

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"The more the drive towards life is thwarted, the stronger is the drive towards destruction; the more life is realised, the less is the strength of destructiveness. Destructiveness is the outcome of un-lived life."

—ERICH FROMM
 ("The Fear of Freedom")

THE WORKERS PAY BUT GET MORE ARMS!

Butler's Economies

GOVERNMENT spokesmen are fond of saying nowadays that "we are living beyond our means," that "we have got to pay our way." Apart from the sneers over their shoulders at the departed Labour Government whose "legacy" the Tories have to clear up, these clichés mean that Gt. Britain has an unfavourable balance of trade—that imports are exceeding exports. The Conservative Mr. Butler, with unconscious irony, called this in his speech on January 29th, "a great moral issue".

Students of politics get used to automatically translating the wordy effusions of our administrators into some kind of practical meaning. It is almost ludicrous, however, to hear working-men and housewives struggling to make ends meet using—with absolute gravity—the same clichés of "living beyond our means" and the rest. And it is difficult not to feel that the workers in this country are far more gullible in this respect than those of France or Spain or Italy or Germany. For the upshot is that the practical, thrifty men and women who from the solid basis of Conservative or Labour votes, straightaway defend the proposals of the Chancellor of the Exchequer even when they themselves are directly hit.

The Economies

The proposed economies involve, briefly, the following: Reduction in imports of food and various other consumer goods: cuts in production of goods for the home market such as cars, bicycles, household machines, radio, etc., together with adjustments of hire purchase, i.e., which will make these goods more difficult for people to afford: Passing on some of the cost of the health service to the sick both as regards dental services and appliances like surgical belts and boots, and a prescription tax of one shilling.

Distribution of Hardship

It is quite obvious, merely from a glance at this list, that those who are comfortably placed will not suffer much. Stiffer hire purchase terms will be felt mainly by workers with no reserves. The increased scarcity

of the goods whose production is decreased can only mean an increase in their price—another way of saying that the cost of living will rise.

Most plainly of all, however, the prescription tax is a tax on workers. The vast majority of N.H.S. prescriptions are dispensed to the working class. The twelve million pounds which Mr. Butler expects this to bring in will come straight out of the workers' pockets. More unjust still, the effect of this tax can only mean that the very poor will be deterred from seeking medical advice. A shilling does not mean much to an unmarried man even if he went to his doctor once a week. But to a mother with several children, whose income has to be divided among as many mouths, the contribution is not merely heavy but is multiplied in inverse proportion to her ability to pay. The Chancellor said that where there is hardship help will be given—but it is difficult to see how this can be effectively done even with a system of almoners or other assessors which would be more costly than the saving.

Much has been said about the dental service. But the merit of a free service has been to enable the poorest to do something about their dental health. The paying of up to £1 will effectively deter those most in need and convert the dental service into a mere State-aid for the middle-class.

Diversion to Arms

Mr. Butler spoke throughout of "retrenchment" and "economy" and "paying our way," but it is clear that his cuts

have another aim also—that of facilitating the shift from consumer goods production to arms production. Less production of motor cars does not mean less profits for the manufacturers: it means that they will move even more into war production. Elsewhere in this issue is an account of how America is "solving" the same problem.

A pertinent comment was made on the same day as Mr. Butler's announcement by Lord Chorley in the House of Lords. He pointed out that far too little attention was paid to building up positive health . . . £400 million a year of public money was spent on curative aspects of medicine while we could not do without one great bomber a year to keep the Peckham Health Centre alive.

Head-scratching

For anarchists, all this head-scratching about how to keep our national economy on its feet will seem extraordinarily remote and impractical. In its way, the provision of a "free" health service showed vision. How quickly the needs of capitalist economy strangles that vision is apparent. Surely the time has come to see that the needs of society require the strangling of capitalist economy?

Not Bombs, But Eggs!

SOMEBODY excitedly called across the garage to me and shoved the *Star* under my nose. Tucked away in the Stop Press column was a very interesting item.

"Demonstrators, styling themselves 'anarchists', threw eggs and tomatoes at delegates in United Nations General Assembly, Paris, and broke it up, says *Exchange*."
 —*Star*, 2/2/52.

Of course, nobody supposes that this sort of action does any good in the sense that one believes that while Sir This and Commissar That are brushing away bits of egg and tomato from each others well-tailored suits they will round, shake hands and agree not to sacrifice any more lives to military etiquette in Korea. The Egyptian pasha in his bespattered suit of English cloth will still read his brief against the foreigner in his country, and when the American and Chinese delegates have rubbed the tomato juice out of their respective eyes, they will still see the mote in each others.

However, that is not the point of a demonstration like this, which—as the mechanics who read that bit of news saw at once—is an apt expression of what the ordinary person thinks of the representatives of the international governments (as well as of international government).

They are all tarred with the same brush—and last Saturday, at least, they were all spattered with the same egg. The only expression of sorrow I heard that evening was in regard to the eggs (it was only hoped that they were bad ones and even those are fivepence each locally).

The effect of this on a group of mechanics (none of them even knowing what anarchism—or even what the *Star* called "anarchism"—was) would, I think,

THE VARYING TIDE

LABOUR GALLUPS AHEAD

DISILLUSIONMENT with the Tory Government, if not widespread, is at least sufficiently vocal to make itself felt in any conversation about contemporary politics. Before the General Election there were hopes of what a change of government could do but now it is common to hear nostalgic remarks (equally rooted in hopes and wishes rather than reality) to the effect that "at least Labour did try to help the working-man." One gets the clear impression that the new Government has already lost the gloss of newness and has attracted the usual grumblings.

To "blame the Government" is a familiar British attribute. For anarchists it is a completely infuriating one because it is always to blame the Government, never to blame government. Every Government defeats the hopes and wishes of those who elected them to power, yet the electors still think in terms of changing the Government—never in terms of abolishing government itself. There can be no questioning the truth of Octavius Caesar's sneer

in Shakespeare's play, misquoted a few months ago by one of our editorial writers:

"This common body
 Like a vagabond flag upon the
 stream, goes to, and back,
 lackeying the varying tide, to rot
 itself with motion . . ."

Observers of the state of the people, who are also critics of government, will not think the phrase "to rot itself with motion" by any means too strong.

Trends in the Public Opinion Polls

This "going to, and back," is already reflected in the trends in Gallup Polls. We have never set much store by public opinion polls, least of all by single ones. But when shifts in public opinion occur, the polls are perhaps on safer ground. Thus, the most recent poll gives the Labour Party a 3.5% lead, the Conservatives' electoral gains being already lost. The general trend is shown in the following table which gives the relative public opinion strengths at the time of the General Election, in December last, and to-day.

	Election Result	12/12/51	To-day
Conservative	48.1	47.5	44.5
Labour	48.7	45.5	48
Liberal	2.5	6.5	6

This shows that by December, the Labour Party had lost in popularity to the Liberals. By to-day, the Liberals have kept this gain, but the Labour Party has regained its Election Day strength, this time at the expense of the Conservatives.

