

# Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"Obedient subjects are more desirable than enlightened citizens."

—EMPEROR FRANCIS I OF AUSTRIA

## Moussadeq Out — Shah (& Anglo-Iranian?) In

# NEW PHASE IN OIL STRUGGLES

EVENTS in Persia have moved with a rapidity which has startled political commentators. Most of them have shown little grasp of affairs and only a superficial analysis of the political struggle which recent weeks have brought to a head. It was not, perhaps to be expected that the mass circulation papers would do otherwise than make sensational accounts of the Shah's creased suit and his Queen's torn dress, only to turn attention again to the "weeping wailing Mossadeq" a few days later. But it is more surprising to find such papers as the *New York Times* or the *Manchester Guardian* so completely in the dark. The former, in an editorial written after the apparent failure of General Zahedi's attempted coup of August 16, described Mossadeq as having made himself "absolute dictator of Iran". The *Manchester Guardian* on August 18 declared that he held "in an iron grasp the reins of all the effective forces in the country—the army, the police, the town mobs, the electoral machine . . .". Yet the next day, Mossadeq was under arrest.

Events in Persia were discussed in *FREEDOM* at the time of the nationalization of oil and the expropriation of the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company's £300,000,000 plant at Abadan. Control of Persian oil was clearly not simply the interest of the Persians and the Anglo-Iranian. British government was obviously involved, but the United States and Russia were also keenly interested parties. Hence a variety of very powerful factors were operated behind domestic politics in Persia.

### British Imperialism Can Wait

The apparent ease with which Mossadeq and the Persian Nationalists took over the Anglo-Iranian Company was widely regarded at the time as evidence of the degeneration of British Imperialism (under the Labour Party) into a spent force. Others saw the British Government as in the pocket of the United States, having to go cap in hand asking for help. *FREEDOM* did not subscribe to these views. British Imperialism has the longest history and the most experience of any international force

except perhaps the Roman Catholic Church. American and Russian power may have increased in the international sphere, but that does not mean that British Imperialism has fallen back into insignificance. *FREEDOM* ventured to doubt the completeness of Mossadeq's apparent success with the oil fields. British oil interests could afford to wait.

How different was the weighing of economic interests has been shown in the event. In two years Persian economy has been brought to virtual bankruptcy. One of the contributory causes of Mossadeq's fall was the fact that government salaries had in many instances not been paid. Virtually no oil had been sold and the government's income of £16,000,000 annually from Abadan had ceased. How different the situation of Anglo-Iranian! In 1952 it paid a dividend of 30 per cent. and despite the loss of a three hundred million pound capital asset it paid a cash bonus of one shilling per one pound share! The nationalists may have won in prestige, but relative economic strength was very different.

The Shah has said that Persia needs economic help from abroad in the shape of an outright gift. But such things are unknown except as propaganda. Such a "gift" may materialize and the giver fix no interest payable, yet conditions will in fact be attached. Similarly with the oil nationalization, the decree may not be reversed for political reasons, but it will be surprising indeed if British technicians do not return to Abadan and some measure of control be retained by British oil interests.

### Behind the Scenes

So far there have been no reliable reports of affairs behind the scenes in the governmental reshuffle in Persia. If the *Manchester Guardian* and the *New York Times* are so poorly informed it is hardly likely that *FREEDOM* could have such information. Our analysis as always is made on what we know of the general principles of power and politics, and must remain general.

One can be quite certain that the

British government (and also the other great powers) has been seeking to secure an outcome favourable to British oil interests in Persia, but no direct evidence is yet available as to how the recent coup was engineered. Indirect negative evidence is to be inferred however from the line taken by the *Times*, that powerful paper with an insignificant circulation which has nevertheless possessed almost a diplomatic corps of its own. While other papers were making fools of themselves over Persia, the *Times* never committed itself in an editorial comment at all last week. One suspects that the *Times* knew much about the interior moves in the game and preferred to await the outcome, rather than join in the uninformed comments of mere ignorant spectators.

### Socialists' Line

A curious commentary is provided by Michael Foot's article in *Tribune*. So concerned is he to denounce British Imperialism—though his article is the only one generally in the press to indicate an awareness of the strength and persistence of Imperialism—that he finds it necessary to praise Mossadeq as an "honest, skilful, if stubborn champion of Persian Nationalism". Socialists of the left are still hypnotized by nationalist aspirations. They give the impression that any opponent of Imperialism must therefore be seen as an ally. (Some anarchists even took this view over Indian nationalism ten years ago). Michael Foot seems to forget Mossadeq's imprisonment of opponents, suppression of free speech and press (such as they ever existed in Persia), and manipulating of elections on the

## E.T.U. Guerilla Tactics

THE threatened strike action by Electrical Trades Union, in support for the electricians' demand for a "substantial" wage increase, has taken the form of sporadic, localised strikes beginning at different times and possibly of different duration. "Guerilla" tactics in fact.

On the day set for the action to begin, Monday, 24th August, about 1,000 men were out altogether—the chief site of operations being Aldermaston, the Supply Ministry's Atom Station near Reading. Here 200 electricians are employed on new buildings—all new houses for research workers are inside the security fence, by the way—and their stoppage may affect 3,000 building workers.

Altogether 40,000 electricians may be involved unless the employers' federation—the National Federated Electrical Association—meet their claim.

Already, at the time of writing, an overtime ban has been operating at

two big exhibitions due to open in London—the Radio Show is one—and strikes are likely which will prevent their opening on time.

Work on new oil installations at Ellesmere Port, Liverpool and the Isle of Grain have been threatened with complete stoppage, while those workers who will not be called out will be levied one hour's pay to go towards the strike fund.

Already it is said that one Manchester firm has pulled out of the federation and is asking the E.T.U. for terms. If the electricians use their strength to the full and use it intelligently, as they seem to be doing so far, there is little doubt they can win their claim with no great cost to themselves.

### Sinister Red Plot

ACCORDING to an AP report from Tarragona, Spain: "Spain's enemies are trying to destroy its religious unity by introducing immodest clothes in the country, Benjamin Cardinal Arriba Castro, Archbishop of Tarragona, charged in a pastoral message made public to-day.

The prelate said Communists are supporting a campaign under which foreigners are appearing in scanty bathing suits and other costumes. He said the campaign is undermining the Christian faith in Spain.

The pastoral message is part of a move to forbid light clothing at summer resorts and beaches.

At the start of the summer the Minister of the Interior ordered strict enforcement of the law on bathing suits, which provides that men's trunks and the skirts of women's swim suits must reach to mid-thigh, while women's chests must be completely covered and men must wear tops.

Bathrobes, too, must be worn to the water's edge and donned immediately after each dip.

## French Imperialism in Morocco

THE struggles of Morocco against French imperialism are partly concealed by clashes in the interests of Moroccan property owners' and the French administration has exploited these divisions to the full. But the struggle between the Sultan and El Glaoui with the French as adjudicators obscures the real struggle of the Moroccan people against French imperialism itself.

