

Freedom

AN ANARCHIST FORTNIGHTLY

"All our liberties are due to men who, when their conscience has compelled them, have broken the laws of the land."
Dr. CLIFFORD

CONSCRIPTION GAINS GROUND

THE failure of the anti-conscriptionists in parliament to hold the ground they wrung from the government last year makes plain once again a general proposition which anarchists have always urged upon reformers—that where a general trend is in operation it is futile to pick at minor objections while making no resistance to the trend itself.

A year ago the opposition to conscription was sufficiently strong within the Labour Party to make the cabinet compromise its proposal for an eighteen month period for military service, and reduce it instead to twelve months. Now, the government proposes to reverse that concession, and once more make military service eighteen months—and it seems as good as certain that opposition will be negligible. The reason is partly to be sought in the varying motives of last year's oppositionists. Some were merely anti-Bevinists, others fellow travellers or softies who hoped for a rapprochement with Russia which would make military conscription unnecessary from a practical point of view. A few were pacifists; and these will probably provide the rump of last year's opposition.

Two World Camps

For it is clear that the hardening of the division of the world into two major power blocs has strengthened the hands of the "practical" men and weakened that of the socialists who felt queasy about Bevin's support for reactionary regimes such as that of Greece. Once again we see that nationalist, patriotic sentiments favouring the defence of our country (or "our way of life") and its dependencies cut right across the wishes of those who wish to support left-wing movements against reaction. Greece may be heading for a military dictatorship but patriotic socialists now see that it is an outpost in the defence against Russian aggression, and that what is needed is not a left government but an effective one.

Triumph of the Practical Men

Similarly, if one sees that the struggle is already engaged and that Russian progress is only to be stopped by military force or the threat of it, then opposition to conscription on mere ideological grounds, mere traditions of the Labour movement, is not practical politics at all. For practical men are already showing that Britain's overseas commitments cannot be met by men whose period of service is so short that they cannot be used further away than Germany or at most the Middle East, so that the tasks in the Far East fall to the regular army which is insufficient to shoulder them. Inevitably, therefore, military service must be increased to eighteen months of even two years . . .

Against the background of the cold war against Russia the position of most anti-conscriptionists becomes untenable. But that does not take away from the force of the arguments against conscription itself. It still remains an insult to every liberal principle, an addition to the State system of education of the most undesirable kind. So the problem expands into one which embraces the whole trend towards militarization because of the continual threat of war.

Those who recognize the basic un-

desirability of military conscription ought not to surrender their feelings to what is called practical necessity. It is not only basically immoral to do so, but the surrender is to the alleged practical necessity for military resistance—in short, to accept in advance yet another world war. Bertrand Russell has already accepted this prospect. He may hide behind such chimeras as a "preventive show of force", or even that hoary old veteran, the war to end war. Not even the chance of "third time lucky" can make people swallow that one.

Russell an illustration

Russell's position however typifies that of the anti-conscriptionist who has no social outlook beyond the hope of piecemeal reforms. And it is all the more penetrating a lesson in that Russell was an anti-war advocate in 1914-18 who served considerable terms of imprisonment for his views. His conversion to what could justly be called warmongering illustrates the truth that if you accept the world and society as it is, and accept the reformist way of striving to better it bit by bit, without any radical destruction of its main features such as unequal social classes, the sanctity of property (whether private or state), and the production of goods for exchange rather than for need, then you must accept the necessity to fight wars for hypothetical ideologies and actual misery.

The More Practical Alternative

The alternative is to reject conscription because it is unjust and morally repugnant, to reject wars, social inequality, and the property system which obstructs progress towards the provision of material comfort for all. The alternative, the constructive alternative, is to work for the social revolution, to further all those trends towards social justice, and to refuse one's participation in basically immoral acts urged upon us in the name of practical necessity.

In view of our considerable knowledge of what war involves, the revolutionary alternative will not perhaps seem as impractical as it sounds. It is quite certain that the establishment of social justice, of the social revolution in this country would have a far more devastating effect upon Russian imperialism than any strong arm show of force by British or American Imperialism.

We MUST Resist!

ONCE again the nations are preparing for war. Before the noise of battle dies away, before the homeless and displaced peoples of Europe and Asia are provided with even the simple necessities of life, the grim shadows of another ghastly struggle darken this unhappy earth.

The enemies of 1939-45 are vanquished and but for the echoes aroused by trials of war criminals, wherein the victors satisfy their lust for vengeance and strive to hide their own misdeeds, the causes for which some 20 millions perished would be forgotten. And well might they be forgotten, for the events since the end of the war have shown all those who wish to see how hollow was the mockery, how hideous the sham behind the parrot-phrases of the politicians, the exhortations of the back-room boys.

What price democracy to-day? What price this freedom from both fear and want when in a world of man-made shortage we are conscripted for a new destruction? Of course, the patriotic leaders find excuses. They have a world to play with, a world divided up by frontiers, beyond which, they tell us, dwell our enemies, those wicked men who'll steal our liberties—as if we were free men, with liberties to lose!

So, to prevent our enslavement by somebody else, our leaders enslave us themselves. To save us from Hitler, Churchill enslaved us; to save us from Stalin, Attlee enslaved us—but who will save us from Churchill and Attlee?

Who will break our chains so that we are free to save ourselves from tyrants everywhere? Who will prevent the tyrants from having the power to enslave us? Will anybody? Anybody but ourselves, that is?

The question begs the answer. No Leader will free us, for who can be a leader over free men? No politician will save us, for politics is the science of government and men who are governed are not free men and those who wait for a messiah will wait into their graves and those who just don't care are as good as dead anyway. The man who lives is the complete man—the man who uses his eye and his brain and his hand and his will and his courage and who says "NO" when the saviour comes along with the shackles.

STRAWS IN THE WIND

Mr. Vincent Tewson, general secretary of the T.U.C., told a conference called by the Royal Arsenal Co-op Society yesterday that the Ship of State was making progress in spite of heavy seas.

"Anyone who attempts to tamper with the engines or to spread disaffection among the crew will be handled by the crew," he said.

Mr. Chuter Ede, the Home Secretary, said last night at Melksham, Wilts.: "If national defence is necessary, no fit man should be able to evade it."

Reynold's News, 5/12/48.

Our Record Against War

THE Anarchist record is a clean one of constant anti-militarist and anti-war activity. We have been consistent against conscription since its first introduction, have not switched our "line" in the middle of a war like the Communists or in any way betrayed our principles like the Labour politicians. Here is the proof, in quotations from Anarchist publications during and between the two world wars—and we are already against the next one, too!

THE crime of crimes has been committed, and England is at war. In view of the Government's foreign policy during its whole existence, no one need feel surprised at this. When it was seen that the Imperialists in the Cabinet had the controlling voice, and when later Churchill was made First Lord of the Admiralty, it became a certainty that in the next great struggle of the European powers, England would be involved. To discuss the hideous machinations of international diplomacy, however, is

worse than useless. The plague of war has infected all the nations, and its breath will spread death and destruction on a scale never seen before . . . And it is this organisation for profit and plunder that modern Governments serve. It is to satiate their monstrous greed for wealth and power that ten millions of men, who ought to be gathering harvests that their dear ones will never taste, are thrown at each other's throats. For their advantage the corn-fields of Europe will become the graveyards of the tens of thousands who are doomed to die for a cause they do not even understand.

—Freedom, August, 1914.

The Law and the Profits

THE National Legal Scheme that the Government are contemplating on somewhat similar lines to the National Health Scheme is a classic example of Labour reformism and as such is worthy of attention. For this is, after all, the most that capitalism can offer; Social-Democracy is doing its best to make capitalism workable and ease its stringencies, and such fruits as this are not intended as temporary concessions or reforms won out of a bitter struggle against the Government, but as the acme of the struggle, the things the labour movement has always fought for, the characteristics of the Promised Land.

