

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

Look Out For Wage Cuts

THESE are suspicious times, and perhaps anarchists will not be regarded as ungenerous if they look on Mr. Churchill's cabinet salary cuts with a rather narrow eye. It is obvious enough that "the people" (that newspaper-reading abstraction) are meant to reflect "the Labour Party never did anything like that" and so feel warm to Tory public spiritedness. In fairness to the Labour Party it must be pointed out that in these days of steeply graded income tax such "cuts" are rather easier to Ministers with other sources of income—as most Tories must have. What are the real cuts, in fact?

We snarling anarchists did not have to do this piece of financial arithmetic ourselves: the *Manchester Guardian* (and, no doubt, other small circulation papers) did it for us. "The reduction in Ministerial salaries may be an omen as well as a gesture," they write, "but it is unlikely to cause hardship. By the nominal surrender of £1,000, a Minister gives up in fact about £300—even assuming, improbably, that his salary is his only income. . . . For the lucky ones, who pay 19s. 6d. in the pound anyway, the sacrifice amounts to £25, which is no overwhelming payment for a noble gesture."

Twenty-five (or even three hundred) pounds is certainly a cheap price for a piece of political advantage, and, as we have suggested, the Tories are probably in a better position to get it cheap than the Labour Ministers with their (supposedly) smaller private incomes. We may be pardoned for turning our noses away from a cheap political trick, which has the familiar political smell, and—as is now usual—insults the intelligence of the men and women of this country. No doubt Mr. Churchill counts on the workers' ignorance of the intricacies of surtax.

For those Labourite socialists, however, it is well to point out another aspect which this juggling brings to light. The *Manchester Guardian* points out that senior Ministerial salaries have been £5,000 for 120 years, since 1831. And,

calculating the cost of living as being to-day about three times what it was then, the equivalent net salary would be £15,000. "In order to have such a net income to-day a married man with two children would have to earn (it is the *M.G.*'s word, not ours) £462,000 a year."

The point here, surely, is that in recent

times the rich have substantially lost their former extravagant spending power. Much of the propaganda of the early socialists has lost its force, and that particular aspect of capitalism considerably modified. The Labour Party make great claims about the "levelling out" of incomes and take credit for it. Is it not time to see that the position of the bulk of men and women who make up the working class has not been substantially altered by this wearing down of the extravagant income inequalities of capitalism. Are not the anarchists right in saying that it is the structure and direction of society and economy that must be changed, and that the reformist mitigation of the effects of capitalism is quite insufficient.

"An omen as well as a gesture," wrote the *Manchester Guardian*. It is pointed out that Ministerial salaries were last

cut during 1931. Workers with long memories may remember what followed—the Means Test and the years of extreme poverty. We do not suppose that the Tory Government would ever re-introduce legislation so hated as the Means Test and all that went with it. But we may expect that wage cuts will follow, and that their own gesture is intended to prepare the way.

Wage cutting seems particularly likely since the Ministry of Labour reports an excess of jobs over men to fill them—a situation which in the ordinary way would result in wages rising. The situation is paralleled by the early days of the war when in a similar situation of labour shortage the Essential Work Order prevented mobility of labour and hence the rise in wages. It seems likely, therefore, that we may look out for wage cuts.

The T.U.C. and the Tories

WHEN the Labour Party came to power in 1945 with its overwhelming majority, such was the optimism of millions of workers that they thought a new era of well-being was about to be ushered in.

But when the reality dawned on them (it didn't take long) and they realised that they would have to fight for improvements just the same as they had under previous governments, the trade unions came out with the cry, "Don't embarrass our Government."

"Our government," you notice, implying that there is a difference between "our" government and "their" government. And that is exactly what the T.U.C. wanted us to think. Before 1945 it had been "their" government, the Tories' government, the upper class's government, but with the election won by the Labour Party, it became "our" government, the Labour government the workers' government.

That was their story, and in spite of much frustration, discontent and misgiving, the workers on the whole refrained from "embarrassing" the government.

Labour Party and T.U. spokesmen often pointed out the great difference between the number of working days lost through disputes just after the first World War, and those lost in a similar period after the second; the workers, because they were so much more contented under Labour rule, had not had to wage the class struggle as fiercely as they had under the Tory rule of the 20's.

What they forgot to point out was that the economic situation in 1945 was such that hard work for everybody was the order of the day. After World War I, British capitalism was still in a relatively healthy condition and "abnormal" circumstances prevailed immediately—i.e., there was heavy unemployment. But after World War II, British capitalism had to compete for world markets as never before (in spite of chief rivals Germany and Japan having been knocked out) and in those abnormal conditions, full employment was inevitable. Hence the industrial peace which prevailed—and for which Labour took the credit.

Looking back over that period, by the way, it is interesting to note that the two bodies of workers who were said to have benefited most from Labourism, the dockers (de-casualisation) and the miners (nationalisation) were the very people who showed the most militancy.

But when the T.U.C. referred to "our" government, they were in fact pulling a fast one. Having trained the workers to identify themselves with the T.U.C., the union leaders were able to make the workers think that their (i.e., the T.U.C.'s) government was also their (the workers') government. But as anarchists have always shown, there is no common interest between any government and the working class, and all the T.U.C. proved to us was that they were now on the side of the government instead of on the side of those who paid their wages—the rank and file workers.

That was understandable, and expected. After all, the trade union movement had fathered the Labour Party, and the Labour Government, through its nationalisation, was providing jobs for the boys.

When, therefore, the General Election was announced by Mr. Attlee, the T.U.C., naturally, issued an appeal "to trade unionists and to all workpeople in all industries and services to respond to the Prime Minister's appeal and to work vigorously and wholeheartedly for the return of Labour candidates."

Referring to the difficulties under which the Labour Government had worked, since 1950, with its slender majority, the statement continued:

"Many years of intimate experience of Governments and of the problems of government compels us to view with grave apprehension any possibility of the return of a Conservative parliamentary majority at this time. Great and just schemes of social security, brought carefully but rapidly to maturity by two Labour Governments, could easily be halted and reduced to mere shadows under the pretext of economy. The process of industrial reorganisation and improvements upon which our future depends could be restrained and turned

back by a Government unwilling or unable either to plan themselves or to encourage others."

That was before the election, and when the Tories began their campaign to woo trade union support, the union leaders were highly indignant, and gave them what is known as the brush-off.

But, also before the election in *FREEDOM* dated 13/10/51, we discussed the Tories' apprehension about possible industrial conflict if they were returned, and wrote:

"With this in mind, the Tories are seeking now to win the support of the Trade Unions, knowing the T.U. leaders can be relied upon to take the 'responsible' line in the 'national interest'. . . . It can be fairly safely prophesied, therefore, that the Tory approaches to the Trade Unions, though stoutly resisted now, will bear fruit if the Tories are elected. The two forces will in fact unite to secure unity in industry and an absence of class conflict."

How right we were can be shown now, when, within a week after the Tory victory (though with just the same shaky majority Labour gained last year), the T.U.C. issued a statement in which it said: "It is our long-standing practice to work amicably with whatever Government is in power. . . . There need be no doubt, therefore, of the attitude towards the new Government."

As they say, "there need be no doubt," and in our minds there was no doubt. We have watched too closely the development of the Trade Unions into dis-

Continued on p. 4

"I entered Parliament with what I thought to be the lowest possible opinion of the average member; I came out with one still lower."

—JOHN STUART MILL

While the Profits Go Up & UP!

The nationalised Cable and Wireless Company made a profit in the year ending March 31st last of £2,232,743, compared with £1,893,699 in the previous fifteen months. Despite austerity and the sedulously inculcated anxiety of the past years, even nationalised industries have not done so badly.

FREEDOM has often stressed the institutional character of war in contemporary economy and this is once again born out by the Cable and Wireless directors' report. They consider that this increased profit was "influenced largely by greater activity in commodity markets and by the general re-armament programme." (The italics are ours.)

