

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"They are slaves who fear to speak
For the fallen and the weak;
They are slaves who dare not be
In the right with two or three."
—J. R. LOWELL

THE AMERICAN WAY FOR Saving Democracy

HOW many crimes have been committed in the name of democracy and freedom since that day eleven years ago when our politicians became the self-appointed leaders of the crusade against the forces of darkness! How many millions of human beings have been and are still being killed and maimed on both sides of the ideological line for freedom; and how many countless millions are homeless and unemployed, or in concentration camps and prisoner-of-war camps, or threatened with death from starvation and diseases caused by malnutrition . . . all in the name of freedom! As Herbert Read has so well put it: "The most terrifying object in the world to-day is not the atom bomb but the political cliché." We know all the crimes that are being committed in Russia and her satellite countries in the name of Socialism and economic freedom. What is so often overlooked by the champions of freedom and democracy on this side of the curtain are the crimes being perpetrated in defending "our way of life" from the Communist threat, which will ultimately result in world-wide totalitarianism, in a muzzling of all freedom of thought and expression . . . and all in the name of freedom from the totalitarian threat East of the curtain!

It is in America that this development is the most noticeable and FREEDOM's New York correspondent in his article on "Intellectual Thought in a War Atmosphere" showed with reference to a study conducted by the *New York Times* of seventy-four major colleges how the mobilisation of the nation for war stultifies thinking and distorts information, not only on the immediate issues of the war but in all areas. To what extent in the field of academic freedom, in America, has been further revealed recently in a number of ways.

THE first example to which we must refer is the document issued by the Superintendent of Schools in the State of Indiana, the text of which we reproduce in full:

TEACHING AMERICAN DEMOCRACY IN OUR SCHOOLS.

During the past few years administrators and teachers in the public schools have come to realise that more time should be given to instruction that will give boys and girls a more thorough

* *A One Man Manifesto* (FREEDOM, 3/3/51).
* FREEDOM, 2/6/51.

understanding of our American Democracy. The threat to American institutions by international Communism makes imperative that greater emphasis be given in our schools to the study of the meaning, significance, and the value of American Democracy.

Indoctrination has never been in good repute among educators in the United States. American schools have not followed the plan used in many countries of indoctrinating youth regarding a particular form of government. Boys and girls of Hitler's Germany, Mussolini's Italy, Franco's Spain, Stalin's Russia, Tito's Yugoslavia, and other Totalitarian nations have for many years been educated by a programme of indoctrination. Education in these countries has definitely sought to teach the young people that their particular form of government is the best and that all other forms of government are weak, evil, and corrupt. In particular, Democracy has been attacked.

It now appears necessary for the schools in the United States to indoctrinate American youth for American Democracy. We need to do this for self-protection, in order to combat the influ-

ences both at home and abroad that are trying to undermine our form of government.* Those people who are charged with the responsibility of directing the work of the public schools realise their responsibility in giving greater emphasis to the teaching of Democracy.

There are many common misunderstandings of words and terms relating to types of government. Direct instruction in our schools is needed to clear up these misconceptions. Boys and girls in American schools should understand the American meaning of these words and terms.* They should discredit definitions and descriptions used by foreign governments of such words as Social Revolution, Communism, Fascism, Totalitarianism, Police State, Dictatorship, Welfare State, Bureaucracy, Conservatives, Liberals, Capitalism, Socialism, Communal Enterprise, and propaganda.

In our present confused world, it is essential in America that we teach our young people that American Democracy is the best government in the world and that we explain why it is the best.* They should know that the United States

Continued on p. 4

Knocking the Dockers

AUNE: How dare science and capital set all this new mechanism to work before the community has educated a generation that can use it?

BERNICK: H'm; when printing was discovered, many copyists had to starve.

AUNE: Would you have admired the art so much, Consul, if you had then been a copyist?

IBSEN: *Pillars of Society* (1877).

AFTER refusing since October 16th to operate the Port of London's new £150,000 floating grain elevator, John Anderson, London corn porters, began working it to-day in the Victoria Dock. It was disagreement on the rates of pay to the corn porters operating the John Anderson that led to the giant elevator lying idle for five weeks.

The elevator is one of two ordered by the Port of London, the other being the Douglas Ritchie, named after the Authority's vice-chairman, and due in the docks in a few weeks. Its discharge rate of 210 tons an hour compares with about 100 tons an hour by the other elevators.

Sir John Anderson, chairman of the Authority, said recently that the machine had to be taken out of service because the corn porters complained that it worked too fast. Sir John said that the situation was reminiscent of the Luddites—the early 19th century workers who wrecked machines because they feared that they would take away their jobs.

—*The Star*, 23/11/51.

ALTHOUGH Sir John is forced to call upon the memory of the Luddites in the early nineteenth century, the problem faced by the dockers is not one that has suddenly popped up after a hundred years' oblivion. In the late nineteenth century, Ibsen built a play around the same theme; in fifty years'

time, if capitalism continues, the same theme may yet be topical. It has gone on throughout the ages, for the simple reason that new machines and new methods of work cause harm to the workmen under the existing system of society. Those, incidentally, are Ibsen's words, and so are these: "It's that cursed American (ship) that's put in for repairs. Those people imagine that work can be done here as they do over there." Why press the point further? The same problem is still with us, as acute as when the old Norwegian dramatist observed it in his place and age, and seven decades of stupendous industrial and scientific change have gone no nearer the solution of the problem nor afforded any answer as to where the Luddites were wrong.

The Luddites smashed the machines rather than starve; it may not have been a method conducive to industrial progress, but did it in fact prevent them from starvation? There is no denying that it did; that resistance to new machines may be bad enough when you can take a broad view, but it is much easier to take such a view where somebody else is concerned.

It is purely ironical that (because the Communist Party believes in industrial struggle as a tactic in countries not at the moment in alliance with Russia) some people might imagine that Bolshevism inspires the dockers' Luddism. For in point of fact, Sir John Anderson is expressing the purest Stalinist Bolshevism in his opposition to Luddism; he uses the term "Luddite" as the Kremlin uses "Trotskyist-saboteur". To do the Kremlin justice, one must admit they have to deal with far more difficult cases than face the old Bengal Lancer: they are faced with primitive peoples whose opposition to machinery is of the most rudimentary character—who object

John Anderson, my jo, John,
When we were first acquaint,
You'd made your dough at I.C.I.
To Bengal you were lent.
But now your brow is beld, John,
And Winnie's left you in the snow,
But you shift two hundred tons a day,
John Anderson, my jo.
(Apologies to Robert Burns and all
Scotsmen.)

Where the Power Really Lies

LAST week we drew attention to recent references by outside sources to an increase of interest in Syndicalist ideas.

This week we are pleased to point to rather surprising corroboration of one of our main arguments, this time in the Liberal daily, the *News Chronicle*.

We have consistently maintained that it is in industry that the real power lies in modern society. Parliament may be the seat of political strength, but since the industrial workers and technicians produce all the real wealth and maintain all the essential services, it is they who have the effective strength in society.

In the *News Chronicle* for Nov. 22, an article by the industrial correspondent, Margaret Stewart, supported this viewpoint. Her article started off by noting that the new Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Butler, lives in Smith Square, Westminster, where also is situated Transport House, headquarters of the Trade Unions.

"The Labour Party," writes Miss Stewart, "has been defeated in election, but this red-brick, stolid eight-storey building still remains the seat of industrial power. And Mr. Butler is an astute enough politician to realise that this power could break him and his Government."

"There was a time when a Conservative Government did not have to bother very much about what the T.U.C. thought. Some of the traditional Tory politicians were openly contemptuous about the 'cloth-cap brigade'."

"Troops could be called out to break a strike, there were millions of unemployed workers and the mines could be closed down for months on end without affecting anybody outside the mining areas."

not merely to machinery that displaces labour, but anything at all that is in contradiction to a way of life thousands of years old. It sweeps aside all these preferences for life in the past with ukases demanding forced collectivisation and mechanisation with the alternative of slave labour in Siberia.

