

Views & Comments Number 10, January 1956

Libertarian League

1956, January

Contents

Libertarian Forum	3
What We Stand For	3
Whither the AFL-CIO?	3
Leadership	5
Book Review	6
[quotations]	8
More About the Slave Rebellions	8
The Movement of Makhno	10
The Last Word	10
Science and Morality	12
Note	13

Libertarian Forum

Round Table Youth Discussions Every Friday at 8
Libertarian Center
813 Broadway (between 11th & 12th Sts.) New York City

What We Stand For

Two great power blocs struggle for world domination. Neither of these represents the true interests and welfare of Humanity. Their conflict threatens mankind with atomic destruction. Underlying both of these blocs are institutions that breed exploitation, inequality and oppression.

Without trying to legislate for the future we feel that we can indicate the general lines along which a solution to these problems can be found.

The exploitative societies of today must be replaced by a new libertarian world which will proclaim—Equal freedom for all in a free socialist society. "Freedom" without socialism leads to privilege and injustice; "Socialism" without freedom is totalitarian.

The monopoly of power which is the state must be replaced by a world-wide federation of free communities, labor councils and/or co-operatives operating according to the principles of free agreement. The government of men must be replaced by a functional society based on the administration of things.

Centralism which means regimentation from the top down must be replaced by federalism which means co-operation from the bottom up.

THE LIBERTARIAN LEAGUE will not accept the old socio-political clichés, but will boldly explore new roads while examining anew the old movements, drawing from them all that which time and experience has proven to be valid.

Whither the AFL-CIO?

The newly merged AFL-CIO—15 million workers in 141 unions—is now the largest labor organization in the "free world." Despite its size it comprises only 1/6 of the wage and salaried workers in the U.S. 45 million are unorganized and approximately 2 million belong to independent unions. The merger, however, is an event of the greatest importance to the labor and radical movements and it is necessary to evaluate its significance. We are, of course, heartily in favor of a united labor movement—but on what basis? Does unity mean monopoly of the unions by the labor leaders who will carve out their spheres of influence like thieves dividing the loot? Will it end the shameful partnership between labor and management? Will the labor unions continue to act as the labor front in the structure of state capitalism? Will It get rid of the grafters, racketeers and other varieties of business unionists, become democratic and end the dictatorship of these elements over the rank and file of the workers? Will it seek [sic, possibly the word should be cease] echoing the foreign policy of the western bloc, and take an independent position in relation to both war camps? Can the united AFL-CIO ultimately emerge as a revolutionary force whose social objectives will be, not class collaboration, but workers control of industry?

If the AFL-CIO showed signs of correcting the abuses and changing its suicidal course, we would add our voice to the general chorus of approval. We cannot do this because the facts forbid.

We are unfavorably impressed by the fact that "unity" was engineered at a series of conferences between the top officials, headed by Reuther. and Meany. The members were not consulted—no referendum was taken and all vital decisions were unanimously endorsed by 1500 hand picked stooges, in convention assembled. The policy and structure of the organization therefore faithfully reflect the character and views of the leaders.

Exposé of Dec. 1955 declares: "The convention marked more than the creation of labor monopoly by a few porkchoppers. There were many who felt that the Catholic union movement had taken command... as the meeting was called to order, a small, roly-poly figure of a man wearing a clerical collar, pushed his way up to the speakers' dais... he was saying, 'Please let me through. I've got to bless this meeting.' No representative of any other faith was so honored... When not blessing George Meany's meetings, Spellman has also acted as a part time strike breaker." (The grave diggers' strike)

Murray Kempton (*NY Post*, Dec. 13, 1955) gives us a pretty good idea of the caliber of some of the leaders—for example, Eugene C. (Jimmy) James, secretary-treasurer of the old AFL Laundry Workers Union. Kempton shows that James "assisted in looting something like 1 million dollars from his union's welfare fund... he ran an employer association in the Detroit juke box industry." And further on: "Half the Brotherhood of Carpenters came in too (into Reuther's Industrial Union Dept. of the CIO-AFL), including, we may assume, Brother Charles Johnson, an eastern vice-president' who once took \$35,000 for settling a strike at Roosevelt Raceway... Also one half the Brotherhood of Operating Engineers Joseph Fay, the enchained extortioner, used to be a vice-president of the Engineers, who average a convicted business agent a year, and his influence does not appear to have withered in his absence."

