

# Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

FREEDOM

is now published  
EVERY SATURDAY

Subscription rates see p.4

Vol. 12, No. 12

May 19th, 1951

Threepence

## War Supplies to China

SOMETHING MORE MATERIAL THAN MORAL INDIGNATION BEHIND AMERICAN DEMANDS

THE issue of British trade with China illustrates the complications of apparently simple issues as soon as one digs beneath the surface. Chinese troops, supplied from China, have for the past six months been fighting against forces in Korea which include British troops. On the face of it therefore it would seem an obvious move to refuse to trade in war materials with China. Some would say that refusal of any trade contacts is morally inescapable. In actual wartime, acts of parliament forbidding trading with the enemy are regularly enacted, and to give succour or comfort to the King's enemies becomes treachery, punishable with death. Even here, however, some exchange of goods does go on between the warring nations, and it is one of the functions of neutrals to act as clearing houses for such traffic. At such times it is customary for anti-militarist propagandists to denounce all this as blatantly immoral (as indeed it is), but a more practical outlook observes that the trade world is so interlocked that national economies are interdependent, and that wartime trade presents a kind of blackmailing give and take, necessary in order that war economies can be maintained at all. No doubt it is true that such trade represents but a fraction of the normal, but it is quite enough to create a moral storm when "our boys are being killed" by material supplied by themselves.

Since the people who make most moral noise are often enough those who have best access to the facts, and who are accustomed to take a severely practical view of economic administration, we may perhaps not take their morality too seriously. One of the difficulties is to define war materials. "Senator Malone," wrote the *Times* on May 12th, "gave his ideas when he said that 'shirt buttons are war materials when a war is in progress'—an interpretation which would make General MacArthur a serious offender. But any less inclusive definition, though it would still leave Japan in difficulties, need not worry most of Western Europe." Since it was General MacArthur who started the hare about war materials for China,

this shows how easily such fowls may come home to roost—if we may be permitted a traditional political mixed metaphor.

In the last month before war broke out with Germany in September, 1939, the commerce in steel and other war material rose very sharply, the tense international situation notwithstanding. Similarly during the first

four months of this year, China's imports of rubber from British sources was enough, according to Sir Hartley Shawcross, the President of the Board of Trade, to suffice for Chinese civilian requirements for a year. (Mr. Raymond Blackburn, M.P., insists that the figures are in reality much higher.)

Now this fact in itself is in contradiction with the obvious propaganda question of "our boys, &c." and our doubts are given more substance by informed discussion of the likely results of the recently imposed ban on war materials especially rubber. *The Times*, for example, remarks (12/5/51): "Rubber prices have dropped steadily this week, shaking local confidence in the ability of the Singapore market to withstand price-depressing manoeuvres, especially by

American buyers, which, many traders believe, are capable of being disastrously successful if British and European purchasers do not resume heavy buying." It seems that American demands for an embargo on goods to China has something more material behind it than mere honest indignation.

**Indonesian Rubber**

Another problem arises from the readiness of the Indonesian Government to sell to China if China can supply goods of which Indonesia is in need—a readiness which, according to O. M. Green, the *Observer's* Far Eastern expert, "threatens to make any ban on exports to China futile." Indonesia has an exportable surplus of rubber more than enough to supply China's entire war needs. Incidentally, the policy of the Indonesian

Government is not unaffected by the fact that it possesses a local Chinese colony numbering two millions, who practically monopolise the retail trade of the country—so that even here purely moral considerations, of which the Indonesian Government, like any other government, no doubt likes to make a show, probably have to give way to more practical pressures. Since this new nation exported no rubber at all to China in 1950, the British embargo presents a considerable trade opportunity.

In Singapore, the possible advantages are also being explored. "Government officials here believe... that... the rubber market will recover. Chinese buying of Indonesian rubber will displace the previous buyers who will naturally turn to Malaya for their purchases. It is pointed out that the total of Chinese rubber purchases in Malaya last year was little more than 7 per cent. of the total production, and that shipments to Hong Kong... were at a similar level—namely, 7.1 per cent" (*Times*, 12/5/51). In business it's an ill wind indeed that blows nobody any good!

Finally, there is yet another difficulty. To quote the *Observer* once more: "But... (the ban) does not mean that no more rubber will leave Malaya for China; these waters know too long and glittering a tradition of what ordinary people call smuggling for mere formal licences to stay their traffic" (13/5/51).

And so we come back to the moral indignation. Having used the hubbub about General MacArthur incidentally to put this propaganda pressure on the British Government, and at the same time to blow a loud moral trumpet, the American Government will return to more usual diplomatic methods of unseen pressure and compromise which constitutes the day to day commerce between the nations.

ANARCHIST.

### "I Shall Fight" says BRIAR PATCH KIRBY

WE have not yet heard the last word in the Briar Patch case. In March, Mr. Kirby sued the various Councils and Ministries responsible for ordering the demolition of the bungalow he built for his family on Briar Patch in 1940 without their permission. He lost his case. But now the Ministry of Local Government has decided that the bungalow can remain for three years. In that time Mr. Kirby is expected to find another house or a site on which to build himself one (with their authority!)

To this news, Mr. Kirby is reported as saying: "I shall still fight. Three years' grace is no good to me."

LIBERTARIAN.

## FOREIGN COMMENTARY After Willy McGee, the "Trenton Six"?

SO deeply ingrained is racial prejudice in some parts of the United States of America that those men or institutions with the power to undo some piece of racial mischief, almost inevitably prefer to refuse in the teeth of world-wide protests and with the knowledge that their refusal will be used as a propaganda weapon by their political enemies among coloured people throughout the world, and not without effect.

These were the conclusions one came to in the shocking case of the Martinsville negroes, seven of whom, all youths with one exception were executed for the alleged rape of a white woman. Democratic consciences throughout the world were deeply disturbed, by this case. But as evidence that the American nation is completely impervious to world opinion where American domestic affairs are concerned, the Martinsville case has been followed by the McGee case which ended last week when the victim, 37-year-old

Willy McGee, father of five children was led to the electric chair.

ON May 3rd, 1945, that is just six years ago, a Mrs. Hawkins, a white woman living in Laurel (Mississippi), complained to the police that she had been raped by a man at 4 o'clock in the morning. The same evening, some thirty miles away a negro lorry driver, McGee, was arrested on their charges at the instigation of his employer. Bloodstains having been found on his overalls, McGee was alleged to have made a complete confession of his crime—not of theft but of rape!

As in the Martinsville case, so with the McGee case, insufficient details are available for us to state without fear of contradiction that McGee was not guilty. That the woman was raped in a room adjacent to the one in which her husband and two children slept, without managing by her screams and struggles (she must have struggled if the prosecution's case that the bloodstains found on McGee were of her blood) to awaken them, seems too fantastic to be true. We will content ourselves with quoting the independent Paris paper *Le Monde* (3/5/51): "... an examination of the documents available to the public results in the existence of a very serious doubt as to the guilt of McGee. As in all civilised countries should not doubt weigh in favour of the accused?" Not in America, even if it takes five years to go through all the complicated processes of the law, to dispatch the victim to eternity.