Such reforms cannot be opposed by the Tories in the same way as schemes for nationalisation and for electoral purposes they are bound to agree with them or even point out their inadequacies; although the unrepentant Right Wing continues to denounce such "pampering of the poor", and will soon doubtless be echoing in all the newspapers how people are sending each other to prison in the same way as we have heard since the Health Scheme that everybody is getting free spectacles and having their teeth out

unnecessarily. Like the Health Scheme, the Legal Scheme is founded on a perfectly substantial premise: namely that a misfortune that afflicts a particular person ought to be met by society. Whether this is fulfilled is quite another matter; but the point about law is that this is certainly a perfectly avoidable misfortune. As, of course, up to a point is ill-health; which is caused by poverty in the main, and legal problems are caused solely and entirely by the judicial system. The only aim of the Legal Scheme, this pinnacle of Labour reformism, is solely to alleviate the major misfortune that is incurred by a litigant, whether

successful or unsuccessful. It does not limit the enormous fees that pass hands in the administration of justice; but transfers them. The guinea-a-minute gentry are not to lose any of their substantial pickings; it would indeed be unlikely for any legislation to be passed affecting lawyers adversely, since they are better-represented than any other trade, profession, industry or racket in the House of Commons. The Legal Aid and Advice Bill widens the range of persons entitled to "Poor Person's Aid" considerably but naturally allows the rich man to be able to command the services of the expensive lawyers, some of whom are paid by the State to defend the poor man's interest in Parliament but spend a major part of their time defending the rich man's interest in the Law Courts.

It will still remain a crushing financial blow to be involved in any civil action, and injustice will still be a lot cheaper than any legal remedy could possibly be. There will still remain the distinction between rich and poor in the matter of solicitors and legal representation in the criminal courts, since the police on arrest

(Continued on page 4)

CONSCRIPTION is the culminating point of the attack on the few liberties which the people had gained by generations of struggle against their rulers. The latter had made these concessions in times of popular revolt, but had always waited for the day when they could take them back again. The war has given them the opportunity, and since it began they have crushed freedom of the Press, free speech, and freedom from arbitrary arrest . . . This is the direct result of the servility of the people, who of recent years have begun to look on the State as their guardian angel anxious to do things for their welfare. Shakespeare sums up the situation very nicely in "Julius Caesar", where he makes Cassius say:—

"And why should Caesar be a tyrant then? Poor man! I know, he would not be a wolf; But that he sees, the Romans are but sheep."

—Freedom, March, 1916.

AGAIN the European sky is black and sinister with impending war. The powers that breathe war and their allies who grow rich on the implements of death and destruction are again competing with each. The cry for armaments, more deadly machines, more devastating explosives, greater manpower, a mightier navy, again rend the air. The shibboleths used in the last world conflagration to deceive the masses are again to serve the warmongers of to-day in their conspiracy to lead the masses to slaughter. "The War to end War," "The War for Democracy," What a lying face was hidden under the hideous mask of democracy. Spain and the World, May, 1938.

WARS between capitalist nations are fought to safeguard illegal conquests from being conquered by other marauders. The next war, we repeat, and will repeat until our voice is stifled by the forces of law and order, will not be a war for "democracy against Fascism" for democracy does not exist under Capitalism. Revolt! May 1st, 1939.

THROUGHOUT the belligerent countries there are those who would rush to defend their own chains without even waiting to be conscripted (at the beginning of the war, at least!) Still there is to-day little enthusiasm but conscripted workers go off like lambs to the slaughter. There still remain others who are not fooled by the old slogans of "saving Democracy" or "defending the Fatherland" and who are unmoved by frenzied and repeated appeals to patriotism, national honour or other false ideals. For these the question is, not how best to serve their Government but how best they can serve their class, and humanity itself.

The Anarchists believe, of course, that there is one way in which war, capitalism, fascism, and imperialism can be utterly vanquished, and that is by a libertarian revolution—for only by overthrow of ALL governments will

(Continued on page 4)

Two Controversies on Sex

IN our issue of October 30th we printed a review of Number 2 of the *Journal of Sex Education*, edited by Norman Haire. The reviewer, John Hewetson, referred back to the *World League for Sexual Reform* which was dissolved after disagreement between its two presidents, Doctors Haire and Leunbach, on the question of political affiliation.

We have been very pleased to receive
A REPLY BY NORMAN HAIRE.

DEAR SIR,
The very generous review of the October issue of the *Journal of Sex Education*, in your issue of October 30th, has only just come to my notice, and I feel that the reference to the difference of opinion between Dr. Leunbach and myself, referred to in your review, and also in Reich's *Sexual Revolution*, calls for some comment.

The *World League for Sexual Reform* was founded by Dr. Hirschfeld, who was its President, and only after some years was a Praesidium of three—Dr. Hirschfeld, myself and Dr. Leunbach appointed. At Hirschfeld's death, Leunbach and myself remained co-presidents. Leunbach was of opinion that it was impossible to achieve the sexual reforms at which the League aimed, unless it tied itself up with Communism. He was at that time an ardent Communist.

I had never belonged to any political party. I believed that the sexual reforms we aimed at would be easier of achievement in a Communist Society, because the Communist revolution in Russia had been followed by such reforms. But, in spite of this, I was unwilling to tie up the W.L.S.R. with the parties of the Left, for two reasons. Firstly, Hirschfeld had made it quite clear, from the very beginning, that the W.L.S.R. had not, and should not have, any political colouring. Most of the early literature connected with the W.L.S.R. had disappeared, but I remember distinctly that some of it stated quite explicitly that the League was not connected with any political party, and would accept co-operation from, and give co-operation to, any individuals or bodies who put forward projects for reforms that the League was striving for, irrespective of the political views of those individuals or bodies.

I felt that Hirschfeld's policy should be the permanent policy of the W.L.S.R. Secondly, I felt that the League had quite enough opposition to face from those who disapproved of the sexual reforms we advocated, without arousing further opposition on political grounds. Indeed, this had been Hirschfeld's reason for his decision that the League should not tie itself up with party politics. I have said that I believed that the reforms we aimed at would be more easily reached in a Communist Society, because we had the example of Soviet

Russia before us. But later experience has shown that *post hoc* is not necessarily *propter hoc*, for practically all of the sexual reforms which had followed the Revolution in Russia, were swept away in the middle thirties. It is very difficult to get any reliable information about marriage, divorce, contraception, abortion, sexual abnormalities, or any other matters in the sexual sphere, in present-day Soviet Russia; and current rumours are unreliable, because they may emanate from fanatical Russophobes or equally fanatical Russophiles, or from people without prejudice either way who are simply ill-informed. But there seems to be no doubt that most of the reforms have been swept away, and a good deal of reason for believing that, at least in some ways, the pendulum has swung so far in the opposite direction that in the view of those who shared the aims of the W.L.S.R., the present state of sexual liberty in Soviet Russia is worse than it was before the Revolution.

So that one can no longer believe that the sex reforms we aimed at would necessarily be easier of attainment in a Communist Society. Indeed, one is struck by the fact that, in England, it was the parties of the Right, and not the parties of the Left, which were mostly sympathetic to the Birth Control movement. The Labour Party does not seem to have been very helpful at all. Dr. Edith Summerskill, in her early days, was a militant advocate of Birth Control, and very progressive in her attitude to sex reforms. But, since she became a Labour

M.P. she has remained remarkably silent about such problems, and, if one did not remember her earlier activities, one might imagine that she had never heard the words Birth Control at all.

In the lively interest which is currently being shown in the question of food shortage and over-population, Dr. Dalton is, so far as I know, the only member of the Labour Party who has had the courage to state publicly that England is over-populated and would benefit by sending large numbers of emigrants to other parts of the Commonwealth.

