

# Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"No revolution ever rises above the intellectual level of those who make it, and little is gained where one false notion supplants another."

—HERBERT SPENCER

## MAKING THE CHILDREN PAY

# EDUCATION CUTS

THE Minister of Education waited until the M.P.s had begun their Christmas holiday before issuing her request to local education authorities to cut their expenditure in the next financial year by five per cent. In doing so she again avoided having to give an answer to the Opposition's questions on whether the government proposed to raise the school-entry age from five to six or lower the school-leaving age from fifteen to fourteen. Rumours that the government intends to take this step have been widespread in the last few weeks, but the *Manchester Guardian* reports that not even the Ministry is certain of the government's precise intentions. A statement by the National Union of Teachers declares that, "Any reduction in the length of the school life will seriously endanger standards necessary to this nation's survival."

### THE CUTS

Miss Horsburgh's circular to education authorities (No. 252) which demands the 5% reduction in spending, does not suggest precise economies but suggests that they should be made in the field of administration, capital expenditure out of revenue, school transport, physical education and recreation. Authorities are also warned, says *The Times Educational Supplement*, "that further measures of economy may be required and that separate guidance is to be issued on capital investment and awards to students and pupils." The Permanent Secretary to the Ministry, Sir John Maud, in a speech discussing the circular, said that "economy should not be confused with parsimony. It is not intended that there should be any reductions in the standard of teaching."

His complacency is not shared elsewhere. The National Union of Women Teachers in a statement on December 8, expressed strong indignation that education was the first social service to fall victim to the Government's proposed economies. The presumption that a five per cent. cut could be made without impairing the essential fabric was, the union said, rank hypocrisy and could only mislead the general public. The public was already misled by estimates which inflated the apparent cost of education by including the cost of milk and meals and the spending on medical and dental services for children at school.

The National Association of Labour Teachers says, "Sir John Maud has emphasized the difference between economy and parsimony; but there are those local authorities whose education budgets are already restricted to the point of parsimony. Such local education authorities are unfortunately those which will be inclined to regard the five per cent. reduction as a mandatory minimum, even though such a cut will only gravely jeopardise their existing services."

### MORE TEACHERS AND CLASSROOMS WANTED

We have already mentioned in FREEDOM the pamphlet issued by the Workers'

Educational Association in October on "Expenditure on Education" which pointed out that education was bound to fall victim of the economisers, since it takes a much bigger share of the rates than it used to, partly because of higher pay and partly because local authorities had relinquished other services like the hospitals, and were paying next to nothing on public assistance. The increase in the number of children also makes increased educational expenditure necessary.

"In 1940 and 1941 births fell below 600,000. Then they rose steadily, and by 1946 topped 820,000; these are the children entering the schools this year. In 1947 more than 880,000 children were born, and they will start coming in next year. After that the total begins to drop; but the peak year for infants and juniors in the schools will not come till 1957. So either the schools will need more teachers (to say nothing of more classrooms) over the next five years or we shall have to put up with more excessively large classes, and that means more children the groundwork of whose schooling is not well laid. Professor Lester Smith has calculated that by 1945 we shall need about 229,500 teachers in the county schools—an increase of about 20,000—even to maintain the staffing standard of 1950."

But is the "staffing standard of 1950" satisfactory? In a recent article in the *New Statesman*, "Education in Danger", Prof. G. D. H. Cole discussed the Ministry's review of the development of English education during the past fifty years and made the rather odd statement that, "Since 1900 the number of teachers in grant-aided schools has nearly doubled, and the number of pupils per teacher has fallen from 48 to 27."

Correspondents were not slow to point out that the figure was misleading because it did not take into account specialist teachers and head-teachers "who are so burdened by administrative duties that they have no time to teach. Mr. B. B. Mager wrote:

"Consider the case, quite typical, of a primary school of 210 children with seven teachers, of whom one is a non-teaching Head and another is a 'supernumerary', specialising perhaps in Art or Music or Physical Education, but without a class of his own. The number of pupils per teacher is only 30, but the average number of children per class is 42."

"Now, it is not difficult for a teacher to control a class of 42 children, nor yet to instruct them, but it is quite impossible to give them the individual attention which is necessary if they are to be effectively educated."

"There is nothing in the 1944 Education Act to limit the size of classes, but the Ministry has issued regulations prescribing a maximum of

### WAYWARD YOUTH

If, to some extent, the [French] young have lost faith in the old generation, they have drawn the logical conclusion and taken their affairs into their own hands—and the results are not too bad.

—HENRI APPIN,

B.B.C. Third Programme, 6/12/51.

## HOUSES FOR SALE

(1)

A man was ejected from the public gallery, a councillor suspended, and there was general uproar when Glasgow Corporation decided yesterday to sell 522 council houses being built in Merrylea, a suburb. A demonstration of two thousand people, who carried banners and placards and protested against the proposal to sell the houses, had dispersed by the time the debate began.

A young man in the public gallery shouted: "You can't vote. People are dying from T.B. If you vote you will condemn them to death."

*Manchester Guardian*, 7/12/51.

(2)

A survey made this year by Birmingham City Council of the 60,000 people on its waiting-list for houses, found that about 10 per cent. would be willing and able to

buy a house. "They were practically all either single people or married couples with no children, well down on the housing list. In other words, none of the people most needing accommodation could even contemplate the expense of house purchase."

(3)

Believing that many of the 396 people on their housing list—also 242 tenants of municipal properties—would like to have a home of their own built by private enterprise, Rayleigh (Essex) council sent out an inquiry.

But only 27 on the housing list and 23 council tenants said they would be willing to consider the proposition should permission be granted.

Now the council has decided to drop the matter in view of the replies.

*Star*, 14/11/51.

30 children for secondary schools and 40 for primary schools (to be reduced later to 30). There is, however, an escape clause which makes the regulations meaningless.

"In 1950, there were only 64,937 classes with 30 children or less, compared with 106,528 classes with more than 30 children. Of these, 37,106 classes had more than 40 children, while 1,557 classes had more than 50!"

### THE GUARDIAN AND THE GOVERNMENT

The *Manchester Guardian* discussing the educational cuts makes its most trenchant attack upon the present government since it came into office. The leading article on December 12, says:

"It is nonsense, of course to pretend that the average cut of 5 per cent. demanded by the recent circular, in the educational estimates of authorities for 1952-3 can be anything but injurious. The forest of 'frills', ripe for pruning, supposed to proliferate in the public primary and secondary schools, exists only in the imagination of Conservative members of Parliament, most of whom, except for the purpose of election meetings, have never entered them. . . . The history of the last thirty years offers more than

Continued on p. 4

### BURNING THE BOOKS

The Oct. 20 issue of *Catholic News*, the newspaper of Cardinal Spellman's archdiocese, quoted Monsignor McMahon, in attacking Paul Blanchard's latest book, *Communism, Democracy and Catholic Power*, that:

"Not Catholics but every right-minded American citizen should participate in a book burning."

—*Secular Subjects* (U.S.A.), Nov. 1951.

## CZECH PURGE

### Gottwald Denounces Slansky

THE purges in Russia and the Communist-controlled countries follows, as we have pointed out in previous articles, a definite pattern or plan. Each stage is accompanied by speeches and justifications which have little direct relation to the real situation. At the same time the repetition of the pattern gives the whole affair a nightmarish quality with a kind of irrelevant logic. There can be little doubt that it has a powerful effect on those who have a critical attitude to the régime.

The case of Rudolf Slansky in Czechoslovakia is typical. First, the suggestion of disloyalty and temporary cessation of public duties (at the time of the Clementis-Sling arrests). Then appointment to a new, largely nominal post. Finally, the accusation of attempting to flee to Western Europe, confirming the charges of espionage, etc.

