

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

Vol. 12, No. 28

September 8th, 1951

Threepence

THE LABOUR PARTY'S "DOUBLE-THINK"

PEACE IS WAR

THE policy statement issued last week by the National Executive of the Labour Party with the title "Our First Duty—Peace", is designed to offset the influence of the Bevanite manifesto "One Way Only", at the Trade Union Congress and the Labour Party's annual conference at Scarborough next month. The Bevan-Wilson statement quarrelled, not with rearmament but with the scale of the programme. The National Executive's view is that the arms programme "represents what all consider the minimum required to deter aggression and so prevent a Third World War". The greater part of the document is therefore devoted to a series of platitudes to support the hardly original or historically successful doctrine, "If you wish for peace, prepare for war." The emphasis on "making the rich pay", which has so angered the anti-Labour press has obviously been inserted in order to steal the thunder of "One Way Only". The statement declares that: "High rates of income tax and surtax have already achieved an enormous redistribution of income in Britain. In 1938, after taxes had been paid, only £39 out of every £100 of personal incomes went to wage earners and £24 to salary earners. In 1950 the share of wages had gone up to £47 out of each £100. The share of salary earners was about the same at £25. The increase in the share of the national income going to wage earners is due almost entirely to a reduction in the share taken by those who live on unearned income."

This means, presumably, that after six years of "Britain's wartime revolution", and seven years of "the silent revolution in our midst", the workers' share has increased by 8 per cent., and that 28 per cent. of personal incomes still goes to people who do not earn it. And this is despite the increase in the working population and increased productivity. It should not be imagined, however, from the talk of "sharing the burden" that it is these people who are going to pay for the arms race, for, "to pay for rearmament some sacrifice must inevitably be made by everyone." The worker and his wife will discover the meaning of this every time they go shopping. The homeless and the old will find what is meant by the phrase, "There is need for common sense and restraint on the part

of everyone in the community."

The statement says that, "Investment in coal, electricity, gas, coke ovens, railways, roads, and petroleum during 1951 will be higher than in 1950. The programme of new building for the manufacturing industry will be about the same. There will be bigger investment in education. The housing programme will be maintained."

But it does not add that increased expenditure will fail to rise with increased costs and consequently that real investment will be less. And it does not add that housing and educational authorities in many parts of the country are abandoning new projects for lack of materials diverted to armaments industries.

What will happen when the three-year programme is completed? It will be discovered that Russia and its satellites have rearmament to keep pace with America and its satellites, and that consequently the "security minimum" will have to be increased, another programme embarked

upon. But research in the development of lethal weapons continues at a rate faster than their production. It is the field of research that advances most rapidly—because the demand is greatest. Germany lost the battle for air supremacy in the last war because its enemies, through starting, later were able to produce more advanced machines. So the accumulation of armaments will have to be used up somewhere before they become obsolete. This is the ultimate implication of "Our First Duty—Peace", just as it is the implication of the "policies" of the Labour Party's political opponents, who would serve up the same dish with different trimmings.

And this is the policy which after suitable back-stage revolts and whiplashing, the Trades Union Congress and the Labour Party Conference will endorse. "We do not accept the view that war is inevitable," says the statement. It might as well have added: "But we'll do our bit to make it so." C.W.

"The primary aim of modern warfare . . . is to use up the products of the machine without raising the standard of living."

—GEORGE ORWELL.

("WAR IS PEACE" in 1984)

Railmen Attack Centralisation

IN an article entitled "The Commune and the Syndicates" (FREEDOM, 21/7/51), I wrote: "Anarchists and Syndicalists are not ashamed to pronounce their Regionalism."

It is with some interest, therefore, that I read of a protest organised by footplate workers of the Western Region of the British Railways. For this protest specifically pronounced the Regionalism of some 3,200 signatories who found the administration of the Railway Executive "reckless and inefficient".

The protest took the form of an open letter, which six railmen from Swansea, S. Wales—four drivers and two firemen—brought to London to present to the Minister of Transport.

The number of signatories represents a fifth of the sixteen thousand locomotive engineers and firemen working on the Western Region, and the letter may

thus be said to be representative of only a minority viewpoint. The fact is, however, that workers as a whole (even Welsh workers!) are slow to put pen to paper on matters of administration, and that the initiative to do so was taken and, without, as far as I know, the machinery of any political organisation to "help" them, they were able to gather so much support indicates a fairly high general measure of agreement among their fellow workers. Add to this the fact that the workers launching the initiative clearly feel very strongly about it and can thus become an influential "ginger group", and it seems likely that we have not heard the last from the regionalists of S. Wales.

For, of course, they were not made exactly welcome at the Ministry of Transport. This Ministry's offices are situated, like the National Coal Board, in Berkeley Square (where nowadays even the nightingales cannot be heard above the rattle of bureaucratic tea-cups) and when the six delegates arrived there, threading their way among the sleek limousines, they were refused audience with the Minister himself, Mr. Alfred Barnes, and had to present their message to an underling, and leave.

They were indeed optimistic if they thought they could see the great man himself. If London dockers are not allowed to see their own union boss, Mr. Deakin, when they call at Transport House, what chance have these provincials of seeing a Minister of the Crown? After all, democracy has its limits. (I'll say it has!)

The open letter read: "We, the undersigned locomotive enginemen and firemen of the Western Region, make a sincere appeal for the termination of the reckless and inefficient administration of the Railway Executive over the Western Region."

"In the interests of the safety of the railway passengers and ourselves we demand a complete control over the Western Region by our own regional officers, who were former Great Western Railway experts, to resuscitate the Great Western Railway's highly efficient mechanical, technical, and welfare administration over the Western Region."

"We, as British subjects, feel it is our solemn duty to have at least one region of the British Railways to pay its way, to run speedily and, above all, safely. We recommend a public inquiry without delay into the rapidly deteriorating situation on the Western Region which compels footplatemen to seek alternative employment."

The points raised in this letter are too numerous to discuss more than briefly here, while hoping to return to them at a later date. But what stands out a mile is that these workers feel responsibility for the running of their railway. The objection to workers control that "workers don't want the responsibility" is shown clearly in a statement like this open letter to be absolute nonsense.

It is true that the letter asks for control by experts—which is not the same as workers' control, but, as I have argued before, the technicians must be included in the term "workers" if they are concerned with production and not with finance. And it is obviously much better for the workers that administration should be in the hands of those who know the job rather than those who do not.

The railways are second only to the coal-mines in the incidence of industrial accidents. Working on the railways is a dangerous job, and it becomes dangerous for the passengers too when administration is not in the hands of those directly doing the work.

We may feel the opening of the third paragraph to be rather pompously worded and capitalist-minded, but the sting lies in the tail. Footplatemen, more highly-paid than station staff, and after years of training, are leaving the industry because they are dissatisfied with conditions after they had hoped for so much from nationalisation—that is why they want their Region to pay its way.

Political and state-minded thinkers have told us for years that centralised planning makes for efficiency. They have had their way and are being proved wrong. The workers' urge for responsibility as expressed in the open letter above can only find its full expression through a syndicalist movement aiming at the most de-centralised form of control—Workers' Control.

P.S.

FOREIGN COMMENTARY

THE KOREAN TRAGEDY

ELSEWHERE we reproduce an editorial comment from the Chicago weekly *Industrial Worker* (organ of the I.W.W.) which deals with the Korea Truce talks in a very similar vein to the one in which it was dealt in this column last week. And the New York anarchist weekly *L'Adunata dei Refrattari* in its issue for September 1st, refers to the Kaesong armistice talks as a "tragic farce" in which "the two sides are in agreement on only one point: of not concluding an armistice which might end the military operations and the shedding of blood on both sides." Quoting from the official figures of American casualties published in *Time*, our contemporary shows how during the two months uselessly spent by the peace delegates in wrangling over procedure, 500 American soldiers have been killed and 2,200 wounded on the Korean battlefield. And from these figures one can guess what casualties there must be among the

Koreans, Chinese and other troops engaged in this senseless struggle.