Now these figures are not to be taken too seriously. But they do reflect, probably, the very transient nature of "public opinion"—whatever that vague abstraction be taken to mean. Here the main voting strength of the parties comes from loyal and staunch supporters who always register their vote for the party of their choice regardless of contemporary successes or failures. The "vagabond flag" comes from the more or less non-political voter who to-day holds a disproportionate political influence.

Fears and Hopes

However, some further Gallup figures give an inkling of what is in people's minds. To the question, "Which party can do the best for people like yourself?" 42% cent. plumped for Conservative, 48 for Labour and 7½ for Liberal.

On more specific points: to the question, "Do you think unemployment will increase," whereas 38% answered 'yes' in December, to-day 48% expressed fear that unemployment would increase. A similar unfavourable foreboding was shown in the replies of two months ago and to-day to questions regarding fears of price increases.

Whatever exact significance one attaches to these figures, the fact is clear that dissatisfaction with the Tories has increased since the Election to the point of wiping out their narrow majority. One cannot regard this dissatisfaction as evidence of political advance, however, what we would like to see is the sentiment "the more fool us for believing that another Government would make any difference!"

Continued on p. 4

SYNDICALIST NOTEBOOK

DUSTMEN REFUSE TO SNOOP

MOST laws operate only because the general population help them to. Many cases of law-breaking come to light, and many more are cleared up by the police, only through "information received". Without informers, the agents of the law, for all their modern equipment, are often helpless.

It is then, in the interests of those concerned with enforcing the law, to encourage and, where possible, to organise the flow of information about breeches of the law. And with this in mind, the City Engineer of Plymouth, Mr. J. Paton Watson, issued an instruction to the 300 dustmen who work for the city, ordering them to report any building work they may see on their rounds.

Since all building can only be carried out under licence—you must get permission to put up a garage or a chicken-house in your back garden—the local authority must know what crimes are being committed in order to enforce the law. And who better as a source of information than the men whose job takes them around all the houses, into the back gardens, and who would notice at once any addition to the scullery, a new wood-shed, or an outside lavatory being built?

Luckily for the stealthy builders of Plymouth, their dustmen have no intention of being turned into snoopers for the City Engineer. Members of the National Union of General & Municipal Workers, they asked their local Secretary, Mr. W. J. Oats, to write to Mr. Paton Watson, asking him to rescind the order

to snoop.

Mr. Peter Watson declined to do so. He thought the instruction was reasonable, pointing out that council revenue is derived from rateable value and that the dustmen are paid from the rates. He told Mr. Oats that all corporation employees are expected to serve the authority to the best of their ability.

We are sure that the totalitarian states think it reasonable for children to spy on their parents, and that all subjects should "serve the authority to the best of their ability". But are the Plymouth dustmen really to believe that their wages depend upon their becoming informers on their neighbours?

The dustmen think differently. In his letter to the City Engineer, Mr. Oats said: "Members feel very strongly because they are being turned snoopers on every side. We contend this is the job of rent collectors and individuals employed by you as building inspectors." And they are refusing to carry out their boss's order.

EQUAL PAY: What DO the Civil Service Want?

JUST like the last Government, this one is stalling on the question of Equal Pay for women in the Civil Service.

A deputation from the staff side of the C.S. National Whitley Council approached R. A. Butler, Chancellor of the Exchequer just before Christmas, asking for equal pay for women. Mr. Butler, of course, turned it down.

General Secretary of the Civil Service Clerical Association, L. C. White, regarded this as unsatisfactory, and said they would continue to campaign to try to get a majority of M.P.s in favour of the gradual introduction of equal pay in the service at the earliest possible date.

The amusing part about all this is that, just about a year ago, the Civil Service Clerical Association claimed and obtained a rise in salary for male typists who were earning only the same as women typists!

So that, at that time, the Civil Servants' own Association fought for discrimination between the sexes doing equal work!

Of course, as long as the wage system lasts, these anomalies and stupidities will last. The wage system is part of the larger lunacy of capitalism, and plays, among other important functions, the one of dividing wage earners among

themselves and against each other. And the trade union leaders, whose cushy jobs and positions depend upon the continuance of this condition, fall in and play the game for all they are worth.

Equal pay for equal work may some day be achieved by the women. But equality in society can never be won through the wage system at all.

FIREMEN'S PAY—Is it a Defeat?

THE firemen seem to be faced with defeat in their pay dispute. Their union leaders have accepted the Arbitration Board's offer of 16s. 6d. a week increase, and also, "with regret," the Board's rejection of the principle that firemen should be treated as equals of the police.

Permanent War Economy & Conformity

OCCASIONALLY the Editors receive indignant letters from readers who complain that FREEDOM is anti-Russian, from others who will not renew their subscription because they consider the paper anti-American. Curiously enough we have never received a complaint from any American reader to say that we were anti-British—or anti any of the others. Indeed, perhaps the most encouraging letters we receive come from American readers—and this may perhaps be interpreted as a comment on the growing difficulties in that country to express views which do not conform with those of the ruling class supported by that large section of the community imbued with hatred and fear of the Communist threat to “democratic values” and the “American Way of Life”. And, of course, our American readers know that we are no more anti-American people than we are against the Russian or British people. One can be accused of such an attitude when in fact one is suffering from the disease of nationalism (my country right or wrong) or that of transferred nationalism (such as the Communists outside Russia who have such religious faith in the ends of Bolshevism and in the incorruptibility of the leaders in Russia, that by a process of double-think they justify all the means, though they are the first to agitate when similar means are adopted in the countries in which they live). Those readers therefore who detect an anti-American or anti-Russian “line” in FREEDOM are simply reflecting their own political allegiances—not FREEDOM’S. We are opposed to all forms of power and coercion; to all forms of capitalism (and so far as we are concerned there is capitalism on both sides of the Iron Curtain).

THAT we should give more space in our paper to exposing the evils of Western Democracy than in denouncing the slave system of Russia is understandable. Since Russia has become the enemy of civilisation in the eyes of Western politicians and the capitalist Press, the barrage of propaganda aimed at exposing the Russian régime staggers the imagination in its intensity. So vast indeed that it has succeeded in paralysing the minds of millions of people to a condition which prevents them from realising what is happening around them in their own countries. So much so, in fact, that the very people who point to the double think of the Communists are themselves the victims of it, seeing all the evils in the Russian system and remaining impervious to the rapid growth of totalitarianism in their own countries. And this it must be said is particularly the case in America where “the American Way of Life” is now identified with “Western Democracy” and mainly through the efforts of American Big Business is being “sold” to the world as the model for democratic emulation. How pernicious, how de-humanising this mechanised, this Coca Cola civilisation is, needs to be exposed again and again. Russian Communism may be the opium to which desperate people, without hope in themselves or in their rulers, may turn as the last resort. This is bad enough; but that the only alternative to it is the “American Way of Life” is as bad, if not a worse prospect.

SOME idea of what this means was given in the article on “The Legal Basis of the Garrison State (FREEDOM, 2/2/52). A writer in the *New Leader* (New York, 7/1/52) an ardent, if some-

times critical, supporter of the American way, explains in more detail what the Permanent War Economy means. It is America’s attempt to confute Goering’s dictum of “guns or butter”. For the Americans the aim is guns and butter. And without ever debating the question in Congress, it has been decided to build two economies, consumer and war, alongside one another instead of converting one to the other as has hitherto been the practice. This means “the acceptance of a war economy as a permanent feature of American life”. By the end of 1953 \$50 to \$60 billion will have been spent for expanded plant capacity to produce raw materials and finished goods.