The preliminary period must make clear to the victim what is in store, the temporary relaxation and new appointment then provide an opportunity for preparing plans for escape—which can only be to the West, obviously. Thus the victim manufactures his own evidence. Needless to say, if he is prominent, the Western Powers will have sought to effect his escape, for the information he might give, and the propaganda value. The pattern thus arranges part of the net, the victim weaves more of it, and finally draws it tight around his own neck.

### Gottwald's Denunciation

The Western press have seen the Slansky affair as an internal struggle for power between two groups led by President Gottwald and Rudolf Slansky.

There may be truth in this, but Gottwald's recent speech denouncing Slansky proves nothing. Slansky himself "unmasked" foreign minister Clementis, but is now accused of being a member of the Clementis group. Gottwald's position is such that he must denounce Slansky whether they were bitter rivals or close friends.

What he actually said was no more than the regular patter. Slansky created "the danger that a second leading centre might be established", i.e., might have rallied disaffection. Gottwald declared that at that time they had no direct proof that Slansky was an "enemy of the party" believing that his mistakes had not been deliberate, they appointed him to a leading economic post so that "he might prove that he had learned the lesson of his earlier errors". Later on, "A further very important fact came to light which filled in the picture—as it were, from the other end—of his true character. We obtained conclusive evidence that the espionage services of the Western imperialists were organising and preparing the escape of Slansky to the West."

That the basic aim of the purges is to strike terror into the heart of all but the most abject supporters of the Soviet Union was hinted at by Gottwald when he threatened that "in the end every one of these villains will be dealt with . . . Czechoslovakia will not be another Yugoslavia."

In the same vein was his threat that "only the West's creatures and agents have good cause to tremble in fear of what the future may hold in store for them." Anyone who criticises Russia and casts eyes elsewhere writes himself down a "traitor".

## Foreign Commentary—What Mr. Lyttelton saw from his Armoured Peephole More Violence Promised in Malaya

STUDYING the press reports of the Colonial Secretary's (Mr. Oliver Lyttelton) tour of Malaya, one comes to the conclusion there is little chance of fighting and useless slaughter ending in the near future. So long as the struggle is viewed as between "law and order" (British rule) on one side and "Communist bandits" on the other, there can be no solution until, as in India, the British will withdraw from the country, and the Malays, Chinese and Indians who constitute the population of that country seek the solutions which will make it possible for them to live in peace. It is not to be denied that the mixed populations in Malaya are in certain cases as hostile to one another as some are to British rule. But these differences are only increased by the presence of the British. One leading planter gave a clue when he said: "Not until the Chinese in the rural areas are more afraid of the British security troops than they are of the Communists will we make any headway." The implication is that "loyalties" to-day in Malaya are based on fear and on interests, and not on any desire from any quarter, with the exception of the planters and the native quislings, that the country should remain a British colony.

\*

MR. Lyttelton's tour was virtually carried out as a minor military operation. For the journey from Singapore to Mr. Malcolm MacDonald's residence twenty miles away, his car was (according to *Reuter* reports) in a convoy of two armoured scout cars, a jeep-load of military police, detectives in a staff car, a Gurkha police squad, troops in a military truck, and two police radio cars. Civil and military police guarded the route through Singapore.

And most of his stay he travelled in a ten-ton car, the windscreen and windows of which are bullet-proof glass an inch thick, and the bonnet, radiator-grille and floor of armour-plate. Whilst one can sympathise with these precautions to ensure that Mr. Lyttelton should die in his bed, "the leading officials, planters, tin miners and community leaders" said afterwards that the Army security measures were overdone and, "according to one leading official, apart from hampering Mr. Lyttelton in his fact-finding mission, the elaborate armoured escorts which have protected him even in the towns will result in a

Communist commanding more respect in future from local inhabitants. He declared that it had been a 'very bad policy' for the Army to insist that the Colonial Secretary should drive to the centre of Ipoh in an armoured car with the hatch clamped down." What "copy" this makes for a political cartoonist!

\*

BUT what did Mr. Lyttelton have to say on the occasions when he was allowed to unclamp the hatch of his armoured car and poke out his head?

He started by "putting his foot in it" when, in reply to a question put to him by newspaper reporters as to whether he agreed that political progress was an integral part of the struggle against militant communism in Malaya, he replied, "No. The first duty of the Government is to assure law and order." He added, "There is no point in giving political progress to people if they get their throats cut." The same language, it may be remembered, was used to justify remaining in India.

But a few days later he somewhat changed his tune following an uproar in the British House of Commons, caused by his statement, and at a meeting with Malay, Chinese and Indian political representatives, Mr. Lyttelton accepted the fact that constitutional, political, and social aspects had to be considered in dealing with the emergency but stressed that the "emphasis at the moment must be on the military side." He also declared that political advance in Malaya would "have to be slow."

Politicians ignore the meaning of the word "humility", and Mr. Lyttelton is no exception, for after five days in Malaya (how many times he was allowed out of his armoured car we do not know) he was able to declare that he had "not quite made up his mind" on measures which could help the country but conditions might well become worse before they got better. For, in the words of this super-man, "Many of the measures I have in mind could not become effective for many months."

A deputation of the Central Committee of the Malayan Trade Union Council told Mr. Lyttelton that: "It is unnecessary to reassure the British Government that Malayan labour is solidly on the side of law and order. It is fully pledged to a democratic and constitutional course of action," a statement which can be taken in more than one

sense particularly since in a memorandum the Council urged the British Government to give a clear-cut declaration of policy towards the Malayan trade union movement "to allay the fears of pessimists". The memorandum pointed out that the return to power of the Conservatives in Britain had caused "much speculation and considerable apprehension" in trade union quarters about the attitude the Government would take.

Mr. Lyttelton's replies were non-committal, for the taste of the Malayan trade union leaders, who had also asked that vigorous action should be taken against illiteracy, social insecurity and bad over-crowding in the towns. Some days later, the Colonial Secretary had more second thoughts and included education as one of the main points for solving the Malayan emergency and made a special statement emphasising that the British Government wants to see strong trade unions capable of reaching bargains and seeing such bargains upheld over the whole of the industry in which the trade union is formed.

\*

AFTER a tour lasting eight days, Mr. Lyttelton drew six conclusions from what he had been allowed to see from his armoured peep-hole. These were: The need for a decision on the over-all direction of the forces in Malaya, the re-organisation of the police, an accelerated education programme, greater protection for the Chinese resettlement areas, the decision to bring large numbers of Chinese into the Home Guard, and the need to relieve the strain on the Civil Service.

This programme means an intensification of military operations and terrorism, and such a programme can only mean that eventually the British will give up Malaya the hard way. There is a very clear parallel, to our mind, between the situation in Malaya and the one that existed in Palestine. The "respectable" Malayan nationalists, who talk about "law and order", etc., are in fact secretly obliged to the "terrorists" for who can deny that it is they, and not the "respectable" people who are shaking the British status quo in Malaya? Just as in Palestine, whilst condemning the terrorists, the Israeli politicians knew only too well that it was the terrorists and not the politicians who were making the British position there untenable.



## Two "Tough" Types

**THE PREACHER AND THE SLAVE,** by Wallace Stegner. (Hammond, Hammond & Co. Ltd., 12/6d.)

**JIMMY BROCKETT,** by Dal Stevens. (Britannicus Liber Ltd., 12/6d.)

THE recent publication of two novels affords an interesting comparison between two "tough" types—one an Australian capitalist and the other an American worker—battling their way through life in the same period of history, around the period of World War I.