Abderrahman Ben Abdellali, a member of the Moroccan delegation to the United States recently described in the *American New Leader* some of the real aspects of French rule under a number of headings:

"There is no freedom of assembly. According to the law of Aug. 2, 1914, renewed in 1939 and 1945:

'No public or private meeting may be held without previous authorization granted by the military authorities on the advice of the local civil control authority.

Only French citizens will be allowed to speak at public or private meetings and only the French language is to be used. Access to such meetings may be forbidden to Moroccan subjects.'

"There is no freedom of the press. The people have no newspapers to defend their rights. On August 1951, the French lifted the harsh censorship hitherto imposed on Moroccan newspapers, but then suppressed the papers altogether instead. By contrast, the publications of the French colony and the Residency continue to circulate freely.

"There is no freedom of movement. In order to travel from one to another of the zones into which the country is divided, a Moroccan must obtain a special visa in addition to his passport. Yet, French nationals are free to move at will throughout the protectorate. The French administration assumes sole authority in all matters relating to passports, visas and permits, and grants them at its absolute discretion.

"The workers have no rights. The Moroccan worker is probably the lowest-paid in the world. Agricultural workers, who constitute the great majority, receive at most 200 francs a day, or 3/6; the women get no more than 50 francs. Family benefits are reserved for a few privileged groups, and even they are subject to racial discrimination. In Casablanca, for example, a Moroccan bus driver with eight children receives benefits lower than those paid to his European fellow-worker with only one child. Agricultural labourers work 10-12 hours a day, yet they get neither a weekly day of rest nor an annual vacation. Moreover, they are obliged, under penalty of imprisonment, to give every Frenchman a military salute.

"The people have no social rights. There are schools and hospitals in Morocco, but most of them are exclusively for the French. Only 7 per cent. of Moroccan children of school age are enrolled in schools;

the remaining two million are on the streets. Yet, French children have no difficulty finding desks in the schools built especially for them under the Moroccan budget. After 41 years of the French protectorate, there are no more than 400 Moroccan college graduates. The same pattern of discrimination is found in every sphere of Moroccan life."

The same writer goes on to point out that "The police, Army, finances and administrative systems of Morocco are already in French hands. Under the proposed 'reforms,' the French settlers would become the masters of the country, *de jure* as well as *de facto*. The 'reforms' are one more proof that France has no intention of granting Morocco independence."

Continued on p. 4

## A SENSIBLE YOUNG WOMAN

IT is not often these days that one hears of people turning down tempting offers by impressarios to secure their services. Indeed it seems that most attractive young things aspire to the glamour of Hollywood and its fabulous salaries, or to securing husbands who will secure for them their every superficial whim. Noteworthy therefore is the action of the 22 year-old Olympic ice-skating champion, Jeannette Altwegg, who rejected an offer of £2,000 a week to turn professional and instead took on a job looking after war orphans for less than £3 a week. She has recently completed a year at the Pestalozzi Children's village in Switzerland. Describing her work, in a broadcast last week, she said it took a 10 hour day to get through all the washing, ironing, mending, and housework. The children did their share of the work, and did it extremely well. There were twelve houses in the village and eight nations—French, Italian, Swiss, German, Austrian, Greek, Finnish and British. Each house had from ten to eighteen children, with the house parents and "help" from the same country.

"One of the happiest rewards for our work is to see the alert, happy, and normal expression in the eyes of children who when they came only looked hopeless and frightened—like some of the

Greek children, children of bandits, who had never had a home or known their parents. And you can see the change in the lives of these children in their painting as well.

"At first they drew brutal pictures of war, of suffering—one eight-year-old boy in my kindergarten class made models of a crucified man with daggers sticking into him, and when I asked him why he did it he said it was something he had seen and remembered. Now after several years at the village their drawings are of the mountain scenery and animals and the activities they take part in.

"It is more wonderful than anything you can imagine to feel the love and confidence these children give you and the knowledge that you are needed. They may not say 'Thank you' in so many words, but the way they come to take you for granted and trust you—as they would their own parents—means much more."

During the same week we read that American millionaire Barbara Hutton, who is spending a few weeks in fashionable Deauville, has been telling friends: "I have really nothing to live for. I am just waiting to die."

Could not a meeting be arranged between Miss Hutton and Jeannette Altwegg?

# REFORM & REVOLUTION—2

WE shall not get anywhere in our discussion if we do not admit that reformism has been successful. That is, reformist organisations have achieved their aims and those aims have led to improvements in standards of living for millions of people.

In this country, in fact, we are witnessing a situation in which the reformist Labour Party and the Trades Unions, having achieved much of their goal, don't know what to do next. What with nationalisation and the Welfare State the Labour Movement has got what it wanted, and although there is much to criticise, we are hard put to it to prove to the hundreds of thousands who are enjoying the use of spectacles, dentures, hearing aids, invalid carriages, without having had to pay directly for them, that they are not worth having.

The Labour Party has bought the support of all these—and all those who have been better off since the war than before—and although the Anarchist can show that in the long run they have not in fact gained but have stood still—well, we have to admit that most people are simply not interested in the long run.

"Better an increased Old Age Pension now" the old folk will say, "than the possibility of Anarchy in the next generation". And I think they are not to be despised for that attitude, for they will not be here to see what the next generation is getting.

## Part of the Revolution

But then, if we all take that attitude, neither the next generation nor any other will have an Anarchist society, for Anarchy can only be brought about by the action of human beings who desire it and are prepared to work for it.

So we are going round in circles unless we can resolve this apparent conflict between satisfying immediate needs and working towards a free society.

As I see it, this can only be done if we regard the winning of reforms as a part of the revolutionary process—but as a means not, an end and further that the methods shall all the time be revolutionary ones.

For whereas we cannot gain revolutionary ends by reformist methods (one of the socialist mistakes is that they say we can) we can gain reformist ends by revolutionary methods. And the winning of reforms should be regarded as no more than battles won in the class war—as steps on the path to the free society.

The reformist organisations are all right for their purpose and as far as they go. They just don't go far enough for our liking, but by the methods they use they could not go much further. It is ridiculous to imagine that by parliamentary methods anything more than parliamentary ends will be reached. An Anarchist society must be made by the direct

action of those who desire it and all that parliamentary action has ever done is to take the initiative out of the hands of the people and thereby guarantee that they will not achieve their freedom.

## Self Confidence

But through organising their strength for direct action the workers can not only win all the reforms that are possible but they will at the same time be gaining experience and—most important of all—will be building up their own self-confidence; their belief in their own strength and ability.

This, in my opinion, is the vital factor, the first essential for a widely-supported revolutionary movement. And because you must have individuals with self-confidence before you can have a movement with a revolutionary morale I am not one of those syndicalists who deny the importance of the individualist and egoist anarchist points of view. A revolutionary movement cannot be made up of humble people, of persons without personalities, of individuals who maintain that as individuals they don't matter.

