

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"It is clear that thought is not free if the profession of certain opinions make it impossible to earn a living."

—BERTRAND RUSSELL

BUTLER & THE T.U.C.

ANARCHIST and Socialist journals often discuss the question of trade unionism and union organisation. So do individual workers, for what the unions do is of considerable importance to their material life. Often in recent years workers have been shocked and disillusioned because the unions in Britain have regarded the economic interests of the workers as secondary to such questions as increased production, the danger of inflation, the avoidance of stoppages through strike action and so on. The idea is frequently voiced that union leaders are traitors, place seekers, no longer concerned with the interests of the class to which they belong.

Union leaders reply to such criticism by calls to patriotism, by urging that the interests of the nation as a whole transcend those of any particular class, or that sacrifices are needed to tide the country over the prevailing economic crisis. They speak with the gravity (and, it must be said, also the emphasis) of statesmen. And like the politicians they use the same dividing tactics, employ similar red herring tactics, for they are leaders seeking to control a huge mass of trade unionists.

Anarchists have long declared that the unions which used to fight for workers' interests against the employers, for the working-class against its exploiters, have long since become an essential part of the mechanism of the state. Union leaders would probably not disagree with such an opinion, only they would regard it with satisfaction and pride. Just how important a factor they have become is shown by the following quotation (*Times*, 26/2/53):

The T.U.C. general council decided yesterday to warn the Chancellor of

Riots in Teheran

IT is difficult to assess with certainty the significance of the events in Persia of last week-end. At the time of going to press the decision of the Shah to leave Persia has been used by the opponents of Dr. Moussadeq to stage a demonstration against him. The Shah's second decision reversing the first has been interpreted by the B.B.C. and the daily press as representing a victory for Dr. Moussadeq.

But the whole affair is doubtless much more complicated than the newspapers allow one to suppose. At all events it does not seem unreasonable to suspect the hand of British diplomacy in this affair. It is said that Moussadeq is regarded as a bulwark against Communism. But he has used his bargaining power to oust the Anglo-Iranian oil Company, and therefore must be reduced to a position of less strength. This is no doubt what the riots (if they were indeed politically inspired) sought to do.

The British throughout seem prepared to wait. The longer the question is played out, the weaker the Moussadeq administrative machine becomes. Deprived of the revenue from the Abadan refinery, the government gets shakier and shakier and Moussadeq's coffers emptier and emptier. British imperialism can afford to wait.

the Exchequer that they are "very much disturbed" about suggestions to make the pound sterling convertible at the present time.

Their general financial advice to the Chancellor, which they give every year before the Budget, will not be submitted until after a further meeting of their economic committee next month, but they were anxious that their views about convertibility should reach Mr. Butler before he leaves with Mr. Eden for the United States.

An official statement explaining their view said they considered that, until there has been a substantial strengthening of the gold and dollar reserves, until there have been important changes in the pattern of production in Britain and the rest of the sterling area, and until steps have been taken to overcome the shortage of dollars generally, even a partial restoration of convertibility could not be permanently sustained without accompanying measures of deflation or devaluation. Such measures would be incompatible with our present level of employment and living standards, and would be "wasteful, unfair, and dangerous."

It will be news to many that the general council of the Trades Union Congress give advice every year to the Chancellor of the Exchequer before he frames his budget. Yet in a stable society such as ours it is clear that the Chancellor would seek the advice of so powerful a body as the official spokesmen of "organised labour". In doing so, he effectively secures that the T.U.C. General Council will reach a "res-

ponsible" decision—that is to say, one that accepts the reality of the capitalists' struggle in the world's markets, the health of trade, the decisions of the government regarding the conduct of economic affairs. Such "responsibility" inevitably produces the state of mind evinced by the union leaders in their speeches to the rank-and-file. In short, one here catches a glimpse of the process of ironing the rebelliousness out of a workers' leader.

The Chancellor therefore receives the memorandum of the T.U.C. General Council and replies to it with full gravity and respect:

"When the outcome of the conference was debated in the House of Commons on February 3," Mr. Butler wrote, "I drew particular attention to the three major preconditions to any advance towards convertibility—successful action to strengthen the economics of sterling Commonwealth countries; the prospect that trading nations will adopt trade policies conducive to the expansion of world trade; and the availability of adequate financial support. I also emphasised the close inter-connexion between the trading and financial aspects of the plan. More generally, I expressed the strong conviction that it was only by moving forward to an expansion of world production and trade that we could underpin the military, economic, and social policies to which we are committed."

"I hope that the general council will give these statements careful con-

Continued on p. 3

Comment on Mr. Sanders, Mack Ingram & Sir Bernard

"The Law Must Take Its Course"

MR. Churchill's refusal to consider the Stalinists' offer to exchange their prisoner, Mr. Sanders (an English businessman imprisoned for espionage in Hungary), for a young Malayan woman communist sentenced to death by the British (under the Emergency Regulations for being in possession of a hand grenade) is not a surprising one. In his statement to the Commons, he said, "There can be no question of bartering a human life or deflecting the course of justice or of mercy in Malaya for the sake of obtaining the release of a British subject needlessly imprisoned in Hungary." In this statement which was, we are told, made in "quiet but firm tones" is revealed all the arrogance of those who consider the arbitrary actions of their governments in other people's lands—for how else can the Emergency Regulations made by the British in far away Malaya be described?—as *justice*, with the imprisonment of a Britisher in Hungary found guilty of spying, which they call "needless imprisonment". This is the very kind of double-think of which the Stalinists are always rightly accused of suffering from.

That British Governments do not always take such a moralistic approach to "deflecting the course of justice" was pointed out by a Labour M.P. when he asked Mr. Churchill, "Are you laying down a principle about the bartering of one life against another, because don't you recollect in the case of Sir Bruce Lockhart, an exchange was made? Surely you should not depart from a method merely because the individual at stake may not be so important."

Mr. Churchill—"This is a matter for which every member can judge upon his conscience."

We feel that Mr. Bellinger has probably hit the nail on the head when he suggests that Mr. Sanders is small fry compared with the importance of "pacifying" Malaya by making an example of those who dare to resist British rule.

We do not suggest that in these matters Mr. Churchill is any more

jesuitical than his predecessors. We recall that in 1950 we drew the attention of a Labour M.P. to a similar case; that of a young woman, Ho Mun Wah, who was sentenced to death in Malaya for being in possession of a hand grenade. The reply he received from the Minister, Mr. James Griffiths, stated that: "As the woman, Ho Mun Wah, who was alleged to have been actually carrying a bag containing a grenade at the time of her arrest, was found guilty by the Court, and as the death penalty for carrying explosives is mandatory during the Emergency, I see no alternative to allowing the law to take its course, in this as in other cases." How simple it is to save one's conscience by saying that, after all, it is only "the law taking its course"!

