

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

Can anyone remember when the times were not hard and money not scarce?

R. W. EMERSON

Vol. 14, No. 6

February 7th, 1953

Threepence

CHIANG & THE COLD WAR

Eisenhower O.K.'s Formosa Raids on China Mainland

FEW politicians are so thoroughly discredited as Chiang Kai Shek. The butcher of the Chinese revolution, he has probably more blood on his hands than any other leader apart from Stalin. His dictatorship was both bloody and corrupt and inefficient. Finally, he was discredited by physical defeat. Retired to Formosa, though given the protection of America, his political propositions were persistently snubbed by the Truman administration.

Now, however, almost the first act of the Republican administration has been to withdraw the ban on Chinese Nationalist raids on mainland China. Although the U.S. Seventh Fleet is nominally to be withdrawn it has been made clear that Formosa will be protected from attacks by Communist China, while Chiang Kai-Shek's hopes of an invasion of China are not discouraged.

Informed experts say that, in fact, Chiang's armies are not in a position to offer an effective threat to the mainland. The men are getting older, with no possibility of further recruitment; and it is concluded that the "threat" consists mostly in making it necessary for the Communist Chinese Government to divert troops to the coastal areas as a defence against a possible landing.

On the other hand, the Nationalist naval commander-in-chief is to be received in Washington this week, and the Nationalist delegate to the United Nations, Dr. Tsiang, has made a significant speech. On January 28th, speaking in New York, he advocated an independent offensive from Formosa against mainland China as the only means of saving Asia from Communism. It is significant that although his speech was given in a private capacity, it was circulated at United Nations headquarters. He urged that Nationalist forces should be re-equipped and provided with the naval and air forces necessary to carry out an invasion of China.

This new American move is clearly a dropping of the pretence of exclusively peaceful and defensive intentions in the Far East. As such it is said to be regretted by the British Government, although Aneurin Bevan has sought to connect the new move with Churchill's visit to America.

Indian political susceptibilities have been upset more especially since General Eisenhower, in his election campaign stated that "a section of

opinion in the United States is not opposed to the extension of the war in Asia so long as it means Asians fighting Asians."

Parallell with this decision regarding Chiang Kai-Shek is the recognition that the war in Indo-China is not solely a French responsibility. There the war has reached the same position as in Korea. The Viet Nam forces are supplied by France, and probably in the future by the United Nations. The Viet Minh forces are maintained by China and contain Russian technicians. Actually, the stalemate is kept going by the fact that Chinese assistance has been less recently, although a former Viet Minh minister, Le Bong, who has gone over to Viet Nam, declares that full-scale intervention by China would quickly ensue if the West were to launch an offensive powerful enough to be a serious threat to Viet Minh.

Thus the situation to-day in Asia is that the Communist bloc of Russia and China maintain and supply guerilla troops in Malaya and regular armies in Korea and Indo-China, while Britain and France and the United Nations maintain large military organisations in these countries.

Civil wars in these Asiatic countries are therefore kept going by a judiciously adjusted policy of assistance by all major protagonists in the Cold War. The American action in Formosa fits into this pattern.

In Indo-China and Korea it is openly admitted that a solution is impossible and both wars have been carrying on for years now. The advantage to both Russia and America is plain. Each side is compelled to divert part of their armed

forces into these sterile cockpits. At the same time, this never-ending war in Asia provides a much needed relief to capitalist economy. Many industrialists in America would undoubtedly welcome an extension of the war in Asia as a means to ward off the imminent trade depression.

Neither side has the slightest regard for the human material involved. So long as Asians fight Asians what does the American Government care—what did they or the British care during the prolonged Chinese war with Japan in the thirties? The whole situation in Asia provides that "controlled state of war" which FREEDOM has often pointed out as being the saving condition for capitalism.

But it should also be remembered that cold wars are not enough. The Korean war provided an extraordinary boost to Western economy at the beginning. Now the shadow of trade recession is again predominant. Simply on economic grounds an extension of war can be clearly foreseen, and a general war is ultimately almost inevitable if buying and selling is to remain the motive force of our civilisation.

87 Americans Court-Martialed in Korea

SEOUL, Korea, Jan. 25 (A.P.)

UNITED States 8th Army headquarters disclosed yesterday that 87 men and an officer of the American 65th Regiment—composed of Puerto Ricans, plus some Americans—have been convicted by a court-martial of refusing to go into action last October on the central front against Chinese Communist forces.

Sentences ranging from six months to ten years imprisonment with hard labour have been imposed, the announcement said.

Derek Bentley--A Final Thought

AT 9.10 on the morning of 29th January, 1953, a notice announcing that the execution of Derek Bentley had taken place, was posted on the doors of Wandsworth Prison. The inane and barbaric ritual of retributive murder, which reoccurs so often in this country, had once again been repeated. The scene arranges itself in our minds. The representatives of the Church and of the State accompany the prisoner to the scaffold. One recalls the moving prose with which George Orwell recollects the bewilderment of his emotions upon witnessing the hanging of a native in Burma:

"It is curious, but till that moment I had never realised what it means to destroy a healthy, conscious man. I saw . . . the mystery, the unspeakable wrongness, of cutting a life short when it is in full tide. This man was not dying, he was alive just as we are alive. All the organs of his body were working—bowels digesting food, skin renewing itself, nails growing, tissues forming—all toiling away in solemn foolery. His nails would still be growing when he stood on the drop, when he was falling through the air with a tenth-of-a-second to live. His eyes saw the yellow gravel and the grey walls, and his brain still remembered, foresaw, reasoned. . . . He and we were a party of men walking together, seeing, hearing, feeling, understanding the same world; and in two minutes, with a sudden snap, one of us would be gone—one mind less, one world less."

But these legal killings are not infrequent; countless men have similarly been done to death in the names of the

Queen (or the King), of justice and of the British Public. It is seldom that many days pass without some such individual as Bentley receives a gratuitous obituary in the columns of *The Times*, which, in perhaps three lines, states that another man has been executed yesterday morning in one or another of Her Majesty's Prisons. Their deaths are lamented by the public.

Why, then, in the case of Bentley was such an outcry raised. It was not because the people had ceased to believe in the right of vengeance of the State, the "eye for an eye" formula of Mosaic Law. It appeared to them as mockery of justice, a mockery of even that retributive justice in which many of them still kept their faith. The prosecution had not even suggested that Bentley had killed another man, it was alleged merely that he had incited another to kill. The jury which pronounced his guilt had recommended mercy, thousands had petitioned for his reprieve. The jury's recommendation was ignored, the clamouring of the thousands found deaf ears. Neither the decision of the jury or the wishes of the people may interfere with the workings of that which we call justice.

What then shall be Bentley's epitaph? Shall we say that:

"On the 28th day of the month of January in the year one thousand nine hundred and fifty-three Derek Bentley was done to death with an inhuman cruelty which, we hope, our descendants will be unable to imagine. He was a victim of a murderous abstraction known as the State, and so for his murder there is nobody whom we can hang."

COLIN QUAYLE.

'TRANSPORT STRIKE DISASTROUS' —says DEAKIN

THE unofficial strike of Road Transport workers that was being "plotted" by the Shop Stewards Association on a nation-wide scale, was due to take place on Jan. 19th. It did not do so and to our knowledge not one single worker stopped work on this day that was supposed to be going to show the country the Haulage men's opposition to de-nationalisation.

We should be pleased to receive from any Transport worker the full details of just how this strike was prevented, for a hint of what was done has been given by the boss of the Transport and General Workers' Union, Mr. Arthur Deakin, in an article in the union's official journal, *The Transport & General Workers' Record* (and a very interesting record this journal should expose, too).