THE *New York Herald Tribune* (N.Y. edition) in a pointed editorial "Koreans are People" discusses the tremendous problems created for the Koreans by this war: "Americans are appalled—and rightly—at the terrible cost in young American lives of the fighting in Korea. Yet large though the American casualty list seems, more than twenty times that number of Korean civilians are dead, wounded or missing, if official Korean estimates are to be believed. Like Americans, these Koreans are people. Like the rest of us, they are human beings, with the same sensitivity to pain and the same desire to live. More than 2,000,000 Korean civilians have been killed, according to Korean estimates, and countless others have been uprooted from their homes or from the rubble of what was once their homes. Considering Korea's population—only about 28,000,000—this would make the civilian disaster one of the worst, relatively, in history. Vast areas of the country have felt the crushing weight of war's steamroller—not once, not twice, but several times, as the contending armies swayed back and forth."

The editorial writer suggests that Americans are not sufficiently conscious of this tragedy—and we would add that the observation applies to this country as well. It may be because Korea is so far away or because the people's senses have been "numbed by the endless succession of 'refugee stories'" that the two wars have produced, or just that "Perhaps some of us still suffer from the illusion that in crowded Asia death and suffering are less meaningful and somehow less painful than in America and Europe.* In any case, mere words have been singularly unsuccessful in conveying to the American people the extent and depth of the ordeal through which the people of Korea have been moving."

Do we owe any responsibility to the Koreans? asks the writer. And his answer is: "On humanitarian grounds alone, the answer, of course, is an emphatic yes. But there is more to it than that."

Whilst blaming the war on "power-hungry Communists dictated to from Moscow"—a sad lapse into cheap sloganeering, in our opinion, from the high moral tone of the rest of the editorial—he admits that splitting Korea "at its heart, without reference to the wishes of the people" encouraged and facilitated this "act of aggression."

Since he presents the Korean war as a struggle between Communism and

*The attitude that Asiatics are inferior is brought out very blatantly in the report on General Michael's testimony before a Congress Committee on the Korean war. At one point he indicated at least a suspected reason for the Chinese soldier's fight-to-the-end attitude after assuring Rep. Errett P. Scrivner, R., Kan., that this also was characteristic of the North Korean Communists. Mr. Scrivner wanted to know why it is impossible to get our South Korean allies to perform the same way in battle since they are "pretty much the same breed" as the North Koreans. (Our italics.)

Democracy, it is natural that he is concerned that a military victory in S. Korea should not be meaningless, which it will be "unless it is accompanied by a rehabilitation programme sufficient in scope to convince the S. Korean people that the costly war of resistance against Communism was worth while". We think it is asking too much of the Korean people to ever hope to convince them that this war was worthwhile—is there any war that has been worthwhile when everything is taken into account, including the new problems created by such wars?

NEVERTHELESS, the *N.Y. Herald Tribune* realises that a military victory for the "democracies" does not automatically carry with it an acceptance by the Koreans of the "democratic way of life". One can only counter the myth of "communism" by better ideas and obviously for the Koreans democracy must show them that it not only provides them with the freedom to starve but that "democratic" capitalism ensures economic security as well.

So far the Koreans have little to choose between the two 'isms'. Those refugees who came from the North to the South, have found that they have simply jumped from the frying pan into the fire. Now, a Canadian correspondent reports that more than 120,000 Koreans have been pulled from their homes in frontal areas to clear the way for military operations. Many, he says, have had to abandon their possessions, and in some cases even rice stocks were burned. Ninety per cent. of these refugees, the correspondent adds, are malnourished cases.

To meet these ever-increasing human problems, the United Nations have voted 250 million dollars (about £84 millions)

Continued on p. 3

COLLECTIVE SECURITY

There are 4,000,000 Refugees in Korea living—and dying—in the worst conditions in the World.

There have been nearly half a million casualties among South Korean civilians in the past year. Washington estimates that there have been nearly 200,000 "non-battle" casualties in the North.

Disease and death daily exact a terrible toll among these homeless wandering people. And the shortage of doctors is appalling.

One hundred and eighty thousand houses have been destroyed.

The black shadow of famine is over the land. This year's rice crop—staple diet of the Koreans—is 75 per cent. of normal. Next year's will be doomed unless fertilisers are rapidly supplied.

A quarter of a million farm animals, mostly oxen, have been killed.

In industry, 85 per cent. of Seoul's factories have been wrecked. And the once-vital factories of the North have been obliterated. War damage in the South alone is put at £600,000,000.

Sunday Pictorial, 26/8/51.

Mersey & London Dockers Form Co-operatives

WE reported, in our issue of August 18th, that dockers on Merseyside were planning to form a Stevedore's Co-operative. This has now been formed and London dockers have also taken the plunge and formed the Associated Stevedores' (London) Ltd.

The idea is that the dockers take out shares in the co-operative (which operates in the same way as the ordinary stevedoring companies, the difference being that profit on work done is distributed back to the shareholding dockers).

In London, the co-op is coming up against difficulties, in that they are not getting big ships to unload, being able, so far, only to get work on small ships, which are not so profitable to work.

In the Surrey Docks, where the co-op was formed, there are eleven stevedoring companies already operating who get the big ships allocated to them in rotation. The dockers co-operative applied to go on the rota, and take their turn with the other companies, but the Board of Trade, which apparently governs these things, has turned down their application on the grounds that the dockers are "inexperienced".

But Mr. Henry F. Whitewood, secretary and managing director of Associated Stevedores has pointed out: "Four foremen in charge of the last two ships we dealt with have worked 115 years between them on the docks. And they call that inexperience! But we need a share in bigger ships. One big ship equals in profit four or five of the small ships we have been handling."

For his work as managing director and secretary—"a 24-hours-a-day job"—Mr. Whitewood, himself a stevedore and trade union branch official, gets about the same pay as he would for an eight-hour day on the docks. He is the

co-op's only paid official. The 12 elected directors, who undertake financial responsibility for the company, are paid five shillings a year—and they pay their own expenses.

It was inevitable that difficulties would be put in the way of the new venture, but we hope the dockers will be able to overcome this opposition.

The general principles of the co-operative seem admirable as a means of dealing with the matter of responsibility and reward as things are to-day. The dockers will be showing that they are capable of running their own industry—and already members include not only dockers and stevedores, but clerks, lightermen and ship and tug pilots.

It may be that these co-operatives will prove the beginning of an industrial organisation which could eventually take over the control of the docks entirely. That remains to be seen.

There are dangers and snags in any venture endeavouring to work within capitalist society. The profit motive seems a dominant one in these new co-operatives, and, while that is understandable, it would be a great pity if they were to develop in the same way as the consumers' co-ops have done—into just another vast capitalist concern.

However, as long as membership is limited to those who are actually doing the work, the directors are unpaid and the only paid official is not getting more than he would on the job, corruption will not be so easy.

We wish the dockers of Merseyside and London the best of luck in their initiative. To work in co-operation with his fellows, and not under the control or for the profit of the boss, should be the aim of every worker.

THE REWARDS OF LABOUR—Five Viewpoints

WE publish below five points of view on the rewards of labour, four of them from newspapers and magazines published during the last twelve months, and the fifth from one of the "classics" of anarchist theory. In the first extract in this symposium, the editor of the paper founded by Gandhi, comments on a complaint by an "educated" man that he can only get menial and poorly-paid work. The editor concludes with the suggestion that if differences are to be allowed, more strenuous or less attractive work should be the better-paid. The second contribution comes from an American magazine. Here a very similar complaint is considered and in discussing it, the editors show how special skills are rewarded by our society to the degree in which they help to maintain those who wield power.

The third point of view is that of "rugged individualism"—that the rewarding of personal ambition is a law of nature. But it contains one truth worth hammering home: "No State of any kind," says its

author, "could possibly exist, much less thrive, in which the workers as a whole refused to co-operate with the governing power."