The *New Leader* continues: “American business has completely accepted the idea of a permanent ‘standby’ economy. General Motors has just finished a new tank factory in Cleveland that probably will never be converted to civilian use. General Electric, for the first time in its history, has set up a full-time unit to deal with war work. And, as a sign of the times, an enterprising Swiss company has set up an American subsidiary to build engines for the Air Force—the first company in the United States wholly devoted to war work and nothing else; apparently it sees a bright future.”

It is an understatement to say that Big Business has “accepted” the idea. For it is just what they want, as can be judged from what follows:

“From the start, the auto companies resisted any talk of conversion. They wanted to keep their production lines open to tap the bull car market that developed shortly after the outbreak of war in Korea . . .

“At the same time, the idea of plant expansion fitted in well with decentralization plans which the auto industry has had in mind since 1945. The expansion of consumer markets in California and the South, plus the basing-point decision (which tacked freight costs on to the price of steel and made it desirable to locate production closer to supply), had wrecked the old economic idea of “integration”. It now made better sense to have assembly

plants along the Atlantic coast, in Texas and in California than to complete all operations in Detroit. Hence, Chrysler is building a new plant in Newark, Delaware, and GM is planning one in Arlington, Texas.”

The ostensible aim of the “standby” economy besides being that of having “guns and butter” is to have a war industry which is ready at a moment’s notice to produce the very latest weapons of destruction. At present because of the time-lag in the conversion of civil factories from peace to war production it is necessary to build up large stocks of armaments which rapidly become obsolete and have to be replaced as and when new and more deadly weapons are invented. We underline ostensible because to our minds this is not the real reason. We believe that the “standby” economy confirms and extends the views put forward in this column last year, viz.: “Because modern wars create almost as many problems as they solve, from the capitalist point of view, it may be that capitalism will seek to survive by means of a cold, rather than a hot, war economy. Certainly it appears . . . that the present rearmament programme is capitalism’s short-term answer to the threatened slump.”*

From the point of view of Big Business, two economies avoids the delays—and consequent loss of profits—created by conversion. It also means that impending slumps will be accompanied by artificially created war scares to justify starting up the “standby” armament plants. (This may sound a fantastic suggestion to those who believe in the existence of such a phenomenon as “ideological wars”. We do not, holding as we do the outmoded view that capitalist economies and wars are indivisible).

Those who suffer for this “American Way of Life” of to-morrow are the workers. At the present time, and for two or three years to come, there will be large pockets of unemployment, as in Detroit at the time of writing. The B.U.P. reports (31/1/52) that, “The first soup kitchen since the depression was set up in Detroit to-day for motor industry workers who have been laid off. One-third of the men in this town are out of work,” said a member of the city council. “The city should set up public soup kitchens immediately.”

“The kitchen set up to-day is financed by an American-Polish organisation for workmen of Polish extraction who have been hit by unemployment. Ghosts of the depression years have been revived in Detroit. The United Auto Workers’ Union estimates that 16,000 out of

*FREEDOM 28/7/51 and included in Selections from FREEDOM, Vol. I, 1951, p. 113.

What Hope for Liberty? Non-Anarchist View

AS modern democracy requires everybody to be mixed up in politics, so it requires everybody to be involved in war. Among the first attempts to institute equality at the French Revolution was the decree of the Committee of Public Safety in 1793 which made every able-bodied Frenchman liable to military service. Men were no longer free to volunteer for war; they were conscripted. They have been conscripted ever since. In short, the French Revolution made wars national. Today, the distinction between soldier and civilian has been virtually obliterated. Rightly or wrongly, our demagogues believe that the only way to maintain the courage and endurance of the whole people throughout a modern war is to present war as in some perverted sense a crusade—a crusade that has nothing to do with a cross. This means that propaganda in war-time beats its tom-toms till every man, woman and child is a whirling dervish of righteous passion. Seemingly the demagogue never pauses to recollect that passions, once aroused, do not go to sleep again like dogs after the chase. On the contrary, once aroused, popular passions go on growing more lively, and they remain insatiable. And the demagogue must then pander to those passions, or else himself perish in the fury of them. So it is that to-day there is no more peace. We are condemned to live either at war or under the threat of war. And I do not have to labour the point that the conditions of the modern total war are the antithesis of political and civil liberty.

That being the contemporary situation as regards liberty, the question naturally arises: Is anything to be done? Can liberals—lovers of liberty—people like ourselves—do anything about such a situation? Let us not forget that among the teeming millions on the face of the earth, we lovers of liberty are, of course, a mere handful. . . . We are so few that we cannot undertake any operations on a grand scale. We cannot raise armies. We cannot overthrow governments. We have to act individually or in small inconspicuous groups. That does not mean, however, that our action must be vain. We may make little noise, and yet we shall no more just mark time than the mouse marks time behind the wainscot.

Can we do anything? It seems to me that we can each and all do just two things. First, we can refrain as far as possible from interfering with the liberty of others. Secondly, we can strive to evade and circumvent interferences with our own.

—MONTGOMERY BELGION (in a lecture to the Present Question Conference.

36,000 union members have been laid off.”

Henry Ford predicted that eventually there would be some 200,000 motor industry workers idle in the Detroit area alone. It is also estimated that 75,000 building trades workers may shortly be unemployed in New York. As a long-term prospect it means that large sections of the industrial population will be uprooted from their homes and friends to be settled in one of the new industrial centres which are springing up.

How far this Permanent War Economy will solve the contradictions of capitalism we do not profess to know. But what it means in terms of Direction of Labour (by force or hunger), of a joint military/Big Business dictatorship, we have no doubts: it will be a new form of slavery.

BUT there is another form of slavery in the “American Way”. It is the slavery of conformity. In its survey on the Corporation and the wife, the American magazine *Fortune* concluded: “Conformity, it would appear, is being elevated into something akin to a religion.” Let us examine the findings of this particular survey which are so revealing in themselves, and because they are “by no means peculiar to the corporation way of life.”

The survey—one of a series on the “Caste and Social System of the Modern Corporation”—examines the rôle played by the wives of Executives (that is management) in the careers of their husbands. As one Corporation boss put it: “We control a man’s environment in business and we lose it entirely when he crosses the threshold of his home. Management, therefore, has a challenge and an obligation to deliberately plan and create a favourable constructive attitude on the part of the wife that will liberate her husband’s total energies for the job.”

What is the corporation’s ideal wife? With “a remarkable uniformity of phrasing” she is described as “a wife who (1) is highly adaptable, (2) is highly gregarious, (3) realises her husband belongs to the corporation.”

Said one Executive: “She should do enough reading to be a good conversationalist . . . Even if she doesn’t like opera she should know something about it so if the conversation goes that way she can hold her own. She has to be able to go with you if you’re going to make a speech or get an award, and not be ill at ease.”

