

Confusion over the Yalu Raids

THE raids on the hydro-electric power installations along the Yalu River in North Korea, have provided the biggest crisis in the Korean War since General MacArthur's dismissal. And the crisis is mainly round the same issue—that of the possible extension of the war into a full-scale struggle between—initially—America and China.

The power installations along the Yalu River supply industry in North Korea. But they also supply power to industrial plant on the other side of the river in Manchuria, that is to say, in China itself. Indeed to a part of China that is also on the Russian borders and where Russian control is probably still exercised fairly thoroughly.

From a military standpoint, the Yalu power stations are obvious targets. And since it seems certain that North Korea is receiving direct help from Manchurian industries, the fact that they are supplied from the same source only makes them still more clearly a military objective.

At the same time, the political aspects of the war in Korea—the fact that it is the hot end of the cold war—makes these raids of a potential political significance which may outweigh their military importance.

A final twist to the political aspect was given by the fact that the raids took place without prior consultation between the U.S. and British Governments.

Political Outcry

The nature of the outcry, however, against this episode, shows how unrealistic, from every point of view, are the critics in this country. Or if one regards them as fully understanding the nature and significance of the Korean war, then their outcry shows how readily they will use wars simply as a means for sectional propaganda.

To take the last point first: the Opposition has taken the opportunity to attack the American Government for failing to seek advice on the political advisability of the raids from the British Government. In doing so, they diminish the stature of the Conservative administration, kicked around, as it were, by arrogant America. And they also cash in on the anti-American feeling which Bevan used in his own attack on the Labour Party leaders.

Not unnaturally, the American State Department replies that when Morrison was Foreign Secretary, a list of targets in North Korea was jointly agreed upon between the U.S. and the then Labour Government of Britain, and that this list contained the Yalu installations.

Morrison replies to this that "it was different then," and then rebukes the Americans for making public diplomatic documents.

Nehru "Aghast"

So much for the political capital which can be made out of this military adventure. There are also those like Nehru, the Prime Minister of India, who stated that he was "aghast" at the raids. This point of view has been widely shared in Britain especially among lefties and progressives, and it is worth examining.

What shocks these people is apparently that the Chinese may be so angry at the raids that they will turn nasty and start a full-scale war. Such argumentation is typical of those who half oppose war and yet are helpless against the arguments of those who support particular wars.

First of all, the Korean war is already a full-scale war in which

hundreds of thousands have been killed and wounded and millions rendered homeless. But, secondly, if that war is accepted, as most of these progressive people do accept it, as a joint action of the peaceful nations to defeat aggression, then it clearly must be conducted efficiently. There is something ludicrous in these people expecting the United Nations to fight the war with one hand tied behind their backs. If you accept war, you ought to have the courage to accept it in all its implications.

Admission of China to U.N.

The Labour Party are now demanding that the Chinese should be admitted to the United Nations and that this would conclude the Korean war. Such a plea is pure power politics and makes nonsense of whatever ethical façade the United Nations may ever have seemed to have. It partakes of the pre-war appeasement of the Tory Government towards Fascism, and of the complete disregard of "moral" questions such as characterised, for example, the non-intervention policy during the Spanish war.

It may be true that some Americans want to extend the war. But

if this happens it will not be because of their wishes. It will be because the world economic situation demands more war for its own stabilisation. If that happens (as it will, of course, if capitalism continues) the war will be extended whether any individuals or group of individuals want it or not.

Hidden Economic Factors?

The main factors in the Korean war may well be completely concealed from us as yet. FREEDOM has tried to show, within the limitations of incomplete information and depending to some extent on speculation, that the Korean war is not unconnected with world markets, stock exchange fluctuations and the general problems of industry during "peace-time". It is not impossible that the differences in policy between the British and American administration reflects differing economic interests. It seems clear that American economy needs the Korean war, and as we have already pointed out, an extension of war would still further ease certain problems of American industry. But it may be that for Britain, Korea represents more of a drain than an aid to industry. We are too imperfectly informed to make a sure judgment here: but we are certain that these are the kind of factors which are the important and operative ones, though they are not suited for war propaganda and so lie hidden.

In "The Land of Witch-Hunts"

PROFESSOR Owen Lattimore has been a special target for the American witch-hunters for some time, and his is an excellent example of the adage that if you throw enough mud at a man, some of it will stick. Mr. Lattimore has survived two congressional investigations of his "loyalty", and is still a professor at Johns Hopkins University, but for the witch-hunters he is still a target. A few weeks back, the State Department received a confidential tip that Mr. Lattimore had been planning to leave the country to visit either Russia or one of the satellite countries. Some days later, the *Baltimore Sun* heard about the trip and the State Department had to admit that it had in fact sent instructions to American port officials to keep a look-out for him and to prevent his leaving the country.

Professor Lattimore pointed out that apart from negotiations with Johns Hopkins and New Delhi for a period of teaching in India, he had no intention of leaving the United States, and he generously dismissed the State Department's precautions as "midsummer madness". To which the State Department's press officer retorted that the department was not in the habit of acting on "fantasies or inanities". He should have added, of course, that his department had acted on the information provided by a "nark" or informer. Unfortunately for them, the tip turned out to be a "complete fabrication", and Mr. Lattimore was accordingly notified by the State Department that it had revoked its "confidential stop-order" against him following the revelation by the F.B.I. that the "original informant" had admitted that the story which he had furnished concerning Mr. Lattimore's alleged travel abroad was a complete fabrication. Proceedings were instituted which resulted yesterday in the indictment by a Federal grand jury of the individual who initiated the false report.

The letter concludes with expressing to Mr. Lattimore the department's "sincere regret over the embarrassment caused him". Mr. Lattimore, who has described the effects on himself and his family as a result of two congressional investigations, in his book *Ordeal by Slander*, was far from vindictive in his reply. Indeed it was as dignified as the State Department's was abject. He appreciated the department's "belated apology" but thought the American people ought to have "tangible assurances from the

State Department and the Central Intelligence Agency" that this monstrous and un-American injustice cannot happen again". He commented also, for the benefit of the American people, that this fantastic case had shown "there are both amateurs and professionals at work in our country "blasting the reputations of innocent people and undermining our democratic values. They are to-day's lynch mob and operating on a grand scale supported and inspired by highly placed officials."

Such language, however, cuts no ice with such organisations as the F.B.I. Their sordid trade is one which no self-respecting person would ever engage in willingly. To talk to the F.B.I.—or the political or security police in any country for that matter—about human feelings, democracy and civil liberties is a waste of breath. Unfortunately, most people only begin to take an interest in the powers and methods of the political police when they are affected personally, so that they carry on more or less unmolested. We talk of the "police state" when referring to countries under totalitarian régimes. It is a good yard-stick of the political health of a country. Perhaps our ardent democrats might, to advantage turn their attention for a little while from the "police states" east of the Iron Curtain and look around them nearer home. There is nothing like putting your own house in order as a means of influencing other countries in the ways of freedom!

