

# Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

Vol. 12, No. 19

July 7th, 1951

Threepence

"Between the government which does evil and the people who accept it there is a certain shameful solidarity."

—VICTOR HUGO

## AFTER THE DEVASTATION OF KOREA

# Power Makes Policy

THE proposals for a cease fire in Korea are naturally welcome; if successful they will put an end to the military loss of life, and that is a lot to have gained. But one should not forget the political mopping-up which to-day always follows any war. Often such operations are scarcely less bloody and are more distasteful than military killing in that they are conducted in cold blood.

Nor should pacifists and anti-militarists delude themselves with the idea that "the governments have now realised that war does not pay." We have already pointed out in these columns the advantages which the powers have drawn from the mere fact of conducting a war, quite apart from the major issues alleged to be in dispute.

The 7-point terms tentatively put out in Washington can be regarded as very reasonable. Most of them are simply practical matters of mutual security, but the idea of establishing "an international body, not necessarily under United Nations supervision, to see that the truce is being observed..." is a clear recognition of the facts.

### Balance of Power

In recognizing the facts, however, it also underlines the position which *Freedom* has stressed throughout the Korean War: that it is not principles but power which dictates policy. And

the whole stalemate position endorses this view. Power is balanced more or less along the 38th parallel; the disadvantages of war are beginning to outweigh the advantages. In short, there is nothing more to be gained from the Korean conflict, so the time has come to fold it up.

To state the position thus, is not, we believe, to be too brutal. Most people would concede that that is the way national States carry on their business. But to see the reality of this minor war in hard terms is to condemn absolutely, the conduct of national States. The operative factors in Korea have been the interests of the Western Bloc and those of the Communist Bloc. No question of principle, no humane concern for the people

of the land of Korea, has influenced those interests.

From one point of view one can welcome a "reasonable" approach to the question of cease-fire. But such an approach reflects also the normal qualities of international relations. Relief at the prospect of the war ending is mixed with disgust at the calm consideration of pros and cons after more than a million men have lost their lives, and the devastation of a country.

And the most that will have been gained will be a return to the pre-war position. The bankruptcy of the social and economic order could scarcely be more shamefully apparent.

## AT THE YORKSHIRE MINERS' RALLY

# How is Your Digestion?

AT this year's annual rally of Yorkshire miners at Pontefract recently, Mr. Herbert Morrison emphasised two major "principles" of present Labour Party policy.

First, he said, was the need to consolidate and "digest" the heavy and dramatic legislative, economic and social changes brought about by the Government during the 1945-50 Parliament.

Second, the need for the Labour Party itself during this period of change—"and it is the revolution," he stated—to intensify its efforts in the field of moral and spiritual education and regeneration, without which the Socialist cause would stick in the mud.

Now, digestion is the process by which the body extracts from what it has consumed that which is of value and passes on for eventual expulsion that which is of no value. And if we apply this process to the achievements of the Labour Government in the body politic, what should we keep and what should we get rid of?

For the life of me I find it difficult to point to more than one thing that the present Government has introduced that is worth having—the National Health Service. And that is the very first thing

to be attacked in the launching of the re-arrangement drive!

For the rest of Labour's achievements—we readily grant the "dramatic" legislation the Government has handled. For the industrial worker, 1945 was a most dramatic piece of legislation—not, it is true, introduced by Labour, but they would have been delighted to continue it if the workers had put up with their use of it. Making conscription permanent extending it, too—was "dramatic" from a socialist point of view.

And nationalisation—how are we to digest this? While only Anarchists and Syndicalists opposed it, it remained only the target of a militant minority. But now, outside of Government circles and the meeting places of the National Boards—who defends nationalisation? Certainly not the workers!

Miners, dockers, railwaymen, transport workers, gasmen, power workers—large proportions of all these key industries are becoming more and more disillusioned with the centralisation, bureaucracy, inequality and high-handed methods of their new bosses—and, of course, in cases, the bosses are not new—just the old ones working for the State instead of the shareholders.

As for the social changes Morrison mentions—where are they? There has been absolutely no change whatsoever in the relationship between the ruling class and the working class. The workers, out of mistaken loyalty to "our own men" in Parliament, have certainly taken more from Labour than they would have taken from the Tories. If anything, the relationship has hardened recently, however, into more open hostility among the workers. As costs of living rise, and profits soar to fantastic heights, the class division of society is too blatantly weighted on the side of ownership, authority and privilege for even the apathetic to miss.

When Herbert Morrison, then, talks about moral and spiritual education and regeneration, we wonder who he thinks he's kidding? We don't find his kind of "revolution" difficult to digest—we find it hard to swallow!

## MINERS TO PROBE COAL BOARD

AS if to prove what we have just written above, as we go to press comes a report of an investigation into the working of the National Coal Board!

The National Union of Mineworkers have set up a committee of five to make the closest possible examination of every aspect of the Board's work. The purpose is to increase efficiency and it is hoped that "one result will be that it will expose the shallowness of much of the irresponsible criticism levelled at the industry since nationalisation."

Now, semi-official committees are not set up to deal with irresponsible criticism. The uncensured in nationalised industry is now so widespread that even the union leaders have become aware of it.

When working miners describe how the number of officials (each with his own car) has multiplied since nationalisation, they are pointing to the outward signs of a deep-rooted sickness in individual life—the cancer of unproductive officials, many of them very highly paid, growing like fungus on the body of productive workers.

Those who claim that centralisation makes for efficiency are distorting the truth. The more centralised any organisation becomes, the more wasteful and inefficient it is. This problem can only be solved in industry by workers' control—but we do not expect the N.U.M. investigation committee to recommend that!

## GOODBYE TO LORD HYNDLEY

AND getting out just in time—before the N.U.M. committee finds out too much—Lord Hyndley, chairman of the National Coal Board since its birth, retires this month. Not that the N.U.M. committee would say anything against the noble Lord, for, as Sir William Lawler, President of the National Union of Mineworkers, said of Lord Hyndley's departure, "He goes with the good will of all in the industry who have regard for conscientious service."

"His work of the last five years will live in the opinion of the miners as one of the greatest examples of service for his nation in our time."

Who could not give noble service at £8,000 per year? The new chairman is obviously well-fitted to lead the coal industry. He is Sir Herbert Houltsworth. He is a K.C.

## The Law and Identity Cards

"No wonder the anarchists, with more generous modes of life in mind, have invented the ominous phrase: 'Incinerate the documents!' That would wreck this world worse than an earthquake."

LEWIS MUMFORD: *The Metropolitan Milieu.*

AN English judge once remarked that, "We are all supposed to know the Law, and nobody does." This was not true, apparently, in the Identity Card case since the findings of the Magistrates against the Defendant were upheld by the Appeal Court. But to determine who had correctly interpreted the Law, the Lord Chief Justice felt it necessary to call in six additional judges. And for two days

the most eminent interpreters of the law spent their time seeking a definition of the term "Emergency". That they found it such an exclusive term to define is no excuse for us laymen to plead that we thought it meant something else: "Ignorance of the law excuses no man. Every man must be taken to know the law." But let us start from the beginning.

LAST December, a Mr. Willcock failed to produce his identity card when required to do so by a Police Constable who was in uniform. Mr. Willcock was driving a car at the time. It was contended on behalf of Mr. Willcock before the magistrates that the "National Registration Act, 1939, was to continue in force until such date as the King might by Order in Council declare to be the date on which the emergency, which was the occasion of the passing of that Act, came to an end and should then expire except as respected things previously done or omitted to be done: that pursuant to the Courts (Emergency Powers) (End of Emergency) Order, 1950, it was declared that Oct. 8, 1950, was the date on which the emergency which was the occasion of the passing of the Courts (Emergency Powers) Act, 1939, came to an end, and that the emergency which was the occasion of the passing of the Courts (Emergency Powers) Act, 1939, was the same emergency which was the occasion of the passing of the National Registration Act."