I do not belong, and never have belonged, to any political party. The world has always seemed to me to be a pretty bad mess. Many people lay the blame for this on the parties of the Right, which have, until recently, been in power. And all sorts of people assure me that the cure for the trouble lies in the parties of the Left. The Socialist advocates Socialism; the Communist Communism; the Anarchist Anarchism, and so on. Each one thinks he has a panacea, and I really do not feel competent to choose between them. Within my own very limited field of knowledge I think I am unusually knowledgeable and competent, but outside that limited sphere I am extraordinarily stupid, inept, and ignorant. I have never been able to learn to knock a nail into the wall or drive a car, or to determine the rights or wrongs of political views. I see no reason to suppose that Socialists, Communists, Anarchists or any other ists would make less of a mess than the other parties have made, and, until someone persuades me to the contrary, I prefer, on the whole, the devil I know to the devil I don't know.

So it seems to me that I can best serve the Community by keeping my nose out of politics, which I don't understand, and keeping it close to the grindstone in my own sphere, which I do understand.

NORMAN HAIRE,
President, Sex Education Society,
Editor, *Journal of Sex Education.*

IN our last issue (27th November) we printed a criticism by Tony Gibson of Alex Comfort's book *Barbarism and Sexual Freedom*, published by Freedom Press. Tony Gibson maintained the book is "reactionary in its main tendency".

We are very pleased to be able to publish below,
A REPLY BY ALEX COMFORT.

I WAS very interested in Tony Gibson's comment, but I must deprecate some of the interpretations he places on my book—in particular, I specifically stated that the balance of evidence suggests that pre-marital experience short of intercourse is beneficial rather than harmful. If this were not so, I would hardly have advised it as part of sexual education. His suggestion that such forms of experience contribute to unwanted pregnancy is also contrary to the evidence which I quoted. New data for other communities may, of course, modify this view.

The term reactionary seems to me meaningless in this context. Where the orthodox morality has sanction in scientific fact, I will support it; where it has not, a new morality must be devised which has. In no case have I advocated the coercion of those who do not accept my own conclusions, which, like others of this type, are likely to be modified very widely in the light of further knowledge. It would surely be anomalous if a psychologist were to refrain from advocating any line of conduct because such a line has been advocated in the past upon wrong premises.

Freedom to experiment in sexuality regardless of the consequences to others,

differs from the freedom we all enjoy to drink lysol instead of coffee in that it is bound to involve personalities other than our own. It seems to me that responsibility is a fundamental conception of anarchism. The decision for or against a given line of conduct must, I would have said, be based on assessment of scientific evidence, such as I have attempted to give. My reason for extending such types of conduct as I advocated to those who have no wish to found a family is that their wishes, in the present state of contraceptive knowledge, are unlikely to be fulfilled. Freedom to produce ill-health in others is closely similar to the freedom which political leaders enjoy to coerce fellow-men, or that of an individual to shout his neighbour. I would be the last person to demand uniformity of conduct, but there is nothing in libertarian social ideas to prevent the advocacy of a particular series of standards. The objection to conduct because it is orthodox seems to me as invalid as the objection that it is unorthodox. The evidence of its effect is the only criterion. While therefore, future research may show Tony Gibson to be right, I could accept his conclusions, but not his underlying attitude.

ALEX COMFORT.

well acquainted with Hyndman but never really made friends with William Morris. Perhaps Hyndman's dabbling in foreign politics drew them together, whilst the artistic interests of Morris may have made him look small in the eyes of Kropotkin, who in those years was a greater revolutionary rigorist than he at

As it was, both sections kept aloof, and did so even after 1890, when the League had become quite Anarchist, with the exception of William Morris and his comrades at Hammersmith; and groups like the *Commonweal* group now replaced the branches of the League. After the cessation of the *Commonweal* in the

The Early Days of FREEDOM

(The early days of Freedom and the Anarchist movement in England are often a somewhat blank page to those who have become anarchists in recent years. In 1926, on the fortieth anniversary of the first publication of *Freedom*, Max Nettlau, the industrious historian of the movement, wrote an interesting article on this subject, and we reproduce here a section which seems to us to give an excellent summary of this chapter in Anarchist history.)

ANARCHISM in England—unknown in the '70's, when all the links connecting some men in earlier years with the ideas of Josiah Warren, the American Individualist Anarchist, had been broken—rose from three main sources in the first half of the '80's. The first Socialist propagandists—the men of the open-air meetings, the leaflet propaganda, and the lectures all over "Red London" (the Radical clubs, etc.)—came in contact in the International Club, at the Revolutionary Congress of July, 1881, and elsewhere, with some early Socialists, Chartists, and O'Brienites, still sturdy men then; with French refugees of the Commune, German refugees, the comrades of Most and Neve, of the *Freiheit*, and with Malatesta and other Italians. Whilst most of them remained Social Democrats or Revolutionary Socialists, a few looked farther ahead and arrived at Anarchism by the natural process of logical thinking. Wishing to obtain the complete realisation of Socialism, they saw the inevitability of the Social Revolution, the need for solidarity and federation, the struggle against Authority in all its forms, and the fallacy of Parliamentary methods and State Socialism, and they became virtual Anarchists, whether they used this word or not. Joseph Lane explained these ideas in his "Anti-Statist, Collectivist and Revolutionary Manifesto" of 1887, the first English Anarchist pamphlet. Sam Mainwaring was another of these early Anarchists whose ideas later on attracted some of the provincial comrades, the most active of whom in those years was Fred Charles, then in Norwich. The ideas of these men were no doubt less elaborated theoretically than those of the Continental Anarchists of the *Révolte* group, but they were thorough-going popular revolutionists and less separated from realities than some of the keener theorists.

A second impulse was given by Benjamin R. Tucker's *Liberty* (Boston), first published in 1881. This paper necessarily created the impression with English readers that only Individualist Anarchism was real Anarchism. In those days Tucker's paper expressed sympathy with the Russian revolutionary struggle, then at its height (the killing of Alexander II in 1881), and Tucker had the excellent idea to translate Bakunin's *God and the State* (Boston, 1883). Henry Seymour issued copies of this with a local title (Tunbridge Wells, 1883), and the pamphlet was widely circulated and made many readers see more clearly, eliminating the God and State illusions which early surroundings and education create in most of us.

The third impulse came from thoughtful readers of the *Révolte* who accepted completely Peter Kropotkin's Anarchist Communist ideas as elaborated in that paper mainly since 1880. Mrs. Charlotte M. Wilson was one of these, and the first careful expositions of Communist Anarchism can be found in a few early numbers of *Justice*, the organ of the Social-Democratic Federation, and even in one of the earliest Fabian Tracts (No. 4). The declaration of the Anarchists on trial at Lyons—many French comrades and Peter Kropotkin—in January, 1883, was issued as a leaflet by the international groups. This trial attracted general attention, as Kropotkin was well-known then in England for his personal qualities and his scientific work, and also for his agitation for Russian freedom by means of lectures (1881-82) and in the *Newcastle Chronicle* and the monthly reviews. This led to many inquiries about Anarchism, and Elisée Reclus wrote *Anarchism by an Anarchist for the Contemporary Review* (1885), the first of these fine magazine articles, of which Kropotkin wrote so many for the *Nineteenth Century*.

When Kropotkin settled in England in the early months of 1886, after three years of French prison, Mrs. C. M. Wilson and other English Communist Anarchists began to work with him, and the group was formed which in the autumn of that year founded *Freedom* and was henceforth known as the Freedom Group. At first Henry Seymour offered them the use of the *Anarchist* as their propagandist paper, and this offer was accepted and operated for a few months. But no real harmony ever existed, and this induced the group to publish a paper devoted entirely to Communist Anarchist ideas, namely *Freedom* (October, 1886).

