

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"Anarchism is not a repudiation of social discipline, but rather an assumption of humanitarian responsibility."

—SHOLEM ASCH.

They Want a Profitable Railway System

TRANSPORT: BUSINESS OR SERVICE?

TO argue, as almost everyone does, from the press and political pundit down to the man-in-the-street, that something must be radically wrong with the railways in this country because they are losing money, is to confuse the real issues. The National Health Service is a most unprofitable business, yet very few people would today be in favour of changing its financial basis to make it pay, because the public service it provides is considered invaluable to the community. The Tobacco industry is very profitable both to the shareholders and to the Exchequer, as well as probably being very efficiently run, yet from the point of view of the service it renders the public, is undoubtedly harmful to health. The National Press is notoriously inefficient so far as its methods of production are concerned, but is very profitable to its shareholders, and being subsidised by advertising revenue, is available to the public at considerably less than its cost of production. And so on!

If the problem of the railways is to make them a profitable concern, nothing could be simpler. Raise freight charges and passenger fares to a level where income more than covers expenditure. In the process some lines would close down for lack of business. Why worry? It's only the law of supply and demand in operation. On the routes where demand persists, the railways could extend their profitable activities by insisting that all travellers must buy either a bar of chocolate or a packet of cigarettes with their ticket! After all, all the big industrial concerns have fingers in many pies, so why should the railways just stick to running railways? Indeed, one of the suggestions put forward last week by Mr. Macmillan on the financial future of the railways was that they should make "a better use of all their assets", and that it was urgent to examine "the question of relieving the industry of restrictions and obligations which limit the Commission's earnings and prevent it from making the best use of its resources". To some commen-

tators this implied that the Transport commission might go into the Property racket in a big way, with visions of underground termini with massive office blocks above, earning high rents for the railways. There is no doubt about it that the possibilities of earning money are unlimited once the "right men" get together. What this has to do with running a national transport service is quite another matter!

★

BUT this is the kind of thinking which largely dominates the economic life of all countries today, and with such disastrous results. Finance, and not need, determine policies, and the yardstick of efficiency or personal success is not what one has done but how much one has "made" doing it. How deeply this is ingrained in people's minds is surely demonstrated when a problem such as the railways comes up for discussion. Hardly a voice is raised to point to the number of long established public services for which no-one would dream of suggesting that those who benefit by them should invariably pay an economic price or be without them. Imagine anyone suggesting that the Post Office should stop delivering letters to isolated villages because to send a van for a matter of half a dozen letters is "uneconomic"; or of letting a patient die because the drugs that will keep him alive are too expensive for the N.H.S. Yet these are the kind of arguments one reads even in the paper which caters, so

it says, for "lively minds", when the railway "problem" raises its ugly head!

There is bound to be hardship to some people when uneconomic lines are closed; equally there is hardship when country bus services can no longer run because not enough people still want them. But these are social rather than transport problems, and they should be tackled as such. There is no case for saying that large sections of the existing railway system, which can never hope to pay, should be kept going with a subsidy because they provide a "social service". They provide a transport service, with heavy overheads, that is still useful to some people, but it is not a "social service".

When is a transport service not a social service? And the simple answer is: when it in fact does not provide a service! That is when the private interests of the transport operator come first and the public need is only of secondary importance. Of course road transport is cheaper, and profitable at the same time, because its services are re-

stricted and operate when they can expect to be filled to capacity. But as soon as road transport is designed to cater for the needs of a community (such as, say London Transport, with its 5,700 buses) then the financial trouble starts and for obvious reasons which have nothing to do with inefficiency, or any other of the diseases from which the railways are at present suffering, apparently.

The main problem, and the one the government and the experts say nothing about, is the concentration of the working population in the urban centres, which each year grows larger as the new buildings grow taller. In Central London alone, 22 million square feet of new office buildings have been completed since the end of the war, and this means that more office workers in their thousands have been pouring in and out of London daily to fill the desk space such expansion has created.

True, more and more people travel to work by car and scooter, but they represent in numbers a very small proportion of the travelling population however great their contribution to traffic congestion. Every morning, 1,200,000 people come into Central London, of whom little more than 100,000 come by private transport, that is, less than 10%. Of the remaining 90%, 240,000 come by bus, 450,000 by Underground and 400,000 by main line trains. Not only is the movement of such astronomical numbers of passengers a major operation in itself, but when one considers that a

fifth, or nearly a quarter of a million do so in the space of a quarter of an hour, only then can one realise what kind of organisation and equipment are required to deal with such a problem. And until that organisation and equipment are again required in the late afternoon to return the stiletto-heeled typists and the bowler-hatted aspiring executives to their suburban dormitories, there is relatively little call for their services: but the staff rightly demands to be paid and the equipment has to be stabled, which means acres of sidings, which in a capitalist society means, paying rent or occupying space which could be "earning" rent . . . all of which adds to the "overheads", dear to the heart of the *Guardian*.

No private operator would entertain the idea of dealing with this traffic unless he received double the fares now being charged to the commuters in the large cities. But the Transport Commission has a statutory duty not to lose money and an obligation to maintain a number of

Continued on p. 3

Horse Sense

To the Editor of the "Guardian"

Sir,—While applauding the action of Keith Prowse in refusing to make any further tourist bookings to Ireland as a protest against cruelty to horses, I should like to know whether this agency is proposing to impose a similar embargo on bookings to South Africa where cruelty is practised on human beings.

Yours &c.,
(Mrs.) JOYCE CLYNE.

London, N.2.

SUPPORT THE BOYCOTT!

THE campaign for the boycott of South African goods continues, and continues to gather strength. Significantly enough, not a great deal of attention has been drawn to it in the Press since it began—most of the discussion took place in press and radio before the boycott began, although television programmes have dealt with the subject—not unsympathetically.

Since the inception of the campaign over 400 campaign committees have sprung up all over the country. Poster parades and meetings are going on all the time—though often getting publicity only through the interference of the fascists, who are running true to form by gathering in gangs to attack or insult individuals,* and to break up meetings by shouting anti-Jewish and anti-coloured abuse.

Tradesmen are maintaining that the boycott is having no effect—but have nevertheless found it necessary to reduce the price of South African products in order to try to maintain sales. So that even if the goods are selling, the shopkeepers are losing money on them. This would seem to indicate pretty clearly that the boycott is having an effect.

In view of the opposition, we urge our readers to redouble their efforts in support of the boycott. It is the least we can do to express our disgust at the slave labour system and apartheid in South Africa—a disgust which can only be sharpened by our observation of the South African Government's fascist supporters in this country.

*In one incident we know of, a gang were insulting a campaign helper and his pregnant wife who were getting into their car, when they were silenced by a well-phrased argument with a starting-handle, which landed their leader in hospital.

Seven Months to say "Apartheid"

PRETORIA, MARCH 10.

The prosecution completed its case in the South African treason trial to-day, seven months after it began calling its scores of witnesses and putting in its 4,000 documents as evidence. The defence of the 30 accused is due to open on Monday—*Reuter*.

WILD-CAT LOCK-OUT and no Howling from the Press

THE impartial news gatherers and commentators of the national press are invariably highly indignant when some of those irresponsible workers stop work at a moment's notice.