★

BERTRAND RUSSELL, in his debate with the American journal, the *New Leader* (FREEDOM, 19/1/52) pointed to the legal and severe economic penalties which were the price one had to pay in America for openly expressing non-conformist views. This, the *New Leader* denied at the time, yet six months later it devotes an editorial to "the Lenz case" which is an excellent proof of Bertrand Russell's contention. Dr. Lenz is a model American in most respects. He is an "active" anti-Communist; he does not belong to any of the proscribed organisations but does belong to such "anti-communist liberal groups" like "Americans for Democratic Action" and the "American Civil Liberties Union". The trouble is that Dr. Lenz is too democratic and has attracted attention on himself during the past few years for championing the right of members of "subversive" groups to speak on the college campus.

SYNDICALIST NOTEBOOK

T. & G.W.U. TO SWALLOW N.U.R.?

THERE have been rumours for some time that Jim Figgins, head of the National Union of Railwaymen, is soon to retire.

This in itself is of no great importance. Mr. Figgins will not be missed; some other busybody will be found to take his place. But another, much more sinister, rumour has just flashed around among railwaymen.

It is that the NUR is to be absorbed into the Transport & General Workers Union! It is said that a meeting was held on Friday, June 27th, at National Executive level between the two unions, and this matter was discussed.

We must stress that so far there has been no official confirmation, but rumours of such startling nature do not arise with no foundation at all. We suppose that the merger could not take place without a ballot throughout the NUR, but such are the ways of a union with its members that maybe if the bosses decide, that is all that is considered necessary.

But for the railwaymen, bad as the NUR has often proved to be, amalgamation with the T. & G.W.U. would be the end. They would become just another section in that vast conglomeration of occupations (from mid-wives to gravediggers, as it is said) under the dictatorial thumb of Arthur Deakin.

For Deakin—more power. Already in the block-voting democracy of the TUC he has only to lift his hand for a million and a quarter votes to be cast—enough to sway any vote the way he wants it. The addition of the hundreds of thousands of the NUR would give him unparalleled power and would bring under his control a section of the workers who have a long history of militancy, a tradition of knowledge of direct action, and who are showing no inclination to accept Mr. Butler's wage freeze, as Deakin wishes them to.

One good result could come. That the more militant railwaymen would leave these useless unions and form their own organisations under their own control.

EUSTON'S OFFICIAL BRANCH

As a footnote to last week's story on the Euston workers' struggle against the NUR, it is interesting to note that when the entire Euston No. 1 Branch elected to withdraw, the Union Executive looked around for stooges to form another official Branch.

They found four rank and filers willing to form a local Department Committee and to the line from Head Office. They were all members of the Communist Party!

SOME PARTNERSHIP

THE John Lewis Partnership consists of about sixty retail stores in London and Liverpool, Manchester, Sheffield, Nottingham and Edinburgh. In this organisation the workers are not employees, they are partners. Readers may remember a certain amount of publicity the head of the organisation—partner-in-chief, as one might say—Mr. John Spedan Lewis gained a few years back by launching an enquiry into the politics of his fellow partners.

He declared his intention to get rid of any Communists who may have availed themselves of the partnership's splendid benefits. Upon an outcry in the Press against this junior "un-American Activities Committee", Mr. Lewis extended his ban to Fascists also—any "totalitarians" in fact. Presumably they are now gone—leaving Mr. Lewis the only totalitarian among an organisation of democrats.

For Mr. Lewis has now announced to his fellow partners that they must receive a cut in their wages. We have no information that this decision was arrived at by democratic means, but Mr. Lewis has measured out the cuts according to the income of each partner. Those who earn £12 a week or less will be cut 1/- in the £; those earning up to £1,000 a year—10%; up to £2,000—15%; and above £2,000 will be slashed by £8 a week.

Continued on p. 4

JUDGE CENSURES POLICE

MR. Justice Ormerod attacked the police at Cheshire Assizes recently for taking a Ministry of Food Inspector with them when they visited a farm in Denbighshire while investigating a complaint.

"The only inference I can draw is that the inspector was taken to the farm so that a search could be made," he said. "I think that is quite an improper use of the inspector, and I hope it is not a practice which is common or will be repeated. If the police wish to search premises when they suspect a crime has been committed, there is a proper way of doing it—that is, by applying for a search warrant and not taking with them inspectors of Government departments who have the right to search premises for a different purpose. I think it must have been an abuse by the inspector of the power vested in him."—(*Times*, 10/6/52.)

The incident shows how powers granted to Ministries can be abused. But it will take something more than complaints by judges before the police change their ways.

LIBERTARIAN.

London Anarchist Group SUMMER SCHOOL 1952 (August Bank Holiday Weekend)

Those requiring accommodation should apply before the 15th July to enable us to complete arrangements. Accommodation is limited so please contact us as soon as possible.

A complete programme will be circulated in due course, and will also be available at Freedom Press.

If any comrades in the London area have accommodation to offer either in the form of beds, floors, cellars, etc., we shall be grateful if you would contact the Summer School Committee, L.A.G., c/o Freedom Press, 27 Red Lion Street, W.C.1.

EMMA GOLDMAN

news of the rising of the Spanish people against Franco's coup d'etat.

It would be difficult to think of any one person whose name is more dynamically associated with the history of libertarian struggle in America than Emma Goldman's. Others, like Thoreau and Emma's own companion, Alexander Berkman, have certainly a greater right to our consideration for the depth of their thought and the lasting value of their literary work. But for her continued activity over more than fifty years in and outside the boundaries of America, Emma Goldman has gained a name which is remembered even by many people who are almost completely ignorant of her life or the ideas around which it moved with such energy and emphasis.

Emma Goldman was born in 1869 of a Jewish family in the Lithuanian town of Kovno, then, as now, a part of the Russian empire. When she was sixteen, her family emigrated to America, and she began work, like many other immigrants, in a dressmaking sweatshop at the miserable wage of 2 1/2 dollars a week. At this time she was not yet an anarchist, though she had watched the struggle of the revolutionary movements in Russia with sympathy, and had come to America, more than for any other reason, because she expected that it was really, as it pretended to be, the "sweet land of Liberty".

Her illusions were gradually eroded when she saw the kind of treatment which the poor immigrants received in this so-called democratic country, when she became aware of the extent of industrial exploitation and political corruption. And her dreams of finding freedom in the United States were roughly broken by the notorious trial and execution of the Chicago anarchists, after the Haymarket explosion of 1886. These men were killed on charges and on evidence which were completely devoid of support, as was later realised by Governor Altgeld when he reviewed the case some years afterwards and released the survivors from gaol. This gross miscarriage of justice aroused the intense horror of Emma Goldman, then a girl of 17. She immediately took up the cause for which the Chicago martyrs had died, and from that time, until her death more than fifty years afterwards, her activity for the libertarian idea was constant and unremitting.

Firstly, she associated herself with Johann Most, the German anarchist propagandist who was publishing *Freiheit* in New York, and who at that time was the leading figure of the movement among the German-speaking emigrants. But shortly afterwards she met the young Alexander Berkman, like herself a Russian by birth, and commenced a friendship which lasted until Berkman's death in 1936. It was with Emma Goldman that Berkman elaborated his scheme to execute the steel magnate Frick for the massacre of the Homestead strikers in 1892. The attempt was unsuccessful, and Berkman was imprisoned for many years. Emma was unremitting in her efforts to obtain his release, and she also took part in the abortive effort to engineer his escape by digging a tunnel under the prison walls.

