

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"Man is free the moment he wishes to be."

—VOLTAIRE

Vol. 13, No. 19

May 10th, 1952

Threepence

ARCHBISHOP CONDEMNS PETROL BOMBS BUT NOT WAR

THE Church of England is not distinguished for tender heartedness or pacifism. Indeed, religious bodies as a whole have a doctrinal stake in suffering which has often astonished mere humanitarians. It is therefore all the more gratifying to find the Archbishop of York condemning the napalm jellied petrol bomb. In his diocesan letter for May, the Archbishop writes:

"There is grave concern over the use of napalm which has been admittedly employed. From reliable reports it appears to be a weapon which inflicts terrible and indiscriminate loss and suffering."

In modern warfare, he continues, it has become very difficult to distinguish between combatant and non-combatant or to classify weapons as legitimate or illegitimate; but "Christians should demand the outlawing by international agreement of the use of weapons so horrible and destructive to all who come within their range, whether soldier or civilian, whether man, woman, or child... which indiscriminately destroy those for whom Christ died, as if they were worthless flies."

This very welcome plea illustrates the dilemma of a body like the Church which claims to hold ethical views, which accepts contemporary society and works in with finance and government. The operative expression in the Archbishop's statement is "outlawing by international agreement". But few to-day would think it possible to agree not to use effective weapons. It is only outlandish methods of war by bacteria or poison gas that are outlawed and it is just the effectiveness and decisiveness of the atomic bomb which makes "international agreement" difficult.

But for official Christianity it is necessary to believe in such international agreements as being possible and practicable. If one does believe in it one's humanitarian feelings are satisfied by the sense of "trying to do the right thing".

COL. PINTO'S DISCLOSURES

BRITISH counter-espionage officers use a vicious form of physical torture to draw confessions from suspected foreign spies.

This is the astounding disclosure made by Lieut.-Col. Oreste Pinto in his book, *Spy-Catcher*, to be published to-morrow by Werner Laurie.

The War Office declined to deny this charge outright last night. Instead, after consulting MI5 chiefs, they told me: "We consider this to be unlikely." This is tantamount to an admission that it could happen.

Spy stories from the last two world wars are two a penny, but this 12s. 6d. worth will make the British public sit up and take notice.

For Colonel Pinto, once described by General Eisenhower as the "greatest living expert on security," says: Counter Intelligence Officers have been known to use physical discomfort as an aid. They have given the suspect a hard chair to sit on or have him stand to attention for long periods of questioning.

"One quite common trick used, I believe by interrogators in the Army when they were dealing with a senior enemy officer who might be an easy victim to embarrassment, was to offer him large quantities of tea or coffee before the interrogation and then to prolong the questions until the needs of nature were pressing him to such an extent that he would often give away vital information in order to be free to relieve himself."

"Personally, I strongly deprecate such methods. True, they do not actually constitute physical torture. But they are close to the borderline and may occasionally stray over it."

—Reynolds News, 20/4/52.

But if one recognises the plain fact that any method of war will be used if it is effective, without regard to such factors as horror or inability to discriminate between civilians and combatants, men and women and children, etc.: if one recognises this, then one must condemn all warfare. After all when it comes to destroying "those for whom Christ died as if they were worthless flies" does it greatly matter, in ethics, that they are in uniform or not, signed on for the duration or not? Whether they volunteered to kill and perhaps be killed or were compulsorily conscripted (with

penalties for refusal)? When the Chinese used "human sea" tactics and were "slaughtered in thousands" as observers on the spot and newspapers over here reported, did the Churches talk about "dying like flies...?"

The dilemma of the Church is that you can't condemn warfare, and support wars. And that the let-out formula of "international agreement" is mere pious self-deception.

Having said all this, it is still gratifying that a high dignity of the Church of England should have publicly condemned napalm.

Atom Scientists Fears

MANY years ago, FREEDOM pointed to the inroads made in the internationalism of science by the recent war. Penicillin and new remedies against malaria were treated as war secrets which the enemy should not have. The advent of atomic fission as a factor in international politics made scientists heavily subject to the Official Secrets Acts and severely restricted their right to publish their work. It is needless to state that no reversal of this trend has occurred. *The Observer* (20/4/52) quotes Sir John Cockcroft:

"Sir John Cockcroft, director of Harwell Atomic Energy Research Establishment, referred to the freedom of movement of scientists when he spoke at Reading yesterday, and

said the only restriction on discussion in the West was on those scientists who worked on secret Government projects. He added, however, that there were signs in the Western world that there might be more restrictions in the future. These had resulted particularly from the passage in the United States of the Internal Security Act, 1950.

"As a result of this Act," he continued, "scientists now experience long delays in obtaining visas for visits to the United States, even for short-term conferences."

ATOMIC BOMB ON TELEVISION

THE purpose of the new atomic bomb explosion in America's southern desert, according to the publicists was to improve the morale of American troops by exposing some of them to the blast. Troops entered 4½ foot deep fox-holes just before the explosion. General Joseph Swing, 6th Army Commander, said:

"No soldiers were hurt and everybody is happy. We were only in foxholes for ten seconds. They gave us god protection from heat and blast. The worst that happened was that most of us got a mouthful of dirt." He said the troops joked as they came out. He said the distance was "half last time's."

They were 4 miles away. Civilians in an atomic war may not be so lucky as to have advance notice, or to live in an uninhabited desert. But the Americans do not forget civilians. Their morale has also to be boosted, they have to get to know the atomic bomb. With less safety precautions required and much more comfort, the American public saw the explosion on television. "Television brought the atom bomb into the homes of 35,000,000 Americans," cheerfully commented Associated Press. Shall we ever understand the "American way"?

CONCENTRATION CAMPS IN JUGOSLAVIA

THE following letter was received by CRIA in Paris from a Bulgarian comrade who escaped from the camp of Essenitza in Yugoslavia. It indicates quite clearly that Tito is not lagging far behind his old masters in the application of misery.

"In the camp of Essenitza there were about 160 to 180 of us, refugees, 87 Bulgarians, the others of different nationalities, Rumanians, Hungarians, Albanians, Italians, etc.

"We had been interned in what is called a 'Repatriation Camp'. This repatriation had been promised for March and April, in the expectation that all the prisoners, weakened by long years in prisons and concentration camps, would slowly die of hunger and cold.

"Three of our comrades went secretly to a nearby village, with the object of offering some clothing in exchange for a little food, were detained and placed in a filthy cell without food.

The rest of the prisoners presented themselves immediately to the director of the camp to protest against this action. The guards gave us the order to disperse, and when we refused, fired over our heads. Our comrade T. was detained as 'organiser of the sale of clothing'. All the prisoners responded with a hunger strike, and after three days T. was returned to the camp.

"Being unable to take any more of the treatment we were receiving, and feeling ourselves exposed to disciplinary action for the slightest incident, we decided to escape. On the 18th December at three in the afternoon, we left the camp to collect fuel for the fire; a few of us having crossed the main road were noticed by the guards, who fired on us. We replied with stones. By various routes the majority of us reached Austrian territory. In all, 32 reached the Austrian frontier, four were caught by the militia and three have disappeared."

(Bulletin No. 10 of CRIA) D.J.

SYNDICALIST NOTEBOOK

Miners Defend Foreign Worker

AT last! British miners—and Yorkshiremen at that!—have shown solidarity instead of hostility towards a foreign worker, in a dispute with an Englishman.

And shown it on a good scale, too! 3,200, the entire complement of workers at Brodsworth Main Colliery, near Doncaster, the largest pit in Britain, stopped work when a Yugoslav was ordered out of the pit by a deputy.