The fourth statement is by an anthropologist, who observes in a mining village a reflection of the point of view discussed in the first two items. He believes the incentive to be not money but social status—a status based not on social usefulness but on the "middle-class" standard of values.

In the final quotation Kropotkin, who also draws his illustration from miners, demonstrates that it is quite impossible to assess in relation to society the social contribution of any individual and consequently reaches the conclusion, "All is for all." To follow Kropotkin's argument for the abolition of the wages system—or of any labour-ticket system of barter, the reader should turn to the three-penny pamphlet *The Wage System*.

I. Rewards & Education

"Last year, 80,000 boys and girls sat for the High School Examination. This year, their number rose to 1,000,000. And in the coming year it may reach—the educational authorities estimate—1,500,000. And as the number of undergraduates and ex-high school boys jumps, their "price" slumps. How much is a school-leaving certificate worth these days? Let an ex-high school boy who works as a "water-sprayer" answer. He says: 'It is Re 1-8 a day, during summer and none during the rest of the year. Because that is what I earn by spraying water on *khas tattis* during the summer months.' And how much is an undergraduate worth these days? If you put this question to one of the tribe who has just secured the job of a *chaprasi* his reply will be: 'Formerly it was Rs 85 a month; now it is only Rs 45. I was then a clerk and now I am only a *chaprasi*.' But there are not as many *khas tattis* to spray water on as there are ex-high school boys without work; nor is the job of a *chaprasi* waiting for every unemployed undergraduate."

The *Times of India*, 22/5/51. Commenting on these remarks, Mr. K. G. Mashruwala, the editor of Gandhi's newspaper, *Harijan* (30/6/51), says:

"What is wrong here is not that a high school boy has to accept the job of a water-sprayer at Re 1-8 per day, or that an undergraduate has to be *chaprasi* at Rs 45 per month. Indeed, if we want education to spread universally, having regard to the present standard of high school and collegiate education than that of a high school boy, nor should a *chaprasi* be less educated than an undergraduate. And if different occupations are doomed to have different scales of payment, the two cannot complain if they receive the remuneration appropriate for their respective jobs.

"The present condition looks 'bleak' for two reasons: (1) because only a few water-sprayers and *chaprasis* are matriculates and undergraduates, and so a comparison is made on the ground of 'education'; and (2) 'the educated' by their very training are made less efficient and sturdy water-sprayers and *chaprasis* than their uneducated colleagues. The result is that both the employer and the employee are more satisfied when the worker is uneducated than when he is educated.

"What is needed is (1) that the superiority complex of the educated must go; he must cease to think that a water-sprayer's or a *chaprasi's* job is not a proper kind of employment for a matriculate or an undergraduate, or that it is less honourable than the work of a copying or a despatching clerk. If there is to be eight years' compulsory education, the whole nation will be educated; every boy and every girl, even a road labourer, a sweeper, and a cart-driver will be a matriculate or an undergraduate, that is, will have the amount of information and literary equipment of the present-day matriculate or undergraduate. Since the illiterate coolie will disappear, all work will have to be done by 'ladies and gentlemen'; (2) the education must therefore be improved so as not to decrease the educated person's efficiency and inclination for jobs requiring physical and unattractive labour; and (3) the differences in scales of remuneration of different jobs must not be so wide as at present. Indeed, if differences are to be allowed, better remuneration should be paid for more strenuous work than for less hard and more pleasant work."

2. Rewards and Power

An American magazine, *Manas* (Los Angeles) in its issue of 13/12/50, says:

"The German scholar, E. Bodewig, announces that he will write no more for *Mathematics Review*—that he is going on "strike" against the small remuneration of advanced scholarship. He says:

"I wrote a book on *Numerical Methods* in a year and a half, working 5—10 hours a day. It was translated in the U.S. When the contract was drawn up, it turned out that I was to get about \$350 (and the translator the same amount). And this in a field where one can say that no book at all existed before. Afterwards the publisher wanted to make even these conditions worse in underhanded ways. Then I cancelled the whole contract on the ground of violation of its terms. What lawyer, doctor, or chemist would work for a year and a half or two years for \$350? Are we scholars only for philanthropic purposes?"

"Naturally," one does not use his science for making money. (It would be terrible if a scholar did what everybody else takes for granted.) But the exploitation of the scholar is one of the worst in the world. . . .

"What, exactly, is the meaning of the phrase—the exploitation of the scholar? What theory of rewards and punishments has this mathematician embraced? Apparently, there is not sufficient 'demand'

for mathematical reviews for him to be paid at the rate, say, that a lawyer would be repaid for the equivalent amount of research. So on amoral economic grounds, his complaint is without standing. Suppose he were a manufacturer who had given an inordinate amount of time to developing a commodity which was of interest to only a very small number of people, and that, finding he could not market the commodity except at a loss, he then wrote a plaintive letter to the *Journal of Commerce* to object to the lack of consideration shown for his years of effort which remain uncompensated. The claim of such a manufacturer that he had been 'exploited' would be laughed at as ridiculous.

"Obviously, this is not the position assumed by the mathematician. What he really means is that he is not being offered a reward commensurate with his cultural contribution. But how does one measure the monetary value of a cultural contribution? An advertising agency can measure its value to its clients by the sales increase that results. The advertising agency exerts a kind of 'will-power' over the buying habits of the public, and is rewarded in proportion as a change in those buying habits increases the income of the client. But a truly cultural contribution may not affect income at all; more than likely, it will make the matter of income seem unimportant to those who are affected. Dr. Hutchins wants us to overcome our love of money. If we love money less, we shall probably have less of it, so that, on a monetary basis, Dr. Hutchins threatens our way of life.

"Obviously, the rewards due to scholarship make a most complicated question. No doubt scholars should be better paid, but according to what standard? Dr. Bodewig proposes one basis of comparison:

For example, Professor X invited to take a position at the Mathematical Centre at Amsterdam—for 300 gulden a month. I wrote him that for that he could get a plumber. It is too bad that at the time I had not seen a newspaper advertisement for nurses in an insane asylum at 3,300 gulden a year with half-room and board. Otherwise I would have recommended a nurse from the insane asylum to my 'colleague' (even though she would have received rather less pay at the Mathematical Centre).

"Why is an expert mathematician worth more than a plumber or a psychiatric nurse? The mathematician may have an elevated brow and a penetrating intellect, but why is he worth any more? Now, if he were a theoretical physicist, as well as a mathematician, with potentialities for atomic energy research, his talents would probably command a much larger reward than they did fifteen years ago. To-day, a knowledge of atomic physics has a direct and evident relationship with power. The men who occupy positions of political power will pay highly for the kind of technical knowledge that will make their power more secure. Such knowledge can be made to subserve the purposes of the human will, and can exact a corresponding price."

Society and the Adolescent

WE saw in the last article that the Trobriand Islanders placed no obstacles in the way of their children in respect of their sexual games and sexual activities. Neither did they surround their children with an atmosphere of "morality", in the sense in which it is generally understood in our society, nor exact a compulsive obedience from them. We indicated, all too briefly, that the adults were able to do this because they themselves had been brought up in freedom and love. Love for children exists to be sure in our society; but because it is combined with the idea that children must learn to obey at any cost, it becomes tempered on the children's side with resentment and on the parents' with irritation. In the upshot it becomes mixed with a good deal of hatred, often enough disguised as excessive affection, and becomes the motive for much undesirable behaviour. (It is not possible here to illustrate and develop these bare statements any further. To anyone who is accustomed to look beneath the surface and to understanding family situations they will seem self-evident.) We shall see that a like atmosphere of freedom and approval is extended to the sexual activities of adolescents. With his customary brevity of expression, Malinowski describes this period thus:

"As the boy or girl enters upon adolescence, the nature of his or her sexual activity becomes more serious. It ceases to be mere child's play and assumes a prominent place among life's interests. What was before an unstable relationship culminating in an exchange of erotic manipulation or an immature sexual act becomes now an absorbing passion, and a matter of serious endeavour. An adolescent gets definitely attached to a given person, wishes to possess her, works purposefully towards this goal, plans to reach the fulfilment of his desires by magical and other means, and finally rejoices in achievement. I have seen young people of this age grow positively miserable through ill-success in love. This stage, in fact, differs from the one before in that personal preference has now come into play and with it a tendency towards a greater permanence in intrigue. The boy develops a desire to retain the fidelity and exclusive affection of the loved one, at least for a time. But this tendency is not associated so far with any idea of settling down to one exclusive relationship, nor

do adolescents yet begin to think of marriage. A boy or girl wishes to pass through many more experiences; he or she still enjoys the prospect of complete freedom and has no desire to accept obligations. Though pleased to imagine that his partner is faithful, the youthful lover does not feel obliged to reciprocate this fidelity. . . .