"ASSAULT BY LEER" CASE SEQUEL

AN example of the "law taking its course" was the sentence of two years' hard labour on the roads passed in 1951 on a negro sharecropper, Mack Ingram, found guilty of "assault by leer". Though at no time did he approach the girl in the case nearer than sixty feet, she alleged that he frightened her by "leering" at her curiously from the car he was driving, as she walked along a rural road. She said he stopped the car and walked rapidly after her, appearing to be trying to cut her off as she walked across a cornfield towards her home. Fortunately, the law was not "allowed to take its course", for by the time of his third trial Ingram was given a six months' suspended sentence and placed on five years' probation. But the matter did not stop there. Now the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina has overruled Ingram's conviction of a criminal offence "solely for what might have been in his mind". The Supreme Court's decision is interpreted as a ruling that the old statute under which Ingram was convicted was too vague to be valid. In its unanimous ruling the Court declared: "The facts in evidence in the case at bar are insufficient to make out a case of assault. It cannot be said that a pedestrian may be assaulted by a look,

Is the Amnesty Genuine?

THERE was no rush to take advantage of the amnesty to deserters. Once the terms of its provisions became known, this could hardly be expected. There is an old phrase, "Beware of the Greeks when they come bearing gifts," and the acclamation which the House of Commons gave the Coronation "gift" makes one wary. That a number of deserters will receive free pardons for the years of absence and the inevitable altered documents is all to the good, even though it be granted in the spirit that has characterised so many military operations—"too little, and too late".

It is too late to remedy a large number of results that have sprung from the senseless vendetta that the police and Army have pursued during nine to fourteen years against people who decided not to serve. However, the overlooking of certain "offences" on ration book and identity card lines is all to the good—especially since one system is dead and the other dying. It is encouraged by the desire to "tidy up" now that these systems are over, for the State cannot bear the idea that so many lives are untabulated. But what is the major drawback from the conscripted man's point of view? Precisely the fact that he is to be tabulated and transferred to the Reserve like other time-expired conscripts. But the "Z" men were called up and may be so again. He does not want to be called up, thank you, he is doing very well as it is in many cases, and it may not be so easy another time to cover up his tracks. Let our politicians have second thoughts. What, after all, is the use of a "Z" man who has succeeded in evading their grip for so many years? Make it unconditional—indeed, abolish the "Z" schemes altogether. What difference can it make to them? Alas, they can get the mugs in

all over again when they want it. Let us have a few years of peace in between wars, at least.

Another absurdity lies in the fact that only war-time deserters are "amnestied". If you left it six months too late you are not included! But eventually you will have to be pardoned—if not, they still won't have caught you, so what difference can it make to them? They are simply hedging, afraid of the effects upon conscription. This anomaly is tied up with the whole wretched conscript system, which no military man really wants, but which is a political consideration, undertaken because of the effect it has upon the Continent who can tell by the fact that Englishmen do two years military service that a supply of cannon-fodder is guaranteed, even though the service is largely wasted.

But greatest of all comes the staggering decision that Regulars are not really included in the amnesty at all. At least, they are amnestied the offence but not their service. Having promised that they will not go to detention by virtue of deserting before 1944 rather than after, they will still find themselves liable for the whole of the term for which they enlisted, having lost their previous service, which cannot be restored before 18 months further service.

It is true they originally signed on and volunteered which the conscripts did not. But surely considering the years of their absence it may be taken that the promise of service was withdrawn? After all, the State went back on its promise to the conscripts—remember when "Duration of war" was altered in the paybooks to "duration of emergency" and then to "duration of requirement"? The emergency, at least, has long since finished but they still can fish out the "Z" scheme. It is at all events a different enemy that occasions any "emergency" to-day! Have not the deserting Regulars effectively withdrawn the promise made sometimes under duress of circumstance or propaganda; the rash effect of unemployment or hot youth? Who supposes that after nine years of freedom they will go back to serve for the period laid down? What sort of service does the State really expect? May one disturb the peaceful slumbers of our generals by asking them to consider the effect on their raw young soldiers by a nucleus of hardened deserters—even if they try to put them all in the Pioneer Corps?

A true amnesty will be one of "cut and call again". Cancel the sentences and the terms of service alike. No more prosecutions for desertions, no more insistence on the completion of service with the Colours or Reserve, and the end of conscription. It will save them a big administrative headache, and they can always dip into their inkwells for inspirations and with a few flowery orations present the whole thing as a gesture of peace and unilateral disarmament. In the end they will have lost nothing but an impossible burden, for—unfortunately—they can soon "call again" if they want to, providing people respond. And if they do not want to respond, no power on earth would make them anyway.

INTERNATIONALIST.

NO REDRESS

Even now, however, it does happen that an innocent person is arrested, and unless he can prove "wrongful arrest"—i.e., that the police arrested him without reasonable grounds—he has no redress.

Last week, for example, a man who had been five months in prison was released, his innocence having been established. The police, it seems, were not to blame—but neither was the victim. In such a case, the sufferer should surely have a legal claim to compensation from public funds.

The Observer, 1/3/53.

London Anarchist Group

(for address and times see page 4)

MARCH 10—Robert Copping on
COSHING—HOBBY OR CAREER?
MARCH 17—F. A. Ridley on
WORLD POLITICS—1953 PATTERN

Down With Education (Continued from last week)

Before anyone grows impatient I want to deal with the question of knowledge. I am not trying to suggest that those who go to school do not learn anything of value; they do. They learn to read and write; they learn to do sums (and some of them—when they are fortunate enough to find the right teacher—even learn something of the theory of mathematics); and they learn a few facts about the world they live in. Unfortunately, the very fact that they are forced to learn what they do produces in many of them a revulsion against the subjects they are studying, a revulsion that the methods of teaching often intensify. At my school, for instance, arithmetic was reduced to a meaningless set of rules ("First you do this, and then you do that")—rather like Court etiquette.

It is interesting to consider the sort of knowledge that is dispensed in these institutions. Reading and writing are useful accomplishments, and any danger that may lie in them is offset by the attitude to life that education fosters. A literate people is an advantage to the State: they can read the notices forbidding them to pass betting slips; they can fill up the forms that are sent out by bureaucrats; and they are more susceptible to the propaganda the State is anxious to spread. A knowledge of history, so long as it is taught in such a way as to encourage chauvinism, makes for a ready acceptance of the newspapers' claims that "British buns are the best in the world." (Often the same newspapers contain editorials complaining that the British are too modest and suggesting that they should begin to blow their own trumpet for a change; but the compulsorily educated will see nothing incongruous in that.) And a knowledge of history, taught in the right way, will secure support for the State's military adventures. Geography also helps: so many parts of the map are coloured red that it is difficult to resist a feeling of pride—often tinged with regret that our empire-builders were not enterprising enough to ensure that more of the map should be printed in this colour.

The rulers of the totalitarian states realise only too well the importance of controlling the schools. The National Socialists in Germany, the Fascists in Italy, the Communists in Russia and other countries, and the Falangists in Spain have all made sure that the attitude to life induced in the children of those states by education is the attitude the rulers want.