But, perhaps most important, she continued their joint work of propaganda, and in 1893, after having delivered a speech in Union Square, New York, in favour of the strikers who were active at this time, she experienced her first prison sentence, a year in Blackwell's Island Penitentiary, on a trumped up charge of "inciting to riot".

During the next quarter of a century, Emma Goldman carried on a fearless campaign on many fronts against the reactionary complacency of early twentieth-century America. She preached anarchist ideas from one end of the country to the other, partly by means of lecturing, partly through her magazine, *Mother Earth*. She protested with no thought of the consequences against the many frame-up trials which were being held at this period in an attempt to crush the rising working-class movement of direct revolt against oppressive industrial conditions. She realised the peculiarly bad situation of women, and devoted a great deal of time to spreading birth-control propaganda and instruction. She attacked every kind of puritanical restraint, and was probably the most untiring critic of the notorious Anthony Comstock, with his moralistic attempts to "purify" art and literature out of existence.

During these struggles, Emma Goldman by no means got away scot free. She was able to arouse many people to enthusiastic support of her campaigns, but she also had the power to enrage her opponents, and she was one of the propagandists most feared and most hated by the conservative and the respectable. Consequently, she had to pay the price, through countless arrests, and more than one other prison sentence. When Czolgosz assassinated President McKinley, Emma was immediately arrested and held incommunicado by the Chicago police, who applied third degree methods to try and implicate her in the affair. Incidentally, it is interesting to remember that these methods included the constant flashing of lights in the victim's eyes to keep her awake—a procedure which, used by the MVD, arouses so much indignation among patriotic Americans. Finally, she was released, and it was characteristic of her that, while most of her comrades stood aloof from Czolgosz and allowed themselves to be intimidated by the great anti-anarchist outcry of the time, she publicly defended him.

There were many times when Emma Goldman was forbidden to speak in American cities by the local police, or when scared hall-keepers refused her the use of their premises. Once, in 1917, she was driven out of San Diego by the Vigilantes, while her comrade, Ben Reitman, was caught and tarred and feathered by these "patriotic" hoodlums.

But the vicissitudes of these years of activity did not turn Emma Goldman into a fanatic with a single-tracked mind. She remained an immensely tolerant woman, considering the provocations she had to endure, and she contrived to live a rich intellectual life. She played a great part in introducing to American audiences the new forms of drama exemplified by Ibsen, Strindberg and Chekhov, and her knowledge of European literature was wide and appreciative. Such important writers as Frank Harris, Rebecca West and Henry Miller have all paid tribute to her literary taste and her services to the modern writing of her time.

When the Great War broke out in 1914, Emma Goldman protested against it, as she had protested against the Spanish-American War, and she used every effort to prevent America's participation, and later, when this participation became inevitable, to delay the introduction of conscription and to support the conscientious objectors. She and Berkman, indeed, were the most active people in the anti-war movement, and in 1917 they were both sent to prison for two years on disaffection charges. This was not the end of their punishment, for when they emerged in 1919 they were recommended for deportation. Emma was herself an American citizen by marriage, and her deportation was therefore technically illegal, but this did not trouble the red-baiting authorities of the time, and she and Berkman, with more than two hundred other Russian radicals, were

LEAVE men free and the needs of the moment will enforce cordial union. Man is a social being and in the absence of coercive interference his own interests would lead him to a closer union with his fellows, to a kinder regard for their necessities, to a warmer interest in their welfare and a clearer conception that their distress relieved would be his own social advancement. This is not the view of a sect, but founded upon the fundamental principles of human nature. Remove restrictions and the incentive to greed and selfishness disappears. Proclaim liberty and the better nature of man will assume control and in the genial warmth of an emancipated race a closer social feeling would be engendered, in which disputes relative to the different merits of deeds and needs would sink into insignificance and deserved derision.
—DYER D. LUM (1839-1893).

herded on board a leaky old ship and taken across to Finland, from which they were able to re-enter Russia.

Both of them returned with enthusiasm and expectancy, believing that the Bolshevik propaganda of the workers' and peasants' soviets administering the country was literally true. They suffered a radical and progressive disillusionment as they witnessed the authoritarian administration of the Bolshevik leaders, the ruthless suppression of opposition, the liquidation of socialists and anarchists, the steadily growing power of the secret police. The Bolshevik leaders were anxious to gain the goodwill of Berkman and Emma Goldman, and employed them in a number of missions, such as salvaging paintings and other objects of fine art which had been dispersed during the civil war, but the two anarchists felt they could not remain in Russia, and in 1921 they were able to escape.

Emma Goldman now believed that it was her duty to tell the western world the truth about the state of affairs in Russia, in the hope that the pressure of public opinion outside might induce the Communists to change their methods.

She wrote *My Disillusionment with Russia*, she contributed to any newspaper or periodical that would take her articles, she lectured in Sweden, Germany, France, England and Canada, and vainly tried to enlist the liberal and radical intellectuals and labour leaders to protest against the conditions in Russia. Her work was largely in vain, and it was only years afterwards that many of the people who had refused to listen to her began to realise the truth of what she said.

She was now unable to return to the United States, except for one short period during 1934, and until 1936 she spent her time between Canada and Europe, trying to organise help for the persecuted revolutionaries in Russia and writing her memoirs, *Living my Life*. In 1936, within a few days of each other, there came Berkman's suicide (he was suffering from an incurable illness and did not wish to become a burden on his friends) and the outbreak of the Spanish civil war.

The first event was a great tragedy for Emma Goldman, after forty years of close friendship and collaboration, but her gloom was largely dissipated by the

The CNT and FAI representatives invited her to Spain, and asked her to act as their representative in England, to put their viewpoint there and counteract the reactionary propaganda against their cause.

For the next three years she worked unremittingly in London, except for three trips to Spain, on which she spent her time touring the front, visiting collectives and assiduously gathering information on the situation there. In some respects she disagreed with the CNT; she disapproved of anarchists entering the government, she denounced the activities of the Communists and demanded a firmer attitude towards them, but for the constructive achievements of the Spanish people in their industrial and agricultural collectives she had nothing but enthusiasm, and she regarded Spain during the civil war as the only country in which the kind of society for which she had striven all her life was, if not achieved, at least begun.

When the Spanish revolution was finally crushed, she returned to Canada. When the war broke out in 1939 she remained faithful to the position she had

Continued on p. 3

A New Godwin Volume

GODWIN AND THE AGE OF TRANSITION, ed. by A. E. Rodway. (Harrap, 10/6. School edition, 7/-)

IN view of the relative scarcity, inaccessibility or expensiveness of Godwin texts, there has long been a need for some kind of fairly substantial and cheap volume which would present the gist of Godwin for the general reader who has neither the money to afford nor the time to read through the monumental definitive edition of *Political Justice* published some years ago by the Toronto University Press.