Montague Burton, the tailors, had a record trade last year, their profits reaching £2,278,122 against £924,095 the previous year. Ordinary people may think clothes difficult to get, but the manufacturers know how to adapt themselves to difficult situations.

Austin Workers Get a Share

Most astounding profits, however, were shown by the Austin Motor Company, whose profits reached seven millions—£7,014,755, or over two millions more than the £4,982,969 of the previous year.

The directors have raised the dividend from 35 to 45 per cent, and they have also given their 17,000 employees a bonus of one week's wages. This challenges us once again to look official generosity in the eye. Assuming an average wage of £10 a week the directors are thus giving the workers £170,000 and many who think that it is workers who make the profits for the employers may think they deserve it. But look at the figures: £170,000 to the workers; increase in profit over the previous year, £2,000,000; total profit £7,000,000. So the workers bonus amounts to less than 10 per cent. of the profit increase (the shareholders get a full 10 per cent. increase—35 to 45 per cent.), or about one-fortieth part of the total profits.

PEACEMAKERS REACH AUSTRIA

IGNORING all warnings about the perils of crashing the border, four American conscientious objectors entered the Russian Zone of Austria last week and distributed pacifist leaflets to Russian soldiers urging them to refuse to serve any longer in the armed forces. The COs were without visas.

The leaflets were printed in Russian and a quantity of them were left at the Russian barracks in the town of Baden, about fifteen miles south of Vienna.

They met with no hostility or interference during the two hours they spent in the town, although sixty-five Russian soldiers were among the people to whom leaflets were given.

—Peace News (reporting the American "Peacemakers" Mission).

CRISIS IN THE VATICAN?

400 MID-WIVES CALLED IN

THE Pope besides being a man of God, is also a man of many parts, as indeed he must be since his visitors are drawn from all walks of life—whether they are the barefoot pilgrims who flocked to Rome last year for the Holy Year celebrations or the five hundred banking executives attending a conference in Rome last month, whom he received when their deliberations were ended and to whom he gave some sound advice on investment and the ill-effects of "sleeping-money". In some respects one might say that the Pope is a man of the world, a practical man. Last July, for instance, it was announced that the Vatican had installed an elaborate clocking-in system at all its entrances, which is said to have cost several million lire. The five thousand employees of the Vatican City who live in Rome now have to clock in at the various gates of the Vatican every day.

And in the same month, *L'Osservatore Romano*, the Vatican newspaper urged that candles rather than electric lights be used on Roman Catholic altars.

An article by a counsellor for the Congregation of Rites—one of 11 that govern Church affairs—said no permission was ever given for total or perpetual use of electric light in Catholic churches.

Permission for temporary use of electricity was given after the first World War, the writer said, but a "return

to normality"—candle-lit altars—should be made as soon as possible.

It could be argued that from an aesthetic point of view, candles are more satisfying, more inspiring in a church than electric lights; it might even be felt that God disapproves of these new-fangled ideas and has perhaps intimated to His Holiness—via our Lady of Fatima?—that he will not heed their prayers until the proper candles are restored. On the other hand, cynics might suggest that the Pope has recently received a deputation of devout candle-manufacturers who complained to him that business is bad and that they cannot make their contributions to the Vatican coffers if these electrical devices—obviously the work of the devil—are retained. But like God, the Pope moves in a mysterious way and we must leave our speculations to return to more concrete matters.

★

THAT a deputation of bankers should be received at the Vatican, where more gold is to be found than in the Bank of England, is not surprising. But that 400 midwives should have an audience in that House of celibates must be most disturbing news for orthodox Catholics. However, we have already recognised that the Pope is a man of

Continued on p. 3

FOOD PRODUCTION INCREASES TOO SLOWLY

THE Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations in its annual report, just published, declares that: "There is a real danger in the formulation of huge defence programmes urgent agricultural requirements may be overlooked and that the expanding re-armament needs may slow up even the current modest plans for economic betterment in many under-developed countries."

The director-general, Mr. Norris E. Dodd, reports a 3 per cent. increase in world food production in 1950-1951 but, he says, increased food output must be measured against the growth of population. Although last year's increase in production slightly outran the growth of population it did little to raise the level of nutrition in areas where it was most needed. The biggest increases in production were in areas already well fed. Progress towards adequate levels of nutrition has been much slower and considerably less than had been hoped.

A similar comment is made in a leading article in the *Manchester Guardian* (30/10/51), and says: "The Korean war and the consequent impetus given to rearmament are already showing signs of halting the agricultural progress that has been achieved since 1945. Competition for industrial raw materials encourages peasants to grow cash crops instead of food; but the money they hope to make will be largely useless to them, for inflation everywhere is sending up the price of everything they want to buy, either to improve their land or to improve their lives. In turn, of course, food prices will go higher."

Introducing the B.B.C.'s feature last week on British agriculture, Mr. Laurence Easterbrook wrote: "Some fifty million

people are crowded upon this small island with its total available acreage of fifty-six million—just over one acre for every person. To feed ourselves we have little more than thirty million acres of crops and grass, together with another seventeen million acres classified as 'rough grazings'. Even if we added all in the latter category on the over-optimistic assumption that every acre could, at a pinch, produce food of some sort, we should still have less than an acre of food-growing land per head. Before the war it was estimated we were using the produce of about two-and-a-quarter acres to feed each person. It is thus evident that the use of our land for food-growing is of the most vital concern to us all."

The Ministry of Agriculture's 'target' for farmers set in 1947 was for output to be raised by fifty per cent. above pre-war figures in five years. Forty per cent. of the increase has been reached. Dairy farmers reached the figure aimed at ahead of schedule, increasing production by 300 million gallons even though only one-third of the pre-war import of feeding-stuffs were being received. Beef production has been raised since 1947-48 by 120,000 tons, mutton and lamb by one-third, while pig-meat production is more than two-and-a-half times the 1947-48 figure.

But discussing these achievements, Mr. Easterbrook says: "They bring us nowhere near to self-sufficiency in food and, even when the full target is reached, no one with any knowledge of the potentialities of our land would consider that this approached our maximum."

Some Aspects of Soviet Family Policy.
Lewis A. Coser. Reprinted from
the *American Journal of Sociology*,
Vol. LVI, No. 5, March 1951.
*Changing Patterns in the U.S.S.R.:
The Family.* Rudolf Schlesinger.
(Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1949.)

FAMILY AND FREE LOVE IN RUSSIA—II

and modern, and he can engage domestic help. To maintain a family that comes up to official standards is a leisure-class activity." (Coser.)

Illegitimacy

The need to increase the birth rate necessitates State care for illegitimate children. Formerly the Soviet law had done away with the legal distinction between legitimate and illegitimate children. With the strengthening of the family these distinctions were reintroduced. Such children must carry the mother's not the father's name, and an unmarried mother can no longer hold the father responsible for the support of the child. "The new Soviet code has adopted the principle of the Code Napoléon: *La recherche de la paternité est interdite.*"

Abortion

In the early years abortion was legal in Russia provided it was performed in hospitals, and statistics were produced showing that it was safe and much less productive of ill-health than when it was an illegal activity. The 1936 decree banning abortion officially declared that it was to combat the "light-minded attitude towards the family and towards family obligations", and that it was detrimental to health.

Coser makes a most interesting comment here. "This decree," he says in a footnote, "was the only law in the recent history of the Soviet Union that was submitted to public discussion before

promulgation. Test votes were taken in factories and at women's meetings, and the official press carried a number of letters pro and con. They showed heavy majorities against the law, at least in urban centres—whereupon the discussion was called off and the law promulgated by decree of December 27th, 1936." Schlesinger gives the text of the law and some of the published discussion.

