no different from any private employer.

The main position, however, and the real struggle, remain the same. Since a management can exist of only a few individuals, the maintenance of the manager-worker set-up entails the continued dominance of the many by the few, and the workers have been presented with enough examples of the "self-made man" to know by now that the ex-worker in a position of authority is no less dominated by his pocket and his pride than the boss by inheritance.

When, therefore, we read supposed Socialists putting forward these managerial ideas, we can only suppose them to be the victims of a theory, or completely unaware of the nature of true industrial democracy—or, more likely, both.

And this leads to some very muddled thinking indeed. "We have to develop within the working class," says Mr. Bright, "the desire to give service. That will lead to some (and those will be among the best) wishing to fit themselves for service at the highest levels, so that ultimately questions of consultation or joint management will not arise."

Now my view is that it is about time the working-class started thinking in terms of getting a little service instead of giving it. For generations the workers have been serving the community—and getting sweet Fanny Adams in return for it. They should now begin to realise that the wealth they have created belongs to them, by right of creation, and not to those who exploit both them and that created wealth by right of legal ownership.

While to speak of "some wishing to fit themselves for service at the highest levels" is just a nice cosy way of saying that some will have their eyes on the main chance. We know all about this "service at the highest levels", and the only high level about it is the level of

remuneration, and we find no pleasure in seeing ex-dockers or ex-miners now enjoying fat salaries as members of national boards while the real service is provided by workers who have no say in the running of their industry.

It is easy to find satisfaction in service at a salary of £5,000 a year! But let managerial jobs carry a salary equal only to the average earned by bench-workers, and see what sort of unselfish desire for service most of the present managers will show!

Mr. Bright goes on to contradict himself on other issues. After maintaining that neither a manager nor even a foreman can seek agreement from his workers, but must give orders, he goes on to say that "we now have to aim at taking the term 'boss' out of our discussions."

Now it is all very nice to take the term "boss" out of discussion. What we want to do is to take the function of boss out of industry in fact. And it is

useless for Labour apologists to claim that workers in publicly-owned industries are their own bosses, for that is just not true, and while there are managers who give orders and workers who take them, no matter how much consultation there may be, there are still bosses, and they are not the workers.

How different all this covering-up, and talking round the unpleasant point is from the anarcho-syndicalist point of view! This states quite categorically that in a system of workers' control there is no room for bosses under any guise whatever.

When industries have been socialised instead of nationalised—that is, when they have passed into the hands of the people and not into the hands of the State, all the direction or co-ordination necessary can be carried on, where possible, by agreement by all workers in a plant through full factory or workshop meetings, or, if that is not practicable, through workshop committees of delegates elected directly by and from the workers on a basis of no-privilege and no permanent office-holding. This safeguards against the possibility of the growth of a privileged sect of managers—for these delegates are not elected to discuss with capitalist or State-nominated managers, but to do the whole work of running the industry on behalf of the workers concerned and of the community as a whole, and cannot be motivated by desire for personal gain.

In the free society of which workers' control represents the industrial principle, the aim should be to use the productive capacity of modern technology to the full—while at the same time eliminating the fierce tempo of work that much of modern production demands. If this work is carried on for the benefit of the community (of which every worker is a part) and not for the profit of an employer or the purposes of a capitalistic State, it will not be a question of "service" but of workers playing an essential part in a society which recognises that they are an essential part of that society, equal in their responsibility and freedom to all others.

P.S.

The Abolition of Property

ONE of our readers asked us to explain more fully the views of the Anarchists on property. We answered him by reproducing short extracts from Proudhon, Bakunin, Kropotkin and Tolstoy. From all of them it appeared clearly that Anarchists condemn property as being based on injustice and obtained through exploitation, oppression and violence. They condemned it further, as being "at once the consequence and the basis of the State" and having a corrupting influence on the privileged classes while the poor starve and are physically and morally crushed.

According to the Anarchists the first task of the revolution must be the abolition of property. Both the means of production and consumption goods must be expropriated and put at the disposal of the whole community.

How property is going to be abolished does not seem to be clear to many people. Some confusion has arisen in their minds because of the expressions used by revolutionary movements and the Anarchists in particular who advocate the seizure of the land and the factories by the workers. This seems to imply that property instead of being abolished is going to be transferred from one group of people to another.