This industrial Stalinism being introduced into the docks—give way to new methods decided by us for you, or else—has certainly had its initial success. Before Sir John rhapsodises too much about the benefits of it all, may we bring up once more the argument about the copyist? Mechanisation, which could be a great boon to the standards of life and cut out the unpleasant work, is in fact a curse because we have not the living conditions in which we can use it properly. However, it could cut out not only the routine manual work but the routine administrative work (often—perhaps humorously—called "brain work"). Sir John might well try the effects of science and machinery in the offices of the Port of London. He might find, indeed, that any intelligent junior clerk capable of routine clerical work, and able to transmit decisions from one technical adviser to another, could not only do his job for a twentieth of the cost, but probably be able to do his own typing and save the expense of a secretary. There is not quite the same anxiety, of course, in cutting out the superfluous jobs at the top as there is to save labour at the bottom, but there is no doubt that when the workers control their own places of work, these highly-salaried executives will be mechanised right out.

I must add that when I read that report in *The Star*, my thoughts were not of the Luddites at all, but the Caesars of ancient Rome. The Commander-in-Chief of the victorious armies was always Caesar, even when Caesar was defeated in battles he personally led. Sorry to return to Ibsen: "Do you know that the Emperor has held a triumphal entry into Rome? . . . Beaten, as he was on the Danube! . . . When he rode through the mighty arch of Constantine, he fancied himself so tall that he bent his back and bowed his head down to his saddle-bow—like a cock in an archway." (Emperor & Galilean). Can't you imagine the former Home Secretary (how many thousand prisoners was it?) sitting at his desk with a phone in each ear and saying to his vice-chairman: "John Anderson did the work of forty dockers yesterday. How about Douglas Ritchie?"
A.M.

"But 1951 is not 1926, or even 1931. . . . To close the pits for even 6 days—let alone for six months, as in 1926—would cripple British industry."

"In fact, no Government these days—Conservative, Liberal or Labour—can afford to take decisions on economic and industrial policy which would antagonise organised labour."

Of course, the Conservatives need not worry. They can sleep soundly at night, secure in the knowledge that the T.U.C. will seek only, as they have said, to work amicably with the new Government, provided the Tories don't try any rash and openly provocative business. But as Margaret Stewart has suggested, the Tories are astute enough not to try it, so the T.U.C. will be able to sit back and take it easy.

For the T.U.C. are no longer the "cloth-cap brigade". Miss Stewart pointed out that "To-day there are bowler hats on both sides of Smith Square." And the bowler, as everybody knows, is the symbol, the very trade mark, of respectability and conservatism.

Fundamentally, however, it is in the hands of the men in cloth caps that the real strength lies. The bowler hat brigades can parade their bold fronts as much as they please, but when the cloth cap brigade decide to stop giving their strength away to those who use it against them, but keep it in their own hands, the power that is vested in Smith Square, Westminster, will return to its rightful place—the point of production.

The Firemen's Boycott

WE have already referred to the token boycotts against routine duties operated by firemen all over the country in their fight for equal pay with policemen.

The fight is still going on, and last week a nation-wide 48-hour concerted effort, focussed public interest on the firemen's grievance.

Their claim for a return to their traditional equality of pay with the police force means a demand for a rise of 35/- all round, so far have they been left behind by the authorities' desire to bribe men into the police force with higher wages. The firemen have been offered 15/- a week increase, an offer which they have promptly rejected.

Their boycott action and refusal to obey routine orders resulted in a number of suspensions, and in several instances police were called in by fire chiefs to remove suspended firemen from the fire stations—another cause of bitterness for the firemen.

In some cases, these suspensions have meant under-manning, since the firemen made perfectly clear that they would not refuse to answer any emergency or fire calls—they were only refusing "spit-and-polish" routine work—and consequently the public were put in danger by the disciplinary action of the authorities.

After a meeting of the Manchester Fire Brigades' Union, Mr. A. Burge, the secretary, said the following resolution had been passed:—

"We condemn the action taken by the Chief-Officer during the 48-hour demonstration. He has shown his disloyalty to the citizens of Manchester by exposing them and their property to the hazards of fire in replacing trained firemen at his disposal for fire-fighting duties by unskilled and civilian personnel, some of whom were intimidated. He also impeded the transmission of communications and closed down stations. We, therefore call upon Manchester City Council to suspend him from duty forthwith, pending a full inquiry."

The boycott was declared for a specified period (48 hours) and has already resulted in a new consideration of their claim. They have shown the near-100% solidarity of the men, and that they will continue to have such actions until their claims are met.

FULL CIRCLE

We have had a wearisome experience in the past ten years of how effortlessly opposites become the same. The fervent adolescents of the Nazi Youth movement are now the leaders of the Communist Youth movement in East Germany. The Russians had little trouble in Austria and Rumania recruiting public prosecutors from the judges who had performed the same chore for the Fascists.

—Alistair Cooke in
Manchester Guardian, 23/11/51.

INDIA LAUNCHES BIRTH CONTROL CAMPAIGN

DR. Brock Chisholm, Director-General of the World Health Organisation, stated recently that the programme to educate Indians in birth control would begin within a few weeks under the Indian Government. According to press reports, he said that the technique to be taught would be the so-called "rhythm method".

The Indian Government requested W.H.O. to send a team to initiate the programme, and, apparently, no religious objections have been raised from Moslem or Hindu quarters. This is very encouraging.

The task before the Indian Government is no doubt a tremendous one, and the nature of the difficulties has probably determined the choice of method. The "rhythm method" must be taken to mean advice to limit intercourse to the so-called "safe period", and it is one of the few methods (*coitus interruptus* is another) which do not involve the use of any chemical or any apparatus.

Serious Objections

Nevertheless, despite its apparent simplicity, there are serious objections to the "rhythm method". Firstly, the so-called "safe" period would more accurately be termed the "relatively infertile" period. It is not fully safe, even if properly used. Secondly, it is dependent on knowledge of the time of ovulation (the time when an egg is shed from the ovary and becomes available for fertilisation) and this is difficult to determine accurately, even with up-to-date advice. Third, there is something unnatural in "making love to the calendar". It is only acceptable if sexual activity is itself held in poor esteem.

There are, moreover, serious disad-

vantages in starting off a contraception campaign with an inefficient method. Failures provoke disappointment and anxiety. There are many people in this country who are fatalistic and refuse all contraceptive advice on the grounds that "It's no good, anyway." The best way to combat such apathy is to provide effective birth control.

Problems of Peasant Populations

Unfortunately, effective methods are more easily obtained in a literate society than among illiterate peasants. Not because peasants are unintelligent—they are not—but because they are scattered and the establishment of centres or clinics correspondingly difficult. On the long view, the setting up of such clinics is an urgent matter. But they should be supplemented by a more readily available, if less effective method.

The "rhythm method" does not really fulfil this requirement, being too difficult to apply (abstinence being enjoined during what is for many women a period of greatest desire), and too uncertain even when applied rigorously. Since Egyptian times peasants have used sponge-tampons dipped in honey, or butter, or vinegar and water, and this might have been a better method for mass inoculation.

It is possible that the "safe" period (despite the Pope's recent dictum) is more acceptable to Catholics—and it should be remembered that India's health Minister is a Catholic. Furthermore, the self-control it requires commends it to a sex negative attitude. India, perhaps more than any other people, has a sex-affirmative tradition, however, and a more courageous approach to a mass contraception campaign might well be justified.

FOOD PRODUCTION AND POPULATION-2

I HAVE referred to the fact that of the 33,000 million acres land surface of the Earth only 4,000 million acres are alleged to be cultivable: this pronouncement by the United States Department of Agriculture simply means that the conquest of the ecology of one-eighth of the land surface has been achieved, and the remaining seven-eighths has an ecology which, in the present state of things, is too difficult to master. A similar pronouncement may well have been made about England by the Doomsday surveyors of A.D. 10, but since that time a considerable amount of ecology of England has been altered by the draining of swamps, clearing of forests, dyking of tidal areas, and the introduction and breeding of new varieties of plants which now take the place of the old native flora. Our enquiry must therefore lead us to a consideration of the present state of things in which seven-eighths of the land of this planet is unproductive of food, although most of it receives the essential energy from the sun just as the fruitful one-eighth does.