Birth Control

Abortion was rudely resorted to because of the scarcity of birth control facilities. Fannina Hale (*Women in Soviet Russia*, 1933) stated that contraceptives were in short supply. Coser quotes Milton Hindus: "Birth control remained legal but was frowned upon. Literature on the subject vanished . . . Physicians were not forbidden to impart the necessary information to patients, but they were urged to use their influence to dissuade women from preventing child-birth." Coser adds: "The upper strata are accustomed to the use of contraceptives and have the means to practice it; but the lower classes in this planned society are denied the means of planned parenthood. The law against abortion is indeed a rank example of what the Communists call 'class legislation'."

Divorce

Marriage and divorce were formerly a matter for individual Soviet citizens—"for a court to concern itself with the conduct of either party in a divorce case would imply an utterly false interpretation of Soviet law."

The new Family Laws of July, 1944, have changed all that. "The new procedures for divorce are equivalent to the mediaeval pillory. The notice of divorce action must be advertised in a local newspaper at considerable expense. Compulsory entry of divorce is made in the home passports of man and woman. The proceedings take place in an open court, the People's Court, whose only task is to attempt to reconcile the couple, and where both parties must appear before proceedings can begin. The claimant has the right of appeal to the next highest court, which may or may not dissolve the marriage; and subsequent appeals to still higher courts are possible. But the fees are such that divorce has become a luxury which the average citizen cannot possibly afford . . ."

According to statistics quoted by Schlesinger, there was a rapid fall in the number of divorces after 1944 and Coser drily comments: "One can well understand Monsignor Fulton Sheen's appreciation that 'the family is higher in Russia than in the United States, and God, looking from heaven, may be more pleased with Russia than with us.'"

Education

There is little space to discuss the official apologies for the abandonment of co-education in Russian schools. The new code "makes an effort to syn-

chronise a revived paternalistic school system. A new Code of Rules for Soviet schools was adopted in 1943. Some of the rules are: 'Obey without question the orders of school principal and teacher . . . Sit erect during the lesson period . . . Rise as the principal or teacher enters or leaves the room . . . Be polite to elders, respectful to school director and teacher . . . Obey parents and assist in care of little brothers and sisters.' For violation of these rules, the pupil is subject to punishment, even to expulsion from the school."

Since 1940, fees have been reintroduced for higher education and for universities. Hence education is becoming accessible to the well-to-do, and difficult for the worker. Posts tend to become hereditary and class distinctions fixed. Coser sums up: "The new educational policy serves to assure inheritance of social status through transmission of skills and connections. This is in tune with the revival of the principle of inheritance, as laid down in the Soviet Constitution of 1936, which assures transmission of wealth from parents to children, thus cancelling the early Soviet measures which abolished inheritance by law or will and all life insurance . . ."

These two publications shed a flood of light on the actual situation of people in Russia. J.H.

IN the last issue of FREEDOM the general trend of Soviet Family legislation was broadly discussed. Here, a more detailed account of the change in outlook will be attempted.

Coser tries to show, on the whole convincingly, that the decision-making class in Russia regard women now as primarily child bearers, and only secondarily as bearers of labour power. Nevertheless, these are not incompatible rôles, though Coser points out that "the attempt to reconcile the rival demands upon the woman's time by building creches, day camps for children, etc., is not made to overcome the contradictions stemming from rival definitions of the woman's rôle." Public child care keeps the child away from the family and thus weakens traditional family ties."

Nevertheless, the virtual necessity for Russian women to go out to work makes the economically stable family unit impossible. "One arrives at the startling conclusion that the economic basis for a stable family life, such as is required by the new Soviet ideology, can be found only among the families of the upper strata. The top bureaucrat can allow himself the luxury of a stable family life and of a Victorian morality. He has enough housing space, his wife does not have to work full time, his household equipment is more adequate

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

THE CHANGING CULTURE OF A FACTORY: A Study of Authority and Participation in an Industrial Setting. By Elliott Jaques. (Tavistock Publications, 28/-)

SINCE we are anarchists, our approach to a book on what is called "industrial relations" is a frankly partisan one. We are emotionally and mentally committed to a philosophy of freedom and from this derives our support for the idea of workers' control of industry, and since we do not imagine that either shareholders of privately-owned industry or the governments who ultimately control publicly-owned industry will of their own accord surrender their authority to the workers they employ, we support the seizure of control of industry by the workers. So in examining this book we are, inevitably, not students of anthropology or sociology or psychology, but people with minds made up who want to see whether this prolonged investigation of the social structure of a modern factory provides evidence which either confirms our point of view or suggests that it is invalid.

Dr. Jaques' book is an exhaustive study of researches made over 24 years at the factory of Glacier Metal Company, an engineering firm in North-West London employing 1,500 people, by a team of investigators with training in social and industrial psychology, anthropology, psychiatry and psychoanalysis, production engineering and statistics from the Tavistock Institute of Human Relations. The firm with which they were concerned is not a typical one. An "enlightened management" had for a number of years been concerned with "human relations in industry" and when the team started work they found the factory was described by employees as "a fine place in which to work, in which everyone was 'treated as a human being', in a manner unfamiliar to many who had worked elsewhere."

The book begins with a history of the

firm, especially from the point of view of its "internal politics"—the position of union membership and shop stewards, and reactions to rates and methods of payment. After a description of the firm's internal organisation, the second part of the book is devoted to the specific problems which the team studied: "Methods of Payment and Morale" in the Service Department; "Problems of Worker-Management Co-operation" in the Works Council; "Relations among Workers' Representatives" in the Works Committee; "Organisational Problems in the Management Chain" in the Superintendents' Committee; "Top Management and Executive Leadership" in the Divisional Management Meeting.

The third part of the book, under the title "Analysis of Change interprets the evidence gathered in the earlier sections, on the nature of authority, responsibility and group relationships in the factory.

Now one of the unusual aspects of this prosperous firm is that, since 1941 the dividends paid to shareholders have been limited (to 7½%) and the surplus revenue has been devoted to five objects which are: Research and development; Betterment of working conditions; Betterment of equipment; Raising of wages and salaries; and Lowering of the price or raising the quality of the product. Consequently the desire of the management to bring in psychological consultants need not so readily as usual be dismissed as just another attempt to increase profits. Nevertheless it was regarded with a healthy and justifiable scepticism, as were its plans for joint consultation. ". . . The management's asserted policy of wanting to increase the opportunity for participation was looked at with a great deal of suspicion. The first question employees would ask themselves when some new scheme was mooted was: 'What's being put over us?'"

The main subject of this long book is, in fact, psychological difficulties involved in introducing "democracy"

into the factory system. For the heritage of industrial exploitation is not broken down merely by the good intentions of enlightened management. The Tavistock Institute team's task, as it saw it was, not to make recommendations to the numerous committees within the firm, but to help their members to uncover the conscious and unconscious barriers to co-operation among the committee's members.

It will be seen that this book has very little to say on the question we raised in our opening paragraph. The tensions it unravels are those of a class-divided society and a hierarchical industrial organisation. No-one should imagine that the degree of workers' participation that is envisaged in the Glacier Metal Company approaches what we mean by workers' control. It could not within our social structure do so, since in any other limited company, the management is responsible to the shareholders whose money is invested in it, and not to the workers employed by it.

Thus *The Changing Culture of a Factory* is a study of the psychological aspects of attempts to provide some of the satisfactions which arise from freedom and responsibility, within an industrial atmosphere (what in Marxian terms would be called "the capitalist mode of production") which is basically neither free nor responsible. W.

MORE ABOUT FEWER SCHOOLS

Middlesex County Education Committee has protested to the Ministry of Education against the reduction in the 1952-53 school building programme in Middlesex. It will seek approval for its action at the meeting of the council tomorrow.

The committee reports that the Ministry reduced the provisional list of new primary schools projects from 14 to 13; of secondary modern schools from 17 to 12; and of secondary grammar schools from five to two.