MARIE LOUISE BERNERI MEMORIAL COMMITTEE

First List of Contributions

Receipt No. 1. Fordingbridge: A.J. £100; 2. Wimbledon: E.M. £10; 3. Hounslow: Miss E. 5/-; 4. Leicester: F.E.O.B. 1/-; 5. Peterborough: M. & A.W. £1; 6. York: H.A.A. £1; 7. Kirby-le-Soken: C.C. 10/-; 8. Liverpool: H.H.J. £2/2/0; 9. Cambridge: C.L.D. 7/6; 10. Glasgow: S.M. 6/-; 11. Anon. per K.R. 10/-; 12. Anon. per K.R. 2/6; 13. Colne: L.B. £1; 14. Colne: K. & P.R. £1/1/4; 15. Hawick: W.A.L. 5/-; 16. London: J.G.H. £1/1/0; 17. London: L.G.W. £5; 18. St. Anne's: C.A. 7/6; 19. Bristol: Anon £1; 20. London Hospital Students 12/-; 21. Oslo: K.P. 15/-; 22. Hull: M.A. £1; 23. London: R. 2/-; 24. Los Angeles: S.C. 5/-; 25. Glasgow: per J.G., H.T.D. 5/-; 26. Per J.G., C. 5/-; 27. Glasgow: J.W. £1; 28. Birmingham: B.C.L. 10/-; 29. Leeds: M.S. £1; 30. London: Freie Arbeiter Stimme Group £1; 31. Bristol: E.B. £1/1/0; 32. Madras: K.S.R. 10/-; 33. Edinburgh: W.M.C. £1; 34. Donated at Summer School, per C.W. £1/7/6; 35. London: C.W. £5; 36. London: V.R. £10; 37. Anon 14/6; 38. Per O.M., Bronx, N.Y.: N.N. 12/6; Providence, R.I.: H. Circ. Lib. £3/15/0; Newark, N.J.: O.M. £1/5/0; 39. Glasgow: J.W. £1; 40. Mexico: M.F. £1/16/0; 41. London: N.T. £30; 42. London: N.T. £20; 43. Per O.M., Corona, N.Y.: A.M. 14/-; 44. London: E.C. £1/10/0; 45. London: Mrs. W.S. 10/-; 46. Melbourne: Comrades per B.F. £9/11/0; 47. London: Mrs. R. £5; 48. London: V.R. £5/16/0; 49. London: N.T. £20; 50. London: V.R. £4/4/0; 51. London: A.M. £1; 52. Anon: £25; 53. London: P.S. £2; 54. London: Mrs. R. £10; 55. York: H.A.A. 10/-; 56. Selkirk: W.A.L. 5/-; 57. London: A.C. £1/1/0; 58. London: J.P. 10/6; 59. Glasgow: S.M. 10/3; 60. Sidmouth: J.S. £1; 61. Cambridge: J.W.S. 4/9; 62. London: A.P. 10/6; 63. Bury: J.H.M. 5/-; 64. Leeds: M.F. £1/4/3; 65. London: H.F. £1; 66. Guernsey: B.S. 5/-; 67. London: L.F. £1; 68. London: W.W. 5/-; 69. London: J.V. 10/6; 70. Coleman Hatch: D.M. £1; 71. London: C. & P.D. £2/2/0; 72. Aldenham: J.B.P. 10/3; 73. Bradford: A.B.H. 4/9; 74. Inverness: J.E. MacD. 5/-.

TOTAL up to April 7, 1950:
£308/12/7

This does not include payments for the Brochure or advance payments for *Journey Through Utopia*.

On the first anniversary of Marie Louise Berneri's death, we are reprinting one of her articles which will later be gathered together in book form and published by the Memorial Committee. In answer to a questioner, she outlines the anarchist attitude towards property, in a little essay which illustrates her lucid but simple method of dealing with subjects which political theorists have made complicated and abstruse.

Ownership

When the Anarchists advocate the occupation of the factories by the workers and the seizure of the land by the peasants they do not mean that those workers should become the owners instead of the capitalists or the State, but that they should act as agents for the whole of society. After the revolution everything will belong to all—which comes to the same thing as saying that nothing will belong to anyone in particular.

When workers expropriate a factory they will not become a kind of shareholders, each owning 1/10th or 1/100th part of the factory. The factory will not belong to them any more than to the miners or the agricultural labourers who may be working nearby; they will be merely running it for the whole of the community which meanwhile will provide them with the things they need.

If we said that the factories, and land, etc., should become the property of the workers (using the word in the sense it has been used up to now) we would be creating a new injustice. Property "is the right of using and abusing"; there is nothing which prevents a man from destroying his own house, and for years capitalists have destroyed whole crops of wheat, bananas, oranges, or coffee, or thrown fish back into the sea merely because it belonged to them and they could do what they wanted with it. Eccentric ladies have their dogs, their personal belongings, their yachts, etc., destroyed after their death. According to the present conception of the word 'property', workers owning a factory would be able to destroy it if they wanted to, or destroy its products if they chose. This is a very unlikely hypothesis and there are other reasons for condemning property. Collective property is as illogical and unjust as private property. Everything created in society is the result of common labour. A factory which may have taken hundreds of workers to build, which possesses machines created by the efforts of generations of engineers cannot be said to belong to anyone in particular. If from one owner the property passes to a hundred, the injustice would still be there.

Of course, the abolition of property in factories and land must be followed by its abolition in consumption goods, the abolition of money and the abolition of wages. Men value property to-day for the privileges it gives. Shareholders value their shares in a factory because of the profits they draw from them which allow them to live on a better scale than ordinary workers and give them a superior position in society. With the abolition of money and wages, and private property in consumers' goods, "owning" a factory would become a completely meaningless term.

"Social" Property and "Personal" Property

The injustice of private property in the means of production is generally recognised, but many people try to draw a distinction between two kinds of property: the factories, land, etc., which would allow men to exploit other people's labour on one hand and the personal possessions like a house, cars, books, etc., on the other. Says our critic, "Surely you don't want a man's hammer or bicycle to belong to the whole of society?"

The answer is yes and no. There are obviously things which can't belong to several people; a tooth brush, for example, is rightly considered by people as an instrument they should have an exclusive privilege to use. But supposing hammers and bicycles were in very short supply; then it would be wrong for a man to say: "this hammer or bicycle belongs to me" and thereby deprive other men from using them. The same principle would apply to a house. There is nothing wrong in a family wanting to have a house to themselves; they are obviously entitled to comfort and privacy. But supposing that after the revolution there were for a time a number of people without shelter, then it would be wrong for a man or a family to have a whole house to themselves and if they refused to share it with other members it would show that the old capitalist mode of thinking is still alive.

We want to abolish poverty altogether. It might at first seem just that a man should own a house, tools, bicycle or car because it is true that these possessions would not allow him to exploit his fellow workers but it is equally true that by owning these commodities he may be excluding other workers who have an equal claim to them. One cannot share everything and one will still say my bed when sleeping in it, my coat when wearing it but one will realise that one has no exclusive right to the bed or coat as long as other men go without.

After the Revolution

During and after the revolution it will be the job of the communes or the distribution syndicates to distribute the food and other commodities amongst the population. They will start by collectivising food, transport,

clothes and other commodities and will distribute them as fairly as possible. But if there were a shortage of goods it should be the duty of each member of the community to bring to the distribution what "belongs" to him so as to share it with others. If this were not done spontaneously, if a man possessed stores of food while the population starved there is no reason why the commune or the syndicate should not take the goods and distribute them amongst the population. If bicycles or cars were urgently needed they should be equally requisitioned. This is why we cannot accept the view that only the land and the factories should belong to all.