The defence's argument was therefore that a policeman no longer had the legal right to request the production of an Identity Card. The justices' view was that section 6 (4) of the National Registration Act had not been repealed and accordingly convicted Mr. Willcock. This interpretation was upheld by the Court hearing the appeal.

Lord Goddard began his judgment by saying that the question was of very great importance as was indicated by the fact that a Court of seven judges had been specially constituted to deal with it. In the opinion of all the members of the Court it was essentially a question of con-

### Freedom Defence Committee

AN outcome of the Identity Card case has been the formation of an organisation with the title Freedom Defence Committee, which as some readers will recall, bears the same name as the civil liberties organisation whose activities *Freedom* supported and to which some members of our group belonged. For this reason we think it essential to point out in order to avoid any possible misunderstanding that the present organisation is not a revival of the Freedom Defence Committee with which we were connected.

struction. It was common ground that some Order in Council was necessary to terminate the Act and that no Order existed expressly dealing with the Act.

It was argued on one side by Mr. Marshall that there could only be one emergency and that must be deemed to be ended for all purposes from the time the first Order in Council was passed stating that the emergency had ended. On the other hand, it was argued that there could be different forms of the same emergency. On the true construction it was contemplated that to bring any of these aspects of the Acts to an end there must be an Order in Council dealing with that particular aspect.

This particular Act had not been terminated by reason of the first Order in Council passed as long ago as February, 1946, and as there had been no Order in Council terminating this Act it could not be said to have terminated.

SO much for the Law. How this contrasts with morality was clearly revealed by comments made by Lord Goddard himself during the hearing of the Appeal.

Mr. Marshall (for Mr. Willcock): "The power of forcing subjects to be registered, to be numbered, and to carry about with them their card of identity, which, at the request of some police officer or military authority, has to be produced, is an unusual interference with the subject's liberty which has never previously operated in normal times. I submit that the power was given only for emergency purposes."

Lord Goddard: It never operated before. In the First World War we had registration, but we never had identity cards. It shows the danger of using legislation passed for one purpose for an entirely different purpose. The showing of an identity card is not being used for security purposes at all.

On another occasion, Lord Goddard said to Mr. Vernon Gattie (for the police): "The Court invites you, if you can tell us if the police do this as a matter of routine: that, if they speak to a person who has not got his lights on, they want to know his identity number, his name, address, sex, and 'everything else.'"

Mr. Gattie: What they really want to know is his identity number. It started in May, 1941, when instructions were issued to the police to ask for the identity cards of anybody who came into their hands. That included motorists. So far as criminals are concerned, there are other means of establishing identity, but most motorists are law-abiding people. When

➔ TO PAGE THREE

### "TREASON" IN KOREA

The South Korean Minister of Information, Mr. Clarence Rhee, declared on June 28th, that anyone found advocating support for the Soviet cease-fire proposal would be regarded as a traitor and severely punished. Anyone who spread "rumours not in accordance with Government opinion towards the peace proposal" would also be severely punished.

## The Tshekedi Case

THE case of Tshekedi Khama, banished without charge or trial from his tribe in Bechuanaland, was discussed in detail in *Freedom* on 9/6/51, and no new facts have emerged from last week's debates in both Houses of Parliament. What the debates have demonstrated is the completely unprincipled nature of parliamentary decisions. Although Mr. Attlee, in winding up the debate in the House of Commons, said that it was not a party matter, the "Whips were on" and with only four voluntary abstentions, the Labour members voted with the Government. This, despite the fact that as Lord Chorley said the following day in the House of Lords debate (when the Government was defeated), and as Mr. J. P. W. Mallalieu said in *Tribune*, "an overwhelming majority of the Labour Party would have been for Tshekedi. One also had the spectacle of a great majority of the Tories, including the most imperialistic Blimps voting for the motion to rescind the order of banishment. "We saw," says Mr. Mallalieu, "Lennox Boyd, the friend of Franco, gallivanting as a progressive and defending the rights of man".

Tshekedi Khama, after listening in the gallery to the Lords upholding his case, said, "Whatever the outcome, I shall leave this country feeling satisfied that the British public did everything in their power to see that justice was done."

But what he had in fact seen was his case steam-rollered by the party machine, opposed by the Labour Party because the Government opposed it, and supported by the Conservatives for the same reason.

Mr. Gordon Walker's behaviour during the debate does not do him much credit. The issue was whether or not justice had been done to Tshekedi and Mr. Gordon Walker evaded it by offering to have a new trial meeting called to discuss whether Tshekedi should return, after the

atmosphere had been poisoned against him, and by waving before the House a telegram "just received" from the Resident Commissioner. "There is a great deal of evidence," said Mr. Gordon Walker, "of the happiness of the tribe and their co-operation with the administration. The tax collection has this year reached a record." So has it in Britain!

But the whole discussion itself carefully evades the real issue in another way. The whole discreditable affair arises from the marriage of Tshekedi's nephew, Seretse Khama, to a white woman, and because of the susceptibilities of white opinion in South Africa this must not be brought into debate. As Tshekedi says, "The obvious reason of racial intolerance is too delicate for any public discussion or assertion; hence individuals have been ruthlessly sacrificed for the unexplained 'public good'."

Tshekedi in discussing the implications of his own case, links the issues involved with the current proposals for a new Dominion of British Central Africa in the Rhodesias and Nyasaland. In describing these proposals in our last issue, we questioned the value of the elaborate system of safeguards (on paper) for the African people. This is what Tshekedi says: "The refusal of the Government to allow the British public to get the facts surrounding the banishment at first hand assumes an even greater significance at this particular moment when far-reaching proposals for the formation of a British Central Africa state are being made. In this proposed state safeguards for the protection of the rights and interests of the African people appear to be vested in the Secretary of State. What is the meaning of the warning given by the Commonwealth Relations Office in the House of Lords some days ago that 'the Government trusted that Africans elsewhere would take note of the Government's sole aim and motive—the welfare and constitutional progress of the Bamangwato people'?" Is the arbitrary manner, the blind confidence in the word of the local officials, which has been exhibited in the present Bechuanaland case, a convincing proof that the welfare of the African people in Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland will be safe in the hands of the Secretary of State?"

**Machinism.** This is not a subject to be dismissed in a paragraph: it is perhaps the basic problem of our civilization, embracing war, famine, social disintegration, moral degeneration, and metaphysical despair. It is not a subject on which anarchists have a clear and coherent point of view. Most of us, I think, tend to distrust the machine; the modern state could not exist without it, and is in some undefined sense a creation of the machine. We tend to speak of the state in terms of the machine—"the machinery of government", "the bureaucratic machine", etc. Metaphors, no doubt, but the day is not so distant when Whitehall will become one vast calculating machine, with forms fed in at one end and infallible statistics controlling our lives coming out at the other end. A new word has been invented—cybernetics—and it comes from our most mechanised society, the United States. It means "the theory of communication and control in the man and the machine", and it is very necessary for all of us to understand its implications. We cannot do better than read Dr. Norbert Wiener's *The Human Use of Human Beings*, a book on *Cybernetics and Society* as its subtitle more clearly indicates. Wiener is professor of Mathematics at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and one of the men responsible for the development of the "mechanical brain"—"which," says the blurb, "can do routine mental jobs better than any man, and which therefore make the untrained mind a drug on the market" (the book is published here by Eyre & Spottiswoode, price 18s.)