In the face of pent-up feelings it became necessary for the union to take vigorous action among its members, he writes, making it quite clear how futile it would be to take strike action of the character which had been advocated so strongly in unofficial quarters; that it would, in fact, merely be playing into the hands of the Tories and create opportunities for them to take repressive action against the trade union movement.

We cannot believe that simply these craven arguments would have swayed the would-be strikers—who must have known and gauged for themselves how much they would be playing into Tory hands. Incidentally, couldn't it be said that the Road Transport workers were playing into Tory hands by doing nothing to prevent their industry returning to private ownership? Couldn't it be said that Arthur Deakin was playing into Tory hands by telling his members that, "Notwithstanding all our efforts, the die appears to have been finally cast; the Bill, it is expected, will become law"? And by urging them to accept it without any effective protest?

What, in fact, were the efforts Deakin made to prevent de-nationalisation? One or two protest meetings, and, presumably, support for the Labour Party at the last election.

But here we see shown up one of the basic weaknesses of democracy. Having played the parliamentary game, the official unions have to stand by the consequences, and since the majority of Members of Parliament approve the return of Road Transport to private exploitation—the workers in the industry have to put up with it.

This really means that the fate of Transport workers, in relation to their industry, has been decided by all those middle-class housewives who voted for Churchill and his supporters, by all the petty business men and shopkeepers who have a stake in "free enterprise". Narrowing it down still further, one can say that the decision as to who shall boss the Transport workers was taken by that tiny minority of the population who make up the floating voters—those who voted Labour in 1950 but Conservative in 1951.

In other words, the destiny of an important section of the productive and distributive economy of our society is in the hands of a small vacillating minority who have nothing whatever to do with it.

However, this is leading me rather off

EUROPEANS AND INDIAN CHARGED WITH DEFYING APARTHEID

A POLICE commandant told a court at Germiston, near Johannesburg, on 26th January, that the "natives were becoming excitable" when Patrick Duncan, son of a former Governor-General of South Africa, addressed them in a location last month. Mr. Duncan is one of seven Europeans and an Indian—Manilal Gandhi, son of Mahatma Gandhi—appearing before the Court charged with inciting natives to resist, break, or obstruct the administration of any law. The accused were also alleged to have entered Germiston location without a permit.

the point I set out to mention. Deakin has said that in order to counteract the pent-up feelings of his membership, it was necessary for the union to take vigorous action among its members. What was this vigorous action? Threats of expulsion, perhaps? Disciplinary action of various kinds? Did Deakin prove to his members that it would be futile to strike, or dangerous to go against the Executive? That it would give the Tories opportunities to take repressive action against the T.U. movement, or that it would lead to the Executive taking repressive action against the membership?

He went on to write: "It should also be appreciated that this type of action (i.e., the strike) could not be limited in terms of time to the period during which the Tories constituted the Government of the country. It could be used at all times regardless of the colour of the Government and would constitute a real threat to democratic parliamentary government."

In other words, Deakin thinks that the workers should not be allowed to realise their own strength. They must be kept down under a Tory Government in case they learn techniques of struggle that could be used against any Government.

The statement of Deakin's amounts, in fact, to a compliment to anarcho-syndicalism, for he is virtually admitting that opposition to government is deep-rooted among the workers, and that they have weapons in their hands with which they can fight government. But they mustn't use them. The workers must not be allowed to develop means of struggle for their own defence—so that if, as is quite possible, some form of dictatorship is ever established in this country, they can be handed over, bound and helpless, without the means to fight it.

These are all the implications of the present trade union attitude.

Deakin's present action against the Transport Bill is to refuse to appoint a T.U. representative to the disposal board which is going to arrange the carve-up. He writes:

"In our view it would be quite indefensible to engage in selling out something the sale of which we regard as a betrayal of the best interests of the country and in complete conflict with our view that a properly organised, efficient, and co-ordinated transport system could not be achieved on the basis of the Government's proposals. It will be our job to see that we secure those considerations which will safeguard the interests of our members. This will require steadfastness of purpose and calls for the greatest loyalty and co-operation within the road haulage and passenger branches of the union. For our part we shall see that every step is taken with a view to giving the most effective service to our members."

Unfortunately for the members, their ideas and Deakin's ideas of what is "the most effective service" do not coincide. P.S.

Guns and Margarine in America

BECAUSE of high butter prices, the American housewife has switched to margarine. As a result, large stocks of the former are being held in cold storage by the government which, under an agreement made with farmers, is under an obligation to buy up all excess production. In this way they prevent glut on the market forcing down prices below their guaranteed level. The situation, however, is becoming embarrassing to the government and expensive for the taxpayer. Some authorities fear a repetition of 1950, when there was a surplus of 242 million pounds. About half was eventually returned to the market at comparatively little loss, but 100 million pounds had to be given away before it rotted. This year, with a record winter production and the American housewife's inability to afford to buy more than half the quantity consumed per head before the war, the government is buying at the rate of about a million pounds of surplus butter a day, which at 4/7 per lb. means a daily cost to the taxpayer of £230,000.

The Price of "Liberation" in Egypt

CAIRO, Jan. 25 (A.P.)
 A DECREE to-day empowered the Egyptian Government to proclaim a state of general mobilisation in Egypt in the case of war, threat of war or of "international tension".

The decree said the proclamation of general mobilisation would give the authorities the "right to summon the reserve officers, to draft person working in public utilities or in jobs related with defence, to requisition essential materials and commodities, buildings and transport".

The new legislation also provides that "nationals of governments with whom diplomatic relations would be severed should report within three days after the proclamation of general mobilisation to the governorates of the provinces in which they live".

ANARCHISM & VIOLENCE

IN the penultimate article of his series, "Lessons of the Spanish Revolution" (FREEDOM, 13/12/52), V.R. has chosen to select an article which I wrote in 1947, on the question of the presence of violence in revolutionary movements, as a subject for attack. Since, in his discussion, he has managed to represent it rather inaccurately, I should like the opportunity to reply to his strictures and also to raise one or two further points which his arguments involve.

Firstly, there is a question of definition, which is not merely academic, since it does involve rather fundamentally the issues which V.R. is trying to establish. He says that the use of violence has hardly ever been justified as a principle or as a means to an end by anarchists, but that it has "at the most" been justified as "a revolutionary necessity, or tactic." I would protest, to begin with, against the use of the word *necessity*. It implies lack of choice as to methods, but the idea of choice and of making the appropriate choice is, correctly enough, the underlying current of V.R.'s whole series. If he assumes that *necessity* rules in revolutionary situations, then he implies that they cannot have been other than they have been, and he might just as well have saved himself the trouble of writing his articles. Fortunately for our enlightenment, however, he had in fact shown himself a consistent disbeliever in the rule of necessity. Secondly, I would question the distinction which is drawn between a *tactic*

and a *means to an end*. Anything we do in pursuit of an objective is a *means* to that objective, and if we use violence as a *tactic* it automatically becomes a *means*; to claim anything less is mere casuistry. The distinction between *tactic* and *means* on the one side, and *principle* on the other is apparently greater, but only apparently, for a principle is in fact only an abstraction from conduct; our actions give it life, and it is in what we do, as well as what we think, that the principle attains actuality. The actuality in which, for the sake of this argument, *principle*, *tactic* and *means* are united is the fact that some anarchists feel that in some circumstances violence is justified. They say they have no *principle* of violence; the only alternative is that they justify an unprincipled use of violence. It is for them to choose.