The acid test of the worth of a labor movement is its attitude towards and its relations to the employers. It is very significant that the formation of the AFL-CIO did not alarm the bosses. The reason is perhaps best explained by the following item taken from *Time Magazine* of Dec. 19, 1955: "In a rare gesture, the NAM invited George Meany to come over from the AFL-CIO merger meeting 16 blocks away, to tell members, 'What Organized Labor Expects of Management.' Meany made clear that he expected the hand of friendship. U.S. labor and management, he said 'have much in common and little, really, that they can take a different attitude about.' He listed points of mutual agreement: devotion to the profit system, recognition of management's right to manage, dislike of Government interference, hostility toward Communism. Meany even conceded that the Wagner Act which labor regards as its Magna Carta, perhaps went too far one way, just as I think the Taft-Hartley Act goes too far the other way. I never went on strike in my life, never ordered anyone to run a strike in my life, never had anything to do with a 'picket line.'"

While labor and liberal circles deplore the abuses and undemocratic procedures of the AFL-CIO, they hope those abuses will eventually be corrected. The New-Dealers are enthusiastic about the merger because they expect strong political support for the New Deal wing of the capitalist class—which accounts for the enthusiastic reaction to Adlai Stevenson's speech at the convention. The "radical" political parties and groups hope that the AFL-CIO will sooner or later become the backbone of a new Labor Party. This attitude is understandable. The labor unions play a secondary part in the social philosophy of the authoritarian parties and sects. To them, the state or the party is the main thing. The unions are regarded as tools to be used in the conquest of power. Whatever smacks of New Dealism, Welfarism, parliamentary action by the unions, or

a Labor Party, is considered progressive because it leads to the establishment of the "workers' government" version of state capitalism.

The Libertarians disagree fundamentally with this point of view. Because we believe in a stateless society and because the labor unions, together with the cooperatives and other mass organizations, must supplant the state, we want to halt the drift towards the absorption of the labor movement by the state. It is up to the left wing—the discontented workers at the point of production, the Independent unions, a rejuvenated IWW and other healthy elements, to reconstitute an active opposition and orientate the labor movement in a revolutionary course.

Leadership

A Short Story by G W R

"Those sons-of-bitches have really fouled us up." The speaker leaned back in his easy chair and frowned, puffing on his cigar. The two other men in easy chairs nodded, and the man behind the desk did nothing. Instead he said:

"That's obvious. But why?"

"Damned if I know," said the man with the cigar, "There wasn't a bit of warning. We finished negotiating a good four-year contract and the next week they walk out. Doesn't make sense."

"Maybe there are some damned Communists stirring them up," suggested one of the other men in easy chairs.

"Not a chance," said the man at the desk. "The company cleaned them all out long ago, with the attorney general's help."

They sat in silence for a few minutes, the blue-white cigar smoke curling through a shaft of afternoon sunlight. Then the man behind the desk spoke:

"We've got to sit tight. Not a word to the papers. Visit a few of the men and see if you can find out what they want. Suggest they form a committee. We can deal with a committee. I'll see you here at 11 tonight."

The others nodded and filed out, shutting the door behind them. The man behind the desk got up and looked out of the window of the union local at the snow covered parking lot.

All these years building up a good, solid union in one of the biggest plants in the country, he thought, and it crumbles overnight. We might patch it together again, but it'll never be what it was. It's too late for me to start again. Too late. Why didn't it hold together?