A revolutionary movement can only be strong when all the individuals composing it are strong. We don't want those who do things "for the sake of the movement"—they will be stronger and, in fact, more faithful revolutionaries who do things for their own sake. He who sees that his own self-interest is bound up with the revolution will work for it harder than he who sees a conflict between his own interests and those of the movement, but will fight for humanity, or for the working class, or some other abstraction—for which he will stop fighting as soon as it lets him down.

What we have to do then is to show as many people as we can reach that their interests do coincide with the revolutionary approach and not with the reformist. And in spite of all the false teeth and hearing aids, I think we can do this if we don't adopt an "either-or" attitude but an "all this and freedom too" approach.

For I don't think we should flatter

ourselves that we anarchists are the only ones with any misgivings about the future. The recognition is spreading that the social advances of the last few years are of an extremely fragile and temporary nature. The tampering that is already going on with the "free" health service; the ever-present anxiety that whatever is gained may go up in smoke in another war; the consciousness that the welfare state has been bought pretty dear in terms of individual liberty; the restlessness among industrial workers with the failure of nationalisation to confer on them any greater control over their work; the frustrations that apparently permanent sacrifices are being demanded—these and many other intangible trends are weighing heavy on more and more people.

In spite of all the reforms that have been won a basic dissatisfaction remains—unconscious and more instinctive than reasoned, perhaps, but that is largely because our very efficient educational system has fairly successfully destroyed our reasoning powers but has not yet discovered how to smother the instinctual and irrational.

The Anarchists would say that this groping dissatisfaction is a natural reaction against authority and it is there that the fertile soil lies fallow awaiting the revolutionary seed. But the seed that we sow must be an appropriate variety or it will not germinate. It must bear a relationship with the soil and the climate and the season, or the plant will be a weak thing and will not strike deep roots.

(To be continued)

HAVE YOU ASKED YOUR  
LOCAL LIBRARY  
FOR COPIES OF OUR  
RECENT PUBLICATIONS

THE collection of essays and addresses by Ludvig von Mises recently published by the "Libertarian Press" (sic) of South Holland, Illinois, can be described as a polemical illustration of the author's statement in "Kritik des Interventionismus", published in 1929, that "Science has succeeded in showing that every social construction which could be conceived as a substitute for the capitalist social order is in itself contradictory and senseless, and could not work out in the way its advocates explained".

It is difficult to find to-day a more ardent and competent supporter of "orthodox" economics or a more determined opponent of Keynesian theories. His main contention is that State planning or any intervention in economic matters leads inevitably to Socialism. So the path chosen by Britain and started on not by a Labour but by a Conservative government, is already resulting in something very similar to the compulsory economy (Zwangswirtschaft) of Nazi Germany. Government measures making for Socialism and, in the author's view, for worse conditions both for capital and labour, are the control of foreign exchange, price control of an article causing the withdrawal of marginal producers and then a chain of further price controls, progressive taxation bringing about capital decumulation, credit expansion, pensions, and minimum wage rates. The self-styled anti-communist governments enforcing these measures to-day are (paradoxically enough) carrying out the programme outlined in the "Communist Manifesto", using political supremacy to wrest, by degrees, all capital from the bourgeoisie. This, wrote Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, "cannot be effected except by means of despotic inroads on the rights of property and on the conditions of bourgeois production; by means of measures, therefore, which appear economically insufficient and untenable, but which in the course of the movement outstrip themselves, necessitate further inroads upon the old social order, and are unavoidable as a means of entirely revolutionizing the mode of production".

Mises also attacks the fallacy that democratic institutions can work satisfactorily where the government has full control of all production activities and the individual citizen is bound to obey unconditionally all orders issued by the central planning board. "The idea," he writes, "that political freedom can be preserved in the absence of economic freedom, and vice versa, is an illusion. Political freedom is the corollary of economic freedom." And he adds, quite correctly, "The fathers of socialism and modern interventionism were fully aware

that their own programmes were incompatible with the political postulates of liberalism. The main target of their passionate attacks was liberalism as a whole".

There are no loop-holes in capitalism, and no middle-of-the-road policy except as a transition to socialism, communism, planning or state capitalism which all mean the same thing. Mises is most emphatic about the impossibility of conciliation or compromise between the socialist system and that of *laissez-faire*. As he is not concerned with pre-capitalist economic systems nor with anarchist theories and experiments, it is for him obvious and peremptory that there is no third road. Scorning the appellations of royalist economist and Wall Street sycophant frequently levelled at him and his school, he endorses the whole of the capitalist system, and holds that a free market economy best serves the common man.

While welcoming the competent and outspoken opinions of this twentieth-century orthodox economist in denouncing what we may call the crypto-communist teaching of economics in Western universities, and trends towards a compulsory economy in still proudly democratic Western states, we are far from agreeing with him about the blessings of the old-style capitalist system. In the hope of putting forward at some future date some principles and features of an anarchist-inspired economy, we wish to give now the main reasons why the capitalist system is to us unacceptable.

(1) For the average worker under capitalism there may be the freedom of choosing one boss and rejecting another, and also, occasionally, by saving or limiting his desires, the freedom of taking an unpaid holiday from work. Under the economic state instead there is only one boss, and the worker is entirely at his mercy, getting severely punished if he shows signs of disapproval or dislike, and there are no holidays for him except those that his boss decides. But from an anarchist point of view both systems transform the social necessity of work into an alienation of the individual's freedom. The capitalist may speak of his factory and the bureaucrat of his department, but the average man is but a unit of labour or administration in a mechanized substitute of society. He is the object, the property, the tool of this mechanized substitute, and never enjoys that sense of fulfilment, self-realization and integration that would be his if the economic and social unit in which he

# GEORGE ORWELL

GEORGE ORWELL, by Tom Hopkinson. (British Council, 2s.)

That time at least Orwell was under no illusion. GEORGE WOODCOCK.

WITHIN this 40 page pamphlet Tom Hopkinson has contrived to include the biographical sketch-plan of Orwell's life and an overall critical view of his work; taking into account the superficiality inevitable in such an approach, it is a masterpiece of condensation. The criticism is, on the whole, sound, and Hopkinson probes into many of the weak points of Orwell's social attitude, as well as giving full credit for his literary achievement.

From a biographical point of view, there are some distortions. Hopkinson exaggerates Orwell's physical ineptitudes (it is just not true that "the cigarettes he rolled continually fell to pieces"—I found Orwell enviably able in this occupation), and he makes too much of his tendency to feel himself persecuted. It is true that Orwell was something of a sorehead, but not entirely without reason. It is a fact that the radical writer makes enemies, and, perhaps more important, he encounters a timidity on the part of editors and publishers to take the responsibility of accepting his more outspoken work. Orwell encountered this enmity and this timidity, and reacted with a bitterness that was perhaps extreme, but certainly understandable. Here again Hopkinson tends to distort facts to suit his argument. He says that Orwell "fancied a leading London publisher was persecuting him by trying to prevent *Animal Farm* from being published." This was no fancy on Orwell's part; I heard at the time from a director of another publishing house the hostile report of *Animal Farm* which had been spread by this "leading publisher".