McGEE was found guilty for the first time in December, 1945, but a retrial was ordered by the Supreme Court because of demonstrations against the accused during the trial which were meant, presumably, to intimidate the jury and the defence (shades of political trials behind the Iron Curtain, or indeed in France after the liberation!). The second trial which took place in a similar lynch atmosphere again resulted in a death verdict but was again dismissed, this time because the jury was composed entirely of white people. The third verdict of guilt was passed in March, 1948, and confirmed by higher Courts two years later in May, 1950. And in March of this year the Supreme Court of the United States (which deals not on the facts of the case, but on the constitutionality of the laws) refused to interfere thus leaving to the State Governor alone the decision whether or not to commute the death penalty.

The Governor may have dismissed from his mind a large proportion of the 15,000 letters of protest he is said to have received as emanating from Communist supporters making political capital out of the case. But he could not easily dismiss world liberal opinion which had been deeply shocked by this and other "racial" cases in America. Nor could he, from a purely opportunistic point of view, ignore the use Communist propagandists would make of this case in working up anti-American feeling in Africa and Asia.

## Can We Do Nothing for India?

Famine looms up in Bihar

The *Manchester Guardian's* special correspondent in Patna writes (9/5/51) that: "A sort of torpor has slowly settled over the Bihar plains, as subtle as alluvial dust. There is no work on the land from Ganges to Nepal, there is no food to eat, so man and beast lie silently clustered in the shade of the mango groves. Even the small children are quiet as they chew acid green mangoes. In the Sitamarhi district most wells are parched, and

women and children scrape the bottoms of dried-up tanks in search of tadpoles and snails to eat. Ornaments have been sold or pawned, land is being mortgaged, and money borrowed at 70 per cent.

"The men of Bihar, by nature sturdy, are kept going by their robust constitution, but children and old people are already showing signs of starvation. Children's legs cave in and rickety ribs embrace bloated bellies; adults have lost their last ounce of fat so that healthy men look like adolescents. Deaths from starvation are not yet reported, but whether a man who has not eaten for several days dies of starvation or of dysentery when eating leaves, is a point for casuistry..."

"A nursing mother gets 450 calories a day, a man gets 600, and not all get the ration. I have seen people who eat one meal every other day and one family whose members had not taken food for four days. The fair-price shops sell wheat and very inferior-quality millet, unfit almost for human consumption. "When you come back we shall be dead," people have said.

[Readers are referred to the two articles which appeared in *Freedom*, May 5th and 12th: *India Once More Faces Famine*, and *Famine and the Problem of Food Supply*, copies of which are still obtainable 7d. post free from *Freedom Press*.]

### Earnings in India

The average Indian earned 255 rupees (£19) in the financial year 1948-49, the National Income Committee said in a report described as the "first scientific attempt made at estimating the national income."

### Some Russian Wheat Ships on the Way

The Indian Prime Minister, Mr. Nehru, announced in Parliament last week that some Russian wheat ships were now on the way to India. Discussions were going on between the two countries about trade on a barter basis, he said.

### No Buyers for American Dried Eggs and Potatoes

The government to-day offered for sale on the export market 10,000,000 pounds of dried eggs at 60 cents a pound. The eggs were bought at a cost to taxpayers of \$1.03 a pound to support prices.

Dried egg sales to foreign buyers from January 1st to April 20th totalled 1,507,549 pounds at an average loss of 68 cents a pound.

Included in the export sales list of surplus commodities for May was a "substantial quantity" of potatoes at a price ranging from one cent to 60 cents per 100 pounds. The same commodities were offered to the domestic market at current market prices.

## FISH AND FINANCE

THOUSANDS of stones of fish are being thrown back into the sea because heavy landings at port have brought down prices. But, merchants say, "The collapse in price will not be fully reflected in the shops because there is a limit to which prices can be reduced if trade is to be carried on profitably." So, with all this abundance, prices still remain high in the shops.

Anarchists have always recognised that there could be enough food produced in the world to satisfy the needs of everyone, and this is just another example of the senseless waste of food carried out in the interests of profit.

We agree with some of the Labour Members of Parliament that "private enterprise should be stopped throwing fish back into the sea," but we do not agree that controlling prices in the interests of State enterprise is the answer to the

problem. We suggest that it would be much simpler to do away with prices altogether, and distribute the fish, and every other commodity, according to the needs of the people.

### REDUNDANT

DELEGATES at the Electrical Trades Union conference at Hastings expressed dissatisfaction with the Nationalised Industries. Most of the complaints were against the preponderance of black-coated workers over manual workers.

One delegate said there were seven officials to four workers in his town in Lancashire. Another complained that there were five "engineers" to look after five manual workers in a South West city.

No wonder the pension schemes and pay increases for manual workers have not been worked out in all nationalised industries. R.M.

# SIMONE WEIL'S "THOUGHTS ON WAR"

WE can speak of war in general only abstractly. Modern war differs absolutely from anything designated by that name under previous régimes. On the one hand, war is only a projection of the other war which bears the name of competition and which has made of production a simple form of struggle for domination. On the other hand, all economic life now moves forward towards an ever-impending war. In this inextricable mixture of the military and economic, where arms are put at the service of competition and production is put at the service of war, war merely reproduces the social relationships constituting the very structure of the existing order—but to a more acute degree.

**T**HIS essay is extracted from Simone Weil's article "Thoughts on War", which was written in 1934 and published in an Italian translation by Camillo Berneri and in L'Adunata; the English version appeared in the New York International Review. The remaining part of her essay analysed the attitude to war of the socialist and Marxist movements and the part played by militarism in the degeneration of the French and Russian revolutions.

logical writings, La Pesanteur et la Grâce and L'Enracinement which have been very widely circulated in the last few years. They are to be published soon in this country. (In this connection, "Candide" says, "It is hardly necessary to add that her transcendental concept of Christianity had nothing in common with the various business enterprises which go under that name.")

year went to America. Anxious to return by any means and share the sufferings of her people, she joined de Gaulle's forces and arrived in England where she determined to eat no more than the miserable rations of her own country. She died as a result, in a sanatorium at Ashford, Kent, in 1943.

Although Simone Weil, "the holy fool", as she was recently called in an American paper, graduated from opposition communism, through syndicalism to what one might call "opposition catholicism" (she would not join any Church), there is, in both her early revolutionary articles and the mystical books of her last years, the same concern for the despised and rejected, the same probing analysis of the structure of modern society, and calm condemnation of authority, that give these brief extracts their value for us to-day. C.W.