He sat down at his desk and looked around at his brand new office. He knew what they wanted, better than they did themselves. They really didn't know why they had walked out. They were just vaguely discontented. Once he would have known how to talk to them, but not now. He wasn't a radical any more. He was "responsible" now.

He rested his head on his hands. He wasn't happy. Not any happier than his men were. And maybe a lot unhappier, since he knew what was wrong. He'd like to take off his \$200 suit and put on an old, beat-up leather jacket he still had in his closet and tell the men what they wanted, and really make the strike stick.

Make the bosses scream. Fight for justice again. Be back with his men again. But he wouldn't do it. He was too old, and it was too late.

Too late.

Book Review

by A.E.K.

The Sane Society by Erich Fromm. New York: Rhinehart & Co. 1955 370 pp.

Fifteen years ago, in the conclusions to his *Escape From Freedom*, Erich Fromm wrote that "the only criterion for the realization of freedom is whether or not the individual actively participates in determining his life and that of society, and this not only by the formal act of voting but in his daily activity, in his work, and in his relations to others."

He said that one of the conditions for the realization of democracy is "the elimination of the secret rule of those who, though few in number, wield great economic power without any responsibility to those whose fate depends on their decisions."

In this new volume, which caps his previous critique of authoritarian social structures, Fromm rejects both the Soviet and American systems because of their failure to provide participation and because both systems tend to be psychologically destructive to the individual human personality.

No doubt he has done us a service by pointing out that it was Marx who once defined socialism as a society in which "the full and free development of each individual becomes the ruling principle." Yet it is one of the tragedies of history, and perhaps the deep error of Stalinism, that this democratic ideal was sacrificed to the autocratic expedient. Fromm suggests that the West is developing rapidly in the direction of Huxley's *Brave New World* while the East is today Orwell's *1984*.

Marx is criticized for his "naive optimism in supposing that emancipation from exploitation would automatically produce free, cooperative and rational beings. Yet the author admires Marx enough to make use of the thesis that the mode of production tends to determine the social relationships in a culture, particularly in the case of the "marketing" personality which is found to be a characteristic American type.

In this orientation, a man experiences himself as a thing to be employed profitably and human qualities like friendliness, courtesy and kindness are transformed into commodities which are conducive to a higher price on the "personality market."

About one third of the book, 130 pages, is devoted to a portrait of "Man in Capitalistic Society." Here Fromm develops his main thesis, that of alienation. This thesis of "meaninglessness" or "estrangement" or lack of personal authenticity is, as the author recognizes, by no means new.

Marx, Hegel, Kropotkin, Proudhon, Durkheim, Owen, Thoreau, Riesman and many others have sensed the trend toward dehumanization in our Western culture. Fromm; states that his purpose is "to apply the concept of alienation to various observable phenomena, and to establish the connection between the illness of alienation and the humanistic concept of human nature and mental health."

The alienated person is out of touch with his "inner world" and has a loss of the sense of self. He is to be contrasted with the schizophrenic person who is out of touch with his "outer world" and is exclusively preoccupied with the self. "Schizophrenia and alienation are complementary. In both forms of sickness one pole of human experience is lacking.

The alienated man who worships such idols as the leader, the state, or the economic system, does not experience himself as the active bearer of his own powers or the agent of his fulfillment but, instead, as an impoverished "thing," dependent on powers outside himself, "unto whom he has projected his living substance."

In a capitalistic system, persons tend to be conceived in terms of their abstract, quantitative exchange value rather than in their uniqueness or concreteness. In the newspaper caption "Shoe Manufacturer Dies," the richness of a human life is lost to the abstraction of an economic role or function.

A young man's evening with a girl, or a visit with friends, raises the question of whether the activity was worth the money or the time. Yet the alienated person finds it almost impossible to remain by himself because he is seized by the panic of experiencing "nothingness."