The survey concludes that: “The good corporation wife, the rules continue, does not make friends uncomfortable by

Continued on p. 3

BOOK REVIEW

MODERN PSYCHOLOGY

PRINCIPLES OF DYNAMIC PSYCHOLOGY, by Jules Masserman. (W. B. Saunders & Co.)

FOR those who believe that psychology, particularly psycho-therapy, is still sailing along in clouds of speculation, this is the book to reassure them. Too few people outside professional circles realise the staggering amount of first-class experimental work that is being carried out in modern psychological laboratories—the bulk of it in America.

In a fascinating series of experiments, we are shown how neurosis can be produced in animals under strictly controlled conditions, while the parallel with human emotional disorders is clearly maintained and examined. Symptom-formation, the relation between frustration and aggression, and the various forms of therapy are all demonstrated and investigated.

Of especial social significance is the series of experiments with drugs and alcohol. Neurotic cats would deliberately choose milk “spiked” with alcohol to relieve a conflict. A few of these addicts used their condition of lowered anxiety to work through their neurosis. Once the conflict was relieved in this way, the addiction ceased.

Perhaps the most revealing part of the whole book for the intelligent layman is the chapter on propaganda. Here we have a cool account of the techniques employed by governments to persuade their peoples to accept and eagerly participate in such unpleasant activities as mass murder. One can only admire the scientific detachment with which the precise details of moulding public emotional attitudes are presented. At the end one may well be left with the uneasy feeling that psychology has become too scientific for humanity’s own good.

R.T.G.

COMMENT

The Captains and the Kings

OF the making of books there is no end, particularly of the memoirs and explanations of the generals and politicians of the last war. As anarchists we are not particularly interested in these volumes, though they all tend to confirm the views we expressed at the time, and the belated “revelations” serve only to strengthen our low opinion of the political and military supermen that were built up by propaganda into wartime idols. One of the latest books which attempts to survey the closing years of the war and to find out what the “mistakes” were that cheated the victors of their victory, is Mr. Chester Wilmot’s *The Struggle for Europe*. Advertisements for this book recommend it to the bewildered citizen who wants to know why so soon after the war, a wartime atmosphere has again descended upon us. Mr. Wilmot puts “the British case” and blames Roosevelt’s appeasement of Stalin for the present situation. The gross over-simplification which this “explanation” represents should not (though it probably will) convince the book’s readers, but even in terms of strategy it is hardly a convincing case. As Mr. R. H. S. Crossman comments:

“Mr. Wilmot rightly observes that what assisted Stalin most in his European ambitions was the declaration of Unconditional Surrender and the consequential Anglo-American policies, which turned Germany into a power vacuum. But he tries to suggest that these were essentially ‘American’ policies. The fact, of course, is that Unconditional Surrender was enthusiastically approved by Churchill; and at the Quebec conference—in the autumn of 1944—he initialled the disastrous Morgenthau Plan, though he did not bother to consult his Cabinet before doing so. Indeed, Churchill was the leading advocate of toughness to Germany, not merely in words but in action. Mr. Wilmot is severely critical of Bomber Command, whose area bombing demonstrated to the Germans with merciless brutality what was meant by Unconditional Surrender. But Churchill fought like a tiger for Air-Marshal Harris. The Morgenthau Plan became a dead letter. But by then the Harris Plan had ensured that Germany would be a vacuum when the war ended.

“Mr. Wilmot’s contrast between Churchill’s wisdom and Roosevelt’s political innocence would

be even less convincing but for some remarkable omissions. He discusses the Sicilian landings without referring to Churchill’s decision to let the Italian people ‘stew in their own juice’ while he tried to prop up an effete monarchy. Many of the President’s advisers were absurdly and malignantly suspicious of ‘British Imperialism’. But Churchill increased those suspicions by his plans for the restoration of the monarchy in Italy and Greece, and his determination to restore British, Dutch and French colonial rule in the Far East.”

In fact, of course, “war guilt” is shared by everybody and nothing is gained by becoming belated armchair strategists and pointing out what the war leaders should have done. Mr. Donald McLachlan, in a broadcast last week, pointing out the folly of praising or blaming any one of the Western Allied strategists for the way in which they allowed Eastern Europe to fall into the hands of their then ally, Russia. Talking of Hitler’s strategy, he said, “Here was a politician who met the demand for unconditional surrender with a fanatical determination to lead his country to annihilation rather than give in. How could one plan a balanced military and political strategy against such a man? How could one hope to keep communism out of Europe against a man who in the winter of 1944 deliberately weakened the Eastern front in order, as he thought, to frighten the British and Americans?”

But the people who would perhaps benefit from reading the memoirs of the generals and diplomats are the advocates of the “lesser evil”, the people who said, “This is no time for our petty divergences and reservations—with all their faults we must back the United Nations against Germany and Japan,” and who say similar things to-day about another enemy. Did they really know the kind of people into whose hands they were surrendering their personal responsibility? Let them take a look at yet another volume of military memoirs just published, *A Soldier’s Story* by General Omar Bradley, who is generally regarded as one of the less flamboyant of the American military commanders. Through this book, says *The Times* (which com-

ments on the General’s “somewhat immature outlook”), there runs “a scarcely adolescent sense of rivalry with any formation or any personality which might seem to dull the lustre of the author or his command.”

Bradley tells of his psycho-pathic comrade, General Patton arriving at his H.Q. “with sirens shrieking . . . the armoured vehicles bristled with machine guns, and their tall fishpole antennae whipped crazily overhead. In the lead car Patton stood like a charioteer. He was scowling into the wind and his jaw strained against the web strap of a two-starred steel helmet.”

In the “pincer movement” in Normandy when Patton was to move northward to meet the British, he declared to Bradley on the telephone, “Let me go on to Falaise and we’ll drive the British back into the sea for another Dunkirk.”

Later, when the American front was pierced in the Ardennes, the American armies north of the gap were placed under the command of Field-Marshal Montgomery. Bradley says, “Montgomery unfortunately could not resist this chance to tweak our Yankee noses.” And Capt. Liddell Hart remarks that Montgomery “talked as if his intervention had changed the whole situation and saved the Americans from disaster.”

When General Bradley told Patton how he would rather resign than be under Montgomery’s command, he says, “George clasped me by the arm, ‘If you quit, Brad,’ he said, ‘then I’ll be quitting with you.’” Mr. Peter Fleming has found a parallel quotation from one of the girls’ school stories of Miss Angela Brazil: “Georgina gripped Olive’s arm, ‘If you cut hockey practice,’ she cried, ‘then I will, too! Somebody must teach that odious Barbara a lesson!’”

But the schoolgirl antics of the Pattons, Bradleys, Montgomerys and MacArthurs, and of the Roosevelts and Churchills, the pastors and masters of every nation, were not laughing matters. They cost the lives of millions. If people are to learn anything from the tedious self-justifications of the men into whose hands their future was entrusted, it is what fools they were to trust them.