—*The Times Educational Supplement*, 2/11/51.

There now comes information that school desks without holes for ink-wells are liable for purchase tax; those with holes are not liable. At the cost of twenty pounds the Corporation of Wallasey are to have holes drilled in a hundred and five desks, ordered for a new technical school. This will save them a hundred and ten pounds. But, no ink-wells will be fitted. The pupils do not need them.

—*Church Times*, 26/10/51.

Lady Simon of Wythenshawe denounced "some people who ought to know better, and who carry considerable weight in educational circles" who believed that educational opportunity had been achieved by abolishing school fees and opening the grammar schools to all according to merit. To say this was to ignore the 75 per cent. of children who could not go to grammar schools. She urged the immediate raising of the ceiling on the cost of school places fixed early in 1950, since when the cost of building materials had risen. Mr. H. D. Hughes, the principal of Ruskin College, said that there was talk in certain circles of "very substantial cuts in Government expenditure". Cuts had already been made. The economy circulars had gone out. "We are watching very closely," he said.

—Report of W.E.A. Annual Conference.

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

- The Life of George Lansbury
Raymond Postgate 21/-
Bermondsey Story Fenner Brockway 15/-
Biographies of George Lansbury and Dr. Arthur Salter, two Labour pioneers who had little in common with most of the occupants of the Opposition benches in parliament to-day.
Humanity & Happiness
Georg Brochmann 14/-
Lewis Mumford writes in his introduction to this book from Norway that the author "has discovered certain essential truths about human existence not given in either the orthodoxies or the heresies of our time."
You Shall Have Music
Sidney Harrison 1/-
Browsing Among Words of Science
T. H. Savory 1/-
Two of the new Thrift Books.
Memoirs of a Sword-Swallower
Dan Mennix 12/6
Wildly funny.—*Sunday Times*.
Monstrously diverting.—*Spectator*.
Origins & Ideals of the Modern School
F. Ferrer 6d.
A pioneer anarchist educator.

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

THE LITTLE FELLOW

CHAPLIN never forgot the extreme poverty, the destitution and neglect he suffered in England as a child; "all his past proclaimed his future," and even when he was setting them rolling in the old ninepennies with his bowler hat, his cane and the magnificent absurdity of his efforts to maintain his dignity in the depths of humiliation and disaster, he was preaching, indirectly and by mime, his own message of social revolt. This duality in Charlie Chaplin also does something to explain the paradox that one of the best-known and most beloved figures in the world was detested and persecuted in the country of his adoption. It was not that Chaplin was a "red"—he is far too much of an individualist, an anarchist even, for that—and certainly the much publicized scandals of his private life had much to do with his unpopularity, but his real crime against society lies in his failure to be impressed by the triumphs on which it prides itself. Charlie indicted society the first time he shuffled on to the screen in his preposterous boots, and he underlined that indictment when, as the immaculate Monsieur Verdoux, he spoke from the dock to judge and jury, themselves the agents and the symbols of a criminal conspiracy to crush the weak, the poor, the lonely, the down-trodden.

—*The Times Literary Supplement*, 2/11/51.

In Our Lifetime . . .

IN our lifetime we have seen war deteriorate from the pretty filthy business which it was in 1914 to a level of psychopathic cruelty which is quite possibly without historic parallel, at least since the barbarian invasions of Europe.

Our country is engaged at the present time, with the United Nations, in conducting a war of extermination in Korea, under the title of collective security—an utterly unnecessary war of the utmost savagery.

In the course of this war to defend freedom; we have given our support to a vicious police state, we have acquiesced in mass executions, in the use of torture, in absolutely indiscriminate warfare with petrol and explosive bombs, which has killed about two million civilians, made homeless another four million, and destroyed every habitable town and every factory in Korea.

Pacifists in the past have been met with the argument that war could be a lesser evil. I would like to ask you what evil the people of Korea might be expected to regard as greater than what we have done to them under the name of liberation.

Does anyone to-day remember the bombing of Addis Ababa and Guernica? Do they remember how public opinion regarded those actions, and, if they do, are they proud of the change which has taken place? Within 20 years of those events we see our country allied to a General Staff which regards genocide as a normal method of warfare, and to an

Administration which explicitly states that it bases its policy on force and not on diplomacy. *

If a war comes in Europe, we know how it will be conducted because they have told us. I would like to know what evil a tyranny, however objectionable, could set in motion which would remotely compare with what we have done, what we are doing, and what we have expressed ourselves ready to do if necessary.

We hear much about lesser evils. But faced with the situation which does face us, I say quite frankly that I'm not interested in the alternatives.

There are some policies, of which Hitler's gas chambers were one, and the idea of war by genocide, atomic and otherwise, is another, which leaves no room for the discussion of alternatives.

Unless we refuse to countenance them, whatever the excuse, whatever the supposed alternatives, whatever the alibi which is offered for them, we have no right to describe ourselves as human beings. Unless I personally resist the preparations which are being made by mentally deranged individuals to defend Western civilisation by lies, massacre and the other normal concomitants of war to-day, I shall despise myself at least as much as I hope other people will despise me.

—From a speech by Alex Comfort on October 27th.

FOUR NEW FREEDOM PRESS PUBLICATIONS

YOUTH FOR FREEDOM

by TONY GIBSON

A Consideration of the Factors Influencing the Development of a Free and Socially Effective Youth

In this pamphlet the author, a frequent contributor to FREEDOM, who has practical experience of working with children of all ages, deals with the problems of education and upbringing which condition the future pattern of a social organisation. The recommendations of progressive educationalists are considered, and their limitations in the face of the complexity of the social problems is discussed. The necessity for a process of simultaneous revolution in family relations, in education and in social organisation is continually stressed, and some positive leads are given as to practical ways and means.

YOUTH FOR FREEDOM is a work which will stimulate discussion among teachers as well as among parents and young people, and we strongly recommend it to our readers as one of our important publications.

Now Ready

Two shillings

DELINQUENCY

by ALEX COMFORT

This pamphlet gives the text of Alex Comfort's lecture at the Anarchist Summer School 1950 with an introduction by John Hewetson.

Now Ready

Sixpence

SEXUAL FREEDOM FOR THE YOUNG

by JOHN HEWETSON

This pamphlet comprises the five articles recently published in FREEDOM and a new introduction by the author.

Ready Nov. 17

Sixpence

Syndicalism—THE WORKERS' NEXT STEP

by PHILIP SANSOM

This 48-page pamphlet comprises the series of eleven articles published in FREEDOM earlier this year. This is an important publication which, at a time of growing disillusionment among thinking workers in the Trade Union movement, offers them a practical alternative to the existing forms of working-class organisation. Workers' Control is being discussed by an ever-growing number of workers, and Philip Sansom's pamphlet, which discusses the question at length, is also, therefore, a timely and valuable contribution to the discussion.

Ready Nov. 17

One shilling*

(*Special "bulk rates" for readers of FREEDOM, Groups and Trade Union branches: 12 copies 9/-, 50 copies 33/-, 100 copies 60/-, post free)

Order now from

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

KREMLIN-VATICAN AXIS

IN 1984, George Orwell described the totalitarian state of Big Brother as being hideously anti-sexual. Children were compulsorily enrolled in the Anti-Sex League. In this satire he made the attitude of authority towards the sexual relations of men and women the subject of fierce comedy.

But the comedy and the satire would have little force if they did not incorporate a considerable element of penetrating observation and truth. In the last two issues of FREEDOM we have published material which shows that both the Vatican and the "godless rulers in the Kremlin" are at one with Big Brother in attacking the sexuality of the masses.

Anarchists are proud that they have always championed the course of sexual freedom, and have attacked the factors and institutions in society which hinder sexual fulfilment. Many years ago they instinctively understood that rigid sexual morality was part and parcel with authoritarian conceptions and anti-libertarian systems. In recent years, Reich has done much to demonstrate the connection in detail, and other less radical scientific writers have admitted it with varying degrees of willingness.