But it is of course quite legal and therefore proper for an employer of labour at an hourly rate to sack that labour at an hour's notice—though if the labour is hired on a weekly agreement, a week's wages in lieu of notice is required.

These days when we have never had it so good, such sackings on more than an individual level are rare. But while it is possible for an employer to deprive a man of his livelihood just like that it will happen.

This week it happened in Birmingham, where Mulliner's, Ltd., the car body building subsidiary of Standard-Triumph International, Ltd., Coventry, on Monday dismissed the entire production force of 150 at its Coventry plant. Shop stewards were told during the morning and all the dismissed men had to be out of the factory within an hour. They received a week's wages instead of a week's notice.

Mulliner's, Ltd., made no statement, but the Standard-Triumph group said that its contract with Mulliner's for the partial supply of Vanguard bodies had been terminated. The termination, however, would not affect the current or future production, or sales of Van-

guard cars—and that, of course, is all that matters.

The dismissed men belong mainly to the National Union of Vehicle Builders, the Transport and General Workers' Union and the Amalgamated Engineering Union, and as soon as the Company announced its decision, union leaders hurried along down to plead with the bosses—to change their minds. But they were told that the firm's decision was irrevocable. It is understood that a request for the men to be reinstated was refused. A union official said afterwards that they did not yet know whether the factory was to be closed or not. Maintenance and stores men were continuing to work there.

In a *Guardian* report, Mr. Charles Gallagher, the Coventry organiser of the vehicle builders' union, said the dismissals had come like a bolt out of the blue. "This is a wild-cat lock-out, for there had been no hint of sackings at all."

Union officials understand that the termination of the contract meant the immediate stoppage of work. Apparently the plant had not been operating economically and the work will probably be dispersed elsewhere. The factory was taken over last year by the Standard-Triumph group for its subsidiary, Mulliners Ltd., from the Birmingham firm of Fisher and Ludlow, Ltd.

Usually, when a firm of this kind is said to be operating "uneconom-

ically" the blame is put upon the workers for going on strike or not working hard enough. In this present case, however, there is nothing said on these lines. The uneconomical working of Mulliners was, presumably, because of the organisation of the work by the bosses—but it is the workers who are put out, not the bosses, which might have been more just.

But this is the way things work when there is one party which owns and/or controls industry and another which does the work under domination. While this situation exists a form of class struggle is inevitable even though it may be obscured by welfare schemes by the bosses and acquisitive submission by the workers, and this struggle—which is certainly not waged consciously by the workers today—can only be resolved, to our way of thinking by those in industry whose functions are productive taking over control of industry.

It is to this end that workers' organisations should be organised, and the anarcho-syndicalist methods provide the best means. But while the workers allow themselves to be organised into trade unions with no other functions than wage bargaining and the like they will never get out of the situation where they work in other people's factories on other people's terms for other people's purposes as long as other people allow.

Freedom of the Press—Turkish Style

ISTANBUL, MARCH 7.

Ahmet Emin Yalman, the owner and chief editor of the independent Turkish newspaper "Vatan", went to prison here today to begin a fifteen-month sentence for reprinting an article from an American newspaper which was held as belittling the Turkish Prime Minister, Mr. Adnan Menderes. Mr. Yalman, who is 72 years old, and two associate editors—who received sixteen-month gaol terms—were sentenced last December, but Mr. Yalman's sentence was postponed at his request for health reasons and because of editorial preparations.

Shortly before entering gaol to-day Mr. Yalman said in an interview:

"I have a journalistic career of 153 years. All this time has been spent in a firm belief in liberty and in a devotion and longing for it.

"If someone had made the prophesy that the selfless struggles which I carried out as a journalist in the service of liberty would lead me to gaol at the age of 72 I would have found it ridiculous and considered it as a bad joke." (Mr. Menderes it will be recalled is the man who was so concerned about the freedom of the Turkish minority in Cyprus!)

IN our issues for December 5th and December 12th last we printed a long article from an Australian contributor under the title *Is Anarchism Authoritarian?* which reached the conclusion that "anarchism is authoritarian if its followers preach or follow the line of organisation. It is anti-authoritarian if its followers are individualistic. In other words the only solution to the authoritarian trend in anarchism is anarcho-individualism." This was followed by critical letters from R.J.W. in our December 19th issue, and further letters in support or in opposition to

J.G. in our January 2nd issue from A.W.U., C.K.J. and B.F.

We have now received from Australia a rejoinder by J.G. to R.G.W.'s letter and also a very long answer to J.G.'s original article from K.D., another anarchist in Australia. The time it takes for FREEDOM to get "down under" and for letters to reach us, are responsible for the delay, but it is only fair to publish their contributions to this perennial debate amongst anarchists, at least in a condensed version.

Controversy: Is Anarchism Authoritarian?

Egoism: J. G. replies

IN his letter, R.J.W. hastens to announce me as a plain egotist, a popular conception of an anarchist, minus bombs and raped maidens. Is he endeavouring to rescue the bad reputation of the anarchist and give a respectable appearance to the eternal rebel? That he does not take into consideration the forces which determine the popular conception of an anarchist, namely, the organised violence, the coercive powers of the State and its laws, the privileges, class distinctions, dominance, immunity of the master and finally the general ignorance. In an Authoritarian society with its two-edged morality, in which killing is elevated to the highest degree of virtue and the soldier is regarded as a symbol of national honour, in which order is unconditionally accepted and glorified, the individual depersonalised and changed into a cog to promote efficiency of the oppressive social apparatus, the anarchist—the negator—will be anarchist and the popular conception of bombs, raped maidens and chaos will follow him. But what will the popular conception say when killing is honourably discharged and duty exalted? Approve! Then we can see how much R.J.W. has to do with reality.

Certainly R.J.W.'s egoist is not plain like myself; he is an enlightened one and

he discovered "that to defy conscience—the humanistic conscience—is not worthwhile, it doesn't pay off". The conscience I was referring to was "internalisation of external social demands" and the euphemism "humanistic" does not make it less authoritarian. Therefore my reaction is a logical consequence of my anti-authoritarian attitude. To what extent it pays or it does not pay and what the value of it is, does not worry me because I would not like to be canonized as an anarchist saint.

And the organization? But "J.G. is himself organised as well as anyone else, organically he is pumping blood breathing air, etc. . . . the body shall become the system of the whole of society—that mankind shall become one organic being . . ." Beautiful wish concept but is it anti-authoritarian? Authoritarians used to show that anarchism is an unworkable utopia. Does R.J.W. accept every organ as a free, voluntary unit being able to accept or reject any organic union? And even if he is idealistically inclined he poorly defends his case because the organs are not self-aware of their existence. Even if we assume that they are, there is no parallel between the organic and social organization. If my brain is injured I as a body can die or be completely disabled. If for example, British government disappears, the social body will not suffer and I, as an anarchist, even if not an enlightened one, will be full of joy. In my opinion an anarchist should oppose such an organic concept of society and think a little bit more about the individual and freedom. I thank R.J.W. for such a beautiful illustration of my assumption that the organised anarchists are easy prey for the authoritarian spirit, and that in their organically perceived society there is no place for freedom.