The widespread belief that in the more democratic parts of the world education is not used for a similar purpose is, in my view, a mistaken one. The modern totalitarians have all been revolutionaries who have come into power during the present century. It is only because of their predecessors that its dissemination in their schools has been noticeable enough to evoke comment: the contrast between the old and the new education has made clear to everyone what is going on. The democracies are more conservative, and the changes that take place in their institutions, habits, and ways of thought occur more gradually. The education that is provided for their children is intended to produce in them an attitude to life that is more or less the attitude of most of

the adult population, which in turn is largely the result of the education the adults received themselves. The changes that do occur come gradually, and it is only the old who are occasionally moved to protest about "modern youth", whose faults are invariably attributed to modern methods of education, which it seems are introduced by cranks with no appreciation for the benefits of the good, old-fashioned methods of discipline.

For, in education as in politics, there are many reformers. This is not surprising when we consider the fate of so many children. There they sit, imprisoned in some grim building, listening—or trying not to listen—to some tiresome bore, who is only there very often because he has to earn a living somehow and he thought the long holidays would give him the opportunity to travel. There they sit, in the words of Maria Montessori, "like rows of butterflies transfixed with a pin". They are, she remarks, "not disciplined but annihilated". Being a Catholic, she does not object, you will notice, to discipline. Maria Montessori is one of the best-known of educational reformers. Her work, and that of other reformers, did much to make school less unpleasant for the inmates. When I think of some schools I am tempted to say that it would be difficult to do anything that would not make them less unpleasant. However, I do not want to appear contemptuous of the work of these reformers: anyone who succeeds in making school a little less odious deserves our gratitude.

Nevertheless, educational reform—like political reform—is no more than an attempt to relieve the toothache without removing the tooth. The reformers still want, in the words of the contributor to the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, "to shape the development of the coming generation in accordance with their own ideals of life". Their purpose is the same; it is the method of achieving it that they want to change. They want to replace coercion by persuasion.

Now it might be argued that persuasion is a form of coercion; and from my experience of anarchists I am sure there must be some comrades who would have no difficulty in arguing about it for weeks. However, I think a different approach might be more profitable. The purpose of both coercion and persuasion is the same: when we use either we are trying to get someone else to do what we want him to do. In practice it often happens that persuasion is tried first, and only when that has failed are coercive measures used.

We can see in this a gradual shift from simple persuasion to coercion, rather like a transition from white to black through deepening shades of gray. Perhaps the best approach is to look at the question from the semantic angle and say that the areas of reference symbolized by the words "persuasion" and "coercion" overlap. Any decision about where we are to stop using the word "persuasion" and begin to use the word

"coercion" will be to some extent arbitrary, and argument about it—though doubtless entertaining—fruitless.

Whichever method is used, the aim of educationists is the same. Whether they belong to the old school and talk of "moulding the child's character" or whether they are "progressive" and talk airily about "developing its latent capabilities" both want to see the child behave in a way they consider it ought to behave. Both believe that they know what is best for it. Whether they discourage modes of behaviour they disapprove of by beating the child with a stick or by inducing a feeling of guilt in it by psychological methods does not affect the fact that they are trying to impose on it a preconceived pattern of behaviour.

One answer to the pretension that a particular group of persons, because they are said to be endowed with superior wisdom, virtue, or what you like, should have the right to decide how others shall live their lives is, of course, the classic "Quis custodiet custodes?"—"Who will keep an eye on the guardians themselves?"

One of the copy-book maxims beloved of our educationists is the one about respecting our elders. It has always struck me as a curious notion that I should respect someone merely because he has lived longer than I have. I can see no merit in growing older; that is something that happens to us whether we like it or not, and to demand the respect of others because we have travelled farther along our span of years than they have is to make a virtue of necessity with a vengeance. The quaint belief held by so many grown-ups that their greater size and age make them a race apart seems to me to be no more than a piece of unjustifiable conceit. So many of these god-like creature, who are wont to say with such lordly condescension, "Oh, you're only a child," seem to have no talent for anything except making a mess of their lives that we have every reason to suspect their claims to be allowed to arrange the lives of others. As for the claim that the old have profited from their longer sojourn on this planet to become knowledgeable and wise, we need only take one good look at the world they have made to be able to reject it without any misgivings.

MONEY FOR NOTHING

What is a spotter? He is a man who warns street bookmakers when the police are coming, said Edward Charles Cannadine, at Luton bankruptcy court yesterday.

Asked how much he earned "spotting," Cannadine said, "Twenty-five shillings a day for about three hours' work. We just stand there dreaming. It's money for nothing."

Stated to be owing the Inland Revenue authorities £1,700, Cannadine said he thought "money got illegally was not taxable." The hearing was adjourned.

—*News Chronicle*, 13/2/53.

Each Individual His Own Universe

PUBLIC events, however portentous, trouble little the great mass of mankind, who feel with reason that they are powerless to influence them, and in any case must endure their consequences. An aching tooth is more woeful than Hitler, a cold in the head of greater concern to the sufferer than the annexation of Albania. What turns a Foreign Secretary grey and haggard in a few months, leaves unperturbed the half-million who assemble to watch the Derby. His egotism is involved but theirs is not, though later the decisions he takes may cost them wounds, bitter separations, their lives even. Until this happens, the fortunes of the horse in which they have invested a few shillings, are of greater moment than proposed alliances, fallen dynasties, and persecuted minorities. Power, the raw materials of politics, is a specialised taste; most find money and fornication and snobbishness more alluring. Those who are preoccupied with power—politicians, dictators, revolutionaries, reformers, to inflate their own importance try to create the illusion that others share their preoccupation, or rail against them for not sharing it, complaining that when civilisation is endangered, the foolish multitude goes on its way, unheeded of them and their prognostications, too apathetic to read or listen to what they have to say, or to register votes for or against them. Such apathy cannot be wholly obscured even in dictatorial states, will all their propagandist and coercive resources. Though

apathy is made a crime punishable with imprisonment or death, still it exists; perhaps more than ever. How stupendous must be the apathy of one who has for the hundredth time processed with a banner past Lenin's tomb, or roared his salutation to Führer or Duce; for the thousandth time opened his Pravda or Angriff or Popolo d'Italia to find there a glowing account of his rulers' achievements. Flags are obediently displayed, slogans obediently shouted; yet somehow the result is not convincing. A football match, a photograph of an almost nude beauty chorus, the announcement of lottery winners evokes more authentic enthusiasm...

Each individual is his own universe, reacting subjectively to the confused happenings around him, and to the confused influences brought to bear upon him. Entities are envisaged—as, public opinion, informed circles, Germany, Peru, the Workers; but these are largely imaginary. No individual wholly loses himself in any corporate existence. He remains alone, a separate partical of life, with eternity before him and behind, coming solitary into the world, and solitary departing from it. Even propaganda, whose function it is to create mass emotions, a heat which makes the tough ego molten, so that many run together into one brew, cannot entirely overcome this persistent subjectivity.