"We refer, of course," says V.R., "to those anarchists who call themselves pacifist-anarchists, or non-violent-anarchists, and who thereby imply that those not included in these categories, must be violent-anarchists." It seems again a curious question of definition. Perhaps any labels are ridiculous; one could go on indefinitely inventing—vegetarian-anarchists, Esperantist-anarchists, Baconian-anarchists, and I think that one can fairly admit to V.R. that, if a man is a pacifist and an anarchist, he does not necessarily belong to a

special breed called "pacifist-anarchist". (At the same time, the label *pacifist-anarchist* would not imply that all other anarchists are violent-anarchists; it would merely imply that other anarchists are not convinced pacifist anarchists and leaves a vast field for neutrality and what in the Great Revolution was called trimming.) Nevertheless, the fact that he is a pacifist, like the fact that he may be a vegetarian, will necessarily colour in some respects the way in which his anarchism comes out in actuality, and on questions like Spain there are inevitably some points on which the pacifist and anarchist will find himself at loggerheads with certain other anarchists. However, I object, with all the violence of the non-violent roused, to V.R.'s suggestion that it is the "pacifist-anarchists" who have been solely responsible for the distinctions which have arisen. I can remember, not a decade ago, when some anarchists—I don't suggest V.R. was among them—objected to being in the same group as other anarchists who objected to violent methods. That seems to me a pretty clear way of making a distinction.

Again, V.R. complains that "the 'non-violent' advocates fail to make a distinction between violence which is used as a means for imposing the will of a group or class, and that violence which is purely defensive". I would submit that this is in fact an unreal distinction. Since revolution is by definition a movement of initiative, and therefore in its nature offensive, any violence in connection with it can only be incidentally defensive. It can only be to defend something won by aggression (violent or non-violent) and hence cannot be purely defensive. I use the words *offensive* and *aggression* merely for the purposes of definition and not pejoratively.

Now I will come to my own article. It was written six years ago, and to-day I might express it differently (the translation in *España Libre* was printed without my knowledge and I have not seen it yet), but I do not think I would change what seems to me the important thesis contained therein. And it is this thesis which V.R. does not allow to emerge clearly from the cloud of dust he raises. It—the thesis—is that there is relatively little possibility of immediate success in a revolutionary insurrection, and that

prolonged military operations inevitably involve the appearance of "forms of organisation which negate the revolutionary principles of liberty, equality and fraternity". I will not trespass on your space at present with the detailed quotations necessary to further outline the theme; my point of view was put a great deal more concisely in a minority note which, as an editor of FREEDOM, I contributed in the same year as the article in question.

"On the question of violence, I do not deny that there are occasions when there may be no way of stopping it taking place in a revolutionary situation; there may even be occasions when individual acts of violence are justifiable. . . . A spontaneous burst of violence may be harmless; the kind of continued and organised violence which exists in prolonged civil war inevitably tends to crystallise into inhuman shapes and to produce power complexes among its practitioners."

To return to V.R.'s strictures, he asks the rhetorical and hypothetical question—What should the people have done on July 19? Such a question borders on absurdity. One cannot pick on a certain point in a historical development and say—what should have been done in this minute? The situation on July 19 was involved in the whole tradition of Spanish political life and social struggle. It was the result of a whole series of complex factors that came together in

that time and place, and the action of the active section of the people of Barcelona and the other cities and villages was inevitably conditioned by these factors. I find it difficult even to imagine, not what else they *should* have done on July 19, but what else they *would* have done. But that does not mean that I have to accept what they did as being right or expedient, or that I must inhibit myself from drawing what seems to me the unavoidable solution, that the civil war which began with the actions of July 19 carried within it the corrupting condition of sustained violence that militated constantly and ever more heavily against the triumph of a libertarian revolution. I am willing to grant V.R. that it is possible that, if the violence of July 19 could have been kept to one spontaneous outbreak, if the preconditions of a constructive revolution (for July 19 was not a revolution, only a prelude) could have been established in that one day, without violence being continued until it imposed its own structure on the revolutionary movement, then the degeneration might not have set in. Such an admission is contained in my statement above quoted; it is also implied in the article which V.R. attacks. On the other hand, the chances even on the 19th July were great against such a possibility; it is all very well for V.R. to say that Franco *might* have been beaten in days but for the treachery of officials appointed by the Popular Front Government and the hesitation of certain sec-

Continued on p. 4

THE REAL RULERS

THIS very revealing letter from Mr. Tom Johnston which appeared in last week's *New Statesman and Nation* calls for no comment from us:

The reference in Mr. Kingsley Martin's Harold Laski (page 81) to the allegation preserved in one of Laski's notes that M. Flandin assured me during the crisis of 1931 which smashed the Labour Government, that gold withdrawals by France from London were made at the direct request of Mr. Montagu Norman, then Governor of the Bank of England, prompts me to invite any reader of your journal who may be in a position either to corroborate or to criticise, or to explain M. Flandin's assertion, to do so before the trail becomes forever obliterated.

What happened was this: as recounted in the chapter on High Finance and the Crisis of 1931 in my book, *The Financiers and the Nation*, page 198 (Methuen, 1934), along with Mr. Ralph Wigram, then Counsellor at the British Embassy in Paris, I had, with the full approval of the British Foreign Secretary, Mr. Arthur Henderson, an interview with M. Flandin, the French Chancellor, and Laval, the Prime Minister. Both separately and together assured us that France had in fact offered to lend money to Britain in order to save the £ sterling, and that "upon at least two occasions" when the Bank of France had bought British gold "it had done so at the direct request of the Bank of England which had made the request for purely regulatory and administrative reasons." More than that, declared M. Flandin, he was seriously annoyed at the completely false accusations in Britain that France had been recklessly pulling down the £ and he was prepared to make a public statement on the subject.

He offered further to bring into Paris next day M. Moret, the Governor of the Bank of France, to meet me, and substantiate his assertion that any gold withdrawals from London had been made at

the request of the Bank of England. I have the late Mr. Ralph Wigram's confirmation in writing of the accuracy of that account of our interview with Messrs. Flandin and Laval.

Back in London, Mr. Philip Snowden expressed sheer incredulity both to Arthur Henderson, the Foreign Secretary, and to myself. Unfortunately by this time the Governor of the Bank of England, Mr. Norman, had gone to Quebec on a health recuperation holiday and was not at the end of a telephone, and the Government crashed before ever we were in a position to get explanations as to why gold should be exported (amid the wildest British press declarations that France was the villain of the piece) "for regulatory and administrative reasons" without the knowledge of the Chancellor or of the Cabinet.

COMMENT ON SMOG—2

The death rate during last month's great fog was the same as that during the peak period of major epidemics.

This is stated in a report for the week ended December 13 last by the L.C.C. Health Committee. Deaths in that week were 2,484, an increase of 1,539 over the previous week.

The fog deaths (although more pronounced among babies and the elderly) were not confined to people of any particular ages.

Compared with the average of the previous three weeks, deaths from bronchitis increased 10 times, from influenza seven times, from pneumonia nearly five times, from pulmonary tuberculosis four and a half times, from other respiratory diseases six times, and from heart and circulatory disorders nearly three times. —"Evening Standard," 30/1/53.

Dr. Parker, the director of fuel research for the Department of Scientific and Industrial Research, estimated that of the 190 million tons of coal burned in 1948 over seven million tons went straight into the air as two million tons of tarry smoke, 600,000 tons of grit, and 4,700,000 tons of sulphur. In other words, we blew the work of 25,000 miners straight up the chimney. —"Manchester Guardian," 22/3/51.