## ALL DELINQUENTS!

MR. JOHN B. MAYS, poet and warden of the Liverpool University Settlement had some interesting things to say about juvenile delinquency last week at the summer school at the Howard League for Penal Reform. He had made, he said, an intensive survey of a small group of young people and found that 40 per cent. of that group were officially delinquent at some stage of their lives, and that another 40 per cent. were unofficially delinquent. He had grave doubts whether there had not been some delinquency in the remaining 20 per cent.

This group was a fairly typical cross-section of the community, and 80 per cent. of delinquency was an astonishing figure. But he also discovered that the period of delinquency was very short, and that the frequency of the offences became less and less until, in late adolescence, it vanished altogether. He thought, therefore, that much juvenile delinquency was nothing more or less than childish behaviour.

When he questioned young people about stealing from multiple stores, he found that they had no sense of guilt and would reply that the stores had "pots of money" and that in any case they charged fantastic prices for their goods, which was the same as stealing from the public. But these youngsters would not steal from one-man shops or from vans when the "driver might get the blame," or from old people.

He was certain that in Britain the areas where there was the most juvenile delinquency were nearly always adjacent to the industrial parts of large cities. They were nearly always areas where bad housing was chronic. There was also, in his own area, an almost complete failure of the educational system, and it seemed that the Education Act of 1944 had as yet no effect on the young people. In one district only 1 per cent. of the children were going to the grammar school.

# The Capitalist System

lives and works belonged to him.

(2) A government, the more so the more it is centralized, cannot be neutral. A policy of *laissez-faire* is to the exclusive advantage of the capitalists because all initiative rests with them. When the workers took the initiative *laissez-faire* governments declared trade unions illegal, and often broke strikes by police intervention. Later on governments passed legislation to the detriment of the capitalist class, and where the capitalist class was eliminated, the government took its place in the exploitation of workers, and made a far more extensive use of police methods to render impossible all initiative on their part.

(3) A particular feature of capitalism is the idolization of money, and the supreme power resulting to those who own it. All social and cultural activities become commercialized. Everything is tainted, corruptible and venal. Even churches have to resort to advertising and compete with one another in capitalist fashion. We may be thankful to capitalism for having abolished the predatory warrior, but it has also abolished the saint. We are not, however, so much nostalgic about types of man capitalism has relegated to the past as we are resentful for the impediments it has erected against the emergence of a new type of man, whose supreme value is not money nor the political power coveted and idolized by the undertaker of capitalism, the socialist and communist man.

(4) Mises writes: "There are no means by which the height of wage rates and the general standard of living can be raised other than by accelerating the increase of capital as compared with population". Now, one of the most striking features of capitalist development is the tremendous pace at which the population of the world has multiplied, and there are no signs that State-controlled economies can or intend to slow down its momentum. But there are no guarantees that the per-head quota of capital invested will increase accordingly. A different ratio between the two in different countries has proved to be one of the main incentives to international enmity and war. Even in a unified world there are limits to the population it can support, and limits also, we believe, to the progressive accumulation of new capital, required for the improvement of technological methods of production. Capitalism has not only created the mass-men and the proletarians but has also made the quantitative aspect of men override all their qualitative aspects.

It has created the problem of population control, which means that, excluding war and starvation, somebody may have to decide how many people have to be born and how many to die.

(5) In their arguments against State interventionism the advocates of free enterprise claim that an unhampered market and competitive manufacture are the best means of securing that the consumer will get the best quality of the articles he wants at the cheapest possible price. That would be true of it were not inherent in competition to gradually limit and finally abolish itself. The formation of trusts and cartels and finally of monopolies with the concentration of capital in ever fewer hands leads to a control of economy not on the consumers' part but on the part of combines, which differ from that of State capitalism simply in that they are not directly burdened with political responsibilities and social services and disservices. Operating on an international scale such combines will abstain from investing their capitals in certain countries if it pays them more to invest them in others, and the result is colonialism, a feature communist Russia has inherited as soon as the opportunity arose. Furthermore by means of advertising and the sponsoring and control of mass-media it is possible for capitalists so to influence the consumer as to elicit and direct his wants to a very large extent.

(6) Although, in the opinion of Mises, crises are mainly due to State interference, other factors cannot be excluded. Obviously in a stationary or retrogressive economy, but also through temporary maladjustments in a progressive one, to the loss of certain capitalist concerns there corresponds a loss on the part of the workers, usually in the form of unemployment. The capitalist may still remedy his loss or else he will sink into the mass of the proletarians, but in crises and unemployment the workers are left helpless, and many starve. It is the effect of capital malinvestment and shifts and shrinkings of markets on millions of people depending for their living on their weekly wages that has given mass support to the open or crypto totalitarian parties which have replaced or are replacing free economy with State control. The congenital vice of capitalism is to consider labour as a commodity, callously refusing responsibility for the discomfort, misery and death that the non-utilization of this commodity means to ever greater numbers of human lives. GIOVANNI BALDELLI.

## FREEDOM BOOKSHOP OPEN DAILY

OPEN 10 a.m. to 6.30; 5.0 SATURDAYS

### New Books . . .

*Kinsey's Sexual Behaviour in the Human Female* will be available at the beginning of October, price 50/-. Orders now accepted.

*Ethics* Peter Kropotkin, now 6/-  
*Great French Revolution*  
Peter Kropotkin (two vols.) 12/6

### Reprints . . .

*Restoration Plays*  
(ed. E. Gosse) Everyman 6/-  
*Shorter Novels of the Eighteenth Century* (Jonson, Walpole,  
Beckford) Everyman 6/-

*Head and Hand in Ancient Greece*  
(B. Farrington) Thinkers 1/6

### Pamphlets . . .

*Race and Culture* Michael Leiris  
*Race and Psychology* Otto Klineberg  
*Race and Biology* Leslie C. Dunn  
*Race and Society* Kenneth Little  
*Racial Myths* Juan Comas  
*Roots of Prejudice* Arnold M. Rose  
*Race and History* Claude Levi-Strauss  
*The Significance of Racial Differences* Geoffrey M. Morant

U.N.E.S.C.O. 1/6 each  
*Conscientious Objectors: Their Position in 1953* (C.B.C.O.) 6d.

### Periodicals . . .

*Perspective No. Four*  
(Contributors: Saroyan, Stegner, E. B. White, Gilbert Seldes, Edmund Wilson).  
Some copies No. Three available

Resistance, August 1953 6d.  
Individual Action No. 14 3d.  
Prometheus No. 2 6d.

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

## "OUR SEX-SODDEN NEWSPAPERS"

WHEN Mr. John Gordon, editor of the *Sunday Express* "declares" that "the Sunday Press is a disgrace to Britain" he echoes our sentiments! The point of disagreement between us is that Mr. Gordon excludes his own newspaper from the charge. The disagreement is based on a different conception of values. Mr. Gordon is horrified by what he calls the Press' infection "with a sex mania as virulent as that which regularly lands individual pervers in the dock at the Old Bailey." He believes that it is time "the Churches, the leaders of the nation, and all good citizens challenged this iniquity openly and vigorously and stamped it out before it rots the nation". In the same article Mr. Gordon says that it "may be argued that the real solution lies with the public themselves. If they did not buy those newspapers the blow to their revenues would soon force a change in policy." And he adds sadly: "There is truth in that, but it isn't a course which is likely to be effective. Sex is a best seller. Offer it, and there will always be a scramble to buy it."