The untrained mind means, apparently, the mind incapable of understanding and controlling these robots. "Any machine constructed for the purpose of making decisions, if it

does not possess the power of learning, will be completely literal-minded. Woe to us if we let it decide our conduct, unless we have previously examined the laws of its action, and know fully that its conduct will be carried out on principles acceptable to us! "Woe, woe, woe! The hour is very late, and the choice of good and evil knocks at the door." Dr. Wiener is a very frightened man, and when he looks round for a principle or a faith that might conceivably control the machine for the benefit of humanity, he finds only Voices and Rigidity. His final remarks are addressed specifically to Americans, but in this sense we are all Americans. He slashes into Communists and Capitalists alike, and into the Catholic Church, and concludes: "It is again the American worship of know-how as opposed to know-what that hampers us. We rightly see great dangers in the totalitarian system of Communism. On the one hand, we have called in to combat these the assistance of a totalitarian Church which is in no respect ready to accept, in support of its standards, milder means than those to which Communism appeals. On the other hand, we have attempted to synthesize a rigid system to fight fire by fire, and to oppose Communism by institutions which bear more than a fortuitous resemblance to Communist institutions. In this we have failed to realize that the element in Communism which essentially deserves our respect consists in its loyalties and in its insistence on the dignity and the rights of the worker. What is bad consists chiefly in the

ruthless techniques to which the present phase of the Communist revolution has resorted. Our leaders show a disquieting complacency in their acceptance of the ruthlessness and a disquieting unwillingness to refer their acts to any guiding principles. Fundamentally, behind our counter-ruthlessness there is no adequate basis of real heartfelt assent."

A vague expression—"heartfelt assent". I suspect that Professor Wiener means "mutual aid", and that he is one of our crypto-anarchists.

**Juenger and Mounier.** There are two other books which might be read with profit now that we are debating the problem of machinism. One, a furious onslaught on the machine and all its works, has not been published in this country. It is a translation of a book written in 1939 (but not published till 1946) by Friederich Georg Juenger, the brother of the more famous Ernst Juenger, and is called *The Failure of Technology*, and is published in the United States by the Henry Regnery Company at \$2.75. It is a powerful and persuasive book, and its thirty-eight short chapters attack every aspect of "technological progress". I will quote its conclusion: "The state itself is now conceived by technology

as an organization which must be brought to perfection, which must be controlled by a perfect automatism. The technician asserts that the state can properly fulfil its tasks only when it becomes organized on a completely technical basis, when the idea of the state and its purpose are organized into a centralized functionalism, an all-embracing machine which nothing escapes. But precisely this definition annihilates the very essence of the state. For, indispensable to the state is that which is not state, and can never become state. This something by which alone the state can be a state is the people. The people may well be conceived as the carriers of the state; there are all kinds of relationships between the governed and the government, but never can the people be the state itself. The very idea of the state is null and void once this basis collapses whereon the state is built. The technical organization of the whole people to the point where no sector of life remains unorganised, in the end brings the downfall of that state."

Another crypto-anarchist?

The other book that deals to a considerable extent with the problem of machinism is *Be Not Afraid: Studies in Personalist Sociology* by Emmanuel

Mounier (Rockcliff, 15s.) Mounier, whose early death about a year ago is to be greatly regretted, was a Catholic, a disciple of Péguy. But his attitude to the machine is very different from Gill's and other Catholic distributivists. He is almost lyrical in his praises of the civilizing influence of the machine, and takes the view that as a direct extension of man's faculties and intelligence, it is divinely sanctioned and should be developed for the benefit of mankind. But only, of course, within the controlling ethos of a Christian community. Mounier's personalist sociology has many points of contact with anarchism, and his general principle, that a morally healthy society could be trusted to make a right use of technology, is one with which we can agree. But how distinguish the good machines from the bad ones? It is simple, says Mounier. Good machines are an extension of the human hand; bad machines are automatic. A bicycle is a good machine—"it is well adapted to the human body: the handlebars correspond to the arms and hands, the pedals to the feet, and it is entirely controlled by the human body". The motorcycle, however, is a bad machine—it is merely a mechanism that performs controlled automatic work. "And now I am lost in contemplation of my typewriter! It is a good machine, I decide, for though it has its full share of "that measure of disorder known to the statistical mechanist as entropy", it is the moving finger (or rather, two of them) that writes.

## "KICKS AND HA'PENCE" by Herbert Read

# MACHINISM

### BOOK REVIEWS

## A Cold War Novel

**THE CASE OF COMRADE TULAYEV**  
by Victor Serge. (Hamish Hamilton, 12/6d. net)

ALTHOUGH this book is long and at times very tedious, and although the receptive reader in the end is more likely to feel confused than satisfied, it is nevertheless well worth reading. For, in spite of some weakness as a work of art and as a "document"—a preliminary note emphasizes that it belongs "entirely to the domain of fiction"—it is probably the best of all the cold-war novels that have been published to date. Koestler has written of it: "In this great novel, Victor Serge makes the dumb suffering of an enslaved continent articulate". It is certainly a cry from the heart of a sincere writer whose theme is life under the totalitarian State Capitalism of Soviet Russia. The picture, presented in the form of story, seems on the whole to be convincingly authentic, which is the most that can be said of it by one who, like this reviewer, has not lived in the circumstances so vividly depicted by the author.

The story is a simple one. A high official of the Communist Party, Comrade Tulayev, is shot on sudden impulse by a militant younger member of the Party who disapproves of his senior's repressive measures. The authorities seize on the incident for a grand-scale round-up of all sorts and conditions of suspects and doubtless, prepare them carefully by prison-conditioning, interrogations and

the tricks with which we have been made familiar (of which there need be no doubts whatever) and then, when all the characters have been well rehearsed, a court of law becomes the theatre for one of those great propagandist trials to which the Russian political stage-management can rise with great dramatic art. As one reads of the astonishing ramifications of the investigators—they reach from Moscow to Siberia, and extend to fighting Spain, taking in the between-worlds of exiles and weak-kneed intellectuals in Paris—one feels very strongly that the author knows at first-hand most of what he writes about. In all this, the young Communist Kostia, who shot Comrade Tulayev, is a mere symbol behind the grand opera of trial, confessions, and what not. A delightful turn is given to the whole story by the fact that Kostia, the man who actually used the revolver, is not caught in the vast net! He gets away with it, whereas many others who had nothing to do with the crime are involved, some of them being prison-conditioned into confessing to a guilt which could not possibly be theirs. That reads like good O. Henry. The reader may wonder whether such things could happen; but there is no doubt of the effectiveness of the story-telling. It is as exciting as any political thriller could be.

If this book were not a novel (with such emphasis placed on its being "entirely in the domain of fiction") and if it were written from the pro-Soviet point of view, it would not require much skill or knowledge on the part of a reviewer to expose some grave weaknesses. For example, there are many pages devoted to republican Spain; to happenings there during the Spanish War; and to personalities. The point of mentioning Spain is this: whereas we have no first-hand knowledge of life behind the Iron Curtain, the same does not apply to the republican zone of Spain. Many of us followed the Spanish struggle with great keenness; others of us were in Spain and saw something of the struggle at first-hand; a few went behind the political scenes, and even saw something of what happened there. Perhaps the author of this book did not leave any of these advantages, which may account for the weakness of his pages about Spain. It would not be difficult to make fun of them, if anything were to be gained thereby; but we may pass them over as so much plain fiction, granting full artistic licence to the novelist. The Jesuit-minded reviewer in the pro-Soviet camp, using that not too honest method of seizing upon one weakness to discredit the whole, could make good play here. It is such weakness as this which, alone, would keep *Comrade Tulayev* out of the top rank of "fiction documentaries". For the rest, as Koestler rightly says, the book makes dumb suffering articulate.

G.D.

### THE SECOND OF THREE ARTICLES by GEORGE WOODCOCK on

## The Pacific Coast Indians

THE economy and social life of the British Columbian Indians were inevitably disrupted by the arrival of white settlers in large numbers, and the bad effects of this contact were probably much more severe than that between the Indians of Quebec and the French settlers in the east during the seventeenth century. The Iroquois of the east were an agricultural people, and the gap between their customs and those of the French peasants of that time was sufficiently slight to make the process of assimilation relatively easy. The Indians of British Columbia, on the other hand, were all hunters and fishers, with almost no agriculture of any kind, and there was a vast gulf between their life and that of the nineteenth century traders and farmers who introduced them to European life.