★

THE direct cost of atmospheric pollution from the inefficient burning of raw coal is estimated to be £50,000,000 a year.¹ But, as the Ridley Report says, "It is impossible to measure all this cost in money. . . . In real terms it is certainly enormous, as everyday observation in our large towns and cities shows—most clear to those who know conditions abroad, where less coal is burnt raw in inefficient conditions. Among the social costs are the loss of sunlight and the harm to the health of the citizens, the reduction in the amenities of town life, the damage to buildings and textile fabrics, the extra costs of painting, washing and laundry, and the loss of food production which results from the smoke deposits in the countryside around the towns. These are only some of the main losses the community endures through smoke."²

The Registrar-General told the Royal Commission on the Distribution of the Industrial Population that in his view smoke pollution was one of the four main reasons for the excess of urban over rural death rates.³ But smoke is only a symptom of something else—unburnt fuel in the 12 million domestic open fires burning raw coal, in smaller industrial boilers and furnaces which burn raw coal, and in steam railway locomotives. Some people press for legal measures to end these twin evils of atmospheric pollution and fuel waste. But

1 This is the figure quoted by Mr. Arnold Marsh, Secretary of the National Smoke Abatement Society, who thinks that the indirect costs are likely to be in the same order. The reader is referred to the pamphlets issued by the Society from Chandos House, Buckingham Gate, S.W.1. See also *Smoke: The Problem of Coal and the Atmosphere*, by A. Marsh (Faber & Faber, 1947).

2 Report of the Committee on National Policy for the Use of Fuel and Power Resources (H.M.S.O., 1952).

3 Barlow Report, p. 61.—Report of the Royal Commission on the Distribution of the Industrial Population (H.M.S.O., 1940).

The Price of Wasted Coal

even if these were desirable it is impossible to see how they could be put into effect. We have already discussed the equivocal policy about fuel for domestic fires. Of the 35 million tons of solid fuel burnt domestically, only 6 million tons are coke. If a much greater proportion of householders decided, or were obliged, to burn smokeless fuels, would there be any for them? Mr. E. H. Browne, Director-General of Production, National Coal Board said in a broadcast that, "There is unlikely to be a shortage of coal in the ground, but special coals which can be mined economically will grow scarce. Coals of low coking power, suitable for general industrial or household use, form the bulk of the attractive reserves which remain. As the good coking coals become scarce and more costly they must be reserved more and more for the purposes for which they are unique." In other words, not for household purposes.

In the case of the smaller raw-coal burning industrial boilers, the Ridley Report observes that, "there is danger that the more general and stiffer legislation against smoke might actually reduce fuel efficiency, as firms sought to avoid prosecution by using excess air in their appliances." And of steam railway locomotives, the Report says, "There appear to be no practicable methods of making the standard steam railway locomotive fuel-efficient and smokeless."

"The law is of little help: let railway passengers who have sat by the open window of a compartment on the gritty side of a train remember that by a clause in the Railway Acts all locomotives have been compelled for many decades past to consume their own smoke!"⁴

Two municipalities, Manchester and Coventry have established smokeless zones in the central area of their cities. In Coventry, thirty smokeless acres were achieved "more by tact than coercion." Owners of smoke-producing property "were given the choice of using coke or anthracite stoves, central heating, oil fuel, gas or electricity. All adjusted themselves without much trouble or expense, and few asked for the financial aid (up to half the cost of a new installation) which the Council may provide. . . . In the event, almost everyone agreed that 'it's only common sense', and accepted the rules in the spirit of, say, the Highway Code."⁵

In Manchester, too, "the policy has secured a gratifying measure of public approval and co-operation that promises well for its future extension."⁶ But the difficulty will arise when attempts are made to extend these two smokeless zones—outside the bombed and partly rebuilt centre of Coventry and out of the business centre of Manchester into the ring of railways and obsolete industrial premises. Thus the Coal Utilisation Joint Council "consider that a note of warning should be sounded, lest the smokeless zone movement should outrun the supply of suitable fuel," and that "the only practicable solution to the problem is the progressive development of appliances capable of burning bituminous coal with less and less smoke," and the Council concludes: "If a general movement develops to establish smokeless zones throughout the country,

there would not at present be means of making this effective. The opinion of the Council is that if the present supplies of solid smokeless fuels are to be used to the best advantage in the interest of smoke abatement, it would be better if the declaration of smokeless zones could be confined to new towns or redevelopment areas (which can from the start be equipped with suitable appliances)."

Meanwhile, the National Coal Board in its evidence to the Committee on National Fuel Policy says that, "no systematic investigation has so far been undertaken to explain how it is that the fuel consumption per head of the population in Britain (calculated by converting all major fuels into 'hard coal equivalent') appears to be roughly—

30%	higher than in Belgium
60%	" " " Scandinavia
90%	" " " France
90%	" " " Western Germany
130%	" " " Switzerland
130%	" " " Holland."

The Board adds that "the obvious explanations that suggest themselves—such as the relatively high degree of industrialisation and urbanisation in Britain—do not seem to be able to account for more than a part of these differences. The above figures by themselves do not 'prove' anything, but they seem to support the widespread conviction that much of the fuel used in this country is wastefully used."

★

But there is another aspect of the price of wasted coal. Between 450 and 500 men are killed in the mines every year and between 2,000 and 2,500 injured. A thousand men die every year as a result of the officially recognised "dust" diseases such as pneumoconiosis and silicosis.

"In one South Wales village I visited, where the best anthracite in the world is mined, a man had died, was dying, or was disabled by the dust in every single house along the street."⁷

"I always remember a remark, quite a casual aside, made by Ammanford's M.P., the Rt. Hon. James Griffiths. Of all the friends with whom he worked down the mines, he said, he was the only one alive. He remained alive because he stopped hewing coal and became a politician."⁸

We have already commented in FREEDOM that the fact of recurrent deaths in any industry should be enough to pose the question: *What right has society to demand that some of its members submit to such hazards?*

Miners' work is dangerous and arduous, it is done in conditions as unpleasant as can be imagined. Why should anyone be surprised that the number of miners decreases year by year, or that they tell their sons, "You're not going down the pit; one bloody fool in the family is enough"? We are rightly and often told that our society depends upon our coal industry. But what are we to say when we learn that so much of the coal won at such a price is wasted? C.W.

7 Annual Report for 1950 of the Coal Utilisation Joint Council.

8 Dr. Charles Fletcher: "Fighting the 'Modern Black Death,'" *The Listener* (28/9/50).

9 Laurence Thompson: *Portrait of England*.

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP
OPEN DAILY

New Book . . .

Sheila Patterson
Colour and Culture in South Africa 30/-
(A Study of the Status of the
Cape Coloured People.)

New Reprints . . .

George Gissing
Private Papers of Henry Ryecroft 9/6
R. H. Theuless
Straight and Crooked Thinking 2/-

Reminders . . .

Peter Kropotkin
The Great French Revolution 12/6
(U.S. Vanguard Press, 2 vol.)

Second-hand . . .

Boris Souverine Stalin 20/-

Periodicals . . .

Poetry & Poverty. Contributions by
Charles Madge, James Kirkup,
Louis Adeane, D. S. Savage, etc. 2/-
Portworker's Clarion 2d.
Postage extra in all cases.