The method of consumption will undergo a change as radical as that of production. Things like cars, tools, books, records, will generally no longer be used by men individually but will be shared by a group. There is no reason why individuals should accumulate a great number of tools, books, etc., in their own house when they can borrow them from a communal centre. There is no reason why each man should have a car in his garage if he can borrow it, when he needs it, from the communal garage. The lending library system could be applied to most commodities of life. If a family has guests it should be able to go to the communal centre and get the extra crockery, bedding, beds and chairs necessary to accommodate the guests; when these have left, the articles borrowed could be returned to the centre. Vacuum cleaners, washing machines, paint sprayers and a hundred other things could be equally borrowed every time they are needed. In this way even if the production of industrial goods does not expand so as to provide each individual with all the commodities he requires he will be able, nevertheless, to have access to them. The

other advantage will be to cut down the amount of furniture and household articles in the house which generally take up a lot of space and complicate housekeeping.

Changed Conceptions

To our minds, influenced by capitalist ideas, the abolition of property may seem rather disturbing. There is in many of us a reluctance to share what we have with others. The isolation of man in present-day society has created in him a strong individualistic feeling. This selfish attitude did not exist amongst savages or in primitive societies where men used to feel part of the community. As Kropotkin has abundantly shown in *Mutual Aid*, members of the same community shared all they had, food, clothes, houses, implements of work.

There is no doubt that, after the revolution, the work in common for the good of all, the daily contact with neighbours in factories and at home will give birth to a revival of feelings of fraternity amongst men. It is by no means unpleasant and one likes sharing what one has with friends. When friendly relations will exist amongst all men it will seem a natural thing to put everything one has in common.

One may remind sceptics that relations between men have undergone very deep changes through the ages and that there is no reason why the relation between men and things should not undergo equally deep ones. There were times in history when men thought that they had the right to possess slaves and do what they liked with their lives. This would seem repugnant to most men to-day (capitalists and politicians excepted). Man considered his wife as his personal property which he could treat as he wished. Now he tends to regard her as a companion and admit that she is free to think and act as she chooses. There is no reason to suppose that once capitalism, money and wages have been abolished our attitude towards property will not undergo a similar fundamental change so that the word will be rendered completely meaningless.

M.L.B.

(War Commentary, Mid-June, 1944)

Marie Louise Berneri

IT is appropriate that the first publication of the Marie Louise Berneri Memorial Committee should be a tribute to Marie Louise herself. It is a beautifully produced brochure of 52 pages, cloth-bound. The fourteen illustrations show Marie Louise at various stages of her development, and in various moods—straight portraits which catch the beauty and gaiety of her spirit, snapshots of Marie Louise at work or on holiday, with a group of Spanish refugees and addressing a meeting of factory workers in Glasgow. To all who knew her, these are precious memorials, and we must be thankful that among her nearest friends were two such excellent photographers as V.R. and P.D. The Introduction relates the main facts of her life—her childhood as the daughter of political refugees, her growth to maturity in an atmosphere of intense revolutionary activity, and the final twelve years in which she herself took up the leadership from her assassinated father. She was the great daughter of a great father. There is about everything that Camillo Berneri wrote the clear impression of genius—he himself would have preferred the word "style"—in a letter to Marie Louise printed in this brochure he says: "Whenever conscience is involved, reason leads me to no decision. The *ultima ratio*, what really decides

the issue, is style: this is not my style—for me that is the last word." It was the last word for his daughter, too. She had this instinct for living with style, and if this should seem a modish word, let us remember that her style took the form of love for humanity. Camillo Berneri wrote his letter a few hours before he was seized by the Communist assassins in Barcelona, while he was keeping watch over his sleeping comrades, and in it he says: "... I am watching

over all of them, working for those who will follow. This is the only thing which is wholly fine. More absolute than love, more true than reality itself. What would man be without this sense of duty, without being moved at the thought of his oneness with those who have been, with the unknown men of the past and with those who are to come?" This is the feeling that Marie Louise inherited from her father, and which she communicated to all who came into contact with her brave spirit.

The volume "Marie Louise Berneri, 1918-1949—A Tribute" may be obtained for five shillings from the Committee or through Freedom Press.

Many readers will have been informed of the publishing activities which the Committee proposes, in continuing the work and influence of our comrade. Those who have not are invited to write for particulars.

Marie Louise Berneri Memorial Committee, 27 Red Lion Street, London, W.C.1

There is a tribute from one of the comrades she worked with in France (S. Parane); an account of her work for Freedom Press by the Freedom Press Group; a tribute from a Spanish refugee (Manuel Salgado); and another from George Woodcock, who worked with her so closely on the Freedom Press publications. All these contributors emphasize her beauty, her sympathy, and her vitality; I am glad to see that Woodcock also brings out clearly that quality in her which superficially might seem to be inconsistent with her great charm—her penetrating intelligence and clarity of vision. These qualities will become more evident to the general public as the publications of the Memorial Committee take shape, and the full range of Marie Louise's influence is felt.

HERBERT READ.

'I am a Professional Picket!'

NOT long after I last wrote to you, I left Newark, N.J., and got myself a job on one of the Hudson River excursion boats, plying up and down the Hudson during the vacation months. This provided 3 months of congenial employment and enabled me to see some New York resorts.

Following this, I put in 6 or 7 weeks on a construction job in the Bronx, N.Y., and then, together with my two Scots buddies, I decided to pull out of New York and head for warmer parts.