The first explorer to visit the coast was Captain Cook, who established contact

with the Nootka of Vancouver Island during the eighteenth century. He was followed by a number of sea traders, and then, in the early nineteenth century, the Hudson's Bay Company and its rivals pushed their fur-trading enterprises over the Rockies from the prairies. These first white men were comparatively few in numbers, and they had no interest in changing the customs of the Indians, since they were seeking the furs which resulted from a continuance of hunting, and their arrival, paradoxically, resulted in a brief flowering of west coast art into its most brilliant and abundant phase. The early totem poles and other carvings had been done laboriously with stone tools; the arrival of iron axes and chisels immensely increased the ease of working wood, and the poles, which hitherto had been available only to very rich chiefs, were now carved in much greater abundance and with an increasing wealth and fantasy of design.

But already the contact with white men began to show a disintegrating influence on Indian society. The new demand for furs and the competition of white trappers who had come in from the east began to diminish seriously the stock of game and fur-bearing animals. European diseases, such as smallpox and consumption, began to take their toll of the Indians. A large-scale prostitution traffic began; the Haida and Tsimshian, as well as the local Salish, would take their women down to Victoria for the use of the white men there, and there was a consequent spread of venereal disease among the tribes. Added to this, such organisations as the Hudson's Bay Company began to buy up the land from the Indians at fantastically low prices. The whole site of Victoria was purchased from the Songhees tribe for just over £100; the Indian chief who revealed the existence of the rich coal measures at Nanaimo was rewarded with a bottle of liquor.

By the 1840's the missionaries had appeared, and began to interfere with native Indian life. It must be admitted that they persuaded them to abandon some unpleasant customs and helped to put an end to the institution of slavery. On the other hand, they and the governmental authorities broke up the Indian way of life by such measures as the banning of the potlatch, and thus left the Indians wide open to the advance of a rapacious form of exploitation against which they were not at the time fitted to struggle.

The gold rushes to the Fraser Valley and the Cariboo during the 50's and 60's dealt a final blow to the Indian economy in this area. The supplies of game began to dwindle rapidly, and the land was occupied, not only by miners who wreaked a bloody revenge on any interference they received from the Indians, but also by the unsuccessful gold seekers who began to turn to farming. In 1847 and 1850 there were smallpox epidemics in Victoria; the Indians from the coast who happened to be there trading at the time were the first victims, and they were driven out by the white men, so that the disease was spread up and down the coast, and whole villages were killed off. As it was, the warriors

and fishermen who were in Victoria at the time caught the disease, this meant that the fitter members of the tribes were the first to die, and the result was a general impoverishment in the standards of living of the survivors, and a resultant lowering of resistance to disease, so that since that time the Indians have been far more susceptible to tuberculosis than their white neighbours and have also suffered greatly from such epidemics as the influenza of 1918. A later smallpox epidemic, in 1862, swept over the southern part of the interior, and had a parallel effect in a wide depopulation of the province.

By the second half of the nineteenth century the Indian tribes seemed to be completely engulfed in the tide of European pioneering, and this was increased by the building of railways and the coming of European fishermen to the coast. The lands of the province were alienated and the Indians segregated into reserves. More than that, their native ways of life became impracticable. The hunting tribes of the interior found their food animals diminished, and were forced to change over to a settled life of subsistence farming for which they had not the requisite experience and which they disliked. The Coast Indians found their elaborate society, with its complicated art and ritual, and its intricate social patterns, breaking up rapidly before the onslaught of a new society which they did not understand. Their fishing grounds were being used by people with much better equipment than theirs, and weakened by disease and starvation, they began to live a dispirited imitation of the white man's life. So demoralised had they become that a responsible sociologist, writing in the 1920's, regarded them as a dying race. The only tribe which seemed to adapt itself to the new life right from the beginning was the Kootenay, whose country was colonised comparatively late, in the 1890's, and who became expert horsemen and ranch-hands. Their resilience was largely due to the comparative simplicity of their society, which was relatively lacking in class barriers and elaborate ritual.

The result of the impact of the whites can be seen most vividly in the drastic decline in the Indian population during a century. Some smaller groups, like the Tagish and Tsetsaut, have become completely extinct. Among the larger tribes the present populations are from a quarter to a half of what they must have been at the arrival of the first explorers. The most populous group, the Coast Salish, must have numbered nearly 15,000 when Cook arrived. Now they are about 4,000. And elsewhere the figures are very similar. Only the Kootenay, a relatively small tribe, retained anything approaching their original population.

The last twenty years has seen a change in the condition of the Indians. They have begun at last to understand their new environment, and they have become vocal once more as a group. We became very much aware of this fact during our recent tour of the back areas of British Columbia.

(To be continued)

## FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

The Case of Comrade Tulayev

Victor Serge 12/6  
He seems to me to be "on the side of man."—ALEX. COMFORT.

Orgone Energy Bulletin,

Vol. 3, No. 2, April 1951 10/-

Articles by William Reich and others.

Arrow to the Heart

Albrecht Goes 7/6

"One of the finest novels which have come out of the last war."

This Human Nature

Charles Duff 3/6

Has human nature changed? That is the question behind this enthralling history of civilization.

The Human Use of Human Beings

Norbert Wiener 18/-

(See *Kicks and Ha'pence* on this page.)

... Obtainable from

27 Red Lion St. London,

W.C.1

## FREEDOM PRESS

M. BAKUNIN:

*Maxism, Freedom and the State*—paper 2/6, cloth 5/-

HERBERT READ:

*Art and the Evolution of Man*—4/-

*Existentialism, Marxism and*

*Anarchism*—3/6

*Poetry and Anarchism*, cloth 5/-,

paper 2/6

*The Philosophy of Anarchism*—

boards 2/6, paper 1/-

*The Education of Free Men*—1/-

GEORGE WOODCOCK:

*Anarchy or Chaos*—2/6, cloth 4/6

*New Life to the Land*—6d.

*Railways and Society*—3d.

*Homes orhovels?*—6d.

*What is Anarchism?*—1d.

*The Basis of Communal Living*—

1/-

ALEXANDER BERKMAN:

*A.B.C. of Anarchism*—1/-

JOHN HEWETSON:

*Ill-health, Poverty and the State*—

cloth 2/6, paper 1/-

PETER KROPOTKIN:

*The State: Its Historic Role*—1/-

*The Wage System*—3d.

*Revolutionary Government*—3d.

*Organised Vengeance Called Justice*—

2d.

M. L. BERNERI:

*Workers in Stalin's Russia*—1/-

F. A. RIDLEY:

*The Roman Catholic Church and the Modern Age*—2d.

Marie Louise Berneri Memorial

Committee publications:

*Marie Louise Berneri, 1918-1949:*

*A Tribute*—cloth 5/-

*Journey Through Utopia*—

cloth 16/- (U.S.A. \$2.50)

★

27, Red Lion Street,

London, W.C.1.

## IDENTITY CARDS

MR. WILLCOCKS lost his case in law, but he secured a moral victory in creating the opportunity for the judges to expose the legal anomalies of identity cards. And he has succeeded in bringing the whole question of identity cards into the public mind at the same time. It is therefore timely to consider again our own attitude to the question of official papers.

Identity cards, working permits, all those pieces of paper which authorities can demand and scrutinize to see of they are "in order", all derived from the period of Bonapartist reaction after the French Revolution. Since then it has always been a commonplace for men and women to be stopped and held by the police on the Continent because their papers were not in order. The English liberal outlook which dominated the nineteenth century always looked askance at the practice, rightly seeing it as a grave incursion on political liberties. Today, there are in most Continental countries, concentration camps for those who have no papers or who have "unsatisfactory" ones—but who are charged with no other known crime.