In 1886, the Socialist League—founded December, 1884—still contained William Morris, Edward Carpenter, and many members under the spell of that free and beautiful Socialism which these men so well understood how to expound amidst everyday ugly life. There were also revolutionary Socialists, of whom Frank Kitz was a characteristic type; Anarchists like Joseph Lane and Sam Mainwaring; the few English Marxists, the Avelings, Belfort Bax, and others; some Trade Unionists, like Binning; and still more moderate Socialist reformers—all propagating their ideas within the League.

They were united for a common protest, voiced in the address "To Socialists" (December, 1884), against the ideas, tactics and various personal traits of H. M. Hyndman and his followers, and founded the Socialist League and the *Commonweal*. But each section kept their own opinions, and very soon three main currents appeared; that of Morris and his friends, that of the revolutionary Socialists and Anarchists, and that of the Marxists and reformists. The first two currents prevailed, and in the Spring of 1887, the Marxists left.

least appeared to be in later years; he did not change, but he was less passionate. These circumstances, and no doubt the presence of the Marxists in the League, probably explain why the Freedom Group did not care to enter into relations with the Socialist League, a fact inevitable perhaps, but regrettable, for in 1886 and 1887 the League contained the very best Socialist elements of the time, men who had deliberately rejected Parliamentarism and reformism and who worked for the splendid free Communism of William Morris or for broadminded revolutionary Anarchism. If Kropotkin's experience and ardour had helped this movement, we might say to-day Kropotkin and William Morris, as we say Elisée Reclus and Kropotkin. Unfortunately, we cannot say so. There was a latent lack of sympathy between the Anarchists of the League and those of the Freedom Group in those early years; the latter were believed by the former to display some sense of superiority, being in possession of definitely elaborated Communist Anarchist theories. They concentrated their energies on theoretical propaganda, whilst the revolutionists of the League endeavoured before all to reach the people and to promote popular action. If both efforts had been co-ordinated, a much stronger movement would have been created.

summer of 1894, followed by several months' interruption of *Freedom* early in 1895, the remnant of the *Commonweal* Group joined the Freedom Group, and *Freedom*, restarted in May, 1895, became and has remained the principal English Anarchist organ.

Freedom had the good fortune to have careful, patient and modest editors, men and women—Mrs. C. M. Wilson and Alfred Marsh are typical of them—who kept the paper on a high level, aiming at being always fair, gentle, and courteous, and striving to introduce beauty and harmony into the exposition of Anarchism. No violent polemics, no personalities, nothing ugly and trivial will be found in the many pages of *Freedom*, set up by composers, mostly comrades, who worked often under the stress of really hard circumstances. Very few papers insisted so much on the beauties of Anarchism, working by fair reasoning, and avoiding all exasperating phraseology. Somehow, after all, besides all the help given by Kropotkin to the paper from 1886 to the Autumn of 1914, which saw the death of Alfred Marsh and the outbreak of the War, the example of William Morris, his love of a beautiful free Socialism, has left its mark on *Freedom* to this very day.

M. NETTLAU.

A Lesson for the 'FORCES OF FREEDOM'

A 600-page book on the Sacco and Vanzetti case has recently been published in America,* and though copies are not available in this country, yet from two reviews we have read in the *New York Times* and the *N.Y. Herald Tribune* this is an important volume, and shows what a deep impression the case of these two Italian anarchists has left on the social conscience of the United States.

On the legal side of the case which is exhaustively dealt with, the *N.Y. Herald Tribune* reviewer writes: "Few people today still believe that Sacco and Vanzetti were proved guilty of murder, and there should be fewer still after the coldly dispassionate examination of the record by Professor Morgan, who sums up the evidence of their guilt as 'a mass of misty doubts'. He holds that counsel for the defence, in the early stages, hopelessly mismanaged their case; also that the prosecution was guilty of "monstrous misconduct"; that the record shows the trial judge "stupid" in court and so prejudiced outside court and that he is unlikely to have concealed his bias from the jurors; that the jurors rendered a verdict "contrary to the great weight of the evidence"; that the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts, bound by the code of the time—the Legislature has since changed that code—limited itself strictly

to review the law on the assumption that 'law' can be separated from 'facts', and that the report of the Advisory Committee headed by the late President Lowell 'is not a convincing document'. In sum, 'the defendants had a trial according to all the forms of the law, but it was not a fair trial.'"

In the study of the social background, Mr. Joughin analyses 144 poems, six plays and eight novels on the Sacco-Vanzetti theme. All of them report: Not guilty. And the reviewer concludes: "In all the literary harvest of the case—and it includes such names as Dos Passos, Millay, DeVoto, H. G. Wells, Upton Sinclair, Farrell, Maxwell Anderson and Thurber—nothing is more impressive and convincing than Vanzetti's own letters. They are already in the anthologies. They will survive both hysteria, and legal and sociological analyses."

Just before being electrocuted, Vanzetti declared: "What I wish more than all in this last hour of agony is that our case and our fate may be understood in their real being and serve as a tremendous lesson to the forces of freedom—so that our suffering and death will not have been in vain."

And, indeed, though 21 years have passed, the names of Sacco and Vanzetti live on, and perhaps the dwindling "forces of freedom" have learned something from the sufferings of the anarchist shoe-maker and fish-peddler.

V.R.

* THE LEGACY OF SACCO AND VANZETTI. By G. Louis Joughin and Edmund M. Morgan. Harcourt, Brace, 598 pages. \$6.

BOOKS FOR PRESENTS
for your friends
and yourself . . .

WE CAN GET YOU ANY
BOOK IN PRINT IN THIS
COUNTRY

Please state Author and
Publisher to avoid delay

★
PUFFIN BOOKS FOR CHILDREN:
Children of the New Forest
Captain Marryat 2/-
Child's Garden of Verses
R. L. Stevenson 2/-
Through the Looking Glass
Lewis Carroll 2/-

★
André Malraux: Man's Estate 8/6
Theophile Gautier:
Mademoiselle de Maupin 6/-
Emily Bronte: Wuthering Heights 7/6

★
Bulgaria—A New Spain 1/-
—a new pamphlet published by the
Alexander Berkman Aid Fund,
Chicago.

All funds from the sale of this booklet will
go to the relief of Bulgarian anti-fascists.

★
Kropotkin's Appeal to the Young 6d.

We are accepting orders for the
KINSEY REPORT ON SEXUAL BEHAVIOUR IN THE HUMAN MALE (800 pages, 32/6), copies of which will be available in limited numbers shortly. Order your copy NOW!

★
Postage is not included in above prices, and should be added.

Please send all orders to

FREEDOM
BOOKSHOP
27 RED LION STREET
LONDON - W.C.1.

A SYNDICALIST CONFERENCE IN PARIS

Revolutionary syndicalists will be interested in a National Conference of Autonomous Syndicates which was held in Paris on the 19th and 20th November. One of the objectives of this conference was to study the possibilities of agreement between the National Federation of

Autonomous Syndicates and the minority movements of the C.G.T. (the French T.U.C.), of Force Ouvrière and the C.N.T. (the French revolutionary syndicalist organisation). The C.N.T. proposal that an organisation embracing all syndicalist sections of the working class, with the exception of those controlled by politicians, should be formed was rejected. A resolution was adopted instead which called for the "creation of a Committee of syndicalist action including the Autonomous Federation, the minority Force Ouvrière, C.N.T., the minority C.G.T., and the autonomous group 'l'Ecole Emancipée'. Other syndicalist organisations could join which subscribed to the Amiens Charter."