Jimmy Brockett is a go-ahead Australian boxing promoter, around whom a legend is gradually built, who corrupts all he touches and swindles his way up to the top. In the circumstances with which he is faced, he has to buy up the Labour Party, knowing he can corrupt its leaders, whom he helps to nomination by his pressure on slum-tenants in arrears with the rent. It is a fascinating story of the type of political corruption which Australian "Socialism" was always noted for; the sharks like Brockett having nothing in common with the "wowsers" and Orangemen always clamping down on any form of public entertainment, but as his business interests extend, and particularly owing to the war, he goes over to them, the Nationalists. In the process of building up a fortune by his business interests, and protecting it by his intervention in politics, a legend is built around "Jimmy Brockett," the boy who rose from nothing to "make good", and in his devotion to money-making and "pleasure" his potency and even his reason are dissipated, until he finishes up an enormously rich, lonely, half-mad old man in a big house in Sydney.

The fictional character whom Mr. Stegner portrays in *The Preacher and the Slave*, is also one who finds himself a lone wolf, struggling against circumstances, in the rebellious background of American seamen's halls. Instead of devoting himself to business and political corruption, he turns to the I.W.W., then in the full apex of its battle-scarred fight with business and politics, and devotes himself to a determined solitary fight for the "One Big Union". "The preacher" watches the struggle and sees how "the slave" organises his fellow-

workers chiefly by the inspiration of his songs of revolt but also by his characteristically I.W.W. guts and good humour that won so many fights of the American workers. He has renounced all political corruption and simply in order to keep alive resorts to bank-robbery and the like from the big business class that had martyred so many of his kind. In a robbery in Utah, he shoots his way out, is caught and tried for murder. He does not want to implicate the organisation because it had nothing to do with the affair, but when it is brought into it, he puts on a show of being innocent, and in the defence (a wobbly organiser framed by a labour-hating state) he becomes a legend in his own way.

This fictional character is an extremely sympathetic one, and nobody could quarrel with Mr. Stegner for the picture he has drawn, as notable an invention as in its own way Mr. Stevens' "Jimmy Brockett". Unfortunately, Mr. Stegner falls on a cheap and specious trick of labelling the character he admits "is not biography, though it deals with life... is fiction, with fiction's prerogatives" with the name and some incidents of a real man, Joe Hill, the rebel poet of the I.W.W., who was in fact framed by the labour-hating State of Utah. He after all is no legend and instead of the "slave", Mr. Stegner draws becoming a positive fictional character like Mr. Stevens' slave, one can only read into his book an attempt to whitewash the State of Utah. A pity, because from a dramatic point of view the truth is so much more stark, when one thinks of the history of the Mormons (almost as bloody a struggle against American "justice" as that of the I.W.W.), who when esconced in power and consolidated by compromise turn out to be as bitter persecutors as they were patient sufferers. From any other point of view, Joe Hill's reputation is quite safe from the Wallace Stegner's, the brood of parlour-radicals of Greenwich Village, who are slightly bored with the old battle legends of American labour and the cultured grandsons of the get-rich-quick capitalists like Jimmy Brockett are with the way in which Grandpa made his money.

INTERNATIONALIST.

## The American Minorities—Conclusions

(Continued from our last issue)

7

### The War of All Against Everything

MANILA, Oct. 3 (U.P.)—*Arsenio Ortega, a seven-year-old first-grade student in the Calbayog City elementary school in Samar Province refused to submit to the school's medical examination, school authorities reported to-day. When they asked him why, he said: "If I pass, they might send me to Korea."*

Thus it is no accident that neuroses, psychoses, and suicide rates decrease in wartime. [That is to say, socially unacceptable neurosis and psychosis, and suicide, and even race prejudice in the U.S.!) decrease.] The perverse energies are discharged in a socially acceptable way, viz., against the enemy. Also one has a false solidarity and acceptance among one's comrades in death and danger which has a palliative effect on people's sense of isolation. In addition, war promises freedom from the deadness of ordinary existence and if he no longer carries a baton in his knapsack the ordinary soldier still has a condom.

And if the scientist is (from one point of view) merely a frustrated poet unable to mythise the world and turning in despair to the frontal assault of rationality, the bigot is the frustrated artist of human relations trying to force his way into human love or relationship. His technique includes the vulgar, crude blunder of the stereotype, the "race". He is even incapable of meeting people as individuals.

Since he cannot persuade by the genius of his own person, he invokes the false rationale of his "race".

His ultimate failure only increases his anguish. His final creation is the death of his enemy (really his lover). His failure, his lack of contact, his defeat is hypostasised in the minority: the mass victim of his mass authority. Since the authority is not his, neither is the catharsis, and the sadist remains unsatisfied, insatiable and knowing no other way: he will gladly bring the whole world down with him.

Whereas rational anger stops when the temporary dam of energy is released,

the bigot's sadistic energy continuously renews itself: i.e., he has no outlet in love.

\*

If our simple enquiry into minorities has extended itself into a subject ranging wide over vast areas of the whole culture, it is of course due to the by now simple truism that our culture, our society is an interlocked one: personal war, class war, national war—all seem sometimes nothing but different modes of the same irrepressible (some would say) the same eternal conflict: the desire for freedom. Negatively for freedom from restraints, positively for freedom to develop spontaneously, joyously, tragically in accordance with one's own peculiar gift and fate.

Our society by its massifying, its vulgarising of all struggles into blind struggles of unthinking masses, instead

of struggles of the peculiar choice of the individual, degrades his tragedy to the rank of the wounded blood-painted khaki soldiers in Woolworth's plastic-toy stalls. Neither is this a glorifying of any type of war, of the essential vulgarity of all violence. If man must struggle and die, let him struggle with things that are worth it: himself, love, ideas, art, nature, God.

8

### Summary and Conclusion

Prejudice has been considered:—

- (1) Politically: as a question of authority.
- (2) Psychologically: as a question of sex repression, "orgone stasis" and social biopathy.
- (3) Economically: as a question of class and group warfare.

All are bound in the mass terror institutions of class society, the authoritarian family and the State.

Prejudice is essentially a social or political institutionally-approved expression of personal hatred. Channelled through the class bases of society, frustrations of the individuals of society are permitted not an individual or personal expression, but a mass, total expression. Economically, prejudice is expressed in direct institutional patterns of discrimination, exploitation, class war, colonial and national wars. Poli-

tically, prejudice is expressed through fascist and authoritarian ideologies. Psychologically through feelings of superiority and sadistic outbursts terminating in death camps and total slaughter.

"The targets selected for attack, he said, may be Negroes, Jews, Republicans, Democrats, or members of a different religion or nation. The disease has much more to do with the prejudice of those affected with it than with the supposed sins of the target groups, he added, asking why the authoritarian personality bulked ever larger as a world problem.

"The chief reason has to do with the increasing complexity of life everywhere," Dr. Adorno answered. "Modern life has become so concentrated in large institutions that the individual has trouble to follow his own way. He longs for simple outlets for his frustrations. What is a simpler outlet than to join with others in attacking some group, any group? It gives a release to the stupid, but may destroy civilisation."

"Dr. Adorno noted that something had happened in Germany that showed the danger of authoritarian personality. The target now, instead of being the Jews under Hitler, he said, constitutes the millions of "expellees" who came to Western Germany after being expelled from Eastern Germany, Czechoslovakia and Silesia. There now are all sorts of false whispering campaigns about these people, many of whom cannot get jobs, Dr. Adorno reported."

New York Times, 22/9/51.

Can an F.E.P.C. wipe out prejudice? Has the Soviet Union wiped out prejudice by legal terror?

