

# Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"Freedom and Justice escaped their pursuers like birds that fly too high for the arrows of children."  
—ANGEL CABRERA

Vol. 13, No. 25

June 21st, 1952

Threepence

## Forced Repatriation Demand for North Korean Prisoners

IN a recent editorial article, FREEDOM commented on an ominous note in the discussion of the future of the 70,000 North Korean prisoners-of-war in United Nations' hands. While the principle that the United Nations have enunciated—that no prisoner should be unwillingly forced back to a régime he fears—is obviously right, the *Times* in a leading article claimed in effect that men had not the right to choose where they would live, despite the claims of political asylum.

Now comes Mr. Peter Baker, M.P., in a long letter to the *Times* (13/6/52) claiming that the refusal to repatriate the unwilling prisoners constitutes a threat to Allied prisoners in North Korean hands and to the many thousands of German and Japanese prisoners still in the Soviet Union. Mr. Baker invokes Article 118 of the Geneva Convention of 1949 which states: "Prisoners of war shall be released and repatriated without delay after the cessation of active hostilities."

The argument is carried on by other correspondents. One, Mr. J. R. T. Smalley (*Times*, 16/6/52) points out that forcible repatriation may "jeopardise any future military advantage that may come to us through wholesale desertions of enemies who prefer our protection to continuing to fight for their Communist masters, and also forfeit the confidence of the large numbers of political refugees at present in the free countries that the asylum which they now enjoy may, in certain circumstances, be refused them." Despite all this, Mr. Smalley joins Mr. Baker in demanding forced repatriation of all prisoners.

### Tory Opposition

The only spirited opposition to these pragmatic suggestions comes from a Conservative, Mr. Tufton-Beamish. He very forcibly deplores (16/6/52) the use of prisoners-of-war as "counters or stakes", and he makes some telling comments on Article 118 of the Geneva Convention. To hold, he argues, that this means that our government is thereby bound to repatriate prisoners whether they like it or not, is to defeat the whole purpose of the Convention—that of "protecting" the rights and safety of individual prisoners-of-war.

Mr. Tufton-Beamish's arguments provide a welcome contrast to the shifty arguments of the *Times* and the supporters of Mr. Baker.

Clearly the only morally just position is that of permitting a prisoner-of-war free choice as to where he will live.

Despite all this discussion, in which the position of FREEDOM has been made clear, our previous comments on the United Nations' new-found morality still stand. The Western Governments have many times repatriated individuals who sought political asylum and who have committed suicide rather than return to the country they sought escape from. Nor are they by any means above using prisoners-of-war as "stakes or counters". If the discussion on this matter shows anything at all, it is the moral obliquity of many would-be advisers of the administration.

### FOREIGN NOTES

## A PEEP BEHIND PORTUGAL'S IRON CURTAIN

THE Iron Curtain surrounding political life in Portugal, Britain's oldest ally, has been lifted for a brief second for the announcement to filter through that a former presidential candidate has been sentenced to three months' imprisonment and five years' loss of rights having been found guilty of "conspiring against the security of the State". It appears that the charge was based on a signed manifesto denouncing re-armament and the Atlantic Pact.

In an editorial comment on this case, the *Manchester Guardian* (16/6/52) points out that: "Dr. Salazar's régime does not pretend to be a parliamentary democracy as this is understood elsewhere in the West. At the same time it avoids the scarlet signs of dictatorship; the price Portugal, pays for stable authoritarian government is the dullness of conformity rather than the brutality of the concentration camp."

This seems to us a polite understatement. For many years free trade unions have not existed in Portugal and militant workers have been persecuted and even executed for "conspiring against the State," or in the *M.G.*'s language, against the stable authoritarian government. As to concentration camps we always under-

stood that political prisoners in Dr. Salazar's Portugal, were sent to the Cape Verde Islands.

But as Portugal is a member of the Atlantic Pact and a champion of democracy, outside her frontiers, and all she allows the outside world to know of her internal affairs is the excellence of her Port, it is unlikely that any newspaper in this country with the necessary resources will carry out an investigation into the régime in Portugal.

Or would it be possible now that the *Manchester Guardian* has brilliantly exposed in five articles, the racket of the Irish export industry in horses, it will turn its roving reporters to a similarly thorough investigation in Portugal—not of the Port racket with its wide British ramifications—though even that may have some bearing on the "stable authoritarian government" as well as provide an explanation for the conspiracy of silence—but of working conditions and the situation of workers' organisations in that sunny but unhappy country, not to mention those other elementary rights, such as freedom of the press and of speech.

## Outlook for World Agriculture

### India's Food Prospects Improved

AFTER the famines of recent years in India, with their appalling death rolls, it is good to hear that the present outlook is much better. Broadcasting on June 14th, Prime Minister Nehru declared that India was "turning the corner in regard to food production, and that the prospect is definitely hopeful."

According to Nehru, stocks of food grains have increased and food prices have gone down. Stocks, which at the beginning of the year amounted to 1,330,000 tons have now increased to 3,600,000 tons. The wheat harvest is good and more food grains are coming from abroad. "There is at present plenty of wheat and milo in the country.

There is not quite enough rice, but we are making special efforts to get larger quantities. Prices of locally produced grains have gone down, but unfortunately we had to pay heavily for imported grains."

**World Food Reserve Proposed**  
The Food & Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations, at its fifteenth session meeting in Rome last week, discussed the problem of building up a reserve stock of food to meet famine demands when required.

"A report prepared by the F.A.O. to assist the council suggests that to provide a basis for calculating the assistance that might be required in forming and paying for an emergency food reserve, a 'yardstick

unit', to be known as an 'emergency food reserve unit' or E.F.R.U., might be created.

"One E.F.R.U. is defined as the quantity of food required for supplementing the diet of one million people by 1,200 calories a day for one month.

"Mr. Dodd, director-general of the F.A.O., reporting to the council on his recent world tour, said that the 'two gravest dangers' were the present Middle East plague of desert locusts and the scarcity of rice in the Far East. The scarcity was most serious in Ceylon, where there was insufficient rice to maintain with certainty even the present low ration of five and a quarter ounces a day for any length of time." (*Times*, 10/6/52.)

(Nehru, however, declared that in Madras, a neighbouring state of Ceylon, "there was a stock of rice enough for more than a year on the present scale of rations, and there was also much wheat and milo.")

At the conclusion of the session, the F.A.O. approved the suggestion to create this emergency food reserve, ready to meet famine wherever it might occur.

"The reserve would not be for use in emergencies arising from war or civil disturbances, but for famine caused by crop failures due to natural causes, such as drought, blight, earthquakes, volcanic eruption, or plague.

"There was a discussion on the means of implementing the proposal and three alternative methods were suggested: (i) an internationally owned stock of foods in an emergency reserve; (ii) an internationally owned emergency relief fund with which to buy and move food upon need; (iii) nationally owned stocks which contributing Governments would pledge themselves to deliver upon call."

(*Times*, 16/6/52).

### Landlordism Condemned

AT the same session, problems connected with land reform were examined. Dr. Wahlen, director of the agricultural division, after outlining the "real difficulties and limitations" inherent in any

ANARCHIST.

Continued on p. 2

## Continuing Terrorism in Eastern Europe

PUBLICISTS in the west take considerable interest in the internal struggles of top Communists of the Iron Curtain countries—the purges and counter-purges. FREEDOM from time to time reports these events and discusses their possible significance. For anarchists' sympathy for political prisoners and victims of torture is natural: but in the case of Communists like Kostov or Rajk or Anna Pauker, such feelings are more than tempered by the knowledge that these people were also the instruments who applied the Communist tyranny. Their fate is no worse than what they themselves inflicted on many others—who were moreover innocent of cruelty or brutality but were revolutionists or opponents of the régime or even specific classes of peasants or intellectuals singled out for bad treatment in the process of dividing and ruling.