I am not going to begin by dealing with the Sahara desert or the Himalaya mountains or the equatorial forests of South America, but with a country which I know personally and which, it is alleged, cannot feed half its population. I refer to Britain. Passing northwards from Carlisle I noted the barrenness of the hills; apart from magnificent crops of bracken, heather, reeds and scant rough grass, these thousands of acres grow nothing at all, except where Forestry Commission has caused a few stands of conifers to be planted. Occasionally, a single cottage stands on a bare hillside and in its little garden grow vegetables. If anyone points out that the garden is part of the hillside and asks why vegetables do not cover the whole hillside the question appears naive and ridiculous. Vegetables grow in the garden because care and patient labour is applied to the soil there; vegetables could after a time be grown on the hillside by the application of sufficient labour to plant windbreaks, level terraces and generally "work up" the soil to take on a new ecology, but the price of such labour would be prohibitive. The cash return would not pay any landowner.

So we arrive at the plain fact that the barrier to growing food on certain land is not one of biological impossibility but of economic impossibility, within the framework of things as they are. I am not impressed by the technical objections to bringing poor, barren land into cultivation; we spend the greater part of the wealth of the community in doing far, far more technically difficult things than that. The amount of labour, skill and ingenuity spent on such industries as

armaments, plastics, electronics and atomic fission make the problems of overcoming difficulties in crop growing child's play by comparison. But our economic system is so taken for granted by Socialists and Tories alike that even the threat of world starvation cannot make them think in other terms. Such inanities as the following are produced by any attempt to consider increased food production at the expense of the economic system.

"It is true that there are people who refuse to accept Malthus... they are quite convinced that there are still huge tracts of land literally (*sic*) shrieking to be cultivated, and only the crass selfishness of the 'workers' prevents these lands from providing teeming millions with the highest possible standard of living. Alternatively, the fault is due to the 'capitalist class' (always unnamed) who deliberately refuse to allow immense quantities of food to be cultivated, who are always ready to destroy millions of tons of food 'to keep the prices up', and who, no doubt, eat huge quantities of food themselves which could be better distributed among the 'workers'."

This extract is from a review by H. Cutner on *Population Trends and the World's Biological Resources* by Dr. G. C. L. Bertram. Mr. Cutner further confuses the issue by assuming that those who try to point out the relevance of the economic system to the non-cultivation of land, are "anti-Malthusians", whereas Malthus' thesis is not in fact questioned at all.

Where then does the key lie which will unlock the economic bar to land development and food production? It is useless to expect to find a solution from State enterprise in this direction, for the State cannot act otherwise than according to its own nature. In this country it is committed to the policy of developing industrial interests (nationalised or privately owned) and in order to sell the products of industrial production food-stuffs produced many thousands of miles away must be imported—and this, of course, gives a boost to the shipping industry, the coal industry and the steel industry. To grow all the food we require here would create a disastrous short circuit, and industry would suffer. I do not believe this to be a clearly thought-out plan manipulated by Machiavellian schemers, but like so much else it is the inevitable result of a number of conflicting tendencies which make up the balance of the *status quo*. It is unrealistic to expect the State to have a "change of heart" and go in for production for use on a rational basis; for one thing the State is an institution and not an individual and therefore has no heart or mind to change.

Progress in the direction of a greater measure of State control and land nationalisation offer no solution to the great problems of food production. The late lamented Ground Nuts Scheme in West Africa on which so many millions of pounds were wasted stands as a monument to State enterprise in food production. In Russia, 14 years after the Bolsheviks had seized the power of the State their efforts at stimulating food production by bureaucratic control of the land resulted in a famine of fantastic proportions. The famine of 1932-33 stands out in Russian history as a most unnecessary catastrophe brought about by political meddling.

Recent reports from Yugoslavia show that there has been some withdrawal from the earlier policy of State interference with the management and control of agriculture.

In actual fact the chief agent of stable food production all over the world has always been the small peasant cultivator. Although peasants are often backward and ill-equipped in their methods of farming, their deficiencies are due less to their own innate incompetence than to the drain on their resources by the exactions of landlords, tax-collectors, brigands, bourgeois exploiters and other human parasites who drain away the surplus which should naturally go into the improvement of the land. The peasant works like the humble but essential earthworm, that churns up a small quantity of soil every year, doing it very thoroughly, dragging the humus down into the earth, aerating it, draining it, and by his vast and greedy numbers and his tireless activity, leaves no inch of it untouched. For the soil is a most curious medium: apart from its mineral constituents of sand, clay, salts and the organic humus, there are a host of living agents both in it and on it which are vitally necessary to plant growth—bacteria, protozoa, fungi, worms, insects. All are agents who must work together to produce a particular ecology, and when that ecology is one of food crops, man himself becomes one of the animal agents. I have described farming as an essentially "unnatural" process; by this I do not mean that all that is necessary is for the chemist and the tractor driver to combine and try to force whatever crops they please out of the land. This method has been tried and produced barren deserts. Farming is "unnatural" in that its aim is to create a totally new ecology, but a stable and healthy ecology of food-bearing plants, and this can be achieved only by methods more subtle than those of the chemical land-rapist.

Again, it is useless to achieve high yields of crops (and thus establish statistical records) unless the food itself is of adequate quality. Vegetable produce which is apparently sound and healthy may yet lack the proper factors which make it give proper nourishment, and animals (ourselves included) which are fed on poor-quality trash not only degenerate in health themselves, but even give dung which lacks the proper quality of stimulating plant life to healthy growth. Thus, though the sun shine never so brightly, and water and chemicals are plenty in abundance, the wheel of life may run down if abused by ignorant business men or politicians who think only in terms of tonnages of food to be sold or doled out as rations.

In considering the human factor in land cultivation we come up against the stumbling-block of those who regard the peasant with a sort of mysticism, and rever even his stupidities and unscientific methods of farming which are the outcome of poverty and his not unnatural mistrust of outsiders. All I am pointing out is that only when the actual cultivators of the soil are given access to the great wealth, technical skill and scientific knowledge that are now squandered on socially useless projects, the problem of producing food from the untapped seven-eighths of the land surface of the globe will begin to be solved. I use the term "given access" advisedly, for if land-cultivators simply have forced on them by decree certain techniques, rule-of-thumb methods and short-term policies, much improvement can hardly be expected. Only when men have a real control over their own work will they be able to take advantage of the collective wisdom and wealth of the community. I cannot see this coming about through political means; what signs of hope there are of sanity in food production at this present time are to be

found in a-political bodies such as the Soil Association and in unofficial groups of farmers, market gardeners and biologists who attack their problems directly. In the last analysis, the pre-conditions for solving the problem of feeding the population will be arrived at only through a world-wide social revolution destroying the power-States, which are to-day limiting and destroying the world's resources. This solution does not appeal to many people in this country at the moment, for they are as yet unconscious of its relevance to their own work, and mistakenly regard it as yet another "political" idea—and one of the most extreme variety. Yet there is no doubt that recognition of the validity of the anarchist case is growing.

I cannot leave this subject without a final tribute to *homo sapiens*, without whom the continuation of terrestrial life on this planet will hardly be possible in future ages. We discussed how plants and animals played a round game with certain chemical elements, taking their motive power from sunlight. Water and aerial gases will always be available, but not so with the mineral salts. Gradually, very, very gradually, they are being washed out of the land continents and drained away into the sea. This is an inevitable process which has in the past been compensated for by the rise of continents out of the sea by volcanic action, but as the crust of the earth cools and stabilises, this will no longer happen. Save for *homo sapiens* the continents would become too depleted of mineral salts to support terrestrial life (except for a few sea-birds) who rescue the mineral wealth from the sea and spread it on the land again by our fishing activities and by the rarely practised art of manuring fields with seaweed. I mention this not out of mere academic interest or out of concern for terrestrial life a billion years hence, but to point out that available

acreages of land are not the only source of food. The vast wealth of the sea is hardly touched at present; the sea weeds that grow in such abundance in some areas provide an almost inexhaustible supply of vegetable humus, and the plankton on which the whales feed so leisurely may yet prove a far greater food source than the fish caught by trawlers—and nowadays not infrequently thrown back into the sea.