Now, Mr. Gordon's outburst on "Our Sex-Sodden Newspapers" as he heads his article, has been occasioned by the pre-publication release of the contents of Dr. Alfred Kinsey's second volume on Sexual Behaviour which deals with Women. This monumental work which has taken Dr. Kinsey and his associates fifteen years to compile is dismissed by Mr. Gordon in these terms:

"A new book by Kinsey, a now notorious American dabbler in this business, provided them with the opportunity.

Kinsey is a very shrewd and clever man at this game. His "facts" may not be worth much; his "guinea pigs" may be a collection of oddities and exhibitionists; but he knows the sort of stuff that makes the adolescents (young and old) lick their lips.

To those of our newspapers whose eyes rarely lift above beds and brothels, the new Kinsey masterpiece came like manna from a sexy heaven."

An obvious point about the publication of Dr. Kinsey's books has escaped Mr. Gordon though, to our minds, it is the main clue to his problem of "our Sex-Sodden Newspapers". It is that sex, unlike any other aspect of human behaviour, has been so driven underground or so suppressed through the teaching of a morality that is contrary to nature (a code of morality established just by the representatives of anti-Sex), that when a Dr. Kinsey produces a book in which he has assembled the data concerning the sex-lives of a cross-section of the community, the findings come as a bomb-shell, and according to Mr. Gordon and his like, these revelations of our sex-behaviour cannot but undermine the nation and deprave our youth. In reality what Dr. Kinsey's work does is to undermine the false standards of morality that are propounded by the Church and the anti-sexers and which have been written into the criminal code. What shocks the Mr. Gordons of this world is the fact that in their sex lives the majority of people have transgressed the Law. And until they succeed in implementing the horrors of Orwell's "1948", and have telescreens installed in our bedrooms, people will go on transgressing the sexual laws.

But Mr. Gordon is mistaken when he suggests that the Sunday Press encourages sexual freedom. Not one of the many newspapers headlining Dr. Kinsey's report have drawn the

obvious conclusions. If they did the questions of sex would come into the open, and would not be expressed in smutty innuendoes. And it is also to be noted that the sex drooling of the yellow press is generally morbid, either connected with violence and murder or in the details of unsatisfactory sex relations which have led to the divorce courts. Such a treatment of sex read in conjunction with its suppression in the family circle and in school militate against free healthy sexual relationships rather than for them.

The work of men like Dr. Kinsey and his colleagues will do much to tear aside the dusty and moth-eaten cloth that ostensibly protects sex, but which in reality soils it. The question of sex freedom, however, like that of freethought or of pacifism, or of education cannot be resolved in a vacuum; they are inexorably linked to the main problem of the free society. It is a point which we anarchists have been making for many years to our friends the progressives in education and sex matters, the freethinkers, and the pacifists who look to "benevolent" governments to legislate for the particular freedoms they advocate, as if oases of sexual or religious freedom could flourish in a desert of political and economic serfdom; or non-violence among governments which implement their Laws and Decrees by the use, or the threat, of violence; or progressive education in a society which rejects individual freedom.

## FREEDOM PRESS

- E. A. GUTKIND :**  
*The Expanding Environment* 8s. 6d.
- V. RICHARDS :**  
*Lessons of the Spanish Revolution* 6s.
- 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.  
Vol. 2, 1952, *Postscript to Posterity* paper 7s. 6d.
- TONY GIBSON :**  
*Youth for Freedom* paper 2s.  
*Food Production and Population* 6d.  
*Who will do the Dirty Work?* 2d.
- PHILIP SANSON :**  
*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* boards 3s. 6d.
- PETER KROPOTKIN :**  
*The State: Its Historic Role* 1s.  
*The Wage System* 3d.  
*Revolutionary Government Organised Vengeance Called Justice* 2d.
- ALEXANDER BERKMAN :**  
*ABC of Anarchism* 1s.
- JOHN HEWETSON :**  
*Sexual Freedom for the Young* 6d.  
*Ill-Health, Poverty and the State* cloth 2s. 6d., paper 1s.
- GEORGE WOODCOCK :**  
*Anarchy or Chaos* 2s. 6d.  
*New Life to the Land* 6d.  
*Railways and Society* 3d.  
*Homes or Hovelts?* 6d.  
*What is Anarchism?* 1d.  
*The Basis of Communal Living* 1s.
- F. A. RIDLEY :**  
*The Roman Catholic Church and the Modern Age* 2d.
- Marie-Louise Berneri Memorial Committee publications :**  
*Marie-Louise Berneri, 1918-1949: A Tribute* cloth 5s.  
*Journey Through Utopia* cloth 16s. (U.S.A. \$2.50)
- K. J. KENAFICK :**  
*Michael Bakunin and Karl Marx* paper 6s.

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

## SOCIALIST WITCH-HUNT NEXT ?

THE correspondence that has passed between Mr. Norman Thomas (veteran leader of the almost defunct American Socialist Party) and Mr. McLeod, head of the State Department security system on the question of employment of socialists in Government service has been made public, and both the naiveté of Mr. Thomas and the cynicism of Mr. McLeod are clearly revealed in their respective letters.

Mr. Thomas is at pains to distinguish between Communists and Socialists. "I assume with confidence that you do not challenge the loyalty of socialists as socialists..."

While socialists obviously cannot be appointed to "a policy determining position involving, for example, the management of our natural resources", Mr. Thomas draws attention to those socialists "who have worked honorably and successfully in the State Department and in various lines of State Department activity abroad, where often America must deal with socialists in office or as the major party of opposition. What is your present policy with regard to the employment of socialists in such positions?"

In his reply Mr. McLeod dismisses Mr. Thomas' suggestion that you need socialists to deal with socialist governments pointing out that by such a logic he should employ communists to conduct America's negotiations with the Soviet Union!

He draws attention to the fact that in the form all applicants for Civil Service posts have to complete, no questions of a religious or political nature are asked except one: whether the applicant is or was a member of the C.P. Notwithstanding, Mr. McLeod gives his personal view that: "I would never knowingly employ a socialist to fill such a position within the Department. It is undoubt-

edly needless for me to point out that this opinion has no reference to the loyalty towards the United States of American socialists. As you correctly pointed out, the loyalty of any individual must be determined by the particular actions of the particular individual.

And with brutal frankness Mr. McLeod rubs salt into poor Mr. Thomas' wounds:

"Just as I am strongly opposed to appointing any socialist to a policy-making job within the Department, I am equally opposed to retaining any socialist who may presently hold such a job. I must tell you that whenever I become aware that any person who occupies such a position is a socialist, I shall use my best efforts to see that he is removed from that position."