"Against authoritarian government. Against military service. For the rights of colonial peoples to live their own lives. For an international association of workers, whatever their race or language. Against Russian, American and all other imperialisms." Commenting on the Conference, our Paris contemporary *Le Libérateur* (26/11/48), regrets that the C.N.T. proposal was not accepted and whilst fearing that this Committee will suffer from the usual weakness one expects from such organisms, it is nevertheless felt that the conference has made the first important step.

THROUGH THE PRESS

ANSWER TO SEGREGATION

In Austin, Tex., boogie-beating pianist Hazel Scott, flouted out on a scheduled concert before a segregated audience of 4,900. Said she: "Why would anyone come to hear me, a Negro, and refuse to sit beside someone just like me?" *Time*, 29/11/48.

SMALL COMPENSATION!

A 22-year-old sanitary engineer, Anthony Millar, of Chingford (Essex), was freed at Stratford court yesterday after a month in custody on a burglary charge. A second man, charged at another court for another later crime cleared him. For his month's detention, Millar was awarded £5 5s. costs. *News Chronicle*, 25/11/48.

APING RUSSIA

An elaborate series of honorary titles for diligent workers and peasants has been drafted by the Legislative Committee of the Yugoslav Parliament.

Five titles will be bestowed on peasants according to their merits, the draft law said. The first four of these titles, in order of ascending importance, will be: "Deserving Agricultural Worker"; "Deserving Agricultural Worker and Member of a Co-operative"; "Distinguished Agricultural Worker and Member of a co-operative of the People's Republic"; and "Distinguished Agricultural Worker and Member of a Co-operative of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia".

The fifth and highest title for peasants will be given to "those who distinguish themselves by applying agro-technical measures or who, by special measures, achieve higher production in quantity and quality". These peasants will be named "Fighters for Higher Production".

Similar honours for industrial workers were outlined by the draft law. In order of ascending merit they are: "Shock worker"; "Leader of Socialist Labour"; "Distinguished Leader of Socialist Labour"; "Hero of Socialist Labour of the People's Republic"; and (the highest honour) "Hero of Socialist Labour in the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia". The titles are intended to give peasants and workers "visible signs of recognition for their enthusiastic work". According to the importance of their titles, recipients will also get "medals of labour" and "other privileges" which were not specified.

N.Y. Herald Tribune, 18/11/48.

VOTE—WHAT FOR?

As a means of increasing the vote in national elections, New York's Democratic Representative, Arthur G. Klein, proposed a \$30 income-tax deduction for every voter who casts his ballot.

Of the nation's 95 million eligible voters, only 50% went to the polls on Election Day. Comparable figures from post-war elections abroad: Britain, 73%; Sweden, 80%; Italy, 92%; France, over 80%.

Time, 29/11/48.

HUNGARIAN PURGE

The dozen of the Communists in Hungary, Professor Lukasz, recently declared: "What we are doing is not to transform the old culture, but to create an entirely new one." The introduction of the new culture has been accompanied by a large number of pensionings, dismissals, expulsions, and arrests. A trial of nearly 100 officials in the Ministry of Agriculture has been going on for weeks. Twelve high officials in the Ministry of Finance have lost their jobs, while the Ministry of Justice has published a list of 110 judges and public prosecutors dismissed and 67 transferred, a number which constitutes 10 per cent. of the total.

Two hundred out of 700 employees in the Ministry of Industry have been fired. Eighteen hundred professors have been retired or transferred from the University of Agricultural Science, while five in the faculty of law have been pensioned and four have left the Academy of Music. Inside the political parties the new broom is also at work. The Communists have closed their lists for six months, and a thorough examination of the party is going on in the Peasant Party and as many as 10,000 of its 18,000 members in Budapest have already been expelled.

Worldover Press, 5/11/48.

CHINA & GREECE

The continued failure of the Chinese Nationalists to hold North China has given point to some observations of the Clark report to the American Senate Appropriations Committee. American aid has hitherto been simply wasted, and the report declares that "piecemeal aid will no longer save China from falling to Communism. It is now an all-out programme or none." But other critics point out with increasing insistence that what really cripples American aid is the continued bolstering up of reactionary and discredited cliques. And this is true of Greece, where British and American army officials regretfully say that however deplorable a military dictatorship may seem, there appears to be no other alternative. It must be remarked that the Russian aid is more effectively used by the so-called rebels in Greece and the Communists of North China because it is administered by what amounts to a military dictatorship. Yet even when such regimes are established (as in Chiang Kai-shek's China) they are rendered ineffective by their support for outworn landlordism and corrupt officialdom. The same pattern is shown in the Ruhr where the Germans have sought to re-instate the German capitalists.

Both in America and China the more realistic of American or pro-American observers urge the necessity of an agricultural and administrative policy more progressive than the Russians'. Actually, however, it appears that the progressive

reforms of the Communists are backed by the kind of force which silences critics and by destroying or threatening to destroy opposition secures the apathetic "support" of the population. The effect of such agrarian reforms, whether enforced by the Russians or proposed by American publicists is to make for more efficient administration; but it does not lift much burden from the backs of the workers and peasants.

Their position is well illustrated by Greece, where the local populations have learned a prudent apathy. Support for the rebels earns a firing squad at the hands of the Government's forces, while rebels punish those who have talked to the UNO commission. The success of either side would offer little to these people caught between the jaws of rival power blocs far beyond their shores. The situation cannot be much otherwise in China, and Berliners probably recognize only too well the deadly and demoralizing necessity for prudence—did they not know it well enough under the Nazis?

In the last issue of *Freedom* a parallel was drawn between China and Spain. This pattern of civil war directed from foreign capitals is evidently basic to our time. As the revolution is the chief threat to this pattern so the pattern itself is the current mode of undermining a developing or an actual revolutionary situation. It provides a formidable problem for revolutionary men and women to grapple with.

CORPORAL PUNISHMENT

THE reports of the caning of a lecturer on the merits of corporal punishment by the boys and girls of Mr. Copping's school in Staffordshire has caused a great deal of delight. They have also thrown into relief the sensationalism of the popular press, and the sadistic and pornographic motives always underlying the upholders of "Corpun". Are the *Daily Mirror* readers anxious to make an end of the practice, or are they merely wishing that they too had got hold of the weapons when they were at school? The *Daily Mirror* (26.11.48), not for the first time, intrigues its readers by writing up a school where a pupil lounges in the Headmaster's armchair, and the children allocate the staff salaries. To usurp the position of power is equally the childish fantasy of the neurotic revolutionary who himself was chastised in his youth.

The lecturer, of whom a revealing account is given in the *New Statesman* of 4th December, "carries on his crusade in terms of high moral principle, and with careful injunction to avoid undue severity"—but we are not told that he advocates, as depicted in a recent cartoon of a progressive school, the use of local anaesthetic. On the contrary, in asserting that by being whipped our children "will grow up as honest and upright citizens worthy of this country's heritage" he is expressing an all too popular heresy.

Last year, when teaching in a London Secondary Modern School, my argument that discipline and high academic standards had been maintained for 100 years in France without corporal punishment was answered: "France! She succumbed to Hitler like a pack of cards. We, less effeminate, did not. The nation that becomes afraid of physical pain can no longer endure." To point out that there are many more dignified ways of developing physical endurance than by submitting to being caned, had no effect.

The senior master in a Grammar School told me that "No healthy boy wants to work: so we have to make 'em"—implying, I presumed, "make 'em unhealthy" so that they would fit into the school system.

Any anarchist wanting proof for his social theories, has only to apply them to a state educational system. The large-scale centralisation, and the large numbers in each school inevitably bring competition and punishment, corporal and otherwise, in their train. Project work, creative activities, self-government, co-operation with the parents are only feasible with comparatively small numbers; and otherwise a persuasive discipline is impossible.