I agree with R.J.W. that anarchism could be more than my paltry egoism but certainly it is not more than what the individuals make of it. And in conclusion may I say that it is easier to talk about organisation and anarchist utopias, than to be an anarchist. What anarchism suffers from is not organisation but anarchists.

Sydney, Feb. 24. J.G.

Organisation: reply to J.G.

I AM not going to describe the biological and physiological meaning of organization, where little cells are gathered together—forming tissue, organs, systems and body for efficient survival, but I would like to mention that the general trend in living matter is the struggle for survival and perfection. In this struggle the cells are set in such a relationship that they assist each other. In animal and insect communities the survival of society is put first, and when the community is threatened, instinctively self-sacrifices are the first manifestation on behalf of the little beings. In human society we have not only instincts but awareness, reasoning and judgment. Man precedes society. Society is created by man to secure his survival. Society as a whole embraces all man's activities expressed through various organizations. This is possible because man is a being with social and anti-social instincts. The conflict between an individual and society derives from these two kinds of instinct innate within human nature. From ancient society till now there have been authoritarian relationships. By authoritarian I mean that there has been in existence a ruling power composed of one person or more but they are considered the source of righteousness, wisdom, morality, justice, and so on. This kind of relationship between individuals in society is not a healthy one, because it gives the upper hand to the anti-social instincts thrive and the social instincts ruthlessness, cruelty, fear, hatred, and so on. In an authoritarian society these instincts thrive and the social instincts are diminished, because each kind of organization adopts a centralized structure, which assures domination and exploitation of man by man. In such a society the individuals are deprived of freedom to think by various organizations. This relationship allows a ruling

body to impose its will upon the majority without their consent. Some of these authoritarian organizations by their structure are so despotic that they persecute any individual of independent thought. They ask for full individual submission, such as: militarist, religious, police and monolithic parties. In such an organisation an individual is a robot. He is reduced to living labour. He cannot cooperate with his fellow men freely. He is forced to keep within a certain prescribed pattern. He can't initiate anything which is not within the ruling law. Man is forced to execute another's will—the master's will.

Anarchists reject authoritarian society as unhealthy for the individual. They reject authoritarian institutions and their organisational structure. They think that centralism is an artificial social relationship and accept federalism as a natural social relationship. They analyse existing society and find out that the individuals in an authoritarian society are in permanent economic war and are fettered in developing their natural endowment, while federalistic society introduces peace and opens up possibilities for each individual to develop his faculties to the last extent. In a federalistic society man enters into a relationship with others in free agreement and equality. All kinds of organization in an anarchist society are built on federalistic principles; which means an individual in his labour or cultural organization enters into relationship with his fellow man on equal terms. This society has principles which allow each individual to preserve his individuality in all walks of life. They state

clearly that man's happiness is possible through the fullest expression of individual creativeness, which varies in biological inequality, therefore, biological inequality must be allowed for, while economic equality of opportunity to each one must be secured. Anarchists adopt mutual aid as a social basis. This principle, together with freedom, solidarity, equality, self-initiative, justice, etc., allow any member in any anarchist organization to be himself, a proud being like all others. The structure of an anarchist organization is built from below upward, which means the initiative originates from an individual or smaller group and goes upward to the biggest unification but always the basis—the smallest group—has the final say for any decision concerning it. In such a relationship individual independence is assured, his personality developed, his fortitude enriched, his social urges stimulated, his magnanimity broadened, etc.

I MADE this rough review to show that there are two kinds of organization. Authoritarian and anti-authoritarian. These two kinds of organization have their principles on which they build. The centralist organisation stifles individual initiative, while federalist stimulates individual initiative and broadens his space for creativeness.

I am obliged to make this clarification in answering Mr. G.'s negations of the anarchist conception concerning organization. Mr. G. rejects organization—any kind of organization. He rejects

BOOK REVIEW

Warsaw in Chains

WARSAW IN CHAINS, by Stefan Korbonski, George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 30s.

THE author was a deputy of the Polish Peasant Party, an opposition permitted by the Communist régime in post-war Poland mainly for purposes of show, in order to persuade Britain and America (or the more gullible or idealistic Britons and Americans) that the new Poland was truly democratic and that the Communist rule represented the genuine will of the people as expressed through the ballot box. When the Peasant Party became too much of a nuisance it was suppressed. Its leaders fled or were imprisoned. Even under Gomulka Poland remains a one-party state.

H. G. Wells said years ago that one could draw a "hate map" of Europe, just as one draws maps coloured to show the form of vegetation, the amount of rainfall and so on. This map would show the Poles sandwiched between Germany and Russia, between the hordes of the Western and the Eastern barbarians, and hated both, and being hated by both. Then the Germans and the Russians do not exactly love each other. It is a fine mess. What makes it worse is that it shows no sign of ending.

While the Germans held Silesia there was an underground organisation of fanatical Polish patriots, whose object was the return of these ancestral lands to the mother country. Now that at last Silesia forms part of Poland there is a movement of fanatical German patriots, who are struggling to reunite "their" country with the fatherland. So it goes on. Who benefits?

To many in the Iron Curtain countries the West, in spite of or because of the official propaganda, seems a paradise, though it is to be noted that some of the Hungarian refugees have since gone back. Snobbery, money, status, "leisure", the motor car, the television set are cosier but more effective means of keeping the people docile than concentration camps and secret police. The author is right to admire the Swedes, but they have no colonial empire, unlike many of the other countries of the "free world".

The tragedy is that men are still limited. "Poland fights on, her spirit is unquenchable", and so forth. But before we are Poles and Russians and Britains and Germans and Jews we are human beings. That is the important

thing. Even if the popular idea of man as an inherently bellicose creature were correct it would still not explain Belsen or the Stutthof Camp which the author visited. There is nothing martial, or even aggressive in the ordinary sense, in the ritual slaughter of large numbers of helpless people.

On the other hand, *pace* Stefan Korbonski, this sort of thing is not peculiarly Germanic. All one can say is that throughout the civilised period there have been epochs when, for various reasons, large sections of the human race have gone berserk. Afterwards everyone wonders why, things return to normal, and liberals begin to believe in progress. Then comes another outburst of destructive sadism. We seem to be witnessing a form of mental sickness on a very wide scale, and though its causes, and hence its cure, remain rather mysterious, this does not mean that cause and cure are beyond human reach. One thing is certain, it is recurrent, and the usual political solutions, democracy, socialism and political reforms are not the answer, and do not even scratch the surface of the problem. Though they succeed for a time they are always swept away by the next outburst.

"These southern districts of ours, formerly called the 'Wild Fields', comparable to the American Wild West early in the nineteenth century, are a veritable no man's land, haunted by Ukrainian gangs, a few scattered Home Army guerillas, Zymierski's troops, and Soviet troops. It becomes difficult to say who fights whom, for as a final touch, gangs of Soviet deserters attack all the others, Zymierski's [Polish] troops liquidate the latter with special ruthlessness. They express all their hatred for the Soviets on those innocent deserters. In many cases they also battle with the 'fraternal Soviet army'."

This surely sums up better than anything else could the positive insanity into which Europe had fallen during the decade. No wonder the bloody forties have been followed by the apathetic fifties.