—MALCOLM MUGGERIDGE:
"The Thirties."

As anarchists we are concerned with bringing about a state of society wherein everyone will be free to live his own life in his own way. We realise that we can only have the freedom to do what we want to do if we respect the freedom of others to do what they want to do. This implies that we shall not try to use any superiority of physical strength we may have to compel others to do our bidding, and it also implies that we shall not try to use any native superiority of intelligence or cunning we may have for a similar purpose. There is nothing altruistic in thus forgoing the possible advantages over our fellows that our natural talents might gain for us if used in such a way; we are rational enough to see that such an attempt on our part would be a gamble that would not be worth taking. Having once escaped from the horrors of our present-day society we should not be anxious to slide even a little way down the slope that would bring us back to it.

There might be some, however, who would fear that unless children were brought up to be good anarchists they might succumb to the temptations of authoritarianism. This, in my opinion, is a mistaken view. Children are natural anarchists, and once they are free from the tyranny of their elders they will be able to grow up into complete human beings quite unlike the warped and stunted creatures that education produces. No society can be free unless its children are free; and children cannot be free unless they are uneducated. Most of the children I have met seemed to me at least as intelligent as their elders; and I found their outlook on life a refreshing change from the convention-ridden approach of most adults.

I turn now to those who will say, "Oh, but you must have education or nobody will learn anything and we shall relapse into barbarism." This is on a par with saying, "Oh, but you must have a government or social life will come to a standstill." There are plenty of instances to support the view that you

do not need to go through the educational mincing-machine if you want to learn something. Schliemann, the German scholar, learned Greek in four months when he was middle-aged—when he wanted to learn it, not when somebody else wanted him to learn it. Our educationists spend years trying to make schoolboys learn Greek—a sheer waste of time in most cases because few of the boys want to learn it. Marie Curie, one of the discoverers of radium, studied what she wanted to study all by herself in a lamplit room after a day's work as governess. Arthur Koestler tells us that his father used to get up at four o'clock in the morning and spend three hours learning German, English, and French before he began his ten-hour working day. I do not think we need worry about a decline of learning if we remove the educationists with their whips and goads and their high-pressure salesmanship.

I hope that by now I have made it clear that I am concerned to attack the whole concept of education, which is fundamentally the attempt to bring up children "in the way they should go".

This, it seems to me, is the very antithesis of anarchism. No matter how much you may try to water it down, it will still remain an authoritarian concept, and the sooner we get rid of it the better. As anarchists we are not so presumptuous as to claim the right to mould anyone's character or to shape his destiny for him. To us people do not present the characteristics of a lump of type-metal to be melted down and cast into uniform slugs carrying the stamp of another's devising. They are individuals, and we want to see them free to develop their idiosyncracies to the full. What we want is a society of eccentrics where no-one will have any need to attempt the impossible task of trying to become like everyone else but will be able instead to satisfy his curiosity and use his talents to the full—a society where children can grow up without the hindrance of an education.

E. PEEKE

Letter

THE ANARCHIST REVOLUTION

A.M.'s impetuous criticism of my article illustrates so well the lamentable lack of recognition (and perhaps even of the necessity for such recognition) of the principles upon which Anarchists may reasonably take their stand, that I can only thank him for substantiating my remarks so promptly.

A.M. seems to have a bourgeois bee in his bonnet. We are not responsible for our origin, and I make no apology for the fact that mine is undeniably bourgeois. Whatever meaning "bourgeois" may have it is as an attitude of mind and a way of life, a sort of *Weltanschauung*. If this simply consists in the ability to find some measure of happiness in the pleasures of family life and friendship plus the desire for a certain level of material comfort in such things as clothing, food and housing, then I have no objection to being called bourgeois. If it means that I do not believe in liberty, equality, and fraternity between all men, regardless of colour, class or race, it is a lie. Or are these "the middle-class ideas" whose introduction into Anarchism A.M. finds so deplorable? Then again there is no virtue in being "a worker" (incidentally, which of us isn't?) only necessity, and as a class the workers (presuming that by "the workers" A.M. means the non-professional workers in industry and such like) are quite as bourgeois (according to my conception) in their outlook as any other section of the population.

In any case, the fundamental division in society is not to be understood by such arbitrary classifications as "bourgeois", "middle-class" and "workers". (These are highly-charged emotive words of the type spoken of in M. G. Anderson's excellent article on "The Emotive Use of Political Terms.") It is a division firstly on the plane of ideas—between libertarians and authoritarians (regardless of their particular social origin!) and secondly (at least as far as libertarians are concerned) on the plane of action—that is to say, on the methods proposed for the realisation of those ideas. These ideas are essentially moral ideas, and one does not evade the moral responsibility involved in their acceptance or rejection and their active realisation or denial (and it was of the moral responsibility of the individual for his actions—and inaction!—of which I was writing) by labelling it as "bourgeois-Christian", nor by assuring oneself that when the time comes the workers will know what to do. In any case, all our knowledge and experience of the past indicates that "the workers" hardly ever know what to do when the time comes.

I can well understand A.M.'s scorn of logic since he attacks me for dismissing "without even mentioning it, the whole theory of Anarcho-Syndicalism!" (My italics.) Of course, no one can find Anarchism or any other philosophy by logic alone, but the great strength of Anarchist theory is that given certain ethical premises—liberty and equality first among them—that are common to many other social and political theories (including those of liberal and socialist "democracy") its conclusions are logical in a way that theirs are not.

As an example of my allegedly bourgeois attitude, A.M. quotes a comment of mine on the Spanish political trials in such a way that it gives a totally false impression of my attitude. Anyone turning to my article will find that I am concerned with the way such issues are allowed to be forgotten and, I think, will also understand that I see the crisis as a permanent and growing one, and in no way as a disconnected series of sensational events.

The motive force of my article was the conviction that almost all of us were standing outside the conflict with hands upraised in horror but not in anger. I readily admit that Anarcho-Syndicalism has many valuable (perhaps vital) contributions to make to the Revolution, but where is the evidence of the sort of activity (the immediate action as opposed to the plan for immediate action) of which A.M. writes? A widespread and possibly fatal misconception among Anarchists is the assumption that because we do not believe in authoritarian leadership (i.e., leadership of command) we cannot logically believe in the necessity of leadership by exhortation and example, but must simply wait for "the masses" to rise. Unfortunately, "the masses" or "workers" or whatever else you like to call them are for the most part not at all conscious of the fundamental issues at stake, in other words, of the goal at which they are aiming. It is our job as revolutionaries, to help them to recognise such issues and to present the Anarchist ideas for their solution. My article was an appeal to Anarchists to make every effort consistent with libertarian principles to shape the future instead of just waiting for it to descend on us. Let each judge for himself whether or not he is doing all he can to forward our (on the whole) common beliefs. For myself I know this is far from so. If those who feel likewise were to get together to discuss all possible ideas for action, something more fruitful might come of it.