Simone Weil is probably best known to English readers for an altogether exceptional piece of literary and moral criticism, The Iliad, or The Poem of Force, which first appeared in the Marseilles Cahiers du Sud in 1940-41 and was translated in Politics (New York) for Nov. 1945, and The Wind and the Rain (Spring, 1950). But in France it is her mystical and theo-

She was born in 1909, of a French Jewish family, studied philosophy and became a school teacher. At the age of twenty she began to write in L'Ecole Emancipée and later in the syndicalist paper La Révolution Proletarienne. She worked at a factory bench for two years, and went to Spain at the outbreak of the civil war. When the anti-Jewish laws drove her from her teaching post in 1941 she worked on a farm and the following

But the helplessness in which we find ourselves at present, an helplessness which must never be regarded as unchanging, cannot exempt us from keeping faith with ourselves. It cannot excuse capitulation to the enemy, no matter what mask he assumes. No matter what is the name by which the enemy adorns himself—fascism, democracy or "dictatorship of the proletariat"—the main enemy still remains the administrative, the police and the military apparatus. Not the apparatus that is in front of us—that is only as much our enemy as it is the enemy of our brothers—but the apparatus over us and at the back of us, the monster that says it is our defender and makes of us its slaves

No matter under what circumstances, the worst possible treason consists in accepting subordination to this apparatus and trampling, in order to serve it, all human values in ourselves and others.

Marx has shown forcefully that the modern method of production consists essentially of the subordination of the workers to the instruments of labour, which are disposed of by those who do not work. He has shown how competition, knowing no other weapon than the exploitation of the workers, is transformed into a struggle of each employer against his own workmen, and, in the last analysis, of the entire class of employers against their employees.

In the same way, war in our days is distinguished by the subordination of the combatants to the instruments of combat, and the armaments, the true heroes of modern warfare, as well as the men dedicated to their service, are directed by those who do not fight. And since this directing apparatus has no other way of fighting the enemy than by sending its own soldiers, under compulsion, to their death—the war of one State against another State resolves itself into a war of the State and the military apparatus against its own army.

War in the last analysis appears as a struggle led by all the State apparatuses and their general staffs against all men old enough and able to bear arms. But while the machine used in production takes from the worker only his labour power and while employers have no other weapon of constraint than dismissal—a weapon that is somewhat blunted by the existence of the possibility for the workers to choose among different employers—each soldier is forced to sacrifice his very

life to the needs of the total military machine. He is forced to do so under the menace of execution without the benefit of a trial, which the State power holds over his head. In view of this, it makes little difference whether the war is offensive or defensive, imperialist or nationalist. Every State is obliged to employ this method since the enemy also employs it.

The great error of nearly all studies of war, an error into which all socialists have fallen, has been to consider war as an episode in foreign politics, when it is especially an act of interior politics, and the most atrocious act of all.

We are not concerned here with sentimental considerations or with a superstitious respect for human life. We are concerned with a very simple fact, that massacre is the most radical form of oppression and that soldiers do not merely expose themselves to death but are sent to death. And since every apparatus of oppression, once constituted, every war that it is shattered, every war that places the weight of a military apparatus over

the masses, forced to serve it in its manoeuvres, must be considered a factor of reaction, even though it may be led and directed by revolutionists. As for the exterior compass of such a war, that is determined by the political relationships established in the interior. Arms wielded by the apparatus of the sovereign State cannot bring liberty to anyone.

functioning of the military machine of which we are ourselves so many cogs and blindly aiding that machine to continue to crush human lives.

Thus Liebknecht's famous words: "The principal enemy is in our own country," take on their full significance and are revealed to be applicable to all wars in which soldiers are reduced to the condition of passive matter in the hands of a bureaucratic and military apparatus. This means that as long as the present war technique continues, these words apply to any war, absolutely speaking. And in our time we cannot foresee the advent of another technique. In production as in war, the increasingly collective manner with which forces are operated has not modified the essentially individual functions of decision and management. It has only placed more and more of the hands and lives at the disposal of the commanding apparatuses.

As long as we do not perceive that it is possible to avoid in the very act of production or of fighting, the domination of an apparatus over the mass, so long every revolutionary tentative will have in it something of the hopeless. For if we do know what system of production and combat we aspire with all our heart to destroy, we do not know what acceptable system could replace it. Furthermore, every attempt at reform appears puerile in face of the blind necessities implied in the operation of the monstrous social machine. For present society resembles an immense machine that ceaselessly snatches and devours human beings and which no one knows how to master. And they who sacrifice themselves for social progress resemble people who try to catch hold of the wheels and the transmission belts in order to stop the machine and are destroyed in their attempts.

It seems that, generally speaking, history obliges every political action to choose between aggravating the oppression exercised by the various State apparatuses and carrying on a merciless struggle against these apparatuses in order to shatter them. Indeed, the almost insoluble difficulties presenting themselves nowadays almost justify the pure and simple abandonment of the struggle. But if we are not to renounce all action, we must understand that we can struggle against the State apparatus only inside the country. And notably in case of war, we must choose between hindering the

## BOOK REVIEWS

# BAKUNIN FOR TO-DAY

**MARXISM, FREEDOM AND THE STATE** by Michael Bakunin. (Freedom Press, 5/-. Paper edition for Freedom readers, 2/6)

**T**HE lack of adequate translations of Bakunin's works has long formed a notable gap in the texts of classical libertarian thinkers which are available to English readers. "God and the State", a fragment of a major work, has been the sole representative for many years. One of the reasons for this situation has, I think, been the nature of the writings themselves. To a very great extent they were the by-products of a life of action, pamphlets, letters and treatises keyed in closely to the political life of their

time, and much of their contents is of interest only to the historical student. Added to this, Bakunin, like Proudhon, had a certain exuberant diffuseness, a lack of formal discipline in his writing, which makes the reading of his works in extenso a somewhat arduous task.

Yet Bakunin was a man with an unusually acute insight into the political life of his day, and his works are filled with passages of analysis and prediction which have an undiminished relevance even in our own age, while his general social philosophy is likewise imbedded in these polemics on the changing situation of his time.

For this reason, Bakunin is a writer admirably suited for selection. Few of his works are so closely knit that important passages lose their significance when isolated from their context, while at the same time, in a collection of well-chosen extracts, the virtues of his thought can often be seen to greater advantage than in the lengthy and often verbose works in which they originally appeared.

The present volume, a series of six extracts from Bakunin's work which have a bearing on his philosophy of freedom, his attitude towards the State and his view of the historical destiny of Marxism, have been selected by K. J. Kenafick, whose earlier volume, *Michael Bakunin and Karl Marx*, provided a useful introduction to the general field of Bakunin's ideas. The extracts are accompanied by a foreword outlining the scope of the volume, and a brief sketch of Bakunin's life.

Reading through these extracts, one cannot fail to be impressed by the nobility of Bakunin's concept of freedom as compared with the political expediency of Marx and his followers. But even more impressive is the validity of the criticism which, from this point of view, he directed against the authoritarian socialists, and at least one passage contains a completely

accurate prophecy of the form the Marxist state would assume when it came into being. In this, after noting the Marxist claim to establish equality of every kind, he goes on to point out that:

"... there will be a government and, note this, an extremely complex government, which will not content itself with governing and administering the masses politically, as all governments do to-day, but which will also administer them economically, concentrating in its own hands the production and the just division of wealth, the cultivation of land, the establishment and development of factories, the organisation and direction of commerce, finally, the application of capital to production by the only banker, the State. ... There will be a new class, a new hierarchy of real and pretended scientists and scholars, and the world will be divided into a minority ruling in the name of knowledge and an immense ignorant majority. And then, woe betide the ignorant ones!"