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

MODERN DISASTERS & THE COMMUNITY

THERE can have been few winters which have been as disastrous in a civil sense as this one. The fog at the beginning of December resulted in many hundreds of deaths. The number of deaths registered from all causes in London during the week ending December 13th was 2,484 compared with 945 for the previous week—a difference of over 1,500. This figure is said to be greater even than that of the great fog of December 1873.

Now comes the gales and high tides which wrecked the Stranraer ferry and spread devastation over the whole low-lying east coast of England, from Lincoln to Kent, and involved also the other Low Countries of Belgium and Holland.

Living in cities gives a comfortable sense of security from natural forces. Earthquakes may happen in far away Japan or India or South America: floods may be a recurrent disaster in China: that kind of disaster does not happen here. When it does in fact happen the shock is proportionately greater, and the inability to deal with it, and the unpreparedness, are very disruptive of our normal feeling of security.

Lynmouth and the Po

In recent years these disasters have seemed more common. There was the virtual destruction of Lynmouth by floods last summer. There was the appalling flooding of the Po Valley in north east Italy last year with its loss of life and setback to agriculture and local fertility. Then there was the train smash at Wealdstone.

In each of these cases there was the possibility of prevention. Doubts about the safety of Lynmouth's reservoir were expressed before the disaster. The Wealdstone crash has made the extension of safety devices in regard to signalling a matter of public urgency, although such methods were well worked out and had even been operated by the old Great Western Railway.

Ancient Precautions

With regard to damage and loss of life by floods one speaks of unpreparedness, but is it not rather that the watchmen have fallen asleep? The appalling high tide on the coasts of Lincolnshire in 1571 passed into ballad history, and every school child knows of the dykes which guard the Dutch coast and the eternal vigilance against the encroaching sea.

At Canvey Island, requests for public action regarding the sea wall were made in 1951, but it has taken the present disaster to secure public action, too late. Yet the sea walls and groynes and harbour structures all round the coasts of England bear witness to the practical concern of our ancestors for public safety in this matter. At the time of the Po Valley disasters we pointed out that work necessary to prevent the canals bursting had been foreseen but never attended to.

Rates and Votes

Public works to-day involve public money. And where the party system with its dependence on vote-catching prevails no local administration adds to the rates if it can possibly avoid it. In such circumstances it is just these ancient, basic, and therefore taken for granted, undertakings which are neglected. Their neglect increases the cost which final repairing involves and so tends to prolong the neglect.

Yet the money required is a mere fraction of the amount spent uselessly, unconstructively and viciously upon armaments.

Nor are rates and armaments solely to blame.

To undertake afresh the works done by our ancestors would to-day be almost impossible. Such work would involve vast quantities of labour and capital: but it would not show a return in the form of dividends or adequate profit. It would not conform to the modern criterion of paying for itself.

Yet the labour involved and the material involved were even greater for our ancestors who could not call on the technical resources available to us. The all-important difference is that in former centuries such necessary work for the community was recognized as the community's responsibility and was undertaken as a matter of course without regard to rates of profit or dividends or money to be spared from armaments. Today the very sense of community is lacking. With all the increased means of communication and news, the disasters in Eastern England are only pictures and headlines in newspapers to the population at large. The actualities of disasters do not directly touch them. Relief may be assisted and is usually initiated by private individuals, but the final coping with disaster remains a public—that is, to-day, an impersonal—concern.

Modern Ignorance

With all our scientific advances, we are little better able to cope with fog than in 1873, probably less able to cope with high tides than in 1571. Scientific advance is largely a matter of non-human application and knowledge of larger natural phenomena and their control, the control of the elements, is slight indeed. More serious than this ignorance, however, is the extinction of the sense of community which may well be more destructive of humanity and human flowering than the atomic bomb.

What Happened in Casablanca?

A group of influential Catholics at a meeting held in Paris last week, placed the responsibility for the Casablanca massacre of last December on the French authorities. Their comparison of this crime, in which they allege several hundred Arabs were killed, with the bombing of Guernica by Franco and the Italian bombing of Abyssinia, has stirred opinion in France just as some years ago another French Catholic writer, Georges Bernanos, aroused world opinion over Franco's repression in the island of Majorca with his book *Les Grands Cimetières sous la Lune* (A Diary of My Times).

The report prepared by the Catholic group reaches conclusions diametrically opposed to the Government's official communiqués.

The report says the fighting started when police fired on the demonstrators on the night of Sunday, December 7. Despite a crop of atrocity stories, deliberately circulated to create "a true psychosis of collective horror" and afterwards discreetly denied, no Europeans were killed until the following afternoon—and then only in the rush when police repulsed demonstrators with tanks and machine guns.

Towards the end of Monday, Dec. 8, the report alleges, police deliberately allowed about 2,000 Arabs to enter the centre of the European city which houses their trade union headquarters. They then sprang a trap, rounded them up with "indiscriminate brutality" and delivered many unarmed Arabs to a mob of howling Europeans. These, including many women, and driven crazy with the atrocity stories, rushed at them screaming "Aux assassins".

"On that afternoon it is indeed true there was a massacre; it is true there was lynching; it is true that men and women ran amok and murdered other men. But these people running amok, these massacres, these lynchings, were the Europeans of Casablanca, and this must be said."

General Guillaume, French Resident-General in Morocco took the opportunity when he was the guest of the American Club in Paris last week to defend the official communiqués issued about the Casablanca massacre. He has since been answered by Professor Charles-André Julian, of Paris University and one of the principal French historians on French North Africa, in a letter published in last Saturday's issue of the Paris newspaper *Le Monde*. The professor, who is not a Catholic but a Freethinker and a Socialist, after paying tribute to the "serenity" and "objectivity" of the Catholic meeting, accused the French Government of trying to stifle the whole affair with a communiqué about the numbers killed and asked a series of pointed questions. Recalling General Guillaume's speech of the previous day in which the general spoke of "appeals to revolt", Professor Julian asked:

"What were these appeals other than the trade union appeals to the workers and people of Morocco published in the Arabic newspaper *Al Alam* on Dec. 7, which could certainly not be accurately described as an 'appeal to revolt'? How was it, if there had been such appeals, that sixteen hundred trade unionists dispersed quietly on Dec. 7 from before the trade union headquarters through the European part of the town without so much as a shout? How was it that after

such appeals trouble only started in the course of the following night, and exclusively in one of the Casablanca slums, that of the *Carrières Centrales*?"

Professor Julian went on to refer to the two bomb outrages mentioned by General Guillaume as having taken place on Dec. 7. "What were they?" he asked. He went on:

"What is the truth about the 'mouse-trap' at the trade union headquarters on the following day—to use the approving expression of one of the French Moroccan newspapers? Did the police first allow two thousand Moroccan trade unionists to assemble there in spite of the ban on public meetings and then proceed to arrest the Moroccans as they came out, knocking them over the head with their truncheons and even handing them over to the European crowd, which set upon them savagely, as is evident indeed from the still more approving comments of the French Moroccan press?"

"Further, could a statement be made as to the extent of the repressive measures adopted since the riots? Would it be correct to say that the aim of the police authorities in Morocco was not so much to suppress the Istiqlal party as to suppress the Moroccan intelligentsia itself?"

Professor Julian concluded by referring to what he called the disquieting and hysterical ideas of a number of the European settlers in Morocco who would evidently like to see established there a régime somewhat like that in South Africa.

Needless to say, Government officials have hit back with accusations that their critics are "anti-French", "anti-patriotic" and "disloyal". Perhaps we may even hear that they are "Communist agents"!