London, Feb. 28.

"ANDREAS".

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP OPEN DAILY

New Books...

- Hugo Dewar
The Modern Inquisition: An Account of the Technique of the Soviet Propaganda Trial 15/-
Edited by Muriel Spark and Derek Stanford
My Best Mary: Selected Letters of Mary Shelley 12/6
George Woodcock
Ravens and Prophets 15/-
Norman Mailer
The Naked and the Dead 8/6
George Orwell and Reginald Reynolds
British Pamphleteers, Vol. I 16/-
Reginald Reynolds and A. J. P. Taylor
British Pamphleteers, Vol. II 21/-
New Pamphlet...
Stuart Morris
Neutrality: Germany's Way to Peace 4d.
Individual Action, No. 7, now on sale 3d.

Postage extra in all cases.

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

BUTLER & THE T.U.C.

Continued from p. 1

sideration. If they do, I am sure they will realise that the procedure to which Her Majesty's Government are a party is not one leading to hasty and ill-considered action, but that its broad lines are soundly conceived and designed to serve the best interests of the country as a whole."

The T.U.C. has probably never been so powerful as it is today. Its arguments and views carry more weight with the government (whether Labour or Tory) than ever before. Yet the interests of the workers in their struggle for higher wages seem never to have been so inadequately pressed.

The British trades unions, whatever their origins, are not revolutionary. They do not seek social justice or economic equality or the abolition of classes or the extinction of State authority. These are matters for irresponsible, for doctrinaires, for wild-eyed revolutionists. Instead they see that at the present day, a falling off of trade means unemployment and puts the workers in a poor bargaining position in the wage war. Prosperity by contrast increases wages and the bargaining power of labour. Is it surprising that they consider the economic interests of trade—that is, of capitalism—are also their interests and those of the workers. As such they are concerned with the financial policy of the Chancellor. Once again we see them being moulded into conformity by capitalist processes.

The broad view, the economic realism taught by the Webbs and the Fabians generally and exemplified by the London School of Economics which they founded, is thus completely destructive of the original view of trade unionists as evangelists of a better and juster world. Advising the Chancellor has little in common with revolutionary concepts.

But it is also to be observed that the reformism of the T.U.C. commits them to nurturing the welfare of British capitalists. On behalf of the workers, the trade union leaders seek expanded trade for British employers of labour. This means that they are unconcerned with the workers of those countries against which British trade hopes successfully to compete. Thus the stake of British workers in British capitalism necessarily is in opposition to that of workers abroad whose employers compete with Britain. The advice of the T.U.C. to the Chancellor about British financial manoeuvres is a very different thing from the ideal of the revolutionists that the international interests of workers all over the globe should be the same and should not take cognizance of the international rivalry of employers and the pushing of mere national interests.

It cannot be denied that the T.U.C.'s line seems the practical down to earth one, with no doctrinaire nonsense about it. Anarchists want to abolish international rivalry, want to see international solidarity between workers. They seek social justice, amity between different lands, productive forces used to increase the wealth of the community rather than the individual employers, all peoples instead of only the great imperialisms.

The practical folk scoff at such airy dreams—"We are interested in a stable economic structure and the maintenance of 'our present level of employment and living standards'." The imaginative conceptions of the revolutionists appear to them mere visionary stuff inappropriate to practical men and women.

Yet the material prosperity of the workers is not very striking despite the powerful position occupied by the "realists" of the T.U.C. Nor do they in fact gain security. More important still, their lives are meaningless because their work is without significance or satisfaction. True realism consists in recognising that it is not identification with our society and absorption into it (as with the T.U.C.) that is required. It is the protest against economic sectionalism and injustice, the refusal to accept our society, the determination to build a new one based on co-operation, solidarity and freedom, that provides a truly practical realism.

Forcible Conversion in France

IT is interesting to note that since the mention in FREEDOM of the present sensational kidnapping case in France, a number of daily papers have commented on it, not always extensively. The *Manchester Guardian* (21/2/53), however, now gives a detailed account of the Finaly case. It is now known that the two Finaly orphans have been smuggled into Spain by a conspiracy, and several Catholic notables have been arrested.

"The surviving members of the Finaly family (none of whom are resident in France) have declared that if the children are handed back they will personally request that no further steps should be taken against Mlle. Brun and the other accused persons." (M.G.) This is a "Christian" gesture which comes from the Jewish side, since it is known that Mlle. Brun's decision to baptise the children in 1948 came when she knew that the relatives were claiming them back. The Protestants not unnaturally feel similar uneasiness to Jewish circles.

The *Guardian* gives the following interesting comment: "A statement by the well-known preacher, Father Riquet, condemning the kidnapping of the children and declaring that the Catholic Church has always opposed forced baptism has been met by a vigorous protest from the Protestant side stating that, whatever may have been the official attitude of the Vatican, numerous Protestant children were compulsorily brought up as Catholics in the eighteenth century. Other Protestants have pointed out that, whereas the Church had always officially opposed baptism of children without consent of their parents, it was none the less maintained in the past that

FOREIGN COMMENTARY

Reflections on the C.P. Press Crisis

THE publicity given in the Press to the falling off in membership of the Communist Party in a number of countries, as well as in the readership of the Communist Press, is perhaps intended to give the impression that the anti-Communist propaganda of the Democracies is beginning to produce results. Obviously such propaganda has had some effect, but other factors have played a much more important rôle in any disintegrating process in the Western Communist parties. In America, for instance, only a courageous or stubborn man will carry

his party card and receive the party literature. With almost every profession closed to a C.P. member, with the quite open admission that telephones are tapped and mails tampered with by officers of the F.B.I., and with the reading of communist or fellow travelling literature raised to the level of a crime, and a label, is it surprising that the *American Daily Worker* is almost on its last legs and the Party membership a shadow of its past?

That we do not exaggerate the situation can be shown by a case reported from Chicago in the *New York Herald Tribune* (Paris edition, 7/10/52) in which—

"A Federal judge to-day told a German-born Chicagoan he would lose his United States citizenship because he failed to tell immigration authorities he subscribed to left-wing magazines.

"Federal Judge Michael L. Igoe issued a summary judgment to revoke the citizenship of Charles Anthony Tuteur, 37 years old.

"Judge Igoe said Mr. Tuteur did not show 'good moral character' when he failed to include *People's World* and *The New Masses* in a list of his magazine subscriptions given the Government when he applied for naturalisation at Vancouver, Wash., in 1944.

"Mr. Tuteur, who entered the United States in 1940, can appeal the judgment." And with the conviction in January of thirteen "second string" C.P. leaders, bringing the total up to 87 who have tried and who, with the exception of two, have been found guilty of advocating the overthrow of the United States Government, the C.P. has been in fact, if not legally, proscribed. Indeed, it is only another step before that is

once baptised they must be treated as Catholics."