I fear that the above facts and my interpretation of them will hardly calm the ardent Malthusians who will excitedly point out that the Earth's population is growing like a snowball rushing down hill, and that only State-administered birth control will prevent a terrible famine. Unfortunately, the States of the world are only too eager to take advantage of the teeming reproductivity of their own subjects to ensure a good supply of cannon fodder. Why kill off the spermatozoa when in 17 years some of their number can contribute to the war machine? But the Malthusian case can best be met by assuring the conditions in which people will be able to limit their fecundity by rational contraception. When the people are herded into the slums of a big city or the grinding poverty of an exploited village, it is difficult for them to apply contraception properly. Anyone who has himself experienced such a life even for a short time will understand how in the dull grind of getting a living, of satisfying one's appetites under adverse circumstances, a hopeless apathetic state of mind is engendered and the idea of cautiously limiting fecundity becomes as ridiculous as the idea of a daily bath. People will only adopt contraception—effectively—when they have a certain decent standard of life. By this I do not imply anything connected with radios, leather shoes, canned goods or mechanised transport, but merely a life in which work is not an enforced drudgery and leisure something to be enjoyed.

TONY GIBSON.

Social Responsibility in Science & Art

A Broadcast Talk by ALEX COMFORT

THERE have been times when, in the history of art and of science, responsibility was not a pressing issue. Both, like any absorbing occupation, could provide a very real intellectual refuge. That is not true to-day, I think. In the first place, the pressure of ethical decision upon all of us, all the time, is now intense and unavoidable, and that applies just as much to the postman, the shoemaker and the solicitor's clerk as it does to the artist or the scientist—any of them may at any time be called on, under compulsion, to support, or to carry out themselves, actions which would have disgusted Ghengiz Khan. Secondly, I believe that the artist and scientist have special responsibilities in addition to their normal duty, of remaining human beings in whose eyes no other human being is quite deserving to be treated as vermin.

I am claiming for the artist and the scientist no kind of privilege or leadership which sets them above that responsibility. In fact the only pre-eminence they can claim is one which makes the need for conscious ethical choice more pressing and more inevitable than it is for others with other aptitudes.

The problems we all face are not new. There can have been no period, at least since the development of large centralised societies, when they haven't had to be faced to some degree. The main difference to-day is in their acuteness and in our awareness of them. It may be true, and I think it is true, that the modern centralised state makes very few claims which have not been made by previous states; it can be argued that the atom bomb poses no fundamentally different moral choice from that which the Napoleonic conscript with his bayonet or the citizen during the Hundred Years' War had to face, but the growth of our self-awareness, for which science and art are both responsible; has made a profound difference to our attitudes. We see ostensibly civilised cultures committing themselves to genocide as a weapon of war, we see the really fundamental human problems of continuing over-population and disease neglected in favour of psychopathic feuds—and most significantly we are put in the position, all of us, of choosing between enforced participation and active resistance without being able to trust, as our fathers did, to the idea of protest and progress through the usual political channels. Everything we sense as individuals, and very nearly everything we learn as social psychologists, makes it clear that any gesture of protest, any attempt to modify the course of events, must initially, if not throughout, be a personal one—a

reassertion of our own responsibility towards other individuals.

I think we have to face it—throughout very nearly the whole of Western culture, what is, in effect, the same problem of social ethics uppermost in the minds of very nearly everyone who is capable of articulate thought. And when I say Western culture I'm referring not to any polemical conception of Western culture but to an entity which includes both Russia and America, and spills over into all those parts of Asia where the intellectual techniques of the West are established. This preoccupation with social ethics has led to widely diverse results—much of the appeal of Marxism, for example, seems to me to have lain in the attempt it has made to restate the issue of social responsibility. That particular restatement fails to satisfy me personally, and it fails, I think, to satisfy the majority of English artists and scientists, but the fact that Marxism does make an explicit demand on the intellectual for him to formulate and act upon definite beliefs about his responsibility to society, may turn out to have been its most important consequence; that is what European intellectuals are trying, I think, to do at the present time—or at least I find them doing it in every country I visit, and every country where I have friends, whether the immediate problem takes the form of resistance to war or resistance to irrational political institutions. Of all intellectuals, moreover, I think the burden falls most heavily upon the artist and upon the scientist.

The reason it falls on those groups does spring, I believe, from their function. I didn't select art and science arbitrarily, to discuss their responsibilities, or even because I have an interest in both of them myself. Man has so far developed only two effective techniques for widening his grasp on external realities: the technique of com-

municating total perception which we call art, and the technique of investigating objective experience which we call science, and these are complementary techniques.

They are both effective ways of using the human brain, they both have extremely wide social effects—science as a source of practical knowledge, and art as a source of widened individual awareness and of social integration. In our own society, the integrative effects of art, as one finds them in some primitive cultures, are almost imperceptible, but the artist does retain social importance as a disseminator of ideas and as a result of the prestige which he still, to some extent, retains. In our own culture his power to influence is selective, but it is greatest among his fellow intellectuals. The social consequences of science are obvious, and it too has prestige, but by far its most important power is the power it possesses of applying to human behaviour the same technique of fact-finding and the same possibility of control which have given such striking results in their application to natural forces outside man. In the past, artists have often been content to discuss their responsibility in aesthetic terms, and scientists have taken, and some still do take, the kind of view which rejects any direct concern with the application of their results—the usual argument has been, I think, that the scientist has only the ordinary responsibilities of a citizen, and that he has no right to make special claims on the ordering of society. Those attitudes, I submit, have broken down. They have broken down in the face of the experience we have had of Nazism, in the face of the atom bomb and the advent of policy-determination by mass hysteria; most of all they have broken down, for the scientist, in the face of the realisation that the policies now being applied over large parts of the

Continued on p. 3

FREEDOM FOR YOUTH ?

WE train children as we train other animals, by breaking their spirit. We fit them, not for the life they are prepared for as they emerge from the womb—and no one has ever bothered to find out what the natural human life is—but rather for a very different civilised life, forced upon them ready-made by adults. The child's natural character—again, whatever it may be—must be distorted to fit civilisation, just as his feet must be distorted to fit shoes. This is called education, and naturally the child resists it.

—G. LEGMAN: *Love & Death*.

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

Some books to send to your friends this Christmas...

- The Spendthrifts Péroş Goldós 12/6
A Spanish classic translated by Gamel Woolsey, with introduction by Gerald Brennan and illustrations by Charles Mozley.
- Homage to Catalonia George Orwell 10/6
The new edition of Orwell's account of his experiences in Spain.
- Crime & Custom in Savage Society B. Malinowsky 15/-
Important anthropological studies.
- The Papacy in Politics To-day Joseph McCabe 2/6
- The Popes & Their Church Joseph McCabe 1/-
- Catholic Church Against the 20th Century Avro Menhatten 5/-
- The R.C. Church & The Modern Age F. A. Ridley 2d.
Four studies of the social rôle of the Catholic Church.

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

THE MISSING PAPERS

THIS interesting revelation was made in the Evening Standard's review of Raymond Postgate's *Life of George Lansbury*:

"Mr. Postgate's book contains some gaps. He discusses the reasons for these gaps in his preface. They deserve comment.

"During the war Mr. Postgate received letters from Sir Norman Brook and Sir Edward Bridges of the Cabinet Office demanding the return of some twenty secret Cabinet documents believed to be among Lansbury's papers. Mr. Postgate agreed to hand over thirty boxes of papers on condition that they would be returned to him as soon as the secret documents had been extracted.

"It was an imprudent act. Not one of these papers did Mr. Postgate ever see again. He made repeated applications to Mr. Attlee, by then Prime Minister, but was informed that all

the papers were Crown property and that he could not even look at them.

"Mr. Postgate certainly appears to have cause for complaint. Whatever the legal position may be under the Official Secrets Act, it seems an abuse of power to impound documents most of which cannot possibly be, in the words of that Act, 'prejudicial to the security or interests of the State'. They might, of course, have been prejudicial to the interests of some members of Mr. Attlee's Cabinet, but that is another matter.

"It is fair to add that we merely have Mr. Postgate's side of the case, and there may be reasons, not so far disclosed, which would justify the action taken.

"But the moral for those who own such papers is clear: don't hand over anything more than you have to, and remember that although possession may not be nine-tenths, it is much more than half of the law."

DOMESTIC NOTE

A woman member of the Territorial Army, fined £2 at Liverpool yesterday for failing to attend annual training camp, said that her husband would not let her go.