Discounting reports of acute unemployment in California, we agreed on the "Golden State"; so, one of my buddies contracted with a New York car dealer to deliver one of his cars—a 1949 Cadillac—to his business associate in Hollywood, Calif. This afforded us cheap transportation, and we picked up a fourth migrant in Fred Beal, the author of *Proletarian Journey* (English title: *Word from Nowhere*) and *The Red Fraud*, whom we had met at an I.W.W. Labour Martyrs Symposium in New York a couple of days previously; Beal figured on going to the West Coast to speak around the Labour unions and to sell his booklet *Red Fraud*.

We took off from New York in our 1949 "Caddy", in the early morning of November 22nd, feeling that the big city

was already booked for an early winter visitation. Out over the interState highways, we sped on a highly-interesting, if uneventful journey which took 7 days, sleeping each night in "cabins" or "courts" which dot every cross-country route.

Los Angeles is a vast, sprawling city of over two million people, with far-flung boundaries; its city limits are carried to such ridiculous lengths that it is something of a standing joke. It happens that recently L.A. displaced Philadelphia as third city in the U.S., and in point of area covered, the City of the Angels is the largest on earth [see John Gunther's *Inside U.S.A.*—chapter on Calif.]

The population complexion has a high colouring of Mexicans, Japanese, Chinese, Hawaiians, Indonesians and Negroes, added to which the "native" population is made up of Mid-Westerners who trekked West and stopped at the Pacific.

We duly found Pershing Square, the recognised open-air meeting place, a spot which was known all over the Pacific Islands among war-time G.I.s, and whose association is altogether unsavoury. For here assemble all brands and varieties of evangelists, revivalists, cultists, messianic maniacs and crackpots. The total absence, at all times, of any discussion on pressing social and economic matters is a remarkable feature. From inquiries and our own observation, we learned that such radical discussion is "discouraged" by the police.

A couple of weeks in L.A. served to convince us how critical was the job situation, so, after taking the sights, my comrades took off for Miami, Florida, where one of them has landed a job for the season there, and the other arrived back in New York where he, too, has got a job.

Meanwhile, I got myself hired by a union—Retail and Departmental Store Employees Union, C.I.O.—to serve as a professional picket, picketing a clothing store with which the union was in dispute. I was posted to a store out in Glendale, Calif., and when I entered on picket service the strike had already been on 13 weeks and now, at the time of writing, I am in my 15th week here. "Job" is to "pound the pavement" in front of the store, carrying a picket sign informing passers-by that the firm's tailors and salespeople are on strike. The store owner, on his own account, has big placards placed outside with the legend: "These pickets are not our employees, they are paid professionals", and another, "Our employees are satisfied, still on the job, and ready to serve you as usual"—which is only half-true, since the guy who relieves me on picket duty is a regular employee of the firm, and now on strike.

Already this strike has registered its own little success in the field of civil liberty. The city of Glendale, Calif., 8 miles out from L.A., is a ritzy, middle-class community of retired business people, professional and white-collar workers, and, being situated close to Hollywood, has no industry; there is an atmosphere of pride in the city's freedom from strikes, picket lines and other vulgar manifestations of labour trouble. It is a city where stores are very colourful, streets are tremendously wide and clean, and efficiently patrolled by radio cars and motor-cyclist police who promptly slap a "ticket" on you for jay-walking.

And so, it would be consistent with the traditions of such a well-trained, well-behaved community that there should be an old ordinance buried somewhere in the city's law books, which made it illegal to picket; and fittingly enough, one morning, after about 4 months picketing, my relief was arrested and taken off the line by the police and charged with having violated the city's anti-picketing law.

However, before the case went to trial, the city's Attorney informed the City Council that the law was unconstitutional and in conflict with Federal regulations in regard to picketing and labour strife, and that if the city failed to remove this little-used ordinance from its books it would run the risk of incurring suits for false arrest. Consequently, Glendale is wiping out its anti-picketing law and the union has agreed to forego its claim against it.

Victory No. 2 in this little dispute lay in the union winning the legal right to picket the home of the store proprietor. The latter took out a Court injunction against this home picketing, whereupon the union, considering the ruling unconstitutional, placed a picket right back there in defiance of the Court order. The picket was of course arrested and hauled into Court, but the presiding judge ruled that the employment by the union of a picket in front of the store proprietor's home was quite in order.

And so the fight is now 6 months old and yours truly has been almost 4 months

on the line. There you have one for the book: a professional picket—and the practice is very common here. I hope you see all the amusing angles to this institution (and it's entirely unorganised). What a field! So you see I'm still a "friend of Labour"—if only in a distorted kind of way.

I would like to say a word about Hollywood. The name is an abstraction which connotes the movie colony. Actually, the community, 8 miles from L.A. centre, but nevertheless a Postal District of L.A., houses only minor studios. The big studios are all outside the town, in Culver City, Burbank and Studio City. Likewise, the home of the movie actors are outside in Beverly Hills, Bel-Air and Malibu Beach.

However, Hollywood does contain such famous attractions as Grauman's Chinese Theatre, Earl Carroll Theatre and the Brown Derby.

So much is known all over the world about the wealth of America that I would like to tell you how millions of American "little people"—workers and unemployed are faring in this prosperity. Government Census Bureau reports and press releases record climbing unemployment, and although continuing to play down and understate the position, have to acknowledge that the current jobless total represents the highest figure since August, 1941 (i.e., before America's entry into the war), and that the condition is nation-wide. Also, in some sections, unemployment is reported to be greater to-day than it was in the depression. It was also disclosed that some States have had to ask the Government to assist them in shouldering the unemployment compensation load. Robert C. Goodwin of the Labour Department's Employment Security Bureau revealed that in the last year 20 States and Alaska and Hawaii have spent more for jobless payments than they have collected.

Partially because of the influx of seasonal agricultural workers from Mexico and migrants from other States, the unemployment position in California is inordinately acute. The "Golden State" which does everything in a big way, has

racked up a total of 600,000 jobless, and yet Governor Earl Warren, who recently called a special session of the State Legislature to tackle the question of "crime", when asked to investigate the unemployment situation, pronounced that there is "no crisis" and—more recently—"not calamitous".