Mr. Rodway's volume, *Godwin and the Age of Transition*, has now appeared and in very great measure fills this gap, while the reasonableness of its price, in view of modern costs, makes it the kind of book which few people will be unable to afford, in the school edition at least.

The volume begins with a sensible

and balanced introduction of some 40 pages, giving the main facts of Godwin's life, discussing the roots of his thought, his position in the English literary and political tradition, and his influence. Perhaps the most interesting point of this is Mr. Rodway's suggestion that Godwin in fact bridges the two main tendencies of the period—Romanticism and Utilitarianism, bringing together the emotional urge to rebellion of the former tendency and the intellectual rationalism of the latter. Godwin's "peculiar interest and significance," Mr. Rodway tells us, "lies in the fact that he contains the complexity of a disordered and disintegrating age." I find the arguments for this point of view convincing, while Mr. Rodway has also ably rebutted the familiar and unjust charge that Godwin abandoned his beliefs in later life.

The introduction is followed by a few selections from Godwin's fore-runners and contemporaries, illus-

trating the mental climate in which he wrote. Then comes a well-chosen series of extracts, totalling nearly 120 pages, from *Political Justice*, giving almost all the essential passages which confer originality upon Godwin's masterpiece. The remainder is taken up by some interesting passages from Godwin's novels, and a number of extracts from the writings of his disciples and his adversaries. It is perhaps unfortunate that Owen was not included among the former, since it was through him, more than any other individual, that Godwinism penetrated into the tradition of English libertarianism.

The defects and omissions of *Godwin and the Age of Transition* are, however, of a decidedly minor kind, and in general it is a sound handbook which will fulfil the needs of most people who wish to know what Godwin stood for and to gain a working introduction to his ideas.

GEORGE WOODCOCK.

Community Development

MEANWHILE, a movement of an entirely different order has been growing almost unnoticed from many different points and is to-day claiming ever-increasing attention from those who care about development in what are called "backward" countries. It was at first called "mass education"—a serious misnomer, despite that fact that an attack on illiteracy is almost always involved as part of the work. It is better described as "community development", and is something which starts on quite a small scale, in a single village, a group of villages, or at most in a single district. It always depends upon the inspiration of an individual or of a quite small team of men and women; and its essence is to win and create in the people at the grass roots a belief that with little or no material assistance and advice from outside, they have it in their power to begin to improve their own lot. Once this idea has been grasped, the possibilities are almost unlimited. New roads, small dams and irrigation works, schools, dispensaries, wells are made and built and dug; new handicrafts are adopted, or existing ones developed; standards of village hygiene are revolutionised; new ways of storing or cooking foods are adopted, farmers are ready to consider and adopt new methods of agriculture; conservatism is rejected and opportunities are opened for all that can be learned from science through the agricultural extension service; even farm boundaries can be altered by agreement to allow for the introduction, where appropriate, of mechanical assistance in cultivation; co-operative organisation for buying and selling is readily taken up.

The pioneer work done on these lines in Eastern Nigeria has been told to the world in the film "Daybreak on Udi" (Dr. Rita Hinden writes: "At Udi the initiative has come from the people themselves, though supported sympa-

thetically by an imaginative District Commissioner. Labour has been given voluntarily to build roads, maternity clinics, schools, the whole village has participated in creating the buildings and services which the people actually wanted. This would certainly be the way of arousing a 'dynamic democracy'.") Corresponding achievements can be recorded from Southern Rhodesia, from the Fiji Islands and from Sarawak, as also from Kigezi in Uganda; they are also to be found in the work of the Srinaketan Institute of Rural Reconstruction, which started work in India as early as 1922, and in the development projects undertaken at Etawah and Gorakhpur in the United Provinces under the inspiration of a team of American workers led by Albert Mayer. In the Gold Coast in the summer of 1952, there is to be launched under almost exclusively African leadership an unprecedented attempt to attack illiteracy and to initiate community development in every substantial village in the southern half of the country.

Indeed the successes achieved in many small areas by this kind of community development have led some observers towards the conclusion that no major or expensive operations are required, and no special effort called for from the privileged countries, but that community development can do it all. This is not so. To begin with, the enthusiasm engendered by this kind of work can be killed stone dead if the "missing components"—be they cement or other building material, water pipes, pumping gear, simple agricultural tools or even tractors—do not arrive at the expected time; and these items, though relatively cheap for any one little project, will add up to an immense total if community development is to cover the underdeveloped areas of the world, as it must. In addition, it is no use increasing agricultural output and general prosperity in every little village, if the roads, railways and harbours of the country concerned cannot handle the immense increase in traffic that the increasing well-being will call forth.

Michael Young writes: "However the people may improve their village, all will be washed away if the local river floods its banks. Whatever may be done to catch and store purely local supplies of water, certain resources can only be tapped if giant dams are built. In fact, village self-help and regional development are complementary to each other."

—From *War on Want*, published by the Association for World Peace, at 1/-.

BIOLOGICAL GOAL

A memorandum from the National Association for Mental Health presented to the Royal Commission on Marriage and Divorce yesterday said that the breakdown of marriage appeared to be a crucial example of failure to maintain a healthy, responsible, and natural, human relationship. An important value in marriage was the achievement of the biological goal of healthy sexual relationships issuing in the procreation of wanted children.

Emotional harmony, warmth and devotion in the home were the greatest factors contributing to good mental health in the adult. For any child to be deprived of such a background could often be shown to have had serious effects on his subsequent personal development and mental health out of all proportion to the apparent disturbance.

Manchester Guardian, 30/5/52.

CAMUS & FRANCO

Albert Camus, a leading French writer, yesterday rejected an invitation to contribute an article to a cultural anthology sponsored by UNESCO because, "I cannot consent to such collaboration as long as there is any question of bringing Franco Spain in," he said. Spain's application for membership was approved last month. But she has not yet been admitted.

—News Chronicle, 21/6/52.

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

Godwin and the Age of Transition
ed. A. E. Rodway 10/6
School edition 7/6

This book, primarily intended for students, has a long introduction to Godwin and his background, a selection of the writings of Godwin's contemporaries, including Boswell, Burke, Tom Paine, Priestley and Malthus, followed by 129 pages of extracts from Godwin's works, and completed by writings by his disciples and opponents.

William Godwin George Woodcock 5/-
"From this direct and sincere study there is much to learn... Mr. Woodcock has certainly done much to clean off some of the mud... and he has written a book which is stimulating, lucid and sincere."
—HAROLD NICHOLSON.

The Dilemma of South Africa John Hatch 18/-
This new book describes the background to the present crisis in South Africa.

Areopagitica John Milton 3/6
A new reprint of Milton's "Speech for the Liberty of Unlicensed Printing", with introduction and notes by H. B. Cotterill.

Society and the Homosexual G. Westwood 9/6
A plea for rational attitudes.

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

Undress Parade

IN New Delhi, recently, conductors and drivers of trams and buses went to work wearing only singlets and pants. Notices pinned on the singlets said: "We want free uniforms."