He goes on to point out that such a government will need immense armed forces to keep itself in power, and, comparing the Marxist ideal to the Bismarckian ideal he adds:

"In foreign affairs it is the same deployment of military force that is to-day, conquest; and in home affairs it is the same employment of this armed force, the last argument of all threatened political powers against the masses, who, tired of believing, hoping, submitting, and obeying always, rise in revolt."

It is hardly necessary to point out how far this analysis anticipates the NKVD state of Marxist Russia, with its territorial aggrandisement and its internal dictatorship of a privileged class of administrators and managers.

Indeed, this selection displays admirably the continued relevance of the central core of Bakunin's thought, his realisation of the corrupting and self-perpetuating nature of authority, whether its advocates claimed to be Socialists or Conservatives. It is to be hoped that the response to it will justify the publication of further selections of his works, so long inaccessible to the English reader.

GEORGE WOODCOCK.

## COMMENT Impeccable Busman

**I**F the visitor to the South Bank exhibition approaches it by way of Charing Cross Underground Station, he will be delighted by the transformation of the District and Circle Line platforms. Simply by tidying up the platform furniture and signs, by encasing the old cast iron columns in sky-blue tiles, altering the lighting and building new low ceilings to the platforms out of fibre-board and aluminium, the station (one of the oldest in the London Transport System) has been improved beyond recognition. And if he goes to the exhibition at the Science Museum or the Book Exhibition at the V. & A. Museum by way of the subway from South Kensington Station to the museums, he will pass through a display of London Transport posters from 1908 to 1951, which may amaze him by their high quality and their superiority over the usual level of "commercial art" during all those years.

The man who was responsible for the continually high standard of design for London's transport system was Frank Pick who became assistant to the general manager of the Underground Electric Railways in 1906 and retired from his job as vice-chairman of the L.P.T.B. in 1940. Throughout the period, and with growing understanding and enthusiasm as his aims became clearer, Pick sought out the very best designers, artists and architects for the vehicles, equipment, buildings, notices and signs, furniture, lamp-posts, and even litter-baskets, of the services under his control. And, whatever we think of London Transport, with its hierarchical organisation which has served as a model for the nationalised boards of managerial Britain, and its attempts to cope with London's insoluble transport problem, which merely create new difficulties as they ease old ones; we can only be grateful for its pioneering and civilising influence in almost every field of design, and for the way in which Pick's unobtrusive visual education of the public has improved standards everywhere.

If you travel a lot in London, you will come to recognise the work of different periods in the development of

the urbane, orderly and unpretentious "L.P.T.B. style"—for it is, ten years after Pick's death, still developing, as a comparison of this year's work with the rebuilt Aldgate East Station, the pride of 1939, or even with platform work in the Central Line extensions of a few years ago, will show. The Underground lettering, designed in 1916 by Edward Johnston (on which his pupil, Eric Gill, based his famous sans-serif type), the stations by Charles Holden, and the posters of McKnight Kauffer, have had a tremendous influence in opening our eyes to our surroundings and creating a demand for the highest standards in contemporary design.

Frank Pick, an example of that rare bird, an "enlightened despot", has been called a modern counterpart of Lorenzo the Magnificent, but whereas Lorenzo was a patron of the arts for his own gratification and glory, Pick saw his task as being to make the L.P.T.B. a "civilising agent" carry on "propaganda for the visual expression of honesty, harmony and order." His few writings reveal an intensely communal spirit, a distaste for commercialism, and a great respect for the craftsman—but also a lack of understanding of the nature of a class-divided society and too much faith in "order" and "discipline". Nevertheless, he has his place in the tradition of William Morris and W. R. Lethaby, with his demand that we should "go about asking questions of things. What are they? Are they fit for their purpose? Are they well made? Has the maker enjoyed their making? Is their material sound and appropriate? Have they any added grace which fits them for human use and society?"

Early in the war, when Pick was at the Ministry of Information, the Minister arranged for Winston Churchill to see him to discuss propaganda. Pick said that he could not agree to the Prime Minister's suggestions because they were not true. Churchill furiously told the Minister that he never wanted to see "that impeccable busman" again.

C.

## FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

- History as the Story of Liberty 12/6  
Benedetto Croce  
Rejecting the idea of a perfect state, the Italian philosopher argues for the greater realisation of man's capacities.
- Wayward Youth 9/6  
August Aichhorn  
Psycho-analysis applied to delinquent children. Foreword by Freud.
- The Brigand 9/6  
Giuseppe Berto  
A novel by the author of *The Sky is Red*.
- The Genius of Europe 12/6  
Havelock Ellis  
A reprinted volume by the great psychologist.
- The Age of Longing 12/6  
Arthur Koestler  
Angst and Stalinism in Paris.
- Australian Short Stories 4/6  
(World's Classics)  
48 authors from 1894 to 1946.
- News from Nowhere 4/-  
William Morris  
A delightful vision. The best of the utopias.
- On The Eve 1/6  
I. S. Turgeniev  
The new Penguin translation. Please add for postage.

... Obtainable from  
27 red lion st, london,  
W.C.1

# Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

Vol. 12, No. 12 May 19, 1951

## ON KICKING THEIR BACKSIDES

FROM time to time the editors of *Freedom* receive letters deploring—sometimes denouncing—our “destructive” attitude, and urging us to be more “positive” or “constructive”. Since we do not accept the implied criticism it may be well to discuss the matter a little further, and so define our attitude (and, we believe, that of anarchism also) more exactly.

Now this criticism goes back as far as the emergence of anarchism as a separate social trend from the social democracy of the early Second International. There were those, sixty years ago, who conceded that anarchism was a lofty body of ideas—but essentially negative”. And there were the less kindly band of snarling Marxists sneering at what they called petty bourgeois destructivism”.

Both these criticisms came from friends of political thought which were not fully radical: the philosophical liberals who had never embraced revolutionary ideas; and the newly emerging parliamentary Marxists who were abandoning them for reformism. Both recoiled from the radical nature of the anarchist criticism of existing society, for both thought that less radical measures than revolutionary ones would do the trick.

That is one side of the picture. On the other is the paradox that whereas the governmentals from Tories to Marxists have no faith in the ability of the generality of people to conduct their own affairs (“someone must govern, you know”), the anarchists insist on the need to decentralise responsibility right down to the point where it rests squarely on the shoulders of every individual.

It is only if one has a kind of nostalgia for the present, some remnants of faith in the organised-from-above way of doing things, that one winces if the mirror is held up to present society. For without this half-retained love for an old and tarnished mistress, it is easy to see the necessity and the value of destroying prejudice and of clearing the ground—the processes which are the obverse of what is called anarchist destructiveness.