In line with Warren's policy of minimising the extent of unemployment, the hysterical "press" of L.A. never misses out on the "sex-crime" circuit; their screaming headlines focussing "sex-crime" are designed to sell papers as well as to distract people's attention from the growing threat of insecurity embodied in unemployment.

Already in this State, two towns—Long Beach and San Diego—have been added to the 42 areas throughout the country that are classified by the Federal Government as "E" areas, i.e., distressed areas where 12% or more of the employable work-force is out of work.

Gov. Warren [No Crisis] recently disclosed that convicts in State Prisons who have paroles coming up, have had their paroles deferred for 6 months to 1 year on account of the jobless position on the outside. And, whilst on the subject of prisons, he also revealed that the State Penitentiary at San Quentin (the biggest walled prison in the world next to Michigan State Penitentiary at Jackson, Michigan), which was built to house 5,000 convicts, is now containing 11,000 prisoners.

Further up the coast, in the State of Washington, the job market for wage-slaves is at a post-war low. The State Employment Service reports the greatest number of applicants in history for unemployment compensation. Thousands are weekly drifting over the 26 weeks maximum pay period for jobless pay, into the near-starvation public relief grant. According to the State Social Security Dept., 10% of Washington's State population were in the breadline at the end of February. The State director of S.Sec. announced that, with some exceptions, on April 1st, up to 39,000 employable men would be cut off relief. Grants to other welfare recipients, their compensation previously slashed to or

C. Berneri:	KROPOTKIN—HIS FEDERALIST IDEAS	2d.
Errico Malatesta:	ANARCHY	6d.
	VOTE WHAT FOR?	1d.
M. L. Berneri:	WORKERS IN STALIN'S RUSSIA	1/-
F. A. Ridley:	THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH AND THE MODERN AGE	2d.
Gaston Leval:	COLLECTIVES IN SPAIN	1d.
Charles Duff:	A HANDBOOK ON HANGING	2/-
John Olday:	THE MARCH TO DEATH	1/6
	THE LIFE WE LIVE, THE DEATH WE DIE	2/6
A. Ciliga:	THE KRONSTAT REVOLT	2d.
Icarus:	THE WILHELMSHAVEN REVOLT	6d.
"Equity":	THE STRUGGLE IN THE FACTORY	3d.
McCarthy:	THE FRENCH COOKS SYNDICATE	3d.
William Godwin:	SELECTIONS FROM POLITICAL JUSTICE	3d.
	ON LAW	1d.
P. J. Proudhon:	GENERAL IDEA OF THE REVOLUTION IN THE 19TH CENTURY	Cloth 5/-

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

below the hunger level, will not be cut further before April 1st. Sign of the times was the ordinance passed last year in Seattle, Washington, fining garbage-can scavengers \$25 or 8 days in jail. The I.W.W. paper reported this grim situation: "Despite the ordinance, more and more two-wheeled carts are appearing on the streets, pulled by men collecting scrap paper and metal, empty bottles and, perchance, half-eaten pork chops from garbage-cans." I had seen plenty of evidence of this garbage-can scavenging around Newark, N.J., and New York City.

DENIS MCGLYNN

THROUGH THE PRESS

THE DEAR VICAR

The Vicar of Bracknell (Berks), the Rev. J. E. J. Fisher, suggests the birch and the "cat" as preliminaries to divorce proceedings.

In that way, he tells his parishioners, we should go far to stay the rot.
News Chronicle, 1/4/50.

QUESTION TIME

"My boy friend is being called up for National Service. We are both terribly upset about it because we have been in love for a long time and had planned to be married. All we want is to be together. I realise how selfish it is but can't National Service be avoided?"

Your problem is not to avoid National Service, but to solve your own emotional problem. I am sure that you didn't really expect me to suggest a way out. I can and must repeat those things you have heard from other people—that the period of National Service is a part of everybody's duty and must be accepted cheerfully as such. He would not be happy, you know, if you did find a way out. The day would come when he would feel ashamed and you would not want your love to be blamed for this worst of all feelings. *A man can stand most things, but shame and embarrassment—no!*

Sunday Pictorial, 2/4/50.

BROODY—OR ADDLED?

In more than one memorable passage Mr. Churchill broods on human destiny and the lust for power, surveys the unfolding scroll of our imperial history.

Times Literary Supplement, 31/3/50.

NO CARROTS

A truck-load of new carrots from Algiers lies in a siding at Dover.

The importers value the carrots at £500, and they would be quickly snapped up by greengrocers. But the Customs cannot give clearance.

Why is that? Because they are cropped carrots. They have arrived unadorned with foliage. And the Ministry of Food has ordained that from March 1 all imported new carrots must wear their "tops".

So, unless they grow some foliage while waiting in the siding (which is unlikely) they may not be eaten in Britain.

Daily Express, 27/3/50.

A ROMAN HOLIDAY

Mr. David Lilienthal says that atomic fission will provide "a whole new source of energy to do man's work". He overlooks the paradoxical fact that the more potential work-saving devices we invent, the harder, in fact, we work.

We now have—counting 52 Sundays and 7 Bank Holidays—only 59 non-working days in the year. The unscientific Romans, after their Emperor, Marcus Antonius, had reduced the number of public holidays, still kept 135 days in the year as festivals, on which freemen and slaves were obliged to cease from all business and labour.

—Letter in *Picture Post*, 1/3/50.

ATTACKS ON PRESS FREEDOM

FOREIGN COMMENTARY

HOW relative is the freedom of the Press is not always appreciated by the general public. It is a subject which *Freedom* has dealt with on many occasions, and which must be constantly raised, for only a vigilant public opinion can guarantee even a relative freedom of the Press.