DOG DOESN'T BITE DOG

WHEN the Labour Party attacked the American political conduct of the war in Korea over the bombing of the Yalu power stations, the U.S. not unnaturally replied that Morrison as Foreign Secretary, had agreed that these installations were legitimate targets. Herbert Morrison has protested that the conditions which made them legitimate targets then were not applicable now. But much more interesting were his remarks about the Americans using their argument at all.

"I regret," he sadly declared, "what appears to be the tendency of departmental officials of the United States Administration . . . to use confidential communications from former British Governments and the United States Government in the process. . . . This practice of inspiring or making *ex parte* statements about such diplomatic exchanges is not helpful to Anglo-American relations. It makes frank and intimate diplomatic exchanges impossible."

The passage we have italicized is most interesting to students of government. It will be recalled that Mr. Morrison was highly indignant on a former occasion when Mr. Churchill used a similar defence against the tendency of the Labour Party to attack with the utmost self-righteousness policies which, when in office, they had fully agreed to or even initiated. On that occasion it was Mr. Bevan who was most indignant.

If we consider what Morrison's protest amounts to we shall learn something about the art of governing. In effect he is saying "how can we say what we really think, when it comes to high level discussions with the American Government, if they are then going to publish it afterwards? In effect, he means that there ought to be tacit agreement on the part of politicians not to give each other away, by blowing the gaff as to what is said off the record.

From a political point of view, of course, he is right, and the rather raw, inexperienced Americans quite wrong. For all politicians depend on the short memory of the public to enable them to shift their policies and their arguments when the situation changes, and to attack political opponents to vigorously on what they once said is to invite trouble for one's own house of cards.

Politicians may well think that it doesn't matter that anarchist papers with their insignificant following should have long memories, but when one's political colleagues start the same thing—well, that's not playing the game at all.

Reflections on Birthday Honours

"Titles are but nicknames, and every nickname is a title. The thing is perfectly harmless in itself, but it marks a sort of foppiness in the human character, which degrades it . . . It talks about its fine blue ribbon like a girl, and shows its new garter like a child . . . If a whole country is disposed to hold titles in contempt, all their value is gone, and none will own them."

—THOMAS PAINE

Intensive Farming in Jersey

JERSEY is an island where the farming community enjoys an extremely high standard of prosperity from their particular system of agriculture. In the same way that machines are gradually taking over the human function in many industrial, constructional and agricultural occupations, to meet a world-wide increase in demand or the challenge of highly competitive markets, so the Jersey farmer has profited from his own system of intensive farming. Until this year it seemed that he would be able comfortably to meet the most serious threats of competitors in his export markets. A disastrous potato season, however, during which it was impossible for a time to sell his produce at any price, has suddenly awakened fears that his staple crop may no longer be the assured prospect of previous years. Although there were similar periods of slump before the last war, the comparative prosperity following it has tended to induce a false security and complacency.

The intensive farming of to-day, which is the most significant feature of the island, is something of quite recent origin. Even a century ago, very little produce was exported and Jersey relied to a great degree on imports of food. To-day, of a total area of 28,000 acres, 23,000 are farmed and the produce is calculated to bring in more than £1,500,000. These figures, remembering that 20,000 inhabitants live outside the town of St. Helier, suggests both a high yield per acre and a certain degree of rural over-population. Here one has the most important contributing factor to the intensive farming of small areas—the density of the rural population, which much be profitably occupied. In reality, then, the Jersey farmer is no more than a smallholder—a grower with probably five to ten acres of land affording him an annual income of £400 to £1,000.

Such a comparative prosperity shows itself indirectly in many ways. It gives the grower a degree of independence which is seldom enjoyed by peasants elsewhere and also, collectively, grants him a wide authority in an island-community where, except for the inevitable division of town and country, political and social groupings are negligible or non-existent. The country parishes have therefore evolved to a pattern which adequately expresses and safeguards the growers' desire for the maximum of individual liberty within the framework of traditional customs and behaviour, and the minimum of interference from the im-

personal State authority. The exact form of this local government might easily be dismissed as an anachronism—conservative and subtly authoritarian—were it not for the visible truth that, to the grower himself, it forms a satisfactory and unobtrusive constitutional framework to the real business of living and farming. Perhaps with the emphasis on farming, to which, ultimately, everything is subordinated.

Turning aside from the immediate picture, there are certain unique historical and geographical features which have tended to encourage the individualism of the Jersey peasantry, underlining his fatalism and cultivating in him a sense of being outside the mainstream of European affairs. Had Jersey retained its allegiance to the Duchy of Normandy, of which in the twelfth century it formed part, instead of preferring the Norman king of England, its geographical position alone, as part of France, would have radically altered the island's future. In agriculture, perhaps more than in anything else, would this have been apparent. Instead of being the southernmost part of the British Isles, and able to enter freely a protected market with its early produce, it would have formed part of a northerly *département* of a country extending to the warm Mediterranean.

Loyalty of this sort is tied up with prosperity, however, and there has been no serious attempt by the Jerseymen to reverse the accident of history. To-day, for the countryman, this association with

England, like the laws of his country parishes, serves a convenient purpose. First in importance is the market it provides for the crop of Jersey early potatoes. The significance of this cannot be overstated. The whole of his year, his efforts, his prosperity, is hinged on this. Through the weeks of preparing the 'seed', manuring his land, ploughing and planting, on through the twelve weeks while they are in the soil, weeding, watching the weather anxiously, to the time for digging. And then the climax of each year—digging the crop and carting it to the weighbridge, where each load is bid for by the merchants' buyers. In this last stage there is the added anxiety and excitement of a gamble since the price fluctuates all the day, at times doubling or halving itself in the course of a few hours. Even on days when the buying is steady, there is a normal fluctuation of ten or fifteen per cent. This means that at digging time every grower, except those who have arranged to sell throughout the season at the average of the day, has to make daily the very important decision of whether to cart his produce to the 'bridge' before lunch or after, at three or four o'clock.

After the catastrophe of this season, however, there are schemes afoot for revising this chaotic procedure. Whether anything comes of the new marketing proposals depends greatly upon the readiness of the growers to realise that not even the assumed security of a Conservative Government in England

THE FINAL IRONY

By now the pattern of defeated hopes and outraged sense in Korea is just about complete. One stage only separates us from the final irony, which will be the resumption of full-scale war on none of the original principles, the liberation of Korea from the Koreans.

The grotesque farce of the truce talks have set a level of cynical hypocrisy outstanding even by the standards of contemporary international doubletalk. The scandalous behaviour of Syngman Rhee is matched by the very nearly incredible lunacy of Kojé Island. Only one advantage results: this repellent business has now reached a point where it is possible to protest without, as has been customary hitherto, being de-

nounced as an idealist, a Communist, or an imbecile.

This dismal situation is no great comfort to those of us who two years ago accepted the principle of United Nations intervention, troubled though our minds may have been, and who clung as long as possible, and in spite of everything, to the hope that somehow the end might justify the means. During all that time the issue has been bedevilled by inexcusable actions, not least the fact that anyone criticising the conduct of the U.N. war was presumed to be, somehow, on the other side.

—JAMES CAMERON in *Tribune*, 13/6/52.