"It follows directly from our major findings that countermeasures should take into account the whole structure of the prejudiced outlook. The major emphasis should be placed it seems not upon discrimination against particular minority groups, but upon such phenomena as stereotyping, emotional coldness, identification with power and general destructiveness. When one takes this view of the matter it is not difficult to see why measures to oppose social discrimination have not been more effective. Rational arguments cannot be expected to have deep or lasting effects upon a phenomenon that is irrational in its essential nature; appeals to sympathy may do as much harm as good when directed to people one of whose deepest fears is that they might be identified with weakness or suffering; closer association with members of minority groups can hardly be expected to influence people who are largely characterised by the inability to have experience and liking for particular groups or individuals is very difficult to establish in people whose structure is such that they cannot really like anybody. And if we should succeed in driving hostility from one minority group we should be prevented from taking satisfaction by the knowledge that the hostility will now very probably be directed against some other group."

Authoritarian Personality (p. 973).

Is hate of bosses, landlords, Nazis, neighbours, parents, mother-in-law, etc., rational? Not if we consider them victims of society. It seems we must act as if the evil that men do is a product of forces beyond their control and the good things they do, the choice of their own free will. In a certain larger sense this is absolutely true.

"It is a sore travail which God hath given to the sons of men to be exercised in it."

And who can forget that before that great authority of our own deaths we all stand an eternal minority of one.

And while we yet live, in the words of the poet, Delmore Schwartz:

"I think that now we who are together this evening cannot find anything better to do than to praise Love.

"I propose that each of us, speaking in turn, going from left to right, make a speech in praise and celebration of Love.

"Who can have any objection? said Socrates. Certainly I cannot since I profess to understand nothing but matters of Love.

"For if I have not been talking about Love all the time, what have I been talking about, anyway?"

JACK GALLEGU.

## Communities in Relation to Society

ARE communities an escape from what is called "real life"? By "real life" is meant the sort of internecine society in which we somehow manage to go on existing. But those who maintain that communities are an escape from this state of affairs are usually ignorant of its nature. Therefore, they usually imply that an escape from it is shockingly cowardly or otherwise immoral. They feel that we ought to try to change this society, if we do not find it satisfactory, through the usual channels of parliamentary and social reform, or—if they happen to be extremists—through violent revolution. If, on such grounds, they can make you admit that communities are an escape, they think they have automatically and finally condemned them.

The answer, of course, is that communities are an escape from the society in which we live—or at least that they seek to provide such an escape—but the escape that they seek to provide is a valid one, because they seek to provide something better than we have at the moment. So far as I know there has never been a community that has tried to provide a way of life that was worse than the state of society which gave rise to it. The people who talk so glibly of escapism with regard to communities and other attempts to reconstruct life, do not usually compare such methods of escape with those offered so abundantly by society itself. The forms of escape which deserve to be called immoral or, at least, unsatisfactory, are those which can be summed up by the term substitute living. To escape into the dope world of sensational journalism, of vicarious violence provided by the worst films and pulp magazines, of drink and sex divested of all pleasure, and of secondhand opinion and automatic responses is to admit defeat by existing in a trance. And there is another escape that is even more dangerous—the escape into some ready-made intolerant creed such as Fascism, Communism, or authoritarian religion. These are the characteristic methods of escape at the present time: compared with them, attempts to form communities are, at the lowest possible estimate, harmless.

Such being the case, is it worth while forming communities? And if it is worth while making such experiments, are they likely to provide a solution to the problems facing society at the present time?

Communities are worth forming provided the desire to form them is so strong as to offer no other means of satisfaction to the individuals concerned. Unless a very great degree of enthusiasm is present, it is most unlikely that any

community will be able to survive the inevitable hardships of such an undertaking. This has been proved beyond any shadow of doubt by dozens of communities that have existed in the past. Several other qualities in the members of a community are vital to its continued existence, but without enthusiasm it is impossible even to make an adequate beginning, and unless enthusiasm continues to exist, the community loses its will to live. It is therefore absurd to suppose, as some people have done in the past, that a community can be successful if it is founded simply upon theories that are intellectually appealing. It must offer emotional satisfaction as well. And if it is to be really worth while, it should provide for all its members a fuller and more satisfying life than they could obtain elsewhere. If it could do this, a community would be completely justified whether it had any influence upon society in general or not.

Whether or not communities are worth forming as a specific attempt to change society, is questionable. During the nineteenth century there were some hundreds of communities in America, in which more than a hundred thousand people participated. Some of these communities lasted as long as a hundred years, and one association of small communities contained at its peak, more than 5,000 members. But apart from a certain influence on methods of education which were contributed mainly by two or three outstanding individuals who were members of one of the shortest-lived communities for about two years, it is doubtful if these nineteenth-century experiments impressed themselves upon the American consciousness at all. They certainly didn't change the American way of life in their own time, and have left no perceptible influence in present-day America. This is not to say that they couldn't have done so, had they been so much ahead of their own time as to provide a really new way of life instead of a life that was merely different, and often retrogressive in tendency.

The way of life in most of these communities, which were composed of religious sectarians whose beliefs were founded in creeds adopted at the time of the Reformation, was narrow and

bigoted. Within such moral limitations, the members of these communities were free in the sense that people were free in the Middle Ages. Both types of society were closed and departmentalised, and individuality was suppressed. Both

### FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

Some books by contributors to "Freedom" . . .

Gerald Brenan:	
The Spanish Labyrinth	27/6
The Face of Spain	15/-
Literature of the Spanish People	40/-
Alex Comfort:	
The Pattern of the Future	6/-
Authority & Delinquency in the Modern State	8/6
On This Side Nothing	8/6
And All But He Departed	7/6
Letters From An Outpost	7/6
Charles Duff:	
This Human Nature	3/6
Mark Holloway:	
Heavens on Earth	16/-
Charles Humana:	
The House and The Fort	9/6
Herbert Read:	
Education for Peace	7/6
Collected Essays	18/-
Contemporary British Art	3/6
Education Through Art	25/-
Politics of the Unpolitical	7/6
G. Scott Williamson:	
The Peckham Experiment	5/-
Physician Heal Thyself	5/-
George Woodcock:	
William Godwin	5/-
The Writer and Politics	3/6
The Paradox of Oscar Wilde	15/-
The Incomparable Aphra	12/6
Imagine the South (poems)	2/6
Ivan Avakumovic & George Woodcock:	
The Anarchist Prince	21/-

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

succeeded in reducing personal relationships to a level that is shockingly low in terms of truly human values. The cash or the use value that is put upon almost every transaction is often transferred to the people who engage in these transactions; and people are far too often regarded as mere cyphers instead of as individuals. Again, the economic and political scene is now so vastly complex that it has become an abstraction, something unreal, which no-one understands and which controls us instead of us controlling it, so that our political, religious and moral opinions are in the utmost confusion and are adopted un-

Continued on p. 3



## HERCULES AND ANTAEUS

A QUESTION which knocks with insistence on the doorways of our generation is that of the right use of the land. In Greek mythology, Antæus derived his strength from the earth, his mother, became weak and was finally killed by Hercules who lifted him away from contact with it. Despite our almost complete urbanisation, or perhaps because of it, we in Britain feel the truth of this fable, and continually hanker after closer contact with the soil. Five-sixths of our population live in cities.

Governments are, however, apparently incapable of giving any scope for the townsman's land hunger. Viscount Bledisloe last month asked the government whether "it was either possible or desirable" for Britain to grow her essential foods on her own soil; or, if not, to what extent the government thought it possible or desirable.

In answering for the government, Lord Carrington, Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Agriculture, treated this not unserious question with ridicule. Calculations had been made, he said, purporting to show that it would be physically possible to provide a subsistence in bare calories for the present population. Mostly cereals, potatoes, sugar, and such vegetables as carrots and cabbages, together with corn beef, but little bacon, butter or eggs. He went on to say that large quantities of imported fertilisers would be required, and hence that exports would still be necessary on a large scale. Such exports would not be available for the reason that too many of the population would be working on food production.