Stefan Korbonski, during his career in the anti-German resistance, presided over "underground" courts, which passed and carried out not less than 200 death sentences on people regarded as traitors.

anarchist organization on the basis of being harmful to individual liberty, curtailing individual freedom, depersonalizing him and subjugating his free will. I think he has lost touch with reality. He flies somewhere in mystical thoughts, otherwise how could he not see his own surroundings, his very reality he is living in—"here and now". How could he apply his permanent protest without entering into certain relationships with others? Is any relationship one-sided? Certainly not. It is always two-sided, mutual, interwoven, reciprocal . . .

The authoritarian organization destroys individuality by giving power to an individual to think for others, and force others to do what he wants, while an anarchist organization destroys the possibility for man to rule and exploit other men, hence it furthers individual liberty. By its structure and functioning it enables individual ability to be enriched and expressed in a creative way. He has his own space in relation to others. In such an organization an individual is in permanent interplay with others. He gives his ideas, experience, knowledge, and labour to others and receives the others' . . . In this permanent mutual exchange in society all individuals are sharing each others' experiences and building their knowledge and personalities.

Mr. G. has a very confused notion about anarchist organizational relationship and functioning. He says: "I want to live here and now". Is there any sane person who does not want to live in the present? Anarchists, all anarchists, are aware that life is here and they want to live it as fully as possible. They revolt against the existing order because they are deprived of a full, healthy life at present, here and now. But they are aware too, that the present is a continuation of the past, and the present is the link with the future. As thinking beings, they look at the past trying to find what was good there, to utilise it; and what was bad, to avoid it in the present. They are standing in the present and trying to foresee the future. They know that tomorrow is a continuation of the present and they are as much concerned with the

Continued on p. 3

This is the fatality of fighting an enemy with his own weapons. Presumably they appeared to be the only weapons available.

"While writing this I realize that I grow more and more monotonous—continually reporting exhumations, funerals, obituaries, memorial meetings. But I cannot help it: life in Poland is monotonous in this respect, and much of it is taken up by just such lugubrious affairs."

There are moments of humour though.

"The people's democracy exerts so strong a fascination that it breaks down even the most stubborn resistance. Ancient dynasties yield to it also, for now Rudolf Kweik, King of the Gypsies, has issued a proclamation stating that he resigns from his title of King and henceforward will call himself 'President'."

"The elemental current toward democratization has even invaded the stage: the Lodz theatre now plays *Count Marica* under the title *Marica*. Evidently the people's democracy has no place for *King Lear* or *Hamlet*—too many crowned heads in these days, and not enough decapitated by 'the people's vengeful sword'."

It seems to be a characteristic of Communist régimes that they insist on inessentials, yet tolerate and encourage an inequality as great as that of any monarchy. Only the name is taboo. But then this attitude is very common among human beings all the world over.

The author describes at the end of his book how he escaped to Sweden with his wife. Many Poles in all walks of life managed to make their escape, but the majority had to stay. The story ends, to some extent happily, with the "October Revolution", so that Poland has moved more or less from the status of a "1984" society to that of a South American republic, from totalitarianism to simple tyranny. However it appears that one factor in the relatively gentle treatment the Poles received in 1956 was the protection offered by the rising power of China. The situation had changed since 1945. It is interesting to notice this desire of China for an ally in the West against her fellow-Communist power. The future may see even stranger alliances.

ARTHUR W. ULOTH.

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

OPEN DAILY

(Open 10 a.m.—6.30 p.m., 5 p.m. Sats.)

New Books . . .

Forbidden Freedom
Aymer Roberts 12/6
Blue Fell This Morning
P. Oliver 30/-

The Anger of Achilles
Robert Graves 30/-

Cheap Editions . . .

The World in the Evening
Christopher Isherwood 2/6

Second-Hand . . .

British History in the Nineteenth Century
G. M. Trevelyan 8/-

Second Wind
Carl Zuckmayer 3/-

My Russian Memoirs
Bernard Pares 7/6

The League of Frightened Philistines
James T. Farrell 4/6

The Press and its Readers (1949)
Mass Observation 3/-

The Man Outside
Wolfgang Borchert 5/6

The Red Prussian (Karl Marx)
Leopold Schwarzschild 6/-

Charter for the Soil
John Drummond 3/6

Journey through Utopia
M. L. Berneri 10/-

English Thought in the 19th Century
D. C. Somervell 5/-

Socialism: New and Old (1891)
William Graham 5/6

My Name is Million (Poland 1939-40)
3/6

The Natural Order
Massingham, Blunden &c. 3/-

The World and the West
Arnold Toynbee 3/6

Pictures of the Socialist Future
Eugene Richter 6/-

The Day of the Locust
Nathaniel West 3/6

Italy Speaks (1947)
Barbara Barclay Carter 2/6

Dark Legend
Frederick Wertham 3/6

Pamphlets . . .

Tyranny Could Not Quell Them (Norway)
Gene Sharp 1/-

Periodicals . . .

World Labour News, No. 2
March-April 4d.

Liberation, February
(Albert Camus) 1/9

We can supply ANY book required, including text-books. Please supply publisher's name if possible, but if not we can find it. Scarce and out-of-print books searched for—and frequently found!

We distribute:

Peace News, Socialist Leader, Freethinker, Industrial Worker, World Labour News, University Libertarian, Dissent, etc.

Postage free on all items

Obtainable from

27, RED LION STREET, LONDON, W.C.1

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY
Vol. 21, No. 12 March 19, 1960

Transport: Business or Service?

Continued from p. 1

services that can be run only at a loss unless it can raise fares, which in theory it could do, but in practice it cannot since it is subject to "directions" from the Minister of Transport. And the Minister of Transport being a minor cog in the wheel of Government must curb any ambitions he may have to shine and to solve the railway problem, so far as the profit and loss account is concerned, by weightier considerations of government. To quote the *Guardian* (March 11):

"Commuters are intensely hostile to any increase in the cost of travel to work, and Governments are sensitive to the weight of commuters' votes."

So in the interests of votes the government will sacrifice the unprofitable branch lines, which in many cases meant a "subsidy" of a few thousands a year. So far as making the railways pay their way such action is neither here nor there. The commuters should be made to pay for the service they now receive, part of which is at present subsidised by long-distance travellers, and they (the commuters) if they have brains under their bowlers and guts as well as stilettos, will demand a corresponding rise in salary. It is the bosses who determine where the place of work shall be and equally who determine that their workers will not be able to afford to live in the proximity of their jobs (surely there can be no argument on this matter?). It should therefore be their responsibility to meet the bill of transporting their employees from their homes to their jobs.

But the contrary is the case. The argument that the railways and other public transport must pay their way, means in effect that the travelling public not only pay the operational costs of these services, but also the interest and capital repayments to former shareholders of the old railway companies, as well as the interest and capital repayments in connection with the modernisation programme. If at the end of 40 years' strap-hanging the commuter were presented with his due share of the Shares in British Transport, values being what they are, he might well see in the Share Certificate a reward as well as a justification for all those years of torture. But the swindle lies in the fact that he gets nothing at the end of it! Not a single privilege ticket, not even the corner seat which the French reserve for their *mutilés de guerre* (and who would deny that a commuter is a *mutilé* after forty years' strap hanging?)