It came therefore as something of a shock to read in a capitalist paper of "Anna Pauker and her fellow sufferers"! The public in the west is always more struck by a well-known name—a Trotsky or Bukharin, Tito or Gomulka—suffering the edge of Communist terror, than by the nameless thousands who daily suffer under the régime. It is natural to feel interest in the internal struggles of the régime. But far more important is the general tyranny itself.

### Internal Deportations

The Official Bulletin No. 9b of the Rumanian Government, dated February 16, 1952, published the following decree: "From March 1, 1952, the towns will be 'decongested.' Measures of evacuation in the town of Bucharest will be taken in order to arrive at the total evacuation of the following categories of persons: (1) The families of criminals of war, of the deported, the condemned, and the imprisoned, as well as the families

of those who took refuge abroad. By family is to be understood husband and wife, children, brothers, father and mother. The persons who belong to this category will be given permission to take with them 90lb. of luggage. Their new residence will be communicated to them 12 or 24 hours before departure. (2) Officers who have been eliminated from the army, former judges, former barristers who have been dismissed from the Bar, former industrialists and merchants whose business has been nationalized, and landowners who owned more than 10 acres. Persons in these categories can take with them all their belongings. (3) Saboteurs, *récidiviste* criminals, the pensioned under 70 years of age. These categories of persons can take with them all their belongings. They will be allowed to choose their residence 30 miles away from the point of departure and outside the territories of military or industrial interests as well as of the boundary zones." (Quoted by V. V. Tilea in a letter to the *Times* 14/6/52.)

The same writer goes on to say: "There is, I believe, little explanation necessary to understand what a reign of terror exists in Rumania. All towns are involved and since the beginning of May the deportations have been accelerated. Destinations have not been communicated to the deportees and one does not know of their whereabouts. Deportations have started even in large villages. Wives have been separated from their husbands and children from the mother to be deported. After having imprisoned all political leaders of the democratic parties—Maniu, Mihalache (National Peasant), Bratianu (Liberal), Petrescu (Labour), and many others—as well as the Bishops of the Catholic and Greek Catholic Church, and former high-ranking officers, this is the last act of a mass assassination

of all those who are not loyal Communists and who had some cultural or family relations with the west."

Identical deportations have occurred since 1939 in the Baltic countries, Lithuania, Estonia and Latvia, and in Poland and Bulgaria. Sometimes the deportees have gone to the forced labour camps of the M.V.D. in Russia, sometimes it is an internal deportation with the object of removing opponents, real or potential, from their homes and splitting up of families, with all the despair and political defeatism that it causes.

The same kind of terror is being enacted in eastern Germany under a new government ordinance empowering the Ministry of State security to deal with "spies and terrorists".

"Expulsions are being continued in the sealed frontier regions with a ruthlessness reminiscent of the Nazi era. One report states that 42 families were sent into the interior yesterday from Domitz, a little town on the Elbe across from the British zone, and that another 179 families are awaiting deportation. Officials of the State Security Service, it is suggested, are making investigations in the border towns and villages, and on the evidence of local informers are ordering the expulsion of people suspected of western sympathies. Each family is allowed to take up to 100 east marks for immediate needs, and some luggage; bank accounts are blocked, and the head of the family is required to give a signed statement that his departure is "voluntary". Some were sent by train to Schwerin or Rostock; others were unaware of their destinations." (*Times*, 14/6/52.)

In the face of all this, any sympathy for the Kostovs, the Rajks, the Titos, quickly evaporates.

A REPORT submitted to the Council of the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organisation, which met in Rome last week, said that a large part of the world was still suffering from hunger and malnutrition and the world's need for more food had not yet begun to be met.

The report said that the average daily diet in the least developed and most heavily populated areas of the world was still substantially below the already inadequate pre-war averages and the last year had shown few signs of significant improvement, in spite of all the Government programmes to the contrary. The situation was most acute in South-East Asia, where it was aggravated by chronic civil or military disturbances and lack of personal security, which impeded economic life and progress.

The Director-General of the F.A.O., Mr. Norris E. Dodd, told the council that rice supplies in South-East Asia were less than half of what they should be. Before the war between seven and eight million tons of rice entered world markets. Allowing for the increase in population, the figure should now be about nine million tons, but last year only four million tons of rice entered world markets.

At the same time a United Nations survey of the world's income shows that the United States and Canada, with less than 10 per cent. of the world's population, had more than 43 per cent. of the world's income in 1950.

Countries with half the world's population had an average income of less than £35 a person in 1950, while for a group of countries with only 10 per cent. of the population—most of Western Europe, the United States, Canada, Australia and New Zealand—the average was £214 a person.

The survey says that Russia's national income more than doubled between 1938 and 1951.

SUPREME Court Justice William O. Douglas is no anarchist, but he is obviously a thorn in the sides of those die-hard Americans who are prattling about freedom and democracy and at the same time supporting measures and policies which are nothing more than totalitarianism. In a speech earlier this month, he said that the rôle of America in the world "is as a champion of the weak and oppressed or it is not true to character. We cannot fill that rôle in the world unless we are faithful to our tradition of civil liberties."

He said that if the United States must choose between an unfair oil deal by the British in Persia, and Premier Mohammed Mossadegh, who leads a revolt against the British, the United States must support Dr. Mossadegh. "If America casts her support the other way, we will begin to lose the political contest for men's hearts," he added.

He said similarly that if the United States is afraid of speech at home it will be frightened abroad. Any curbs such as restriction of speech and persecution of political creeds will make for trouble abroad, he said, and added:

"It is time we cast away the false doctrines of guilt by association. It is time we redirected ourselves to the spirit and letter of the Bill of Rights... If we do, we need never fear Soviet Russia can capture the political leadership of the world."



# Kropotkin Defines Anarchism

In his Memoirs of a Revolutionist (1899), Kropotkin describes in the following terms the conceptions of anarchism, developed amongst the workers of the Jura federation in Switzerland after the collapse of the First International in 1872.

★

WE saw that a new form of society is germinating in the civilised nations, and must take the place of the old one; a society of equals, who will not be compelled to sell their hands and brains to those who choose to employ them in a haphazard way, but who will be able to apply their knowledge and capacities to production, in an organism so constructed as to combine all the efforts for procuring the greatest sum possible of well-being for all, while full, free scope will be left for every individual initiative. This society will be composed of a multitude of associations, federated for all purposes which require federations for production of all sorts—agricultural, industrial, intellectual, artistic; communes for consumption, making provision for dwellings, gas works, supplies of food, sanitary arrangements, etc., federations of communes among themselves, and federations of communes with trade organisations; and, finally, wider groups covering the country, or several countries, composed of men who collaborate for the satisfaction of such economic, intellectual, artistic, and moral needs as are not limited to a given territory . . .

There will be full freedom for the development of new forms of production, invention, and organisation; individual initiative will be encouraged, and the tendency toward uniformity and centralisation will be discouraged. Moreover, this society will not be crystallised into certain unchangeable forms, but will continually modify its aspect, because it will be a living evolving organism; no need of government will be felt, because free agreement and federation can take its place in all those

functions which governments consider as theirs at the present time, and because the causes of conflicts being reduced in number, those conflicts which may still arise can be submitted to arbitration.