We have often pointed out that the introduction of identity cards into this country in 1939 was greeted with indignation in liberal circles. Indignation sufficiently powerful to make the then Home Secretary, Sir John Anderson, give the government's solemn word, that they would be abolished at the end of the "emergency". The technical victory of the Government over Mr. Willcocks is due solely to the legal quibble about the "emergency". In 1939, it clearly meant wartime; and it is outrageous that to-day, more than six years after the war in Europe ended, the "emergency" should still protect identity cards.

Although the police in the Metropolitan area have been instructed not to ask for identity cards except in cases of "serious crime", it is a much longer step to abolish them altogether. "Practical folk"—those cursed dupes of authority—justify them on the very ground which makes effective abolition now so difficult: that they have been written into the social insurance administration of the welfare state. In passing, one may remark on the paradox that traditional opposition to such things comes from the Liberals: but also from the Liberal tradition, personified in Lord Beveridge, comes the social legislation which hardens the idea of docking every individual citizen.

But such centralisation of individual docking is not essential to social insurance or rationing or the attempt to plan production to meet the volume of consumers. It may be necessary to know the numbers involved, but just as administration finally has to be done from local offices, so the actual knowledge of individuals could be confined to localities, without turning over dossiers to the State. Such local docking does not recommend itself to anarchists, who would advocate an entirely different approach to administration based on local communities and consumers and producers' co-operatives: but it would avoid the police-like qualities of National Registration and be just as "practical".

Finally, however, there is another important aspect of the Identity Card case which links it up with the abolition of Regulation 1305. This latter has arisen after the failure of the Government to justify it in the case of the dockers on trial. The order to the Metropolitan police to pipe down on Identity Cards follows the moral defeat of the Government

in the case of Mr. Willcocks. The lesson is clear: they will use these measures, intrinsically unjust and hostile to the tradition of freedom, as long as they are not effectively challenged. But when such a challenge is made, results follow.

It remains, therefore, as always, with the individual to raise his voice against injustice and administrative anomaly. These two cases show that the Government is not all-powerful against informed public opinion.

## A New Party in India

### Breakaway from Congress

A political convention meeting at Patna earlier this month, under the chairmanship of Mr. Kripalani, the former president of Congress, has formed an opposition party on an all-India basis, the Kisan Mazdoor Praja (Peasants and Workers' Democratic) Party.

Mr. Kidwai will remain for the time being as a member of both Congress and the Cabinet, although the new party's constitution excludes members of other Parties from membership. He will wait until the next meeting of the All-India Congress committee next month before taking the next step.

The objective of the new Party is given as the establishment, by peaceful means, "of a free, democratic, casteless and classless society". The party manifesto lays stress on the overhauling of the administrative machinery, which is condemned as "top-heavy, inefficient, and corrupt", imposing the "heaviest burden on an impoverished and overstrained economy".

Foremost among its demands is the ruthless elimination of black-marketing and other anti-social elements which have flourished through the "complacency of the present Government". Devolution of political authority and reasonable power for local units is another feature of the manifesto, which visualises a strong central Government deriving from the mutual understanding and voluntary co-operation between healthy, and vigorous autonomous units. Regarding nationalisation the manifesto, while conceding that some defence and key industries must be nationalised, does not believe in the necessity of the Government directly undertaking and conducting all industrial enterprises. The wholesale nationalisation of industry, it observes, would ultimately lead to a State capitalism, inimical to democracy.

## Should Housing Standards be Cut?

A God-fearing child in the school sports might well mutter an inward prayer, "Oh God, let me win, and I'll never pull the cat's tail again, and I'll work hard in arithmetic and keep my bicycle clean." This was the mood behind the talk of post-war reconstruction we heard so much of during the later period of the war. The feeling of guilt, contrition and aspiration enlisted behind it the testimony of technicians and experts to show that a "better Britain" was possible. Some admirable reports and books were produced; two that spring to mind are Sir E. D. Simon's *Rebuilding Britain—A Twenty-Year Plan* (Gollancz), and Prof. G. D. H. Cole's *Building & Planning* (Cassell). But we have always thought it rather futile for economists to compute the number of houses that the available sources of labour materials and finance can produce in a year since when we descend from plans to practice, all sorts of political considerations enter and make nonsense of the hopeful statistics. The limiting factors in housing have been first the "export drive", and now the "rearmament programme". The first of these economic fallacies is based on the curious notion that we are still living in the 19th century, and the second an absurd idea that the way to get peace is to prepare for war. So the great hopes, the plans for "treating housing as a military operation" (a strategic withdrawal?) have been reduced to the Labour Party's aim of 200,000 a year. (We ignore the Conservative Party's 300,000 as a cynical electoral slogan, though it is small enough in face of actual needs.) Mr. Gaitskill told Parliament in the debate on the defence programme that the rate of house building would be maintained at 200,000, but on the basis of the returns for the first quarter of the year it is already down to 175,000. The *Architect's Journal* says, "Indeed, Mr. Gaitskill admits that 'if in a particular locality there is a great scarcity of labour . . . it may be taken from housing and put on to defence.' So this target of 200,000 houses (it might as well be faced) is just a pious hope." Incidentally, this is in spite of the report of the Housing Sub-committee of the Economic Commission for Europe following its Geneva Conference in March, that "urgent housing needs should not be sacrificed because of the current international situation" and that the twelve governments concerned should "maintain

and wherever possible expand their present housing programmes". The British delegates have been withdrawn from the sub-committee, or rather, as the government explains, "as things are at the moment they do not undertake to be present at future meetings".

If we try to satisfy housing needs on the budget allocated to them it becomes a question of trying to squeeze a quart out of a pint pot, and a lot of people are advocating what they take to be an easy way out of the dilemma—building smaller houses, and more of them. Many homeless families, they tell us, would prefer to have a lower standard of accommodation than to wait for years for a home. And, of course, this is true, but as the *Manchester Guardian* (31/5/51) says, "When the cheese ration is cut in a period of scarcity the loss to the consumer is no more than proportional to the amount and duration of the cut. With housing standards the case is different: a substandard house remains a social liability for at least two generations, and there comes a point beyond which a small reduction in space brings a much greater fall in domestic wellbeing."

House building to-day is based on the minimum standards laid down in the Ministry of Health's *Housing Manual* 1949 (H.M.S.O., 3/6), of 900-950 feet superficial area for three-bedroomed houses, as compared with 800-900 feet superficial area in the *Housing Manual* of 1944, and with the 750 sq. ft. of most local authority houses between the wars. The increase in standards are the result of years of agitation and persuasion from voluntary bodies like the Housing Centre and the T.C.P.A. As with controlled prices, where maximums usually become minimums, so with house sizes, permitted minimums have a way of becoming the general standard, and once a reduction is conceded it will take years to re-establish a higher standard. We do not suppose that those building trade employers and journalists who are glibly advocating a reduction, live in a family of five in a house built to the old standard. The value of space in houses depends, of course, on the use that is made of it. Architects can devise ways of reducing "circulation space" in halls and passages as was shown by the recent *Builder* competition for £900 to £1,000 houses. But as *Town & Country Planning* (April,

1951) says, "no matter how you raise the changes, you cannot make one cubic foot give the accommodation of two". It can be shown that this is only partially true, since well-designed economically-sized furniture could save a great deal of space—but it is not on the market at prices that ordinary people can afford and those who proposed to "cut out the tails" in housing certainly do not contemplate including it in the house as built.