It appears that the deputy felt that his dignity had been affronted. The Yugoslav, Michael Gekel, who has worked at the pit for four years, was transferred temporarily to another part of the pit because, it was alleged, he was late for his work as a borer. The next day he neglected to return to his proper work, and when he was rebuked by the deputy, Raymond Henshaw, he ridiculed him in front of other workers and refused to carry out an order. He was then sent out of the pit.

The colliery agent, Mr. Peter Tregelles, in an effort to settle the dispute, called the men together and called for handshakes in the presence of union representatives. Henshaw, it is alleged, refused to shake hands, however, and the night shift struck in sympathy with Gekel. The entire pit was out the next day.

Gekel, at his home in Bentley, Doncaster, said: "I am pleased to see that my fellow-workers are backing me, a foreigner. I don't think I did anything wrong at work and I did not cause any laughter against the deputy but he shouted at me and made the men laugh. I want to get back to work and have us all working together as we used to."

In cases like this, it is always difficult to get the exact facts. But, whatever incidents occurred, there were witnesses, and it is difficult to believe that the entire pit would have stopped work on the Yugoslav's behalf if it was not clear that he was in the right.

Perhaps the deputy is unpopular. Perhaps he has been throwing his weight about for some time, and the men think it is time he was taken down a peg or two. The fact that he refused to shake hands and forget what was obviously a trivial incident in which only his dignity was hurt, betrays a petty-minded official—the nastiest kind to deal with.

Anyway, we are more than glad to see the Brodsworth Main workers showing this solidarity with a foreign worker. Perhaps they may have some influence on their fellow-Yorkshiremen at Bullcroft, who are so anxious to get rid of the Italians.

The Bullcroft miners, by the way, headed the May Day parade in Doncaster, last Sunday. They had the largest banner in the parade—more than 20 feet high, it had to be carried on a specially constructed wheeled framework.

We imagine the Bullcroft workers can read. Could we suggest to them that they ponder the meaning of the words on their own banner? They were "Workers of the World—Unite!"

HOUSING—THE BRIBE

TIED houses have always been detested by conscious workers. The man for whom loss of job means also loss of home, is not so likely to be militant as the independent one.

For years the agricultural workers waged a struggle against tied cottages, and the Labour Party and the Trade Unions supported them. Until the elec-

tion of 1945, when with Labour's ascension to power, the opportunity came to do something about it. And nothing will make politicians drop a line quicker than the opportunity to implement it.

So tied cottages still exist for land-workers, and now the same arrangement is being used as a bribe to entice workers into the aircraft industry.

Recently, advertisements have been appearing in the London papers, of special interest to London's house-hungry workers. "HOUSES AVAILABLE" says the ad., and in smaller type underneath, "FOR KEY WORKERS".

It is the Bristol Aeroplane Company advertising for highly-skilled workers in most engineering crafts. "For super-priority work" and offering "limited numbers of new houses for married men, available by government arrangement with local authorities for successful approved applicants at present living outside normal daily travelling distance from Bristol."

Also "Usual District rates of pay plus incentive bonus, excellent welfare and canteen facilities and non-contributory Retirement Benefit and Life Assurance Scheme." Jeez, what more could you want? Good pay, a new house, bonus, welfare, pensions—all the bribes they can think up.

All you have to be prepared to do is to sell yourself for the purpose of destroying workers like you, with houses like yours, in other countries.

UNION SWINGING BEVAN-WARDS

MR. Bevan made himself rather unpopular with some of the Trade Union leaders a little while ago, by accusing them of ignoring their rank and file votes when on the Executive Council of the T.U.C.

It looks as though the rank and file, however, are now pushing their leaders in Bevan's direction. The Amalgamated

Engineering Union (850,000 strong) has been holding its conference this week, but since FREEDOM went to press.

Pro-Bevan resolutions had been put down by eleven of the 26 divisions of the union, calling for cuts in the arms programme, while a Lancashire division wants the union to urge nation-wide industrial action to prevent Steel denationalising. We know in advance what the leadership arguments will be about that—and since we don't really care whether steel is nationalised or not we can remain unconcerned—but it will be interesting to see how Bevan's influence in the union is shaping.

The Labour Party will have plenty of reason to be grateful to Nye Bevan. He is keeping the dissident "Left" elements loyal to the Party.

DEAKIN IS BOOED

SOME time ago we headed an article "Deakin Must Go!" It appears that support for the idea is growing among his own union members.

At the May Day (May 4th) rally of the Labour and Co-operatives Parties at Trafalgar Square, Arthur Deakin (this year's chairman of the T.U.C.) was booed at the platform, to shouts of "Rat," "Traitor" and "Shut up!"

The booing started when he stepped to the microphone and began to speak of achieving peace through the United Nations. "We shan't achieve it by the methods of some of the people who are not prepared to listen but who are associated with disruptive and destructive elements," he said. His next words were lost in the tumult and his voice was drowned again when he said: "Those who jeer never knew the struggles of the past..."

It is true there were Communists present, but there were anarchists and trade unionists also there, expressing their contempt for this man who, even if he knew the struggles of the past, has completely forgotten their meaning. P.S.

U.S. Government Monopoly 'Ends'

MOST people, possessing illusions about government and the state, imagine that governmental controls are imposed in the interest of everyone—for the common weal, as they used to say. The American habit of frankness enables us to see behind this pretty picture, however, in the case of rubber.

Controls on the buying and selling of natural rubber have been enforced by the U.S. Government for eleven years. In April these controls were lifted. According to *United Press*: "The controls were maintained by the government to make sure that there would be a market for its own synthetic rubber products, which have been in the development stage until recently. With government synthetic rubber now in mass production, the need for the controls just about disappeared."

The controls therefore enabled the

government to set up its own industry, protect its early growth, and finally "compete" on its own feet with natural rubber.

"W. J. Sears, vice-president of the Rubber Manufacturers' Association, said that by the government's action the "synthetic-rubber industry comes of age."

"America-made synthetic rubbers have established themselves in the world market place. They will never again need the protection of government regulation," he said.

The only interest in all this is the light it sheds on the use of clichés about "free competition". The commercial struggle between naturally produced rubber and synthetic rubber is of little direct interest to us. What we do find perennially illuminating is the use politicians make of simple words and ideas, and the readiness of people to swallow official reasons without question.

ANARCHISM—WHAT IS IT?

"Yes, I believe in the displacement of this system of injustice by a just one; I believe in the end of starvation, exposure and the crimes caused by them; I believe in the human soul regnant over all laws which man has made, or will make; I believe there is no peace now, and there never will be peace, so long as man rules over man; I believe in the total disintegration and dissolution of the principle and practice of authority; I am an anarchist and if for this you condemn me, I stand ready to receive your condemnation."—VOLTAIRINE DE CLEYRE.

What Anarchism Is

ANARCHISM is the denial of authority in human relationships. By authority anarchists mean the possession by a man or group of men of the power to compel others into obedience to his or their will. We regard the existence of such a principle in human relationships as detrimental to the enjoyment of life, as well as serving to protect and to perpetuate the rulership and exploitation of human society by a privileged minority. Any man who is subject to the will of another is a slave. Anarchism therefore teaches that the full and free development of the individual—the basic unit of society from our point of view—is only possible in a society in which all domination of man by man has ceased. In other words, a society wherein rulership has been replaced by fellowship. Hence our use of the word anarchy (i.e., without rulers) to describe the free society which we regard as the first requisite for the true development of men.

The principle of authority manifests itself in three main forms to-day, each of which represents a group of constraints:—

(1) The State—the domination of human behaviour. The state is that collection of coercive institutions—the police, judiciary, armed forces and so on—whereby government—the main concentration of authority in the sense that I have defined it—ensures the enforcement of its will, in the shape of laws, and thus maintains the *status quo*.