None of us minimised the importance and depth of the change which we looked for. We understood that the current opinions upon the necessity for private ownership in land, factories, mines, dwelling houses, and so on, as a means of securing industrial progress, and of the wage system as a means of compelling man to work, would not soon give way to higher conceptions of socialised ownership and production. We knew that a tedious propaganda and a long succession of struggles, individual and collective revolts against the now prevailing forms of property, of individual self-sacrifice, of partial attempts at reconstruction and partial revolutions would have to be lived through, before the current ideas upon private ownership would be modified. And we understood also that the now current ideas concerning the necessity of authority—in which all of us have been bred—would not and could not be abandoned by civilised mankind all at once. Long years of propaganda and a long succession of partial acts of revolt against authority, as well as a complete revision of the teachings now derived from history, would be required before men could perceive that they had been mistaken in attributing to their rulers and their laws what was derived in reality from their own sociable feelings and habits. We knew all that. But we also knew that in preaching change in both these directions we should be working with the tide of human progress . . .

We understood, at the same time, that such change cannot be produced by the conjectures of one man of genius, that it will not be one man's discovery, but that it must result from the constructive work of the masses, just as the forms of judicial procedure

which were elaborated in the early medieval ages, the village community, the guild, the medieval city, or the foundations of international law, were worked out by the people . . .

For myself, placed as I was in favourable conditions, I gradually came to realise that anarchism represents more than a mere mode of action and a mere conception of a free society; that it is part of a philosophy, natural and social, which must be developed in a quite different way from the metaphysical or dialectic methods which have been employed in sciences dealing with man. I saw that it must be treated by the same methods as natural sciences; not, however, on the slippery ground of mere analogies, such as Herbert Spencer accepts, but on the solid basis of induction applied to human institutions. And I did my best to accomplish what I could in that direction.

# DELINQUENTS IN THE MAKING

A NEW American book, *Delinquents in the Making* (Harper Bros.) by Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck (a condensation of their long report, "Unravelling Juvenile Delinquency," is a study of 500 delinquents and an equal number of non-delinquents were painstakingly selected and paired according to similarity of age, family background, general intelligence, and environment.

A now familiar and always welcome theme, writes the American magazine, *Manas*, is the argument that criminals, young or old, are mostly people a great deal like ourselves. In chapter entitled, "Meet Frankie and Jimmy," the Gluecks give twelve pages of comparative study of two children, listing intelligence quotients, broken-home and alcoholism factors, income-bracket similarity, etc., without revealing which of the two is "delinquent". (A delinquent is defined as one who would be a habitual criminal if judged by adult standards.) In the "Frankie and Jimmy" comparison, the reader is impressed not only by what our best penologists, such as Wardens Duffy, Lawes, and Kenyon Scudder have told us—that there is often but a hair's line of difference between a "responsible" person and a criminal—but also by the many specific similarities of habit and temperament. The reader is frequently asked if he can guess which

of the boys is the "good" one, which the "bad" one, and when the answer is finally disclosed it is evident being "right" in this selection could be little more than "luck".

We are particularly interested, *Manas* continues, in the Gluecks' discussion of the vital rôle which the adventurous spirit may play in creating delinquent tendencies. While our routinized society leaves little opportunity for constructive adventuring, there is always the desire to penetrate into the unknown, to abandon the trodden highways of thought and deed, and this spirit has often led to new vitality for a community or a culture. We recall a "science-fiction" story which describes the birth of a beautiful civilisation as men finally conquer their slavery to "the rabbit-warren existence of cities." When the people really mastered the machines they had invented, the cities were deserted except for the machinery which kept plugging away with minimal supervision. Men went back to a more natural, decentralised and agrarian mode of life, actually preferring to depend less on the machines at the very time when the latter had reached virtual perfection. Such a "dream society", obviously, would be more sparsely populated by juvenile delinquents, for the urge to adventurous living would have its scope in the out-of-doors, and the challenges of field and stream would once more return. Interestingly, the Gluecks discovered that a high proportion of juvenile delinquents were possessed of excellent bodily capacity, being "muscular" or "adventurous" physical types with vital energy in excess of the outlets available to them. The Gluecks conclude from such facts that the typical delinquent is also typically a valuable potential contributor to society. His thirst for adventure is an antidote to cultural and individual stagnation or apathy, and if this aptitude plus characteristic physical exuberance were better directed, our society might be stronger and more dynamic for the addition.

# THE IGNORANT ARE NOT THE FRIENDS OF THE WISE

THE time-honoured words of Mahabarata are as true as ever: "The ignorant are not the friends of the wise: the man who has no cart is not the friend of him who has a cart. Friendship is the daughter of equality: it is never born of inequality." Without doubt it is given to some men, great by their thoughts, by sympathy, by strength of will, to win the multitude: but if the attachment of the fellows and admirers comes otherwise than of an enthusiastic affinity of idea to idea, or of heart to heart, it is speedily transformed into fanaticism or servility. He who is hailed lord by the acclamations of the crowd must almost of necessity attribute to himself exceptional virtues, or a "grace of God", that marks him in

his own estimation as a predestined being, and he usurps without hesitation or remorse, privileges which he transmits as a heritage to his children. But, while in rank exalted, he is morally degraded, and his partisans and sycophants are more degraded still; they wait for the word of command which falls from the master's lip; when they heard in the depths of their conscience some faint note of dissent, it is stifled; they become liars, they stoop to flattery, and lose the power of looking men in the face. Between him who commands and him who obeys, and whose degradation deepens from generation to generation, there is no possibility of friendship. The virtues are transformed; brotherly frankness is destroyed; independence becomes a crime; above it either pitying condescension or haughty contempt, below either envious admiration or hidden hate. Let each of us recall the past and ask ourselves in all sincerity this question: "Who are the men in whose society we have experienced the most pleasure?" Are they personages who have "honoured" us with their conversation, or the humble with whom we have "deigned" to associate? Are they not rather our equals, those whose looks neither implore nor command, and whom we may love with open hearts without afterthought or reserve?

—ELISEE RECLUS (1830-1905).

# Outlook for World Agriculture

Continued from p. 1

programme of land reform, emphasised that a contented peasantry was the "best guarantee for social and political stability".

Dr. Wahlen did not mince matters when discussing landlordism. In many, if not most countries, he said, "the land-owning class is, of course, the real obstacle, and its influence on the Government may be strong enough to forestall any initiative." Even where all factors were favourable, he added, there still remained the formidable task of "transforming former peons and landless labourers into reasonably efficient peasants and farmers," and of providing them with the necessary farms, equipment, livestock and credit facilities.

Dr. Wahlen had some reservations, however. According to the *Times* report (13/6/52): "Where agrarian reform was concerned, Dr. Wahlen concluded, the men needed were 'those who are not only indoctrinated prophets of the great idea of social justice in a free world, but who at the same time know the intricacies of the technical, legislative, and administrative procedures required to put orderly agrarian reforms into effect'. He thought 'there is something frightening about the idealist who thinks that the problem can be solved simply by giving land away.'"

There is, however, something absurd about condemning landlordism and then in effect implying that something can be done without giving land away. Landlordism is pernicious because it is wrong that men should control land which they do not work, and that the proceeds they derive from it should cripple the land workers' initiative and go into private pockets instead of benefiting the community at large.

Nevertheless, the public recognition that landlordism is a bar to progress on the land is more than welcome.

# RACE HATE

A home-made bomb was thrown into a house occupied by negroes in a previously all-white suburb of Kansas City. A woman visitor threw it outside, where it exploded. *News Chronicle*, 30/5/52.