IF public transport is a national asset it surely follows that it should also be a national responsibility, just as are the postal- and the National Health Service. Either communications are a necessary part of daily life in which case all citizens should be able to enjoy them equally, or they are not, in which case the powers that be should say so, and the public would be clear on at least one point in the complex subject.

But the kind of talk we are hearing at present whether from the government (there must be a "reduction of uneconomic services" declared the Prime Minister last week) or the Press ("Mr. Macmillan . . . must tell people bluntly that they can no longer expect their lives to be subsidised by the railways"—*Guardian* Mar. 11) is the kind of crap which a thinking public must reject with

BOOK REVIEW

AFRICAN OUTLOOK

AFRICAN NATIONALISM by Ndabingi Sithole (O.U.P., 12s. 6d.)

ALTHOUGH I want to encourage readers of FREEDOM to read this book, I must warn them that some of it is abysmal trash. When the author is writing of Christianity or the so-called benefits of colonialism he is really quite shocking:

"It seems as if Providence saw through the long corridor of time and space into the distant forward march of communism, and hastened, in the nineteenth century to send colonial powers to Africa to inoculate all the peoples of Africa . . . against the communist virus."

But he can also shower us with sparks of African fire; at times he spits out his criticisms of European arrogance and smugness. In short, Sithole is the embodiment of African Nationalism, and to know what this is, and how it is to affect us (as it will in the very near future) you must read this book, and read the rubbish as well as the wisdom, for that is the mixture of the African nationalist.

The turning which the African takes, where the lone anarchist holds his ban-

ner of uncompromising rejection, is typified in the chapter on "The positive role of colonialism". It is here that Sithole really goes astray, more than in his acceptance of Christianity. Speaking of the coming of Europeans to Africa he says:

"Many mines for gold, diamonds and uranium were opened, and to these, thousands, and afterwards, millions of Africans flocked to work. For the first time the African went into the bowels of the earth. In towns and cities many Africans were employed as domestic servants, factory workers, and general labourers. Many joined the police force . . . The colonial powers have helped to debilitate the African . . . with the introduction of motor-cars, lorries, buses, trams, and aeroplanes, the African people have become more highly mobile. In many places isolation has been annihilated . . . Colonialism created a radio audience, and the next is likely to be a television audience. Colonialism has engendered a vigorous spirit of progressive competition in all walks of life . . . In most areas the only medium of exchange was barter. There was no money to speak of. But now a new economic system has been introduced. Millions of Africans now have bank accounts and millions are taking out insurance policies. A capitalist class is growing among the African people . . . Colonialism has given Africa a new vigorous industrial pattern, a new social and industrial consciousness, a new way of organising and doing things."

SPEED MANIA

The first airliner to fly around the world in a westerly direction on a service flight, a Boeing 707 jet, touched down at Sydney airport yesterday 81 hours after it had taken off, according to the operators, Q.A.N.T.A.S. Australian airlines. The 25,000-mile flight was made by way of the Orient, London, and America.

The aircraft piloted by Captain John Shields, was scheduled to turn round at London Airport and return to Sydney eastwards, but carried on round the world when the connecting West-bound aircraft was delayed.

(Read Jules Verne and tells us which was the more interesting tour round the world).

scorn. "The "uneconomic" services are not the miserable "bluebell lines" which count their losses in thousands but the *expanding* suburban services which lose millions but carry the vital book-keepers of the capitalist system to and from their desks. And we should like to meet the "subsidised" commuter rushing over London Bridge, along the Strand, Victoria Street or negotiating the hazards of Fenchurch Street, who would declare that the "subsidised" travel was the part of his day he looked forward to most!



THERE is only one way the transport services can be operated efficiently and for the greater comfort of the public, and it is that they should become a free public service, decentralised but co-ordinated. Not the autonomy proposed by Mr. Macmillan, which is intended to rout out the "uneconomic" lines (a ridiculous proposal as the *Observer* demonstrated last Sunday.

Some regions are much less profitable than others and the Scottish railways, which lose money on a magnificent scale, would be virtually obliged to close down if they were expected to pay their way. At the other extreme, the North Eastern region is a clear profit maker, but the autonomy which allows for flexibility of control and operation of traffic in the interest of the service. But above all considerations of a technical nature, there is the fundamental issue: that no public transport service can both provide a good service and "pay its way". And the government in proposing more autonomy, ostensibly to give more responsibility to the man on the spot* is at the same time, according to the *Sunday Times* (Mar. 13), considering inviting three "leading industrialists" to join a planning board to "re-organise the entire railway system". It is patently clear to us that its primary concern is to make the railways "pay" at whatever cost in terms of service. What conclusions would you draw when the trio in Macmillan's mind are given, "unofficially" it is true, by the *S. Times*, as Lord Chandos chairman of Associated Electrical Industries, Sir Alexander Flick who has just retired as Chairman of I.C.I., and Lord Heyworth who retires next month as Chairman of Unilevers? Success unlimited by the sound of it, except for you and me who use public transport!

* At least this is what Macmillan's clap-trap was meant to convey though the last sentence of the following extract shows that it was clap-trap:

"They wanted to make railwaymen feel not only that they had got a fair wage but that all concerned, from the guard to the management, were in a job where there was a chance of making a success of it. It broke one's heart to be in an organisation which made deficits like the railways.")

And what, pray, has it replaced? What was Africa without all these 'benefits', these gifts from the White civilisation of the last fifty years? Let Sithole tell us:

"The laws of the people lived in the consciousness, there were no lawyers employed, there were no records kept . . . the illiterate records what happens in his native memory. The law was simple but very effective. The native courts of justice were open to the rich and poor alike. The presence of relatives and friends of both parties ensured real justice."

Neither, indeed, were there prisons, or lunatic asylums, yet there are both now, African people, Sithole goes on, "are democratic to the point of inaction. Things are never settled until everyone has something to say. African councils allow the free expression of all shades of opinion. Any man has a full right to express his mind on public questions." Not so very unlike the "impossible anarchist utopia" is it?

I know it can be said that I have picked the bad side of our Western civilisation and the good side of African culture. It is done so seldom that it should make quite a change. One hears so often the self-satisfied European in

Africa say, "What can the Africans do, what have they ever done?" No, of course African society was not perfect before it was corrupted by the white man's civilisation. But among its fine and inspiring works of art, it has created this poem, which I make no apology for repeating:

"Ea for those who never invented anything
Eia for those who never conquered anything
But who in awe give themselves to the essence of things."

R.J.W.

Order all your Books from FREEDOM BOOKSHOP THEIR SERVICE IS EXCELLENT!