(2) Property—the domination over the means of wealth production. Property is the control by a privileged economic minority of the means of production, by which they are enabled to dictate to the majority, the workers (the propertyless, the non-controllers) the terms on which the workers can use these means to obtain a livelihood. The property system, whether state or private, ensures that its controllers get a preferential share in the distribution of the wealth produced, thus living at the expense of those whom they exploit.

(3) Religion and Psychological Conditioning—this is the function of instilling into people's minds and conditioning their emotions with the concept of obedience to authority as a necessary part of life. It is performed by the church, the schools and, nowadays especially, through the mass media of the cinema, press and radio.

The tendency of these three forms is to coalesce into one body. We find the end-process of this tendency in the modern totalitarian state.

Anarchism is the avowed enemy of the principle and practice of authority. It proposes to substitute for the present system of rule and inequality, a society based on voluntary co-operation, instead of government, and equality through freedom of access to the means of production, instead of property. To achieve this society it is necessary for mankind to bring about a social revolution, abolishing authority and capitalism—the contemporary form of property.

The Meaning of Revolution

Now this term "social revolution" is still regarded with some distaste even by those who should know better. By it we mean a fundamental change in the re-

lationships between man and man, not the change in appearance, but not in essence, that is reformism. Social revolution means the abolition of the *status quo*—not its improvement by reform.

Social revolution is a twofold process. It is a growth and a historical act. The growth is the development on the part of individuals of the desire for fundamental social change. The historical act in the point in time when the *status quo* is overthrown by the masses and the possibility for new social forms is made actual.

The conditions for the success of a social revolution depend therefore upon the extent to which ideas of social change are accepted and implemented during a revolutionary uprising. It is during such an uprising that the ideas of the anarchists will gain most acceptance. Although the ideal of anarchy may be attractive to many, particularly of the oppressed, they are nevertheless loth to part with the apparently valuable petty privileges and securities their rulers promise to concede to them in exchange for their conformity (in times of so-called prosperity, that is). I consider it futile to expect a widespread acceptance of anarchism so long as the *status quo* gives an appearance of stability (though in turn its stability obviously depends, to a great extent, upon the support given to it by its subjects and the efficiency with which it justifies its existence to them. It follows that the more who are won to our ideas the less there are to support the *status quo*, with a consequent lessening of its stability). Only when the support for the *status quo* is catastrophically weakened by its collapse as the result of its internal contradictions can we expect any mass adherence to our ideas. Until that time we can gain individuals here and there, we may even grow into an appreciable minority, but an ideal so revolutionary and so fundamentally different from other social ideals as anarchy, will only grow and be realised as the result of a long, arduous and often seemingly, hopeless struggle, which may include several revolutionary attempts.

It follows that there may never be an anarchist revolution in the sense of a single historical act—only revolutionary attempts with more or less libertarian tendencies, which will assume anarchist forms according to the strength, clarity and consistency of the anarchist movement. The anarchist revolution consists of the growth of anarchist ideas and actions, the culmination of which is the achievement of the free society.

The rôle of the anarchist in a revolutionary situation is therefore to oppose any attempt to fix the revolution into an

authoritarian system, no matter what specious pleas of "revolutionary unity", "defence of the revolution" may be made. Our task is to encourage every endeavour towards the elimination of authority from human affairs and to always insist in word and deed upon the autonomy of the individual. Anarchists should seek to constitute always the liberative force in a revolution and not allow themselves to follow the treacherous path of compromising their principles by collaboration with authoritarian groupings and institutions, no matter how revolutionary these seem to be. The lessons of Spain and Russia are plain to all who care to see in this respect.

The outlook for the realisation of anarchy in our time appears very remote, to say the least. Perhaps man will never attain it—it is no inevitable result of progress. That men are capable of living in freedom we are convinced, but the free society will only be achieved when they will, desire and struggle to achieve it.

The Situation To-day

This being the position, if anarchism were merely a theory of an ideal society in the indefinite future, there are some who would think that there is no point in striving after something that may never be reached. But we anarchists are not just believers in some future society who in the mean-time aid and abet the system they profess to oppose, we believe that anarchism is a way of life which can be practised (to a greater or lesser extent according to the capacity and courage of the individual) in our present environment, here and now. That we cannot live as complete anarchists as long as authority continues to exist is obvious—if this were so there would be no point in working for a social revolution—but it is equally obvious that even under the constraints imposed by governments and capitalists ways are still open for the carrying out of anarchist acts. We do not have to wait for others for us as individuals to start our revolution. On the contrary, it is the sum total of such 'one-man revolutions' that will constitute the completion of the anarchist revolution.

I have previously defined social revolution as being twofold in character—a historical act and a process of conscious desire and activity for new social forms. The success of any social revolution depending on how far these two characteristics fuse into one.

Given the fact that the only course of action open to us to-day is on the

Continued on p. 3

AMERICA, RUSSIA AND TOTALITARIANISM

IN Russia, if a university professor heretically and persistently disregards the Marxist (Leninist) (Stalinist) line in his particular field he might expect to spend some time in a forced labour camp. And though his colleagues, his friends or his students may agree with his attitude they will hardly say so publicly, even if they happen to be in the majority among those directly concerned in the matter: it is the party line which must be followed, and which is imposed by the party machine and the executive authorities which it controls.

In America, if a university professor flouts his teaching the basic principles which underlie the American way of life he will not normally be awakened by the 3 a.m. knock. The Dean or President will ask him to recant or resign; or he will have to answer questions from the Trustees, rich and influential men who provide funds and prestige: they are men who have been successful within the present system, they feel that whatever is, is (basically) right and that anyone who wishes to change the system fundamentally is a dangerous revolutionary. Most Americans would agree that their way of life is the best possible way. They judge life by the material rewards it offers and point out that these are open to all, to a degree not known elsewhere.

Public opinion would support the removal of the American professor: in Russia there is no public opinion, there is only the party line.

Now, of these two approaches to the question of securing the correct tone in education, it is not the concentration camps and the secret police, but the quiet discussion over the 'phone or in the study which is the more totalitarian.

Power

Totalitarian does not mean ruthless, tyrannical, oppressive. It describes the government of a polity by a single party or faction which does not allow any other loyalties or parties: the monolithic state, in which opposition to the régime is not directed to changing the basic organisation of society but rather to replacing the leaders, on the ground that they are betraying the ideal—the Socialist revolution, or the glorious destiny of the Reich—about which the state is organised. The word has only come into prominence recently, but the idea is old, for, as Machiavelli wrote in his *Discourses*, which were to a Republic what *The Prince* was to a Monarchy, "In every Republic there are two dispositions, that of the populace, and that of

the upper class" ("Chi vuole mantenere" and "Chi vuole acquistare"). The upper class, the rulers, are the men who are obeyed by the bulk of the nation, whether for political, economic or religious motives. It is usually the aim of the rulers to secure the willing co-operation of their subjects, and it is therefore necessary to justify the organisation of society by reference to some non-material entity whose interests are served by both rulers and ruled, since in general the material interests of the two classes are not the same. (As John Ball said in 1360, "... they make us gain for them by our toil what they spend in their pride. . . . They have leisure and houses; we have pain and labour, the rain and the wind in the fields.") Now it is a psychological truth that no man can serve two masters: men need some fundamental, some ultimate aim, some standard of reference, some beacon by which they can direct their steps. For example, if an American were asked, "What are you?" he might reply, An insurance salesman, A Democrat, A white man, A Christian or An American, depending on the circumstances in which he was asked; but his behaviour will be dominated by only one of the many replies he might make to that simple question. Where the behaviour of the people in a state shows that they would all return the same sort of answer, religious, nationalist, industrial or political, that state can be regarded as totalitarian. "The State would carry out its idea to perfection if it controlled all the activities of its citizens, if all wills are directed in harmony with a single supreme will; so long as this has not come to pass, society still exists within the State." (Toennies, commenting on Hobbes's *Leviathan*). That is to say, if all ambitions to power are dependent upon the hierarchy, if all eyes are focused on the same point, be it "the will of Allah" or "the Leader", then the State is total, omnipresent, omniscient, universal. But as Machiavelli pointed out this State will still be in practice divided into rulers and people, and it is not in the interests of the people to allow a few to live in luxury and leisure, while the many are in various degrees overworked and underprivileged. The people, therefore, imagining that this state of affairs is right because God has appointed it, or for the sake of the Nation, resenting any attempt to change it though the change be to their benefit, are deceiving themselves. The rulers are equally deceiving themselves in believing that they,