The last sentence is significant for (as we said) the case is illuminating and revealing when considered alongside the Bertha Hertogh case. Then the Court took a Catholic girl, kidnapped and made a Moslem, away from the surroundings she was brought up in, to Catholic acclaim. Now—Catholics plead that, though the act of kidnapping is wrong, yet the decision of the court which would remove the children from the atmosphere in which they are and place them suddenly in one which is quite alien to them, is difficult to defend in purely human terms.

This concerns France not Singapore! The boot is on the other foot now with a vengeance! Rome, the eternal hypocrite, is like Moscow in demanding one standard for itself and an entirely opposite one for others.

INTERNATIONALIST.

Soviet Anti-Semitism Not New

NEW YORK (W.P.)

Communist arguments that the attacks have been made only against Zionists, and not Jews as such, are no more truthful than other Kremlin propaganda. From the end of World War II, Jews were barred from entry into the Russian diplomatic school. Periodically they have been smeared in the Soviet press. Before Communism took over in Czechoslovakia, the Communist Minister of Information, Vaclav Kopecky, on March 25, 1947, made a speech scourging "the Jewish rabble". The Communist Deputy,

M. Kapoun, on April 13, 1947, charged Hitlerism "for racial reasons".

Especially offensive, however, was the outburst of anti-Semitism in the French Communist organ, *L'Humanité*, during January, 1948. It ran gross cartoons distorting the facial characteristics of Jews in the government, among them Robert Schuman, with the technique once used by the infamous Nazi paper, *Die Stuermer*. One cartoon impugned the patriotism of leading Jews by showing them in the Chamber of Deputies, trying to sing "The Marseillaise," but unable to recognise the tune.

South Africa: Provocative Legislation

THE eight men and women, seven Europeans and one Indian whose arrests were reported in our issues of 20/12/52 and 5/2/53, for "behaving in a manner calculated to cause Africans to resist and contravene a law or to prevail upon them to obstruct the administration of any law, by leading a procession or group of Natives into the Germiston African location", were all found guilty on February 4th at Germiston, near Johannesburg.

Patrick Duncan, son of a former Governor-General of South Africa, was sentenced to a £100 fine or one hundred days imprisonment with compulsory labour.

Manilal Gandhi, Indian journalist and son of Mahatma Gandhi, was fined £50 or fifty days compulsory labour.

Betty du Toit and Winifred Mary McDonald Troup, housewives, Selma Stammelmann, trade union secretary, and Percy Cohen, dentist, each fined £50 or fifty days compulsory labour, half of which was suspended for three years.

Sydney Shall and Margaret Holt, university students, each fined £20 or twenty days compulsory labour, suspended for three years.

CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE

Of the disobedience campaign, a correspondent of the *New Statesman* writes: "It has surprised everyone—and even its friends—by its success and persistence. Originally, the non-White organisations called for 10,000 volunteers ready to offend against pass laws and other discriminatory regulations; and this target was widely regarded as wildly optimistic. In fact, no fewer than 8,000 Africans and Indians have volunteered to face arrest by a notoriously brutal police force, and punishment in the form of fines, imprisonment or lashing. The Government has not known how to deal with

this: far from yielding to police provocation, these volunteers have observed a scrupulously non-violent behaviour, and suffered arrest with passivity."

GOVERNMENT PROVOCATION

The Government's answer is the Criminal Law Amendment Bill, now passing through the House of Assembly in Cape Town. In commenting on the Bill, the *New Statesman* says: "It seems calculated to strengthen the worst forms of extremism by penalising and making finally impossible any form of moderate and reasoned protest against racialism. This, indeed, may be one of the Government's objects: the provocative nature of police action before and during the serious rioting in Kimberley and elsewhere has already suggested that what the Government most fears is precisely the non-violent character of resistance. Once the Government can get Africans to fight back, then an armed and callous police force can do its worst."

The Bill is described by the *Cape Argus* as an even bigger shock than the Public Safety Bill previously introduced. The *Argus* sums up its provisions as follows:

The Criminal Law Amendment Bill makes it an offence to encourage or incite anyone in any way to protest against any law, and prescribes ruthless penalties for both the act of incitement and the act of protest.

This Bill is a complement to the Public Safety Bill and is designed to enable the Minister of Justice to deal directly with the passive resistance campaign without necessarily having to proclaim a state of emergency.

Maximum penalties for protesting or supporting a campaign in protest against any law are a fine of £300, imprisonment for three years, 10 lashes or any two of these.

Maximum penalties for incitement are a fine of £500, imprisonment for five years, 15 lashes or a combination of any two of these sentences. For second and later offences a whipping or imprisonment is obligatory.

PRESUMED GUILTY

It is also made an offence to solicit or accept assistance towards a defiance campaign, and the penalties are the same as for incitement.

When anyone is prosecuted for protesting against law, any person who was proved to be with him at the time will be presumed to be guilty too unless he can prove his innocence.

Groups of persons accused of protesting against a law, or of supporting a protest cannot insist on being tried separately.

When fines are not paid within 48 hours, property, including if need be, immovable property, may be attached.

PROHIBITED

Magistrates' courts are empowered to try any cases arising under this measure, but the penalties they may impose are limited to fines of £300 and imprisonment for three years.

Any person who is not a South African citizen by birth or descent and who is convicted of protesting against laws, inciting others to protest, or solicits or receives assistance towards a defiance campaign, may be removed from the country and shall thereafter be a prohibited immigrant.

Penalties for disobeying such an order are up to £200 in fines and a year's imprisonment, or both.

Any postal article containing or suspected of containing money or anything else to assist in the defiance of laws may be opened and the contents seized.

done, too. Already last month, a that "the Jews" had "run away" from U.P. report from Atlanta states that:

"The Georgia Legislature passed unanimously and without debate a Bill outlawing the Communist Party in the state. Membership in the party would be punishable by imprisonment from one to 20 years or a fine of \$20,000 or both."

In Western Europe, the C.P. also appears to have passed its peak and to be reflecting the struggles and purges within the party hierarchy that have and are taking place in the Iron Curtain countries. The struggle between Belgrade and Moscow, with Tito winning at least the first round has obviously had repercussions, and the anti-semitic (or anti-zionist as the C.P.ers prefer to call the Prague purges) campaign has cost the Party in Western Europe many supporters and an important part of their revenue. But we think, nevertheless, that much more has been made of the recent announcement that the communist evening paper, *Ce Soir*, which has been published in Paris since 1937, than would be warranted if at the same time an impartial study of the condition of the Press in France had been made, and the position of *Ce Soir* related to this situation.

The *News Chronicle's* Paris correspondent's report, headlined "Millions Desert Red Press", reads:

"*Ce Soir*, only Communist evening newspaper in Paris, and its week-end edition, *Soir Dimanche*, cease publication on March 1. Editor-poet Louis Aragon said to-day rising costs make it impossible to carry on.