Behind this form of criticism one senses a wish that anarchists would come out and say what they would do, or at least what should be done. Now this is exactly what we will not do. For to issue instructions (even when disguised as blue prints) is to fall back into the governmental heresy of treating people as unfit to organise their lives for themselves, and to accept the limitations of minority rule as the limitations of humanity itself. Nor can we even follow this line in a concealed form. The editors of *Freedom* will not urge that the solution to, say, the Korean war is for Attlee, Truman (or MacArthur), Stalin and Mao to get together, or for “us” to send more troops, or battle-ships or atom bombs, or to cut off supplies to China and/or Russia, or to throw out Labour and put in Conservatives or Communists or what have you. We are very far from being indifferent to the outstanding problems of the world, but we are neither so naive nor so weary-disillusioned that we offer solutions rooted in the old way of thinking.

Can it still escape notice that all the new political trends that spring up all start off very new and bright; but they all cling to the idea of government. Formerly it used to be less and less government in the sense of limiting the sphere of governmental activity; but latterly it has been

## LETTER FROM FRANCE

(From our Correspondent)

LYONS, May. LIKE Italy with its *Demo-Christians*, Belgium with its *Social-Christians* and Germany with its *Christian Democrats*, France possesses a *Mouvement Republicain Populaire*. This party has just held a four-days congress at the industrial and administrative town of Lyons, whose mayor is the radical Edouard Herriot.

The M.R.P. is a recent creation. It was born at the time of the liberation in 1944. But the movement itself is older and its origin is to be found in the social wing of French Catholicism, always fought by the powerful, always disclaimed by the Church. It is to-day a curious mixture. Its composition is,

according to the statistics of its own secretariat 30% of wage-earners (civil servants and workers); 15% of farmers; 12% of shopkeepers and tradesmen; 5% of members of the professions; 20% indeterminate (!); 10% of industrialists, etc.—in other words, a complete representation of the French nation.

What are the ties which hold together these diverse social groups? In the first place, a common environment, that of religious education; secondly, a certain community of outlook towards social problems, and finally the solidarity born of partisan hopes and action.

The M.R.P. had thought that at the Liberation it would be possible to set in motion a “peaceful” revolution, that is

would eventually lead to “nothing less than the expulsion of white men practically everywhere between the Union and the Sahara.”

“The C.P.P. is Kwame Nkrumah, and should he modify his views the party line would also be modified.”

The liberation of the West Africans will begin when the plantations are controlled by, and produce for the people who work in them, but the C.C.P. is content to offer the cocoa farmers higher prices, “once we get self-government”, in exchange for their votes. One of the party’s biblical mottoes is “Seek ye first the political kingdom and all things will be added unto it.”

Seldom does a political slogan embody within itself the basic deception upon which political action is founded.

Kwame Nkrumah, with his cabinet of three teachers, three lawyers, a doctor and a journalist, lives simply and austere, but in other respects one cannot help thinking of him as a West African Bismarck when we learn from Mr. Douglas Rogers in *Peace News* that:

“Addressing a meeting of Africans, he has a gift of attaining a sort of unity of emotion and intellect with his audience so that what one watches is not just a man addressing a gathering of people, but a corporate experience. He will raise his hands and utter a slogan and gain an automatic, vocal response from those before him.”

The *Manchester Guardian’s* reporter was told by local C.P.P. members, “Do not worry; if Nkrumah lets us down, or acts the dictator, we can get rid of him,” but another correspondent states that:

never denied the story. Witnesses and members of the jury admitted that they had read or heard of the reported confession. Yet no confession was produced as evidence.

When first arrested the two men were menaced by a mob outside the county gaol. They were then taken for safety to the state prison. The home of one of the accused Negroes was burned. A lynching party was organised. Many Negroes fled, and units of the National Guard and the field artillery arrived to restore order.

While the grand jury was meeting, one paper published a cartoon showing four electric chairs and headed: “No Compromise—Supreme Penalty.” At the trial itself there were fears of violence. No one was allowed to carry any bundle into the court-room, everyone had to submit to a search, and persons could bring a crutch or walking stick with them only after the sheriff had certified they were necessary as physical aids.

Faced with these facts, the composition of the jury seemed a trivial matter to Justice Jackson. He said:

“I do not see, as a practical matter, how any Negro on the jury would have dared to cause a disagreement or acquittal. The only chances these Negroes had of acquittal would have been in the courage and decency of some sturdy and forthright white person of sufficient standing to face and live down the odium among his white neighbours that such a vote, if required, would have brought.”

# The Christian-Social Party Congress

to say a transformation of society without violence, without clashes, through the simple goodwill of good people. All the governments which have followed have pivoted around the M.R.P., and now, the elections very close, it is necessary to take stock and draw up a balance sheet.

The ministers and parliamentary deputies came to the rostrum to expound what they had done and what they had not done. There was an obvious tendency to insist on the difficulties which they have encountered and to magnify what they have accomplished.

But the voices which have been raised, above all the voices from the industrial regions, the North and the Paris area, have recalled the promises and hopes of

five years ago, when everything seemed possible and easy. These voices spoke of the hardships of the workers, of the counter-offensive of finance, of the lack of vigour in the members of parliament, of the ease with which the ministers have forgotten their programmes.

In spite of the language peculiar to Christians, the courtesy of their discussions, and the absence of hard words, the essential problems could not be concealed. Politicians and defenders of property on the one hand, the messengers of working-class dissatisfaction on the other. Even in this party the social question cannot be entirely glossed over.

No doubt, the subtleties of parliamentary technique, the weight of the party machine, and the power of the established order, will easily triumph over the murmurs and complaints—apart from the Christian discipline which hinders frank and open revolt.

But it is none-the-less curious to hear in this governmental congress, from the unpracticed mouth of a railwayman or steelworker, ideas which no revolutionary could deny. “The working-class is always betrayed . . . It has a right to the management of the economy . . . There are too many commercial parasites that the workers can do without . . . etc.”

Certainly, the value of these interventions are all relative for the congress itself. But it exists, it is a fact by which to measure the power of working-class uneasiness, and to understand that at this stage capitalism is discredited even in the movements where it has been best defended.

S. PARANE.

## A False Start on the Gold Coast

Youth of the country, wake up to organise for redemption, to make the Gold Coast a paradise . . . so that when the gates are opened by Peter, we sit in heaven to see our children driving their own aeroplanes, commanding their own armies.”

—KWAME NKRUMAH, “Leader of Government Business” in the Gold Coast.

THE granting of a nominal “independence” to the Gold Coast (African population 4,000,000, European 6,000), was a recognition of necessity by the British Government, following what are euphemistically called the “Disturbances” three years ago when 29 people were killed and 237 injured.

The elections held in February as a result of the recommendations of the Coussey Committee, gave an overwhelming victory to the Convention Peoples Party and its leader, Mr. Kwame Nkrumah, was promptly freed from jail where he had been sent on charges of promoting disorder. Mr. Nkrumah on release denounced the new Constitution as “bogus and fraudulent” for final power is still held by the Governor, but said he would take office as a stepping stone to real self-government and Dominion status.