Continued on p. 3

GODWIN ON CHILDHOOD

In our last issue, we reprinted an extract from William Godwin's *The Enquirer*. A newly published book on Godwin, edited by Mr. A. E. Rodway, Godwin & the Age of Transition, includes this passage from another of his lesser-known books, the novel *Fleetwood* (1805).

THE mind of a child is essentially independent; he does not, until he has been formed to it by hard experience, frame to himself the ideas of authority and subjection. When he is rated by his nurse, he expresses his mutinous spirit by piercing cries; when he is first struck by her in anger, he is ready to fall into convulsions of rage; it almost never happens otherwise. It is a long while (unless he is unmercifully treated indeed) before a rebuke or a blow produces in him immediate symptoms of submission. . . . Almost all that any parent requires of a child of three or four years of age consists in negatives: Stand still; Do not go there; Do not touch that. . . .

Consider the subject in another light. Liberty is the school of understanding. This is not enough adverted to. Every boy learns more in the hours of play, than in the hours of labour. In school he lays in the materials of thinking, but in his sports he actually thinks: he whets his faculties, and he opens his eyes. The child from the moment of his birth is an experimental philosopher; he essays his organs and his limbs, and learns the use of his muscles. Everyone who will attentively observe him, will find that this is his perpetual employment. But the whole process depends upon liberty. Put him into a mill, and his understanding will improve no more than that of the horse which turns it.

Public Morality

The new films *Quo Vadis* and *Samson and Delilah* are both commended in the 1951 report of the Public Morality Council, of which the Bishop of London is president and chairman. The council's cinema sub-committee describes these films as of "particular religious interest".

—Times, 25/4/52.

FILM REVIEW --

'LOS OLVIDADOS'

THE Academy Cinema is at present showing a horrifying and splendid film, Bunuel's "Los Olvidados." "The Forgotten" are the miserable children of a large city, i.e., the delinquent children: "The Young and the Damned" is the English title, "Pitié pour eux!" the French title. The film was made in Mexico, and it is the misery of the child in Mexican slums which is depicted; but let there be no mistake about it (a warning from the author makes this point quite clear) the same events could have taken place, and do take place, in any other country in the world; and the problem is fundamentally the same: that of the profound misery wherein the children of to-day are plunged. Material misery: enormous families wallowing in the utmost poverty; material misery which forces them to steal, which strips them of any scruple and trust towards a world where they are indeed forgotten, which makes them cruel, pitiless.

But also emotional misery: what Pedro, the central character of the film, most needs, is a little trust, a little maternal love; several scenes show us this, particularly the very gripping one of the dream (where Bunuel reminds us of his surrealist films); but he is systematically refused this love, and in spite of his good nature and his generosity ("I want to be good, but I don't know how") he is irresistibly drawn into the ring of crime, denunciation and hatred. And throughout the film we can see how these children who receive nothing from adults but misery and contempt, cannot help becoming "the Damned". If Pedro had not died he would have become what his former friend, Jaibo, had become: a criminal, young and yet already hardened, the very incarnation of the evil and decay to which "civilisation" can lead. If one looks closely, the film is full of striking contrasts and symbols; be it only this extraordinary blind man, stoned by the children, a pitiful old man yet full of hatred [and therefore hateful], vain, covetous, cruel, yet an invalid. He is the symbol of a society incurably damned but authoritarian and vain-glorious, ill and malicious, malicious because it is ill, ill because it is malicious; of a society which for centuries has been running round an absurd vicious circle.

Against this society Bunuel brings a charge, stirring and irreplaceable, unalterable, final as De Sica's "Bicycle Thieves" and Chaplin's "Monseigneur Ver-

doux". Perhaps more openly violent than Chaplin and De Sica, Bunuel is quite as poetic and full of warmth, full of this latent yet profound tenderness for children (which reveals itself to be so delicate and moving in the way in which he treats the characters of Pedro, "Big Eyes" and the adorable Meche). And this deep love of man which is the source of the film and which gives it its impetus, makes the crudeness and cruelty of Bunuel all the more effective and valid. One can be sure that the film will be criticised for this, that it will be found exaggerated and shocking. But one might as well criticise Goya on these grounds for having drawn "The Disasters of War", or Picasso "Guernica". For this cruelty is not cheap (how many hackneyed effects could have been produced which have been avoided!) it is not cruelty for cruelty's sake; it is the kind of violence which one could already find in Eisenstein's "Battleship Potemkin" and which is the appropriate—one could almost say necessary—language to express fully what Bunuel has to say. Or rather shout; for it is a veritable cry of horror which he utters in the face of the world's injustice towards children. Bunuel suffers by their sufferings and makes us suffer by them, disposing for

his revolt an extremely sparing and intelligent art, at the same time.

Of these aesthetics of the horrible—which precisely raise him to the level of Goya and Picasso—Bunuel has already proved himself to be a master, in a film which has not been shown to the general public in England—"Earth Without Bread." This film was made in 1933 in the Hurdes, the poorest region of Spain, and was so striking that, apparently, it obliged the Spanish Government to come to the aid of the population of this region.

We do not know if "Los Olvidados" will urge the Mexican Government or any other government, to better the fate of miserable children—that might lead too far! But what appears to us to be essential is that this masterpiece, in every single image (of which the last, the most striking of all, is that of a child rolling into a ditch, murdered because of a corrupt society—of our society), this masterpiece makes us brutally aware of the ignominies of this society and points mercilessly to our responsibilities. Whatever may be the reactions which it will provoke, a film has begun its career, which will leave nobody an easy conscience

C.D.

J.E.

THE REAL PROBLEM

AMONG the aphorisms about anarchism translated in our last issue from the South American paper *La Obra*, was an arresting sentence about slaves who believe that tyranny is the tyrant and that the problem will be solved with its elimination."

The problem of authority and dictatorship is not the authoritarians or the dictators, but the people who submit to authority and to dictatorship. There are plenty of Napoleons and Hitlers in mental hospitals, and though they are certainly a problem they are not the problem. The problem is how they ever get into palaces and Reichs-chancelleries.

The problem is not the delin-

quency of the people in authority but the shortcomings of the people who let them get there. As another article in last week's FREEDOM declared: "The central issue is not one of identifying tyrants whether they be General Franco, General Templer or Generalissimo Stalin; it is the question of understanding tyranny, of enlarging men's consciousness of their own unique and individual importance in the face of the tyrannical *isms* which seek to capture their allegiance."

The fate of Germany was determined when the public first saw Nazi dupes breaking Jewish shop windows and did nothing about it. Dachau was reflected in the broken glass.

W.