"Neither could an 'independent' paper get enough advertising revenue, he said.

"The fate of *Ce Soir* (*This Evening*), founded in 1937, emphasises the decline of the French Communist Party's popular appeal. The paper's circulation dropped from about 600,000 in 1946-47 to 81,000 last October.

"*Reuter reports*: In 1939 there were three Communist dailies with a total circulation of 600,000. By 1946 there were 34 selling 3,200,000—a quarter of the national total.

"But, after Marshall Aid began, readership dwindled until, by last year, only 17 Red dailies survived with an overall sale of 1,095,000."

Against this situation, which must make every good socialist democrat rub his hands with satisfaction, the following report on the condition of the French socialist party's daily paper, *Le Populaire*, will perhaps permit one to view the situation in its proper perspective. It appeared in the *N.Y. Herald Tribune* in December and states that:

"The French Socialist party daily newspaper, *Le Populaire*, published yesterday a front-page appeal to party members for funds, 'without which the paper will have to cease publication'.

"The paper, already down to one sheet, is printed in northern France because costs there are cheaper than in Paris, and has a circulation of 28,000, compared to 278,000 in 1945.

"By comparison, the official Communist party organ, *L'Humanité*, has a circulation of 174,800."

Thus we see that whereas the circulation of the C.P. press has fallen to one-third of its 1946 circulation, that of the Democratic Socialist press for the same period has dropped to one-tenth. And even *Ce Soir* which has ceased publication had a circulation nearly three times as large as *Le Populaire*.

Since 1945, when the "liberation" of Europe witnessed the birth of hundreds of newspapers, periodicals and magazines of every tendency and ism, there has taken place a process of elimination or absorption of the small by the big, and with few exceptions the sensational and subsidised publications have survived and the rest have disappeared. If anything, one can say that *Ce Soir* has held out longer than most, and it is little consolation to reflect that the *Samedi-Dimanche* type of publications go on selling by the million, any more than that the *News of the World* is to be found in every home in England. The fact of the matter is that the public interested in serious newspapers anywhere in the world to-day is a very small one.

Anarchism & Community

I READ with interest and some sympathy the article, "The Anarchist Revolution" (FREEDOM, Feb. 14). In my opinion, the achievement of some synthesis of thought and action is essential in the Anarchist movement if it is to have any effect on the direction of human affairs, especially urgent is some action in those countries where anarchists still have some freedom of thought and action.

To me, anarchism means to be without "isms" and to approach life without preconceived ideas as far as environment permits. Men are scientific when dealing with inanimate objects but are wholly irrational when it comes to living.

Education, religious and political ideas and institutions guide the thoughts and actions of our fellow men along certain lines and leads one to feel that a revolutionary change in the classic sense is not possible to-day. Political and religious "pie in the sky", is an illusion that can also easily blight anarchist thought, unless anarchists are prepared to experiment with living together now. Obviously we have to live together and to live we have to eat, and food production and the secondary productive activities must be a co-operative effort. For the mass of the people, life is not spiritually or physically satisfying. Technical advances have failed to solve the problem of providing sufficient food for the human race, it is a fact that the highly mechanised farm has a lower yield per acre than the small not so efficient farm. Therefore we must learn how far modern tools can help man in his physical needs and need of self-expression. The importance of art in and the art of living on

securing the rational use of the science of life cannot be under-estimated, for it is the art of living that can give science significance.

The most important thing of all is how can we as anarchists be of some significance and the answer is, to my mind, to live as anarchists. Not as irresponsible parasites or hermits, but with others experimenting with social organisation and socially useful production having contact with our neighbours but achieving some economic independence of the existing social order. To continue to live as a family unit without present legal forms or without legal ties is to make our anarchism sterile. The proposition as I see it is for anarchists to co-operate, starting with small units, pooling property, labour-power, skill and knowledge, and acquire the means of production with the surplus such pooling will bring. The necessity of production should be in most cases land, for I think it important for stability that self-sufficiency in food production should be primary. Here in food production lies an important key to the health of the individual members of the community, for a successful community, in my view, must be a healthy one.

If such communities were technically sound and manifestly happy, I believe that they would have a profound effect on the surrounding social order. Experience would determine the optimum size of such a community but they should be large enough to be able to cope with the free education of the children and to assist in economic support of other such ventures. Such communities would synthesise the advantages

of large families with the need of individuals to limit their progeny in the interests of the general economic situation.

Thought and discussion without experiment is sterile as art is sterile until it is expressed. Will it be by our works that people know us?
Colchester, Feb. 18. ALAN ALBON.

CHAPLIN REMAINING IN EUROPE?

CHARLIE CHAPLIN is reported to have decided to build film studios in the French-speaking part of Switzerland, and his representatives are now making enquiries for suitable sites. This news following on the sale of his studios in Hollywood, would indicate that Mr. Chaplin is intending to settle in Europe. This is good news, but it is to be hoped that he will make at least one trip to the United States just for the sake of testing the official statements made when he sailed for Europe that if he returned he would be "screened" by Immigration Officers to ascertain whether according to the terms of the McCarran Act he was a suitable person to be allowed entry to the United States! Such a chance to make the law look an ass should not be missed by the world's greatest debunker!
London, Feb. 22. V.E.

The Anarchist Revolution

THE first statement I have to quarrel with in the article "The Anarchist Revolution" (Part 2, FREEDOM, 21/2/53), is the assertion that suffering and action are inseparable. I seem to have heard it before somewhere, possibly through the mouths of Christian prelates when teaching the doctrine of original sin and the vileness of the human body which is seemingly doomed for ever to hurt itself and others. It is, of course, but a short step from this to the statement that violence is inevitable in our endeavours to build a sane and reasonable form of community; also I should have a full-time job on my hands if I were to attempt to carry out the injunction in the closing paragraph that we must kill those who refuse to recognise our right to personal liberty but when as to-day right from earliest babyhood the child is trained for the service of the state through the sexual and other restrictions of the parents those who favour liberty for each can hardly be said to be in a majority but comprise a very small number indeed.

In between these two points arises the hopeless confusion centring round the term freedom; it and the word "power" and put into capitals as if by so doing they will do something to us.

There seems to be no recognition that "freedom" is a social term involving relationships between human beings, consequently all talk of the "freedom to become what one is" is—to put it mildly—meaningless. What we desire is freedom from oppression, from governments, bosses, the class war and any other form of tyranny that one can think of; and what of our killing for liberty and freedom and all that becoming itself something that other freedom-lovers will have to deal with, thereby adding to the already huge problem. There is plenty of room for action in the field of syndicalism, birth control and the freeing of our offspring from the anti-sexual moralising of to-day.
Guernsey. BERT SMITH.
(More letters on page 2)

London Railmen Go-Slow

THE workers at 11 Midland Region railway depots in the London area are staging a go-slow in protest at the delay over negotiations. They have been demanding for months an increase in their tonnage bonus, but, having left negotiations in the hands of the official unions, have, of course, been put off with continual excuses, and have now had to turn to direct action to get what they want.