ALL IS FOR ALL

IN his book *Zoo Quest to Guiana* (Lutterworth Press, 1956) David Attenborough describes a journey along the River Mazaruni which rises in the highlands of the far West of British Guiana, close to the Venezuelan border. Their guides were Akawaio Indians, "short, copper coloured, cheerful men with straight, blue-black hair," one of whom had acquired the name King George:

"When we had first met King George several weeks earlier, we had been misled by his ferocious scowl into thinking that he was ill-tempered and surly, and he had not endeared himself to us by his irritating habit of demanding gifts. If Charles took out a packet of cigarettes, King George would hold out his hand

and say peremptorily, 'Thank you for cigret', and then accept the gift not as a favour but as a right. This always led to a general distribution of cigarettes, which meant inevitably that we should be short by the end of our trip, for we had budgetted carefully and accurately in order that our loads of stores might be kept to a minimum. However, we realized after a few days that the Indians regarded most property as communal: if one man had something that his companions lacked, then it was only right that he should share it. If food was short, then we should split our tins of bully beef with everyone in the canoe and, if we wished it, the Indians, as their share of the bargain, would give some of their cassava bread. As we got to know King George better, we valued him as a charming and kindly companion."

IS ANARCHISM AUTHORITARIAN?

Continued from p. 2

present as with to-morrow. They are not forgetting reality. They have created their organizations in the past; they are creating them in the present; and they will create them in the future. The individual life of a person within these organizations has been, is, and will be, a living life which Mr. G. has never experienced, or he does not like to see. He says that anarchists are for finality. I do not know of such an anarchist philosophy. I do know that anarchists do not accept any finality. Their philosophy teaches that in the universe as well as in human society everything is subject to change, and anarchists are not in favour of any kind of dogma or static form of society. They do not promise anyone paradise. They display their conception to people, and ask no one to believe or blindly to follow them. They ask every individual to investigate the thing, to use his own mind, his own reason and act according to his own decision. They ask for individual initiative and awareness.

Here we arrive at the term—"conscience". Mr. G. claims that various organizations are appealing to conscience and by that they enslave man's mind. I do not know what he means by "conscience", but to me conscience is a faculty of man to keep harmony between the emotional part of and the intellectual or thinking one. It is an individual's faculty to judge right and wrong. It seems to me that we have two co-operating forces—intellectual and emotional. When intellect proposes a certain action the emotional part approves it, and *vice versa*—when emotion wants a certain move the intellect approves it. In that way it maintains an inner balance of mind, and inner judgment. If there is a disagreement between them, then inner harmony is disturbed and an individual is divided in his mind, he is upset and feels guilt, or remorse, and self-accusation. I think that conscience like any other faculty is subject to development. To judge what is wrong and what is right requires knowledge, awareness and richness of feeling. All these elements of personal judgment are the result of the inherited ability of an individual to receive the acting external and internal

forces. It depends on what environment surrounds him, like education, spiritual institutions, political relationship, and cultural facilities. In this sense conscience could be a subject of education.

ANARCHISTS are for building the individual conscience by appealing to each individual to be self-determining in his judgment and not to accept blindly any authoritarian judgment. They appeal to individual awareness. They think that when a person is aware of what he is, what others are, and what surroundings he has, it means that he is living in reality. Mr. G. is not right when he accuses anarchists of being authoritarian because they appeal to the individual conscience. He must come into reality and see the things "here and now". Mr. G. devotes great consideration to the word—"duty". He accuses anarchists of appealing to duty and responsibility in all their teachings. Here he classifies all kinds of duty into one kind. To him there is no difference—all are authoritarian. Yes, anarchists appeal to the moral obligation of an individual to his relatives, friends, ideas, and society as a whole. In his endeavour to beat down anarchists he loses touch with the nature of duty. Duty is a man's inner feeling to his own behaviour toward himself, relatives, friends, organizations and society as a whole. Duty could be authoritarian if an individual applies it to authoritarian institutions: like the state, taxation, militarism, fatherland and so on, but it is not when it is applied to fellow man, wife, children, parents, ideas, ethical institutions, etc. Anarchists think that life is impossible without obligation and obligation to each other is a healthy natural state of an individual. Can we imagine an individual in the middle of society without any obligation to anyone? Can he be happy centreing everything around his "I"? Is happiness possible in isolation and does self-expression have any value when it is not felt by others? Is love possible without mutual devotion? Does an individual long to share his ideas with others? On these questions and many others Mr. G. has to think, and think. . . .

I do not agree with his expression that man is the end and purpose of himself. An individual appears by blind forces, grows and disappears the same way. Nature creates him with no purpose and destroys him without pity. Throughout the cycle of his existence he is in permanent dependence on many forces. He has no free will. He must struggle to surmount the obstacles in co-operation with others. He lives his own self but his self is dependent upon others. His life becomes valuable in the eyes of the others. He has social urges, which he must share with others, for his own mental health. He accepts responsibility to others and others accept it to him. Anarchist organization is free of all imposed legislative uniformity. It does not stifle individual initiative and stagnate society. It allows free existence to a variety of form, means and ends.

Anarchist organization is composed of free individuals united voluntarily for the common purpose. It combines individual strength with common strength. Each individual is free to stay in or leave.

Mr. G. by rejecting social and individual responsibility, principles, organization, conscience, duty, society, etc., puts the individual into the air, with no touch with reality. He forgets that man's natural instincts make him a social being, not a selfish one. Out of organization man is lost. He is deprived of his natural relationship as a social being. He can't feel himself. He can't express his creativeness and personality. Individual freedom is possible only in common freedom where the individual and society have common responsibility to each other.

Mr. G.'s philosophy could produce dry intellectual individuals fit for any kind of activities where egotism is applied, but certainly unfit for social life.

In conclusion I will affirm: Anarchism by its principles, organizational structure, functioning, philosophical conception and ethics is an anti-authoritarian way of life, which offers an individual his own space for creativeness, and realization of his aspirations, individuality and personality, freely.

Paddington, N.S.W. Feb. 22. K.D.

On Nuclear Weapons

DEAR FRIENDS,

I SEE my letter (Feb. 6, FREEDOM) which said it is illogical to protest against France for wanting nuclear bombs when GB, USA, and USSR already have them, is getting some reaction. D. H. Barasi wrote in FREEDOM Feb. 20, that "there has been so much opposition to the French tests" because "nuclear war is dangerous enough without the spread of nuclear weapons to other countries". He is so correct but I fear there is little chance of preventing the spread of this organized murder until the existing stock piles of nuclear bombs are destroyed. You can't expect other nations not to want to get into the nuclear club of power and prestige as long as such a club exists. First get rid of the Club and then you've got grounds to stand on in protesting against would-be members of such a club.

I am not defending France for exploding nuclear poison, spreading death, destroying the property of Africans and violently forcing them from their homes. I am trying to say that this is what we are going to have to expect from one nation after another as long as there are stock piles of thousands of nuclear bombs already in existence, ready at a moment's notice to set the world afire.

I think that our protests will be more effective if we concentrate on the nuclear bombs already in existence rather than knocking ourselves out over the smaller powers trying to join the big-power club. To concentrate on the little powers is meeting the problem backwards and it is futile. If after much effort and sacrifice we manage to destroy nuclear bomb stock piles, we will be able to stand on logical grounds in protesting against any nation trying to make nuclear weapons. Somehow, from various journals, I get the impression that the US, USSR, and GB are now the great lovers of peace and that only France is the devil that is trying to promote nuclear war. Such writers would have us forget that hundreds of bombs are at this very moment pointed at each one of us and that we live only at the mercy of ignorant militarists. France's capacity for destroying the world is nil as compared to these other three who are now trying to deceive us into thinking that they are the exponents of peace. If Krushchev wants to act peace instead of talking it then let him be the first to destroy his war weapons and let him quit boasting about that new, horrifying, secret weapon.