Freedom Bookshop

- The Idiot Teacher Gerald Holmes 12/6
This book describes the work for the past 30 years of Mr. E. F. O’Neill in transforming the Lancashire elementary school of which he is headmaster into a “free” school based on self-activity and the pupil’s freedom to choose. A very important and encouraging book.
- Learn and Live Unesco 1/-
An illustrated booklet on “a way out of ignorance for 1,200,000,000 people,” describing in particular the fundamental education centre at Patzcuaro, in Mexico.
- Geography of Hunger 18/-
José de Castro
Two-thirds of mankind are permanently hungry, yet, Dr. de Castro shows, only one-eighth of the world’s surface suitable for cultivation is, in fact, being worked. “A large part of the world is not yet entirely convinced of the necessity of doing away with hunger once for all. There are people who consider it more important to maintain high standards of living for their own regions and certain social privileges for their own class, than to fight the phenomenon of hunger as such on a world scale.”

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

PERMANENT WAR OR THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION

IN the last issue of FREEDOM was reprinted an article on the legal basis of the garrison state in America. In this issue is to be found an examination of the gradual consolidation of a permanent war economy in America. America shows these trends with especial clarity: but the trend towards permanent war is general.

Mussolini glorified the moral advantages of a warrior state, and endeavoured to give to Fascist Italy a militarist basis quite foreign to the Italian temperament and outlook. In doing so, he was not, of course, simply giving rein to a private whim of his own. Militarism was a necessary spur to Italian industry. The same could be said of the triumph of Hitler over the pacifistic disarmed Weimar republic, and over terms of the Versailles treaty. The makers of that treaty stood by with complaisance because the economic logic of German recovery through a war economy was too plain to be ignored. The history of Soviet Russia tells the same tale.

We stress this predominant trend in our epoch, because to grasp it lifts one out of that dream state which imagines that policies depend on the "men at the helm". To grasp it is to grasp the fundamental drive of our time, and to understand the full implications of a social and economic system which are generally taken for granted without question or probing.

As far back as ten years ago, in 1942, *War Commentary* published an article entitled "War Without End," which stressed the dependence of capitalist economy on war. The old expansion of capitalism by opening up new markets in "undeveloped" countries has long since disappeared. The capitalist need for expansion has to be satisfied in other ways. So far, wars and preparation appear the only attempts at a solution. That they are unsatisfactory hardly needs saying.

In 1945 FREEDOM returned to the same theme in an article called "Economics of Disaster". The facts which demonstrate this trend towards a permanent war economy, have been presented. They give factual clothing to Randolph Bourne's bare statement: "War is the health of the State."

Ten years ago, the danger represented by permanent incorporation of war economy into social life may have seemed controversial. It can hardly seem so to-day. But if one accepts it as the fact and the menace it undoubtedly is, then the responsible man is immediately face to face with the revolutionary issue.

War and the fear of it and the preparation for it, provides the future prospect of our children. War needs as the first call upon national finances makes hopes for social amelioration increasingly a fantasy. War as a necessary aspect of our mode of economy and our social system, poses the question of breaking away from present economic and social modes—poses, in brief, the revolutionary question. In the past, such huge questions, such drastic breaks with traditional modes of living and economy, have never been made by mere administrators. Such men—the politicians—are too much absorbed into the administrative structure and too much affected by it in their modes of thought and life ever to give the initial impetus for such world

changes. In the past, they have required revolutions—that is to say, the huge impetus provided by great numbers of people who have shaken off apathy and released what Kropotkin called the "creative impetus of the mass".

In intellectual circles, such ideas are received with dislike, perhaps by fear and uncertainty. But the logic of such a situation is plain enough, and courage in accepting the revolutionary implications of that logic is a first requirement to-day. Not that the problem ends there; the implications of a new way of social life and economy are endless, and they arouse fears and misgiving. But such misgivings do not change the basic economic fact of permanent war in our society or the logical necessity for changing it. Since we are driven to our fate, we must meet it with resolve and imagination and courage, not with fears and doubts.

Warmongering

This is warmongering: The Mutual Security Act of 1950 will send \$7,328,903,976 abroad; approximately 80%, or \$5,788,502,457 for arms; 20% to aid distressed peoples, to remove the causes of war; of this \$1,440,401,519, 70% (approximately a billion dollars) will be sent to Europe—to bolster armament economies, not to raise the standard of living; for the suffering countries of Asia, \$237,155,866; but almost half of this to Formosa and Indo-China—for war; for the suffering peoples of the Near East, \$160,000,000—out of the total of \$7,328,903,976. Warmongering is a good word because it is so ugly. And only an ugly word can describe such efforts to "save" the world from Stalinism.

—Catholic Worker (U.S.A.)

EXACTLY!

DR. FISHER recently observed that the disestablishment of the Church of England would be "almost as great a calamity" to the country as the disappearance of the monarchy. It would, of course, be absolutely as much of a "calamity" one way or the other. If the Archbishop of Canterbury makes any more pronouncements of this sort we will esteem him as almost as infallible as the Pope of Rome.

American Commentary

clothes too blatantly chic, by references to illustrious forebears or by excessive good breeding. And she avoids intellectual pretensions like the plague."

Though there are still a number of corporations not interested in their executives' wives, the *Fortune* survey shows that more than half of the companies of which they have data have made "wife-screening" a regular practice and some are not uninterested in fiancées. About 20% of its otherwise acceptable trainee applicants, one large company estimates, are turned down because of their wives.

Besides the "wife-screening," every effort is made to "sell the wife on the corporation point of view," to make her more amenable to accepting as a matter of course longer hours of work and travel for her husband. This is achieved by the use of "such media as films, brochures and special mailings to drive home, in effect, the idea that the corporation isn't stealing her husband from her." Some go further. The chairman of the American Brake Shoe Co. put it this way: "When a man comes to work for us, we think of the company as employing the family, for it will be supporting the entire family, not merely the breadwinner." "The days of the strictly home wife," says a bank president, "are gone. She has become indispensable to our scheme of business."

Social integration, however, does not mean that the corporation necessarily likes the wife. In some cases the corporation welcomes her largely as a means of defending itself against her. "Amiable as it may be about it, the corporation is aware that the relationship is still triangular—or, to put it another way, if you can't beat 'em, join 'em. 'Successes here,' says one official, 'are guys who eat and sleep the company. If a man's first interest is his wife and family, more power to him—but we don't want him.' 'We've got quite an equity in the man,' another explains,

HOUSING AND PLANNING

Mr. Macmillan's Addled Egg

"There is, of course, nothing sacrosanct about the Dudley standard, though it did represent the pooling of the widest experience and the best-informed opinion at the time. It has already been whittled down here and there without disastrous results. There must clearly be a point, however, beyond which any further reduction in standards can only bring a more than commensurate loss in convenience. The question is whether the loss represented by the last £50 or £100 of the average saving (£150) which the new designs are expected to realise is going to be worth incurring for the sake of a consequent increase of about 5 per cent. in the number of houses built."

—Manchester Guardian, 24/1/52.

NOTHING about Mr. Macmillan's new housing plan, says *The Observer*, "is more impressive than the optimism with which he is going about it. But for the past few days there has been a bewildering air of unreality round the spectacular launching of the plan. The Macmillan 'expanding programme' has seemed like a bright sky in the morning, with the black clouds of the economic crisis looming up ominously behind."