Commenting on this correspondence, the *American New Leader* suggests that despite Mr. McLeod's disclaimers "a tacit policy of applying the 'subversive' label to Socialists may be getting under way; if the Administration ever starts lumping together totalitarian Communists and democratic Socialists, at home or abroad, the entire character of the united world struggle by socialists, liberals and conservatives against Kremlin despotism will have been radically transformed."

There may be something in the suggestion. But we must remind the editors of the *New Leader* who have been in the forefront of the "war" against the communist fifth column in America that from the beginning of the witch hunt we anarchists have pointed out that once such a campaign is started there is no knowing where it will end. Already it has thrown up a McCarthy who is now out of control (and is at this moment threatening to investigate the *American Press*). So the *Lib-Lab New Leader* editors must not be surprised if in spite of their unquestionable anti-communism

(every page of their journal seems devoted to the subject) they will be "lumped together with the totalitarians". And why not? They deny the right to a section of the population to propagate their ideas, and in that respect they show an intolerance no less anti-social than the Communists themselves. R.

## Training for the "Rough and Tumble" of Life

A GAME of cowboys in which three little boys were engaged suddenly ended in tragedy, when one of them, swinging a club in the dark hit his six-year-old friend who died from the injuries he sustained.

At the inquest the Coroner told the little boy responsible for his friend's death: "You get used to the rough and tumble of things by playing these games, and it is very unfortunate and very cruel chance that caused John to stoop just at the time Joseph was swinging his club." And turning to the boys he added: "If it were not for British lads playing games like you were playing, we should never win another Test match."

Allowing for the fact that the Coroner was anxious that the lads should not have a lasting feeling of guilt as a result of the accident, his remarks strike one as stupid and in the worst possible taste. That children have to play at swinging clubs at one another (even if they have no intention of striking each other with them) in order to accustom them to "the rough and tumble of things" seems a somewhat curious concept, particularly from a Coroner who in a similar case in which adults were involved, would be responsible for the person concerned being then arrested and charged with murder! Or are perhaps these games suitable training for when later in life these boys will be called to play at cowboys and Indians in the forests of Kenya or the Malayan Jungle?

## Communist Reporting

and unventilated save where one brick had been dislodged above the door."

Two days later on his arrival by air in London, he is reported to have replied to the question "Do you repudiate your confession?": "I don't repudiate it, but you try and be interrogated for 34 hours without stop, or eighteen hours or twelve hours and questions shot at you, you don't know where you are.

"Were you in possession of your faculties during the trial?"—"Sure I was."

The *Daily Worker* report of these interviews is interesting for its omissions. The Vienna press conference is reported as follows: "Speaking about his trial Mr. Sanders complained of long hours of interrogation which had made him turn 'mental somersaults' and sign statements". The London press conference is headlined "Sanders refuses to repudiate confession". "... he said he did not repudiate his confession. He added: 'But you try being interrogated for 12 hours...' When the question: 'Were you in complete control of all your faculties during the trial?' was repeated

to him, he replied 'Oh, yes, I was'.

Mr. Sanders spent the three and a half years in solitary confinement, but this seems to have been the only torture inflicted, and was experienced by all inmates of the prison for political in Ferenc Varos in Pest, a suburb of Budapest. Otherwise, curiously enough, the material conditions were more human so far as prisons go. Mr. Sanders told reporters that he had had a proper bed with mattress and had been given a menu from which to choose his food, which was quite good. Once when seized by a craving for chocolates he was given a good supply on request. He also could obtain as many cigarettes as he wished. In his second year exercise had been cut to forty minutes daily, the third year to twenty minutes. After a year all light literature in the prison library, such as thrillers, had been removed and only classics or translations of Russian Communist works allowed.

These aspects of Mr. Sanders' Press conference are of course fully reported by the *Daily Worker*!

## The Big Fiddles

FOR the worker, the avoidance of any form of taxation is a fairly difficult business. The most direct form of taxation—income tax—is now collected by the employer and is whipped out of the pay packet before the wage earner even sees it.

The introduction during the war of PAYE (*Pay As You Earn*) meant in fact for the worker being compelled to PBYR (*Pay Before You Receive*), while for the employer it meant the continued use of a considerable amount of money. For while wages are paid weekly, PAYE payments are made to the tax office monthly—with of course a week or two of grace—so that the employer has the use of the money he has held back from his workers' pay envelopes for a period of at least a fortnight and up to six weeks.

Similarly with Purchase Tax, which is paid by a purchaser at the moment of purchase. But the retailer or wholesaler responsible for payment to Customs & Excise pays quarterly plus at least a month of grace. This means that they have the use of this money for at least one month and up to four months.

For business men a little extra money in the bank can often be very convenient—even though it must be paid out eventually.

### The Expenses Racket

But this is not tax avoidance—it simply shows how the Treasury allows its unofficial tax collectors—employers and traders handling taxable goods—time to pay, while the worker is done immediately, on the spot—straight out of his

pay packet or straight over the counter on every box of matches, packet of cigarettes, pint of beer, writing pad and envelopes—everything that is taxable.

More interesting is the way in which, quite legally, employers and the rich can dodge taxation. For although they are such patriots, when it comes to paying for the system which pays them so well, they try to dodge like any anarchist—and usually more successfully!

For example, here's a quotation from an article by Bernard Harris, City Editor of the *Sunday Express* (16/8/53):

"A director of more than 20 companies said to me quite simply: 'When I am offered a new directorship it's not the directors' fees I look at. It's the expense allowance which interests me.'"

"This remark, though made only semi-seriously (for expense allowances have to be justified to the ever-vigilant tax inspector), pinpoints the changing trend in income structure since the war.

"Services obtained in kind, instead of cash, the opportunities of making tax-free capital appreciation—this is the sort of thing that has become so much more valuable than ordinary earned income."

A worker, who usually works for only one company, nevertheless has to rub along on an ordinary—usually very ordinary—earned income, from which the tax has already been lifted.

### Death Duties

An even wider fiddle, and a perfectly legal one, however, is carried on in the avoidance of death duties.

We have heard so much about the decline in the fortunes of our noble fami-

lies, who have to throw open the doors of their stately homes to gaping proletarians at 2/6d. a time in order to raise the income to keep the doors open at all, that at times we have felt almost sorry for them. (Haven't we?)

But two wills published recently showed us that there are ways and means of getting round death duties. When Queen Mary died last Spring there were many speculations on the size of the fortune she left behind. John Gordon in the *Sunday Express* estimated the old lady's assets at about two million at least.

When her will was announced last week however (the details were not disclosed—they remain a State secret) it was seen that she left only £400,000. (Only!)

The will of Lord Linlithgow was published last week, too. This gent was the owner of vast estates in Scotland as well as much property throughout the country and was recognised as a multi-millionaire. His will announced that he left £500! (His own bailiff who died about the same time as his master, left £16,000!)

This is the three card trick on a grand scale! For what happened was that both Queen Mary and Lord Linlithgow made over their vast fortunes to their families more than five years before they died—and the law lays down that if that is done, no death duties are liable. So it's a perfectly legal three card trick.