Daily Telegraph, 23/11/51.

THE PEACE OF THE WORLD

IN 1934, David Low satirised the failure of the Disarmament Conference with a cartoon showing a weeping crocodile backed by a group of tigers and jackals on the steps of the conference hall. Addressing the "common people of the world" unkindly (but untruly?) represented as a flock of sheep, the crocodile declares: "My friends, we have failed. We just couldn't control your warlike passions."

This cartoon is revived to-day, not by some bitter opponents of politicians but by—the *Times Literary Supplement*. It expresses the ludicrous, though ghastly, situation in which the world has lived—certainly for the past twenty years—longing for peace and yet divided into nations whose leaders cannot give effect to this universal longing. It is a situation which must make everyone question the sanctity of the nation state and of leadership from above. Those with social courage will begin to seek for a form of social organisation which does give effect to the general desire to live in amity with one's fellows.

Without pursuing this general idea in more detail, let us look once again at the Korean tragedy. There, in remote Asia, a people has been all but extinguished, and tremendous toll has been exacted of American lives and to a less extent of British and other United Nationalities. (It does not diminish these losses to remember that they are a small fraction of the loss of Asiatic lives.)

The Korean war was in the beginning justified by official propaganda as being the necessary check to the mounting forces of aggression. Without a stand in this case, they declared, a third war becomes inevitable. To prevent that, that greater slaughter, surely this present sacrifice is justified; nay, is a necessity for survival?

In the past we have pointed to other ways of approaching the Russian threat—by the establishment of economic and social justice. Nor are we content to accept the idea that "aggression" is purely one-sided. But we will not now argue these points. Let us instead accept the official justification for the Korean war at its face value.

It could be argued that such a sacrifice was "worth while" (though those who die and those who lose friends would be more compelling judges of that than the political spokesmen) if in fact world peace resulted. Such an argument was widely accepted during and after (though for only a short time after) the First World War, the war to end war.

The Disarmament Conference in Paris is failing, the prospect of war no less menacing than 18 months ago. But there are the losses in Korea.

At the beginning, the United Nations spoke of "saving" Korea from aggression, from tyranny. It is not necessary to speak now of the broken and devastated remnants—except in shame that the people of the world docilely swallowed these palpable insincerities and do not even now turn on the politicians who handed them out.

In the recently quoted American public opinion poll 56 per cent. agreed that the Korean war was utterly useless; only 33 per cent. disagreed. Yet American democracy shows no tendency for the leaders to accept this majority, nor for the people to insist. Meanwhile, death and misery flourish in Korea.

A year ago, comparisons were made with Spain. In 1936, too, it

was hailed as a stand against aggression and it inspired many, and many died. But there was this difference. It was the Spanish people who spontaneously resisted the onrush of fascist tyranny—at least during the heroic early months. In Korea it was the politicians and the United Nations abstractions, who used the Koreans for their own purposes. Even if one thought these purposes worthy of admiration, the parallel with the spontaneous uprising in Spain is clearly not supportable.

The waste of Korea—yet who does not know in his heart that men are capable of nobility, that their ingenuity and devotion can produce miracles in the fields where they are allowed unobstructed way. Science has another side from that shown in atomic fission—a life-saving and toil-saving side. And the people of the earth are one.

Social Responsibility in Science and Art

Continued from p. 2

earth are the result not of purposive planning, or even of purposive malice, but of entirely irrelevant factors springing from personality-disorder, neurotic and aggressive compulsions, and even of mental disease.

At that session, a speaker who said that he felt scientists should do something to implement their personal responsibility for the work they undertake, though he was not prepared to say exactly what, was very warmly congratulated on a courageous and provocative speech. The public, sensing this confusion of mind, has not been slow to express some pretty violent anti-scientific sentiments. The scientist has come to rank in news-value and in penny dreadfuls with the spy and the international crook. That may sound a frivolous comment, but the kind of public attitude which underlies it has, I believe, begun to exercise a very real pressure on scientific workers themselves. The need to translate an amorphous sense of social obligation into practical action is being felt more and more. The profound shock caused by the atomic bomb certainly posed the question of personal responsibility for the projects in which one engages in a very sharp and inescapable form; but the issue had been growing to a head in other fields—the psychiatrists, for example, who were forced to choose between the creation of good soldiers full of hatred for the enemy, and the restoration of balanced personalities, or more recently the prospect of the military uses of bacteriology. Some individuals have been in no doubt where their obligation lay—Dr. Norbert Weiner, for instance, the exponent of cybernetics, who flatly refused to provide information to the Guided Missiles Project on the ground that he could not accept responsibility for the use to be made of it, or the international Microbiological Congress which passed an unequivocal resolution condemning the preparation of bacteriological warfare as unethical. Such definite attitudes are not yet general, and they are equally strongly opposed by other scientists, but it does seem to me that there is growing up very widely a desire, almost a craving, for an agreed ethical position.

Those who feel this desire are frequently unwilling to formulate such a position, and may doubt the possibility of formulating it. Yet workers in specifically military research are, I think, already aware of a very slight fall in temperature around them when they mix with their colleagues. The development of a unified ethical voice in science is slow, but it seems to me that its development is inevitable.

(To be concluded)

CROPS—VEGETABLE & HUMAN IN THE BALKANS

THE Yugoslav Government denies that the late sowing is due to political difficulties, and puts this down chiefly to technical causes. Whether this is so or not, the peasants, even if angry with the Government, are not inclining towards the Cominform. The trouble has nothing to do with Communist propaganda. It is a domestic quarrel.

Yugoslavia is not the only East European country having difficulty with its agriculture. The Polish Government put down the food shortages to kulaks, speculators, the Voice of America, and the B.B.C. In Czechoslovakia the "week of deep ploughing" has had disappointing results. One tractor station had accomplished only 13.29 per cent. of its autumn plan. It is interesting to see that furrows in Czechoslovakia are measured so accurately. The satellite Governments are as much interested in larger populations as in larger crops. The Rumanian Government has instituted a new "Order of Maternal Glory", to be conferred in three different classes on women who have brought up seven children or more.

Manchester Guardian, 14/11/51.

AFRICA & GOVERNMENT . . .

"Whatever political party is in power in Britain, it will be forced in the direction of abdication in the colonies; any different policy, feasible perhaps before war, could now only delay and embitter the change, not stop it. Unless, of course, we are prepared to shoot carefully and continually. And even that is not a practical plan. Our aim if only for the lower motives—must be to anticipate the change and to guide it into gentler ways that will cause the least suffering to the poor and the unsophisticated."

"Very soon, as each colony present its crisis, we shall find it harder and harder to be neutral in Africa. We may even be forced to decide whether our moral responsibility is to the 60 million Africans over whom we have chosen to exercise power, or to the 5 million whites who have settled with our blessing. The dilemma will be of our own careless creation."

—PATRICK O'DONOVAN in *The Observer*, 6/5/51.

ONE of the Labour Party's arguments during the election was that the return of a Tory government would lose Britain the confidence of the Colonial peoples. They talked with pride of Labour's achievements, as though the granting of Indian independence was more than a recognition of necessity. They reminded us of the celebrated remark of Winston Churchill, "It is . . . nauseating to see Mr. Gandhi . . . a seditious fakir of a type well known in the East, striding half-naked up the steps of the Viceregal Palace." They reminded us of the sterile Tory sniping at the expensive failure of the Colonial Development Corporation's groundnuts scheme in East Africa and the Gambia eggs project. Mr. Griffiths, the former Colonial Secretary, answering Tory critics in his electoral broadcast, talking about the groundnuts, said: "I'll tell you frankly, it isn't the loss of our money, bad as that is, that troubles me most. It's what it means to Africa, with her people crying out for food. If only this scheme had succeeded we should have learnt the way to make the waste-land and wilderness of a continent yield more food for its hungry people. The Tories can laugh about groundnuts, but that won't feed the multiplying people of Africa: growing food for Africa is one of the biggest jobs we've been doing."

But in uttering these heartfelt sentiments, Mr. Griffiths forgot that the alleged purpose of the groundnuts scheme was to increase Britain's supply of edible oils, not that of the Africans. It is a characteristic of politicians that they should claim to pursue both self-interest and noble altruism in the same activity.