This is perhaps a polite way of saying that the hopes the Government holds out to the homeless with one hand, it takes away with the other. And in saying the sky's the limit and talking of an expanding programme. Mr. Macmillan is merely taking our minds off the promise of 300,000 houses a year.

The Stationery Office has issued a supplement to the Housing Manual, called *Houses 1952*, which gives specimen plans for houses in which space has been cut down and estimated building costs reduced. How one is to look at them depends upon your point of view. To some people desperately hit by the housing shortage, they are bound to look like paradise, or would if they were built. Our grandchildren (for they are meant to last for sixty years) might take a different view, just as we do of the "byelaw" houses of sixty years ago. The *Architect's Journal* has compiled an impressive list of disadvantages in the type-plans, disadvantages which are inevitable when you attempt to squeeze a quart into a pint pot.

Mr. Macmillan spent his Sunday developing writer's cramp in signing each of 1,500 letters to Lord Mayors, Mayors and District Chairmen asking them to hurry things up, and the winning smile of his colleague, Mr. Eccles, the Minister of Works, is making him the would-be speculative builder's friend, but this will not increase the amount of building materials and the Chancellor of the Exchequer has made it pretty clear where they are going. *The Observer's* industrial correspondent, says:

"There are various major shortages, even apart from steel. An increase in brick production will not be easy; the brick industry still suffers from

an abnormally high rate of labour turnover. Indeed, it is said that if building productivity had gone up last year, as the Government thought it might, there would not have been enough bricks for the housing programme. Again, if the Government cuts dollar spending, it is not clear how enough timber can be found for an expanding housing programme. As for cement, to maintain last year's minimum exports to the Commonwealth we had to buy some from Europe. If imports from Europe are to be restricted further, it may be as difficult to get cement from there as from dollar sources."

Moreover, since steel available is to be reduced, and since Mr. Macmillan's circular to local authorities says that, "Flats will have to be built with load-bearing walls and not in frame construction," a greater number of bricks will be needed without taking into account any increase in the programme. Mr. Macmillan in an interview with the *Sunday Times* declares:

"We may develop effective substitutes for things for which there is a shortage. We are not merely surveying all the known resources of the building industry. We are also examining the possibilities of new materials. I believe that there may well be a revolution in building methods in the next ten years as a result of this housing crusade."

Now everyone knows that the building industry is fantastically inefficient and that there must be many new materials that have been and could be used, but of possible prefabricated systems of house-building it is difficult to think of any that do not require steel or timber or reinforced concrete or else a great deal of factory processing with consequent demands on industrial labour and equipment which, because of export and armament priorities, would not be available. (Some enthusiasts have written to the papers recommending house-building of rammed-earth as described in the new edition of Mr. Clough Williams-Ellis's book, *Cottage-Building in Cob, Pisé, Chalk and Clay*.)

HOUSING NEEDS

THE quotation at the head of this article is from the sagacious local government correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian*. The same paper's "Review of Industry," published last month, carries an article by Mr. D. N. Chester, of Nuffield College, Oxford, with the title "Will the Building Boom Last Indefinitely?" It will surprise people, not least the building trade to learn that there is a building boom, but Mr. Chester says there is. And he explains his question thus:

"The biggest question mark is the demand for new houses: the long-term demand—not the needs of the next two or three years. Assuming that the main goal of public policy is to see that each family has a house and that there is a small margin of empty houses to allow for greater mobility of population—how far are we from reaching that goal. A family means any person or group of persons who needs a structurally separate dwelling . . . The key to

And perhaps the most serious admission in this depressing survey is *Fortune's* answer to the question: "Are these rules of the game merely the old fact of conformity?" "In part, yes. But something new has been added. What was once a fact has now become a philosophy. To-day's young couples not only concede their group-mindedness; they are outspokenly in favour of it. They blend with the group not because they fear to do otherwise but because they approve of it." (Our italics.)

Fortune sees the dangers when it points out that: "The devotion to group values is by no means peculiar to the corporation way of life. . . . But how much more are we to adapt? In many modern American environments . . . real advances are going to bring the individual into conflict with the status quo. And unless Americans temper their worship of environment they may well evolve a society so well adjusted that no one would be able—or willing—to give it the sort of hotfoot it regularly needs."

That is in fact what is already happening at an alarming pace, and to our minds, it is in this light that the witch-hunts and the exclusion and screening of non-Americans seeking visas to enter the United States should be viewed. It is not on the grounds of military security that writers, university lecturers are excluded but in the pursuance of this policy of the inculcation of mental and social uniformity, or as the Inspector of Schools in Indiana put it in his circular to teachers: the inculcation of the American Way of Life as the best in the world! In this respect America is taking a leaf out of the book of Russian Communism.

Fortunately there are still some men and women in America who are not convinced by this "guns and butter" civilisation or worshippers of canned culture. They are the "proles" of 1984: the only hope.

LIBERTARIAN.

the demand is the trend in the number of 'families'."

Mr. Chester believes that "there are limits to the demand for housing, and that these limits are much closer than the current demand and supply position suggest." His view is based upon the following statistics.

At the 1931 census there were 11,380,000 "families" in England, Wales and Scotland, and 10,500,000 dwellings, a shortage of 780,000 dwellings. Between 1931 and the outbreak of war there was an increase of almost a million in the number of families and about 500,000 houses were pulled down as slums or otherwise destroyed. On the other hand, over 2½ million houses were built so that by 1939 there was, on these figures, a small margin of about 300,000 houses. This margin of less than 3 per cent. was not sufficient, says Mr. Chester, "to allow the necessary freedom of choice and population mobility, considering the big changes which had taken place in the distribution of population. But had Britain been able to go on building at the pre-war rate for two or three more years, the basic housing problem would have been solved."

It seems strange that Mr. Chester, economist though he is, omits the really crucial point about the pre-war housing shortage: that it wasn't a matter of the number of houses in existence, but the fact that the people whose need was greatest couldn't afford the rents.

He goes on to say that during the war about 500,000 houses were destroyed or made uninhabitable and the number of families increased by some 8—900,000. The annual increase in the number of families was estimated to fall from about 150,000 during the period 1931-45 to 50,000 during the period 1945-50. Therefore, Mr. Chester says, "On the estimates it appeared that a programme of, say, 1,300,000 to 1,400,000 houses would have provided every family with a house by the end of 1950. A further half-million would then have been re-

Continued on p. 4

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. 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 orhovels? 6d.
What is Anarchism? 1d.
The Basis of Communal Living. 1s.
- WILLIAM GODWIN :
Selections from Political Justice. 3d.
On Law. 1d.
- F. A. RIDLEY :
The Roman Catholic Church and the Modern Age. 2d.
- ★
- Marie Louise Berneri Memorial Committee publications :
Marie Louise Berneri, 1918-1949: A Tribute. cloth 5s.
Journey Through Utopia. cloth 16s. (U.S.A. \$2.50)
- ★
- K. J. KENAFICK :
Michael Bakunin and Karl Marx. Paper 6s.
- 27, Red Lion Street, London, W.C.1.

U.S. Manufacturers Seek Cheap Labour

THE Textile Industry in America, like Britain, is undergoing a period of depression (although this is normally a peak period of production both in the textile and clothing industries).