The psychological effects of over-crowding, which is the result of lower standards are summarised by Alma Morand in *Nation and Family* as follows:

- (a) There is insufficient sleep, especially for the children. In dilapidated and over-crowded homes, adults and children encroach seriously on one another's time.
- (b) The play-space of young children is cramped, thus thwarting their development. Their movements must be incessantly curbed, because they conflict with household duties.
- (c) School children have great difficulty in doing their homework, and they become backward in their lessons.
- (d) There is lack of privacy for the adolescents—no chance of having a place of their own.
- (e) Bad and crowded houses mean constant friction within the family because what happens to one has to be shared by all.

And it is these psychological effects which, as Prof. J. M. Macdonald says, "determine the difference between a home and a slum".

If we want to build more houses within the present expenditure, the first things to attack are not house sizes, but the absurd inefficiency of the building industry, and the price rings and huge profits of the suppliers of building materials. But what should primarily be the subject of popular outcry is the standard of values which regards housing which, with nutrition, is the cornerstone of social welfare, as of such small importance.

C.W.

## FOREIGN COMMENTARY

### PEACE THREATENS BIG BUSINESS

THE change-over from civilian passenger car production to war production in the United States is throwing many thousands of Detroit workers out of jobs. The Chrysler Corporation is sacking 20,000 "hourly rated production and salaried employees", whilst the Briggs Manufacturing Company, makers of the auto bodies for Chrysler announce an 8,000 cut in employment. The Company states that the "lay-offs" were of "indefinite" duration and this is taken to mean that it will be months before the workers can be re-engaged on the motor industry's defence projects.

Meanwhile, the Stock Markets in America are reacting unfavourably. According to a *New York Herald Tribune* report (29/6/51), "Korean peace prospects and some unfavourable developments in business and industry led to increased liquidation in security markets and drastically low prices to-day." We draw special attention to the three words which we have italicized, for we are often told that we are behind the times when we maintain that there is a strong link between economics and wars—even "ideological" wars, as in Korea.

### ORGANISED MOTHERHOOD

READERS of Gerald Brennan's article in *Freedom* on the subject of the need for birth control in Italy will be interested in a broadcast item from Russia, where for political reasons large families are encouraged: Some 33,000 Russian mothers who have raised 10 children or more have been awarded the title and medal of Mother Heroine, the Moscow radio reported. More than 3,000,000 mothers of large families have been awarded the Motherhood Medal and the Glory of Motherhood Medal, the broadcast said.

The title *Mother Heroine* is to our mind a most apt title, for it implies sacrifice not pleasure. The Russian State needs more cannon fodder, and there are the women prepared to do their duty for the motherland. And to think that the apologists of Russia are always stressing that in that country the dignity of the individual is sacrosanct!

At the same time, the United Nations Bureau of Statistics in its *Demographic Directory* estimates the present world

population at 2,400 millions, representing an increase of 500 million since 1920.

### CONVERTS TO OBSCURANTISM IN U.S.A.

THAT there are more than 28 million Catholics in the United States came to us as quite a shock. What is even more frightening is that the flock increased in 1950 by nearly one million. There are no less than 43,889 shepherds for this expanding flock and the Church operates 11,767 educational institutions and 5 million children are receiving religious instruction in various forms in classes conducted by Catholic institutions.

Of converts to the faith, the official directory (from which our figures have been culled) claims 121,950 for last year and boasts more than a million during the decade.

No-one can say that the power of the Catholic Church is on the decline, and to our mind it is a mistake to soft peddle the rôle of the Church in politics on the grounds that we must not be intolerant. The organised Church is a powerful political machine on the side of reaction. It is on the side of obscurantism and superstition, and an international force against progress of the mind. And it can be opposed on these grounds with the same determination as we oppose the Popes of capitalism and the Red Pope of the Kremlin!

LIBERTARIAN.

### SPANISH WORKERS AND FALANGE

Speaking at Bilbao on June 19th on the fourteenth anniversary of the fall of the city during the Spanish Civil War, Señor Fernandez Cuesta, Minister of Justice and secretary-general of the Falangist Party, told 5,000 Basque workers that the recent strikes in Spain did not constitute a danger to the State but rather to the strikers themselves, because "such seditious acts" were punishable under the penal code. "The workers must understand that their old and just claims coincide with the aims of the Falangist movement," he said.

The Times, 22/6/51.

## The Law and the Identity Card

FROM PAGE ONE

motorists were reported for traffic offences the Court desired to know if it was the first offence or whether the defendant had been convicted before.

But how illogical Lord Goddard can be, and thereby perhaps revealing his true sentiments, when he states in one part of the judgment that: "The National Registration Act, 1939, was passed for security reasons. It was never passed for these other purposes for which it was now apparently sought to be used. Acts of Parliament were passed during the war for particular purposes." And in the same judgment it was obvious that the police now, as a matter of routine, demanded to see registration cards whenever they stopped motorists whatever the offence might be. "Of course if they are looking for a stolen car or for particular motorists engaged in committing crime it is one thing, but to demand registration cards of all and sundry—from a lady leaving her car outside a shop longer than she should, for instance—is wholly unreasonable," he said. (Our italics.)

\*

And how significant it is that Lord Goddard himself changed his view overnight during the two days of the hearing. For the interpretation of the law that the High Court decided requires us, as *The Times* says, "to believe that we are still involved in thirty distinct emergencies, all of indefinite duration". But on the first day, Lord Goddard declared that: "There is not a trace in these acts to show that Parliament was contemplating any more than one emergency. What are the other emergencies?" (*Manchester Guardian*, 26/6/51), and "There cannot have been 19 and 20 'emergencies'. That is common sense." (*News Chronicle*, 26/6/51). On June 12th he had remarked that "the emergency has either come to an end or it has not". The fact that the Lord Chief Justice's own interpretation of the law can change so suddenly is one more illustration of the citizen's complete inability to know what the law is, unless like Mr. Willcock he is ready to meet the costs of a test case amounting to between £750 and £1,000. The reason for Lord Goddard's change of mind is surely the appalling (from a legal point of view) consequences of any other interpretation. For not only the Rent Restrictions Act, but innumerable other laws would have been found to be invalid. Imagine the proceedings for wrongful conviction which would pile up against the judges or the wrathful 'Z'-men whose present call-up is for the emergency occasioned by the German invasion of Poland!

THIS history of the Identity Card is a confirmation of the Anarchists' contention that legislation passed on the grounds that a "state of emergency" exists has the unpleasant habit of becoming a permanent institution, and inevitably is used for entirely different purposes than those for which it was originally intended (or so the public were led to believe). The Identity Card which in the "Emergency" of 1939 was to be used in connection with conscription and rationing is now, six years after the end of the war, a firmly established document, not only with the police, but one's identity card number is used for instance, in connection with National Insurance, is marked on one's passport, can be demanded at Post Offices when one draws money from a Savings Account or calls for a packet.

Why? Because, to quote Lord Justice Jenkins, "What brought the 'emergency' to an end was not the end of the emergency but an Order in Council." And no such Order has been made. Accident or design? It all depends what you think of Governments!

R.

## VAGRANT CHILDREN

"Of the hundreds of thousands of 'unattached' youngsters roaming the shattered streets of Central Europe, many were vagrants by force of circumstances, seeking only to return to the settled life they had seen destroyed. But the far more elusive majority were in open revolt against the social 'order' they had known. Deprived at a tender age of the affection and security which home and community should have provided and feeling their loss as a sense of grievance and a desperate craving for freedom, they found in the leaderless gang a precarious confidence, personal recognition, and mutual loyalty. With pilferage as their only source of livelihood, they were drifting inevitably into criminal careers. Punishment, reprobation, charity, and conventional reformatory treatment made no impression; but by working on and through the gang, giving scope to its co-operative spirit and sense of honour in an atmosphere of security, friendliness, and freedom, it was found possible to induce its members to experience and accept wider responsibilities until their narrow, aimless solidarity was superseded by a regenerated faith in society at large."