# Children Speak Their Minds

WHAT a shock educationalists would get," writes the main article of the periodic Children's Book Section of the *Times Literary Supplement*, "if *Picture Post*, say, decided suddenly to devote a complete number to the work of children, their drawings, their paintings (in full colour), their poems and articles and stories . . ."

"It has already happened—in India, not over here. For the past three years *Shankar's Weekly* (editor: K. S. Pillai), of New Delhi, has devoted one 160-page number annually in December to children's work."

From the 1951 Children's Number, the *Literary Supplement* reproduces an engaging drawing by fourteen-year-old Dilip Banerji, called "Election Campaign," which shows two "buffaloes charging each other, and the article concludes:

"There is a sad little story called 'The Fateful Consequence,' by Nilendu Haldar (14), of Calcutta, in which the daughter of a rich banker goes with him on the eve of her fourteenth birthday to choose a gold wrist-watch. On the way she sees a ragged urchin of her own age remove from a dustbin the dirty, fly-blown remains of an eaten mango and eat it with great relish. A stray dog in its endeavour to snatch it away from her tight clasp bit her severely. But she clung on to her mango desperately. Molina stood there stunned. The sight had deeply touched her tender heart! That was perhaps the first time Molina looked away from the colourful side of life. She realised perhaps for the first time that day how grave the pang of poverty is!"

"She refused to let her father buy her a gold watch and decided instead to help the poor on her birthday. This is one of a number of contributions which reflect an awakening of social conscience. The voices cry out against poverty and clamour for justice, although sometimes their idealism is clouded with disillusionment. It is interesting to find that, where careers are contemplated, it is usually those of the doctor, the nurse, and the teacher which are sought. Service to the community comes, particularly in the case of Eastern children, before the claims of wealth and personal success. There are other differences between East and West. One notices, for instance, the attitude to adults and the greater regard in which the East holds its teachers. They crop up in pictures, stories and articles, and are nearly always sympathetically drawn. One story, a dream entitled 'Twenty-four Hours After Death,' ends: 'In heaven I was given a large palace to share with my old school teacher and I felt very happy.'"

"The English or American child would surely think twice, even in a dream, before committing himself to this. But the differences are few. One closes the magazine with an abiding sense of the unity of outlook of these children of the 15 nations. Barriers of race and caste, of poverty and wealth, do not exist for them—by so much are they wiser than their elders. Let the last word be with Isao Kan (15), of Tokyo, who closes his 'Message to Young People' with this encouragement: "Let's co-operate with our friends abroad for establishing a peaceful world, because we bear a great responsibility on our shoulders—that of making people all over the world live in peace for ever."

"And, by way of postscript, sincerest thanks to *Shankar's Weekly* for the bold and imaginative decision that allowed these small voices to be heard."

children of the 15 nations. Barriers of race and caste, of poverty and wealth, do not exist for them—by so much are they wiser than their elders. Let the last word be with Isao Kan (15), of Tokyo, who closes his 'Message to Young People' with this encouragement:

"Let's co-operate with our friends abroad for establishing a peaceful world, because we bear a great responsibility on our shoulders—that of making people all over the world live in peace for ever."

"And, by way of postscript, sincerest thanks to *Shankar's Weekly* for the bold and imaginative decision that allowed these small voices to be heard."

# WAR ON WANT

WAR ON WANT: A Plan for World Development. (Association for World Peace, 1/-)

THIS report which was drafted by a committee consisting of Mr. Harold Wilson, Sir Richard Acland, Mr. Leslie Hale, and Mrs. Mary Rosser, is an addition to the growing pile of books and pamphlets on the theme which its opening paragraph describes thus: "Two-thirds of all the men, women and children on earth to-day live their lives surrounded by squalor, hunger, disease, starvation, illiteracy and premature death. Such poverty is not new in human history: it is as old as man. But the industrial revolution in many countries has created a great gap between whole peoples who live in poverty and peoples who enjoy a high standard of life through the use of all the techniques associated with higher production. For the first time in history the peoples that live in poverty begin to know that their poverty is not an inevitable condition of human life."

The first section of the report outlines the facts of world poverty, the moral and practical reasons why the wealthier parts of the world are bound to help alleviate it, and discusses briefly the relation between poverty and population.

The section describes British activities in colonial development and the international action which has so far been taken to assist under-developed countries, by the specialised agencies of the United Nations.

The third chapter gives a very clear exposition of the so-called Colombo Plan for development in south-east Asia and concludes: "Launched in high hopes, the Colombo Plan is now in great danger of collapse."

The fourth chapter is on "Problems of World Development"—agricultural, industrial, social, financial and organisational; and the report concludes with a "Plan for World Development" proposing an International Development Authority with adequate powers, staff and funds. The report as a whole is very clearly written, contains a great deal of factual information and refers the reader to sources so that if he really wants to study the problem, he can find his way through all the statistical reports and official statements.

But whether the governments of the world would ever take the practical steps to set about the elimination of world poverty on a world scale, whether in fact it is in the nature of governmental society to take these steps is quite another matter.

# FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

The Conduct of Life Lewis Mumford 21/-

The long-awaited sequel to Lewis Mumford's books *Technics & Civilization*, *The Culture of Cities* and *The Condition of Man*.

The Books in my Life Henry Miller 18/-

Chapters on Walt Whitman, Dostoevsky, Krishnamurti, Blaise Cendrars, Jean Giorno, Richard Jefferies, G. A. Henty, Rider Haggard and J. C. Powys.

The British Worker Ferdynand Zweig 2/6

"A social and psychological study, presenting the problems, difficulties and struggles of the ordinary man at home, at work, and in his leisure hours."

Portworkers' Clarion 2d.

Organ of the Merseyside Portworkers' Committee.

★

If you have not had a copy of our new list of books, including remainders and second-hand, send a stamped addressed envelope.

Obtainable from

27, RED LION STREET, LONDON, W.C.1



## SET MY PEOPLE FREE

WHEN R. B. Cunninghame-Graham and his companion, Angel Cabrera, were riding across the pampas during one of those South American upheavals of the nineteenth century, they were met by an armed band who demanded whether they were for the Whites or the Reds? "We are of the party of Freedom and Justice," they replied, and their interlocutors were satisfied. Satisfied, no doubt, because the craving for freedom and justice is the motive force of every popular revolution, of every disinterested social act.

But when it comes to embodying this craving in the deeds of the revolution what disillusionment has followed in the past! How to define freedom and justice, let alone give them practical reality? Angel Cabrera later on remarked to Cunninghame-Graham, "Freedom and Justice escaped their pursuers like birds that fly too high for the arrows of children." They seem forever to elude the revolutionaries who crave them, for of what revolution of the past can these sad words not be said? The historical fact has made many a man turn away from the revolution.

When Joseph Conrad came in 1920 to write a preface to his early novel, *Under Western Eyes*, about Russian emigré revolutionists in Switzerland for the collected edition of his works, the Russian Revolution had already come—and gone. The Bolshevik counter-revolution was already firmly establishing itself. In the next January, the suppression of Kronstadt finally extinguished the revolutionary flames. So Conrad wrote sadly and a little savagely of that "purely utopian revolutionism encompassing destruction by the first means to hand in the strange conviction that a fundamental change of heart must follow the downfall of any given human institution. These people are unable to see that all they can effect is merely a change of names. The oppressors and the oppressed are all Russians together and the world is brought once more face to face with the truth of the saying that the tiger cannot change his stripes nor the leopard his spots."