Schools Witchhunt

TO make America secure for "democracy" no stone will be left unturned to ferret out the enemy wherever he may be hiding! The next Congressional witch-hunt will be directed at the universities, colleges and schools. "This is bad news for any Communist or Communist sympathisers still at large in the teaching profession anywhere in the United States, no matter whether his speciality is history or botany"—writes Alistair Cooke in a dispatch to the *Manchester Guardian* (28/1/53), implying by his remark that the process of cleaning up the teaching profession has already been pretty thoroughgoing and that the Congressional search will simply put the finishing touches to the job. He adds, however, that many educationists are afraid that it will be bad news too "for the future of those teachers who value the tradition of dissent."

Dr. James Conant, President of Harvard, whose appointment as United States High Commissioner to Germany is viewed with dismay by many American scholars since it is felt that "an invaluable champion of free inquiry was being removed from the citadel just when the siege was about to begin," expressed his views on the witch-hunt when delivering his final report as retiring president at Harvard. He believed that Communists should be banned from appointments in any school, college or university and hoped that any "subversives" would be ferreted out and prosecuted. Yet he was against any large enquiry into teaching systems and courses of instruction.

"It would be a sad day for the United States," he said, "if the tradition of dissent were driven out of the universities. For it is the freedom to disagree, to quarrel with authority on intellectual matters, to think otherwise, that has made this nation what it is. . . Our industrial society was pioneered by men who were dissenters. . . the global struggle with Communism turns on this very point. . . The independence of each college and university would be threatened if Governmental agencies of any sort started inquiries into the nature of the instruction that was given. The colleges of the United States have nothing to hide, but their independence as corporate scholarly organisations is of supreme importance."

It seems to us that Dr. Conant wants to have his cake and eat it.

As Alistair Cooke points out, "the fear is widespread, and justified by past experiences, that the committees may not exercise the restraint such an investigation calls for if it is to be alert, decent, and generous enough to recognise its implicit dangers." The *New York Times* comments that "there will doubtless be efforts to use the proposed Congressional investigations. . . as devices for whipping professors and teachers into a dreary and disastrous mould of conformity."

We do not appear to have reached

this state in Britain but there are no doubt many patriotic defenders of democracy who would wish to see our schools and universities purified of the "subversive" elements. A case which smells of the witch-hunt is in the decision, reached in private, by the West Riding County Education Committee last week, to dismiss Dr. Ronald Cuthill, principal of Keighley Technical College since 1946. He has been granted leave of absence on full salary until August 31st, when his appointment officially ends. A statement issued by the Committee simply stated that "except for collecting his personal effects, Dr. Cuthill be required not to attend at the Keighley Technical College for any purpose whatsoever." However, a meeting of the Board of Governors, on December 29, recommended that Dr. Cuthill should be dismissed and a resolution to the effect that "The governors are resolved that the college cannot progress under the principalship of Dr. Cuthill" was put before last week's Education Committee meeting.

It would appear that some of the differences, which have led to the present situation, are between local personalities, and those who propose that a public enquiry should be held (and 15,000 people have signed a petition to this effect) have pointed out that the main

reason for demanding it is that the West Riding Education Committee "includes many people who have already become implicated in this matter at a local level, and it is not a good thing that they should sit in judgment on Dr. Cuthill."

But what we find of particular interest is the way the Communist bogey has been used as an excuse by those who oppose Dr. Cuthill. In a letter to the Minister of Education, Councillor S. Unwin, a member of Keighley Borough Council, alleged that Councillor G. S. Mason, chairman of the governors, had said at a meeting of the governors that Communism was being "openly taught at the college".

In her reply, the Minister said she had been informed by the local education authority that no complaint of Communist teaching had been received.

On the other hand, Dr. Cuthill's supporters point out that under his principalship the number of students at the college had risen from 1,623 in 1946 to 2,959 last year, and that a number of new courses had been introduced, including nursing, distributive trades and bakery. No mention is made of a Communist course!

Besides the petitioners, local branches of the Amalgamated Engineering Union, Transport and General Workers' Union, Keighley Trades Council, and the Independent Labour Party have also given their support for a public enquiry.

Kenya: Official & Unofficial

MR. C. J. M. Alport (C., Colchester) asked the Colonial Secretary what was the estimated additional financial expenditure incurred as a result of the existing emergency in Kenya, and what effect the outbreak of violence in Kenya had had upon the flow of capital for development purposes into the colony.

Mr. O. Lyttelton stated in a written reply:

"The Governor estimates that approximately £750,000 will have been expended to the end of January, 1953. The emergency has not materially affected the industrial areas of Kenya and I am informed by the Kenya Government that it has not had any considerable deterrent effect on either public or private planned investment."

In another written reply, Mr. Lyttelton stated that 4,471 Kikuyu squatters, including men, women and children, had been evicted from European farms or Crown forests in the Rift Valley Province. Of this total, 4,324 persons were evicted from 20 European farms in the Leshau Ward of Kaikippia district and were temporarily accommodated and then resettled in their reserve. Of the remainder, 80 persons had been evicted from one European farm in Nakuru district and 300 from a small village in the Njoro Crown forest. Of these two parties, 147 persons were accommodated in permanent buildings and were given free rations pending resettlement in their

reserve, which had now been effected. The remainder were returned direct to their reserve.

A total of 944 cattle, 10,577 sheep and goats, 70 donkeys, 57 pedal cycles, one auto-cycle, and one motor cycle had been forfeited by persons evicted and by the inhabitants of the Genge location of the Nyeri district.

It would appear that the white settlers in Kenya are not satisfied with the publicity given to their cause in this country, for they are proposing to open a London office to "tell the truth about Kenya". At a meeting held recently in Nairobi to launch the fund to finance this scheme, Mr. Michael Blundell, leader of the European-elected members, said it was intended to engage a Public Relations expert who would not only ensure that achievements in Kenya were explained to people in Britain and elsewhere, but would also deal with "malicious and ignorant attacks" on the settlers.

Mr. Blundell announced the appeal at a luncheon in Nairobi to-day attended by city businessmen, at which he proposed the toast of Kenya.

Sir Alfred Vincent, a member of the East African Central Legislative Assembly, replying to the toast, said it would also be the purpose of the movement to make clear that British settlers in Kenya were here to stay, and had no intention of getting out.

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.
Food Production and Population 6d.
Who will do the Dirty Work? 2d.

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.

RUDOLF ROCKER :

Nationalism and Culture. cloth 21s.

ALEX COMFORT :

Delinquency 6d.
Barbarism & Sexual Freedom. paper 2s. 6d., stiff boards 3s. 6d.

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 orhovels? 6d.
What is Anarchism? 1d.
The Basis of Communal Living. 1s.

Marie Louise Berneri Memorial Committee publications :

Marie Louise Berneri, 1918-1949: A Tribute. cloth 5s.
Journey Through Utopia. cloth 16s. (U.S.A. \$2.30)

K. J. KENAFICK :

Michael Bakunin and Karl Marx. Paper 6s.

27, Red Lion Street, London, W.C.1.

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS

For a Revaluation of Anarchism

I WOULD like to comment on the problem discussed in the letter of R. A. M. Gregson "A Revaluation of Anarchism" (FREEDOM, Jan. 17), and with whose point of view I entirely agree.