—*Manchester Guardian*, 6/7/51.  
And looking at European "gangs" of large size, dare we assume that it is not possible of that regenerated faith?

SYNDICALISM

PHILIP SANSOM'S penetrating series on "Syndicalism" now appearing in *Freedom* have prompted me to dig out the following interesting abbreviated extracts from:—

(1) "L'homme qui rit" (*The Laughing Man*) by Victor Hugo (1802-65):  
"What would become of the state if no one consented to serve it? Would not everything come to a standstill? To keep his place is the duty of a good citizen. Learn to sacrifice your secret preferences. Where would we be if everyone had his rights? Can you imagine a city ruled by its citizens? Why, the citizens are the team, and the team cannot be driver. To put to the vote is to throw to the winds. As for me, I wish to enjoy myself; not to govern. A prince is a providence, and takes care of us all. Truly the king is generous to take so much trouble for our sakes. It's his business. Peace, War, Legislation, Finance—what have the people to do with such things? Of course the people have to pay, of course the people have to serve; but that should suffice them. They have a place in policy; from them come two essential things, the army and the budget. To be liable to contribute, and to be liable to serve; is not that enough? What more should they want?"

"They are the military and financial arm. A magnificent rôle. Taxation and the civil list are the salaries paid by the peoples and earned by the prince. The people give their blood and their money, in return for which they are led. To wish to lead themselves! What an absurd idea! They require a guide; being ignorant, they are blind. Has not the blind man his dog? But why are the people ignorant? Because it is good for them. Ignorance is the guardian of virtue. Where there is no perspective there is no ambition. The ignorant man is in useful darkness. He who reads, thinks; who thinks, reasons. But not to reason is duty. These truths are incontestable; society is based on them."

(2) *The life and trial of Thomas Muir, Advocate, of Hunterhill, Glasgow (1765-98), tried for sedition before the High Court of Justiciary in Scotland, and sent to transportation for 14 years:*

"I consider the ignorance of the people, on the one hand, to be the source from which despotism flows. I consider, on the other hand, an ignorant people, impressed with a sense of grievances, and wishing to have these grievances redressed, to be exposed to certain misery and to complete ruin. Knowledge must always precede Reformation, and who shall dare to say that the people should be debarred from information where it concerns them so materially. I exhorted them to adopt none but measures which were constitutional, and entreated them to connect liberty with knowledge, and both with

Curious 'Justice'

MAGISTRATES and judges always show very little mercy for anyone before them who has been found guilty of violence against a policeman, and indeed the "car" has been retained in this country for only one "crime": that of assaulting a prison officer.

But it appears that not such a serious view is taken, at least by some arbiters of the law when the processes are reversed and the police officer takes "the law into his own hands", as the magistrates always put it in such such.

A 34-year-old Barnsley man, Leslie Rodburne, was recently arrested on a charge of being found in possession of certain goods.

After being put in a cell at Cudworth Police Station he was taken into the police office where there were nine police officers. There, he alleged, he was subjected to a "softening-up process" to make him talk.

He had, however, no serious complaint to make against any constable except P.C. Holmes, who, he alleged, punched him about the head and face and kicked him in the ribs when was on the floor.

P.C. Holmes pleaded not guilty and only when Rodburne used an "offensive expression" did he strike one blow "with an open hand".

The Court found him guilty of "an assault causing bodily harm" and fined him forty shillings with costs!

ON THE ROAD

THE report of the National Assistance Board for 1950, recently published, includes statistics on "persons without a settled way of living, formerly described as vagrants or casuals, sleeping in reception centres". It is stated that the year under review saw the first use by the board of its powers to bring before the court any persons who had to be assisted because of persistent refusal or neglect to maintain himself. Four prosecutions brought prison sentences of two or three months.

The news must come as a shock to those who thought that the system of prosecuting vagrants, described so vividly in Chapter 16 of George Orwell's *Down and Out in London and Paris*, had died out with the old Poor Law.

morality. I am accused of sedition. If these are crimes, I am guilty."

(3) "Syndicalism", by J. H. Harley:

"It was in France that Syndicalism, in the really modern sense, had its official birth. The Chartist Movement of 1842 had its distinctly syndicalist accompaniments . . . But the arts of production were not far enough advanced to make it successful in its main ends and objects. Its revolutionary programme occupied a permanent place on the agenda of the ordinary Trade Union meeting. The leading British T.U.s were too reflective, too cautious, too anxious for self-improvement to stake their fortunes on a single throw of the dice. The French workman, on the contrary, is far less deeply read in economics than are the élite of the British Labour leaders. He is inspired by the leaders of the Revolution rather than by the pundits of Socialism. He is full of grand projects of internationalism and anti-military propaganda rather than with the nationalisation of industries, or with the municipalisation of gas and water."  
*Glasgow, 16/6/51. H. T. DERRETT.*

Making Ends Meet

OUR august contemporary the *Spectator* has been publishing a series of articles under the title "Making Ends Meet", in which members of the "middle-classes" have been revealing their financial plight in an orgy of self-pity. The following comment from Mr. F. Barber of Dudley, recently appeared in that paper, and is a salutary rejoinder to those whose arrogant assumptions of superiority lead them to imagine that their privileged position in society is God-ordained and eternal.

CASUALS

During the hearing of the St. George's Election Petition in 1896, a docker was being questioned 'as to credit' by Mr. Samuel Cock, Q.C., "Oh," said Mr. Cock wistfully, 'so you are a casual.' The witness loosened the red handkerchief round his throat, thrust his head forward and replied, 'Yus, I get a job when I can—same as wot yer does yourself.' That concluded the cross-examination.  
—Lord Stansgate, in a recent broadcast.

"I am an ordinary worker living in the midst of an essentially working-class district, and have read your very interesting journal regularly now for ever ten years. I should imagine that the great majority of your readers belong to the professional and middle classes, and I should be very glad if any of them could enlighten me on the following two points which have always greatly perplexed and intrigued me, to which I have never succeeded in getting any satisfactory reply: (1) Why are the middle classes totally unable to 'make ends meet' and apparently living in direct poverty on incomes which are beyond the wildest dreams of the vast majority of the ordinary workers of this country? Neither my own income nor those of my fellow-workers comes to one-half of the figure of £800 after deduction of tax enjoyed by the retired headmaster, yet most of us 'make ends meet' without undue difficulty or, at any rate, without excessive grumbling and self-pity. (2) Why do the middle classes possess, or imagine that they possess, God-given rights to amenities and services not enjoyed by the workers and which, indeed, it is appar-

ently wicked and immoral of the workers to expect?"

"The most annoying and infuriating thing about these people with their handsome incomes and comfortable pensions is the way in which they assume that they are magnanimously 'making sacrifices' for the workers. Are these retired professional people aware that their pensions are a charge on production, and that production depends entirely on the workers, who alone can give real value to the money amounts of these pensions? That, in fact, the workers are 'making sacrifices' for them rather than the reverse? Are they aware, however, that no pensions await the majority of these workers on retirement other than the meagre State pensions, and that these are only assured to them by the Welfare State, at which contributors to the *Spectator* never seem to get tired of sneering?"

"It would be interesting, for purposes of comparison, to publish an article showing how one of the many aged couples in this district manage to 'make ends meet' on a weekly income of £2 12s. per week, and how their budget compares with that of the retired headmaster with his £800 per year and the parson with his £250. But, of course, these people are inarticulate. They cannot write articles for the *Spectator*. Therefore, presumably, they just don't count."

SYNDICALISM — THE WORKERS' NEXT STEP—8

Defence of the Revolution

SYNDICALISTS, like Anarchists, do not make a virtue of necessity, and they recognise that the end does not justify the means, but that the means are governed by the ends in view. With this in mind, we have to consider now the Syndicalist attitude to violence, for the argument is often put forward that Anarchists and Syndicalists must be pacifists, since it is inconsistent to denounce the State for its violence if you are prepared to resort to violence yourself.