We hereby advise all workers, therefore, who are unable to dodge PAYE, PT and duty on beer and fags, that if they will all make over their property to their dependants at least five years before they die (the local palmist will wise you up on that) their heirs will be able to maintain the stately home after all.

The Case of Harry McShane
OUR PETTY MALENKOV'S

IN the tepid waters of British politics, differences of opinion do not have the fatal results they usually have among the dangerous currents of totalitarian intrigue.

But they are there just the same, and if the penalties or prizes are not so extreme, the bitterness, hatreds and wire-pulling can be just as real.

The sudden resignation from the Communist Party of Harry McShane, veteran leader of the party in Glasgow, has exposed the under-currents of petty dictatorship, bureaucracy and struggles for power that go on behind the closed doors of party meetings.

McShane has been in the party for 30-odd years and his resignation, he says, is a protest against the bureaucracy and lack of democracy within the party. One might be forgiven for asking why it took so long for Harry to discover all this, but it seems that it has all developed since the end of the war, when the C.P. deserted its principles and has never got back to them.

It is news to us that the Communist Party had any principles to desert, save one: "Anything is good which serves the interests of the Kremlin" and we have not noticed any radical change in C.P. practice since the war. We, however, are on the outside looking in. Perhaps McShane is right and there has been a more noticeable deterioration within the ranks, and if so, we are not really surprised, for the increasing amount of double-think required of party members must put a strain even on their well-armoured characters.

Discipline

McShane has been in the party for were brought before the Glasgow committee and disciplined because they did not stand up and applaud the closing speech at the Scottish Congress of the C.P. He quotes the case of an Altrincham member of 32 years standing who was suspended twice by the party bosses and whose subsequent resignation was kept quiet.

He attacks William Lauchlan, Scottish party leader, for his instructions to the members to "criticise" themselves and be "guided" by the officials in this criticism, and he has challenged Lauchlan to a public debate in which he claims he can show that the membership cannot remove their officials. "The bureaucrats use the apparatus to ensure that they will hold their positions as long as they like" he says. "The structure of the Communist Party is of such a character

Morocco

Continued from p. 1

pendence, now or in the future. Indeed, this was apparent as long ago as February 1944, when the Charter of Brazzaville, which set forth the bases of French colonial policy, declared:

"The great civilizing task achieved by France in her colonies excludes any ideas of autonomy, any possibility of evolution outside of the French bloc of empire. The eventual establishment of self-government even in the distant future is to be rejected."

This picture presents a reality which is adroitly hidden by the bland platitudes of—for example—the following from a Times editorial (18/8/53):

"French traditionalists, taking a stand on the proud colonial record of Lyautey and other great proconsuls, insist—and with justice—that Morocco is far from being ripe for self-government. They point to the good work that has been done in spreading education, improving agriculture, and preparing the way for political progress. They argue, reasonably, that these essentials have only begun to be tackled. But successive French Governments have found, as Britain did in India and is doing in Africa, that the tempo of determination for self-government quickens as the years pass."

It is certain that a satisfactory way of life for Moroccans is only possible when exploitation by France is ended together with exploitation by Moroccan property rights. Once again it is true to realize that freedom is not possible while a society is founded on different living standards and opportunity standards maintained on a basis of unequal private property rights.

that once the unscrupulous elements get control they remain in control.

We cannot pretend to any sympathy with Harry McShane however. It is obvious that as long as things were going the way he wanted, he was content with the bureaucracy and the undemocratic practice. It is to his credit, though, that he has not immediately begun to tread the path already worn by Douglas Hyde and Bob Darke—of cashing in on the "exposure" of inner party secrets in the capitalist press. He has in fact turned down an offer of £500 from a Tory Sunday newspaper for an article on the C.P.

But McShane has been too long in the party to sever emotional connections so suddenly. Although it is clear that had the party been in power his differences of opinion, if expressed, would have cost him his head, he is still concerned with the well-being of the party.

Unless the present officials are removed, he says, they will "bring the Communist Party to destruction".

To which we can only add: "The sooner the better".

IN THE LABOUR PARTY, TOO

BACKSTAGE struggles for power are not confined to the Communists. Herbert Morrison was removed from the national executive of the Labour Party by popular vote at last year's delegate conference and has been seeking a means of getting back ever since.

With the support of the large general unions, Morrison is pushing himself forward for the job of party treasurer, which automatically carries a seat on the executive.

Comments

On Not Learning the Violin

IT would be a pity if the unusually good editorial "On Musical Education" that appeared recently in FREEDOM (August 15) passed unremarked.

The question of learning to play a musical instrument and the broader problem of music and anarchism are issues that anarchists have been only too willing to ignore, and it is encouraging to find one writer who has made up his mind to shirk them no longer. I am not referring merely to our opponents' contemptible slander that symphony orchestras will be impossible in a free society because no anarchist musician would obey the commands of the conductor's wand. According to our detractors each member of the orchestra would insist upon giving his own individual interpretation of the work being performed (or even—since agreement about the choice of the music to be played is unlikely—a variety of different pieces at the same time). Though even here it must be admitted that our replies have rather a lack of conviction about them. Perhaps the easiest way out for us would be to anathematize orchestras as abominable examples of centralized control.

Where I disagree with the editorial writer is on his suggestion that the young should be firmly guided through the critical period of their early musical instruction. My own experience convinces me of the folly of such a course.

The instrument that was chosen for me was the violin. It was an unfortunate choice: for one thing the violin was a size too small; for another it

To win the job however, he has to push out of the way aged Arthur Greenwood, still popular in the party but now, say the Morrisonians, too old for the job and due for retirement.

Some resentment is being felt at this attempt to brush aside an old party character like Greenwood in order to get office for Morrison, and in his August Circular, Ted Hill, Boilermakers' Secretary, writes:

"We are now experiencing a struggle for power within the Labour party, and the recent storm over this matter will develop into a tempest by the time the Labour party annual conference arrives. The constituency Labour parties decided last year that they did not want Herbert Morrison on the executive of the Labour party, and to resort to back-door methods to return him to the executive will not improve matters.

"Power politics like power trade unionism has no scruples in these matters. Power to some people is more important than comradeship and unity of purpose. Too many leading national officials in the Labour and trade union movement are trying to impose their will on the mass of the movement, and the sooner they change their ways the better it will be for the movement."

Ted Hill is himself a member of the T.U.C. General Council, where he is making himself unpopular with some speeches not in accordance with T.U.C. policy.

For our part, we think it will be better for the working class when they build up a movement which will not present a happy hunting ground for power-hungry national officials by not having permanent jobs with fancy salaries in the first place.

required a good solid chin to hold it firmly in place, and my elders and betters had failed to remark that my chin had very unassuming proportions.

My tutor was certainly a firm enough guide. He had to be. A lesser man would have given me up after a few days, but he stuck doggedly to me for several weeks. Even after a violin of the right size had been procured my inadequate chin remained. But even worse than that was the finger-nail problem. I have always kept my nails fairly long, and my tutor made it clear that he thought this almost as disgusting as picking one's nose. The prospect of paring down my nails until they resembled the vestigial claws on his own spatulate fingers filled me with a horror that is still vivid to-day. I stubbornly refused to cut my nails, and my instructor as stubbornly persisted in his attempts to blunt the sensitive tips of my fingers, which sometimes felt like lumps of raw flesh after he had firmly pressed them down on the strings.