"Young people of this age, besides conducting their love affairs more seriously and intensely, widen and give greater variety to the setting of their amours. Both sexes arrange picnics and excursions and thus their indulgence in intercourse becomes associated with an enjoyment of novel experiences and fine scenery. They also form sexual connections outside the village community to which they belong. . . .

"As time goes on, and the boys and girls grow older, their intrigues last longer, and their mutual ties tend to become stronger and more permanent. A personal preference as a rule develops and begins definitely to over-shadow all other love affairs. It may be based on true sexual passion or else on an affinity of character. Practical considerations become involved in it, and, sooner or later, the man thinks of stabilising one of his liaisons by marriage. In the ordinary course of events, every marriage is preceded by a more or less protracted period of sexual life in common. . . .

"The pre-matrimonial, lasting intrigue is based upon and maintained by personal elements only. There is no legal obligation on either party. They may enter into it and dissolve it as they like. . . ."

I have quoted Malinowski thus at length because he gives in these paragraphs an account of the development of sexual life which comes as near to a natural unfolding as one could imagine. Moralistic complaints are obviously quite out of place. If put forward they would show themselves openly to be motivated by the unspoken belief that sexual activity is, in itself, wrong.

Affirmation of Sex by Society

As with child sexuality, Trobriand society finds the sexual activity of adolescents natural and desirable. But it does more than that—and this is especially important for our society—its social structure is modified to facilitate the needs of the young.

At puberty "a partial break-up of the

family takes place . . . the elder children, especially the males, have to leave the house, so as not to hamper by their embarrassing presence the sexual life of their parents. This partial disintegration of the family group is effected by the boy moving to a house tenanted by bachelors or by elderly widowed male relatives or friends. Such a house is called *bukumatula*. The girl sometimes goes to the house of an elderly widowed maternal aunt or other relative."

Such an arrangement makes for much greater freedom for the growing children, and serves to liberate the parents also. The contrast with our society is even more marked when one considers the difficulties which beset young people in large cities in finding a place of privacy in which to be merely alone, let alone to make love. The use of so inconvenient a place as the cinema whose only advantage is the darkness, but which allows only of a more or less furtive petting, vividly illustrates the difficulties in our society. Anyone who reads the *News of the World*, and many must be adolescents, knows that it is a criminal offence to make love with a girl under sixteen years. Such girls are regarded as being "in need of protection"—an elegant way of saying 'the remand home and reform school. It is a relief to return to Malinowski and the Trobriand Islanders whom he so unreasonably calls "savages".

"It is necessary to add that the places used for love-making differ at this stage from those of the previous one. The small children carry on their sexual practices surreptitiously in bush or grove as a part of their games, using all sorts of makeshift arrangements to attain privacy, but the adolescent has either a couch of his own in the bachelor's house, or the use of a hut belonging to one of his unmarried relatives. In a certain type of yam-house [a house for storing food.—J.H.] too, there is an empty closed-in space in which boys sometimes arrange little 'cosy-corners', affording room for two. In these, they make a bed of dry leaves and mats, and thus obtain a comfortable *garçonnière*, where they can meet and spend a happy hour or two with their loves. Such arrangements are, of course, necessary now that amorous intercourse has become a passion instead of a game.

"It is obvious that the lasting liaisons of youth and adult girls require some

3. Rewards & Ambition

Mr. Lewis Spence, writing in the *Scottish Daily Mail* (27/8/51), says:

"If any theme seems to have grown unpopular in working-class circles in Scotland these days, it is that which used to be known as the "from log-cabin to White House" story—the tale of the enterprising and enthusiastic youth who, by dint of hard work and organising genius, came to the top of the tree.

"Working-class philosophy has, of late years, formulated the opinion that it is not in the interests of its solidarity that a man should accept promotion, which implies 'going over to the enemy' and exclusion from the fellowship of one's class.

"Moreover, they demand that work for which little technical preparation is required in some cases should be remunerated at much the same rate as that which the professional man receives after years of a gruelling and onerous apprenticeship, during which he is unpaid and has to subject himself to mental tests and strains which the average industrial worker never has to face and would regard as 'slavery'.

"By what arguments do the disgruntled seek to justify such a contention? Thousands of their own class have embraced the opportunities presented by increased educational facilities and have succeeded in breaking into the well-paid professions. Are these overpaid favourites of fortune?"

"In a long experience of life I have never yet known of a man who was diligent in his business, whatever it may have been, who did not succeed. In plain words, if he gave his whole heart and mind to his job and used average intelligence and industry in its prosecution, there is no power on earth which can retard him from promotion and success.

"And this is true despite the political conditions under which such a man may exist, whether they be Liberal, Fascist, Conservative, Socialist or Communist. No State of any kind could possibly exist, much less thrive, in which the workers as a whole refused to co-operate with the governing power. Ask Joseph Stalin, ask Clement Attlee, ask Winston Churchill. On that point they would be unanimous.

"No, the rule reads: the person with specialised knowledge is more valuable to the State and to humanity than the man who has little or none. He will thus, naturally, cost the community more. If you wish for a better standard of living, master your job, know it thoroughly and become pre-eminent in it and you will, in the long run, certainly enjoy the success which your efforts deserve.

"But if you are disgruntled, unenthusiastic or suffering from lack of ambition, you will remain as you are.

That is not a law designed by any system. It is the law of nature."

Continued on p. 4

special institution, more definitely established, more physically comfortable, and at the same time having the approval of custom. To meet this need, tribal custom and etiquette offer accommodation and privacy in the form of the *bukumatula*, the bachelor's and unmarried girls' house. . . . In this a limited number of couples, some two, three, or four, live for longer or shorter periods together in a temporary community. It also and incidentally offers shelter for younger couples if they want amorous privacy for an hour or two."

What Vocabulary Reveals

By now, the reader will be glad to excuse me from making the comparison or rather, the contrast, with our own, supposedly civilised, society. Instead, I will point to an aspect which might otherwise be unregarded, but which is also illuminating in regard to ourselves. This is the obvious difficulty which besets Malinowski in his search for words to describe the sexual lives of the islanders. He is at pains to stress their freedom and naturalness, yet he has to use words like "amours" and, still more frequently "intrigues"; both words carry the implication for our ears of *illicit* love. The fact is that we do not have words to describe an innocent and natural love relationship, so long has a natural attitude been repressed.

An instance of the same revealing kind arises when Malinowski comes to describe the act of sex itself, for in describing the difficulty he unconsciously reveals the European's negative attitude. "When the natives wish to indicate the *crude, physiological fact*" [without, that is, any moral overtones—the italics are mine.—J.H.] he writes, "they use the word *kayta*, translatable, though pedantically, by the verb 'copulate with'." Now there is another, briefer word which would also do; but, once again, the associations of this word, in our society, are unpleasant and reflect the smut and repression with which we surround sex. The context in which the word *kayta* is used by the natives (see the quotations in the last article) show quite clearly that for them it has no such overtones, nor would they regard intercourse as a crude, physiological fact. In this respect the Trobrianders are considerably more delicate than European society, and even so valuable an ethnographer as Malinowski cannot escape the vulgarity of language which centuries of sex-negation imposes.