Mr. Facing-Both-Ways is not to be found in the Labour Party alone. The former government declared itself both the guardian of British interests in the colonial empire and at the same time the righter of the historical wrongs done to the colonial peoples. The new government, while not admitting those wrongs, will also have "the best interests of the peoples at heart," and it too will assume that the people's needs and British financial interests are compatible.

In Africa the government has to meet problems in every part of the continent. What is its attitude to be to the racialism of Dr. Malan's government in South Africa, to South Africa's annexation of S.W. Africa and the sufferings of the people there which have been given em-

barrassing publicity by the Rev. Michael Scott, the South African's declared intention of annexing the protectorates of Bechuanaland, Basutoland and Swaziland? What will it say on the proposals to form a Central African Dominion of Northern and Southern Rhodesia and Nyassaland, in the face of the hostility of the Africans who form an overwhelming majority of the population? What will it do about the exiled Tshekedi and Seretse Khama from Bechuanaland, remembering its criticism of the Labour government's lamentable handling of the affair? What is to be its attitude towards the growing political consciousness of the East African people in Kenya, Uganda and Tanganyika? And how will it react to the ambitions of the people of Nigeria and the Gold Coast where there is dissatisfaction with the degree of political independence granted in the last few years, and where it may be faced with far more radical demands for the ending of economic imperialism? The list of questions could be extended to include all the troubled areas of the northern part of the continent. For throughout Africa tensions are increasing and the divine right of the white-skinned intruders are being questioned, just as they are in the Middle East and the Far East.

. . . & THE FATE OF S.W. AFRICA

THE fate of the Herero people of South-West Africa and the struggle on their behalf by Mr. Michael Scott were described in *FREEDOM* for 10/12/49, when in the face of opposition from the South African and the British delegates, he was permitted to address the United Nations Trusteeship Committee.

The *Cape Town Guardian* (a paper which, according to press reports, has since been closed down by the government), quoted in its issue of 24/5/51, the South-West Africa Native Labour Commission's report of 1945-48, which states that "Condition on farms in South-West Africa—with isolated exceptions, housing for Natives on farms in the territory is primitive and unsatisfactory, and in some cases non-existent."

Dealing with the question of feeding on the farms, the report quotes a district surgeon who says that the position in the past four years has deteriorated badly and he has many cases of illness due to malnutrition.

"I am convinced that 50 per cent. of the farmers in this district only give their Natives meat when cattle die on the farm," the doctor said.

So undesirable did the commission feel the position to be that it recommended that farmers buy goats to feed their African workers.

A petition has been sent to the U.N. Trusteeship Committee by the Anti-Slavery and Aborigines' Protection Society which says:

"Under the South-West Africa Affairs Amendment Act, while the European population of South-West Africa, numbering one-tenth of the poll, has been given the franchise to elect representatives to the Union Parliament, the African population, numbering the other nine-tenths, have been given no form of elected representation, although they were alleged by the Union Government to have been competent to take part in a referendum on whether South-West Africa should be annexed by the Union. Their only form of representation is by a single European appointed by the Union Government to the Upper Chamber of the Union Parliament.

"The Union Government has, moreover, dispossessed large numbers of the African population of their land and given it to Europeans. This has been done in a country scantily provided with water and for the most part unsuitable for agriculture. To-day, thirty thousand Europeans have 58 per cent. of the land and some three hundred thousand Africans have 42 per cent. Scanty provision is made for the education of Africans and less for their economic development."

The Trusteeship Committee on November 16th over-ruled South African opposition and the legalistic arguments of Sir Allen Burns, the British delegate, and directed Dr. Ralph Bunche to telegraph to the chiefs of the Herero, Nama and Berg Damara tribes asking them to present their petitions to the Committee in person, and expressed the wish that the S. African government would facilitate "the prompt travel" of the chiefs.

On November 24th, the South African delegate to the United Nations announced "that South Africa will not participate in the work of the Committee until the Assembly repeals the Committee's resolution to hear a petition from the South-West African tribal Chiefs.

He also told the President that the South African Government will not recognise the invitation to the South West African representatives, and this is presumed to mean they will not receive visas to leave the country." (*Observer*, 25/11/51.)

On the previous day the French delegation had walked out as a result of a resolution introduced by Iraq, affirming the Committee's right to discuss political progress in non-self-governing territories.

Miss Nora Beloff, the *Observer's* correspondent writes that: "In the British view the Committee may seriously jeopardise the authority of the United Nations if it starts passing political resolutions which the administering authorities will feel themselves compelled to flout."

This was confirmed by the events at the 1949 Trusteeship Committee meetings, when after a series of resolutions had been passed calling upon Britain, France and other Colonial Powers to report to U.N.O. on the political position, to give equal educational opportunities to all children, to promote, native languages in schools, and to give information on human rights, education and illiteracy. At that time the British delegates said: "Where Britain voted against these regulations, she will not comply with them." As we commented then, (*FREEDOM*, 10/12/49):

"The governments of the world are loud in their protestations of loyalty to the great purposes and high ideals of the United Nations. But, one by one, with unfailing regularity, as their own activities are questioned during U.N.O.'s deliberations, they protest, and obstruct, and refuse to comply with its recommendations. Governments of all political colours—Conservative, Communist and Labour, are alike in this, and as they form into rival blocs against each other, they all with an air of hurt innocence declare that all are out of step but their own group. Nowhere is this clearer than in the discussions on the future of colonial territories, in particular, those in Africa. It becomes more and more obvious that the colonial peoples will have to fight their own battles for their own freedom from the imperialist powers which "will do anything for them except get off their backs". But the coloured workers must learn that national revolution will only exchange foreign masters for masters of their own race. Their revolution, to be effective must be a social revolution directed against governmentalism itself. They must destroy not only white authority, but authority itself."

C.W.

FAMINE THREATENS AGAIN IN INDIA

THE food problem in India is still a tremendous one and the sub-continent looks to 1952 with the prospect of yet another famine year. Rainfall has been poor, with disastrous effects on crop yields, while surplus stocks were exhausted during this year's famine.

In addition, the traditionally fertile areas of the Punjab and Madhyabharat have also been hit by the drought, so that increased imports during 1952 become an urgent necessity.

There is also a scarcity of cattle fodder, which is reported as affecting 10 million cattle, and the government has started a programme for the migration of the best herds to Bhopal, Madhyabharat and the United Provinces.

The *Manchester Guardian* correspondent remarks that "India has, indeed, acquired extensive experience in famine relief and can acquit herself very creditably as long as there is food to distribute—and food for free and democratic India is, no doubt, worth at least one atomic bomb in the cold war."

FREEDOM PRESS

- TONY GIBSON : Youth for Freedom paper 2s.
- PHILIP SANSOM : Syndicalism—The Workers' Next Step 1s.
- 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 : Delinquency 6d. 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 : Sexual Freedom for the Young 6d. 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.

LET THERE BE LIGHT

Report on Monopolies and Restrictive Practices in Lamp Industry

THE research by the Monopolies and Restrictive Practices Commission into the British electric lamp industry has lit up some very dark corners indeed.

It seems that some of our bosses, who hold up before us the virtues and advantages of free enterprise and competition, are not so keen on competition when it might threaten their own interests. They might almost be said to have learned a lesson from the Anarchists, and have realised that co-operation and mutual aid are more sensible and practical than cut-throat competition.

But as with many mutual-aiders, the mutual aid is somewhat one-sided, and whereas Anarchists want co-operation to be applied throughout society for the benefit of all who constitute society, the members of the Electric Lamp Manufacturers' Association want to keep its benefits to themselves.

And what benefits there must be! The Association, more easily known as ELMA—which is apparently a registered trade union!—controls the production of 73 per cent. of the 247 million filament lamps produced annually in this country, and even the few manufacturers who operate outside the ring have to buy components from ELMA suppliers.

The actual members of ELMA produce 60 per cent. of the nation's output. The biggest firms in the association are the Associated Electrical Industries Group (Mazda, Royal Ediswan, Cosmos, Metrovick lamps), General Electric Company (Osram) and Crompton Parkinson (Crompton Kye). These members fix the standards of quality and price for all lamp production, share all technical knowledge and research results, and control a group of five smaller companies who produce cheaper lamps.