The significance of such a banal reply lies less in its substance than in the manner of its approach. British agriculture was largely destroyed by the need of powerful industrial exporting interests to pay for them with agricultural imports. The decay, and the loss of rural workers which resulted was an inevitable process of nineteenth-century capitalism. Clearly, the inheritors of that capitalism are unable to alter its basic trends. Lord Carrington in his reply indicated that with export problems as they are, increased agricultural production is not feasible. From this point of view, Viscount Bledisloe's question was altogether too naïve.

But those who have calculated that it is physically possible to grow sufficient food on native soil (Kropotkin, for example, or more recently and from another political standpoint, Colonel Pollitt, of I.C.I.) have never been under any illusions about the necessity to run counter to the powerful exporting industrial interests involved. The present Government, or a Labour Government either, are not prepared for any such attack.

What if a "revolutionary" government were found that would take the necessary steps? Such governments have been found in Eastern Europe who ruthlessly interfere with economic interests in pursuit of political objectives. They have not lacked ruthlessness in leading with formerly powerful economic interests: but on the positive side of stimulating agriculture they have always failed. In England, lacking a peasant population, such a ruthless government would be faced with still greater difficulties.

Two recent articles in FREEDOM showed the direction in which Antæus could regain strength: by

the patient application of labour to the land. In Britain, much loving care and diligence would be required, qualities not to be inculcated by decree from above.

Ruthless governments, moreover, have not got away from the economic necessities underlying the economies they so radically reorganise. They have not abolished the need of a market economy to buy and sell abroad: they still need exports. A resuscitated British agriculture requires a complete breakaway from the market system which revolution always presupposes, but which "revolutionary" governments never achieve.

There seems little doubt that the soil of Britain could provide a good deal more than a bare subsistence in calories. But the soil will not produce it without willing and intelligent labour, and a willing and intelligent population of land workers who can only come from the urban populations. The social problems, which governments do not even imagine, are by far the most difficult and serious ones in this major question of providing some direct contact once again with the land. It is time Antæus once more got his feet on the ground and sent the governmental Hercules packing.

## International Dispute

BRITAIN and France have asked the International Court of Justice at The Hague to settle a dispute over which country has sovereignty in two tiny groups of islands in the English Channel. Both nations claim the islands, the Minquiers, 15 miles south of Jersey, and the Ecrehos, four miles north of Jersey.

The Minquiers, a 16-mile long reef, barely visible at high water, has valuable lobster and crab fishing grounds. The Ecrehos are two islands about 30 yards long. On one there are a few occasionally-inhabited fishermen's huts.

—Sunday Times, 16/12/51.

A B.B.C. report said that this dispute has been going on for 300 years; the above report in the Sunday Times puts it at six hundred years! Now the V.I.P.s of the International Court of Justice are going to spend many hours of their supposedly very valuable time, at the end of which one of the two countries will have the islands and the other one will have a grievance.

English and French fishermen have played their part in the stupid squabble by pulling down each other's flags and hoisting their own.

How absurd such a dispute is! Can it not be realised that all peoples of all countries have equal rights to the fruits of the earth and—even more especially—of the sea, where no cultivation, no work has been put in.

But national interests, patriotism, national pride and prestige are considered far more than such natural rights, which can only be recognised in a world where national frontiers have ceased to divide the peoples of the world.

## A WHITE BOOK AGAINST AMERICA

THE Hungarian Government published a White Book of 323 pages sub-titled "Documents on the hostile activity of the United States Government against the Hungarian People's Republic." The U.S. Government "supported spies, saboteurs, diversionists and other subversive elements and organisations". It also supported the Hungarian section of the "Free Europe" radio station which "for twelve hours a day broadcast seditious, untrue and slanderous news about Hungary".

There is something comical about the charges, in view of the activities of the national communist parties, and, of course they are partly true. They also illustrate the difficulties of entrusting "liberation" to governments.

First it is clearly intended to brand every critic or resistance worker an American agent and so enlist patriotic feelings against him. Such a weapon is valuable in isolating the resistance. Furthermore, resistance groups will not be long in discovering that if Western governments help them it is for purely selfish ends, and so disillusionment quickly spreads.

But it may be argued that before the 1939 war, anti-fascists attacked the

British, French and American governments because they gave no assistance to the resistance movements in Germany, Italy and Spain. Now that they do give assistance to the comparable resistance inside Eastern Europe, and maintain a radio barrage, ought we not to give them due credit for it?

The answer can only be, no; for the reason that there is plainly no ethical attitude towards tyranny as such, or similar activity would be carried on in the case of Spain. The Western Governments are simply concerned with their alliances, with their interests as national States, and not at all with the struggle for freedom, as such. "Assistance" from the U.S. Government is almost certainly a liability as much as it is an advantage to resistance movements. And within such movements its chief benefits will favour most the nationalists who favour U.S. domination rather than Soviet, and least the revolutionists who seek freedom for its own sake and without the restrictive tutelage of one or other of the great Powers. "I fear the Greeks even when they bring gifts," might with more solid evidence be said of the Americans in the struggle for freedom.

## The Case of Lt.-Colonel Gore

Up and down the City Road  
In and out the "Eagle",  
That's the way the money goes—  
Pop goes the weasel.

A YEAR or two ago, I thought that the subject of the British Army in the Middle East in recent years might be a theme for a novel: unfortunately, every publisher who looked at the manuscript thought it was too dangerous in view of the libel laws. Each one said I must have such-and-such a court-martial in mind—each one mentioned a different one that I had never heard of. Notwithstanding my failure to enshrine him in undying prose, the officer who still claims an unsullied reputation, after years of corruption among the "gold rush" to the Middle East described in my article "Corn in Egypt" in FREEDOM the other week, remains my favourite character in fiction.

If I ever dig my Egyptian novel out of the attic, some publisher may yet tell me I had Lt.-Col. Gore in mind. I yield, however, to his defending counsel, Mr. Milford Stevenson, K.C., who made such a magnificent defence that one is amazed the court-martial cashiered his client and gave him two years' imprisonment instead of awarding him something out of the poor-box.

His court-martial was in regard to some items in the sale of British arms in Palestine—one of the most stupendous operations since the South Sea Bubble, a remarkable testimonial to the spirit of free enterprise among the high ranks of the armed forces, in which Col. Gore was a comparatively minor character in regard to the whole piece.

Mr. Stevenson's defence was somewhat cut in the Press, many newspapers toning down or cutting out his more particularly anti-semitic remarks. Since Col. Gore had played his part in what is no doubt considered one of the greatest military victories of the Jews since Jericho fell down at the blowing of a trumpet, the remarks came oddly from his defence counsel. However, here is one report which did not shrink too much in the wash.

"Colonel Thomas Gerard Gore, facing a Chelsea court-martial on charges concerning the sale of British arms to the Jews in Palestine, said at the resumed hearing to-day that he did not wish to give evidence.

"Mr. Melford Stevenson, K.C., defending, told the court he would call two witnesses to speak of Colonel Gore's character.

"The first was Major-General James D. Dennison, of Saltwood, Kent, who described Colonel Gore as a brilliant wartime leader, but difficult to fit into a peacetime job.

"I have referred to him as a problem child," Major-General Dennison said.

"Mr. Stevenson, addressing the court, said they were dealing with someone like a schoolboy—and a very backward schoolboy at that; someone whose whole life up to the time of the events you have to consider, had enjoyed the shelter of Army life.

"This protected him to a very great extent from meeting the kind of people who are met with in commercial communities, particularly abroad.