Fromm's portrayal is, we see, neo-psychoanalytical and he both criticizes and expresses his indebtedness to the master, Sigmund Freud. It was Freud who first used the concept of "social neuroses" and who, in his *Civilization and Its Discontents*, made the point that human needs and social structures can have conflicting demands.

Fromm states at the outset that he is undertaking research into what Freud called "the pathology of civilized communities." Taking this frame of reference, one defines psychological health not so much as an individual matter but instead, as depending primarily on the structure of the person's society.

One of the main postulates of Fromm's system is that of a normative humanism. While it is true that man has almost infinite malleability, yet he cannot live, without reacting, under conditions which are contrary to the basic requirements for human growth and sanity. Man is not a blank sheet of paper on which culture writes its text. If he lives under contrary economic and political conditions, he must either deteriorate and perish or else bring about conditions which are more in accordance with his requirements for development.

Fromm's presentation is scholarly and well-documented. On the question "Are We Sane?" he cites statistics which indicate that, among various European and North American countries, the United States has the highest alcoholism rate, the highest homicide rate, and the fifth highest suicide rate. Other data indicate that more than half of our total employed population express conscious dissatisfaction with their work.

The solution to the problem of alienation lies, for Fromm, in the "Communities of Work," about 100 of which exist in Europe today—some industrial, some agricultural. Communitarian Socialists have, states Fromm, stressed the organization of work and social relations between men—not, primarily, the question of ownership.

The aim has been "an industrial organization in which every working person would be an active and responsible participant, where work would be attractive and meaningful, where capital would not employ labor, but labor would employ capital."

In Boimondeau, the watch-case factory in France which Fromm uses as an example in some detail, the accent is not on acquiring together but on working together for a collective and personal fulfillment. Within the commune live Catholics, Protestants, materialists, humanists, atheists and communists, governed by a common ethical code which has gradually emerged through consensus.

The participants own a 235-acre farm. They earn, on the average, between 10 and 20 per cent more than union wages. They have complete freedom of speech and discussion. They have an elaborate educational program including courses in engineering, physics, literature, Marxism, Christianity, dancing, singing and basketball.

[quotations]

"Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired, signifies in the final sense, a theft from those who-hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed. This world in arms is not spending money alone. It is spending the sweat of its laborers, the genius of its scientists, the hopes of its children..."

"We pay for a single fighter aircraft with 500,000 bushels of wheat. We pay for a single destroyer with new homes that could have housed more than 8,000 people... This is not a way of life at all in any true sense. Under the cloud of threatening war it is humanity hanging from a cross of iron."

—Dwight D. Eisenhower, April 16, 1953

"Any nation so mad as to contemplate war would be guilty of monstrous murder and almost certainly of suicide."

—Pius XI, Christmas Allocution

... but...

"War is the health of the State."

—Michael Bakunin

"The economic concept of capital, the political idea of the State or of authority, and the theological conception of the church are very closely related. They complement one another, each blending into the others.

"Accordingly, it is impossible to fight the one while maintaining the others intact. This is a fact on which all philosophers are today in agreement. What capital does to labor, the State does to liberty and the church does to the spirit.

"This trinity of absolutism is as obnoxious in its practice as it is in its philosophy. To oppress the people effectively, it is as necessary to chain their reason and their will as it is to chain their bodies. If socialism is to reveal itself in a complete form, universal and free of all mysticism, it has but to make the people aware of the importance of this trinity."

—Pierre-Joseph Proudhon

More About the Slave Rebellions

by A. Volny

For the light it throws upon some little known facts about the slave labor system as developed under state capitalism, a new book, *Concentration Camps of The U.S.S.R.*, merits our attention. Its author, Boris Yakovlev, is a member of the Institute for the Study of Soviet History. Published in Munich (in Russian) the book contains a map of Russia on which are located the various concentration camps—well over 200 of them.