The school is indeed a reflection of the world outside it, and this fact is often used as an excuse for retaining corporal punishment—since the children, it is said, have a harsh life at home and understand no other sort of treatment. But to maintain a coercive discipline in school must be taken by the children to mean that the teachers are determined to

make them submit to the class system which keeps the world in poverty, short of food and in dread of another war. "Disobedience," said Oscar Wilde, "in the eyes of anyone who has read history, is man's original virtue. It is through disobedience that progress has been made, through disobedience and through rebellion. . . . Every man must be left quite free to choose his own work. No form of compulsion must be exercised over him. If there is, his work will not be good"

EDUCATION

for him, will not be good in itself, and will not be good for others." Such a staid authority as the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* says: "Modern psychiatry and genetic psychology have shown the dangers inherent in flogging children, in that such procedure may develop inhibitions, antipathies, and neurotic traits likely to undermine the whole mental and nervous system of the child." Yet there are still people, like Mr. Churchill, who imagine that juvenile crime is on the increase owing to the

WORLD GOVERNMENT AND PEACE

The "citizen of the world", Garry Davies, continues to get publicity for his world government idea, and, judging by press reports of his most recent demonstration,—a growing number of militant supporters.

His latest attempt to make the politicians see reason was at a session of U.N. General Assembly at the Palais Chaillot in Paris. From the balcony he cried out: "I want to speak for the people." "Can I speak for the people?"

Cheers broke out from Davis sympathizers. Noises of general confusion and excitement were emitted by the audience and delegates in general. Dr. Evatt banged his gavel. This and a few sour comments from the platform were heard in a B.B.C. recording.

Meanwhile, on the opposite side of the hall, a young man jumped up and delivered a duplicate message in French. He was able to complete his performance before the police ejected him.

The press was later supplied with a duplicated sheet containing the short speech Garry Davies had intended making. It's key sentence was: "I call upon you to bring forth an immediate constitutional convention to raise the standard of true peace—of one government for one world."

It is a pity that Mr. Davies should believe—and we cannot doubt his sincerity—that world government means peace. It may not mean war on the 1939-45 model, but instead that unending yet equally exhausting and costly struggle that we have witnessed for so long in India under British Imperialism, in Occupied Europe, and in Eastern Europe to-day. For after all, Hitler was aiming at world government, so is Stalin, and by a different approach—U.S.A. Garry Davies calls on the politicians to provide the standard "around which all men can gather, etc." If, instead, he called on his fellow victims to raise the standard themselves, they could then dispense with the politicians who, never more than in present-day politics, are responsible for the tormented world we live in.

LIBERTARIAN.

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS

ARE WE DISHONEST?

DEAR COMRADES,

As a regular reader of *Freedom*, I find your paper extremely interesting and full of useful information, besides taking a sensible approach to all the important problems of the day, but I also feel that you tend to be a little dishonest.

Like your very opposites, the Beaverbrook press, you continually refer to the Labour government as the Socialist government, and to members of the Labour Party as Socialists. You know this to be entirely untrue, so I can only assume that your reason is to discredit both the Labour government and Socialism at the same time.

The Labour government and its party do not possess as their basic policy the achievement of Socialism, nor do they make any pretence that this is their aim. Their policy appears to be, to bolster up, in every way possible, the Capitalist Imperialist system of society, and to use all the methods of oppression known to Capitalism, in order to do so.

Socialism, on the other hand, is a system based on the common ownership of the means of production and distribution of the wealth of the community. In order to bring this about, Socialists believe in the democratic election of a working-class government, with Socialism as their aim, the taking over of all industries, without compensation to the bosses, and the placing of these industries in the hands of the workers themselves. We also believe in the establishment of a United Socialist Europe, as a prelude to World Socialism. In the opinion of us Socialists, this is the only way to world peace.

To identify this with the policy of the gangsters and racketeers who are running the country to-day, is to be, as I stated before, dishonest, and certainly unscrupulous.

As a Socialist, I believe in Anarchy as our ultimate objective, and I have a great respect for the good work being done by *Freedom*, but I do deprecate the sort of thing I have already referred to, and I do not believe you are doing a service to yourselves or to the working-class generally, by such behaviour.

Yours fraternally,
Birmingham. DOUGLAS A. KEPFER.

The Editors Reply:

THOSE Socialists who object to the diversity of opinion in the Anarchist movement should take a look at the Socialists. Labour Party members, Stalinists, Trotskyists, I.L.P.'ers, S.P.G.B.'ers, Commonwealth, Fellow travellers and splinter-groups of all descriptions call themselves Socialists, claim they have the one and only true brand and that the others are gangsters and racketeers.

Take one Labour pamphlet: *Village Life and the Labour Party To-day*. We read "join the Labour Party and help to build up Socialism. . . . Socialists believe in a classless society. . . . Out of 394 Labour M.P.'s, 150 came from manual working occupations, such as miners and railway workers; 134 came from professional classes such as teachers, doctors, lawyers and journalists. Twenty of the Ministers began their education in elementary schools, and nine went to Public Schools. . . . The Labour Party has common cause with the workers of other countries. . . ." And so on. Working-class government? Internationalism? They profess it all!

The fact is, Comrade, that all the Socialist factions put forward the same sort of programme—they may differ in details of compensation, United Socialist Europe clauses and so on, but history and our own experience shows us that whenever anybody professing these ideas reaches power they are corrupted. Why should your particular party be any different?

In any case, when the working-class reach the stage of wanting public ownership, workers' control without compensation, to the extent of voting in an absolute majority, they will be sufficiently conscious, capable and numerous to do the job themselves (they'll have to, anyway) and won't need a government to legalise their initiatives!

If you believe in Anarchy as your ultimate objective, why not try going straight towards it for a change, instead of going round in ever-diminishing political circles?—Eds.

A HANDBOOK ON PROGRESSIVE SCHOOLS

DEAR SIR,
It may interest your readers to know that there is in course of preparation an up-to-date handbook which gives details of private progressive schools in this country. As only a limited number of copies will be printed those interested are advised to communicate with me without delay.

ROSE BUSH,
Hon. Secretary,
The Progressive League,
20, Buckingham St., W.C.2.

Alex Comfort: BARBARISM AND SEXUAL FREEDOM Boards 3/6. Paper 2/6	C. Barneri: KROPOTKIN—HIS FEDERALIST IDEAS 2d.
Alexander Berkman: A.B.C. OF ANARCHISM 1/-	Errico Malatesta: ANARCHY 3d. VOTE WHAT FOR? 1d.
George Woodcock: ANARCHY OR CHAOS 2/6, Cloth 4/6 NEW LIFE TO THE LAND 6d. RAILWAYS AND SOCIETY 3d. HOMES OR HOVELS? . . . 6d. ANARCHISM AND MORALITY 2d. WHAT IS ANARCHISM? 1d. THE BASIS OF COMMUNAL LIVING 1/-	M. L. Barneri: WORKERS IN STALIN'S RUSSIA 1/- F. A. Ridley: THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH AND THE MODERN AGE 2d.
Rudolf Rucker: NATIONALISM & CULTURE 21/-	Gaston Leval: COLLECTIVES IN SPAIN 1d. Charles Duff: A HANDBOOK ON HANGING 2/-

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

Herbert Read: POETRY AND ANARCHISM Cloth 5/- Paper 2/6 THE PHILOSOPHY OF ANARCHISM Boards 2/6, Paper 1/- THE EDUCATION OF FREE MEN 1/-	John Olday: THE MARCH TO DEATH 1/6 THE LIFE WE LIVE, THE DEATH WE DIE 2/6 A. Cigli: THE KRONSTAT REVOLT 2d. Icarus: THE WILHELMSHAVEN REVOLT 6d. "Equity": THE STRUGGLE IN THE FACTORY 3d. McCartney: THE FRENCH COOKS SYNDICATE 3d. William Godwin: SELECTIONS FROM POLITICAL JUSTICE 3d. ON LAW 1d. P. J. Proudhon: GENERAL IDEA OF THE REVOLUTION IN THE 19th CENTURY Cloth 5/-
John Hewatson: ITALY AFTER MUSSOLINI 6d. ILL-HEALTH, POVERTY AND THE STATE Cloth 2/6, Paper 1/- MUTUAL AID & SOCIAL EVOLUTION 1/-	
Peter Kropotkin: THE STATE: ITS HISTORIC ROLE 1/- THE WAGE SYSTEM 3d. REVOLUTIONARY GOVERNMENT 3d. SELECTIONS FROM HIS WRITINGS (Chosen by Herbert Read) Cloth 8/6	

SHADES OF TAYLOR & BEDAUX

HOW often one could start an article or comment by saying, "There was a time when Trade Unionists opposed" something or other, and then go on to show how they had swung round to support what they had once denounced!