"Dealing with Ralph Newman, a former major who has given evidence against Colonel Gore and who has already been convicted in connection with the sale of the arms, Mr. Stevenson described him as 'the spearhead of the enterprise'.

"If they were not in court they would call him by a 'very short and ugly word', and all the more because 'he wore the very thin disguise of officer and gentleman until he came before a court-martial'.

"Mr. Stevenson added that thousands of Jews in Palestine were determined to

use every resort to get hold of arms—people who have in their blood 3,000 years of business experience'.

WHAT TO DO?

"What was the wretched Gore to do if they were determined to catch him?"

"You are here dealing with a man who, despite his magnificent military record and record as a soldier, has become a moral casualty because he was defiled by the scum with whom he came into contact."

"Mr. Stevenson referred to luxury flats in Palestine with the alcohol flowing freely, and said it was easy to understand how these things began."

—Evening Standard, 13/12/51.

The Jews are undoubtedly a remarkable people, and one of the few who have preserved the history and folklore of ancient times so well that their very legends become accepted articles of faith amongst those whose ancestors were living somewhat more primitively at the time. It has not before been realised, however, that there were presumably high-class cut-price emporiums by the waters of the Babylon, that the gentleman whose birth the world commemorates next week was probably tailored by Montague Burton's and possibly the prophets of the great universal truths discussed the profits of the Great Universal Stores in their spare time. If Mr. Stevenson's remarks do not imply all this—with his "three thousand years" which takes us back long before the circumstances of the capitalist world produced the particular type of commercial activity to which he was referring—we do not know what they mean.

But did this upright, honest soldier whom they were determined to catch, lose very much on the deal? We paid for the arms: incidentally, we went without homes, luxuries and even light and warmth at that particular time in order that they should be produced. He contributed nothing towards them, acting purely as a middleman taking 100% profit. And what did they do with them?

From the remarks of Mr. Stevenson, one would imagine they sold them at a higher price! But in point of fact they used them to fight a decisive action, for which in order to get arms it was a case of "go unto them that sell, and buy for yourself". They paid fabulous prices, on which even at Mayfair rates of spending many retired militarists are still living, and the Commercial Road part of it does seem a little on the other side.

What is the primary lesson of importance for the public in this case? First of all, the utter irresponsibility of depriving the public of what it needed, because of insistent demand by the Army. Enormous stocks of arms and material were built up in the tiny country of Palestine, because Ernest Bevin yielded to the plea that it was of major importance. Having done that, engaging in large-scale and complicated military actions, resulting in unquestioned defeat, the Army was withdrawn to Egypt. What happened to those stocks? What could not be taken was supposed to be destroyed, but with Jews and Arabs making high bids in view of the forthcoming struggle, there was a mad grab-and-sell rush. Down the drain went a couple of new towns, a few shiploads of imported luxuries, the blueprints for a few schools and hospitals, Scotland's television for a few years to come and all sorts of other odds and ends that had had to make way for "overwhelming overseas commitments."

You know, there is still an occasional Rolls-Royce going down from London to the country estate every week-end with a retired colonel inside muttering that England is going to the dogs—the working-classes are getting lazy and that's why he had to put up with a power-cut that afternoon in the flat paid for by—well "the scum" he came into contact with" if anything slips up, but ultimately, by our own post-war sacrifices.

INTERNATIONALIST.

## Communities in Relation to Society

Continued from p. 2

thinking and fortuitously by most people. Nevertheless, this is not generally realised, especially by the people most affected; and a community which sets out to give them greater freedom by attempting to change society through examples or models of what society could be, would have to offer a way of life so obviously satisfying and so obviously superior to that which millions are prepared to accept at the moment, that it is doubtful if it could be done.

Apart from such problems as these, which involve the conversion of millions of people to a way of living that would offer them benefits in which they would be unwilling to believe because such a way of life would also imply the abandonment of long-formed habits and dearly-cherished modes of escape, there is an even greater difficulty. If communities were successful on a scale which promised to change the nature of society even within so short a space of time as that of a generation, the opposition from interested parties would be tremendous. Every kind of misrepresentation could be expected from every source of propaganda, and if this were insufficient to alienate the population from the movement, the full barrage of law and force could be brought against it. As we know, these totalitarian forces are now so formidable, that they can be said to make rebellion or revolution—even of a peaceful kind—virtually impossible. The only possibilities of successful resistance to these vast forces would seem to lie with pacifism or non-violent resistance; but in order for this to be successful it would have to be conducted with a fervour that was almost fanatical. You cannot expect many people to be mown down by machine-guns for purely intellectual reasons; they must also be very strongly involved emotionally in what they are doing. The question then arises: If they are emotionally involved to the extent of sacrificing their lives, will they be sufficiently emancipated as human beings to offer real freedom in the society which they will establish if they are successful? This is a question which optimists will answer in the affirmative, but which pessimists and sceptics will, if they are charitable, leave unanswered.

My own view is that it would be unwise to form communities with the intention of changing society as a whole. The intention of changing society as a whole need not necessarily imply a preconceived idea of what form society should take in the future, but in fact it usually does. The temptation to construct Utopias is usually too great to be resisted. If it is not resisted, plans are made for a future which no-one can foresee; and if plans are made, people are made to conform to them. The result is a society which, by the time it comes into being, is based upon out-moded principles. And even if this society, in the larger sense, never comes into being, the community suffers from directing its energies upon an abstraction instead of a reality. Some of the religious sects from which communities were formed in America were based upon the conception of a millenium, and when

this millenium failed to appear even after repeated postponements of its supposed date, the members of these communities not unnaturally lost heart and their societies very soon came to an end. Similarly, the Fourierist Phalanxes were based upon the eccentric ideas of Fourier who had invented his own peculiar millenium. He had calculated that when it arrived there would be exactly 2,985,984 Phalanxes in the world. The Phalanx, therefore, did not pretend to be a civilisation in microcosm, but was intended to be a fully established and integral part of a world system. Whereas the Shakers, the Rappites, and the Owenites concentrated upon the spirit of community life, and were prepared to develop organically and empirically, the Phalanx was to observe Fourier's cosmological and social laws to the letter. It was to spring into being complete in every detail of a predetermined pattern. The results of this policy were an immense amount of impractical activity and an unnecessary complication of life in the three Phalanxes that lasted longer than two years. And if Fourier's original plans had not been severely modified, the Phalanxes would probably have lasted an even shorter length of time.

These are two extreme instances of what can happen to even a small community when it attempts to fit its activities into a ready-made mould. What can happen on a larger scale has been demonstrated in Germany and Russia, and is still being demonstrated to a less ruthless degree, in almost every country in the world. We are still living in systems that were invented by men who died in time to avoid living in them; and because these systems depend upon a high degree of centralisation and authoritarian power, their structures are not sufficiently flexible to adapt themselves to changing circumstances. Short of the breakdown of such systems, or their destruction by war or by violent revolution, there does not seem to be any way of dissolving them. And violent revolutions do not provide an answer to the problem, since they are followed by tyrannies that are usually worse than the systems they overthrow.

What we want is a society sufficiently free and fluid, sufficiently tolerant and alert, to permit the full development of the individual within an organic environment. It seems to me that it should not be impossible for a society on a small scale—that is, a community or a federation of communities—to achieve this. I do not think that such a project would stand much chance of success in this country. In an underpopulated, or a mainly agricultural country, the possibilities of success would be greater. I have already mentioned the difficulties involved in such an undertaking, of which the most formidable is the opposition that could be expected from the State. But these considerations should not dissuade enthusiasts from making an attempt which, even if it should eventually fail, would be a valuable experiment in itself, and might serve to contribute towards the formation of a new organisation of society.

MARK HOLLOWAY.