Such weary disillusionment must be rejected if for no other reason than that it is sterile and leads nowhere but to despair. But it must also be rejected because it looks on the deeds of administrators and sees them as the deeds of the revolution. As it happens, the Russian Revolution which disillusioned Conrad was "led" by Lenin and Trotsky, men who did not believe in Freedom and Justice, Marxists who denounced such conceptions as petty bourgeois idealism. But they were conceptions which decades before had satisfied the men who questioned Cunninghame-Graham and his companion. And they were the slogans which fired the Kronstadt sailors in their revolt against Bolshevik centralisation and tyranny in 1921.

The truth is that, vague as they seem to "practical" minds, these are the conceptions which move men and women, and so provide the energy of the revolution. It is for freedom and justice that men encompass the "downfall of any given human institution" that obstructs them. At the end of his life, Conrad may turn wearily away, but the destruction of restricting institutions is a necessary first step just the same. Such destruction liberates the creative power of the people which Kropotkin discerned in every social upheaval, and it gives point to Bakunin's much

A LETTER published elsewhere in this issue comments acidly on the article "The Cult of the Informer" (FREEDOM, 7/6/52) from our American correspondent (who referred to the Hiss trial as being political) pointing out that in fact Hiss was sentenced to five years' imprisonment on being found guilty of perjury.

What our correspondent seems to ignore is that no government admits that political trials take place in their country, and according to the letter of the law they can prove this. The Moscow Trials, from 1934 onwards, which our correspondent will, we are sure agree were political trials are not considered such by the Russian Government and its apologists. The prisoners were always charged with "high treason, conspiracy to assassinate, criminal intercourse with the spies and other agents of foreign powers, and even the wilful wrecking of railways and industrial plants". In Spain, the political enemies of Franco's régime are charged under the decree law of May 3, 1947, "for the Repression of the Crimes of Banditry and Terrorism."

In America to-day, there is no law which makes membership of the Communist Party or of the 200-odd proscribed organisations a crime in the present or retrospectively. But there exists an organisation called the House Un-American Activities Committee with powers to subpoena witnesses to appear before it and answer questions about their political records. To refuse to testify leaves one open to criminal prosecution for contempt—or its American equivalent. To deny one's association with a proscribed organisation, and to be found guilty of lying as a result of evidence given by other witnesses makes it certain that one will be charged in the criminal courts with perjury, a crime which carries a maximum sentence of ten years imprisonment on each charge. To admit one's association with a proscribed organisation can involve one's livelihood. Furthermore, let it not be forgotten that the House Committee has powers to question you on your

associates: in other words, it demands that those who appear before it should, if they deem it necessary, descend to the level of the informer, the mark.

WE will illustrate the foregoing with two recent examples:

Last month, according to an A.P. report from Washington, Joseph W. Weinberg, a scientist who helped develop the atomic bomb, was indicted on charges that he lied when he denied on oath to a Congressional committee that he had been a member of the Communist Party.

A bench warrant was issued for his arrest, and later in the day he was arrested in Minneapolis and released in \$10,000 bond to appear in Washington on June 2.

Mr. Weinberg is the man who was long described only as "Scientist X" by the House Un-American Activities Committee during an investigation of atomic spying.

To-day's perjury indictment, returned by a Federal Grand Jury here, is based on testimony which Mr. Weinberg gave to the committee.

Mr. Weinberg figured prominently in the committee's investigation of spying at the wartime University of California radiation laboratory at Berkeley.

The indictment contains three counts. Conviction would make him liable to ten years' imprisonment on each count.

The indictment is based on his testimony before the committee on May 25, 1949.

Mr. Weinberg is charged with:  
1—Swearing falsely under oath that he was not a member of the Communist Party.

2—Lying when he said he attended only one Communist meeting in California during the war.

# Political Trials in America?

3—Lying when he testified that he did not remember having seen Steve Nelson before April 26, 1949.

Mr. Nelson during the war was Communist Party organiser in California. The committee charged that Mr. Nelson placed Communists in the radiation laboratory and obtained atomic secrets to be passed to Russia.

Mr. Weinberg, it should be added was dismissed from his post in June, 1951.

The second case is that of Lillian Hallman, author of a dozen Broadway and Hollywood hits, who last month refused to tell the House Un-American Activities Committee whether she had ever been a member of the Communist Party.

Appearing under subpoena to answer charges that she had been a Communist "member-at-large" in Hollywood in 1937, Miss Hellman said she would willingly testify about herself, but would not involve others. She refused to testify on the Constitutional ground of self-incrimination after Rep. John S. Wood, (D., Ga.) committee chairman, replied that the committee would not countenance "trading with witnesses".

Miss Hellman let drop only one hint as to her past. She denied that she is presently a Communist or that she had been one for the last two years. She declined to state whether she had been a party member three years ago.

The witness, who won New York Drama Critics' awards for her plays "Watch on the Rhine" and "The Little Foxes", stated her position to the committee in a letter read at the hearing.

"I am most willing to answer all questions about myself," the letter said. But it added that counsel had advised that Miss Hellman would risk a contempt citation if she replied to questions about herself and refused to testify about others.

"I am not willing, now or in the future," the letter continued, "to bring bad trouble to people who, in my past association with them, were completely innocent of any talk or action which was disloyal or subversive."

"I do not like subversion or disloyalty in any form, and if I had ever seen any I would have considered it my duty to have reported it to proper authorities. But to hurt innocent people whom I knew many years ago in order to save myself is, to me, inhuman and indecent and dishonourable."

"I cannot and will not cut my conscience to fit this year's fashions, even though I long ago came to the conclusion that I was not a political person and could have no comfortable place in any political group."

OUR correspondent accuses us of being so "nationalistic" in our "would-be anti-capitalism" that we get "our facts wrong more than half the time". We might add that our correspondent is so fanatically pro-American that he gets his facts wrong all the time and goes so far as to say that to his knowledge "no one has ever been condemned for his political opinions in the United States". Without having to remind him of the Chicago Anarchists, Sacco and Vanzetti, and the anti-Anarchist laws which were applied most vigorously (we advise him to read Emma Goldman's *Living My Life*) we wonder in what category he would place the trials of the American Trotskyists during the '40s and the recent trial and imprisonment of the 11 American Communist leaders, under the Smith Act, and the pending trial of the "second string" of the CP leadership, not to mention the prosecution of an American publisher of Communist classics.

In case he should reply that those are necessary measures to protect national security, we can only reply that that is the excuse put forward by all governments to justify the political persecution of those whose views they consider dangerous to the *status quo* in which, of course, all governments have a large stake!  
LIBERTARIAN.

## DUCLOS' PIGEONS

### Edible, Carrier or Stool?

THE tactics of the French Communist Party in its recent "test of strength on the streets" undoubtedly may have seemed somewhat "revolutionary" to its most likely sources of adherents—those so frustrated by the tyrannies and even more the conventions of capitalist society that they are over-anxious to "do something", as sensational as possible, they are not sure what, but "do something". So off they respond to the cry—"on to the streets"—with all the trappings of the good old-fashioned "United Front" days—with their "shock-tactics" with the police in a proletarian struggle" so long deserted by the Communists that it comes as something novel, and certainly a welcome relief from listening to the Dean of Canterbury at a Peace Convention, well worth a few broken heads from that point of view.

The aim of the demonstrations is a little lost, and the parallel is not to be found in Russian but in German Communism. There, too, a mass movement was built up in the same way, which also fought the police on the streets (before 1933—nothing of the sort happened again for twelve years, and that is the significant contrast with Spain) for very ill-defined purposes save that of a "test of strength". On the one hand, the demonstrators were the guinea-pigs to test the political stability, and on the other hand there was all the good fun of showing the Social-Democrats the rôle of stalwart defenders of the capitalist régime. If the demonstrators had a few victories, so much the better for the "proletarian vanguard": if, more likely, there were a few cracked heads among the rank-and-file, it furnished material for an entire winter's lecture tour. "The police dogs of Noske..." (Prolonged applause.)