Now, no reasonable person believes that the use of force solves any argument, and, in spite of the popular misconception, Anarchists do not "believe in" violence, any more than the society they want to see is one where everybody rushes around killing everybody else because there is no longer a police force to restrain them. We denounce the State because it organises violence, makes permanent institutions of its violent organisations and forces its citizens to be violent at its command. If one of us murders another individual for motives of our own, we end up on the gallows, but the State tries to force all its young men to train for greater efficiency in mass murder for motives they often do not understand or believe in.

We do not advocate violence as something we approve of for its own sake, but we do claim the right to resist violence by anybody else. Even in a Court of Law, the plea of "Self Defence" is recognised as a valid defence against charges of murder or manslaughter. Has the citizen, then, no right to defend himself against the State, if the State uses armed force against him?

Theoretically, the Social Revolution could be achieved peaceably and bloodlessly. The workers could take over the means of production, and politely inform the employers, the police, the lawyers and the prison officers, the Civil Service and the Armed Forces that their services were no longer required in those capacities and that they could come and do some useful work for a change. And, theoretically, they could all accept it. There is even a school of thought which maintains that all these reactionary forces would melt away in the face of a majority in Parliament opposed to their existence!

But, alas, this remains—theory. The history of the 20th century alone shows us that reaction knows a thing or two better than that. If a little tampering with the Constitution does not do the trick, then there could be a march on Rome, a burning of the Reichstag, a Franco uprising—a seizure of power one way or another. Either way it eventually comes to the same thing: a direct struggle between the people and the State.

Where the people have the advantage is in the fact that the State can only function through their acquiescence. The forces of the State, after all, are manned by workers in uniform. No longer does a regular army of mercenaries blindly serve authority. The conscript armies of to-day are unwilling soldiers, already with a grievance against the State which unwarrantably interferes with their lives. Although revolutionaries are accused of disaffecting the troops, it is seldom that affection exists in the first place!

Supposing, then, that workers began taking over industry on a large scale. A social general strike was turning into a social revolution. Obviously, the Government would take action to defend the employers' interests and to maintain their position by force. (Remember that in the 1926 British General Strike, warships appeared on the Clyde, the Thames, the Humber and the Tyne. The army encamped in Hyde Park—ostensibly to distribute milk but obviously ready for the grimmer purpose.)

What is the first line of defence of the revolutionary workers? Clearly one of propaganda to the workers in uniform. Anti-militarism is one of the most important features of the Syndicalist case, for one of the most important functions of the armed forces is counter-revolution, activity in which the morale of the "other ranks" is already likely to be at a low ebb, for they cannot lose their identity with their own people. Is the soldier lightly to shoot down workers who may include his own father, or brother? Is he to be deaf to arguments about conditions which affect him when he is in "civvy street".

In the Russian Revolution, it was the soldiers "voting with their feet" who began it. The armed forces, after all, bear the brunt of capitalism's wars. They fight and die, are maimed, burnt and blinded, give most and get least—small wonder that social revolutions often begin with mutinies in the Forces!

But, of course, many fighting men will remain true to the colours, and against whatever action they can take, the workers have two lines of defence. The first is that, if they are in

occupation of the factories, those factories will suffer if violence is used against them. Now every employer will hesitate—and the State is just another employer in this sense—to sanction the destruction of his property, even if he seems to be losing it. He would rather take the chance of pulling a political or financial trick after the trouble is over (as has been done so often) and perhaps get back in control that way. It's up to the workers to see that he doesn't.

The second defensive measure is the setting up of workers' militias. These differ fundamentally from the official army of the State in that there is no intention of making them a permanent institution, and in the fact of their decentralised control.

Workers' militias are formed by workers who take up arms to defend their revolutionary gains. They consist of volunteers only, any form of conscription being in contradiction to the aim of the Syndicalists. The conscious worker-in-arms has only two aims: to prevent the means of production falling back into the hands of the ruling class, and to get back to his constructive life as soon as possible.

In Italy, in 1920, the employers locked-out the workers to enforce a wage-cut. The workers replied by taking possession of the factories and beginning to work them themselves. Peasant syndicates organised food supplies, transport syndicates carried it to the towns, power workers got on with their jobs—in a word, a revolutionary economy was being established. Workers' militias were organised, armed from the armaments factories, but—they were not used. The State and the up-and-coming Fascisti were helpless against the workers in control and with arms to defend themselves.

In Spain, in 1936, the story had the big difference that the revolution there was an answer to an officer-class putsch by Franco and his fellow-generals and fascists. There had to be fighting from the beginning. So the workers, already organised in strong Syndicalist and Anarchist movements, created their militias immediately. They raided barracks for arms, in some cases having to overcome stiff opposition, in others being promptly joined by the soldiers. They took over the arms factories, and in fact created an armoured car industry where none had existed before.

Men like Durruti sprang into prominence through their extraordinary grasp of revolutionary strategy. His column went to the aid of beleaguered Madrid, which Franco boasted would be in Fascist hands within three days. It was nearly three years before Madrid fell, although long before that the workers' militias had been absorbed into the centralised army of the anti-Fascist coalition, and had thus lost the striking-force and morale their early revolutionary enthusiasm had given them.

The Spanish militias were organised in small, mobile columns, on an autonomous basis, but close co-operation and exchange of information bound them together. There was no hierarchy of officers, all the men being equal, and free to go home if they wanted to—but they did not. In the rear, their fellow-workers were building a free society. They had something to fight for, and knew it was worth it. The workers' control in the factory was matched by the militiamen's equality in the field. The end—the free decentralised society—was being reflected in the means.

The very fact that Syndicalists are not seeking power, carries the answer to the pacifist arguments that the use of force inevitably corrupts the revolution, "as has been shown in the past". Russia is quoted as the supreme example. But in Russia force took forms quite unconnected with the defence of a libertarian revolution. The terror against counter-revolutionaries, for instance, which only created again the repression the revolution sought to destroy, was the work of State-minded politicians aiming at consolidating their own power, not abolishing it.

Immediately a new authority is born, the revolution is lost. The final defence of the social revolution lies not in fighting and violence, necessary as it may be, for this is only a transitory spasm—the death-rattle of the old society. The revolution will be best defended by the abolition of the means of violence, destroying completely the power structure in society, so that man can no longer dominate man. Let the constructive revolution create such a society that no man would be fool enough to want it changed. The free society will be best defended by—freedom.

PHILIP SANSOM.

Next Week: THE PATTERN OF SYNDICALISM.

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 Charing Cross Road at Gt. Newport Street, next Leicester Sq. Underground Stn.)  
LAST MEETING:  
JULY 8—Francis Tonks SOME ASPECTS OF ANARCHISM  
These Meetings are suspended for the Summer months. They will re-commence in SEPTEMBER.  
Watch this column for future Announcements.

NORTH-EAST LONDON

DISCUSSION MEETINGS IN EAST HAM  
at 7.30  
JULY 10—Round Table ANARCHISM & MYSELF.  
JULY 24—Discussion on FUTURE GROUP ACTIVITY.  
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)  
JULY 17—A Meeting to Commemorate the SPANISH REVOLUTION

GLASGOW

OUTDOOR MEETINGS at MAXWELL STREET  
Every Sunday at 7 p.m.  
With John Gaffney, Frank Leech, Jimmy Raeside, Eddie Shaw  
KINGSTON  
Any Comrades interested in forming a Group in the KINGSTON area, are invited to write to Freedom Press.

1951 SUMMER SCHOOL

This year's Summer School will be held in GLASGOW, 25th & 26th AUGUST  
To be followed by a week's camping at the Gare Loch.  
Applications to: John Gaffney, 18, Finniston Street, Glasgow, C-1, AS SOON AS POSSIBLE.

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