The Double Standard

A RECENT issue of an American religious paper, *Christian Century*, notes quietly but disgustingly that the behaviour of the American servicemen in Japan is leaving an aftermath of humiliation and sorrow in many thousands of Japanese homes. Recently, the editorial relates, Mrs. Tamaki Uemura, "probably the best-known woman in Japan aside from the empress," addressed a letter to Mrs. Matthew B. Ridgway, wife of the commander of the U.S. military forces in Asia, pleading that something be done to end the seduction of Japanese girls. There are staggering figures, such as the fact that "Japanese girls seduced by American soldiers have borne 200,000 illegitimate children and deserted many of them." The letter was published in the largest Japanese monthly, so that it could hardly be ignored.

This is not remarkable, of course, nor a peculiarity of only American young men. It probably would have happened with any army of occupation. Nor is the birth of illegitimate offspring a major tragedy in itself, judging from the attainments reached by some *natural*—a fitting adjective—children. What is peculiarly awful in this situation is the brutalization of both men and women (many of the children were deserted by their mothers—from shame or indifference, one supposes) by the mixture of barracks standards of relations between the sexes with the mental attitudes of subjection and compliance so often found among a conquered people. And in its response to matters of this sort, the wholly barbarous character of the military is revealed. "The Army," of necessity, takes such things "for granted". A shrug, a masculine grin, perhaps, will be the only honest reaction of the military authorities. One recalls with wry feelings the extraordinarily righteous arguments of those who defended a war to extinction with Japan—with anybody we might have to fight: "What would you do if someone attacked your sister, mother, grandmother?" There was no end to the sacredness of womanhood, in those days. . . . "Attack" and "seduction" are not the same, of course, but, thinking it over, what has happened in Japan probably proves the case of those people, who would doubtless insist that this is what the war with Japan prevented from happening here. . . .

Is there so great a difference, whether it happens there, or here?

This is not a very nice question to ask especially in the United States, which has had long practice in the double standard of racial morality. The brave and gallant South boasts a legendary regard for the virtue of its women—a regard which always comes to mind when some industrious sociologist produces figures on the number of "Negroes" who have so much white blood that they are able to "pass" over in the white population without anyone knowing it. The number of such "Negroes" has been conservatively estimated at 10,000 a year. Naturally, this raises the question of parentage, and the matter of the virtue of "black" womanhood.

Curious, isn't it, that for a black man to father a white woman's children is regarded as the most hideous crime imaginable, in some states in the Union, and the thought of marriage between the two only adds an equal portion of speechless rage to the defender of white womanhood, while for a white man to father the children of a black woman is felt to be no more than "natural"—at least is has been natural for a century or more, judging from the extensive infusion of white blood in the Negro population.

All of which points the question: Where in the world will the bold, spirited, and free Americans come out, when the moral law of compensation is done with them? Miscegenation is the least of the problem, for this may be simply part of a long-term biological transition—a mingling of the races in the production of some new stock of a future humanity, a better stock, perhaps, if the prowess of Negro athletes is any indication of the hereditary characteristics of their race. At any rate, marriage and procreation are personal matters—that is, matters of personal responsibility—and no judgments other than personal ones are in order.

The hypocrisy of the double standard, however—this is a social and racial crime of immense proportions. Think of the state of mind and feeling of those Japanese girls, of the Negro girls and women. And think of the feelings of their men, their sense of impotence, and of the indifference, finally, to which their impotence may lead them as to matters that once were thought to involve a crucial issue of self-respect. Further,

think of the children. The children will belong to another generation, of course. Whether their mixed blood will be worn as a lifelong scar, or whether it will be forgotten in a world which has learned to ignore such distinctions remains to be seen. But, unless the people of the United States make dramatic progress in the direction of a world that ignores such distinctions, the sufferings caused to these children by social condemnation will be on the heads of the people of the United States. The United States claimed it was fighting to preserve civilisation, and the United States won the war. Even the *Christian Century*, tragically, but insistently, claimed we had to try to win the war.

This, then, is one of the things we were fighting for; at least, this a by-product of our civilisation and our victory. The *Christian Century* editorial suitably concludes: "The Uemura letter hardly suggests that the American occupation, for which such great things have been claimed, is ending 'on a note of triumph'."

—Manas (U.S.A.), 28/5/52.

EMMA GOLDMAN

Continued from p. 2

taken in 1914, and condemned it as a conflict between governments, from which the people could only lose. To the end she struggled against injustice, and when some of her comrades in Toronto were arrested under a wartime regulation against radical activities, she energetically undertook their defence. She finally died in May, 1940, at the age of 70.

Emma Goldman was not a great original thinker or one of the important anarchist theoreticians. But she was a mordant and tireless social critic, and a surprisingly great part of her writing still retains the vigour and urgency which she always demonstrated in her activities. She was primarily a fighter against injustice, and she remains a symbol of those genuinely libertarian forces in American society which are never likely to be finally suppressed by the reaction and materialism that so often seem to be ascendant in the country where she worked so long.

GEORGE WOODCOCK.

can guarantee a fair return under a 'free-enterprise' system.

Without this market it is improbable that potatoes would be grown in exportable quantities, for to come under the limitations and discrimination of being classed as foreign produce would make it an even more risky proposition. This is not to suggest that, normally, it is not a profitable crop. But the lesson of this year has been the complete unpredictability of prospects and the feeling that the crop on which they had staked their security is no longer to be relied on. Only those growers farming the very earliest land have reasons to still feel confident. They alone, with their crops maturing three or four weeks before the Cornish and the French, have no fear of competition.

The importance of these three or four weeks can be seen from the following comparison of prices, though it must be remembered that the weight of the crop is accordingly reduced the earlier it is dug. During the last three years, the average return to the grower for potatoes sold in the second week in May has been £65—£70 per ton. For the last week in May the average has been £45—£50 per ton. In June, however, when there is competition from home and foreign 'earlies', the price drops quickly to perhaps £15 per ton, at which return, with a heavier yield due to its lateness, the crop still shows a fair profit. This year, however, as an example, the grower was selling his potatoes in the second week in June at £8 per ton. At this figure the loss was between £50—£60 per acre.

If the present crop is a freak one, due partly to a glut occasioned by the unusual earliness of the English crop, and next year the grower's faith in the early potato crop is restored, then the sense of security and complacency will no doubt return. If, however, the very poor season of this year is followed by two or three more of a similar nature, and the unhappy experience with the outdoor tomato crop is repeated with

Continued on p. 4

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

4 GROUNDS FOR DIVORCE

Church of Wales' Memorandum

IF Royal Commissions do nothing else, they at least call for the statements from official bodies as to where they stand on the particular topic in question. The Royal Commission on Divorce and Marriage is performing a useful function in crystallizing out the views held by various institutions on these important matters—which require much more detailed treatment by the anarchist press than they receive, and much more space than FREEDOM is now able to give to them.

Once again the dominant concern of officialdom is for the welfare of the institution of marriage rather than for the individuals involved. The Bishop of Monmouth, Mr. A. E. Norris, recently presented a memorandum from the Church of Wales, in which they have this to say on the question of desertion as grounds for divorce. "We think three years is much too short a period. Petitions for divorce on this ground are being put forward in growing numbers, and it does not carry the same social stigma as divorce on the ground of adultery." The Church wants the period lengthened to 5 or 7 years. (Italics ours.)