Now the major totalitarians have made the position which Orwell foresaw even clearer. The Pope's tirades against sex instruction, against decent conceptions of sexual conduct and birth control have made the Catholic position even clearer, more nakedly life-denying.

It seems clear, however, that the Vatican is on the defensive. It seeks to bolster up the increasingly discreditable Catholic attitude simply by increased dogmatism and the puerile threat of hell-fire. Another article in this issue points to the contradictions in the Papal outbursts: they only serve to show how hopelessly untenable the Catholic position is. Lewis Coser in his account of the changes in Russian family and sexual codes demonstrates the inherent contradictions there also.

There is something irresistibly comic about the sexual obscurantism of these "spiritual" and temporal rulers, and there can be no doubt that they are vulnerable to mockery, so absurd and unsound is their position.

But one should not forget that these edicts and prohibitions spell misery for many millions of people. They block the path to happiness and human aspirations and strivings. Let us mock them by all means, but let us remember the sexual misery which obscurantism imposes, and not be too good-humoured about it. Defenders of Catholicism ought to be made to feel the cruelty of their position, and the responsibility, which slavish following of the Pope's infallibility imposes upon them.

Nor, in attacking Russia or the Pope, should we forget our own society. In a recent series of articles a writer in FREEDOM sought to show that society must bear responsibility for the sex-murders and child-murders. The sexual lives of men, women and children profoundly affect, and are affected by, the prevailing attitudes towards sex and sexual fulfilment. (These articles are being issued as a pamphlet.) The Pope and the rulers of Russia do not underestimate the importance of these matters: neither should we.

WHEN Columbus first touched the shores of the Golden Lands, there were almost 1,000,000 Indians inhabiting the territories that were to become the United States. They lived in perhaps half a thousand tribes and spoke almost as many languages. (Even to-day there are approximately 300 different tribes in the country, speaking 250 different languages and dialects.) They represented a vast spread of ways of life, intense differences in culture and personality types. To the Whites, of course, in the main, they represented nothing but a minor obstacle in his conquest of the land. "They are a loving people," Columbus wrote, "without covetousness, and fit for anything... They love their neighbours as themselves, and their speech is the sweetest and gentlest in the world." But the White man's naked greed, his policy of theft, lies, hypocrisy and force, was to make of the Indian a deadly enemy and a resourceful one, whose capacity of resistance was once described on the floors of Congress by a shrewd Yankee trader arguing for a cessation of hostilities on the grounds that it was costing almost \$100,000 to kill each Indian. Tens of major campaigns, hundreds of skirmishes, thousands of incidents marked the American conquest of the West, leaving to this day the filmy stereotype of the "Wild Indian" in America's childhood and folk and literary heritage. Pushed by treaty, war, bribery and deceit farther and farther West, the centre of Indian tribal concentration moved across the Mississippi into Oklahoma (once called "Indian Territory") and the Great American Desert of Arizona and New Mexico. To-day, after reaching a low of about 220,000 in 1923, Indian population numbers about 450,000. About 70% live on reservations most of which are West of the Mississippi. One may live in an Eastern

American city all one's life without ever meeting an Indian, except perhaps one of the craft store variety. Arizona, New Mexico and Oklahoma contain almost half the entire Indian population. Large groups live in California. (from the first a highly populated Indian centre), Montana, South Dakota, Wisconsin and Washington State. East of the Mississippi live not many more than 30,000 Indians, mostly on reservations. There are about 175 reservations in the whole U.S.

Illiteracy runs about 30% and about 50,000 Indians speak only their native tongue. 90% of the approximately 60,000 Navajo of the South-west (the largest tribe) do not speak English. Of course, Spanish (Mexican) has been the traditional language of this area. And then again the Navajo had less real need to know English, i.e., according to the N.Y. Times of August 28, 1951, the life expectancy of the Navajo (as contrasted to the national expectancy of over 65) did not reach 50. "The health problem among the Navajo was des-

THE AMERICAN INDIAN

"If you happen to know a Papago Indian boy living on the Sells Indian Reservation near Tucson," writes Herb Nelson in the Phoenix, Arizona Gazette, "be good to him: the chances are only fifty-fifty that he will survive his 18th birthday."

"If you have a Montana Indian friend living in one of the State's seven reservations, write him a letter; the chances of his dying from T.B. is fourteen times greater than that of your White neighbour next door."

"The death rate from T.B. in the nation is 40.1 per 100,000. For Indians it is 211.9. Less than 42 American babies in every 100,000 die during or immediately after birth. For children of Indian parents the figure is over 135. The rate of death from pneumonia in the nation approaches 52 in 100,000. For Indians it is over 123. Conditions among Alaska Indians under federal jurisdiction grow steadily worse."

"It is now clear that the tragic plight of the American Indian, riddled with disease, weakened by malnutrition,

plagued with ignorance, is not the result of casual mischance or more casual inefficiency. The accusing finger points to those who year after year recommend budgets (e.g., cutting down medical items, eliminating even paltry \$1,500,000 preventative medicine budgets entirely [No such service has ever been provided.]—J.G.) which perpetuate these festering conditions."

—CARL CARMER, editor of *The American Indian*, Vol. 5, No. 1, 1949.

cribed as the worst in the nation, with deaths from T.B., pneumonia and dysentery more than triple the national average." (According to Dr. Fred Foard of the Indian Medical Service, writing in the *American Indian* of Spring, 1950, the T.B. death rate on the Navajo reservation for 1947 was 302.4 per 100,000 compared to a national rate of 33.4. The pneumonia death rate was 189.6 compared to 52 for the nation. For diarrhoea and enteritis the rate was 105 compared to 5.3 for the general population. The typhoid rate of all Indians on reservations is four times that of the general population. "Trachoma is still highly prevalent among some of our Indian tribes." Dentists are employed at the rate of one for every 19,000 Indians. "The Papago 'population curve' resembles that of Medieval Europe. Of approximately 260 infants born each year, one-quarter die within 12 months; at the age of 6 there are only 160 left, at the age of 18 only 125. The life expectancy of a Papago infant is 17 years, whereas

that of a non-Indian infant in the U.S. is over 60 years."

"It appears," (continues the *Times* article), Mr. Simpson (welfare director of New Mexico) said, "that the major causes of this low standard of health are lack of hygiene and sanitation, insufficient medical facilities and general malnutrition." According to this same article, the U.S. Government drew up plans for a 400-bed T.B. hospital for Navajos at Fort Defiance, Arizona, in 1948 but just never got around to it. (No funds appropriated.) It really costs too much to bother to raise up Navajo youth for the U.S. Army which is to bring the American standard of living to the rest of the world. "Even such a plant as this would be inadequate now," he said."

2

The U.S. Government's relationships with the Indians have been summed-up by Byron Brophy in *One America* (Roucek and Brown, editors) as falling into five distinct periods:

- I. Period of control by community diplomacy with Indians: 1607-1778. The most satisfactory and successful period. Brophy attributes this to the almost equal balance of power of the antagonists. Outstanding was the work of the Quakers which tradition in this area carries through to this very day.
- II. Period of control by treaties: 1778-1871. Essentially swindles, with treaties never lived up to. Bargainings forced on the Indians with the White man's promises unfulfilled; "interpreted"; denied. The period of Indian wars, the treaties often being "peace" treaties. The Indian Bureau created in 1824 as an arm of the War Department.
- III. Period of control by reservations, segregation and pauperisation: 1871-1887. Policy necessitated by increasing Indian resistance. Their last ditch stand. By 1887 the Indians had been

Continued on p. 4

CRIME AND PUNISHMENT

BARBARIC punishment dies hard in this country. The severity of its penal laws as compared with the liberality of many of its institutions, has long been a subject of comment in many other nations. In the nineteenth century people like Charles Dickens did their best to rouse the public conscience against some of the more barbaric punishments. The bureaucratic and judicial mind has fought long and bitterly against these attacks, however, and in some cases changes have been little for the better because of the entrenched forces of the Law. Public hanging was abolished, for instance, but the whole ghastly apparatus went on in private. Had it continued in public, the somewhat more enlightened public opinion of the later nineteenth and earlier twentieth centuries might well have abolished it altogether. As it is, *penis supplicat* the door locked behind of hanging continues.