Those who might have seen any real purpose of achieving working-class

maligned saying that "the urge to destruction is also a creative urge."

Simple people, like the South American armed band of R. B. Cunninghame-Graham's anecdote, immediately respond to the revolutionary conceptions. But the destruction of restrictive institutions only becomes meaningless when the counter-revolution—whether of the left or the right—erects other restrictive institutions to take their place. It is the rebuilding of new power and authority on the ruins of the old that brings the revolution to despair. More thorough destruction, not less, of power institutions is required if the revolution is to succeed in giving reality to the ancient demand, "Set my people free."

emancipation in the old "United Front" tactics may doubtless accept that the French workers were used the other week for something other than international power-politics. They may believe in the French Communist Party eventually disappearing in quite a different way from the German. They may even believe in the eventual re-appearance of M. Thorez in a sealed train across Germany (Uncle Joe might even imitate the delightful feeling the historical touch that his Cousin Adolf possessed so well, and provide the same sealed train that took Lenin to Russia). For all we know or care, they may believe the latest story from Paris, that the pigeons in M. Duclos' limousine were not carrier pigeons but, as he said, for eating "with green peas"; that the revolver was for shooting them; that the bodyguard was in reality his pastrycook, and the radio transmitter for contacting the chef (*du parti*) in Moscow.

What, however, they surely cannot believe is not the tale of the pigeons, but the wail of the stool-pigeons. Ever since the arrest of M. Duclos and the closing down of Communist establishments by the French Army and police, the cry has gone up that "the last time this happened it led to Vichy". This Vichy argument is the only one that Stalinists can have, but it somehow seems a trifle mixed. True, there is an obvious parallel between a French Government—completely divorced from the working-class—closing down the Communists in 1939, when they were allied to Hitler via Moscow—and now, when they are allied directly to the prospective enemy. In 1939 the Government was unable to meet the Stalinoids any other way than by suppression, being itself afflicted with the totalitarian blight. It also welcomed the opportunity to crush all sections of the working-class movement under cover of attacking the C.P. This may well be the case again. But how can the present situation lead to Vichyism? Is that not what the Communists want? Surely their objection to the hotch-potch that calls itself the French Cabinet is the fact that it intends to go to war alongside America and possibly a bit in front, too? Would they not welcome a Vichy Government in Stalin-occupied France?

In theory, they would. In practice, however—that is another story. Dictators are no fools. They do not always choose the faithful to reward them for their services. The sad fate of the French Fascists, so ill-paid for their pains to pave the way for a Hitler victory, is a case in point. Hitler contemptuously pushed away the lick-spittle fascists, hole-in-the-corner Cagouards, wall-chalking anti-Semites, insignificant Royalists and boring pro-Nazis who made up what was thought to be the Fifth Column. Make no mistake, Stalin would do much the same in a similar position—as witness the swift liquidation of the Communist militants in every country he controls. The man

Hitler turned to was the old "Hero of Verdun"; his cohorts were the military generals who shouted loudest for war preparation—people with the respect of the patriotic section of the population who might be most inclined to oppose the invader, but in power would be faithful watch-dogs. Stalin will not pick a French Cabinet from the Renault works but from the chiefs of staff and political salons. His real potential in France as a Vichy government is more likely to be prosecuting than defending this week.

And where will the resistance come from? From the police who have been clubbing down the followers of Duclos? The experience of the last war tells us exactly what rôle the police will play; for whom they will work and for what purpose their secret dossiers will be used. However bitterly the political police in any country may persecute, they are at least impartial to the point of persecuting on behalf of whoever happens to be the government.

When the French workers return to the traditions they built in the past they will give all the politicians an unpleasant surprise, and who can really blame the latter for getting as much as they can out of them before that awakening?  
INTERNATIONALIST.

### WHAT THE KREMLIN COPIED FROM THE VATICAN

Its form of organisation: Both are dictators, ruling from the top down, not from the bottom up.

The ecclesiastical "Iron curtain": That of the Vatican is personal, the Kremlin added a geographical boundary. The Index Expurgatorius: Both ban and burn books.

The setting up of "infallible" dogmas and a build-up of infallibility among the faithful.

Control of education: This is necessary as a defence of the infallible dogmas against free, independent thought.

Limiting of research, scientific method, to defend dogmas.

Bitter denunciation and persecution of deviationists: Since the "modernism" phase of 1900 the Vatican has kept a papal legate at Washington as commissar for deviation in the U.S. Hierarchy. He is Italian, not an American. The Kremlin causes purges of U.S. Communists.

Of all the maledictions the Pope issues against the Kremlin the most devastating would be: "Cop cat!"

—*Secular Subjects* (U.S.A.) May 1952.

### BREAKING POINT

Many schizophrenics in Soviet zone insane asylums believe they are communist heroes Pieck [Wilhelm Pieck, East German state president], Lenin, or Stalin. West Berlin psychiatrists explain that the victims' minds broke down under the strain of trying to make sense of the volumes of propaganda literature they were forced to study.

—*Chicago Tribune*, 27/4/52.

## FREEDOM PRESS

- MARIE-LOUISE BERNERI :  
*Neither East nor West* cloth 10s. 6d., paper 7s. 6d.  
*Workers in Stalin's Russia.* 1s.
- SELECTIONS FROM FREEDOM  
*Vol. 1, 1951, Mankind is One* paper 7s. 6d.
- 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.
- 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.



LETTERS TO THE EDITORS  
**The Cult of the Informer**

IN speaking of the Hiss trial, in "The Cult of the Informer," you say that "the whole nature of the prosecution, based on whether or not a man should be condemned for his political opinions and activities, was an outrage to any decent conception of civil liberties". Hiss was not prosecuted on account of his political opinions or activities. He was prosecuted and convicted for perjury. So far as I know, no one has ever been condemned for his political opinions in the United States. And Hiss could not have been prosecuted for the political activities which were discussed in the trial, because a Federal law prevents prosecution for such activities after ten years have elapsed since their performance. For the same reason, Chambers could not be prosecuted for the activities he had carried out in the Communist Party, since he brought them to light in 1948, which was more than ten years after the date. It is not true that he

went scot free "because he was an informer", as you say here. You are so nationalistic in your would-be anti-capitalism that you get your facts wrong more than half the time. Chambers seems to be a nasty character. But the fact that publishers expect a big sale for his book does not show that the reading public in America is ready to admire or make a hero of him. I imagine most of them will buy it because of the "revelations" and "inside dope" about the Communist Party which they hope to get from it. There is something fake about your moral indignation and the way in which you let it off before you even see what you want to hit with it. And you talk about "bally-woo".

Swansea, June 9. TOM TEMPLE.  
 [This letter is referred to in this week's Foreign Commentary.]

**THE END OF FULL EMPLOYMENT?**  
 3—The Anarchist Alternative

ARE we exaggerating the dangers of a world depression? If so, we are certainly not alone in that, for from many sources come the warnings—and from sources very much concerned to keep capitalism going.

In a speech at St. Annes, Lancashire, last month, Mr. Cyril Osborne, Conservative M.P. for Louth, Lines., told the Incorporated Sales Managers' Association that this country must be prepared for a slump greater than in 1921 or 1931—"unless we have the courage to look at the facts."