This clearly means that the Church welcomes social shame as a deterrent to divorce. Such a viewpoint disregards the fact that such considerations weigh more heavily on sensitive people or people in responsible or prominent positions. To prolong or "preserve" a failed marriage for such people brings especial unhappiness for the sensitive, diminished effectiveness in public life in those who occupy prominent positions. The frivolousness and irresponsibility of the Church are nowhere shown more clearly than in their attitude to such basic problems.

Magistrates' views

By comparison, some of the views of the Magistrates' Association appear far more ethical and practical. Where a marriage was in danger of foundering, they favour attempts at conciliation at the earliest possible time, "but in no circumstances should conciliation be forced on unwilling parties" (reported in the *Times*, 12/6/52).

Magistrates are to be commended for their attitude also regarding

Intensive Farming in Jersey

Continued from p. 3

potatoes, then the outlook will be particularly unpromising. It should also be remembered that the intensive farming practised in Jersey often means that the day following the lifting of the potato crops sees the planting-out of the tomato seedlings. Now that tomatoes are no longer profitable, at least those ready for picking at the peak of the season—mid-August to mid-September—and some growers having had the experience of losing an average of £100 per acre during three consecutive years, the farmer is content to sow turnips or some similar type of green manure. Should this fate repeat itself with the potato crop, it is difficult to see what can prevent Jersey from returning to an island of unpretentious and limited agriculture. And a poor one.

Neither the tourist trade, nor the revenue drawn from the great number of retired English folk enjoying the low taxation, nor Jersey cream and cows, can make any substantial contribution to the solution of a problem which might soon have to be faced. And yet at the beginning of this century, Kropotkin, in his *Fields, Factories and Workshops*, wrote, "If we want to know what agriculture can be, and what can be grown on a given amount of soil, we must apply for information to such regions as . . . the island of Jersey . . .". Even if this is still true, and many authorities insist that Jersey potatoes, tomatoes, milk and cows are unrivalled, the plain facts of the economic confusion of our day might well make it impossible for this island, with its unique system of intensive farming, to maintain the carefully evolved pattern of its agriculture. C.H.

children. "It was desirable in all cases that before an order for custody was made that the welfare of the children should be considered quite separately from the issue as to desertion or as the case may be. No order for custody should be made until the magistrates had received and considered a report on the home surroundings of the child and the parents."

This attitude is in welcome contrast to the mere moralizing which is so often the only contribution of religious bodies to an urgent practical problem.

Legal difficulties

The law, however, has its own complications to offer, as, for example, the suggestion of a solicitor, Miss M. G. Billson, a member of Croydon Borough Council, that no marriage should take place unless a formal engagement has been registered at least 3 months beforehand. "Before the engagement was registered with a minister or registrar, he would interview both parties and satisfy himself that they had sufficient knowledge of each other to justify the marriage proceeding." (Our italics.) Those who find nothing obscene or repulsive in the license to sleep together, which marriage in reality represents, will no doubt regard this interfering suggestion with equanimity—instead of derision.

BARGAIN WEDDING

Forty spinsters have been arrested in the Adans native state for not getting married.

In April, the state native authority, self-governing under British colonial rule, put the girls on one month's notice and reduced the marriage fee to five shillings (70 cents).

The 40 failed to find mates willing to wed even at this bargain price.

The announced reason for the wedding drive is to stamp out prostitution.

—(AP) Accra Cold Coast, (23/5/52).

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS

SYNDICALISM, PACIFISM, THE COMMUNE, P.S. Etc.

I HAVE been following the correspondence on the above lines with a certain amount of bewilderment. J. R. Howes, of Stockport, complained that P.S. overlooked the idea of the commune—quoting in his support (FREEDOM, June 7th) one or two people such as John Hewetson whom I have also heard defending the same thesis as P.S.—against the idea of the "community" composed only of a few people of similar ideas as a means of achieving a free society. Now in the issue of June 28th he comes back to the other "pacifist" plaint against syndicalism we heard a little while before, that it is too "violent", which is a purely invented objection.

"We ought not to be a jealous and esoteric body of conspirators." (I dread to bring up the old but parallel, "Have you stopped beating your wife?") "New Forms of society are not established by conspiracy, seizures of power (is this my horrible 'pacifist dogmatism' again?)"

No, sir, it is not. Pacifists (as such) are not dogmatically against seizure of power. The oldest-established and most powerful pacifist body, to wit, the Quakers, has proceeded most vigorously on the lines of seizure of economic power. You will find it somewhat

easier to deal with the British Army than these Friends. However, the object of revolutionary syndicalism is not the seizure of power, neither economic nor (as with the pacifist Labour M.P.s) political, but the abolition of power. Not in order to create a military state, such as has been created by the pacifist revolution in India, but to abolish the state.

Sidney Parker reintroduces the "commune" objection to syndicalism. So far as an anarcho-syndicalism is concerned, as opposed to the other variants of syndicalism, it does in fact support what he refers to as a "multiplicity of free associations in each industry". The "pyramids of delegate councils" are not anarcho-syndicalist theory, which is distinguished from reformist or more authoritarian syndicalism (such as has been developed in the course of degeneration of many working-class bodies), by the fact that it does not believe in delegating power to the committee but retaining control by the mass meeting. The idea of the mass control at factory level is parallel with the idea of joint responsibility in the commune.

Anarchism and syndicalism are not synonymous, of course, but there is an Anarchist form of syndicalism which—in an industrial society—can be a means bringing anarchism. A.M.

AS two of your correspondents have recently drawn attention to the differences between anarchism and syndicalism, may I go one step further and suggest that the anarchist critics of contemporary British trade unionism at least curtail their use of the term "syndicalism", which lost most of the indefinite meaning it ever possessed before 1914.

Forty-five years ago, Malatesta pointed out in FREEDOM that anarchism and revolutionary syndicalism possessed merely partial affinities, while the failure of industrial unionism as a panacea was abundantly evident before the First World War, even to industrial unionists. As for the much belauded *Miners' Next Step*, that pamphlet was certainly not anarchist, and very dubiously syndicalist, even by the lax criteria of 1912.

The so-called syndicalism of the pre-1914 decade was partly a press stunt, encouraged by the Parliamentary Labour Party to unnerve the government of the day into political concessions, and partly a demonstration of emotional frustration, which was to find a much more satisfactory outlet in the subsequent war. To invoke the examples of this period in support of an anarchist critique of modern industrial organisation would appear most unfruitful.

London, June 28.

P.H.

SYNDICALIST NOTEBOOK

Continued from p. 1

Any partner wishing to do so can borrow the amount of his decrease from the organisation, says Mr. Lewis. How he can be expected to pay it back is not mentioned. Anyone who wishes to leave now and come back after the period of "temporary" decrease is over, must get the written consent of Mr. Lewis or his successor.