These smaller companies are maintained as a "fighting force" to compete with the independent firms outside the combine. Because of their backing from ELMA, they are formidable competitors indeed, and their tactics have included selling vast quantities at a loss in order to capture markets.

Once the markets have been captured, they are parcelled out among the companies. According to their productive capacities, they are allocated a quota of the market, and if any firm fails to sell

his quota, it is compensated by the association, and if it oversells, it must pay a donation into the pool.

The Commission's report points out: "Competition is, in practice, confined to advertising and salesmanship. Though each is selling his lamps under his own brand, all members, so far as any given type is concerned, are selling virtually identical lamps at a common price."

What a farce this makes of advertising! This fantastic activity (on which 100 million pounds are spent in Britain annually) is, as far as the electric lamp industry is concerned, even more hypocritical than usual.

The great posters which tell us that Osram is the best, that Mazda are better, that you get better value from Crompton, or whatever their particular patter happens to be, are even more than most, pure baloney. The lamps they advertise are identical in quality and price and last exactly the same number of hours in use.

In the cheaper grades of lamp, the most anti-social condition of all is imposed. On pain of penalty from the association, no "Type B" lamp must be made by any of the controlled companies which will last longer than 1,000 hours.

If any shopkeeper sells any ELMA products at less than the stipulated price, he is put on a Stop List, which means he will receive no further supplies from any member of the combine, a boycott which no electrical goods retailer could afford to risk.

And the control does not apply only to this country. International agreements have been drawn up by ELMA which have effectively tied up world markets since the "Phoebus Agreement" of 1935. Markets have been parcelled out among the manufacturers, and signatories have agreed not to "poach" in each other's preserves.

All this is capitalism made easy, and we may be sure that it operates very much to the benefit of the manufacturers. There are aspects about the arrangements, however, against which it is difficult to argue. The Commission, of course, are of orthodox capitalist views and queried mainly the price maintenance aspect, whereby the retailers must not sell below standard prices, the sales quota, and the restrictions on quality for "Type B" lamps. They want a return to free competition.

Now, for all the arrangements, it remains a fact that electric lamps are among the very few articles which have fallen in price since 1939—from 1s. 7d.

to 1s. 1d. (excluding purchase tax) for a standard 60 watt lamp. What one is inclined to ask is—how far would they have been reduced without price fixing? But then, with capitalist combines, we can't have it both ways. If the manufacturers had not combined at all, the sharing of technical information would not have been arranged, and the undoubted efficiency of the industry would have suffered—so maybe prices would

not have come down at all!

These are the dilemmas inseparable from capitalist economy. Electric lamps, like everything else, are produced by manufacturers to make profit. They have combined to safeguard their profits.

Now, in a free moneyless society, we could have the advantages of combination without the disadvantages. With the whole industry operating by workers' control, the sharing of information for the common advantage would be taken for granted. Patents need no longer exist, for there would be no point in them, and the suppressing of invention for the sake of market economy, so easy

in a monopolistic organisation like ELMA (although the Commission did not specify any such cases) would also be a thing of the past. And the production of shoddy goods, with a maximum "life", to meet the market for cheap goods, would also cease. Goods would be produced for use and not for profit.

Two new machines are being imported from America. They are Corning "Ribbon" bulb-blowing machines, and between them have an output more than sufficient to meet all the demands of the British trade!

Think what this sort of thing could mean in a free society in terms of human well-being and leisure. But what will it mean to-day? Simply an adjustment of prices and the possible standing-off of workers, who will of course find jobs in rearmament, preparing to defend the interests of the Electric Lamp Manufacturers Association.

P.S.

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS PURPOSE OF MARRIAGE

MR. Robert Green's article, "The Purpose of Marriage", has left us with almost no purpose in life itself—although he does suggest there is an alternative to his theory; but for obvious reasons he chooses to ignore it. Having made his free choice for the "obvious" reason "that man is unable to live happily alone" (though why such a rule for paleolithic man should be applicable to humanity for all time I cannot understand). Why stop at this point in man's history, isn't it reasonable to suppose that man was isolated before the herd pattern developed and by "nature" monogamous and therefore possibly happy?

The herd developed for self-preservation and then later, with greater security, split into family groups, but still keeping within the herd until to-day we have a conscious and constant fight for individuality; here maybe we could hold on to some of that community feeling. In the herd we not only have the strong gathering "desirables" by their greater power, but no doubt using it to break up the remains of monogamy in order to create their own form of polygamy. This belief of force to create a monogamous society rejects one of free choice—implying that the female subjects herself each time to force. Does nature as far back as Paleolithic times suggest this? I think not.

What is this "natural" order that reigns supreme? Is society or order only a natural one when following physical laws? Have we to go to the lower species of animal life for a justification and proof of anarchism? Should we not say that it has evolved through man's thoughts, man's realisation that there is a fundamental truth which springs from the soul of man, which stands apart from written or physical laws and surely above the animal world.

Not once did Mr. Green refer to love between two persons as anything but a means of satisfying some physical appetite of no higher value than a gourmet's menu. How does satisfying ones hunger where and whenever one pleases become less the "lust of an animal" and more of "an agreeable social function"?

As for his humility to those societies which have solved their problems in one way, does he really believe that we can solve ours by delegating our wives to society as part of its chattels? Also, if the Samoan society he speaks of has cured its neurosis by sexual freedom before marriage, why carry on the practice when the problem is solved? Do we still take medicine after we have cured the illness?

The latter part of the debate was three-sided, a new feature among advanced minorities. The third protagonist was Philip Sansom, who sat beaming in the front row of the stalls and uttered never a word. But Comrade Turner hauled him up on the platform and bade him answer for the extraordinary notion that workers should take militant action in their places of work, as set out in Sansom's pamphlet "Syndicalism—The Workers' Next Step" (a Freedom Press publication). Comrade Turner also challenged Sansom to justify the Monarcho-syndicalism of the Anarchist generals, and waved a copy of that notorious Anarchist rag the *Manchester Guardian* as his authority on the subject. As Philip Sansom remained obdurately silent, Eddie Shaw was forced to open up again, but he could do little more than dot the i's and cross the t's of Comrade Turner's masterly exposition of Anarcho-communism. However, he did recommend that Turner should read the Syndicalist pamphlet that he had bought the morning before from the Anarchist bookshop in Red Lion Street. Eddie Shaw also expanded his comrade's theme that violence is lunacy, and produced a bicycle chain from his pocket to demonstrate how he understood the practice of Tolstoyan non-violence when confronted with a lunatic policeman.

The chairman, George Stone of the I.L.P., who had nobly sat, a lone Socialist between two Anarchists, for long enough, rose to his feet. He brushed the tattered shreds of paper from his jacket—the result of Comrades Shaw and Turner ripping the works of Karl Marx and the principles of the S.P.G.B. to pieces—and declared that we had had enough fun for one evening.

(Signed by the superintendent)
Superintendent of Schools.

* Our italics.

In other words, only by indoctrinating youth in blind loyalty to the "American way" can we counteract the indoctrination of Russian youth in the "Stalin way"!

By reading the Indiana document in conjunction with the views recently expressed by the members of the Association of University Professors' Committee on Freedom and Tenure, (namely that only "personal guilt" is a proper ground for disqualifying a teacher—"personal guilt" may take a number of forms including the demonstration of abnormal bias or of thinking "so uncritical as to evidence professional unfitness") one sees how rapidly American "democracy" is contracting that disease called "double-think", with which our native Stalinists

My whole belief in what human nature has been—is—and what it could be rejects Mr. Green's logical theory, which to him will seem very illogical no doubt, but then I don't believe that love is built on logic.

Newport.
MILWARD CASEY.

FLASHBACK—AND FORWARD

TWENTY years ago the scientist Sir Arthur Keith, in the *Sunday Express*, 17/4/32, on the "scientific" subject of "Man is Nearing Perfection," divulged this astounding discovery: "What better assurance do we need than that given us in the last general election? Millions of working men and women voted then for the reduction of their wages in order that our country might continue to prosper. As long as a nation is willing to make sacrifices it is on the ascent."