Europeans have often noted with amazement that the British aristocracy themselves submitted to flogging in youth, and the public school system, like the Army, was built upon it. It continues in public schools and the colonial army to this day. While it has gone from the penal system, there is still a section of the public that hankers for it, however, partially in the cases of cruelty to children which always brings forward an emotional response demanding flogging and exceptional sentences.

Yet what do prison sentences mean in such cases? No parent is going to be kind to a child because he fears flogging or prison! Nobody is going to return from a six months stretch resolved to cherish his child from then on! Obviously this is only the old desire for vengeance, which has for so long permeated our institutions and a section of the people. The solution is plain enough for all who want to see, and that is to ensure there are no "unwanted children". Nearly all these cruelty and neglect cases can be traced to ignorance of birth control methods, or to the other symptoms of an unhealthy sexual life. What is needed is more light and less vengeance. More knowledge and less law.

No statement of the sort that "barbaric punishment dies hard in this country" can be seriously refuted if one takes one simple case: Suicide. There cannot be anything less harmful to any other person than the mere taking of one's own life. *In no country in Europe is this a crime.* Even in Hitler Germany, where it was an axiomatic doctrine that every citizen belonged to the State and not to himself, it did not occur to the Nazis to make suicide a crime.

I certainly do not dispute the fact that suicide may be very foolish indeed, but after all, suicide itself can obviously not be punished; the law has to let its victim go in that case. All that can be punished is attempted suicide—nobody, therefore, could be dissuaded from suicide by legal penalties, since presumably they only attempt suicide in the belief that they will be successful.

Who is it that is dragged before the awful majesty of the Law? Some poor bedraggled wretch, at his, or her wit's ends, fished out of the river or rescued from death by the pressing ministrations of a doctor, obviously having suffered terribly, both in the despair that drove to attempted suicide and in the agony of failure, is hauled before the court. The

other day I read of a girl who screamed and fainted on getting two months' imprisonment for attempted suicide. Anyone with imagination can well understand her frame of mind at the time of the attempt, the failure, the arrest and the sentence. But it is the Law.

Of course the anarchists try to abolish all laws. It is doubtless very wrong of them. But the authoritarian need not worry himself unduly if this particular law is abolished. In the rest of Europe they do not seek to end their lives more readily than here unless they have to,

and the British will not rush to kill themselves once it is no longer illegal to do so.

All that will happen is that some poor devil will be spared a prison sentence at the end of some long period of misery, and there need be no more discussion of whether euthanasia be allowed or not, for there is the answer.

Such laws are not abolished by the good will of governments. They may go when public opinion is disgusted by them. Up to now it does not take a very civilised view of the punishment of crime, and in that it is merely bowing to its age and its conditioning. An enlightened public opinion on the matter has yet to be created.

A.M.

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.
- 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 or Hovels? 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.

Foreign Commentary

Continued from p. 1

CRISIS IN THE VATICAN?

many parts, and the purpose of calling these overworked and underpaid women was not the result of a change of heart in the Vatican, but on the contrary, to indoctrinate them as missionaries for what George Orwell called in another context, the Anti-Sex League.

It is natural that the Pope as undisputed President of the Anti-Sex League should consider that sex as a provider of pleasure is a heretical view which must be stamped out. And he certainly did not mince matters when addressing the midwives. He condemned "the increasing waves of hedonism which invade the world and threaten to submerge all the thoughts, desires, and acts of matrimonial life in their rising tide."

"Some hold that the happiness of married life is in direct relation to the reciprocal pleasure there is in conjugal relations," the Pope went on. "No Matrimonial felicity is in direct relation to the mutual respect of the spouses, even in their intimate relations."

The midwives were bidden to stem the "impetus of this refined hedonism" as much as possible and "to outlaw this cult of pleasure". They were told: "Do your best to stop the distribution of a literature which deems itself bound to describe in every detail the intimacies of married life under the pretence of instructing, directing, and reassuring". Matters have come to a head because of the increasing number of pamphlets published by, and circulating among, Catholics, containing information about the "safe period"—which is a hypocritical (and unsatisfactory) way of offering a "natural" birth control method without openly advocating the use of contraceptives. Now the Pope realises that this is the thin end of the wedge to pleasure in sexual intercourse, for many Catholics have been limiting their sex relationships to the "safe periods" (*fare l'amore col calendario*—making love with the calendar—as some profane Italians call it) without always paying the price of a yearly addition to the family. And he has therefore drawn attention to this in the following words:

"If the theory (of safe periods) is taken to mean that married couples may use their matrimonial rights on days of natural sterility, there is no objection: in this way indeed they do not prevent or

prejudice in any way the consummation of the natural act, and its ulterior natural consequences. In this very way the application of the theory about which we are speaking is essentially distinguished from the abuse of it, which consists in a perversion of the act itself. If, however, people go beyond this point, and allow the conjugal act to take place exclusively in those days, then the conduct of the spouses must be more carefully examined."

This statement contains a very serious contradiction which is made more obvious by what follows. The Pope told the midwives that if they felt that there were cases in which "maternity should at all costs be avoided", and "the safe-periods are not sufficient guarantee", then "you must leave no doubt whatever that even in these extreme cases every preventive manoeuvre and every direct attempt on the life or on the development of the germ is in conscience prohibited and excluded, and only one way is left open, that of abstinence from any complete actuation of the natural faculty".

In the second quotation the Pope makes it clear that sexual relations are ordained for the exclusive purpose of reproduction, and that in cases where "maternity should at all costs be avoided" then the only way out "if the safe periods are not sufficient guarantee" is to abstain. But by implication he says that if "the safe period" is really safe then in these cases sexual relations may be practised. For what purpose if he at the same time outlaws "this cult of pleasure". Similarly he has "no objection" to married couples using "their matrimonial rights on days of natural sterility" so long as they do not abstain on other days.

★

THESE contradictions are, to our mind, an unwilling recognition by the Pope that his Church is fighting a losing battle; yet it will fight to the last ditch if only to delay the day of liberation. When that day comes (and it will not happen without long patient determined effort by the forces of social progress) it will indeed be the defeat of the most pernicious, life-denying dictatorship of mankind.

LIBERTARIAN.

T.U.C. & TORIES

Continued from p. 1
disciplinary organs of State power over the workers to have any illusions left as to their attitude to government.

What is in doubt, is the attitude of the rank and file of the industrial workers, who, looking at Churchill's new Cabinet of Lords and lawyer-knights, will know well enough in whose interests it is going to govern the country. Not their's.

Already rumblings have come from South Wales, where the miners' lodges have expressed their disagreement with the T.U.C. statement of loyalty to the new government. Already the president of the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions (H. G. Brotherton) has said that if the Tories made any "onslaught on the standards of the working people, while the material well-being of their luxury-loving supporters continues to improve [the trade union movement] will ensure that there is such a state of affairs evoked in this country that they will be bound to have second thoughts."

But Mr. Brotherton is a leader, and as such is more likely—personally—to align himself with his fellow-bosses on the T.U.C. than with the rank-and-file. It is, obviously, from the ranks of the workers that the real opposition to the coming onslaught will be made. And that the Tories will attack our standards of living, there can be no question. They have just got to, in order to cope with the economic situation and the re-armament programme. The Labour Party would have had to do exactly the same.