The Africans are late in getting excited about nuclear tests. If they and the rest of us had been excited in 1945 when atom bombs were tested on Hiroshima and Nagasaki killing 250,000 and continuing to kill every year since, as we are today when the tests are a little closer, perhaps there would be no nuclear bombs today.

In this connection I am delighted to hear that the April 16th issue of FREEDOM will contain an introduction to anarchism for new readers. This is the issue which we all ought to try to circulate as much as possible. It is something for which I personally have been waiting.

More strength for the drive towards sanity and truth!

Yours, etc.,
Leicester, Mar. 6. P. D. K. HILL.

Vinoba Bhave on "Non-Party Democracy"

DEAR SIR,
I would like to draw your attention to the following extract from the magazine *Sarvodaya* by Vinoba Bhave.

"NON-PARTY DEMOCRACY"
"In a democracy it is not necessary that there should be a Government of only one party. I am not in favour of such a democracy. There is no hard and fast rule that an all-party Government should be set up only in case of aggression from outside. India should have an all-party Government.

We should establish a democracy of our own pattern and not the one copied from other countries. I am not a politician but in the present age of science, I can say with certainty the politicians have no place. Either the man will exist in this age or the politician. If the politician exists, humanity will vanish.

VINOBA".
Yours fraternally,
Enfield, Mar. 7. TONY SMYTHE.

In Ghana the people have been demonstrating vigorously against the French Bomb but they should not forget that the policy of their government is based on militarism and war just as that of France. Ghana is arming herself strongly with military weapons according to the pattern of the colonialist-imperialists whom she claims she detests. Ghana embraces the same war philosophy that leads to nuclear weapons and if Ghana was in a position to make atom bombs I have no doubt that she would. The best demonstration that Ghanians can make against the French A-Bomb is to demonstrate against the weapons and army of their own government, for then they will be getting at the bottom of the problem which is war itself.

This is my main point, that nuclear weapons are the logical result of an advancing science and a war philosophy. If violence remains the accepted foundation of political governments then no nuclear disarmament can long endure for a war philosophy compels a state to have the deadliest weapons possible. That is why I say it is more logical to demand that political governments renounce violence and disarm totally. I think our protests against France's A-Bomb will be far more logical and effective if they are part of a simultaneous, world-wide protest for total disarmament rather than a single protest against France alone. I know that there are continuous demonstrations against nuclear weapons in England and US, as I have participated in some of them, but they have not been part of a planned, simultaneous, international demonstration except perhaps the time when the crew of the *Golden Rule* was arrested. I still would like to see a co-ordinated international protest for total disarmament at Easter in every national capital and especially in those nations with nuclear bombs. I have written to various world peace organizations about it and I have been speaking to French peace leaders about a demonstration in Paris at Easter and I have been trying to find volunteers to go to Moscow. Let's begin to work hard together before Germany or China starts testing their bombs.

For Peace and Freedom,
Cap Martin, Mar. 6. RICHARD FICHTER.

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP and MALATESTA DEBATING SOCIETY

IMPORTANT
MEETINGS are now held at CAMBRIDGE CIRCUS "The Marquis of Granby" Public House, London, W.C.2.
(corner Charing Cross Road and Shaftesbury Avenue) at 7.30 p.m.
ALL WELCOME

MAR. 20.—Bob McKean, Jack Stevenson, Frank Hirschfeld, on SYNDICALISM—HAS IT ANY RELEVANCE TODAY?
MAR. 27.—Jim Baker (Australia) on SYDNEY LIBERTARIANISM AND PERMANENT PROTEST.

APRIL 3—S. E. Parker on THE FUTURE IS NOW
APRIL 10—J. M. Pilgrim on ANARCHISM AND SCIENCE FICTION
APRIL 17—No meeting

FREEDOM
The Anarchist Weekly
Postal Subscription Rates:
12 months 19/- (U.S.A. \$3.00)
6 months 9/6 (U.S.A. \$1.50)
3 months 5/- (U.S.A. \$0.75)
Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies
12 months 29/- (U.S.A. \$4.50)
6 months 14/6 (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

Inside Story

IN May 1958, the readers of *Encounter* were somewhat taken aback by an article called "Corrective Training: an Unofficial Report" by J.F.N. 1797. Six months later *Encounter* published a sequel called "What Happened Then" and the author was revealed as Frank Norman; at the same time the book from which the original article had been taken was published as *Bang to Rights* (=red-handed). Now, just over a year later, we have his second book, *Stand on Me* (=take it from me), and in the meantime his musical play *Fings Ain't Wot They Used T'Be* has had two runs at the Theatre Royal in the East End and is opening in the West End this month.

Frank Norman is a young man who took to crime in his teens and has been to prison five times. *Stand on Me* is a touched-up picture of the Soho world he lived in; *Bang to Rights* is a more or less straight account of his last lagging—three years' Corrective Training (co-called)—and the end of which he remarked sarcastically, "I'm corrected". The irony is that he has been corrected—not by the treatment he received (as his readers will quickly realise) but by himself. The thing that began his self-rehabilitation was the art-class he went to one evening. "I didn't really want to learn anything, but I thought it might help to pass the time"; he also hoped to get one of the apples or oranges they used for still-life models. "I didn't even get an apple that night, which nearly made me turn it in, but I am happy to say that I got so absorbed in it that at times I wasn't in the nick at all." Evidently the prison authorities could do worse than study Herbert Read. "From that time on I never looked back. Every spare moment I had, I was either drawing or painting or reading about painting."

When he left prison he was allowed to take his fifty paintings and drawings with him ("I wonder what came over them?"), and back in London he avoided the usual relapse into crime by staying with some friends and working as a van-driver, working as an artist when he could ("As yet I haven't sold a picture but I have given away quite a lot"), but his friends persuaded him to write as well as paint. In a few months the results were accepted by *Encounter* and Secker & Warburg, he was introduced to Raymond Chandler by Stephen Spender, and he is now able to live by his writing.

There are some things we must get quite straight. Frank Norman is not a repentant criminal or a dilettante low-life writer. He doesn't patronise his old associates or laugh at them; no more is he to be patronised or laughed at. (I feel that when his editors and publishers left his bad spelling unchanged they did both). Nor is he a crooks' champion, up in arms against law and society. He is a man who has had a hell of a bad start and has nevertheless broken free; but like any good writer he has not tried to forget or reject his past. He is working back from the story of his emancipation into the world from which he has emancipated himself. I think his only real fault is that although he has given up his old way of life he still tends to

regard it too indulgently—but this is understandable enough in view of what he has been through.

He is not a solemn or angry writer; on the contrary, he is intelligent, amused and (rightly) rather bitter. Two aspects of his work deserve consideration—the documentary and the comedy. His work is documentary in the sense that any authentic picture of the world he has come from inevitably has for us the quality of a document; and the distinction of his picture is that it is authentic. Not many of our writers deal with the underworld, and of these very few know—or, more important, feel—what they are writing about. Peter Wildeblood, for example, was already a writer before he went to prison, and he was never a genuine criminal anyway (by any civilised standard, that is). Frank Norman is an underworld writer who really comes from the underworld.