(To be concluded)



# VICTIMISATION OF FIREMEN—Growing Concern in Unions

THE situation developing in the firemen's dispute is getting more and more inflammable every day. The high-handed attitudes of the local authorities in punishing firemen for taking part in the recent spit-and-polish boycott is creating a wave of resentment throughout the Trade Union movement.

For the firemen's action was an official T.U. measure. Not a wild-cat unofficial strike, carried out by the rank and file, and roundly condemned by all responsible T.U. leaders. No, this was ordered by the union after they had gone through all the constitutional channels, everything done in the proper way—and the rank and file have been victimised in a manner which we have yet to see following official action.

We have already given the cause of the firemen's grievance. For years firemen have been recruited on the promise of equal pay and pensions with the police, but following recent increases in police pay, the firemen have fallen behind considerably.

The pay claim put in by the Fire Brigades' Union some months ago, was for 35/- per week increase and corresponding increases in pensions. The local authorities offered an increase of 15/-, which was rejected by the union.

Policemen have been given substantial increases and improved conditions in an effort to boost recruitment. The only answer the State can think up to deal with post-war crime waves is to have more policemen. But it is a policy which is not having much effect, for, like the army and the prison service, the police force can get all the personnel it requires by voluntary recruitment only when there are no other jobs to be had.

The firemen's grievance, then, developed when the promises of parity with police pay were broken. For 50 years that parity had been maintained, and the firemen see no reason for differences to develop now.

The action taken by the men to back

up the demand for equality was a simple boycott of all routine "spit-and-polish" duties. The firemen recognised to the full their responsibility to society and remained on duty for all emergency and fire calls.

Their boycott focused public attention on their pay claim, it showed the authorities that they were determined to pursue it and it harmed nobody. Nobody, that is, except the Fire Chiefs, who found their orders for routine work being disobeyed. And the only damage there was to their pride.

## The Discipline Code

Now, firemen are governed by a Discipline Code, which, like many other measures that workers would rather be without, was brought in during the war. For all the years before that, the country's Fire Brigades had managed to get along very nicely without threats or punishments. But authority likes to see its discipline codified; it likes to see the neck properly in the noose.

And the firemen certainly put their heads in the noose when they accepted the Discipline Code. Of course, "it was never intended" for use during a trade dispute. It was argued—and the unions accepted it—that in the hazardous and highly organised work of the Fire Service, strong discipline was essential. And so the union agreed to give the authorities the right to "discipline" (i.e., punish) the firemen for any breach of the many rules and regulations by which their conduct is controlled.

Now the union is grieved that this Discipline Code is being used against them. But what did they expect? If the union leaders were not so authoritarian themselves they would recognise the dangers in giving powers to authority. The only discipline that matters—especially in time of stress and danger—is self-discipline. That which is imposed from above becomes irksome and resented and inevitably operates against efficiency.

But the union leaders, who believe in discipline from above and follow-your-leader, are now highly indignant when disciplinary measures are used against their interests. It is futile for John Horner (Gen. Sec. Fire Brigades Union) to say that the Fire Service Discipline Code was never intended to be used in a trade dispute. It was intended to be used and disobedience, whether it is a result of drink or a dispute, will be met by authority with the means at its disposal.

What John Horner is admitting is that he was taken in when he agreed to the Discipline Code, and failed to draw upon working-class experience to realise that

such a Code could only operate against the workers he is supposed to represent.

## Exacerbation

Nevertheless, with all that said, there is no doubt that the local authorities have been spiteful and stupid in their reaction to the 48-hour boycott—and that the Government have been two-faced in their handling—or lack of handling—of their first major trade dispute.

While the boycott was in operation, some Fire Chiefs called in the police to eject disobedient firemen who had been suspended but refused to leave their stations. Questions were asked in the House of Commons and Sir David Maxwell Fyfe (Home Secretary) was compelled to advise against the use of police, and appealed to the local authorities not to do anything to exacerbate the situation.

But the Home Secretary knew at least 24 hours before the boycott began that certain fire authorities intended to

use the police in this way. Why, then, did he not use his influence in good time to prevent that stupid exacerbation of the situation?

But after the demonstration came the real crisis. As a result of the boycott the fire authorities agreed to the dispute to go to arbitration. Their representatives and those of the union had agreed on all the terms of references, when there came the news of the first punishments—those of firemen at Nottingham.

After that, thick and fast, came news of other punishments. The Discipline Code was put into action with a vengeance—and vengeance is the right word—at Birmingham, Shropshire, Dudley and in Kent and other places.

The punishments include cash fines and demotions—from sub-officer to leading fireman, from leading fireman to fireman, and at least one dismissal. As the union has pointed out, these punishments not only affect the firemen and their families now, but will affect

them for the rest of their lives, as their rank and pensions (dependent on rank) will suffer. And some hundreds of firemen are being victimised in this way.

The union has, naturally and in accord with T.U. practice, refused to go ahead with arbitration while these sentences are hanging over the heads of its members.

## Union Support

At a packed meeting at the Beaver Hall, London, last Friday (14th Dec.) some indication was given of the concern felt by trade unionists in other industries at this treatment of the firemen. Representatives of construction workers, engineers, electricians, post-workers and building trades workers brought messages of support and sympathy. Telegrams of support were read from other unions, including S. Wales miners' lodges.

What was obvious from the spirit of the meeting was the resentment felt by all firemen that some of their number should be singled out for punishment. "If some are guilty, all are guilty." Also the feeling that if the Discipline Code is to be used for victimisation in this way by fire authorities, the job of fireman will not be worth having.

It is certainly to be noticed that the restraint so far shown by the unions compares favourably with the high-handed action by the authorities. Already some union branches are calling for a "spit-and-polish" boycott of indefinite duration.

The L.C.C. has issued a statement describing the boycott as "sabotage" and leading to "remote control of the Fire Service". We wonder therefore if they would agree that the Syndicalist idea of workers' control of the Fire Service—and every other service and industry—being direct control by the men on the job, is better than control from the Town Hall and Council Chamber? If they are against remote control, they must agree that you cannot be less remote than the firemen, in this instance!

But that raises another issue, with no space left to deal with it. At the moment we are watching with considerable interest the reaction of the Trade Union movement to the victimisation of unionists in the Fire Service.

Will this be the kick-off for that revival of militancy we prophesied after the fall of the Labour Government?

P.S.

## A Meeting on the MOTHER & BABY CONTROVERSY

DR. Norman Haire addressed a meeting of the Sex Education Society last week at the Conway Hall on the Pope's recent edict on "Mother or Baby".

From the outset Norman Haire made his position clear by stating that he would defend the right of the Catholic to follow the dictates of the Pope if he wished, but since there were non-Catholics who might fall into the hands of Catholic doctors and nurses, and who objected to the Pope's pronouncement, he advised women in such cases to refuse to be treated by any doctors or nurses until they found out if they were Catholics.

He attacked such laymen as Lady Rhee who, in attempting to defend Christian morality, try to create the impression that in these days of skilled surgery the question of choice between saving mother or child does not arise.

For his authority that this was not so, apart from his own medical experience, he quoted from the 4th edition of *Moral and Pastoral Theology*, written by a member of the Society of Jesus, who stated that in certain cases of pregnancy, "Surgical skill has not found methods where both mother and child can be saved." And if a Catholic doctor is faced with such a choice he is obliged, on religious grounds, to "abandon the case".

To abandon the case may be less dangerous in the heart of a huge city where other doctors are more easily available, but Norman Haire gave us examples of sheep stations in Australia, where very often a doctor (who may be a Catholic, had to be flown 400 miles to attend a pregnant woman. If she had to be aborted because of complication, and was refused such rights on religious grounds, she would either die or suffer severely in health whilst another doctor was flown to her aid. In such cases, the danger of such religious beliefs strikes us more sharply.