Here again, is the opportunity to do just that, for in their frantic and servile drive for more production the T.U.C. has now decided to hire "top-flight production experts" to advise unions on how to increase output. And if anybody is not quite sure what is meant by "production experts" we

INDUSTRIAL NOTES

should briefly explain that these illustrious gentlemen are the "time-and-motion" students who stand behind workers at the bench with a stop-watch, timing their action to discover where seconds can be saved.

These experts are not workers. They do not themselves have to carry out their own recommendations, so they can be as ruthless as they like in the breaking-down of working operations, as careless of human dignity and as forgetful as they like of monotony, without suffering themselves from the nerve-racking speed-up they impose on others. Their job done, their advice taken, they pass on to another factory, another industry, another batch of victims, and play again, in the sacred name of efficiency, their game of dehumanisation.

Now, it would be foolish to deny that many a time a fresh eye, looking at a way of working for the first time, may see waste where the old hand is too engrossed in detail to see the whole operation. Equally true is it that the efficient way of working is usually the easiest; but production experts are called in not to make work easier, but to make workers produce more in a shorter space of time. You will have noticed that the T.U.C. are hiring "top-flight production experts" not to lighten the burden of labour, but to increase production.

And so we see to-day systems which have been for years bitterly opposed

by the workers now being embraced and encouraged by their representatives. The names of Bedaux and Taylor are despised by militant workers everywhere. They were the original production experts on whose ideas were founded the industrial empires of men like Henry Ford among the pioneers of mass-production, who have done more to standardise and debase popular taste than any others, except possibly the moguls of Hollywood.

The brave New World marches on.

Betrayed by their erstwhile defenders, the workers are to be turned over like guinea-pigs for experiments in time-and-motion, talked into accepting their natural enemies by the glib-tongued Labour leaders who rose to power by fighting against the exploitation they now demand. But the workers should have learned from that struggle, and in the inevitable default of their leaders should work towards the goal of workers' control by acquainting themselves with all the processes in their work and assessing for themselves what is efficient and what is not; what is necessary and what is not, so that when the time eventually comes for expropriation of

the means of production, the work involved can be organised in accordance with the wishes of the workers who will actually do it, and not according to the ruthless speed-up by "experts" from outside.

WHAT'S THE TIME BY YOUR BOMB, COMRADE ?

THE *News Review* for 18/11/48 carried a very interesting article entitled "Switzerland-in-Wales" describing the growth of a State-subsidised clock and watch industry in South Wales to establish an alternative to heavy industry in areas where previously there was none and also to provide light employment for disabled men from the mines.

At least, those are ostensibly the reasons for the growth of the industry, but there may be a more sinister motive. The article says:

"For two centuries Britain led the world in clock-making, but the horological industry slipped badly during the 'twenties and 'thirties and the Swiss became top dogs. Adolf Hitler added his mite of competition. Realising that it could be easily translated into war production, he had Germany's watch and clock industry heavily subsidised. The craftsmen who had made watch-springs were used to produce bomb-springs.

"Determined not to be caught nap-

ping again, the British Government built the first factory at Ystradgynlais as part of its Development Area policy. It bought machinery from Switzerland and leased it and the building to the Anglo-Celtic Watch Company, control of which is shared between Metropolitan-Vickers, Ingersoll and Smith's English Clocks. Smith and Ingersoll share current output." (*Our italics.*)

So the British Government has learned from Adolf Hitler! What appears to be an altruistic move for the rehabilitation of distressed areas and disabled workers becomes a preparation for war. Ingersoll and Smith's are the watch-making firms sharing current output, but Metropolitan Vickers are the armaments firm who will undoubtedly assume control when bomb-springs become more necessary for the State than watch-springs. The State gives nothing away.

THE COAL BOARD REFORMS

AFTER nearly two years of creaking and increasing bureaucracy, the National Coal Board is discovering things which we could have told it before it started.

In a statement issued recently, the Board announced that it is carrying out reforms for greater decentralisation of administration, in accordance with the findings of the Burrows Committee, set up by the Government to look into the obvious faults in N.C.B. organisation.

But lest it be thought that complete decentralisation is going to be established,

let us hasten to add that it will stop at colliery manager level, the recommendations of the Committee including "devolution of responsibility, the creation of a clear channel of command and the maintenance of a clear distinction between policy-making and execution" with the intention of upholding "the prestige and authority of colliery managers and to give them every encouragement to equip themselves for promotion."

Which, of course, leaves the men in the pits in exactly the same position. The men who bring up every ounce of coal that is seen by light of day are still the men who have no say whatever in the control of the industry, they are still the ones who are blamed for failures and who pay with their blood for the successes of others.

THE ANARCHIST RECORD AGAINST WAR

(Continued from page 1)

freedom and lasting peace be established. Direct Action, and, in this case, industrial direct action, is the supreme need. By a social stay-in general strike, the workers can oust their bosses, and make a revolution. All industrial action which leads to strike action, fights against a capitalist system and war.

—War Commentary, Nov., 1939.

ANARCHISTS were in the forefront of the fight against Italian Fascism and German Nazism. They fought reaction on the continent while the rulers of Britain were applauding the "social Achievements" of the fascists. Anarchists fought Franco from the first day to the last of the Spanish War. And they are still fighting him, while the British and American governments still seek friendly relations with him.

Always our programme has been the same: solidarity between workers of all lands against their common enemy, International Capitalism. British workers are exploited by British and international capital, not by German workers. And the German workers are not oppressed by their British fellow workers but by their Nazi bosses and bureaucrats.

Who is our enemy? It is the capitalist and his political henchmen, both in this country and abroad. And in this class war which we proclaim, the fight for liberation, of struggling and suffering workers and peasants throughout the world, our allies are the workers of all countries. Let us recognise the true enemy: let us join hands with the oppressed of all nations and throw off the oppressors for ever.

—War Commentary, Mid-November, 1943.

THE period between September, 1939 and May, 1940, was popularly known as the phoney war. The period between May, 1945, and some unspecified date in the future may well be called the phoney peace. The war has dragged on through many years, under leadership which had told us repeatedly it is inspired and brilliant but has failed to do anything to speed up the six years of drawn-out war, and that war is still unfinished. For even while the black market is raking off quick profits in selling at advanced prices Union Jacks which they bought up cheap after Dunkirk, the war in the East goes on. There is method in this madness. The idea is to get us accustomed to "war in peace": to be used to what were thought war-time sacrifices and restrictions being carried out in peace-time, and even if Japan surrenders, this "phoney peace" is scheduled to go on in the name of keeping order, occupation, preparation, etc. Our struggle against the war is therefore not ended, nor can it be ended except by dissolution of the system which breeds war.

—War Commentary, 19th May, 1945.