Mr. Hervey Rhodes, M.P. for Ashton-under-Lyme (Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade in the Labour Government) told the Textiles Officials' Association that it was no use the industry's thinking in terms of a return to pre-war turnover, and more recently the old profit of gloom, Mr. Churchill himself, has "sounded the alarm" and told us we are standing on a trap-door.

Certainly there are plenty of responsible, respectable people forecasting depression. We must never forget, however, that this is part of the technique of government. Control of populations by governments is based upon physical and psychological coercion. We are governed by fear in the first place, and when that fails, by force, and it is obviously the Government's job always to make us afraid of what is going to happen if we do not do as they say.

But even taking that into account, there is no doubt that we are heading for world depression. How can it be otherwise? In an economic system based upon competition and upon production for sale, the continuous expansion of production must sooner or later saturate the available markets. The tragedy of it is, that it is continually put forward as a problem of over-production, when in fact the real problem is one of under-consumption.

Even to-day, two-thirds of the world's population, the peasant, "backward" populations, are existing perpetually on the edge of starvation. For the majority of mankind, the tremendous and wondrous developments in technology mean absolutely nothing; they have not the means to buy sufficient of the barest necessities for a simple life, let alone the amenities of industrial society.

And so we have the situation where the warehouses of the world are filling up with one of the basic necessities, cloth and clothing, and textile and garment workers are being thrown on to the dole, while throughout the world there are countless millions in need of clothes, blankets and sheets, furnishings—all the things that could be so easily produced—if they did not have to be paid for.

And in times of depression the perpetual condition of the "backward", undeveloped countries becomes also the condition of the workers in the "advanced", developed countries. Textile workers in Lancashire to-day are becoming less and less able to buy the goods they themselves produce. Could anything be more stupid?

The capitalist alternative I have already outlined, two weeks ago. And if any readers still doubt that rearmament and war is the only real capitalist solution, I refer them to the small note in FREEDOM for May 17, quoting Sir Vincent Tewson (last year's chairman of the TUC) telling trade unionists in New Zealand, "If Germany and Japan were not forced to re-arm to defend democracy, they would have an unfair advantage in the world's market." And add

to that Mr. Anthony Eden's remarks during the debate in the Commons on German rearmament: "Is German industry to be allowed to compete with that of the Allies in the markets of the world without any of the burdens and restrictions which rearmament places on our own export drive?" While the TUC, in its statement supporting rearmament, maintains that sharp cuts in the defence programme would mean "industrial and financial difficulties."

Which all lets the cat out of the bag pretty thoroughly. The next war, which will be the result of this rearmament, will be, like the last, fought in the interests of capitalism. The slogans and war aims will be announced as being all for democracy, Christianity, civilisation and the rest, but will be in fact for the control of money markets. Which many people think worth fighting for, but the Anarchists do not.

What then, is the Anarchist alternative? Fundamentally, of course, there is only one alternative: world-wide social revolution. The abominable results of capitalism will not be eradicated until the system which causes them has been eradicated.

But that, let's face it, is a long way off. Capitalism is still very much alive and kicking, and we have to remain alive, too.

To that end, the Anarchists suggest that the workers must begin to close their ranks now. In his book, *In Place of Fear*, Aneurin Bevan discusses the industrial power of the working-class, but maintains that "industrial power is just what the unemployed have not got." But industrial power cannot be divorced from the working-class as a whole, and it is very much against the interests of all workers for any to be unemployed.

The out-of-work suffer from their state of unemployment, and those still at work are threatened with loss of their job and are weakened through the existence of a pool of unemployed waiting for a job.

All workers must therefore realise now that they must prevent unemployment before it assumes unmanageable proportions. This means that they must stop working themselves out of their jobs. Restriction of production should become common practice.

**LOCAL ELECTION RESULTS INTERPRETED BY THE POLITICIANS**

(From a correspondent)

SOME optimists think that figures cannot lie. Yet, faced with the results of the recent local elections held in Wales, the two parties' headquarters appear unable to agree even to the figures, quite apart from the interpretation of the results in political terms:

The *Conservative Central Office* declared that the Conservatives had gained eight seats and lost ten and that Labour had gained 73 and lost 13.

The *Labour Party* instead said that Labour had gained 101 and lost 20.

Then, commenting on the analysis of the results, the *Chief Conservative agent for Wales* said: Wales and Monmouthshire have rejected Socialist interference in local government in a decisive manner.

The *Secretary of the West Regional Council of Labour*, commenting on the results, said: "This is a clear indication that the electors of Wales remain loyal to the Labour movement and have no faith in the Tory Government."

So, reader, take your choice. One thing is certain, the Party bosses don't think much of the people's intelligence. And, so long as we go on playing their game, they are fully justified.

**London Anarchist Group SUMMER SCHOOL, 1952**

THIS year's Summer School has been arranged for the August Bank Holiday weekend—August 2, 3, 4 (Sat., Sun., Mon.)

Comrades from the provinces who will require sleeping accommodation are requested to apply as soon as possible.

Full details will be available from: The Summer School Committee (L.A.G.), c/o Freedom Press, 27 Red Lion Street, W.C.1.

from the continual and unrelenting spate of propaganda backed by superstition on behalf of registered monogamy and against "immoral ideas" that the ruling classes are genuinely disturbed—at the revolution in morals which is taking place. The perennial desire of the ruling class is for stable marital relations and big families, since they are shrewd enough to recognise in the family the microcosm of the State, and in the dissatisfaction and conflicts arising from the alternatives of monogamy or monasticism the mainspring for the "creative" endeavours of useless "industries" in preparation for bigger and better wars.

Hence, of course, the Royal Commission on Divorce, which, while it may be compelled by a realistic appraisal of the situation to recommend reforms hitherto anathema to our rulers—will only throw ballast overboard in order to save the ship. CAVAN MCCARTHY.

The miners are now seeing stocks of coal accumulating at the pits once again. There first step should be to rescind that Saturday morning agreement they recently agreed to. A ban on overtime should be immediately established by all workers threatened by redundancy.

The next step should be the rejection of piece work. Both these measures will no doubt betray the fact that workers have in many cases been depending on piece-work bonuses and overtime to make a living wage. So that then it will be necessary to demand a satisfactory basic wage—for a working week that will ensure work for everyone who wants it. If nine hours is too long (as it is!) cut it down to eight. If eight is too long, walk out when you've done seven.

Redundancy must be combatted with every means at the disposal of the worker. Nobody who has a useful skill and is willing to work is redundant while people need the things he can produce. Unemployment, economic crises, depressions, these are essentially nothing to do with production, distribution and consumption. They have everything to do with buying and selling. This latter, is the boss's business—let him look after that. Let the workers concern themselves with production and distribution—yes and consumption, too. And if the boss says he can't afford to keep you all in his factory—take his factory away from him. He has shown himself to be incapable of running it for the benefit of society or of the workers he employs.

This has been done in other countries—can it not be done here? It entails determined solidarity and a consciousness of the industrial power of the workers. For, as even Bevan would hardly like to deny—industrial power is just what the working-class has got. P.S.

**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 6.0 p.m.

**INDOOR MEETINGS**

at the  
 CLASSIC RESTAURANT,  
 Baker Street, W.1  
 (near Classic Cinema)  
 Every Sunday at 7.30 p.m.  
 JUNE 22—Tony Gibson on  
 ANARCHIST SOLUTION TO THE  
 WORLD CRISIS  
 JUNE 29—BRAINS TRUST on  
 ANARCHISM & SYNDICALISM

**NORTH-EAST LONDON DISCUSSION MEETINGS**

IN EAST HAM  
 Alternate Wednesdays  
 at 7.30  
 JUNE 25—ROUND TABLE  
 DISCUSSION on  
 EUGENICS

**WEST LONDON**

Enquiries to—  
 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

**LEEDS**

Anyone interested in forming a group in Leeds, please contact Freedom Press in first instance.