The weakness of contemporary anarchism is its complete lack of a doctrine or programme. As far as I am aware, the only books in English which deal coherently and in detail with the problems which would face a libertarian society, have been written by non-anarchists. The usual argument in defence of this state of affairs appears to be that as the anarchist movement is still in an embryonic state, a clear-cut programme would be futile and out-of-date by the time its supporters would be in a position to implement it; and that libertarian ideas will develop as the movement itself develops. But how can a movement expect to gain adherents on the basis of a mass of ill-defined generalisations, hoping for a clarification of ideas in the future? Marx and Engels put forward a programme in the Communist Manifesto, in 1848, at a time when there was not the remotest prospect of its being put into effect—yet the Manifesto formed the basis of a pro-

gramme which, 69 years later, was implemented in Russia.

Hannah Arendt, in her book *The Burden of our Time*, points out that lack of a programme is a characteristic of totalitarian régimes. Totalitarianism demands absolute, unconditional loyalty. Emptying the ideology of all concrete content by making everyone dependent on the most recent utterances of the infallible leader, achieves this.

In order for a revolutionary movement to succeed in reshaping society, a necessary condition is the adoption, either of a clear-cut programme, or of the totalitarian leader-principle. At present, the anarchist movement has adopted neither. Assuming that anarchists reject totalitarianism, it follows that anarchism is doomed to perpetual futility at best, and rapid extinction at worst, unless it hammers out an ideology based on rational foundations.

As things stand at present, with many anarchists criticizing "from a set of implicit axioms to which reference is practically never made," as Gregson puts it, the anarchist movement could just as easily degenerate towards totalitarianism as advance on libertarian lines.

Chesterfield, Jan. 26. B. GELSTEIN.

"Titles of Honour"

WHAT an ironical sheet was FREEDOM for January 25th! What a clanging and banging of chains! The chains of "traditional" anarchism seem to be worn with more pride and self-righteousness than any New Year Honour.

The subject of this sentimental moralising is unimportant, but the desire of so many anarchists to substitute dogma and tradition for thought and living shows a disconcerting lack of vitality in the movement. It may be that Herbert Read has done us a psychological service by revealing our attachments to doctrine instead of to freedom.

The writers of these stupid and pernicious attacks upon an individual who has dared to exercise freedom of choice in his private affairs, have called loudly in the past for the necessity of individual freedom. Is this hypocrisy by any chance? They have said that we can live without all law: yet some of their pronouncements last week seem to set out to prove the necessity of laws of libel and slander.

My attitude to the accepting of titles by anarchists could not be less important—it is extremely unlikely that I shall ever

be in the position to exercise my freedom of choice in this matter. But last week's pharisaical moralising, which has its roots in doctrine not in freedom, has made me reconsider the necessity of men like Herbert Read if anarchism is to survive. In all his work with the Freedom Defence Committee, and in all his writings, he has shown a degree of toleration for the other man's point of view which is totally lacking in his critics, and which I have no doubt he will continue to teach them by example in spite of the petty jibes which have been levelled at him.

Our enemies must have chuckled to discover that cross between McCarthyism and Marty-baiting in a paper called FREEDOM. Irony could go no further, but its appearance should force us to reconsider our real attitude to freedom. Perhaps we might begin by learning from Herbert Read that unfashionable virtue of tolerance, even at the risk of displeasing some of those fanatics whose "freedom" seems to be a suitable subject for inclusion in the next edition of *Journey through Utopia*?

Corsock, Jan. 27. KATHLEEN RANTELL.

IN ITALY'S DEEP SOUTH

IN our issue for May 31st, we quoted a description by the Italian writer, Carlo Levi, of the work of a voluntary body, the National Union for the Struggle Against Illiteracy. Further information about the Union's efforts to conquer illiteracy in Southern Italy, was given by a correspondent in last week's *Times Educational Supplement*.

The response to the Union's original propaganda campaign was, the report says, "astounding". Within a fortnight 300 places reported that some 10,000 illiterates had entered their names for night classes in reading and writing.

A questionnaire sent out to all the students revealed that most of them were afraid that the programme was only a temporary measure which as soon as illiteracy was on the wane would leave them even more conscious of their loss and isolation than before. In reply to the question, "What would you like the school to do when the course is finished?" the usual response was "That it should not close." It was because of such appeals that the Union went ahead with its plan for permanent adult education centres.

The first seven centres were organised during the summer of 1949, and were mainly financed by foreign help. By the autumn of 1952 the number had increased to 49, and during the winter and spring 10,000 students attended these centres.

All the centres have a small library, a carpenter's shop, a sewing room, and some a small medical clinic. Apart from teaching the normal school subjects, so that the illiterates can pass the ordinary school examinations, they try to create a social consciousness and an understanding of community life.

Although the centres do not follow a set pattern, but adapt themselves to local requirements, their basic organisation is

the same. One may be noted for its garden, or the recovery of waste land, another for its tailors' co-operative or its agency for packing and marketing dried figs.

One of the oldest centres, says the *Educational Supplement*, is that at Roggiano Gravina, a village in the foothills above the Crati Valley, may be taken as typical. Of the 8,000 people who live in the neighbourhood, 75 per cent. of the women were wholly illiterate, or only able to sign their names, when the centre opened in 1949. About 2,000 of them are casual farm workers (*braccianti*) earning about six shillings for an eight-hour day. They share their homes of one or two rooms with any livestock they may possess. Seeing them, as your correspondent did, trudging home in the dust and the heat after a day's harvesting, with some of the women remaining to glean, it was difficult to imagine them as students. Yet many of these same peasants were to be found an hour later working at arithmetic and geography, joining in a discussion group on labour regulations, or watching a demonstration in the sewing room. This centre also has its orchestra, and a rehearsal for a series of Sunday concerts in the slack season was in progress.

At 9.30, after two hours' work, the centre closed and the students began their journey home—a walk of several kilometres for those who lived away from the village. Some of them would be up at daybreak. Among those setting off was an old woman, with the customary black shawl framing a face that might have served as a sculptor's model. Complimented on her energy in coming to school after a day in the fields, she replied: "Yes, I am old. I have not much longer to live, but at least I have discovered a new world before I die."

I CANNOT join in the chorus of reprobation that has followed Herbert Read's acceptance of a knighthood. It's like hitting a man when he's up. Read must do as he thinks fit. He may take this new, and, as some would say, somewhat equivocal dignity, as an *amende honorable* to one who has made no secret of his politico-philosophical sympathies, and in so doing has displayed at least one knightly qualification—courage. The other virtues enjoined by his Order have not been inconspicuous either. Divergent as our views may be in other fields, I, for one, wish him good luck and more power to his elbow, for he will ride alone.

Fordingbridge, Jan. 28. AUGUSTUS JOHN.



MAY I, through the medium of your columns, offer my hearty congratulations to whoever—probably that wily old warhorse the Grand Havana-Havana himself—was responsible for those astute promotions on January 1st?

In his elevation of Mr. Lincoln Evans, he has raised merry hell at Transport House, and given a kindly leg-up to those poor limping ex-comrades-in-arms of his—the commies.

Less important to him, but nevertheless a neat little afterthought, he has dropped a cat among the Red Lion Street pigeons. The G.O.M. knows full well that though "official" pamphlets may provide digestible reading to the converted the people, who actually make rebels—the anarchists—are often those outside the restrictions of the 'partyline'. Writers, in other words, who not only make people think but are read by sufficient people to make their thinking of some social and historical consequence.

I imagine that the writers who have influenced potential libertarians and anarchists are a surprisingly mixed bag: Rabelais, Shelley, Samuel Butler, Morris, Kropotkin, Norman Douglas, Gandhi, A. S. Neill, George Orwell, Alex Comfort—yes, and Herbert Read.