J.H.

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

Contemporary British Art

Herbert Read 3/6
A new *Pelican* with 70 black and white and 6 coloured plates.

The Meaning of Art Herbert Read 3/6
"The best pocket introduction to the understanding of art that has ever been published."—*Star*.

Social Development in Young Children Susan Isaacs 9/6
An abridged edition for students and parents.

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

THE AGE OF SPEED

WHEN one reads, for example, De Quincey's account of the English stage coach, one is transported into another world. Before the railways, it took days to cross England where now it takes hours, and for the travellers the journey was rich in impressions and experience. In achieving this speed in travel, it is not difficult to see what we have lost both as regards the discomforts and the events of a journey: it is much less clear what we have gained.

We have gained time. Recently aeroplanes have crossed the Atlantic and reached the Far East in absurdly short times and we take it for granted that this represents solid achievement. But if one asks just what in real terms one has gained one is asking one of the awkward questions of the age. There is a tale of a Chinese sage who was told that the record for the hundred yards had been lowered by a tenth of a second. "And what," he asked, "is the winner going to do with the time gained?"

Time, it is said, is money. Speed is a sought after abstraction not merely in travel but in industry, where increased speed in production per worker per hour is continually pressed for. It is easy to "understand" the economists' argument that a speed-up reduces production costs and confers advantages in the constant struggle for markets. But where does this process stop?

Such a question in our age is naïve. But from merely a practical point of view it is not irrelevant. The speed-up in the mines has increased the dust that kills by silicosis. Speed and safety are seldom fully compatible. Everyone knows that piece-workers remove the safeguards which slow up work and so decrease the wage-pocket; that piece-work is itself simply a demand for speed. In "Modern Times", Charlie Chaplin set the production belt in a comical, a ludicrous perspective. But his satire was directed at the age of speed. Where does the continuous acceleration stop?

But speed is not confined to industrial processes. Its desirability is not questioned in every walk of life. The Red Indian children who confounded the intelligence testers simply taking their time over the problems set them instead of competing for who could do them in the shortest time (FREEDOM, 25/8/51) exposed the unconscious attitudes of civilisation. One must save time! But for what? Why must one hurry? It is not difficult to see that we are hurrying away from something, from life itself. For in our age of anxiety scientists ponder the practicability of space-travel but almost no one is happy. A feverish concern for haste serves to divert us from the sense of emptiness in life.

Millions of people all over the world lack the bare necessities of life, but we have no time to consider such problems. Unhappiness is almost universal, but we can't stop now to consider that, we must hurry on . . .

But mankind's vision of the Golden Age has always pictured leisure and ease and quietness. Meanwhile, we live in the Age of Speed, the Age of Anxiety.

Alexander the Great (Optimist)

THE reappearance of the redoubtable Mr. Kerensky in the headlines has some significance, more perhaps for this side of the Iron Curtain than the other. Despite the curious feeling one gets at learning that Alexander Kerensky is still alive and even at recognising that he is a real person and not just an Aunt Sally of the Marxist textbooks ("At the point in a revolution when a Kerensky-type Government arises . . . in the last analysis . . ."), he is, of course, at seventy years of age not a very old man as politicians go.

Prior to the Revolution, Kerensky was one of the able young lawyers of the Social-Democratic movement, and the man selected as Prime Minister of the short-lived Republic of 1917. In a few months the return of other intellectual lights eclipsed Kerensky, and the coup of Lenin and Trotsky ousted him from Russia. Ever since, if his movement inside Russia has dwindled and been decimated to nothing whatever, Kerensky has been always (one would think) sitting in his hotel bedroom with his bags packed waiting for the telegram to tell him to come home. At every crisis he has announced that the moment is at hand, and the one consolation that might have been afforded him in its long-put-off arrival has been the fact that all the gentlemen concerned in the putsch that put an end to his few months of office have either died a natural death or perished at the hands of the monster they created.

And now there appears (from the "practical political" point of view, which never seems fortunately—to succeed in practice) no alternative but Kerensky. The hopes of the Romanovs are not impossible of fulfilment—neither, perhaps, are those of the Stuarts—but the conduct of that house and its followers, so arrogant in victory and craven in defeat, has brought it to the stage where its pretensions are a comic opera joke. It may be that by way of light relief after the tragedy of Stalinism and war the Romanov clowns may waddle across the stage (as Heine said of the Bourbons in a similar position). But though such an absurdity could happen—and may certainly be trotted out as a war-time diversion just to keep attention away from the main issues (as was the restoration of the Hohenzollerns or all that Vansittart business during the last war)—there is really no doubt the hard-headed men who control the destinies of America would not throw away their dollars on the Imperial Court tomfoolery.

For the whole point of the Kerensky movement is that it is a straw in the wind not to the way Russia is blowing (his connections with underground Russia ceased years ago, for although Social-Democrats still exist there, illegally in Russia, openly in the camps of Siberia, as do the other anti-Stalinist groupings, any question of co-ordination with the outside is extremely remote), but to the way America is blowing. Kerensky is seeking the support of the powerful Russian-American organisations for his propaganda directed from Munich to Russia. This may perhaps affect a few soldiers in the Russian Zone of Germany (not so much the propaganda as the chance of escape) but even more will it affect the U.S. policy-makers.

In the twenties the capitalist world hoped for the restoration of the Tsar, and poured away wealth into the attempts of the Whites to succeed. Our Mr. Churchill was somewhat frustrated in his ambitions in that direction (as he no doubt came to welcome, since otherwise he might never have had those magnificent receptions in Moscow where he was treated like a sprig of the Bolshevik aristocracy). They have come to appreciate reality and now no longer make attempts at the overthrow of Bolshevism. In the propaganda which is poured out regardless of cost even by impoverished Britain, no cue, no direction, no suggestion, is made to the Russian people as to what they should do about it. Mr. Morrison may say it would be very nice if they had a Parliamentary opposition, the U.S. radio may tell them how wonderful is the American way of life with television in every bedroom, but as to what they should do about it or how they should get such luxuries remains a mystery.

But not a mystery, of course, to Mr. Kerensky in his hotel bedroom, who has no doubts about the answer and is still waiting for the telegram. Only now it is becoming clear to him that the telegram will have to be sent by the American Commander-in-Chief. And that is the whole secret of this propaganda. The Russians should be used by now to the re-importation of lawyers to control their destinies but, of course, there is no guarantee whatsoever that the second Kerensky government would be any more successful than the first, still less if a mere façade backed by foreign bayonets.

After so much that they have endured the Russians may be able to bear Kerensky again, too, but at any weaken-

ing of the Stalin régime the prison camps would be open and there are many seasoned revolutionaries, tried and experienced, who would soon demonstrate a better way to the workers and peasants of Russia who, in spite of all the indoctrination of thirty years, may yet show the startled Comrades of the outside world in our lifetime how false was the exterior show of the Kremlin.

No doubt, if the Kerensky propaganda succeeds and Alexander the Great Optimist is recognised as the legitimate heir to all the Russias, the approach of the Western Powers to Russia may crystal- lise, and in the event of war post-war plans for the alteration of the Stalin régime may ensue. But naturally these plans are based on the supposition of victory, and preparations for war always leave for the not very important persons one terrible uncertainty—namely, what is going to happen in the event of defeat? They enjoy curdling our blood with what will happen in the event of defeat, and tell us that is why we must support the war. However, defeat is always a military possibility, and it seems more logical to know what we should do when "the captains and the kings depart".