It may be that 1926 is going to be enacted all over again. If it is, the workers will have one advantage to-day we did not have then; that our "leaders" will be against us from the start, instead of pretending to lead us in order to mislead us.

Learning from our past experiences, we must look to no leaders, but to ourselves. We can expect nothing but an unholy alliance between the Tories and the T.U.C., and, in being thrown back on our own resources, we can discover our own strength. Let us organise to use that ourselves, and what looked like a political defeat for the workers, can be turned into a social triumph.

P.S.

The trade union movement in this country is not a revolutionary force, and unless provoked by very foolish handling it can be relied upon not to try to use industrial action with the deliberate intention of interfering with a Government's ability to govern.

Manchester Guardian, 29/10/51.

An Anarchist Commentary on: SONGSTERS, MARTYRS AND ...

I HOPE that readers within reach of the B.B.C.'s Third Programme did not miss the second of the series *The Art of the Negro*. In this programme called "Trumpets of the Lord," Alan Lomax discussed the "greatest of all American folk dramas—the Southern Negro church service, in which the congregation is at once the cast and the audience, and the two principal parts are played by the preacher and the leader of the singing." He included recorded interviews with the washerwoman who leads her community in the singing on Sunday, and with a very old retired preacher who in his gentle voice told of the appalling persecutions his people had met at the hands of their white neighbours. Lomax must be as skilful an interviewer as Henry Mayhew was. Through sympathetic questioning he got the washerwoman to explain to him the nature of the ecstatic state she reached during the service in a way which shed more light on the psychological aspect of religious experience than many a book, and the old man's reminiscences were among the most impressive and moving things we have heard on the radio for a long time.

These programmes and several others which have been broadcast in the last few years (do any readers recall the series "I hear America Singing," presented by Alistair Cooke before the war?) are a reflection of the new non-academic interest in folk-songs and traditional music which has developed both in America and in this country.

This re-awakening interest is welcome both as a change from the inanities of Tin-Pan-Alley and the song-pluggers, and because a society which rejects its past has no basis for its future, and is no less to be applauded because of the fact that a number of its prime movers are what the witch-hunters call "fellow-travellers."

JOE HILL

One aspect of this bias, however, which calls for comment is the way in which the origin of the songs of the American syndicalist union, the I.W.W. or "wobblies", have been appropriated without any acknowledgement of their origin. I have in front of me two song books. The first, *The People's Song Book*, published in New York in 1948. It includes Ralph Chaplin's "Solidarity Forever", with a note that Ralph Chaplin and Joe Hill were among the most important writers of workers' songs in the early twentieth century", but there is no reference to the I.W.W. of which they were members and for which the song was written. The second book, an American *Bantam Book* published in New York in the same year includes the

song "Union Train" with its last verse which begins "Let us join the one big union," but again there is no mention of what the "one big union" was. The same book includes the song by Alfred Hayes, "Joe Hill," and introduces it with these words: "Joe Hill is probably one of the most famous of little-known Americans. The astonishing variety of people who sing this song learned what little they know of his life from these lines. We have heard factory workers, high school and college students, people in the professions, and others in tuxedos singing this tribute to an American who died for his beliefs in Utah in 1915." But the editors of the *Treasury* do nothing to enlighten their readers as to what those beliefs were. So it is perhaps not surprising that last year we heard an American singer at a concert in London finish singing about Joe Hill by giving a Communist salute.

Another thing which makes us smile about the American folk-song revival is the way people keep muscling in with copyrights. Much has happened to the old song "Good-night Irene" since Alan Lomax's father recorded it from Huddie Leadbetter in the Penitentiary, for the book gives nine lines of copyright particulars! And we are told that "Home on the Range" was the subject of a \$500,000 lawsuit over infringement of copyright until a ninety-year-old lady sang it in court declaring that her husband and innumerable cowboys had sung it over half a century ago.

FRANCISCO FERRER

At this year's meeting of the World Union of Freethinkers, the Hon. Secretary (Mdlle. P. H. Pardon, 32 rue St. Martin, Louvain, Belgium), reported that, "Mme. Soledad Ferrer, daughter of Francisco Ferrer, is forming a museum to the memory of her illustrious father, and makes an appeal for material—i.e., letters, photographs, articles, etc.—relating to her father's work and martyrdom."

Ferrer, anarchist and teacher, is remembered more amongst the anarchist movement of the Latin countries than here. He started the "Modern School" movement with the *Escuela Moderna* at Barcelona in 1901 and by 1906 there were more than fifty schools on this model. By 1909 the Catholic Church had its revenge and Ferrer was shot, the victim of an absurd "frame-up". We can easily see the naïveté of his system but it is foolish to laugh at them for as Tom Earley wrote in his article on Ferrer (in *FREEDOM's* series on "Pioneers of Education"), "The Revolutionary nature of the education provided by Ferrer can only be fully appreciated when we re-

member the education it was superseding." Moreover, the astonishing thing is "that so many of his criticisms (in his *Origin and Ideals of the Modern*

School) of existing educational institutions are still valid to-day. This is certainly a terrible indictment of our educational progress".

... THE PENNY TEACHER

A sidelight on the Spanish educational system in Ferrer's day was given by Mr. Arturo Barea in some reminiscences of Madrid in his childhood, which appeared in *World Review*. He says, "Yes, those were revolutionary years. People not only stopped drinking from the ancient springs, but took it into their heads that children should be able to read—in walks of life where this had never been considered a necessary accomplishment, and in a town where strong pull was needed to get a pupil accepted by one of the all-too-few schools!

"As if created by the stir of new urges, two strange pedagogues appeared on the scene: the 'Penny Teacher' and the 'Saint with the Beard'.

"The Penny Teacher one day turned up in the Barrio de las Injurias, the wasteland district at the fringe of Madrid where beggars, gypsies and the poorest casual workers lived helter-skelter, in huts built of old tins and old bricks, in the company of scraggy hens, gaunt pigs and fat lice. The place was lit by a few oil-lamps—wicks feeding on crude olive oil—slung up on green-painted posts. The Penny Teacher settled down in a hovel made entirely of old tins, flattened out and nailed on to pieces of timber. On a particularly rusty bit of 'wall' he wrote the lettering 'school'—like this, with a minuscule. In no time he had acquired a horde of pupils, swarthy kids who squatted round him in the open, dressed in half a ragged shirt or in nothing at all. His monthly fee per child was ten centimos—one penny. For this he taught the ABC.

"The Saint with the Beard did the same in a far more distinguished part of Madrid. He asked no fee, because he lived by buying and selling cigar and cigarette ends. His pupils were on the lowest grade of the social scale, lower even than the sons of the squatters in

A PEER SPEAKS AS A COMMON MAN

ADDRESSING an audience at Dunfermline just before the recent General Election, Lord Milverton, former Colonial Administrator, made a rather caustic comment, which suggested that truth and the Parliamentary seat-seeker were, at least for the occasion, not always on speaking terms. We concur.

His Lordship further observed that the ever-increasing controls on production, distribution and exchange were slowly reducing us to a nation of obedient servants. We agree.

If any government guaranteed full employment, it was lying, because full employment depended on many economic factors outside the control of any one government. Once again we acquiesce.

Another statement was to the effect that the ordinary man in the street placed personal liberty very high, and that to him (Lord Milverton) a servile State was hell. We couldn't put it better. But beyond that we do not find ourselves in complete accord with his Lordship; for the "man in the street" having reduced himself to the inglorious position of an obedient servant to the aforesaid lying political set-up which has vociferously assured him that their one burning desire in life was to become his obedient servants, the "man in the street" becomes disgruntled when he later realizes that his servile status remains as hitherto.

In due course, if he has survived, and has not in the meantime "got wise", he rolls up once more in the desperate hope that *this* time he may find an honest politician and social saviour, and thereby strike a lucky break, only again to discover he is still playing the same old wearisome character of "Drudge" in the political drama.