The British Press was divided in its accounts of the first elections. Mr. Edward Hulton described them as “some-what farcical experiments in democracy”, some people were patronising and others commented on the dignity and earnestness of the elections under the mango trees. Dr. Malan declared that they

would eventually lead to “nothing less than the expulsion of white men practically everywhere between the Union and the Sahara.”

“The C.P.P. is Kwame Nkrumah, and should he modify his views the party line would also be modified.”

The liberation of the West Africans will begin when the plantations are controlled by, and produce for the people who work in them, but the C.C.P. is content to offer the cocoa farmers higher prices, “once we get self-government”, in exchange for their votes. One of the party’s biblical mottoes is “Seek ye first the political kingdom and all things will be added unto it.”

Seldom does a political slogan embody within itself the basic deception upon which political action is founded.

Kwame Nkrumah, with his cabinet of three teachers, three lawyers, a doctor and a journalist, lives simply and austere, but in other respects one cannot help thinking of him as a West African Bismarck when we learn from Mr. Douglas Rogers in *Peace News* that:

“Addressing a meeting of Africans, he has a gift of attaining a sort of unity of emotion and intellect with his audience so that what one watches is not just a man addressing a gathering of people, but a corporate experience. He will raise his hands and utter a slogan and gain an automatic, vocal response from those before him.”

The *Manchester Guardian’s* reporter was told by local C.P.P. members, “Do not worry; if Nkrumah lets us down, or acts the dictator, we can get rid of him,” but another correspondent states that:

never denied the story. Witnesses and members of the jury admitted that they had read or heard of the reported confession. Yet no confession was produced as evidence.

When first arrested the two men were menaced by a mob outside the county gaol. They were then taken for safety to the state prison. The home of one of the accused Negroes was burned. A lynching party was organised. Many Negroes fled, and units of the National Guard and the field artillery arrived to restore order.

While the grand jury was meeting, one paper published a cartoon showing four electric chairs and headed: “No Compromise—Supreme Penalty.” At the trial itself there were fears of violence. No one was allowed to carry any bundle into the court-room, everyone had to submit to a search, and persons could bring a crutch or walking stick with them only after the sheriff had certified they were necessary as physical aids.

Faced with these facts, the composition of the jury seemed a trivial matter to Justice Jackson. He said:

“I do not see, as a practical matter, how any Negro on the jury would have dared to cause a disagreement or acquittal. The only chances these Negroes had of acquittal would have been in the courage and decency of some sturdy and forthright white person of sufficient standing to face and live down the odium among his white neighbours that such a vote, if required, would have brought.”

## Letters to the Editors

### Function and Organisation

‘Germinal’ rightly points out (*Freedom*, 28/5/51), but perhaps does not sufficiently stress, that the vital factor in anarchist organisation is the functional necessity of such organisation. In effect, the anarchist can accept the existence of numerous *ad hoc* bodies, but must deny them any permanent status. Obviously, there exists a continual risk that these bodies will, as a result of the sociological law Michel describes as the Iron Law of Oligarchy, seek to acquire such status, but the price of liberty, it cannot too frequently be argued, is eternal vigilance. So long as the members of a particular society are anarchists, they will prevent such an occurrence. If they cease to be anarchists, they will not oppose authoritarian organisation anyway.

Functional elites cannot be avoided in any complex society, and expert mathematicians, for example, can hardly be controverted as *mathematicians* by the inexpert; and they possess a far better claim to organise the teaching of mathematics than, say, the farmer. We can witness the result of attempts to discount the technical competence of functional experts in the U.S.S.R. to-day. The lesson is obvious.

Cambridge, May 7. P. J. HEAD.

### To The Roots

DEAR SIR, I share your “why didn’t someone tell me about anarchism” correspondent’s feeling, as it has only been in the past year, when I lived in New York and purchased *Freedom* from a news-stand and met some members of the Resistance Group that I realised that anarchism wasn’t something you just read about in histories of 19th century Russia. I think you are on the right track because you have gone to the roots of our problems as no other political group has. I think the state and all other authoritarian influences such as schools, family, churches, are our chief destroyers of healthy living and that war results from these influences. My experiences in the Army confirmed my anti-authority leaning, for as Lincoln said, “No man is good enough to rule another.” You can learn a lot about the state and dictatorship from being kicked around by the state as a conscript, at least enough to be a conscientious objector the next time the politicians want you to do their dirty work for them.

Fraternally yours, New York, April 29. J.W.W.

### Bouquets!

[We have received many encouraging letters from readers since *Freedom* became a weekly, and we hope our comrades and friends who value *Freedom* will welcome the selection printed below as much as we were touched and heartened to receive them.—Eds.]

Herewith postal order for 17/- being one year’s subscription for your paper. I hope I am one of the lucky people to receive George Woodcock’s book. Were

I not an impoverished student interested in knowing more about your faith, it would not be necessary to offer me this volume to help me make up my mind about subscribing for what is undoubtedly one of the most honest papers I have seen so far.

London, May 7. R.J.H.

I enclose a cheque for £1 for one year’s subscription to *Freedom* at the odd 3/- to the fund. I hope that I may be among the first 1,000 and so receive a copy of *A Hundred Years of Revolution*.

I should like to take this opportunity of saying that I very much appreciate *Freedom*. I live in a position where government, law, institutions, etc., are venerated for their own sake, and it is good to know that there are people who value freedom and individuality. It seems incredible that intelligent people should have allowed themselves to become so blinded by the traditional institutions of the world that they cannot see any alternative. I am in constant danger of being shot off the various committees, etc., on which I sit because of the views I hold, so I frequently sit silent, only contributing some small word or two now and then when I feel it may perhaps serve some purpose.

My recent suggestion that if the proposed Royal Commission on Marriage did its job properly, it would recommend the abolition of marriage, and that if there is to be sex education in schools it might as well include some suggestions as to contraception, were treated as jokes in very low taste.

I feel it a pity that so much of *Freedom* has to be devoted to articles and criticisms of a destructive nature, although I realise that with the world in its present state it is inevitable. I do particularly welcome such articles as “An End Story”, where it is possible to praise and not to criticise.

Reading, May 7. D.D.

I would like to avail myself of your offer of a free copy of *A Hundred Years of Revolution* on the strength of extending subscription to *Freedom* for a further twelve months.

May I take this opportunity of saying how pleased I have been to receive the paper since the beginning of the year. Pleased, not only because I have found so much that I agree with, but rather because I think it contains true discussion, which leaves one to work out one’s own conclusions.

Westmorland, May 2. B.B.

It is very pathetic to me to read of the little help you get from readers, when we old ones recall the past struggles and sacrifices it is hurtful to know how you have to beg, beg, beg, for the little you do get.

One would think that readers would help to keep the paper going if only for its literary merit.