From Buenos Aires comes a report (1/4/50) to the effect that the independent newspaper *La Prensa*, one of the chief critics of the Argentine government, will be forced to suspend publication due to lack of newsprint. The Presidential press office controls distribution of newsprint since the government took over all private paper stocks.

A United Press report from New York quotes the magazine *Scientific American* as stating that, "The Atomic Energy Commission has imposed a gag on physicists which threatens to prevent the American people making intelligent judgments on the atom and hydrogen bombs."

The magazine revealed that it was forced to destroy 3,000 copies of its proposed April issue because of an article written by Dr. Hans J. Bethe to which the AEC objected.

Dr. Bethe, who is prominent in the field of atomic energy research and connected with the nation's atomic programme, divulged no classified information in his article, the magazine said. He was ordered to "shut up" merely because he is connected with the United States atomic programme, it added.

From the Gold Coast comes the information that George Padmore's latest book, *Africa—Britain's Third Empire*, has been banned by the Gold Coast Government. The reason given by a Government spokesman was that apart from being "a mixture of fact and fiction", it allowed to circulate "extremist newspapers might reprint portions of it which would worsen the political tension."

As a correspondent in the *Manchester Guardian* points out: "Thus, while the British Government has subscribed to Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Rights, which states: 'Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression, this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference, and to seek, receive, and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers,' about ten million Africans are precluded from means of access to Mr. Padmore's book in their own countries, though they can if resident

in this country acquire it freely. If they take the book back home with them, however, it will be impounded."

WHEN FLOGGING IS O.K.

SIMILAR reasoning to that used by the *Manchester Guardian's* correspondent in the previous paragraph could be applied to the Government's attitude to flogging—in reverse. Whereas the Government has abolished the barbarous practice in this country and has resisted all attempts by a number of vocal editors, judges and parsons to reintroduce it, the British representative at the United Nations Trusteeship has with equal determination resisted attempts to abolish whipping in British Trust territories in Africa, as being "impracticable", and that "an adequate alternative form of punishment would have to be gradually introduced."

Politicians seem devoid of a sense of shame—or even of logic. At the same time meeting a proposal against toleration of child marriages was opposed by the same British delegate on the grounds that "It is best not to pass a law to suppress uncivilised practices and thus drive them underground."

The British Government "regards with utter abhorrence" the existence of such practices in the trust territories, he declared, but they could best be eradicated

by a programme of "educational and social persuasion".

Is whipping, by any chance, a civilised practice?

WHO IS CIVILISED?

HOW blind so-called civilised people can be to their own "primitive" practices when they draw attention to the backwardness of the African natives is shown by one of a number of remarks made by the Prime Minister of Southern Rhodesia at a recent Press conference in London. Speaking on native policy generally, he pointed out that "it is useless to endeavour to force political responsibilities on to a people who have yet to understand modern social, domestic, and economic responsibilities. I would go farther and say that it is irresponsible to place such a dangerous weapon as the vote in the hands of a people who still seek solutions to their problems by studying the entrails of a goat."

Has it never occurred to this very witty gentleman that an African native watching 100,000 devout Catholics swarming St. Peter's Square and falling on their knees when the Pope appears, and chanting prayers; and to be then told that all this is for a God about which (or whom) they know absolutely nothing—must appear most baffling and must surely make him doubt the superiority of the white man or even his sanity.

And many non-Africans would share his viewpoint on the subject!

LIBERTARIAN.

M. L. Berneri's WORKERS IN STALIN'S RUSSIA

The fundamental test of a political regime is "How do the workers fare under it?" This booklet discusses the Russian regime from this standpoint.

A new reprint (11th thousand), with a special foreword by the publishers and photograph of the author.

88 pages, with an index, 1/- (postage 2d.)

★

M. L. Berneri's SEXUALITY AND FREEDOM

was printed in Now, No. 5, together with essays, stories and poems by authors including George Woodcock, Julian Symons, Herbert Read, Henry Miller, Louis Adeane, D. S. Savage, Albert McCarthy, Simon Watson Taylor and Serge Ninn.

Copies of Now, No. 5, as well as numbers 4, 6, 7 and 9 are available at the reduced price of 1/- each or 3/6 for the five issues (postage 4d., or 2d. single issues).

MAXIMOFF AND S. V. PEARSON

THE anarchist movement is small in numbers, consisting of little groups and isolated individuals scattered throughout the world. This, and the great losses which our movement has already suffered sharpen our sense of deprivation and sorrow when we learn of the deaths of our comrades, even when our only contact has been a community of ideas. In the last fortnight, when our thoughts have turned to the tragically early death just a year ago, of our dearly loved Marie Louise Berneri, we have heard that two good friends, G. P. Maximoff, one of the dwindling number of anarchists who participated in the Russian revolution, and S. V. Pearson, a valued supporter of our own activities for a good many years, have died.

G. P. MAXIMOFF.

Maximoff died suddenly in New York on March 16th, at the age of 56. He was born in the region of Smolensk, of a peasant family, and from the age of eighteen was an active anarchist revolutionary. He took part in the armed struggle at the beginning of the October revolution, and worked tirelessly in the Petrograd strikes. Later, he was a member of a factory committee, a delegate to various congresses and a collaborator in many anarchist and syndicalist journals and organisations. He was arrested six times by the Communists. In 1919 at Kharkov, he was thrown into the condemned cell for refusing to serve in the army police. His life would not have been saved but for the intervention of the steelworkers' union.

In 1921, Maximoff was exiled from Russia with nine of his comrades after a hunger strike in prison. In 1922 at Berlin, he and other comrades, including Alexander Berkman and Emma Goldman, formed the Foreign Bureau of the Russian Anarcho-Syndicalist Confederation. (The group which gave the initiative for the famous book, *Letters from Russian Prisons*.)

Leaving Berlin for Paris, he eventually decided to emigrate to the United States, where he became editor of the review *Dielo Trouda*, and continued in this work until his death.