That is one more reason why as revolutionaries we are not concerned with military preparations but with our revolutionary task. In the event of victory, there is not much we can do except give

all help in our power to the movements that arise in the defeated countries. In the event of defeat, we have the task of resistance on the same lines as we offer to our national oppressors; a task which may require more intensity if the degree of oppression intensifies. In this as anarchists we have a particular task: even Mr. Churchill has granted that the last movement in Russia to withstand Bolshevism was the Anarchist movement. If there is to be any social revolution in Russia, it can only take an anarchist direction; it is only the anarchists who have withstood Bolshevism to the gates of Siberia in Russia, and likewise in countries such as Rumania and Bulgaria. In Bulgaria the fight against overwhelming odds is an epic of the post-war period: the anarchist movement, a small enough section of the working-class, has made a stand against Bolshevism that may yet crack the edifice wide open. The other opponents of Stalinism may worship power and transfer their allegiance from Trotsky or Zinoviev or Kerensky (or any other of the lawyers so completely out of touch with the real Russia) to Tito, the Man of the Moment. The anarchist movement keeps alive the spirit of resistance because it believes in freedom.

We may yet be fighting an underground struggle against Stalinist domination. In it we know we have sure allies within that country itself, which would not welcome the assistance of the armed forces of any other Government.

INTERNATIONALIST.

Letter from Paris

FRANCE'S MAN OF DESTINY

"I demand above all that nothing more should be said about me. I have suffered too much and justice has been so distorted because of the unjust and prejudicial publicity given to my case. I fear that people will still try to do me harm without reason. My good name has been ruined. I ask all the world to leave me and my family in peace."

(Signed) JOANOVICI, 23/8/51.

HERE, in brief, is the story of the Joanovici affair, wrangled over two years ago, by the Court of Justice in Paris.

From 1941 to 1944, the R.A.F. supplied the French resistance network with three things: papers, money and arms. The money was always useful; the papers were easily destroyed in an emergency; there remained the arms—dangerously conclusive evidence, and often very hard to conceal.

It was then that there appeared, provisionally, an illiterate rag-picker, the Lithuanian-Jewish Soviet citizen (as he then was) Joanovici, known as Monsieur Joseph—under the protection of his embassy. For three years he bought explosives and arms from the resistance as old iron, and sold them in fact to the Wehrmacht at an honest profit. His discretion and his generosity brought him solid friendships in both camps, and a fortune estimated at more than a thousand million Pétain francs (almost ten thousand million francs in today's currency). He made use of various police forces—and his own personal police—to liquidate those who stood in his way, or who engaged "illicitly" in his own occupation. In exchange, he "rendered services" to them all in every way, and kept an open table of Roman magnificence in a time of scarcity.

When the liberation of Paris was approaching, the Surete Nationale and the Police Judiciaire of the capital, who had until then been completely "collaborationist", found the means of "saving their honour". The only way for the

efforts to save their jobs and their skins, was evidently to "go into the streets" to demonstrate their patriotism under the aegis of the Communist Party and its affiliated organisation, *Honneur de la Police*. But arms, at this precise moment were lacking—one can understand why. Monsieur Joseph, also affected by resistance fervour, procured for the "liberators of Paris" the material for a phoney insurrection, in which a sufficient number of Parisians futilely perished.

Later, unjustly troubled for his activities as double-crosser, informer, plunderer and murderer, the patriot Joano was warned in time by the Communist, Inspector Piednoir, of his instructions to arrest him. He was stand-offish at first and then negotiated, as between great powers, with the government of the Fourth Republic. His conditional surrender was ratified by a term of five years' imprisonment and a fine of a hundred million francs.

In point of fact, he has just left the *Santé* where he enjoyed princely attentions, after two years of gilt-edged captivity. Stateless, rejected and undesirable, Monsieur Joseph will be, by special favour, authorised to honour French territory with his presence—and has been assigned to the district of Lozère, where the climate has been recommended to him as particularly salubrious.

Has the illiterate Joano learnt to write in prison? Or did he merely dictate the message—at the same time menacing and tearful—which he had addressed to public opinion? Everyone in France knows that the régime is trembling from top to bottom, in case this old-iron millionaire should publish his "memoirs" or have them published for him. All the parties are in the hands of this man. That, no doubt is the secret of his good luck.

May God keep him with us for a long time—the man of the century, the symbol of our epoch, and of the institutions which govern us!

A.P.

Foreign Commentary

THE KOREAN TRAGEDY

Continued from p. 1

For Korean reconstruction, a fraction of the sum the United States has given Europe for the purpose of building up its armies, and irony of ironies, UNESCO have voted \$100,000 (about £34,000) for educational reconstruction "with authorisation for a large overdraft". It will certainly have to be a large overdraft if anything effective is to be done? According to UNESCO, one-fifth of the school buildings have been destroyed and the remainder much damaged by military use. The Communists are alleged to have destroyed as far as possible existing text books (which may have been a good thing) while the Library of the National University has suffered irreparable losses since soldiers were quartered in it and used books and archives as fuel to keep themselves warm. And 60 per cent. of the teachers are reported to have been killed or carried off so that in the primary schools only about a quarter of the required staff is now available.

WHEN one faces up to the conditions under which millions of people are existing to-day in Korean, and add to

the conditions of permanent semi-starvation in which millions of Indians and Africans live those few years between birth and death, and the millions who actually die of starvation or disease—when one faces up to these terrible realities, how bogus does all the fine talk about democracy and freedom sound coming from well-fed successful intellectuals comfortably installed in their centrally heated apartments, with all the latest gadgets within reach! For them, obviously, there is a difference between Stalinism and the American way of life. It is worth fighting and dying for—especially when one is over military age or a general in the army for psychological warfare; when one's gun is the microphone and the other one's battlefield.

To those hungry millions, to those homeless and destitute refugees, they are meaningless phrases as insulting to their intelligence and dignity as human beings as that remark made to fellow sufferers in days gone by, that if they hadn't bread they could eat cake. But the author of those words lost her head!

LIBERTARIAN.

LIVES SACRIFICED TO MILITARY ETIQUETTE IN KOREA

THE current "peace" negotiations in Korea would be grimly humorous were it not for the fact that the lives of men, women and children are involved. The sad truth is that the posturing and palaver of the military popinjays on both sides must be paid for in human lives. Each hour that passes without a cease-fire means more useless bloodshed and destruction, and if the cost was only a single life or a single Korean worker's home destroyed, it would not be worth it.

The touch of dignity of the big brass now carrying on the "negotiations" points up not only the fact that they have the mentality of spoiled children, but also the more significant and sinister truth that these gentry are extremely reluctant to stop plying their trade under any circumstances.

The spectacle of the generals of both sides breaking off the "peace" negotiations in a huff because they fancied themselves insulted in some manner, or at least not accorded the respect they thought proper, may look to some like commendable zeal and military dignity, and it certainly has been played up as such in the press reports.

But to those who can think objectively about the matter at all it will appear for what it is—strutting antics based upon a basic desire to continue the senseless slaughter.

One statement can be made with complete confidence in its absolute

PASSPORT REFUSED

When Mr. Ali Naidoo, stated to be a leading member of the Indian community in South Africa, was prosecuted in London last week for stowing away on a ship bound from Durban for Britain, the defending solicitor said that Mr. Naidoo had been asked to act as an adviser before the United Nations on the conditions of Indians in South Africa. When he returned to South Africa his passport was taken away from him and he was told that if he wished to leave the country again he would have to make application for the passport.

When application was made, both he and his wife were refused their passports.

We learn from South African visitors that this case is by no means exceptional.

factuality—there never has been a time in history when the generals really wanted to end a war so long as there was any possibility whatever to continue it. There never has been a time when they did not strut, posture, and spew forth belligerent bombast as long as they could induce a single soldier to shoulder a rifle and go to the front. There never has been a time when they actually wanted the shooting to stop, except on those occasions when things were so bad that they felt there might be grave personal danger in continuing.

The generals in Korea on both sides are faithfully following the stereotyped pattern. They are reiterating emphatically, as all generals have at all previous times, their love of peace, while at the same time they are doing everything they can to keep the war going. With them, when the shooting stops, it is a case of "Othello's occupation gone," and it doesn't take a particularly perspicacious person to see it.