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

The Polished Ploughshare Syd Fox 1/-
How can science help the farmer?
A Thrift book.

Michael Bakunin E. H. Carr 25/-
The standard life of Bakunin. Should be read in conjunction with K. J. Kenafick's *Karl Marx & Michael Bakunin*.

Leaves of Grass Walt Whitman 5/-
New and comprehensive Everyman edition, introduced by Emory Holloway.

The Novel in Our Times
Alex Comfort, reduced to 1/-

The Wisdom of the Heart
Henry Miller, reduced to 4/6
Two volumes of literary essays at reduced prices.

The Illusion of Immortality
Corliss Lafont 10/6

"If a man die, shall he live again?" This book gives a frank and simple answer to the age-long question, presenting in clear and scientific terms the complete case against the idea of personal immortality. With an Introduction by Professor John Dewey.

Obtainable from
**27, RED LION STREET,
LONDON, W.C.1**

OLD ORBITS AND NEW STARS

WITH the last issue, FREEDOM celebrated its first birthday as a weekly paper. *War Commentary* had been a monthly and then after years of struggle had been issued first twice monthly and then fortnightly. At the time the decision was taken to continue this progress by bringing out FREEDOM weekly, it seemed a hazardous one. Chronic shortage of funds, the total absence of any distributing organisation on the commercial pattern, no paid or permanent staff—these seem formidable difficulties for a paper to contend with at a time when so many independent journals have gone out of business completely or have been compelled to appear less frequently. To-day, FREEDOM is at least as firmly established as a weekly paper as it was a fortnightly. We can look back over the first year with the satisfaction of achievement, and with warmth towards the many supporters who have made the expansion possible.

This year, May Day marks another advance in the initiative of an old comrade and the group around him in issuing a new paper, *The Syndicalist*. The continued expansion of anarchist activities is most satisfying and we wish the new venture every good fortune and the same warm support which has maintained FREEDOM.

It is not the first time that the anarchist propaganda of FREEDOM has been supplemented by a paper addressed to the workers as workers. Before the 1914 war, Tom Keele not only edited the monthly FREEDOM but also issued a weekly paper, *the Voice of Labour*. Anarchism has always been associated with the workers' struggle, and the body of ideas comprehended under the name Anarchist Syndicalism gives expression to the aims and methods of the revolutionary struggle on the economic plane.

FREEDOM has always stressed the interdependence of the syndicalist struggle and anarchist ideas, and it is good to see the first issue of *The Syndicalist* laying stress on this. "To us, syndicalism can only be Anarchist syndicalism," writes one contributor, while the editorial insists, "it is not our aim to actually organise the workers in syndicates—that is the task of the workers themselves and cannot be done by anyone else." These are fundamental matters which must never be pushed into the background.

The workers' power lies in their economic activity: a syndicalist paper must stimulate the realisation of that power, must discuss the means whereby it can best be used, must clarify working class aims. It is in this latter activity that an anarchist paper and anarchist ideas are so important to the syndicalist movement. To put the matter in human terms: syndicalism treats of the problems which confront workers as producers: anarchism does this less specifically but also treats of the worker, as a person of leisure, as lover, as father, as mother. The problems of human relationships, sexual relationships, children and their problems and upbringing; men as city dwellers and country dwellers and coastal dwellers; their material and aesthetic aspirations—anarchism takes all these into its view. Syndicalism has a narrower and more specialised furrow to plough, but man as producer must never forget his other activities, his other needs. Anarchism must never forget the struggle which economic man is forced willy-nilly, to conduct. It is into this sort of partnership that we welcome *The Syndicalist*, and wish it every success.

Arrogance & Opportunism in Malaya

SUPREME Court Justice William O. Douglas is not popular with patriotic Americans because he has called them "arrogant, intolerant and fearful of new ideas". We think, however, that such a description not only can be applied to America but to most countries, including Britain as well. This has been very clearly revealed in the British attitude to the struggle in Malaya. No one questions the right of the British to be occupying Malaya in the first place, so concerned is everybody in taking sides in the actual military struggle, against the terrorists!

In an article in the New York Sunday Times, Justice Douglas wrote: "The military approach conditioned our thinking and our planning. The military, in fact, determined our approach to the Asians and their problems. . . . We thought of Asia in terms of military bases, not in terms of peoples and their aspiration. We wanted the starving people of Asia . . . to cast their lot with us and against Russia."

Such is the case in Malaya, with the added incentive that the British are also very concerned because that country is one of the biggest dollar earners in the Empire. And there is no shortage of eminent apologists for the continued subjection of Malaya on the grounds that what we do is right—whatever may be the views of the victims! Thus, last February, the Archbishop of York, Dr. Garbett, in a broadcast on "Return through Malaya," said of the British troops out there: "We at home must make them feel that they are not forgotten, and that we know that they are fighting in the defence of civilisation and of freedom as truly as the men who fought for it in the two great wars."

Of the policy of destroying villages and herding the inhabitants into camps, eventually to be separated and resettled in other parts of the country," the Archbishop, referring to it euphemistically as the "resettlement scheme", thought that it was a "remarkable and most interesting social experiment", but added this note of warning: "the settlements will fail if Communist cells are formed within them".

Concluding, the Archbishop said: "We read week by week of outrages, but we do not hear of the remarkable progress that has been made since the liberation in industry, agriculture, health, and education, and of continuous political preparation for the time when Malaya will have self-government within the Commonwealth."

There, again, we have an example of this national arrogance which presupposes that "our way" is the only good way. "Continuous preparation for the time when Malaya will have self-government"—but it goes without saying—"within the Commonwealth". How could those ungrateful Malaysians want anything but self-government within the Commonwealth, after all we have done for them? Who will determine when the time is ripe for self-government?

Why the British, of course. Aren't we teaching them how to govern themselves? Then who better than us to decide when they are ripe to look after themselves according to our rules of the political game?

BUT the Archbishop is not alone in viewing the Malayan campaign as a crusade of Right over Communist terrorism. In the House of Commons, some Labour members have had the temerity to suggest that group punishment and the mass destruction of village crops were wrong. But their courage was mostly half-hearted, for they sought to convince the Minister for Colonial Affairs by appealing to his practical sense, thus:

Mr. Field: "Will the Minister bear in mind that any form of collective punishment or reprisal which punishes the innocent as well as the guilty is contrary to the principles of British justice and is calculated to make more recruits to communism than the reverse?"

One is tempted to ask whether Mr. Field would be less concerned about principles of British justice if it could be shown that the results justified collective punishment.

The Minister, Mr. Lennox-Boyd, replied: "Our duty to the innocent is to bring this war to an end and this is a most useful way of helping to bring that about."

"Our duty to the innocent." No heart-

*See *Mankind Is One* (Freedom Selections, 1951), p. 202.

AFRICAN AFFAIRS

(1)

Mr. Stanley Evans (Wednesbury, Lab.) repeated that 95 per cent. of the Africans had no political consciousness.

Mrs. White (East Flint, Lab.)—How many of your constituents have? (Laughter.)

—House of Commons, 29/4/52.

(2)

Politics and sincerity don't go together.
—Sereete Khama, at the Holborn Hall, 2/5/52.

FOREIGN COMMENTARY

searchings as to whether we should be in Malaya at all; on the contrary the impression created is that we are there for the sole purpose of protecting the innocent from the "Communist terrorists". Later, in a reply to a member who questioned "the morality and effectiveness" (again the practical governs the ethical) of the experiments being carried out in the use of chemicals for destroying food crops from the air, the Minister replied that, "The experiments were only being conducted either to clear areas on the sides of roads from which many of our own race, our fellow-citizens in Malaya, were being murdered regularly, or preventing foodstuffs from falling into the hands of bandits who otherwise would murder our fellow-citizens."