Maximoff was the author of the pamphlet *Bolshevism: Promises and*

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).

April 16th Speaker: Arnold Pomeranz
"THE WORK OF WILHELM REICH"

April 23rd Speaker: Philip Sansom
"1984"

April 30th Speaker: Dora Russell
"HAS FEMINISM FAILED?"

GLASGOW ANARCHIST GROUP

INDOOR MEETINGS every Sunday at 7 p.m. at the CENTRAL HALLS, 25 BATH STREET, GLASGOW.

with Frank Leech, John Gaffney, Eddie Shaw.

MERSEYSIDE ANARCHIST GROUP

OPEN DISCUSSION MEETINGS held fortnightly
PLEASE NOTE: NEXT MEETING

Sunday, April 23rd, at 7.30 p.m.

Meetings fortnightly thereafter.
Enquiries: Ring Royal 4669

COLNE & NELSON DISTRICT

Discussion Group held fortnightly.
Sunday, April 23rd, at 3.0 p.m.

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

HAMPSTEAD

Discussion Meetings are held every Tuesday at 8 p.m. prompt.

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

APRIL 18th Open Discussion

APRIL 25th "Ideologies & Revolutionaries"
Discussion led by Sam Fanaroff

NORTH-EAST LONDON GROUP

Fortnightly meetings will be resumed shortly.
Will all interested please write c/o Freedom Press

THE INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS-4

We continue below publication of translations of the resolutions passed at the recent International Anarchist Congress. (Previous articles in the series appeared in our issues of 21st January, 4th March, and 1st April.)

PROBLEMS OF THE REVOLUTION Should Armed Defence of the Revolution be Organised?

THE position outlined in the declaration on Violence and Non-Violence can be applied to the defence of revolutionary gains. Reactionary forces will continually seek to annul our victories in the permanent struggle of humanity towards its complete emancipation, since the reaction considers that every revolutionary conquest stimulates discontented elements to activity in the social struggle, to continue their march forward to the realisation of their final objective (in so far as

Reality, and besides his continual and consistent propagandist activities against Stalinist Communism, he leaves a very important book of over six hundred pages, *The Guillotine at Work*, which H.R. described in *War Commentary* as "one of the most impressive indictments ever brought against a political regime." At the time of his death he was preparing a two-volume edition of the works of Bakunin, who he greatly admired and whose ideas he always sought to spread.

To his companion who shared his work and to his comrades, we send our sympathy.

S. V. PEARSON

Dr. S. Vere Pearson died in Kingston, Jamaica, on March 19th, at the age of 75. He was a warm friend to the anarchist movement in this country, though he often disagreed with the points of view expressed in *Freedom*. He was a lifelong believer in Henry George and the single tax, but his friendship with William C. Owen, a one-time editor of the old *Freedom*, influenced his pronounced individualism in an anarchist direction. Later, he met Emma Goldman and was further influenced by her. Last year he was engaged—at the request of Mexican comrades—in collecting information about the life of William C. Owen, who had collaborated with Ricardo Flores Magon in the Mexican revolutionary paper, *Regeneracion*. He was also preparing a series of articles on the "Roosevelt myth" and the fallacies of the New Deal.

From its inception he was a supporter of the "Freedom Defence Committee" and was one of its earliest sponsors.

In 1947, as an authority on town planning problems, he lent his support to the campaign to preserve Wanstead Flats (part of Epping Forest, and one of East London's few playgrounds) from being sacrificed to municipal aggrandisement.

His life work, in which he achieved eminence, was in combating tuberculosis, and he put some of his anarchist opinions into the organisation of the Mundesley Sanatorium. At the clinical meetings, the most junior members spoke first and no "distinctions" were made in discussion. It is pleasing to see that the very warm obituaries in the medical press all speak of his uncompromising, frank, and unorthodox political opinions. In his very individual way he was a true champion of freedom.

FROM PAGE ONE

Capitalism NEEDS War

that there is no willy-nilly about it, for "nations" enter wars to defend their economic spheres of interest, and that to remain neutral would, for a major imperialist power, mean the abandonment of the economic lifelines of its capitalist existence.

But it is also increasingly clear that capitalist economy (and that includes the economy of the Soviet Union) means war economy. Peace means crises and economic depression; it requires rearmament and war to turn the wheels of industry, provide the profits without which there is no stimulus to production. It is necessary to grasp the institutional character of war in our society; without such comprehension the anti-war struggle is completely bereft of any foothold in reality.

For these reasons alone calls to the government to remain neutral are simply visionary. We leave out of account the question of whether a government which wished to remain neutral would in fact be permitted to do so. Some months ago, *Freedom* drew attention to the plans which certain American military high-ups had for using Britain as a base for operations in a future war.

Other Illusions

The anti-war movement, by its lack of clarity, goes in for other baneful futilities, and the pretence of the Com-

the revolution can be considered as a precise end).

Revolution will be as permanent as our species itself. When the free development of individuals and the possibility of perfecting social relationships are assured, the revolution will be by no means complete. Science and art, for example, will remain an unlimited field of experiment which will progressively add to the changing perspectives of society. This constant struggle is an avowal of revolutionary continuity and an affirmation that the revolution has no end and no limit.

But over and above this aspect of the question, we are here concerned with the concrete defence of hard-won liberties. We think, on this point that the defence of natural human rights is indispensable. Without it we must resign ourselves to seeing them cancelled out by the united forces of evil. This defence must be made in every sphere—in education, art, technique, etc., and one cannot finally exclude the use of armed force, since it is by force of arms that the enemies of freedom seek to destroy revolutionary advances.