Norman Haire noted that Catholics used the commandment "Thou shalt not kill" to conform to their particular code of morals, but without being a pacifist himself he had heard little opposition from the Catholic Church against the immorality of war.

Dr. Haire then dealt with contraception, also forbidden by the Pope ("a sex-starved old man"), and gave us examples of the many "safe period" babies he had delivered.

On sterilization, Norman Haire gave us plenty of scientific evidence of the necessity and advisability in some cases of this operation.

Finally, he repeated that those women who were not Catholics and who objected to their beliefs regarding mother and child should refuse to be attended by a Roman Catholic doctor, and in the political field he advised a boycott of Roman Catholic candidates. To Anarchists, this latter advice may seem rather superfluous!

Perhaps the following quotation from the volume mentioned above will give some idea of how keen the Jesuits are to hustle us into heaven:—

"Men are begotten not for earth or for time, but for heaven and eternity."

R.M.

## CONSCRIPT'S DEATH

The War Office has agreed to hold an inquiry into the death of 20-year-old Pte. Samuel Bennett Ainsley, R.A.S.C., who died in Germany three days before he was due to complete his National Service.

His parents say he wrote home after serving 36 days' detention for overstaying leave stating that he had lost 16lb in weight and "they will not break my spirit".

Last week they were told he had been buried on Monday, then that he had been buried on Thursday with military honours at Hanover.

—*News Chronicle*, 10/12/51.

## THE WORRIED SERVICES

Already in the Services there has been concern regarding what may happen if the Charter of the Nuremberg trial is made valid for the future. To those fears, Lord Maugham now gives precision. Recalling that the General Assembly of the United Nations, in pursuit of the ideal of an international criminal court, has endorsed this Charter and also the tribunal's judgment, he declares that as a result anybody who answers his country's call to the colours in wartime may be exposed to trial and punishment by the enemy as a war criminal.

—MONTGOMERY BELGION (reviewing Viscount Maugham's *U.N.O. and War Crimes*), *The Listener*, 6/11/51.

## Special Appeal

December 6th to 13th :

Douglas Water: W.S.M. 11/-; Huddersfield: A.L. 3/-; London: J.P.B.\* 2/-; Denver: R.B. £10/10/0; Sheffield: H.W. 5/-; Chicago: Free Society Group and Italian Group £8/15/0; London: B.G. 2/-; Leeds: C.L. 3/-.

Total ... 20 11 0  
Previously acknowledged ... 478 2 8

1951 TOTAL TO DATE ... £498 13 8

GIFT OF BOOK: Cambridge: J.W.S.\*

\* Readers who have undertaken to send regular monthly contributions.

## EDUCATION CUTS

Continued from p. 1

one example of 'economy' campaigns—the preposterous Geddes and May rackets\* are cases in point—launched with the maximum of ignorance and minimum of circumspection by Governments whose indifference to the welfare of common children turned the thing into a ramp."

The *Guardian's* words surprised its readers, one of whom wrote to say, "I can scarcely believe my eyes, but there it is in cold print. 'Given the policy of economising at the expense of children, which was to be expected from the present Government...' So begins your leading article to-day. Was it for this that you urged your readers to vote the Labour Government out?"

## LABOUR HYPOCRISY

His confusion was understandable and points the moral that neither intelligent newspapers like the *Guardian* nor their intelligent readers should put their trust in politicians. For just as the Tory Government's proposed reductions in the size of municipal houses was foreshadowed by the Labour Government—and the model of an "Economy house" that Mr. Macmillan proudly displayed at the Building Exhibition was prepared under Mr. Dalton's administration, so Miss Horsburgh's educational circular No. 242 which has the Labour Party up in arms was foreshadowed by Mr. Tomlinson's circular No. 210 which required economies in the same services as the new one, and also raised the price of school dinners and withdrew grants for school uniforms. The Labour Party's leaders are busy pointing out the difference between Tory promises and Tory policies, but what could be more sickeningly unctious than Mr. Dalton's broad cast last Saturday, when he attacked the policy of re-arming Germany, a policy to which the government gave its support when in office, or the Party's conversion to "Bevanism" on the question

\* This refers to the "Geddes Axe" of 1921 and the May Economy Committee of 1931.—Eds.

of the size of the re-arming programme? It is only a matter of months since Mr. Bevan resigned in disgrace for opposing the Labour Party's cuts in the Health Service. And it is not very much longer since Mr. Stanley Evans had to resign because of his remarks about "feather-bedding the farmers" on agricultural prices, but one would not think so from the righteous indignation which arose from his Party when the Tories announced their increase in these prices. What makes all the difference is who is in office.

## BAREFOOT TO SAVE "OUR WAY OF LIFE"

In a speech at Ottawa last month, Air-Marshal Sir Basil Embry, R.A.F. Fighter Command Chief, said that as long as Winston Churchill was Prime Minister and Minister of Defence there would be no deterioration in Britain's defence preparations. "If it means that we have to go barefooted in the streets, we will not be unprepared if war comes again," declared Sir Basil (though he did really mean that he would go barefoot—his shoes are part of the defence preparations).

If you don't want to go barefoot in the streets, the thing to do is to make shoes for yourself and not shoes and shells for the next great crusade. And if you don't want the progressively-growing cuts in the educational facilities available for your children, the thing to do is to take these matters out of the hands of politicians. If, on the other hand, you are a loyal follower of either the Government or the Opposition (when it gets back into office), stop moaning and join the Home Guard.

The political and military leaders will tell you that you can't have security and the Welfare State. What they mean is that you can't spend \$2,000 million a week on arms, as the member States of the U.N. are doing unless you intend to use them before they get out of date.

W.

## FREEDOM PRESS

TONY GIBSON : *Youth for Freedom* paper 2s.

PHILIP SANSOM : *Syndicalism—The Workers' Next Step* 1s.

ERRICO MALATESTA : *Anarchy. Vote—What For?* 6d. 1d.

M. BAKUNIN : *Marxism, Freedom and the State.* paper 2s. 6d., cloth 5s.

HERBERT READ : *Art and the Evolution of Man. 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. 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. The Wage System. Revolutionary Government. Organised Vengeance Called Justice.* 2d.

JOHN HEWETSON : *Sexual Freedom for the Young. 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. New Life to the Land. Railways and Society. Homes orhovels? What is Anarchism? The Basis of Communal Living.* 1s.

WILLIAM GODWIN : *Selections from Political Justice. 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.

## MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

### LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

#### OPEN AIR MEETINGS

HYDE PARK  
Every Sunday at 3.30 p.m.  
TOWER HILL  
Every Friday 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. 23—NO MEETING  
DEC. 30—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  
DEC. 26—No Meeting  
JAN. 9—SOCIAL EVENING  
Enquiries c/o Freedom Press

#### LIVERPOOL

DISCUSSION MEETINGS at 101 Upper Parliament Street, Liverpool, 8  
Every Sunday at 8 p.m.  
DEC. 23—XMAS SOCIAL

#### GLASGOW

INDOOR MEETINGS at Central Halls, Bath Street  
Every Sunday at 7 p.m.  
With John Gaffney, Frank Leech, Jimmy Raeside, Eddie Shaw

## FREEDOM

The Anarchist Weekly

Postal Subscription Rates  
12 months 17/- (U.S.A. \$3.00)  
6 months 8/6 (U.S.A. \$1.50)  
3 months 4/6 (U.S.A. \$0.75)

Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies  
12 months 27/- (U.S.A. \$4.50)  
6 months 13/6 (U.S.A. \$2.25)

Cheques, P.O.'s and Money Orders should be made out to FREEDOM PRESS, crossed a/c Payee, and addressed to the publishers.

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