It seems that Mr. Lewis holds most of the cards in this one-sided partnership. For example, five years ago, he cut out the commission payments made to all the staff, and put them on a fixed wage. Five years ago, of course, the retail trade was enjoying a boom period and no doubt the staff were earning good commissions. But having got them on a fixed wage basis, the next step is to cut that wage.

Mr. Lewis boasts that dividends paid to shareholders are only at the modest rate of 4 1/2 per cent. The cuts he has just announced, however, range from 5 per cent. for the lowest paid worker to nearly 20 per cent. for the highest paid.

He also claims that, "Over the last 23 years since I introduced the scheme

[our workers] have had more than £2,750,000 additional to what they would otherwise have got. In other words, they have had that amount which would have been my income, less taxation, and I have worked gratis for them ever since it started."

This large amount works out at about £120,000 a year—among 10,500 workers, less than £12 a year each. The cuts now announced will save the firm £165,000 a year on current wages.

Mr. Lewis does not say what the taxation would have been on the sum he has "given" to the workers who earn these profits for the organisation, but with income tax, super tax and excess profits tax, he has probably not denied himself of very much after all. In any case, we assume he gets directors fees? And that he holds some shares at 4 1/2%. Or are we really to believe that he works "gratis", free and for nothing, only for the sake of his fellow "partners"?

Workers who are looking kindly on the various suggestions for co-partnership in industry might take a look at the Lewis Partnership as an example of how it works. P.S.

LAND GRABBERS

About one new demand a day for land for use of the Services has been made by Whitehall in the last year, and the Council for the Preservation of Rural England is concerned at the continued encroachment "in an island where every acre counts".

Evening News, 19/6/52.

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

OPEN AIR MEETINGS

Weather Permitting
HYDE PARK
Every Sunday at 4.30 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)
MEETINGS SUSPENDED

NORTH-EAST LONDON

DISCUSSION MEETINGS
IN EAST HAM
Alternate Wednesdays
at 7.30
JULY 9—Arthur Uloth
SEX AND THE COLOUR BAR

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.

COVENTRY

Anyone interested in forming a group in Coventry, please write Freedom Press.

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.

Reader's Viewpoint

ON ANARCHISM AND VIOLENCE

RECENT contributors to FREEDOM have brought under consideration again the old question of pacifism versus terrorism as a revolutionary tactic. Anarchists are at least agreed that it is necessary for each man to find his own answer to the question and to employ violent and non-violent tactics as they meet his individual needs. A simple logical exercise, however, may help to clear up a little of the confusion and emotionality which traditionally surround this question.

The problem: Anarchists believe fundamentally in the right, ability and duty of every man to govern himself. A is an anarchist. B is not an anarchist (and, in addition, may be a fascist, scab, butcherer of elderly ladies, etc., however bad you may desire). A—for whatever reason—kills B, thus denying B the opportunity to govern himself. Is A inconsistent with anarchist principles?

First we shall consider two arguments in justification of A's act which anarchists would not generally use.

(1) The ancient Greek doctrine of tyrannicide or regicide, the excusability (by the state from state punishment) of the murderers of despots. Examples in later times are the acquittals of the murderers of Charles I and Petlura in France. Anarchists would not employ this argument because it presupposes an acceptance of the authority of the state over the individual.

(2) A justification in terms of historical determinism, usually nowadays some variant of Marxism. "As long as so many people are going to have to die anyway . . .". Not even Vaihinger's "Philosophy of 'As if'" surpasses this philosophy of "as long as" in its seductiveness and undermining of logical thought. We would not employ this argument because we are not determinists.

Now we shall consider two other arguments which anarchists do use in justification for acts of violence, or "propaganda by deed", as they are more expeditiously known.

(1) It is impossible for A to avoid responsibility for killing, no matter what he does, so long as he continues to be a participating member of parliamentary capitalism. Even if he allows himself to be passively sent to jail, he is still in the society, and probably even still recognises the authority of the state to rule him. If the state indulges in murder, and A is a member of the state, then A indulges in murder. This is pure and simple logic, and what is more, the law surprisingly enough for once is in accord with pure and simple logic. Thus, if we are interested in legal bases for our reasoning (which we are not) we could cite the Nuremberg decisions, which decreed once and for all, and for all people governed by states, that to be a citizen of a state is to be responsible for the actions of that state. Obedience to the orders of a "duly-constituted authority" is no excuse for any crime, according to Nuremberg. (Of course, if one were to disobey the duly-constituted authorities, his life wouldn't be worth much, anyway, so it's merely a question of choosing one's masters.) At any rate, there is no way to withdraw from a state, and there is no way to stay in that state and avoid responsibility for murder. Accordingly, it will quickly be seen that it is better to kill those with a vested interest in killing than to kill the innocent.

(2) Killing as reprisal to avoid future killings and as direct action to abolish the system of slavery which kills millions both in spirit and in flesh as its *modus operandi*. The best example of this reasoning as a tactic has been given by the IWW. It was first enunciated as the "eye for an eye" ultimatum in the Pressed Steel Car Company strike at McKees Rocks, Pennsylvania, in July, 1909, according to Ralph Chaplin in *Wobblly*. It was thereafter used successfully in many strikes, particularly in the Montana mines. One case comes to mind, which I believe happened in Butte. The gentlemen from Baldwin-Felts and Pinkerton had taken to kidnapping and beating strikers, killing several of them, and even manhandling strikers' wives. The union issued an ultimatum that henceforth for every miner or member of a miner's family who was molested,

one company official or strikebreaker leader would be murdered. The next day five strikers were beaten. That night, three company officials were murdered in quick succession. That was enough. It was not even necessary to take care of the other two; the company agreed to abandon further hoodlumism. Even in Haymarket days, anarchists were more interested in preservation than destruction of life. How much more so to-day! We resist passively as long as we honourably can do so. When we reach the point where we cannot, we strike out in open defiance in order to secure for ourselves and our brothers the right to self-government. In great, industrial, inflated, welfare-state America, a baby died last week in Chicago from starvation. To paraphrase Dostoevski, the lives of a million parasites would not justify the death of this one innocent child.

Chicago, June 26.

R.J.H.

Special Appeal

May 29th to June 21st:

New York: I.R. £1/7/4; San Francisco: per A.G. £4/0/6; Dublin: G.F. 3/8; N. Geeling: G.P. 7/-; Johannesburg: C.D.F. 6/-; S. Francisco: Chinese comrades, per C.S. £10; Bishops Stortford: M.J.S. £1; London: J.R. 2/-; London: J.W. 1/6; Los Gatos: L.M. 14/-; London: Anon 2/9.

Total ... 18 4 9
Previously acknowledged ... 330 11 7

1952 TOTAL TO DATE ... £348 16 4

{San Francisco: B.Z. \$3, Anon \$2.50, I.W. \$5; Los Gatos: Alejandro \$1.
I.C.H. \$10, J.M. \$2, A.L. \$3, A.B. \$1, L.H. \$1, P.S. \$1, L.L. \$4, H.J. \$2, P.P. \$2, P.C. \$1, U.U. \$1.

* Readers who have undertaken to send regular monthly contributions.

HAVE YOU RENEWED YOUR SUB. TO FREEDOM?

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