Possibly the old warhorse never gave a thought to the possibility of splitting the anarchist movement, or of divorcing from the movement one of its most widely read publicists. In any case, it seems silly that justifiable disagreement with Read's acceptance of the knighthood should cause such an outburst of emotional indignation as to be in danger of achieving for him one or other of these "side-effects".

Castle Douglas, Jan. 27. L. V. BEHARREL.



RE titles and anarchists. Being forced to pay one's taxes and conform to authority (up to a point), or sink if the stream is too filthy, is quite another matter from accepting favours from our opponents.

Methinks it would be deemed a privilege to refuse one.

Orpington, Jan. 30. CLARA COLE.



OF course his statement makes it even worse and Herbert Read should have spared us this second attack of nausea. Even if, to him, it seems pertinent that all this "could only happen in England". But what hurts most is that during the years we have admired and loved him as a man, he should have held the following beliefs:

- (1) That it would be an honour to receive a knighthood.
 - (2) That a public honour is a desired purpose in the life of an artist.
 - (3) That our attitude to society, and the pattern of our individual lives, must be judged by the positive (*measurable and immediate?*) good we can do. And, similarly, that unless our actions or our protests are going to bring nearer an anarchist society, it would be better to accept humbly.
 - (4) The implication that Gandhi's acceptance of the title of Mahatma makes it easier for Read to become Sir Herbert.
 - (5) That there is no particular need to follow one's principles and ideas when they might conflict with the desire of others to confer honour on that person.
 - (6) That Tolstoy was wrong to feel guilty at possessing so much in the middle of a sea of poverty.
 - (7) That he should think that accepting his "honour" is an "elementary duty" and gives "force and authority to one's faith . . ."
- Hope and love are dangerous guides and if we were wrong to trust them we

ANARCHISM & VIOLENCE

A Reply — Continued from p. 1

tions of the workers' organisations. Does he really imagine that in Spain in 1936 there could not have been corrupt officials and reformist workers' organisations? When have officials ever been simon-pure or workers ever unanimous? V.R.'s *but* for seems to be an attempt to minimise circumstances which anybody who studies the history of Spain in the 1930's knows were there and which must have been obvious to any revolutionary with a knowledge of the situation. Those in Spain who could ignore these *but fors* on July 19 must have been naïve indeed.

In saying this I do not wish in any way to pass a moral judgment on the Spanish anarchists. Towards them my attitude is the same as Proudhon's towards the Parisian workers in the revolt of June, 1848. I think that history had shown that in some of their actions they were mistaken, the even before they acted an observation of past history might have shown what was likely (though not certain) to happen; but I accept their cause as my own, I recognise their idealism and devotion, I execrate their persecutors in Spain and those who have left them to die in neglect outside Spain.

In this connection I would point out to V.R. that, while I suggested that my readers might turn to Bart de Ligt to study methods of non-violent action, I did not imply an acceptance of what de Ligt had to say about Spain, any more than, because I happen to agree with Lord Acton on power, I also agree with what he said about the Holy Church. However, I think that when he said "Violence would have been kept down to a minimum," de Ligt intended exactly what I have said two paragraphs ago, and I deny that, as V.R. so sweepingly asserts, I sweep aside de Ligt's position.

V.R. condemns me because in my article I did not go into detail on the question of non-violence. I always try to stick as far as possible to the subject I am discussing (because of a natural garrulity of the pen I do not always succeed), and as the subject of this particular piece was not "Methods of non-violence," but a study of the results as shown in history of the effect of *organised violence*, I do not think I could be expected to extend my field. The effects of violence are study enough in themselves. The alternative to them belongs to another chapter, or another volume. However, to quote again from my FREEDOM statement: "Personally, I think these dangers outweigh all the supposed advantages of violent action. For the pursuit of the class struggle the workers already have vast resources at their disposal in the form of strikes, sabotage, etc., and their true strength lies in the field of militant industrial struggle."

Finally, like a man who is grimly set on having his cake and eating it, V.R., after having criticised me for not having thrown out some of my other material

were only human in hoping and loving. But what saddens is that Read's statement should make use of all the arguments our detractors use against us. There was no need for him to explain himself. To explain himself by telling us that our limited attempts to live our faith is a hopeless pursuit, that a faith without power to change society is wrong, that all along he had been untrue to his deepest convictions when he helped our ineffective protests. . . . This saddens. Silence would have been easier to bear because being generous we would have been anxious to find the excuses for him.

I think this affair will have made most of us examine our consciences anew, and helped us to find strength rather than despair in the thought that since our lives are dictated by moral rather than by practical considerations, we might be dictated to hopeless ideals. But we can do no other. We are like that . . . that's how we are.

This note from a distant land and therefore probably repeating what has been said before, is simply to say that I join the ranks of the witnesses. . . .

Palermo, Jan. 26. CHARLES HUMANA.

[We believe all points of view on this subject have had their expression in our columns, and many readers we are sure will be relieved to learn that this correspondence is now closed.—EDITORS.]

to find room for a lengthy discussion of non-violent methods, proceeds to condemn me for having restricted my essay to "generalisations" and "carefully selected examples to prove his thesis."

In answer to this I should first remind V.R. that he is a privileged writer who should be humbly grateful for the fact. He was not allowed one, but twenty-three articles in which to develop his thesis, and, while I personally rejoice that for once a writer should not be cramped into the strait-jacket of editorial restrictions, I feel he should for that very reason feel a certain understanding of the problems of those who have to cut and pare to suit a peremptory four thousand words. In such circumstances, one had to select carefully, not to prove one's thesis, but to cram one's article into the space. However, let us take a brief glance at those "carefully selected examples". They included the Paris Commune, the Russian Revolution of 1917, Milan, Vienna and Paris in 1848, and the resistance movement during the last war, besides Spain. Not a small selection, one would have thought, but not good enough for V.R.!

As for V.R.'s talk of generalisations, let me remind him that, though this word has often a pejorative flavour (and is clearly thus intended by him), yet every theory is in fact a generalisation, and the main difference between a good and a bad generalisation lies in the evidence. Personally, I think that there is plenty of evidence that so far in history not a single revolution in which violence has appeared on a sustained scale but has been corrupted and brought, if not to nothing, at least to something very far from the aims with which its initiators set out—so far, in fact, that it has often not been worth the cost involved. Since the editors of FREEDOM propose a laudable scheme to examine the history of past revolutions, presumably from every aspect, I am ready to bring forward that evidence whenever they may want it.

GEORGE WOODCOCK.

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP OPEN AIR MEETINGS

Weather Permitting
HYDE PARK
Every Sunday at 4.30 p.m.

INDOOR MEETINGS

NOTICE

London Comrades are requested to note that the London Anarchist Group's Tuesday evening meetings will be held in future at:

GARIBALDI RESTAURANT,
10 LAYSTALL STREET, E.C.1
(3 mins. Holborn Hall)

The meetings will be held on TUESDAYS at 7.30 p.m.

FEB. 10—Jim Peeke on
DOWN WITH EDUCATION

FEB. 17—Albert Meltzer on
CRISIS MONGERS

NORTH-EAST LONDON

DISCUSSION MEETINGS
IN EAST HAM
Alternate Wednesdays
at 7.30 p.m.

FEB. 11—Arthur Uloth on
PSYCHOLOGIES OF CHINA

LIVERPOOL

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

GLASGOW

INDOOR MEETINGS
at
CENTRAL HALLS, 25 Bath Street
Every Sunday at 7 p.m.
With John Gaffney, Frank Carlin
Jane Strachan, Eddie Shaw,

FREEDOM

The Anarchist Weekly

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

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

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

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