So long as this circus-like performance (which is his tragedy) continues, so long will he remain the servile automaton of the not-so-servile State.

The remedy is so manifestly obvious that if the "man in the street" is a diligent and earnest seeker, he will, in the end, find the way out of the sawdust ring.

Liberty does not descend to a people; they must rise to it. It is life's most precious possession. He who spurns with contempt the offer of the scrag-ends of it being handed to him on a plate is well on the way to the securing of a more satisfying repast. That shoddy liberty which is given can, by the same token, be also snatched away.

The State will ever assume and play the rôle of master, and whoever bends the knee to any master, creates and elevates a tyrant and remains himself an object of compassion.

H.T.D.

AMERICAN MINORITIES

Continued from p. 3

almost entirely pushed into the desert. Their older lands some guaranteed by treaty) were thrown open to White settlement.

IV. Period of control by legislation: 1887-1951.

(a) Americanize the Indian; destruction of tribal organization and seizure of Indian lands under provisions of the General Allotment Act: 1887-1934.

(1) A barbarous attempt to deculturate the Indian. Seizure of Indian children at school age. Purposive sending of children to schools too distant to permit parents seeing them on vacation. Children absent for years at a time. Schools parcelled out among various Christian missionary sects. Total prohibition of Indian languages in schools. Outlawing of various religious rites on the reservation. "Prof. Painter, speaking of his visit during the past summer, says, 'Prof. Gordon, superintendent of the school which is detached from Agency control is wholly unfit for his position. He sent the children home during the winter with the measles broken out in them and many of them, the clerk says 40 out of 85, the doctor says 30, Gordon says 23, died, some of them on their mother's backs, before they could be gotten home.' Of the Ponca school, Prof. Painter says, 'The Superintendent is not fitted for his position, neither is his wife qualified to teach. The school was very poor indeed.'" (*Fifth Annual Report of the Indian Rights Association*, 1888.)

(2) A tragico-ludicrous attempt to both bourgeoisieify and steal more land from the Indian with one shot. All tribal lands were to be broken up into individual parcels. What was left over (i.e., what the Indians "didn't really need") was to be thrown open to White settlement. It is estimated that the Indians lost 86,000,000 acres or 60% of their holdings as a result of this act. All kinds of farces like owning strip sections in areas calling for widespread cultivation, ownership through inheritance (due to restricted rights of selling) of 1/320 rights to a parcel of land.

(Of course such fundamental changes in economy and psychology can be legislated if one is willing to pay the price. The price, however, in cultural and personal shock was fantastic. But then the legislators were not

paying.)

(b) Indianize the Indian: Government efforts at tribal reorganization under the provisions of the Reorganization Act: 1934-1951.

The Rooseveltian New Deal for the Indians. Partial return to system of communal self-government, land use and planning. Gradual increases in land holdings. Refurbishing of Indian culture. Permission of languages in schools. Non-interference in religious rites.

However, before one gets too optimistic, one should re-read the quotation at the head of this article. This after 15 years of the New Deal programme!

3

To-day, the Indian still stands on the margin of American culture. He is America's fastest growing minority with a birth rate which should bring his population to 700 or 800,000 by 1980; but his well-being is not increasing as fast as his numbers. Malthus notwithstanding, explanations closer to the truth, placed the blame for this squarely on our predatory ("and another Redskin bit the dust") form of society.

American Indians are 90% rural. A farming people, but: "Indian lands total 57,000,000 acres but most of this is on a few reservations. Of this only 4,000,000 acres (!) are farmland. (Most of the rest is just desert.—J.G.) It is estimated that the present Indian population needs at least 25,000,000 more acres for a subsistent economy and at the present rate at which lands are, and can be, acquired, this would take at least a generation." (Arnold Rose and Caroline Rose in *America Divided*.)

The Office of Indian Affairs, now in the Department of the Interior, takes care of the Indians of the country who are in a special class wavering between wardship and citizenship, depending on which is more convenient to the government at any particular time: e.g., if they want to sell any of their property they are wards of the government and must obtain government permission, but if war comes they are citizens like anyone else and can be drafted without anybody's permission. Between 1910 and 1941 (the only period for which I have the figures) the Great White Father in the dull gray Interior building at Washington, spent 93% of the tribal monies of his Indian wards on "administrative costs", i.e., salaries and maintenance for

White men.

"We've been applying a little arithmetic to the United States Office of Indian Affairs, which reportedly has one bureaucrat employee for every thirty Indians in the country. Assuming that there are at least three Indians to a family, this means one guardian on the Federal payroll for ten Indian families. Now if each Indian Office employee gets an average annual pay-check of \$4,000 (another reasonable guess on our part), that comes to \$400 per Indian family. (Incidentally, about 1940 the average working Indian in 131 jurisdictions—excluding four very wealthy ones—received an income of \$161 per year.—J.G.) Inasmuch as the official American philosophy of Indian-protection seems to assume that Indians must remain wards of the government in perpetuity unless they strike oil or become professional ballplayers, the \$400 annual expenditure will probably go on until the last living Indian goes to the Happy Hunting Ground.

"How much simpler—and how much more gratifying to those who believe Indians could be men—not wards—if every Indian family were to be presented with, say, a \$4,000 farm, the cost to be amortised over a ten-year stretch. If that could be brought within the ken of our philosophy of Indian-protection, the Indian question might magically disappear within a decade. This would give our children some respite amid paying for the social security we have already paid for and had stolen from us, and the professional Indian-guardians could be heaved off the public payroll and put to some useful work... Alas, we know we're merely day-dreaming; it's just hopelessly naïve to believe a government could even take a direct road toward solving anything that involves separating a bureaucrat from his bureau."—(Freeman, March 26, 1951.)

One may not agree with the private farm as a solution but the general idea sounds immensely reasonable.

Unhappily, however, after the humour, the idea takes its sad place beside those statistics showing how if the money for wars were used for peace each family in the world could have a home and \$10,000 cash and each town a hospital, and so on.

Man does not always act rationally and particularly does not do so in the area of race and inter-cultural relations. The next and concluding article will try to go into some of the more basic causes and ramifications of race prejudice.

JACK GALLEGU.

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

OPEN AIR MEETINGS

(Weather Permitting) at
HYDE PARK
Every Sunday at 3.30 p.m.
TOWER HILL
Every Thursday at 12.45 p.m.
MANETTE STREET
(by Foyles, Charing Cross Road)
Every Saturday at 4.30 p.m.

INDOOR MEETINGS

at the
PORCUPINE, Charing Cross Rd.
(next Leicester Sq. Underground Station)
Every Sunday at 7.30 p.m.
NOV. 11—Arno Pomerans on
LOGIC AND ANARCHISM
NOV. 18—F. A. Ridley on
WHITHER MANKIND?
DISCUSSION & SOCIAL MEETINGS
Every Wednesday at 7.30
at the **BIRD IN HAND**
Long Acre, W.C.
Everybody welcome

NORTH-EAST LONDON

DISCUSSION MEETINGS IN EAST HAM
at 7.30
NOV. 14—Round Table Discussion
OBJECTIONS TO ANARCHISM
Enquiries c/o Freedom Press

BRADFORD

At the
MECHANICS INSTITUTE (Saloon)
Monday, Nov. 19th, at 7.30
Eddie Shaw on
THE APATHETIC THROG

LIVERPOOL

DISCUSSION MEETINGS at
101 Upper Parliament Street,
Liverpool, 8
Every Sunday at 8 p.m.
NOV. 11—J. Noble on
THE PROBLEM OF SURVIVAL

GLASGOW

SUNDAY, NOV. 18th ONLY
INDOOR MEETINGS at
Bridgeton Public Hall, London Road
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 Payne, and addressed to the publishers.

FREEDOM PRESS

27 Red Lion Street
London, W.C.1 England
Tel.: Chancery 8364