"We Must Resist!" and "Our Record Against War" are to be reprinted immediately as a leaflet. Groups or individuals who would like quantities for distribution should order at once. Price 2/6 per 100. £1 per 1,000.

The Fair Arse of Justice

OPEN cynicism is a comparatively recent weapon in the hands of our enemies. It is also a most effective one and difficult to combat, as the cynic is always able to make his opponent an absurd prig.

To take a simple example of this recent trend in public life when the tart in "The Fallen Idol" is asked what she has to say this time and replies "Nothing, except its not my turn." The laughter which follows shows that most of the audience is well aware that prostitutes are arrested in rotation, fined, and given an obscene little talk on morality by the magistrate. "And why not?" says the apologist, "You can scarcely expect the Archbishop of Canterbury to countenance a tax on vice, and yet it is obviously desirable to canalise appetite, so why shouldn't the women pay what amounts to a levy? I don't see why you think there's anything wrong in it."

The "wrong" in it is of course that it allows the police to use these unfortunate females for their own ends,

and to prosecute when they feel like it, but the evil in it is that it avoids a final solution to the frustration of the appetites in modern society. The prostitute is in fact playing the Bishop's game.

To pass on to another arrow in the cynic's quiver, let us examine the absurd façade of Buckingham Palace in this year of grace. The enthusiastic bubbling at every level of journalism whenever a member of the reigning house buys a new hat is accounted for in the most offensive manner. Professor Joad, that prelate of the mediocre, in a recent article in *Picture Post*, turns the Palace into a useful receptacle for the "inevitable" tendency towards snobbery in the human being, and this appears to be the viewpoint of many 'intelligent' Englishmen. Meanwhile, young men are turned into war machines, hung by the neck until dead, and detained for a long period of their lives in prisons at "His Majesty's pleasure", and the unfortunate family itself tears round factories and exhibitions to

show the astonished world how "human" they are.

The only encouraging thing is that cynicism is usually the prelude to the fall of a regime. The Aristocracy of 18th century France and the Romans of the decadence hid behind a trellis of sneers, but they got their packet just the same. In England, of course, as my Uncle assured my Aunt after a performance of *Crime Passionel* which had worried her as to the future of man, such things don't happen. People are too interested in football and things like that.

GEORGE MELLY.

DOES IT MEAN YOU?

DURING the coming week we shall be sending out many renewal notices to readers whose subscriptions are due or will expire at the end of the year. This will involve several hundred subscribers, and we ask them to realise that promptness in renewing their subscriptions assists us financially and from an administrative point of view prevents a lot of unnecessary additional work for us.

May we at the same time ask readers to remember an appeal for donations to meet our past obligations so that we may again publish the 8-page FREEDOM?

We still need £600, not an insuperable problem if more of our comrades were to take their share of the responsibility for solving it!

Special Appeal 9th LIST

November 19th to December 3rd : London: P.H.S.* 10/-; Anlab: D.R.* 1/-; Llanelly: L.W. 2/-; Anon* 2/6; London: A.E.H. 5/-; Bristol: D.J. £1/18/0; London: R.M. 5/-; Llanelly: L.W. 2/6; Castle Douglas: J. & M.A.* 5/-; Colchester: H.S.* 7/6; Heston: B.W. 1/6; Blackpool R.B. 8/-; Sidmouth: J.S.* 1/9; London: L.G.W.* 5/-; London: T. & E.E.* 5/-; Hove: G.S. 2/9; Cambridge: C.L.D. 5/-.

£5 7 6
Previously acknowledged ... £275 3 5
SPECIAL APPEAL TOTAL TO DATE £280 10 11

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

The Law and the Profits

(Continued from page 1)

invariably give quite different treatment to the man with a solicitor at his call and the man without one, a fact which is of the greatest advantage to well-to-do crooks who are always certain of legal representation and bail being speedily forthcoming, where the average person is perhaps not quite so well prepared.

And the question of bail will still remain. It will still be the case that a man can be locked up and refused out even if it is of the most vital importance in preparing his defence; the Bill hardly touches the point of police intervention in criminal cases, and confines itself to the judicial side. Bills are endeavouring to clear away some of the out-of-date and archaic laws which are nowadays never invoked, and have quite recently abolished hanging, drawing and quartering in Scotland and may soon come round to the (still occasionally invoked) Witchcraft Act in England. At the same time, the new age produces its new laws, and offences which King James II would have thought crazy, such as those involved in rationing offences, are now accepted commonplaces, and new inventions such as television are the occasion for Bills relating to radio interference which go far beyond any previous enactments in the right of entry into private homes.

Anarchism and the Law

Just as it is always the bookmaker who wins at the races, so it is always the lawyer who wins at the Courts. The remedy is not to be found in giving easier access to the Courts in civil litigation, and paying costs in criminal actions, but by cutting out the judicial system altogether. The vast majority of people live without

resort to the Courts, and as anyone so misguided as to have become voluntarily involved in a major civil action is aware, they are the happier people, just as "the happiest nations are those without history".

By people accepting the civil courts as a means of settling disputes, they recognise the authority of the capitalist and legal system. Many times in history, as a matter of frequent occurrence, people have set aside the authority of the courts and lived without referring their disputes to them or giving popular support to judicial decisions, however they may have been forced to obey them. These cases have always been due to nationalist reasons, when foreign rulers controlled the courts and a difference in tongue or some other minor distinction marked the rulers from the ruled. We have in those cases, in living memory in India and Ireland, for instance, seen the majority of the people disregard the Courts and live all the better for not accepting their domination. So it is not impossible to live without judicial domination, for whatever reason.

If people were to take that course, not from any nationalistic reasons, but from libertarian motives, against their own ruling-class, and resist and dispense with all legal systems, whether embedded in the civil courts, the criminal courts or all the other magisterial platforms right down to the juvenile courts, they would be taking a most conscious and revolutionary step towards the rejection of authority. By living without making demands for authority or protection they would be creating a tradition for free men, to create the new world within the shell of the old.

ANARCHO-SYNDICALIST.

Meetings and Announcements

UNION OF ANARCHIST GROUPS: CENTRAL LONDON

Every Sunday at 7.30 p.m.
At 8, Endsleigh Gardens, W.C.1.

DEC. 12th George Ineson
Communities

DEC. 19th Geoffrey Thorp
"Organisation in Progressive Schools"

There will be no meeting, for obvious reasons, on Dec. 26th. A new series of Discussion-Lectures will begin on Jan. 2nd, 1949. Titles will be announced in the next issue of FREEDOM

HAMPSTEAD

Informal meetings for discussion, so far without Chairman or any predetermined subject, are held every TUESDAY, at 7.30 p.m., at:

5, Villas-on-the-Heath,
Vale of Health,
Hampstead, N.W.3.
All comrades are welcome.

MERSEYSIDE LIBERTARIAN GROUPS

PUBLIC MEETINGS
in COOPER'S HALL, Shaw Street,
on Sundays at 7.30 p.m.

DEC. 19 David Pude
"CHRIST—the Liberator?" Study in the
Materialist Conception of History.

GLASGOW ANARCHIST GROUP

Indoor Meetings,
CENTRAL HALLS, Bath Street,
every Sunday at 7 p.m.,
Frank Leech, Willy Carlyle, John Gaffney,
Eddie Shaw.

BIRMINGHAM

Discussion-Lectures are held on alternate
Sundays in Dick Sheppard House, 36,
Holloway Head, at 7 p.m.

DEC. 19 Eric Woodward
"Arthur Rimbaud"

CHORLEY

PUBLIC LECTURES
Lecturer: Albert Smith, B.A.
SUN., DEC. 19th
"The Anarchist Solution to World War III"
Lecture will start at 7.0 p.m. and will
be held in the Oddfellows Rooms, 9, Cunkiffe
Street, Chorley, Lancs.