Not a voice was raised from the Labour benches to ask whether in fact the best way of preventing the murder of members of "our race" was to clear out of Malaya. Indeed, that Conscientious Objector of 1914-1918, who climbed the ladder of success to become Minister of War in 1950 in the Labour Government—Mr. Emanuel Shinwell, on a more recent occasion (30/4/52) put it this way: "While it is undesirable to cause embarrassment to General Templer, will the Minister not agree that it is desirable that General Templer should proceed with the utmost caution in imposing collective punishment which may not be efficacious?"

This sentence must be read twice to fully appreciate the Machiavellianism of the man who uttered it.

America, Russia & Totalitarianism

Continued from p. 2

the élite, are needed by the rest of the nation, but since this self-deception is to their advantage it is less remarkable.

By contrast, in a tyranny the people who are ruled are by no means deceived. They are well aware of the corruption and selfishness of their rulers, who must use armed force to prevent rebellion, as in the recent trouble in Barcelona.

[A similar distinction appears in the field of penology: while a tyrant merely wishes to rid himself of an enemy or to break his spirit, the rulers of a totalitarian state wish to make him see reason and to restore him to a useful life in society, after the style of the Holy Office. In America the *lex talionis* attitude formerly taken up towards criminals (that is, those who were recognised as such by society) has been changing to a more enlightened attitude, and it is to be hoped that the repressive measures taken to allay the disquiet felt by the public in the face of internal Communism are only a temporary check in this process. In Russia, while the sentences for criminal acts show a definite trend to increasing severity, the treatment of the political offender is rather directed to conversion than to punishment: the use of crude physical violence to obtain "confessions" is not encouraged, according to the testimony of one victim; the aim is to make the man think rightly rather than merely behave rightly. It is interesting to note the righteous comments on Russian chicanery in political trials, made from the country where the terms "third degree" and "frame-up" originated.]

Franco's allies, the Church, the leaders of industry and the generals are now said to be turning away from him: he left three different channels by which men could reach power, and failed to turn Spain into a totalitarian country. (The "national character" of the people is no doubt a factor here: no Spanish ruler has said that he was "tired of ruling over slaves".)

In Russia, all power is in the hands of the party: in America, as it is said, anything can be bought. And corresponding to these two ways of organising society there are two different "ideas" to which the people in each country adhere. In America, so far as a foreigner can judge, the ambition which is set before a youth by society is that of material success measured in dollars. The orthodox creed says that free competition is the basis of the democratic way of life, but in practice America is the home of trusts, cartels and rings to an extent quite equal to that in countries where they have not been "officially" discouraged. In Russia, the ideal set before young men is that of Socialism everywhere. The orthodox creed holds that the withering away of the state is to be obtained by the dictatorship of the proletariat, but in practice Russia is the home of the most extensive state machinery in the world, a machinery which has the monopoly of every form of industry.

Education

In order to secure the willing co-operation of the subjects, to "pluck the goose without making it cackle," as the French politician Turgot defined the art which he practised, they must be educated into accepting the idea of the world and society which is convenient for their rulers: and similarly the rulers must be educated into believing themselves "called" to lead, for men seem to need the assurance that their behaviour is morally right, that is to say justifiable

It is not surprising that in present society the principles of "might is right" and "the ends justify the means" in general govern relations not only between nations but at all levels within nations, down to individual relations. That there has been a serious deterioration in this respect during the past half-century at this individual level (for we are not concerned with the immorality of politicians) is to our mind the most serious threat to all that is good in our civilisation, and to real social progress. The threat of Russia is not a new threat. Before Stalin it was Hitler, the Kaiser and so on to Napoleon and Caesar! To retain their control of people's minds, Governments must provide at all times an enemy who threatens to destroy their way of life. Fear is the basis of all government. How this has operated on people's minds in America to-day is described by Justice Douglas in these terms: "Fear, has many manifestations . . . The Communist threat inside the country has been magnified and exalted far beyond its realities. . . . Suspicion grows until only the orthodox idea is the safe one."

But this has been the technique for successful government at all times. What is instead disturbing is that the voice of those who distinguish between right and wrong, objectively and independently of nationalistic considerations and opportunism, is rapidly being stifled or corrupted. That, in our opinion, is a serious and dangerous development.

LIBERTARIAN.

by reference to some larger end outside the individual. Self-interest is no match for righteous indignation.

Now it would not be practicable to confine the ruler's education to children of the rulers, as people with the temperament needed for ruling occur in every level of society and it is more efficient to use them than to allow them to remain discontented and downtrodden, unable to rise to a position to which their talents entitled them; also such a state of affairs would be seen not to correspond to the current "idea" of democracy, that the majority of the people in a country are its effective rulers. Such considerations as these are not necessarily present in the minds of the rulers, but a society which did not in practice acknowledge their weight would not survive, it would be a house divided against itself.

The function, as distinct from the alleged function or objective, of the worker's education is to provide them with a stereotyped outlook on life and a knowledge of the fact that their country has always been right in the past: i.e., to produce right-thinking men who appreciate and value the glorious traditions of their homeland; also to provide them with enough technical knowledge to carry on some trade or profession. The function of the ruler's education is in essence to distinguish them sharply and definitely from the rest; to create in their minds the unspoken, unconscious, unquestioned assumption that in some undefined way they are superior to the herd, who need them as leaders and that it is their moral duty to accept the burden of leadership. The foregoing applies to education in the broadest sense, but it is the education administered to children which is particularly important. The young child in his cradle treats his clothes, rattle, knees and toes, uncle's tie indifferently as part of the external world (and tries to assimilate them to himself through his mouth); that is, his ego-consciousness is not developed, and it is only gradually that he comes to think of his body. An analogous process on a longer time-scale occurs in the mental sphere; indeed it may be doubted whether the first ideas put into a child's mind can ever be sorted out from those

Anarchism--What is it?

Continued from p. 2

individual and group level, the possibility of mass action of any purposeful kind to overthrow the *status quo* being remote, it follows that our task to-day is the development of ourselves as conscious revolutionary individuals and the winning of those who are still capable of independent thought to our ideas. By so doing we shall be aiding and intensifying the growth of the anarchist revolution, so that should a time arise when the masses succeed in breaking the physical, mental and emotional bondage imposed upon them by their rulers and by their own acquiescence, we shall have the clarity and strength to influence by our ideas and actions the resulting revolution into a libertarian direction. In this way we can prepare the ground for the ultimate achievement of anarchy.

It is true that we have to submit to many things we hate, that we have to compromise on questions we should prefer not to compromise on, but we can still be free in our personal relationships

which are a result of experience and reflection, just as it may be doubted whether some people ever reach the stage where they are well able to distinguish between their own ideas and those of other people which they have accepted. Once a child has been through the mill his mind is more or less formed, or deformed, and he continues in the same paths like a blinkered horse, passing on to his children in due time the same attitude to life, the same idea of the world and society as he received in his youth. Thus a State of this sort would be characterised by its stability; changes which might occur as a result of external wars or technical progress would affect only the means by which power was exercised. Internally, they would appear as reforms rather than revolutions. Further, a totalitarian state will be one in which the rulers treat their subjects as sheep, to be herded, penned, fleeced and if need be butchered for the sake of the "idea" round which the nation is organised, rather than treating them as human beings, similar to their rulers, ready to rebel and assert their natural rights if they can do so.