The American Woollen Company, one of the biggest fabric manufacturing companies in the world, has had to close down several of its factories, whilst others are being run at half speed.

American Woollen's President, Francis W. White, has stated that although profits last year amounted to 11.9 million dollars, this was only made possible through Government contracts. He also explains that there are several reasons for the crisis, namely high taxes in New England, where his factories are, and unstable wool prices. But, Mr. White maintains, the greatest contributory factor to the threatening loss of profits is the price of labour. The company are therefore seriously considering following the example of other depressed mill owners who have moved their mills to the South where labour can be bought at 40 cents an hour less than in New England. Another more important reason, explains Francis W. White, is the "amount of labour employees in the South give for that wage". Man-hour productivity is so much higher that Southern mills can sell their materials at 20 cents less per yard than mills in the North.

This is a blatant example of a handful of capitalists exploiting a situation in the Southern States of America which has changed little since the days of slavery. The fact that Southern mill owners can enjoy greater profits at the

moment than their Northern colleagues, rests on the cheap labour force provided by the Negroes. There are doubtless poor Whites who are also in the cheap labour ranks, but it is the exploitation of the Negroes, both by poor and rich white alike, which to-day gives the South its prosperity. (That this exploitation, both economic and racial exists, was clearly demonstrated by George Woodcock in his recent article, "The Popular Basis for Totalitarianism," where he says that, "A level of poverty below that of the ordinary workers is set by the presence of a special submerged class—so that there is always a lower step towards which the mass of the people can be thrust in time of economic instability.")

It can be argued that the migration of mill owners to the South will create work for the unemployed there. This may be so, but as can be clearly seen, the work will be on a scale of savage exploitation, and in any case can only be temporary. The cheap labour used by competing manufacturers will flood the market with materials which, if not curtailed, will eventually cause a glut and force mills once again to close down. The inevitable consequence must be unemployment, unless the American Government adopts the policy suggested by the Tailors and Garment Workers' Union in Britain that "the Government should speed up the issue of contracts for clothing under the defence programme" (FREEDOM, Jan. 5th). It seems likely that this policy will be carried out as it is in keeping with the political trends.

And what of the workers who are employed at the moment by the American Woollen Company? They have been presented with an ultimatum. Before clinching their plans to move South, which would leave the New England workers high and dry, the Company, in collaboration with fifty other textile firms, have asked the Textile Workers' Union of America to "negotiate new, lower cost labour contracts this year." From the Union came the inevitable compromise. They said that they had "already agreed to forego any further wage increases in 1952," and that they were prepared to increase their output if the American Woollen Company installed more efficient machinery. As a further example of their solidarity with the bosses, the Union pointed to the fact that they had already signed an agreement with another company under which "individual work loads will be increased by 50% through the installation of improved machinery," but without the increase in wages that a rapidly rising cost of living demands.

With regard to the agreement made by the Union to forego wage increases this year, this agreement was made before the crisis arose in the Textile Industry. We can also predict with a certain amount of safety that if it is in the interest of the Union leaders to negotiate for lower cost labour contracts, they will do so whether or not it is to the benefit of the workers. But American workers would do well to learn the lesson so many European workers have had to learn—that cheap wages anywhere are a threat to wages everywhere. R.M.

Jobs through the State

THE SCHEDULED CASTE SYSTEM

IF parties are separated from each other, they have to keep up an ideological pretence of differences even where these do not exist, otherwise there emerges to the naked eye nothing but a squalid difference of personality. In this country it has been plain as a pike-staff in the last few years that there is no real hope of division left between the two main parties. However, for political reasons the Conservatives have been posing as the "liberators" who would take off controls while the Labour Party have put on the "working-class" act. Nothing would convince the middle-class, and still less the would-be middle-class, that the Conservatives were not going to take off controls.

Every cut we are being told we must make, every control we are told must be imposed, could trip off the lips of a "Socialist" as well as a "Tory". The bluff that is now made is that it is all "temporary". Is there anyone so simple as to believe that anything once taken will ever be willingly restored? Conscripted, we are assured would be only a temporary measure; then it would be only for the duration of the war; it then became for the emergency, and now is incorporated in the life of the country. So long as it is tolerated, it will stay. We have been assured that identity cards are "un-English" but have no fear: the internal passport will stay so long as it is not vigorously opposed. If the Government withdrew it of their own accord it would be only because they had succeeded in getting the population tabbed and checked in some other way.

The ruling class is becoming the State official, who comes from a class which cuts right across the party benches. The problem of every ruling class has been how to stabilise itself in power. One of the surest methods has always been the trick now proposed, the caste system perpetrated by the new use of the Labour Exchange.

Originally these were for the purpose of obtaining employment and drawing insurance (which soon became "the dole"). With the full employment resultant from the war they could have been dispensed with, but no: instead arose the new necessity for the Labour Exchange in direction of labour. That was also for the duration of the war, but

now the Conservatives bring it out again. Not direction—oh, no. Not yet. But all jobs must be obtained through the Labour Exchange. The old Tory bluff about "you too can become a millionaire like Nuffield" applied last century when the particular circumstances of expanding capitalism did provide a lucky few—just as the pools produce a lucky few in these days. But have no illusions that this still applies. Register at the Labour Exchange and they will see you keep to your caste. No direction—not yet. But no job that the State doesn't wish you to have. Everybody must go through the bureaucracy of the Exchange.

Everybody? Well, of course... There are exceptions, naturally. You couldn't have the lawyers queuing up outside the Labour Exchange to get their briefs, could you now? And I mean, it would be hardly proper to have a company secretary, a parson and a film star lining up at some back-alley Exchange while someone passed betting slips around. Oh, have no fears. There will be a few exceptions. They will already have made their money. But you can't go from the pit to the board-room any more except through the recognised trade union.

ANARCHO-SYNDICALIST.

Syndicalist Notebook

Continued from p. 1

Since the whole dispute was based on the firemen's contention that they were entitled to equality with the police, and they were seeking increases of 35/- a week, it seems that all their effort and militancy has been in vain.

What now? Has the punishment dished out after their boycott, scared them away from any future direct action? Perhaps... but let us hope that they have at least learned that a Disciplinary Code giving power of punishment to authority should always be fought against and never accepted by the workers, for it will always be used against them when authority so desires.

CHECKING THE CHECKERS

A FORTNIGHT ago, a correspondent, writing in connection with the recent meter-readers' strike against supervisors, painted a little picture of a "supervisory pyramid" composed of supervisors, supervisors for the supervisors, and so on.

From America, where everything happens sooner or later, came an example of just that pyramid in action. *Time* (4/2/52) reports:

"In St. Louis, city checkers checking the passenger capacity of the Public Service Co. bus and trolley routes were trailed by company checkers checking the accuracy of the city's check, while Missouri Public Service Commission checkers checked on the checking of both groups." P.S.

IN BRIEF

CONSCRIPTION FOR CIVIL DEFENCE

Commander T. D. Galbraith, Joint Parliamentary Under-Secretary for Scotland, told local authority representatives at Dundee on January 24th that he thought compulsory Civil Defence service might have to be seriously considered if recruitment continued to be as low as at present.