And with it all they cannot help but reveal the meagre quality of their minds. Their dominant characteristic is vanity; and running vanity a close second is bloodthirstiness. It is a sad day for any nation when it begins to put its trust in the military. By and large, they are as stupid, as unwarrantedly egotistical and as crassly brutal a lot as can be found.

It should be born in mind, too, that they are always ready to shoot down unarmed strikers, "subversives," and non-conformists at the drop of a hat. They don't even have the virtue of desiring a good contest, but much prefer to butcher in droves an "enemy" which is not equipped to fight on anything like even terms.

If the negotiations for peace in Korea were in the hands of those who actually have to suffer from the war, it is a certainty that they would not be delayed a second by peacock swaggering and ill-founded demands for formal respect. These vicious and little-minded characters think that homage to them and military etiquette is more important than the lives of useful men and women, and the sooner they are totally removed from the scene the better it will be for the really productive and useful members of mankind throughout the world.

—Industrial Worker (Chicago).

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS
WORKERS' MILITIAS

Anarchist Summer School 1951

THE Anarchist Summer School for 1951 (the sixth) was held at Glasgow over the weekend of August 25-26. Some forty comrades from various parts of the country attended the lectures on the Saturday afternoon and Sunday, and on Sunday evening a large meeting was held in the Central Halls.

Eddie Shaw spoke on Saturday afternoon, on "Anarchism and the Ego." "We've got Z-men, G-men, Frog-men and Yes-men," said Eddie. "What we now want is some Own-men." And he went on to expound, with his usual wit and good humour, the egoism of Max Stirner—or rather, the egoism of Eddie Shaw.

On Sunday morning, Tony Gibson spoke on "Anarchism and Resistance to War." He discussed the rôle Britain was playing at the moment, and the means by which the individual could avoid the fate which the lunacy of the politicians was preparing for us all. He also

countered the arguments which many comrades are putting forward in favour of emigration.

On Sunday afternoon, Jimmy Raeside was to have spoken, but was prevented from doing so by family matters, so Philip Sansom led a discussion on "Anarchism Today." He mentioned how the end of the war in 1945 had seen a re-emergence of Anarchist movements in the countries which had suffered dictatorship and occupation, and discussed the work done by non-anarchists in other fields which backed up the Anarchist case.

On Sunday evening, an audience of about 300 workers attended a public meeting in the Central Halls, Jane Strachan took the chair and introduced John Gaffney, Philip Sansom and Eddie Shaw, who all forcefully ramméd home the Anarchist point of view on current affairs. They all stressed the importance of

the workers, and how the ruling class depended on them for all their power.

The audience were appreciative and enthusiastic, and the meeting was a very encouraging ending to the week-end.

On Monday, several comrades went to spend a week amid the Scottish Lochs, at Garelochhead. The weather throughout the week-end was not too good, but the comradeship and hospitality of the Glasgow comrades more than compensated for that, and once again our Summer School proved stimulating and a valuable event in the life of the movement in Britain.

Rewards of Labour

Continued from p. 2

4. Rewards & Status

In an article in the architectural students' journal *Plan* (No. 8, 1950), an anthropologist, Bill Watson, reports on a two-year study of a Scottish mining community, of which he says:

"The most 'intelligent', that is socially ambitious, families now send their sons and daughters into non-mining activities, and the pits are getting the indifferent and unambitious residue. . . . In fact, there has grown up a carefully graded scale of job-desirability which is now universally accepted among the people. . . . At the lower end of this scale is casual labour, at the other end such occupations as teaching and medicine. Mining is not very far from the bottom of this scale in spite of the present high wages that can be earned by a minority of miners. For together with the scale of job-desirability goes the notion of status, and although people believe that high status confers material rewards, it does not follow that plenty of money gives you high status. This is a most important distinction. For example, many school teachers at present earn much less than the highest-paid among the miners. But because the teacher has high status and the miner low, teachers feel extremely bitter about this seemingly contradictory difference in wages. And in reverse, the miner refuses to believe that anyone with a higher-status job than his own can have poorer circumstances than himself.

"Miner and teacher, shop-assistant and factory worker, clerk and steel-worker, all live in identical houses; their children attend the same schools; their wives buy in the same shops. But behind this egalitarian façade is a never-ending struggle for status, as intense as ever. . . . No daughter of a status-seeking miner works in a factory, although as a clerk she earns 25/- a week while the factory girl earns £2/10/0. And no miner's son who has reached the fourth year of secondary education will work in the pit except as a surveyor or tradesman, or in the office as a clerk. As the miners in Haven have narrowed the material difference between themselves and what are called the middle-classes, they have taken over the middle-class ethic."

5. No Rewards but Human Rights

Peter Kropotkin in his essay on *The Wage System*, first published in book form as a chapter in *The Conquest of Bread* (1888), says:

"Service rendered to society, be it labour in factory or field, or moral service, cannot be valued in monetary units. There cannot be an exact measure of its value, either of what has been improperly called its 'value in exchange' or of its value in use. If we see two individuals, both working for years, for five hours daily, for the community, at two different occupations equally pleasing to them, we can say that, taken all in all, their labours are roughly equivalent. But their work could not be broken up into fractions, so that the product of each day, each hour or each minute of the labour of one should be worth the produce of each minute and each hour of that of the other.

"Broadly speaking, we can say that a man who during his whole life deprives himself of leisure for ten hours daily has given much more to society than he who has deprived himself of but five hours a day, or has not deprived himself of any leisure at all. But we cannot take what one man has done during any two

hours and say that his produce is worth exactly twice as much as the produce of one hour's work from another individual, and reward each proportionately. To do this would be to ignore all that is complex in the industry, the agriculture, the entire life of society as it is; it would be to ignore the extent to which all individual work is the outcome of the former and present labours of society as a whole. It would be to fancy oneself in the Stone Age, when we are living in the Age of Steel.

"Go into a coal mine and see the man stationed at the huge machine that hoists and lowers the cage. In his hands he holds a lever whereby to check or reverse the action of the machinery. He lowers the handle, and in a second the cage changes the direction of its giddy rush up or down the shaft. His eyes are attentively fixed upon an indicator in front of him which shows exactly the point the cage has reached; no sooner does it touch the given level than at his gentlest pressure it stops dead short, not a foot above or below the required place. And scarcely are the full trucks discharged or the empties loaded before, at a touch to the handle, the cage is again swinging up or down the shaft.

"For eight or ten hours at a time he thus concentrates his attention. Let his brain relax but for an instant, and the cage would fly up and shatter the wheels, break the rope, crush the men, bring all the work of the mine to a standstill. Let him lose three seconds upon each reverse of the lever and, in a mine with all the modern improvements, the output will be reduced by from twenty to fifty tons a day.

"Is it he who renders the greatest service in the mine? Or is it, perhaps, the boy who rings from below the signal for the mounting of the cage? Or is it the miner who risks his life every moment in the depths of the mine and will end one day by being killed by fire-damp? Or, again, the engineer, who would lose the coal seam and set men hewing bare rock? Or, finally, is it the owner who has put all his patrimony into the concern, and who perhaps has said, in opposition to all previous anticipations: "Dig there, you will find excellent coal?"

"All the workers engaged in the mine contribute to the raising of coal in proportion to their strength, their energy, their knowledge, their intelligence and their skill. And we can say that all have the right to live, to satisfy their needs, and even gratify their whims, after the more imperative needs of everyone are satisfied. But how can we value exactly what they have each done?

"Further, is the coal that they have extracted entirely the result of their work? Is it not also the outcome of the work of the men who constructed the railway leading to the mine, and the roads branching off on all sides from the stations? And what of the work of those who have tilled and sown the fields which supply the miners with food, smelted the iron, cut the wood in the forest, made the machines which will consume the coal, and so on?

"No hard and fast line can be drawn between the work of one and the work of another. To measure them by results leads to absurdity. To divide them into fractions and measure them by hours of labour leads to absurdity also. One course remains: not to measure them at all, but to recognise the right of all who take part in productive labour first of all to live, and then to enjoy the comforts of life."