Of particular interest are its descriptions of prisoner rebellions, two of which I will describe in summary. The first of these took place in 1950, near the city of Salekhard on the river Obi.

This was at camp No. 278, which is engaged in railroad construction. The prisoners, numbering more than 48,000, represent many nationalities, Soviet citizens as well as Czechs, Finns, Poles, Mongols etc.

The plan of action was worked out by lieutenant general Beliayev, who had been on the staff of general Rokossovsky and was now doing a 25 year stretch at hard labor for "counter revolutionary" activity. On an appointed day, Beliayev's brigade, marching out to work together with 14 other brigades, fell upon the guards, disarmed them and bound them hand and foot. He insisted that there be no bloodshed.

The insurgents, now in possession of rifles and machine guns, marched on the administrative barracks, this time disarming the barracks guards. Here, they met resistance and in the exchange of shots which followed, lieutenant Krylov of the MVD forces was killed. After setting fire to some of the barracks, they went on to the officers' quarters which they occupied, here again overpowering and disarming the guards.

That night the insurrectionists marched on the camp military headquarters with the intention of capturing the telephone, telegraph and radio station. However, headquarters had been alerted by some of the escaped guards and here they were met with heavy fire. At daybreak, airplanes flew over the camp, bombing and machine gunning the rebels.

Refusing to surrender, Beliayev, with 400 of his comrades, escaped to the Ural mountains. There for about a month, they fought the encircling MGB squads. All of them perished in battle. In the course of the uprising, 500 camp guards and MGB troops lost their lives.

The second outbreak occurred in 1953 in the group of camps near the city of Norilsk, in the region of Krasnoyarsk. The camp population of about 50,000 consists of Russians, Ukrainians, Balts, Czechs, Hungarians, Rumanians, Chinese, Japanese, Frenchmen and Italians. Here the discontent took the form of a strike. The chief demands were:

- Removal of numbers from the clothing of the prisoners
- Removal of iron bars from all the barracks
- Removal of chains from all prisoners
- Reduction of the work day from 12 hours to 9 hours
- Right of the prisoners to choose representatives (from among themselves) to settle their dispute with the camp authorities—and the inviolability of these representatives.

The struggle dragged on for almost a half year. It was brought to a close after an extensive "weeding out" of the camps. Under an armed guard, groups of 50 to 60 prisoners were driven out into the taiga. There, the most active of the strikers were singled out and led away. Many died in this weeding out—both prisoners and guards.

~ ~ ~ ~

That the ideas of Kropotkin and Bakunin are replacing those of Marx among the Russian masses, is confirmed even by the "black hundreds" press. Writing in the monarchist *Znamya Rossii*, New York, Sept. 15, 1955, No. 130) Pyotr Mar declares: "V. Cherkezov, an expounder of Anarchist-Communist doctrine in pre-revolutionary Russia, denounced the Communist government even as late as 1920. Today, his ideas are the inspiration of the Soviet student youth."

A lengthy editorial article in *Ukrainski Prometei*, Ukrainian nationalist organ, published in Detroit (issue No. 5, Dec. 1955) warns of the Anarchist menace. Under the caption "Shadow of Makhno Over the Ukrainian Immigration," the article accuses a faction of the immigrants of adopting Anarchism as their ideological base.

Organized as the Peasant Party, this group is led by a professor Dubrovsky. The editors are infuriated by his suggestion that the name of Nestor Makhno be added to the roster of Ukrainian national heroes. The professor made this proposal in a pamphlet entitled "Batko Nestor Makhno—Ukrainian National Hero."

Citing passages from this pamphlet, the editors denounce Makhno for having fought Petlura and the Ukrainian People's Republic of 1918. Professor Dubrovsky had said in his pamphlet: "The movement of Batko Makhno was a movement of two million Ukrainian peasants... We take the right to call him our national hero... The Makhnovists were the strength of our people and their deeds are the glory of the 20th century."