Another question arises: is the armed defence of the revolution possible without the use of military and security organisations? We firmly believe that it is. If this is not so, if the armed defence of the revolution implies the existence of a permanent apparatus of coercion, it would be necessary to sacrifice revolutionary gains, since the existence of repressive organisations would inevitably lead to the dictatorship of the people by these repressive bodies, and in the face of such a situation, it would be preferable to accept the bitterness of the defeat of a false revolution, than to accept the maintenance of the situation whereby organised violence becomes an institution.

We believe that the revolution is desirable for mankind, and are convinced that, once we have swept away the fetters which prevent the rational free expression of the individual, it follows logically that the revolution will spontaneously assure its own defence, in view of the moral, intellectual and material benefits of a just and human, logical and natural state of

society. Armed defence of the revolution will be the spontaneous answer to every attempt, organised or not, by the enemies of the revolution who, through violence, seek to subjugate a free society to their own authoritarian aims.

★

Pacts and Alliances

EXPERIENCE has made us opposed to the conclusion of alliances with other forces outside our own movement. In propaganda and in actions, the anarchists have to initiate and participate in all forms of revolutionary activity, arising from popular discontent, avoiding giving assistance by their action to those who follow some limited end contrary to our aspirations towards the complete emancipation of mankind.

★

The declaration on Problems of the Revolution was not unanimously adopted. The following declaration on violence was brought to the notice of the Congress by the delegate from German-speaking Switzerland:

"CONSIDERING the experience of past revolutions which, all starting from the desire for liberation, have ended in the creation of dictatorship and new forms of tyranny; considering the state of modern technology and armaments, which make it necessary for any military force to centralise and concentrate its forces tremendously; we believe it to be very necessary and useful for the anarchists and all who desire freedom to recognise that non-violent defence is the logical form for their struggle. We believe it to be important that this method and its application should be studied by the anarchists and that it should be taken into account in their educative activities."

(To be continued)

The Editors apologise for having to hold over the third article on "Socialist Malthusians." The series will continue next issue.

ABC OF AUTHORITY

(Continued)

L is for Leadership instead of Authority. There is a natural tendency, when a group of people are performing some complicated communal act, for one of the group, not necessarily a specialist, to lead the rest. This can be seen daily among children playing in gangs, and has been observed in non Authoritarian communities studied by scientists. But the tendency towards leadership is not Authoritarian. Natural leaders arise spontaneously and unconsciously out of the group, and when the activity they have led is finished, they cease to be leaders. They never rule or threaten the other members of the group.

M is for Mutual Aid instead of Authority. If a big man overtakes a little man pushing a heavy barrow up a hill, he usually gives the little man a hand, not for gain or fame, but because his social instinct prompts him to do so; the little man would help the big man to push a cart with handles near the ground, for the same reason. This is called Mutual Aid. Without it and the social instinct which prompts it, there would be constant crime in spite of your police, little work in spite of your wages system, continual sin in spite of your priests. Mutual Aid is the fundamental basis of all social life, even under authority.

(To be continued)

D.R.

★ Out and About ★ Painter's Colic

PETER the Painter is reputed to have been given his nickname because he painted the scenery for the plays performed at the Anarchist Club in Jubilee Street. But after spending the holiday painting the house, I hardly feel inclined to emulate him (even if we had an anarchist club, and I hope we shall). My painting experiences have confirmed my agreement with the authors of *Plan 6*, (a stimulating little booklet published by the Architectural Students Association). Building, they say, is the most backward of our industries, and when I think of the windows which cannot be painted (let alone cleaned) from the outside, of the gutters which rust, and of the rain-water pipes which are so close to the wall that you can't paint behind them, I agree. Why is everything so inaccessible and unpaintable? A moment's thought, of course, recalls to mind the innumerable other well-known defects in the building of our houses (if we're lucky enough to have one). I am thinking, of course, of the purely technical defects, and not the sociological ones like the fact that one household in two has no bathroom. The housing problem is, however, not a problem at all but a question of organisation—labour and materials can be used for building houses or for making war materials and luxuries for the dollar market. The building of a house is everybody's business, we're all concerned with making ourselves at home, but for practical purposes it's nobody's business. (Again, leaving aside the fact that the question doesn't really arise, since you have to take what you can get.) The architect is concerned with making a drawing, the builder with making a profit, and the craftsman with making a living wage. As *Plan 6* says: "The building team in action is more like a scuffle of hens for corn than an ordered and responsible group of human beings making shelter for their activities."

It seems clear that the two big things wrong with the building industry are the gap between design and construction, and the fact that money values count to-day for more than human values, and it is hard to see how within the framework of our society these defects can be remedied, at least on a scale big enough to affect you and me. The real remedy will spring from workers' control—responsibility by the people who do the job, but this is not a political solution, for control by the workers means no control by politicians. So when the rain comes indoors because I can't paint the back of the gutters, I shan't say, *They* ought to do something about it, I'll say, *We* ought to.

C.

CO-OPERATIVE HELPS HOUSING

MONTHS ahead of the July deadline, tenants are moving into two co-operatively-constructed buildings near the Porte de Chatillon in Paris.

Leaders of the Building Workers' Co-operative which has erected them say that there has been "an excellent team spirit, as in all co-operatives." The organisation fixes prices as low as possible and distributes any surpluses among the builders. The two five-storey structures, with white walls and blue roofs, contain 116 apartments of two to four rooms.

Worldover Press—Paris.

Special Appeal

March 23rd to April 6th:

London: R.S. 5/-; Hanwell: R.W.M. 4/6; Anon* 2/6; York: H.A.A.* 9/-; Delaware: C.F. 11/-; Cambridge: Anon* 5/-; Glasgow: A.M.C.* 4/-; London: L.G.W.* 5/-; Sandiastre: C.W.R.* 5/-; London: D.C.M. 1/-; Gosport: A.J.M.* 5/-; London: F.E.D.* 5/-; London: C.W.* 5/-.

Total ... £3 7 0

Previously Acknowledged ... £84 10 10

1950 TOTAL TO DATE ... £87 17 10

*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.