A PENNY A LIFE SAVED

The sum of two guineas was awarded at Grantham yesterday to Driver E. Walton (64), of Robertson Road, Grantham, who was driving the Heart of Midlothian, Edinburgh-to-Kings Cross express, on July 5th. Near Peterborough the train, with five hundred passengers was negotiating a curve at 50 m.p.h. under a bridge with the signals in its favour when the crew saw a fish train ahead on the same line. By prompt action Mr. Walton stopped the express with a little more than a dozen yards to spare.

Manchester Guardian, 25/8/51.

That amounts to a penny per passenger.

If this is the kind of treatment they can expect, no wonder the staff are discontented and inclined to leave the railways.

In view of the responsibility they bear, drivers are poorly paid at best. But that is no excuse for treating them like children who get a penny for being good. A putty medal would be better than a pittance when rewards are called for. At least it would not mark down merit.

News Chronicle, 25/8/51.

FREEDOM PRESS

- ERRICO MALATESTA :**
Anarchy. 6d.
Vote—What For? 1d.
- M. BAKUNIN :**
Marxism, Freedom and the State. paper 2s. 6d., cloth 5s.
- HERBERT READ :**
Art and the Evolution of Man. 4s.
Existentialism, Marxism and Anarchism. 3s. 6d.
Poetry and Anarchism. cloth 5s., paper 2s. 6d.
The Philosophy of Anarchism. boards 2s. 6d., paper 1s.
The Education of Free Men. 1s.
- ALEX COMFORT :**
Barbarism & Sexual Freedom. paper 2s. 6d., stiff boards 3s. 6d.
- RUDOLF ROCKER :**
Nationalism and Culture. cloth 21s.
- ALEXANDER BERKMAN :**
ABC of Anarchism. 1s.
- PETER KROPOTKIN :**
The State: Its Historic Role. 1s.
The Wage System. 3d.
Revolutionary Government. 3d.
Organised Vengeance Called Justice. 2d.
- JOHN HEWETSON :**
Ill-Health, Poverty and the State. cloth 2s. 6d., paper 1s.
Italy After Mussolini. 6d.
- M. L. BERNERI :**
Workers in Stalin's Russia. 1s.
- GEORGE WOODCOCK :**
Anarchy or Chaos. 2s. 6d.
New Life to the Land. 6d.
Railways and Society. 3d.
Homes orhovels? 6d.
What is Anarchism? 1d.
The Basis of Communal Living. 1s.
- WILLIAM GODWIN :**
Selections from Political Justice. 3d.
On Law. 1d.
- 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 16s. (U.S.A. \$2.50)
- ★
K. J. KENAFICK :
Michael Bakunin and Karl Marx. Paper 6s.
- 27, Red Lion Street, London, W.C.1.**

AS an anarchist (and therefore pacifist) I should like to add my criticisms of Philip Sansom's support of workers' militias to those of M.A. of Minneapolis.

The suggestion of the use of workers' militias must have behind it the idea of defeating by force people who do not want to be subjected to the principles and beliefs of those who constitute these workers' militias. A workers' militia cannot be formed by people other than those who wish to force their ideas upon others.

Philip Sansom suggests that at the time the workers take over the factories, there may be soldiers who will remain "True to the colours" and endeavour to expel the workers from these factories. This means that there may be people (the soldiers) who believe that they will benefit by removing the workers from the factories, even be it that they are short-sighted enough to believe that the pay they receive is sufficient benefit.

Anarchism cannot be forced upon people. Anarchism imposed is not anarchism at all but despotism—neither can anarchism exist where there are people prepared to use force to replace anarchism by a system alien to it. Anarchism cannot exist until even the capitalist realises that the System by which he imagines he benefits, is the factor which prevents him from being free!

Despite P.S.'s arguments to prove that workers' militias (decentralised mobile forces) are the most efficient organisations for waging war, never in history have they brought about Anarchism.

The supposed need of workers' militias indicates that the time is not ripe for anarchism. Workers' militias must use force or they are not militias—to use force is to impose one's will—to impose one's will is not anarchism. Workers' militias must wield power to be effective as militias, and power corrupts. . . .

Anarchism can never be brought about by force. Only by the enlightenment of people, all people, will mankind be free. Hoddesden, Herts. R. WHEELER.

Philip Sansom replies :

I wonder how much progress—in any field of human activity—would have been made if progressive and advanced thinkers had always waited to convince even the most reactionary before putting their ideas into operation?

Surely the point about workers' militias is that they are formed to prevent someone from imposing his will by force. But if we accept the pacifist argument, then even occupying the factories peacefully is "imposing our will". We must patiently explain to our bosses how they are exploiting us (as if they don't know already!) and then wait for them, conscience-stricken, to invite us to take over. This will ensure that we are always in the "right" morally—but will always remain dominated by the will of others.

I did not try to prove that workers' militias are the most effective organisations for waging war. I tried to show that they are effective means for defending a social revolution from reactionary violence. The only pacifist defence is sweet reason, but it is surely clear that he who serves the State has thrown away his reason, and although I have some confidence in my ability to debate anarchism, I don't fancy my chances when a Fascist, or Communist or any other servile or patriotic tool of the State is coming at me with a bayonet.

Neither have I tried to prove that workers' militias would bring about anarchism. The social revolution means social reconstruction, and as far as I am concerned anybody who does not want to join in it is perfectly free to go his own way—as individualist peasants were able to do in Spain while the majority were collectivising the land. But will the remnants of authority allow us to go our own way? Not until they are all persuaded, says Mr. Wheeler. But surely persuasion is a form of imposing your will?

And like this the argument could go on for ever—and so would your job of persuading the capitalists!

Re-Reading David Copperfield

THE life story of *David Copperfield*, which has intimate relation to that of the author himself, is now running as a serial on the radio. This has enticed me to take up the book once more to renew my earlier acquaintance with its intertwined humorous and tragic events. The following illuminating passages are to be found respectively in Chapters 43 and 48:

(1) "Once again, let me pause upon a memorable period of my life. Let me stand aside to see the phantoms of those days go by me, accompanying the shadow of myself in dim procession. . . . I have come legally to man's estate. I have attained the dignity of twenty-one. I have tamed that savage stenographic mystery. I make a respectable income by it, and I am joined by eleven others in reporting the debates in Parliament for a morning newspaper. Night after night, I record predictions that never come to pass, professions that are never fulfilled, explanations that are only meant to mystify. I wallow in words. Britannia, that unfortunate female, is always before me like a trussed fowl, skewered through and through with office pens and bound hand and foot with red tape. I am sufficiently behind the scenes to know the worth of political life. I am quite an

infidel about it and shall never be converted."

(2) "Having some foundation for believing by this time that nature and accident had made me an author, I pursued my vocation with confidence. . . . I had been writing in the newspaper and elsewhere so prosperously that when my new success was achieved I considered myself reasonably entitled to escape from the dreary debates. One joyful night, therefore, I noted down the music of the parliamentary bagpipes for the last time, and I have never heard it since, though I still recognise the old drone in the newspapers, without any substantial variation (except, perhaps, that there is more of it) all the livelong session." Argyll. H.T.D.

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

- LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP**
OPEN-AIR MEETINGS at HYDE PARK
Every Sunday at 3.30 p.m.
- NORTH-EAST LONDON DISCUSSION MEETINGS IN EAST HAM**
at 7.30
SEPT. 19—Edgar Priddy
THE ABC OF ANARCHISM
Enquiries c/o Freedom Press
- SOUTH LONDON**
Meetings suspended for the time being. Readers interested in possible future activities, please contact S. E. Parker, c/o Freedom Press.
- GLASGOW**
OUTDOOR MEETINGS at MAXWELL STREET
Every Sunday at 7 p.m.
With John Gaffney, Frank Leech, Jimmy Raeside, Eddie Shaw

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