And this, also of course, has raised a scream. The London Evening Standard carried a headline, "Rail Go-Slow threatens London's meat, fish," telling us that the workers' action threatened a serious hold-up of our supplies. Why do they never carry a headline such as "Union Go-Slow threatens London's workers' living standards"?

Anarchism & Blue Prints

TO maintain, as S. E. Parker apparently does, that a programme "forces" future generations to act in pre-ordained ways is nonsense. A programme is an application of certain principles to a concrete situation, and is obviously useless if it is not modified to meet changing conditions. And the gradual modification of an accepted programme is rather different from leaving the whole question permanently in the air.

An important point on which confusion is widespread is the relation of totalitarianism to post-revolutionary Russia. It is not generally realised that the U.S.S.R. has been totalitarian only since 1929, after inner-party democracy had been completely destroyed. Only then was the traditional Marxist programme abandoned, and its place taken by the arbitrary will of Stalin. There can be little doubt that Lenin would be horrified if he knew of Stalin's policies of the past 25 years. In Lenin's day, the Communist Party ruled Russia; today it is the M.V.D. The differences between the one-party dictatorship and the totalitarian police-state are enormous. The former may be a perversion of communism, but the latter cannot be, as there is not the slightest trace of communism to be perverted.

In conclusion, I doubt if the programme which I favour would be of any

interest to Comrade Parker, as I admit the necessity for some form of coercive institution, which is incompatible with anarchism as interpreted by most British anarchists, but not, be it noted, with anarchism as expounded by its Spanish and French adherents.
Chesterfield, March 1. B. GELSTEIN.

EMOTIVE USE OF POLITICAL TERMS

AFTER reading the refreshing letter from M. G. Andersen (FREEDOM, 21/2/53) I suggest three additions.

(1) There is a difference between individual anarchy and collective anarchy. The former implies free will in the sense of obstinacy or arrogance: the latter implies reference to, or collaboration with others whose purpose is as clearly defined as our own.

(2) Freedom is different from licence. A modern writer once spoke of the few persons who are able "to endure freedom," i.e., who have the endurance and courage to meet challenge with a new and definite language.

(3) "Right" would be with advantage often replaced by "true", and "wrong" by "false". "Good" and "bad" should always be made specific in meaning, and therefore be almost eliminated.
London, W.9. EPHRAIMA ANATOLE.

Review

NO MEMORIAL

THE Korean war is now in its third year. News of its "progress" has disappeared from the headlines of the British Press, to be replaced by sensational news at home.

Last week, in the *News Chronicle*, A. J. Cummings (who, as most of you know is a political journalist and can be described as one of those fellows who help governments to gloss over their dirty work) made brief reference to Korea when making a plea for a greater appreciation of our American cousins. Among the list of their sacrifices on our behalf was their gallant resistance to aggression in Korea, and the loss of thousands of men.

The emotions that this kind of statement arouses in people is deliberately fostered. It is true that American soldiers have lost their lives defending American interests, but so have the soldiers on the other side who are defending the interests of their governments, and what of the Korean people divided, homeless and hungry?

In his book on Korea,* Pierre Fisson gives us some insight into what is happening to the Korean people as well as the soldiers fighting there. He vividly describes, without heroics, the horrors of battle, of napalm bombs of the suffering of people who know nothing of the supposed ideals behind the war and care even less.

Books of this kind deserve the widest reading, apart from whatever literary merits they may possess. Above all, it renews our belief in the stupidity of war and our determination to resist it. If the book does nothing else but this it will have achieved a great purpose.

The author takes us back and forth on a pendulum between fear of death and indifference to it, but concludes with a note of hope for mankind. One of the passages sums this up:

"We no longer feared death, nor did we desire it so as to put a stop to our

sufferings we were young and caught up in the struggle after having resisted it. But life and death are raised on a vaster plane. Democracy, Communism, hope, are meaningless words. One does not breathe for a party, the liver does not secrete its juices for democracies . . . such was our courage. It came from the sky, it was in the ploughed fields . . . always a few cold, sad, greedy men will launch our common thirsts one against the other."

Let us hope that future historians when writing about the follies of our generation, will take their material from books like this as well as from the memoirs of the politicians and the generals. R.M.

*No Memorial, by Pierre Fisson (Dakers, 10/6). Translated by Mervyn Savill.

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.

NORTH-EAST LONDON DISCUSSION MEETINGS IN EAST HAM

Alternate Wednesdays
at 7.30 p.m.

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

Miners Must Face the Facts— But Which Ones?

SIR Hubert Houldsworth, chairman of the National Coal Board, speaking at Radstock, Somerset, yesterday, at a "face the facts" conference of 170 miners, said, "As from Monday the price of coal is being put up, and in my opinion, we have reached the limit of increased prices."

"They provoke an inflationary spiral of costs in other directions and we must, therefore, make the industry more efficient, both productively and financially."

"However desirable reforms may be, they cannot be contemplated in the present financial position of the industry."

"We are not attaching blame to anybody. Improvement must come from co-operative effort, and that can only be engendered at the coal-face itself in the individual pit."

It was hoped to set up at divisional level an organisation consisting of management, representatives, junior officials, and National Union of Mineworkers' representatives, which would examine all the factors responsible for any particular difficulty and promote efficiency.
—Observer, 1/3/53.

No wonder coal prices have reached their limit when the National Coal Board increases prices by ten times the increase in cost of production.

The last—inadequate wage increase for miners, 6/- a week—has, the N.C.B. say, increased the pit-head cost of coal by 6d. a ton. They have increased the selling price, however, by 5/- a ton! Why? To pay for their losses in administration and maintain the payments of compensation to the ex-owners!

And miners have to work harder for that.

JOURNALISTS SUPPORT ANTI-THOMSON ACTION— ON PAPER

THE struggle between printing workers and the Dundee, Manchester and Glasgow publishing house of D. C. Thomson is still dragging on, but in a very despirited way.

Thomson has agreed to allow workers to join the union, but still refuses to re-instate the 31 Glasgow men who led the strike at his Glasgow works nearly a year ago.

The National Union of Journalists so far have taken no action whatsoever to support their fellow-unionists, except to pass resolutions. The latest one came from the Periodical & Book branch, which unanimously passed a resolution saying:

"That this branch regrets that the TUC intervention with the Government has failed to produce reinstatement of trade unionists involved in the Thomson dispute, and urges the NEC to press through the Printing & Kindred Trades Federation for all possible action to secure reinstatement."

The mover of the resolution mentioned the action of Natsopa members at the Daily Express, who delayed production for one hour in protest against the paper's printing of a Thomson's advertisement. He said that journalists must continue to play their part in this fight for a basic trade union right.

"Continue" to play their part is very ripe. "Begin" would be nearer the mark.

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.

F. A. RIDLEY:

The Roman Catholic Church and the Modern Age. 2d.

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