The Movement of Makhno

The Makhnovist movement in the Ukraine took its name from Nestor Makhno, an Anarchist with a flare for partisan military strategy. His popularity among the peasants earned him the affectionate nickname "batko" or "little father." The movement itself was largely spontaneous, arising as it did out of the peasants' need to defend themselves alike against Bolsheviks, Whites and the pogromist army of Petlura.

After 1917, Anarchist ideas had spread like wildfire throughout Russia.

The Bolsheviks were able to check the blaze only by mouthing Anarchist slogans while physically destroying known Anarchists and their centers of influence. The partisan army led by Makhno was saturated with a rudimentary libertarianism although the number of conscious Anarchists in its ranks is a matter of guesswork.

Exhausted after its victories over Wrangel and Denikin (victories which, ironically, saved the Bolshevik regime and are credited by ignorant or biased historians to the Red Army) the "Makhnovshchina" was attacked and destroyed by the Red Army of Lenin and Trotsky. Makhno died in Paris in 1928. The memory of his movement, successfully obscured in the West, is stubbornly alive in Russia today.

The Last Word

Jill: Hello, Jack. What are you doing here on 14th street?

Jack: Hi—I'm on my way to the forum. We're discussing "What will replace the state in a libertarian society?" Want to come along?

Jill: Haven't you outgrown that crap yet? What do you want to waste an evening for? Come on down to the Credenzi.

Jack; Tell you what—let's go over to my place. There's nobody home and we'll have the apartment to ourselves.

Jill: Oh—sex starved, huh? That's what's really bothering all you revolutionists up at the hall. What you need is a good piece of a...

Jack: OK—well? How about it?

Jill: ...and you still won't go to see a psychiatrist, will you? Can't you see that you need Therapy? Look at me since I've been taking Therapy. I'm completely different from what I was a year ago.

Jack: Not as I can notice.

Jill: You're just saying that to annoy me. You always did have a sadistic streak. It's a sign of repressed homosexuality. Well, I'm going now. My Therapist doesn't want me to get emotionally involved.

Jack: Hey—hold on a minute! Can't you do anything without that therapist? How much is he soaking you, anyway?

Jill: Yes. You would ask that. As though it's something that can be measured in money, That's why you don't go, isn't it? It's your way of rationalizing yourself out of it.

Jack: Talk of rationalizing.—Sometimes I think this whole psychiatry game is just a way for you characters at the Credenzi to let yourselves think well of yourselves even though you're not doing anything worthwhile, either for yourselves or anyone else.

Jill: Still making speeches, eh? Listen, child, I've had my fill trying to save the world.

Jack: Yes, I guess you have. I remember the first time you came up to the hall—eyes flashing and rarin' to go. It usually is the fire-brands who fizzle out. All you wanted to do then was demonstrate and picket, even when there was nothing to picket. You were such a hell raiser we practically had to sit on you to keep you from pulling some crazy stunt and landing us all in jail.

Jill: Well—I suppose it was amusing for a while. And it was good for my emotional development. But I'm through with that kind of foolishness. I've passed that stage.

Jack: So I see. Now you have become wise. Tell me—did you become wise all of a sudden or in easy stages? And if you admit your judgment was that bad a few years ago, how can you be sure it's any better now?

Jill: Oh you logician, you. It's so obvious that you're just using this radical baloney to avoid facing your personal problems. Why don't you get yourself straightened out first and you'll see there's really nothing wrong with the world. It's all in yourself and you, yourself are all that really matters.

Jack: If that's your new philosophy I would camouflage it a little better—if only for reasons of self interest. Your new friends probably believe that it's only they themselves that really matter. They might screw you up real good if you antagonize them with your sense of your own importance.

Jill: Well, I can't waste any more time now. Just let me know when you've made the social revolution. I want to be around to watch.

Jack: We won't make the social revolution. We can only hope to spread our ideas so that when it does come, people will have a clearer understanding of what's going on—we hope. If you remember, this was why the Spanish Revolution, while it lasted, was so much more successful than the Russian Revolution.