Bang to Rights and *Stand on Me* deal with two sides of this world—in prison and out of it (a division oddly like that of term and holidays for schoolchildren). The first book is better, because prison is a better subject than crime in general. It hasn't the poetry of *Borstal Boy* or the pathos of *Who Lie in Gaol* or the intelligence of *Against the Law*, but it is a fine straight biting picture of prison life seen from the point of view of a fairly typical habitual criminal. It has a real message too: anyone who imagines that the thing to do with a habitual criminal is to send him to prison should read *Bang to Rights* (not that Mr. Norman presumes to have any other ideas). The second book, though not so good, is all the same great fun and pretty good for a man who was illiterate in his teens and learnt to read and write in prison and the army.

Frank Norman is essentially a comic writer. There is no doubt his sense of humour (as well as his courage, which must be considerable) that helped him to go straight in the last couple of years or so. He is able to recount the most miserable periods of his past without involving the reader very deeply. His picture of the underworld in the belt that stretches from Stepney to Hammer-smith (with Soho in the middle) is neither sensational nor grim—for the author always looks for the "right giggle" in the most unpleasant events. Even the occasion when he was slashed by a razor gang and marked for life doesn't seem to have upset him all that much. It is typical that the best passage about drug-addiction concerns the negro who grew marijuana in Kew Gardens; and that the best about homosexuality concerns the "queers' wedding" in Bayswater.

Not that the comic form of narrative is necessarily superficial; take, for example, a character a bit closer to us—"a geezer called Anarchist Alf". Says Frank Norman, "He was a dead miserable geezer and was always complaining about something, and mostly he complained about anarchism not being what it was, because it seemed that there wasn't all that many left in the mob!"

Frank Norman is also a dialect writer (though he says he has stopped speaking it). The dialect he uses is the jargon

of the underworld in southern England, based on Cockney, with an odd mixture of rhyming slang, back slang, army slang, Yiddish, Romany and American words, all jumbled up together and set down in these books with real talent and verve.

Here we can see the world described by Colin MacInnes from the outside. There is clearly no point in bringing moral or rational considerations to bear on it—in just saying that criminals are "wicked" or "stupid"—still more in punishing its inhabitants. We don't even know why they stay criminals, except through habit; why is it the case that "once a brass, always a brass, as the saying goes, once they start there is no getting them off it"?

Clearly it is possible to break away from it all; Frank Norman has. As he says, it's a mug's game. And yet it does have a curious appeal when it can give a man such typically anarchist ideas as those he expressed in a radio interview. "I don't think people should be told what to do... Everyone should really be left alone." And so out of this muddy pool, in which the decent man who thinks he is Narcissus sees the ugly face of Caliban, comes both laughter and wisdom. N.W.
(Frank Norman's books are published by Secker & Warburg).

DEFICIT!

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT!
WEEK 11
Deficit on Freedom £220
Contributions received £208
DEFICIT £12
March 6 to March 10

Croydon: S.E.P. 2/-	London: R.S. 7/-
London: M. & J.S.* 4/6	London: P. & G.T. 5/-
Westthornton: E.M. 12/6	London: J.M.P. 3/5
London: J.S.* 3/-	Hartford: M.G.A. 9/9
Wellington, N.Z.: C.R.V. 5/-	Slough: E.C.* 2/6
Tampa: A.C. £1/1/0	Tampa: A.B. £1/1/0
London: J.M.P. 3/5	Marton: W.G.R. £1/0/0
Franklin Grove: R.R.T. 7/-	Wolverhampton: J.G.L.* 2/6
Exmouth: A.B.H. 5/-	Surrey: F.B.* 5/-
Total ...	£6 19 7
Previously acknowledged ...	201 17 4
1960 TOTAL TO DATE ...	£208 16 11

*Indicates regular contributor.

Active Thinking!

DEAR COMRADES,

I should like to bring to your attention the following excerpt from the front page of the Feb. issue of *Safety News*, the official trumpet of the Royal Society for the Prevention of Accidents. These are the work of Brigadier R. F. E. Stoney, the Director-General of the Society:

"Fundamentally, the fact must be faced that, despite the Society's 1959 campaign, drivers as whole are not Better Drivers. The reason for this is that, throughout the country, in the Press, on the Radio, on TV., in the bar or at the barber's, people are displaying in their talk a mounting contempt for the law and its enforcement.

"The Police are the butt of all this talk and accusation and they are becoming engulfed in the rising tide of abuse and smear. This is not fair. We, the people, make the laws, it is up to us, the people, to obey them."

This crazy logic needs no comment to the readers of FREEDOM.

But may I suggest that wherever anarchists read anything which allows of an attack they should always write to the newspaper or journal concerned in order to spread anarchist opinion.

I feel that there are far too few of us writing to newspapers and far too many who classify themselves in the uncommitted category of "Individualists" or the impotent ones of Philosopher or Pacifist Anarchist. Perhaps people who designate themselves in this way are afraid of understanding anarchist theory in case they become obliged to practise it.

Before I came to know FREEDOM via *The Freethinker* I had never read a thing from an anarchist's pen. If only English anarchists were a little more active I should not have had to flounder my way through a dozen different ideologies before finding one which was acceptable.

It all boils down to this: if one believes in anarchism one should take action of some kind. When a sufficient number of people appreciate what anarchism means in the twentieth century we shall be in a position to do more than write. But not until.

FREEDOM PRESS

SELECTIONS FROM 'FREEDOM'

- Vol. 1, 1951, *Mankind is One*
 - Vol. 2, 1952, *Postscript to Posterity*
 - Vol. 3, 1953, *Colonialism on Trial*
 - Vol. 4, 1954, *Living on a Volcano*
 - Vol. 5, 1955, *The Immoral Moralists*
 - Vol. 6, 1956, *Oil and Troubled Waters*
 - Vol. 7, 1957, *Year One—Sputnik Era*
 - Vol. 8, 1958, *Socialism in a Wheelchair*
- each volume paper 7s. 6d. cloth 10s. 6d.

The paper edition of the Selections is available to readers of FREEDOM at 5/- a copy

- VOLINE:
Nineteen-Seventeen (The Russian Revolution Betrayed) cloth 12s. 6d.
The Unknown Revolution (Kronstadt 1921, Ukraine 1918-21) cloth 12s. 6d.
- V. RICHARDS:
Lessons of the Spanish Revolution 6s.
- E. A. GUTKIND:
The Expanding Environment 8s. 6d.
- ERRICO MALATESTA:
Anarchy 9d.

- PETER KROPOTKIN:
The State: Its Historic Role 1s.
The Wage System 3d.
Revolutionary Government 3d.
Organised Vengeance
Called Justice 2d.
- RUDOLF ROCKER:
Nationalism and Culture cloth 21s.
- JOHN HEWETSON:
Ill-Health, Poverty and the State cloth 2s. 6d., paper 1s.
- MARIE-LOUISE BERNERI:
Neither East nor West paper 7s. 6d., cloth 10s. 6d.
- TONY GIBSON:
Youth for Freedom paper 2s.
Who will do the Dirty Work? 2d.
- 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 5s.
Journey Through Utopia cloth 18s. (U.S.A. \$3)

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