I hope that you will be able to keep to a weekly issue, but that is the affair of the readers.

Manchester, April 30. J.E.B.

ARE there any depths to which commercialism will not sink? Are there any disgusting actions managements will not instigate in the profane cause of business efficiency?

It seems not. It seems that not only are the able-bodied to be subjected to the fierce exploitation of our soul-destroying industrialism by profit-hungry enterprises, but the blind also—the blind, mark you—must also be subjected to the indignity of time-and-motion study by business efficiency experts called in by the General Committee of the Royal Institute for the Blind.

Offhand, I cannot recite the aims and principles of this Royal Institute, but it is an organisation, counting royalty among its patrons, which sets up workshops for blind people, wherein they are instructed (and become amazingly proficient) in the making of things like brooms and brushes, baskets and furniture, the assembly of light engineering products, and other occupations such as the tuning of pianos.

The vast majority of the blind welcome the opportunity to do such work. The feeling of being useless, of being a burden on others—so noticeable in the demoralisation of the unemployed—weighs heavily on those so handicapped. Most blind folk that one meets are anxious not to appear as oddities, to be pitied or pampered, but they develop an almost uncanny ability to get about on their own, as well as a sense of independence that finds expression in the desire to earn their own livings.

And this is all very well. But nevertheless, certain considerations must be shown those who cannot see, and when we find those very do-gooders who run charity organisations in order to provide these workshops trying to put them on a profit-making basis by streamlining and conveyor-belt methods, it points to the inadequacy of such a solution within the existing economic set-up.

In Birmingham, 200 blind workers in the Harborne workshops went out on strike for 2½ hours to protest against a change of workshop manager, and the re-tenation of the business consultants who have been re-organising the workshop over the last 18 months.

In a petition to the management, the workers claimed that the consultants had "destroyed the harmony and contentment that prevailed, by creating suspicion, discontent and a state of irritation. They have saddled the workshop with a conveyor-belt that has not done 24 hours work in 12 months."

The workshop manager they don't want to lose is Mr. Frederick Boulton, whom the management want to move on after more than 20 years in the job, and replace with a younger man. One, no doubt, more in sympathy with the "improved, more modern" methods introduced by the efficiency experts.

But the workers, men and women, are not taking it lying down. Carrying placards saying, "Stop the Injustice," "Remove the Consultants," and "We want Mr. Boulton," they lined the road

to their workshop while the General Committee of the R.I.B. considered their petition, presented by blind Tom Tremble, secretary of the National League of the Blind.

The Committee rejected the petition on the Chairman's casting vote, but compromised by deciding to retain Mr. Boulton as commercial manager. The workers went back on this, but are still dissatisfied and, as Mr. Tremble remarked, "The bitterness in the workshops can only continue." The workers have also complained that their wages are being docked if they are late for work "although some of us have an hour's journey to

work and cannot be expected to do the same as other people".

This interference with working conditions no doubt has a very sound commercial reason behind it. Such interference always does have, but for my part I find something obscene in thus putting pressure on blind workers. There was harmony and contentment in those workshops, where the workers had a manager they liked and trusted. Now there is not, and to the tremendous burden of their blindness is added the suspicion and irritation the experts have provided for them.

Let's hope the experts feel proud of their 18 months' work.

DURHAM AND THE CLOSED-SHOP

IN Durham, for months the Labour County Council have been trying to establish the principle of the closed-shop for all Council employees.

The interesting point about the opposition which this has aroused is that it has driven to direct action a section of the community who are not usually thought of as militant—the school teachers.

The Council attempted to enforce the closed-shop principle on the teachers, but were met with a threat of strike action. (Cheers in anticipation from the children!) This was a greater deterrent than the disapproving letter from the Minister

of Education, but the Council have not actually climbed down.

While pretending not to enforce membership of a trade union, the Council reserve the right to ask any applicant for employment whether or not he is a member of his appropriate association? This obviously means that preference will be given to that applicant who is, and he who is not will stand little chance of a job.

It is difficult to see just what Durham County Council are after in following this line. Is it simply regimentation for its own sake?

Syndicalism — The Workers' Next Step

IT is twenty-five years since the General Strike, the last nationwide manifestation of the syndicalist spirit which was widespread among industrial workers in this country in the second decade of this century. When the General Strike was betrayed by the union leaders (with some exceptions, notably A. J. Cook of the mineworkers), the trade union movement settled down to the reformist rôle in which we see it to-day.

For several years now, the workers have been able to assess the value of nationalisation, the socialist panacea for the problems of industry. Among the miners particularly, where the syndicalist aim of workers' control had a great following since the publication in 1912 of The Miners' Next Step, the disillusionment with

nationalisation is most bitter. As a Durham miner said in a recent broadcast programme on coal: "It's the same team, only the jerseys have changed."

We as anarchists, see in workers' control the only possible path to freedom and responsibility in industry. After the bitter experience of control by private capital, and the disappointment of misplaced hopes in state control, many thoughtful workers are turning again to the revolutionary aims of syndicalism, and the time is opportune for their restatement. This is the purpose of the series of articles which begin below. We hope that our readers in industry will draw them to the attention of their fellow workers and send us their comments, as we intend to reprint the series as a pamphlet.

I. The Importance of the Workers

PEOPLE who consistently defend both the workers' point of view and the actions they take to further their interests, are frequently accused of "glorifying the workers". They are told that the working man is his own, worst enemy and deserves the lowly position he holds in society.

Well, it is not the intention of this writer to glorify anybody. Glorification implies holding someone—some individual or group of individuals—in higher esteem than yourself, looking up to them and lowering yourself in front of their superior powers. This is the basis of all authority, of patriotism—"My country right or wrong"—and can easily become "The workers right or wrong".

This attitude very obviously prevents clarity of thought, and if ever there was a time when clear thinking—and plain speaking—were necessary, it is to-day. For to-day the necessary ingredients to provide a full life for all are available, but they are withheld from us both by our outworn economic system and the abortive reformist "solutions" for its more blatant evils.

No, it is no desire of mine to glorify the workers, or to flatter them into complacency. Instead, I shall endeavour to put before them a reasoned case for what I believe to be the only way in which they can remedy the mistakes they have made in the past.

Not how can I remedy their mistakes for them, but how they can do it themselves. And those who hope to find in these chapters detailed instructions of what they should do, may as well stop reading now, for they will be disappointed. Any politician can come along with a policy or a blueprint and ask you to give him the power to carry it out. But it is no part of the Anarchist or Syndicalist case to set ourselves up as leaders or messiahs. The workers have had plenty of those—and look where we are to-day.

The Union Leaders

What we have to do now is to assess our position honestly and ask ourselves whether it is not the very fact that we have given power to those who have sought it that has brought us into the present position. Is it not time we admitted that we have made colossal blunders in the past by giving our power—and I shall stop later that it is our power, not theirs—into the hands of political and trade union leaders? For it would be boring and quite unnecessary—if not impossible—for me to catalogue here the unending list of leaders who have used the support, the loyalty and good faith of the workers to get into positions of influence and affluence only to forget the workers when they got there.