Supporting testimony (or wishful thinking, each according to his or her own interpretation) came from Field-Marshal Viscount Montgomery at Alton, Hants, 7/1/49. The *Glasgow Daily Record* on the day following, reported the Field-Marshal thus: "There was only one answer to the economic difficulties of Britain, and that was work, and the strength of mind to do more and better work without yet further increased wages. We were all prepared to die for our country in war, and many did. Should we not all be prepared to work for our country in peace?"

A few Cabinet Ministers, deeply touched by this moving appeal for sacrifice have already responded by making a voluntary *pro tem* cut in their princely emoluments, though this gesture is not likely to lead to any great diminution in girth dimensions. But for those of us who receive our more meagre share-out of worldly-wealth in a 4" x 2" wage-pocket, it portends a pulling in of at least another couple of holes in the old waist-belt, unless we are called upon and choose to accept the alternative of lining up to do the dying.

It will be time enough to speak of ascent when we have moved along to that form of society which will teach us to think only with loathing and disgust of senseless mutual slaughter. In that happier day, the domain of science will have ceased to lend and to prostitute its services in the cause of murder, and have shed itself of pseudo and paltry thinkers, and Field-Marshals have become mere museum pieces to remind future generations of man's long and painful trek out of the night of blind abyssal idiocy towards the light.

H.T.D.

Saving Democracy in America

Continued from p. 1

uses private enterprise while Russia uses socialism combined with dictatorship. Then, our young people must be taught that our nation disapproves of the Russian system in all of its aspects. They must understand that American Democracy was founded on private enterprise and that this economic system has brought forth a great and powerful nation which will continue to grow even stronger by perpetuating and protecting private enterprise.* Our boys and girls must be taught to refuse to compromise with any of the competitors of American Democracy. They must understand that democratic principles are guideposts that they follow in order to understand the meaning of citizenship in our society. They should use these principles in their everyday lives—in the home, the school, and in the community. By so doing they will strengthen the cause of democracy in its struggle against dictatorship and tyranny.

(Signed by the superintendent)
Superintendent of Schools.

* Our italics.

are afflicted and against which "democracy" is supposed to be waging its crusade!

IN America an added threat to academic freedom comes from the politicians, in the case of State Universities (which—writes Alistair Cook—"could be at the mercy of every Bilbo and McCarthy who wanted to challenge its syllabus, its policies and its staff") and from the "philanthropists" on whose support the independent universities like Yale, Harvard and Princeton depend, many of whom are now attaching conditions to their "philanthropy", such as sacking professors whose alleged political views they dislike, or "clearing" in advance all speakers invited to appear on the campus or demanding "loyalty oaths" from all members of the staff. And since, according to Alistair Cooke, it is the independent universities in America "that can when they are solvent, guarantee themselves a place in the sun immune from the vagaries of the nation's political climate [for] they are the citadels of academic freedom, and of a diverse and disinterested experiment where the answers are unknown", one realises how precariously balanced is intellectual freedom in America to-day—and for what reason? Why, to defend freedom from the threats of Communist totalitarianism of course!

LIBERTARIAN.

TAILPIECE: The American magazine *Time* (5/11/51) reports that: "The Winter Haven, Florida, High School faculty decided not to let their students appear on the same stage with students from Jewett (Negro) High School for a Junior Chamber of Commerce speech contest. Subject for the contestants: "I speak for Democracy."

ANARCHISM v. SOCIALISM

A DEBATE

A MOST interesting debate was held at Denison House, in London, organised by the London Anarchist Group and the Socialist Party of Great Britain, last Sunday evening. It was announced that Eddie Shaw would support the Anarchist case, and that Tony Turner would support the Socialist case. This announcement was misleading. The audience, although thoroughly entertained by the evening's performance, were somewhat bewildered by the fact that both speakers saw fit to support the Anarchist case. The only real practical advocacy for the S.P.G.B. came from Eddie Shaw, who was speaking for the Anarchists.

Eddie Shaw opened his remarks by a recruiting speech for the S.P.G.B. He seriously advised all young people who want plenty of intellectual discussion with absolutely no danger of getting into any sort of trouble with the authorities, to join the ranks of the S.P.G.B. As a militant Anarchist who had run into plenty of trouble in the working-class struggle he warned any such youngsters from associating themselves with the Anarchist movement. The recruiting figures of the Smallest Party of Great Britain would no doubt have shown a sharp rise as a result of this very practical advice, were it not for the counterblast from Comrade Turner who followed with a masterly exposition of pure Anarchism and a smashing attack on Marxism.

Comrade Turner explained at great length the meaning of Capitalism. He said that at such a meeting he assumed that not one of the audience had the slightest understanding of the meaning of Capitalism. He explained at equal length how the only way to the free society was by eradicating the ignorance of the masses by the elucidation of the minds of men and bringing them to achieve the social revolution through consciousness, thus demolishing the specious arguments contained in "The Communist Manifesto and the Last Hundred Years" (an S.P.G.B. publication), where economic determination pulls all the strings by which we puppets move.

Eddie Shaw returned to the defence of the S.P.G.B. by advocating that such dangerous Anarchists and conscious egoists as Tony Turner should be purged

from their midst. He gave his version—a very mundane one—of the evils of poverty under Capitalism. He seemed to have a sense of frustration that he was robbed of the fruits of his labour as a working-man, and actually expressed a desire for a motor car. Comrade Turner came back with an attack on such unworthy desires for material goods. He explained how he had eliminated this desire for wealth under capitalism in himself, for now instead of having a desire for a motor car he has—the motor car!

The latter part of the debate was three-sided, a new feature among advanced minorities. The third protagonist was Philip Sansom, who sat beaming in the front row of the stalls and uttered never a word. But Comrade Turner hauled him up on the platform and bade him answer for the extraordinary notion that workers should take militant action in their places of work, as set out in Sansom's pamphlet "Syndicalism—The Workers' Next Step" (a Freedom Press publication). Comrade Turner also challenged Sansom to justify the Monarcho-syndicalism of the Anarchist generals, and waved a copy of that notorious Anarchist rag the *Manchester Guardian* as his authority on the subject. As Philip Sansom remained obdurately silent, Eddie Shaw was forced to open up again, but he could do little more than dot the i's and cross the t's of Comrade Turner's masterly exposition of Anarcho-communism. However, he did recommend that Turner should read the Syndicalist pamphlet that he had bought the morning before from the Anarchist bookshop in Red Lion Street. Eddie Shaw also expanded his comrade's theme that violence is lunacy, and produced a bicycle chain from his pocket to demonstrate how he understood the practice of Tolstoyan non-violence when confronted with a lunatic policeman.

The chairman, George Stone of the I.L.P., who had nobly sat, a lone Socialist between two Anarchists, for long enough, rose to his feet. He brushed the tattered shreds of paper from his jacket—the result of Comrades Shaw and Turner ripping the works of Karl Marx and the principles of the S.P.G.B. to pieces—and declared that we had had enough fun for one evening.

G.

Special Appeal

November 10th to 22nd:

London: Anon* 5/-; London: W.E.D.* 10/-; York: H.A.A.* 6/-; Banff: D.G. 6/-; Los Gatos: L.M. £1/15/0; Reading: E.J.P. 2/6; Bolton: R.T.S. 3/-; Anon 8/-; London: H.R.W. 1/3; Minneapolis: M.G.A. 5/-.

Total	4	1	9
Previously acknowledged	459	2	5
1951 TOTAL TO DATE	£463	4	2

GIFT OF BOOK: Edinburgh: W.M.C.
* Readers who have undertaken to send regular monthly contributions.

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 Foyle's, 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.
DEC. 2—Mark Holloway on COMMUNITIES AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO SOCIETY
DEC. 9—John Hewetson on CHILDREN, THE FAMILY AND THE COMMUNITY
DEC. 16—BRAINS TRUST on OBJECTIONS TO ANARCHISM 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
DEC. 12—Bob Lindon on DIANETICS
Enquiries c/o Freedom Press

LIVERPOOL

DISCUSSION MEETINGS at 101 Upper Parliament Street, Liverpool, 8
Every Sunday at 8 p.m.
DEC. 2—H. Sculthorpe on WAR RESISTANCE

GLASGOW

INDOOR MEETINGS at Central Halls, Bath Street 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