Jill: Is there any sadder sight than a bunch of "coffee and" revolutionists trying to change the system?

Jack: Yes—a bunch of extinguished revolutionists trading neurotic symptoms, and feeling sorry for themselves.

Jill: Oh, go to hell. I'm going to Washington Square.

Jack: Good Riddance.

Science and Morality

by Dr. E.L. Dwight Turner

Reprinted from *The Liberal*, Bulletin of Friendship Liberal League, Inc., 5526 Westford Rd., Philadelphia, Pa.

We have no right to divorce morality from science—to make science merely technical, without regard to social consequences. Man is, everywhere and under all circumstances, and at all times, a social being.

He cannot live independently of others. He had to have parents and was, and is, dependent upon others for his very existence. Any shirking of moral responsibility by scientists is therefore, illogical and cowardly.

However, morality and religious belief are not the same thing. The great assortment of religious beliefs in world history have, more often than not, been nonsensical or worse.

But morality is easily and clearly defined as right living, or acting in such a way as to live decently and honorably and to injure no one. This means that every person should do the best he can in all of life's relationships.

Science and commonsense know of no superhuman "revelations" or of any miracles, and they have no use for the multiplicity of so-called religious dogmas. Science deals only with nature and facts, and it has no belief in any of the millions of gods, devils, angels, witches, spooks, etc., that man's imagination has created. To science, the supernatural is unknown, unnecessary and superfluous.

The morality of science should not be conventional, but should be ideal, based on the highest and best activities which the human mind can develop by means of careful thought and practical experience. The struggle to achieve rationality and truth is the business of social science.

Rationality and truth are not inherent in any economic or political system. They have to be laboriously worked out by the advance guard of free and courageous and progressive thinkers. This means that reason—the best that man can develop—is the supreme criterion.

The impediments to rationality are many and varied, especially when there is monopolistic or big-business control over mass-communication devices—and even of educational systems, especially when militarism rather than peaceful co-existence is fostered or emphasized.

The search for truth must go on impervious to persecution, authority, and intolerance. The highest value for the scientist is free inquiry and the knowledge which it has given him. Science is the sworn enemy of human prejudice, intolerance, superstition, and of everything else which opposes truth. Science is in this respect a morality, as well as being a method of inquiry and investigation and advancement.

The findings of social science are not now widely heeded because society is not rationally structured. Reason involves an acceptance of those values fundamental in science, of tolerance, equality of opportunity, free assembly and freedom of discussion and cooperation.

To discover the proper kind of society for our future world and the structure of social relations therein consonant with reason and truth, we have only to observe the pattern of social relationships which are necessary for the promotion of science itself. Scientific endeavors are themselves a system of social relationships and cooperations, and this system is itself the ideal towards which the great society of the future should aim if it is to be truly scientific. Science knows no territorial boundaries and is consequently international in its organization and outlook.

Every struggle against tyranny over men's minds has been part of the struggle for the advancement of truth and science. It is a mistake to view science simply as a technique. Its social relationships involve a morality that should advance cooperation in all human activities and provide a better world for all peoples to live in—a world free from superstition and oppression, a world of true culture, peace and prosperity.

Note

The Libertarian League wishes to thank its friends and well-wishers who have contributed financially. It is our ambition to expand Views and Comments and eventually put out a printed paper. The response so far has been insufficient to do more than barely keep our heads above the water. Please contribute as generously as you can, with ideas and suggestions as well as financially.

The Anarchist Library
Anti-Copyright



Libertarian League
Views & Comments Number 10, January 1956
1956, January

Scanned from Views & Comments Number 10, January 1956
Libertarian League (publisher)
813 Broadway, New York 3, N.Y.,
Box 949, 920 Third Avenue, Seattle 4, Wash.

theanarchistlibrary.org