**SAN FRANCISCO**

FREEDOM readers are invited to support a Spanish Protest meeting to be held in San Francisco, at the Hall in 827 Broadway on July 19th.

**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

**Yorkshire Miners & the Italians**

I CAN well understand Comrade Tonks's discomfort at the treatment of the Italians at Bullcroft. And perhaps, in my indignation, I wrote about it in a manner which seemed to him to be an attack on Yorkshiremen—or at least, South Yorkshiremen—in general.

This was of course unintentional, but I thought all along that it was a very important issue, and still think so, and that no good purpose was to be served by underplaying our attitude to it. We are sometimes accused of glorifying workers and of taking the "workers right or wrong" attitude, and maybe I leant over backwards in my criticism of the Yorkshire miners because I think that when the workers have behaved stupidly we should say so in no uncertain terms.

But what, in fact, were Francis Tonks's arguments? Firstly, that Communists among the South Yorkshire miners are so few that they can be discounted.

I should have thought that Comrade Tonks's own experience in his own union would have shown him how vocal a small minority can be, and he must know how a small pressure group can wield an influence out of proportion to its numbers. (For instance—the ASCW has a CP membership of 5-10%, but they now have 10 out of the 12 places on the National Executive—83%!) There were enough CPers around Bullcroft to put Party slogans on the walls, and at the National Service Hostel in Doncaster, it was a Stalinist on the Residents' Committee who tried to stir up the residents against the Italians there (FREEDOM, 26/4/52). Couple this with the campaign the Italian Communist press has been running, saying that British mines are death-traps and that the Italians over here are underpaid and overworked, and that anything the CP can do to drive wedges between the nations of the western bloc serves the interests of the Kremlin, and you get the reason for the *Daily Worker* opposing the employment of Italians and why party stooges in Yorkshire "stirred up national feelings" against workers from "an ex-enemy country". Also, why they didn't say anything against workers from eastern European countries where the people are establishing "People's Democracies".

I don't quite see the argument in Tonks's second point: "... not all miners in this coalfield are actually

Yorkshiremen." Is he trying to say that it wasn't really Yorkies at Bullcroft, it was the Taffies and the Geordies, who acted silly? I'm afraid it won't wash, nor will his irrelevant stuff about working and drinking together.

The unpleasant fact is that miners in Yorkshire allowed a handful of miners from another country to be treated in a shameful fashion on issues arising from a petty grievance and irrational prejudice, whipped up by a few political stooges with an axe to grind.

I don't like that: Tonks doesn't like it: I'm prepared to accept that thousands of Yorkshiremen don't like it. But what did they do about it?

On their May Day banner, the Bullcroft men had "Workers of the World Unite!" which simply made them look ridiculous. I think that we should be doing a dis-service to the workers of the world in general and the workers of South Yorkshire in particular if we soft-pedalled on this issue.

I appreciate that maybe Comrade Tonks's regional and personal loyalties have been bruised and I do want him to understand that I am not, as a Southerner, throwing bricks at Yorkshiremen for the fun of it. To use a phrase we've all heard before: "This hurts me as much as it hurts you, son." P.S.

**MANCHESTER UNIVERSITY**

A LIBERTARIAN Society has been formed at Manchester College of Technology (which is part of the University), "for the discussion of anarchist ideas of the freedom and responsibility of the individual."

Would any readers of FREEDOM who are at Owen's College (the main body of the University), please contact me at the address below, so that we can discuss the possibility of forming a similar society there? By way of encouragement, we have started with more members than the Liberal Society, and on a pro rata basis, the University proper should be able to support a society of 30 or 40, since we are only one faculty.

Further, would anyone interested in the formation of a Manchester Anarchist Group, please contact me, or Freedom Press, for preliminary discussions? 13, Bannerman Ave., V. MAYES, Prestwich, Manchester.

**Reader's Viewpoint**

**POST-MORTEM ON MARRIAGE**

THE "Liberal" (Nonconformist) *News Chronicle* has recently concluded an "inquiry" into the apparent relapse or transformation of Western monogamous marriage under the heading "For Better or Worse!"

In order to ensure what the Press regards as "objectivity", the more violent reactionaries were carefully excluded, and so also with scrupulous fairness were those who could by any stretch of the imagination be suspected of secretly harbouring "progressive" or "unorthodox" ideas.

Instead, readers were confronted with a truly formidable cast consisting of two politicians, two Doctors of Divinity (one a Dean), a magistrate, an author and television star, a couple of actresses, a dramatic critic, the secretary of the "Marriage Guidance Council, and a housewife and civil servant. Of these only the dramatic critic suggested to bewildered readers that there were or ever had been any alternatives to monogamy.

The stage was now set for "free speech" but let us not imagine that the inquiry should be in any way impartial or even controversial. Nothing of the sort. The whole object of this "inquiry" was to vindicate existing institutions, to "stem the rising tide of divorce", and to find new grounds upon which coercive monogamy and repressionist morality can be perpetuated. Where they appeared to be yielding ground, they were merely consolidating new positions from which to defend the System, and at the end of the series there was a masterly

"summing-up" by that redoubtable "Fidei Defensor" and political oracle, A. J. Cummings. It is true that once a week readers were permitted to "answer back", letters being restricted to 150 words, and in the case of the present writer, 89 of these were "cut", presumably in the interests of "free speech" and the whole subject-matter taken out of context in deference to "objectivity". The manner in which most of the replies re-echoed the views of the editors bore unmistakable witness to the "freedom of the Press". All except one gentleman, who believed in the matrimonial state so fervently that he had entered it no less than five times, and a terrible cad who annoyed the "Summerskill Girl Snipers" by a churlish reference to able-bodied alimony-mongers.

But, on the whole, it merely repeated the tedious reiterations of the old familiar clichés on "life-long love", "perfect harmony" and "ideal marriage", etc. Apart from this, it served as a platform for the "cake and eat it" pseudo-feminism of Dr. Edith Summerskill which seeks—not to achieve anything so revolutionary or "disgusting" as the complete emancipation of Woman from the economic dependence of marriage, or to vindicate the biological right to motherhood of what are cruelly dismissed as "surplus women"—but merely to demand better conditions for the "more fortunate sisters" from their "employers". A sort of embittered, defeatist, vindictive "feminism" which shirks all the issues of freedom and

represents only one privileged section of women in the shape of the closed-shop Matrons' Trade Union.

Most progressives will heartily endorse the idea that a wife is entitled at least to some payment for work done as a housekeeper, as long as we have a "wage" or monetary system. But the "Summerskill Snipers" seek to obtain all the advantages for helplessly "dependent" wives, at the expense of bachelors, spinsters and husbands—even demanding that wages shall continue to be paid in the event of desertion by the "employer"—for services no longer given or required, and quite irrespective of the "housekeeper's" independent means or income from subsequent employment. Here again, the economic principal which lies at the root of marriage is upheld—namely that all females and children are economically dependent upon individual males—which enables the Capitalist State to work these males harder, to "discipline" the rebellious and to shirk (its) communal responsibility to provide full employment or maintenance for all able-bodied adults, and support, by the adult community of children and those unable to work.

In a libertarian society, of course, "work" would be socially necessary, voluntary and congenial, and "wages" would consist of the equitable distribution of services, amenities, and consumer goods according to need. This is the Solution, of course, which all States—"capitalist" or "socialist"—are determined to avoid—and we can only judge