(To be concluded)

with our friends and comrades, we can still make love without seeking the permission of church and state, and we can still refuse a yes when faced with a fundamental issue such as war. Whenever possible we can live outside rule and exploitation, and when we cannot we can still sow seeds of discontent that one day, perhaps, may blossom into the "liberty and pride and strength of the single soul and the free fraternisation of men". When the day arrives of the free man, the free woman, the free child, we shall have not only realised liberty in our souls, but in the very fabric of our individual and social being.

"The law," says Israel Kalisch in W. L. George's novel of that name, "can do nothing but coerce. The freedom of your deeds lies in the freedom of your soul, but willingness to join together freely and to part freely, to love freely and to die freely. . . . Comrade, believe with Nietzsche that to build a sanctuary one must overthrow a sanctuary."

S. E. PARKER.

FREEDOM PRESS

- TONY GIBSON :
Youth for Freedom paper 2s.
- PHILIP SANSOM :
Syndicalism—The Workers' Next Step 1s.
- ERRICO MALATESTA :
Anarchy. 6d.
Vote—What For? 1d.
- M. BAKUNIN :
Marxism, Freedom and the State. paper 2s. 6d., cloth 5s.
- HERBERT READ :
Art and the Evolution of Man. 4s.
Existentialism, Marxism and Anarchism. 3s. 6d.
Poetry and Anarchism. cloth 5s., paper 2s. 6d.
The Philosophy of Anarchism. boards 2s. 6d., paper 1s.
The Education of Free Men. 1s.
- ALEX COMFORT :
Delinquency 6d.
Barbarism & Sexual Freedom. paper 2s. 6d., stiff boards 3s. 6d.
- RUDOLF ROCKER :
Nationalism and Culture. cloth 21s.
- ALEXANDER BERKMAN :
ABC of Anarchism. 1s.
- PETER KROPOTKIN :
The State: Its Historic Role. 1s.
The Wage System. 3d.
Revolutionary Government. 3d.
Organised Vengeance Called Justice. 2d.
- JOHN HEWETSON :
Sexual Freedom for the Young. 6d.
Ill-Health, Poverty and the State. cloth 2s. 6d., paper 1s.
- M. L. BERNERI :
Workers in Stalin's Russia. 1s.
- GEORGE WOODCOCK :
Anarchy or Chaos. 2s. 6d.
New Life to the Land. 6d.
Railways and Society. 3d.
Homes 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.

THIRD SOCIALIST LITERARY CONTEST

THE first and second Socialist Literary Contests, held in Reus and Barcelona at the end of the last century, provided the basis for the diffusion of anarchism throughout Spain. The editors of CNT (the paper of the Spanish Revolutionary Syndicalists in exile) with other comrades, are now organising a Third Socialist Literary Contest, and invite all Anarchists, all Revolutionary Syndicalists, all a-political Socialists to participate, with the aim of making a reevaluation of the International Libertarian Movement, giving a fresh impulse to its activities, and establishing a basis for these activities. The subjects upon which contributions are invited are the following:—

1. Philosophical Study of Anarchism.
2. Anarchist position in relation to the bankruptcy of Capitalism.
3. Study of a free economy, based on experiences, and applicable in the twentieth century.
4. Study on ethics, and their essential anarchist basis.
5. Study of evolution and revolution, from an anarchist standpoint, through history.
6. Anarchist position with regard to the war psychosis.
7. Creation of a popular Syndicalist movement to counteract political, amorphous and totalitarian Trades Unionism, and set up a positive base from which to move forward to a new society.
8. Libertarian position in relation to modern education.
9. Methods of obtaining a popular reaction against totalitarian, reformist and religious tendencies.
10. Contemporary science and the anarchist ideal.
11. Is it considered that any aspect of anarchist thought is too idealistic?
12. A novel based on the Spanish social and revolutionary struggle.
13. Summary of the salient features of anarchism.
14. Account of a Utopia in the near future.
15. Art and anarchism.
16. Libertarian experiences in ancient society.
17. Methods of increasing the volume of propaganda, and of reaching the distant and backward peoples of the world.
18. Libertarian propaganda for youth.
19. A play, drama or comedy, of anarchist tendency.
20. Six short stories of anarchist inspiration.

Nobody must expect more than the publication of their work in a book to be published containing the works selected by a jury drawn from CRIA (Committee for International Anarchist Relations). The closing date is midnight on the 31st December, 1952. A pen-name should be used, and contributions, preferably in French, sent to Juan Ferrer, 4 rue Belfort, Toulouse (HG), France.

The organising commission—
 Federica Montseny
 José Peirats
 Evelio G. Fontaura
 Ricardo Mejías Peña
 Juan Ferrer.

Toulouse, March, 1952.

LAND NOTES

Productivity and the Meat Ration

THE only answer to the question "Can we afford to bring marginal land into use?" is another question: "Can we afford not to?"

A survey of marginal land in England and Wales has been made for the Agricultural Research Council by Prof. W. Ellison of the University College of Wales and Dr. D. A. Boyd of the Bureau of Statistics at Rothamsted. They suggest that if all the marginal land in England and Wales which might be expected to respond to recommended treatments were producing at its full potential, it would add about seventy thousand tons of meat to the ration each year, which would represent an increase of about 10 per cent. in the present total production of beef and mutton from British farms.

"It is estimated that there are about 2,400,000 acres of marginal land in England and Wales, and about 500,000 acres of common grazings in marginal land areas. Of this about a million acres is in Wales or on the Welsh border, and the remainder about evenly divided between the Northern Counties and the South-west. This land might carry an additional ten store cattle or ninety sheep per hundred acres each year if the suggested improvements were carried out."

An account of what has actually been accomplished in bringing new land into food production was given recently by Mr. Laurence Easterbrook, agricultural correspondent of the *News Chronicle* who describes the result of the ploughing and re-seeding of about 1,000 acres of Bodmin Moor in Cornwall. "As usual," he says, "critics were not lacking who regarded the whole thing as a crazy waste of money."

"But today, the new fields stand out a shining example of success, a bright oasis of green fertility even in winter. Here fine cattle graze contentedly and sheep also, needing nothing but the grass and a very little hay to enable them to grow into beef and mutton. Cattle from the committee's land began coming into local markets astonishing everyone by their size and quality. 'Where have they come from?' asked the farmers, dealers and auctioneers in amazement. They would not at first believe they had come off the moor. Local farmers saw this, and many were thereby encouraged to go and do the same sort of thing on some of their own farms. The enterprise is

HUNGRY INDIA

Land—this is the heart's desire of every Indian peasant. Land, and sons to inherit it. But many are denied even this comfort. Lately, the number of India's landless people has been growing, as family after family gripped in poverty has fallen into the hands of priest and money-lender.

While he lives in these conditions it makes little difference to the villager who governs him. For the most part he knew little and cared less about his country's struggle for independence from the British rule. His rulers, the priest and moneylender, live next door to him. His life and outlook are limited to the village and the land around it. Often he never leaves it from birth to death. His hunger, poverty, and physical weakness—these are his life, his world. India's villagers are hungry people. They are born in hunger. They live with it and die with it.

now paying dividends in cash as well as in food. It has raised the productivity of the land by a degree that can hardly be measured. To give a figure, one might say that productivity has been raised seven-fold."

"If half our counties," concludes Mr. Easterbrook, "could do as much as Cornwall is planning to do, our meat problem would be well on the way to solution, for Britain has not less than 4,000,000 acres where similar things are possible."

TWELVES MONTHS AT THE DOUBLE!