This is something practically every worker will admit, and it would indeed be foolish to ignore the logical conclusions—that it is dangerous and useless to continue giving this power to leaders and so we must adopt means of struggle that will keep control in the hands of the rank-and-file.

These means have already been clarified, in the ideas of Anarcho-Syndicalism, which is the expression in economic and industrial fields of the social ideas of Anarchism itself. Basing its approach on opposition to capitalism and the State which protects it, Syndicalism starts from the point of view of the importance of the productive worker in industrial society.

I say "productive" worker deliberately, and it would be as well from the outset to draw the distinction between the productive and unproductive worker. According to one definition, a worker is one who has "nothing to sell but his labour power", but under capitalism there are millions who fall into that category, but who do no useful work. They sell their labour power to an employer, they are wage-slaves and they may work hard and long, but their real contribution to society is nil because they are concerned with activity which is purely administrative or bound up in some way, direct or remote, with money, its distribution or collection. As far as production is concerned they are just as much passengers as shareholders or the idle rich.

But by productive workers I mean those who are concerned directly with the production and distribution of goods, materials or services, even if their products are socially useless, as are armaments, for example. And within the general definition must be included technicians, research workers and advisers—so long as the advice is on production and not on finance.

All wealth is produced, and all social services rendered, by these productive workers, and it is no glorification or flattery to state quite bluntly that they are therefore the most important section of the community. The railways, for example, could function quite efficiently without booking clerks, but not without the train crews or signalmen, and the more industrialised or mechanised society becomes, the more reliance must be placed upon, and the more essential become, the productive workers.

In a Strong Position

This is not apparent to all to-day, because the control of industry is not in the hands of the workers, and the controllers—private employers and State boards alike—are very concerned that the workers shall not realise their strength. For their part, the workers themselves have appeared quite content to remain in a subservient position, asking for, at the most, representation through their unions on joint production committees and other bodies which clearly serve the boss's interests first, the workers' part being mainly limited to secondary issues of welfare.

But the present time sees the workers in a very strong position. Labour is scarce and the outcry and hysteria which follow practically every strike of any size show that the employers are in no position to offer strong resistance to determined action for the betterment of conditions. The armament programme, however, means that greater control of the workers will be attempted—not so much by the employers as by the State, and we are entering a period of struggle in which even to defend our existing standards of living, vigilance and militancy will be required.

For this purpose, and for others to be outlined later, the workers should realise that their strength is greatest at the point of production, and that action is most effective which is direct and which keeps the initiative in their own hands. For them to look to political parties which take control away from them; to hope that State boards consisting of ex-employers and extra-union officials can have their interests at heart, is throwing away their most important advantage—the fact that on the job they are indispensable and union officials, employers and political leaders are not.

(To be continued)

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP
OPEN-AIR MEETINGS at HYDE PARK
Every Sunday at 3.30 p.m.
INDOOR MEETINGS
Every Sunday at 7.30 p.m.
at the PORCUPINE (corner Chancery Lane and St. Dunstons Street, next Leicester Sq. Underground Station)
MAY 20—John Hewetson on AN IRISH COMMUNE
MAY 27—Ernest Silverman on THE MENTAL DEFICIENCY ACT

NORTH-EAST LONDON
DISCUSSION MEETINGS
Every alternate Tuesday
at 7.30
Enquiries c/o Freedom Press

SOUTH LONDON
Fortnightly meetings, sponsored by the S. London Anarchist Group, are held on alternate Tuesdays, at 7.30 p.m. at the KENTISH DROVERS Public House, Peckham (corner of High Street and Rye Lane)
May 22—S. E. Parker on ANARCHISM versus SOCIALISM

GLASGOW
OUTDOOR MEETINGS at MAXWELL STREET
Every Sunday at 3 p.m.
With John Gaffney, Frank Leech, Jimmy Raeside, Eddie Shaw

Renewing Your Subs?

OVER the Whitsun holidays we sent out notices to readers whose subscriptions are now due for renewal as well as to readers whose subscriptions will be due for renewal between now and the end of June.

In hard figures the number involved is 240. We hope that the past few issues of "Freedom" have given them a foretaste of what they can hope from "Freedom" as a weekly and will promptly renew their subscriptions. And if they send us a year's subscription we can guarantee that they will receive a free copy of "A Hundred Years of Revolution", the 15/- cloth bound book we are offering to all readers, new and old, who send us 17/- (U.S. \$3.00) for a year of "Freedom".

From those comrades and friends who realise the important step we have taken in making "Freedom" a weekly journal, we hope for more than just a renewal. Our Fund is still far short of the figure it should be if we are to reach £600 this year. And we still have a long way to go before we can announce that we have the 1,000 new readers we need to establish "Freedom" on a sound financial footing (quite apart from the fact that we must reach more people with the anarchist point of view). So, to those subscribers about to send their renewals, what about increasing your subscription to two copies and using the extra copy to introduce new readers to "Freedom"? And it only costs 10/- (U.S. \$1.50) a year extra.

Above all, please don't take "Freedom Weekly" for granted. It is an experiment, a shot in the dark, since we have no reserves on which to draw but depend entirely on the help

of sympathetic readers in increasing our circulation in order to carry on. Must the experiment fail or are there instead enough comrades who share our determination that the experiment shall succeed?

But Time, Time, is an important factor. So please do not put off doing what you propose doing as your share in this voluntary co-operative effort in revolutionary journalism.

Freedom — Weekly Special Appeal

May 3rd to May 9th:
New York: R.L. 14/4; Gillingham: M.C. 3/4; London: R.R.A. 1/8; London: F.E.D.\* 5/4; Gt. Bookham: J.L.R. 5/4; Bromley: J.M.C. 3/4; London: R.W.M. 6/8; London: E.W.P. 10/4; Anon. 2/6; London: H.O.C. 1/4; London: S.B. 5/4; Reading: D.D. 3/4; London: J.P.B.\* 2/4; Anstey: M.A. 1/4; London: R.S. 2/4; Legam: B.M.C. 11/4; Bishops Stortford: M.J.S. 1/4; London: H.R.W.\* 2/6; Bradford: A.B.H. 5/4.
Total ... £6 2 6
Previously acknowledged ... £154 11 9
1951 TOTAL TO DATE ... £160 14 3

GIFT OF BOOKS: M.K. and C.E.

FREEDOM The Anarchist Weekly
Postal Subscription Rates
12 months 17/- (U.S.A. \$3.00)
6 months 8/6 (U.S.A. \$1.50)
3 months 4/6 (U.S.A. \$0.75)
Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies
12 months 27/- (U.S.A. \$4.50)
6 months 13/6 (U.S.A. \$2.25)
Cheques, P.O.'s and Money Orders should be made out to FREEDOM PRESS, crossed a/c Payee, and addressed to the publishers.
FREEDOM PRESS
27 Red Lion Street
London, W.C.1. England
Tel.: Chancery 8364