★

... AND FOR REFUGEES IN GERMANY

The German Refugee Association Press Service in Göttingen published a statement on January 24th claiming that the ten million refugees in the Federal Republic were far from ready to spring to arms as a result of the declaration of the shadow Defence Ministry, that conscription would have to be introduced in Germany.

This fact, according to the statement, is a direct consequence of the present hardships which refugees undergo and of the Government's failure to give them real social and economic equality with other German citizens.

—Manchester Guardian, 25/1/52.

THE POOR GET POORER IN THE U.S.A.

The bottom fifth of the U.S. population gets only 3 per cent of the country's income, while the top fifth gets almost half, the Census Bureau reported in figures released on December 1st. Income distributed was shown to be as follows:

Top fifth—47%.
Second fifth—24%.
Third fifth—17%.
Fourth fifth—9%.
Poorest fifth—3%.

The startling fact disclosed in these figures is that 40% of the population of the U.S. gets only 12% of the money income of the country. This supports previous disclosures that almost 70% of the families of the country have a cash income below the \$4,000 minimum which has been set as the lowest figure for maintaining an American family at a "health and decency" level.

The Census Bureau figure on the lowest fifth, showing that 20% of the people have to try to live on 3% of the national income, shows that the trend of relative impoverishment of this group is continuing. In 1910, the lowest fifth got 8.3% of the national income, in 1918, 6.8%, in 1929, 5.4% and in 1937, 3.6%.

Short Time and Dismissals

BEFORE the war, many governments launched schemes of work, State-aided or directly for the State, to absorb the unemployed which capitalism had created. This work, of course, usually took the form of making armaments.

To-day, the situation being what it is, the government has first to create the unemployment in order to find the manpower for its armament programme. And it is doing this, as we have shown before, by withholding supplies of raw materials from the industries it regards as "unessential", so that firms have to stand off their workers.

This technique seems to be working very well. From various parts of the country come reports of workers going on to short time or being dismissed. Naturally, this is regarded as being only temporary—some of the firms will be able to take back their workers when the factories have been refitted for war-work—but for the workers concerned, unemployment even for a short time means hardship.

In Oxford, the management of Morris Motors decided last week to go on to a four-day week owing to a reduction in supplies of wide steel sheets. At the neighbouring factory of the Pressed Steel Company several hundred workers, chiefly in the pressing shop, are already on a four-day week.

From that other stronghold of the motor industry, Coventry, we hear that the Rootes group is to dismiss eight hundred men from its car assembly works at Ryton-on-Dunsmore. Only two days before, short-time had been announced for 700 workers at the group's two factories in the city of Coventry,

where already most of the car factories are on a short week.

Rootes have a big contract for a military truck, and Standard Motors has a contract for jet aero engines for which they will need plenty of workers when production begins.

In South Wales, where during the last fifteen years, light industries have been introduced to give work to disabled miners as well as to give the area a more balanced range of work, other reasons—decline in demand for consumer goods and competition from Germany and Japan—are causing short-time and unemployment. The industries concerned are mainly light industries, but iron and steel seem also to be affected.

From the government's viewpoint, this unemployment serves another useful purpose, besides simply creating a pool of workers for re-armament. It creates the economic pressure and fear of unemployment among all workers which makes them easier to handle. However uneasy workers may be at the thought of another war, they can be pressed into working for it by being faced with the simple choice: war-work or starve.

In the view of governments, workers are pawns to be played with as they like. Men and women—repeat men and women—should have too much self-respect than to allow themselves to be used for the disgusting purposes of war. It is still possible to break the chains which authority forges for us and make some sort of more satisfactory life—perhaps with others of like-mind. It is getting increasingly difficult as the world gets more totalitarian, but—it is still possible.

HOUSING AND PLANNING

Continued from p. 3

quired to provide the necessary margin. Since the end of the war about 1½ million houses of all kinds have been made available (including temporary prefabs and the division of houses into several flats). On these figures, therefore, it looks as though the first aim—to provide each family with a house—may be virtually complete. Yet to judge by popular demand it would appear to be as far off as ever.

He then declares that much of this continuing demand comes from people already with houses—people who want a new house just as they prefer a new motor car. This is a curious remark and must apply to rather a small and privileged part of the population. By far the greater number of people on local housing lists who already have accommodation, have over-crowded, insanitary dwellings whose inclusion in the number of houses in existence is yet another example of how statistics can mislead. His next point is more sensible, when he says that it is becoming more apparent each year that the estimate of the number of families is too low under present conditions.

As to the future, Mr. Chester says that:

"Keeping on with a programme of 200,000 houses a year would bring the stock of houses up to about 14½ millions by 1955. The number of families then, on the estimates of the Royal Commission on Population, would be about 13½ millions, giving an apparent surplus of three-quarter million. (The Royal Commission estimated that the total number of families would start to decline after 1954.) Even if a substantial allowance is made for various possible errors, there would be still a large enough gap

between the two figures to warrant the conclusion that by the end of 1955 the first aim of any housing programme would have been achieved. After this point there would be an increasing number of empty houses, assuming the building programme continued at that level and there was no large-scale pulling down of existing houses. If more houses are completed in the next two or three years, this state of affairs will be reached so much sooner."

He concludes that then the price of old houses will fall below that of new ones and consequently that the demand for new ones will be greatly reduced.

The fallacies. Well, firstly, the very much under-estimated number of "families" or households; secondly, a gross under-estimate of the number of dwellings quite unfit for human habitation; thirdly, he assumes no large-scale pulling down of existing houses, but there is likely to be a large-scale falling down through age and neglect. (It was stated at the Royal Sanitary Institute last year that houses were going out of occupation more quickly than they were being built.) Finally, he neglects as before, the fact that houses stand empty in the midst of a shortage because people cannot afford the rent.

In fact, this "expert", who asks, "Will the Building Boom Last Indefinitely?" when he means "Will the Housing Shortage Last Indefinitely?" has overlooked the basic fact altogether, the fact that as both Engels in *The Housing Question* and Kropotkin in *The Conquest of Bread* showed a lifetime ago, the housing shortage is inseparable from an economy where production is for profit and not for the satisfaction of human needs.

W.

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP OPEN AIR MEETINGS

Weather Permitting
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.
FEB. 10—F. A. Ridley on
THE R.C. CHURCH AND
COUNTER-REVOLUTION.
FEB. 17—Robert Copping on
HOW TO HOLD YOUR OWN
WITH CHILDREN
INFORMAL DISCUSSIONS
Every Wednesday at 7.30 p.m.
at the CLASSIC Restaurant, Baker St.
(Near Classic Cinema)

NORTH-EAST LONDON

DISCUSSION MEETINGS IN EAST HAM

Alternate Wednesdays
at 7.30
FEB. 20—Arthur Uloth on
WAR
MAR. 5—Edgar Priddy on
AN A.B.C. OF ANARCHISM
Enquiries c/o Freedom Press

LIVERPOOL

DISCUSSION MEETINGS at
101 Upper Parliament Street,
Liverpool, 8
Every Sunday at 8 p.m.

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 Payne, and addressed to the publishers.

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