WE wonder how many readers and comrades when they received their copy of last week's FREEDOM consciously realised that with that issue, FREEDOM had completed its first year as a weekly? Many were the pessimists when we announced our intention of converting our fortnightly journal into a weekly. And there was a certain justification if one looked at all the difficulties opposing such a change; paper costs were rocketing, postages increased by 50 per cent., printing costs rising and many were the publications closing down. To have to double the subscription rates at a time when money was becoming scarce was to invite cancellations wholesale! Fortunately there were a number of friends who felt that the experiment should be made. That it has survived the first year is cause for congratulations all round! The circulation of FREEDOM has not only not decreased but has actually increased during this past year by 500 copies. Three hundred of these are postal subscribers, the other two hundred are mainly the result of untiring efforts by a few young comrades in London who have persevered with street selling on every possible occasion.

But our hopes of making FREEDOM self-supporting after one year as a weekly have not been realised. The "gap" is in the region of £10 (\$30) each week. In relation to the effort of publishing and distributing a weekly journal, this is a small amount, yet our finances are so precariously balanced that we cannot allow this weekly deficit to accumulate—and fortunately this is realised by some readers who have, during the past year, sent regular contributions to the Special Appeal Fund. But how much more satisfactory it would be if this fund could be used for further publishing activities instead of for the purpose of meeting the losses on FREEDOM! By obtaining 750 new readers this year we should be doing three things: (a) reaching a wider public with anarchist ideas—which is, after all, our purpose in publishing FREEDOM; (b) increasing the potential public for our other publications; (c) having the necessary capital for publishing more books and pamphlets.

This brings us to another aspect of our work. Parallel with the added res-

*NEITHER EAST NOR WEST (192 pages) paper 5s. (U.S. \$1), cloth 7/6 (U.S. \$1.50).

MANKIND IS ONE (240 pages) paper 5s. (U.S. \$1), a few cloth at 10/6 (U.S. \$2).

(Postage: please add 6d. for postage. American prices include postage.)

A FREE COMMUNITY?

IT was interesting to see the idea of forming a free community appearing once again in the correspondence columns of FREEDOM. It is like a hardy annual, this community plan, putting up its green shoots every spring, giving itself an airing for a season and then dying off as the colder winds of autumn chill the rising sap.

There really must be something basic for human beings in the conception of living in close community; it comes up so often. But it seems just as quickly to die away again when the people discussing it get to know each other better. And it would also appear to be more sentimental than rational.

However much the Communards cover up their own reasons for wanting to commune, I am convinced that the underlying emotions which urge them on are either (a) religious, (b) a need for emotional security, or (c) both.

I believe D.I.D. (see Letters, 26/4/52) to be mainly motivated by the first. In her delightfully vague letter she envisages a community in which love for one another would be the only restraining factor—and, it seems, the motive force as well. Shades of Jesus Christ!

But what sort of community is she proposing? In order to "create new forms of culture, and their language [to] contain no words for hate and aggression, fear and punishment, because such things would not exist" nothing less than a few generations on a desert island would be sufficient.

And then what? From this isolated utopia, would the new race of men send out radio messages to the rest of mankind, still ground down by economic tyranny, eaten up by fear and hate—and expect to be understood?

Seriously though, I do sympathise with D.I.D.'s obvious sincerity. But supposing a handful of anarchists do manage to live together in love and harmony—what does it prove? Does it prove that railmen could run the railways without a central executive, or that doctors and nurses could control the Health Service? In a word, if we could find a small group able to run a small community, would it prove that the whole of society could be run on anarchist lines?

I don't think it would. It might solve the housing problems of its members. It

might iron out the neuroses and give their children a chance from the start to be integrated personalities. It might create a haven of security and sanity in a mad world. It might. And if that were its declared aim it would be very good and valid and absolutely supportable.

But don't let's kid ourselves that it would be done for the good of mankind, or to show the world that anarchism is workable. It would be done for the good of the members in the community and would show that a community is workable. The Brüderhof and other religious communities have done no less.

I think that *function* creates *community* and if D.I.D. would like to start something communal which would really help the Anarchist movement—and so indirectly, humanity—and which would have an immediate impact on the outside world, how about starting an Anarchist Club in London?

There are many people in London today, getting in touch with us through our publications and meetings, who are frustrated in their interest in anarchism by having no means for social contact with anarchists. There is nowhere they can drop in for informal discussions, can bring their friends for a cup of coffee, can sit around at ease among anarchists. We haven't even got suitable premises for our Sunday evening meeting, so that new contacts (and old comrades) are thrown out as soon as the formal meeting is over—with no further opportunity for meeting for a week.

We badly need premises of our own, comprising a meeting room big enough for small socials, recitals, concerts or plays, a bar or small café—at any rate facilities for refreshments—a reading room, and if not living accommodation, at least space to put up for short stays comrades from the provinces or abroad, for whom at the moment hardly any of the London comrades have room.

If suitable premises could be found, I'm sure there would be no lack of voluntary labour to fit them up for our use, and if we established it as a club, a very small regular subscription, together with cash raised from meetings and other functions and from the café-bar, would make it pay its way.

In this way, anarchists would be show-

ing that they are practical people, able to communally run and control a going concern. They would also be performing a great service to the anarchist movement in this country.
 London. P.S.

THE THIRD FORCE

COMRADE John Loeb's letter in FREEDOM (19/4/52) is based on the supposition of the existence of international working-class solidarity. Alas, this desirable condition does not exist either on this side or on the other side of the iron curtain. I would never have criticised the Third Front if there were any signs of it. Under the prevailing conditions, the Third Front is a revolutionary romanticism which in the case of war would cause the useless slaughter of our French comrades.

Stalinists have their own conception of political fights. Why should "Cominformists" not join a Third Force for the purpose of fighting Truman and sabotaging the fight against Stalin? Very true, we should not be sectarian towards non-anarchists, but that applies only to countries which are not under the rule of Stalin or any other dictator, otherwise the anarchist may very quickly find himself in a concentration camp. While we are not able to beat our opponent with violence and organisations, we may be able to resist him with non-violence and non-organisation, until the tide turns again to our favour.
 Germany. WILLY FRITZENKÖTTER.

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK

IN the House of Commons debate on emigration on April 21st, Mr. Baldwin Conservative member for Leominster, said that there should be planned migration. "We should put our arms industry away from any fear of the atom bomb and the best place would be the centre of Africa," he declared.

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

OPEN AIR MEETINGS

Weather Permitting
 HYDE PARK
 Every Sunday at 3.30 p.m.

MANETTE STREET
 (by Foyle's, Charing Cross Road)
 Every Saturday at 4.30 p.m.

INDOOR MEETINGS

at the
 CLASSIC RESTAURANT,
 Baker Street, W.1
 (near Classic Cinema)
 Every Sunday at 7.30 p.m.

MAY 11—Richard Nielson on
 ASPECTS OF AMERICAN
 CULTURE

MAY 18—Bert Willis on
 CHARLIE CHAPLIN—ANARCHIST
 MAY 25—J. H. Moorhouse on
 TWENTIETH CENTURY RACKETS

NORTH-EAST LONDON DISCUSSION MEETINGS

IN EAST HAM
 Alternate Wednesdays
 at 7.30

MAY 14—SOCIAL EVENING
 MAY 28—Rita Milton
 SEXUAL FREEDOM AND
 RESPONSIBILITY

WEST LONDON

A Group has been formed in West London and any comrades interested in working with it are invited to contact—
 C. Brasnett, 79 Warwick Ave., W.9

LIVERPOOL

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

GLASGOW

OUTDOOR MEETINGS

at
 MAXWELL STREET
 Every Sunday at 7 p.m.
 With John Gaffney, Frank Leech,
 Jane Strachan, Eddie Shaw
 Frank Carlin

MIDDLESBROUGH

Anyone interested in forming a group in this area is asked to communicate with D. C. WILSON, 3 Norman Terrace, South Bank, Middlesbrough.

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