It was not long before I came to hate the violin and to hate my tutor even more. His attempts to initiate me into the mysteries of musical notation struck me as singularly inept. He was, I fancy, a mystic who regarded music with a superstitious awe; and no doubt he felt that to explain the curious alphabet of his art would have been a form of profanity.

Our relations grew daily worse. I soon decided that I was not going to learn the violin, and it did not take me

What's Left?

ONCE upon a time there was a party that opposed capitalism, imperialism and militarism. It claimed to represent working-folk and called itself the Labour Party; but this was all many years ago. Since it was a political party it had to have leaders to tell the rank and file what to think and what to do. One of them, Ramsay MacDonald, found that causing a little flutter in upper-class drawing-rooms was much more pleasant than the company of the people who had put him in power.

"Conscription is the badge of slavery", said Keir Hardie. A Labour Minister of State for War, Mr. Shinwell introduced re-armament after the Second World War and used conscripts as pawns in the vast game of power-politics. The party that had once opposed imperialism, under pressure from the South African government, sent Seretse Khama into exile. Like the revolutionary pigs in "Animal Farm", the Labour leaders had become indistinguishable from their masters.

A few months ago a Yorkshire Miners' Rally was held in Doncaster. It was led by Aneurin Bevan. Plump and pink in a smart lounge-suit, he marched before the banners and the bands. After him came the miners, pallid, scarred and weary in their hardworn blue suits. On the edge of the procession came the wives with shopping-baskets, children and prams. He treated them all to some fine oratory and back home they went, no better than when they came.

Anarchists have never said put us in power and everything will be all right. In fact Anarchism means taking responsibility for one's own life and the end of political leaders. The Irish Republican poet expressed a thought that was fundamentally Anarchist when he wrote:—

"No blazoned banners we unfold One charge alone we give to youth; Against the sceptred myth to hold The golden heresy of Truth."

R.T.

OUR MUSICAL EDUCATION

THE editorial in FREEDOM (15/8/53) seems to call for some comment. Let us first examine the following statement:

"The educationists who hold the view that the child must be entirely free to do as he wishes at school . . . seem to us to place a too great responsibility on the understanding and foresight of an immature human being."

The crux of the argument depends on what is meant by "maturity". It may mean full "mental" and "physical" health (i.e. psychosomatic health) and the resulting full capability of using one's freedom to the greatest advantage, both for oneself and for one's fellow-men.

Or it may mean the state of being a (healthy) adult as opposed to the state of being a (healthy) child or infant.

To avoid confusion, maturity in the first sense will be referred to in terms of "healthy" or "unhealthy", and in the second sense as "adult" or "undeveloped" (the latter for want of a better word).

It is a commonplace in anarchist thought that healthy human beings should be entirely free to do as they wish, it being rightly assumed as a fact that such people, having high ethical standards of their own, have no need for "moral" regulations imposed by others. It is also a commonplace that the great majority of human beings of to-day are not healthy, and the problem of knowing what to "do with" them is no so easy. Since we have all, to a greater or lesser extent, been subject to repressions, the removal of external moral regulations will, in the first place, lead to attempts to satisfy our secondary, antisocial impulses which have been installed by the repressions.

Thus, relaxation of authority does not, in general, produce any immediate and obvious improvement in the state of society. This makes criticism of anarchism easy, as follows, for instance:

"The anarchists, who hold the view that the individual must be entirely free to do as he wishes, seem to us to place a too great responsibility on the understanding and foresight of immature human beings."

When unhealthy individuals are placed in an environment of complete freedom, there will ensue for some time a state of chaos. This is not caused by such freedom, but by the previous lack of it. Chaos is inevitable until such time as authority is re-introduced (this making the position even worse by producing less obvious chaos) or until the unhealthy

long to convince my tutor that he was not going to teach me no matter how hard he tried.

I have never regretted my decision. It is true that I sometimes lament my musical illiteracy; but my distress is relieved by the conviction that I could easily remedy my ignorance if I had a mind to. For I do not share the belief that adults have more difficulty in learning than children. They say they do; but in most cases it is no more than an excuse for their laziness or their unwillingness to devote to study the time that they prefer to use in other pursuits.

If I were to learn a musical instrument now I should choose the piano. It has the same advantages over other instruments that the typewriter has over the pen: the notes are ready made, and all you have to do is to hit the right key, which I imagine is not a very difficult feat. Perhaps one day I shall learn the piano, but for the present I am content to hear others play it. But I will not make the excuse that it is too difficult, because I am no longer a child.

If I have learned anything from my early musical instruction it is the truth of the maxim that if you would learn anything you must go to the masters, not to the pupils. The hacks who make a business of teaching are all too often those who have learned their subject like obedient parrots, and its only value to them is that knowledge of it will enable them to earn a living. If such as these persist in teaching under anarchy it will be their well deserved fate to be reduced to the condition of Aristides, who, as readers will recall, had only seven pupils—four walls and three benches. The true teacher is the man who loves his subject passionately and for its own sake. You will learn from him because he is really anxious that you too should know how wonderful it is, and your stupidity will serve to stimulate his powers of exposition.

It is perhaps unfortunate for the world that my decision not to learn the violin should have deprived it of another Menuhin. But if you feel that one Menuhin is not enough, there is always Heifetz. And it may be some consolation to reflect that this irreparable loss to music has resulted in an immeasurable gain to English letters. E.P.

group becomes healthy (either by the therapeutic effect of freedom itself, or by quicker, more direct methods of therapy).

There are unhealthy children as well as unhealthy adults, and the above remarks apply equally to both. Thus to deny children freedom because they have been denied freedom in the past (and thus not fully capable of enjoying it) does not seem very wise.

But it is more likely that the quotation employs "immature" in the second sense—that of being a child and thus not fully developed. The argument is then, presumably, that a healthy child is not capable of utilising the opportunities of freedom simply because he is not fully developed. In other words, that a healthy adult knows better what is "good for" a healthy child than the child does himself. It is, however, an unfortunate fact (unfortunate that is, for this theory) that healthy adults are the last persons to wish to impress their ideas on anyone (including healthy children) against their will, and healthy children are the last persons to accept ideas with which they do not agree. Unhealthy members of either species behave rather differently, of course, but they have been discussed and disposed of above.

If the child is to remain healthy, it is essential that he should not be forced to do things he doesn't want to do, even if, at first sight, the wishes of the adult seem "wiser" than those of the child. In such cases, the natural wisdom of the unspoiled child may prove more sound than the artificial thinking of the adult, a conclusion which may be arrived at by deeper thought on the part of the adult.

It is one thing to introduce a child to a particular topic or interest, and quite another to force it on him. The chamber music which I had to listen to in school nearly put me off chamber music for life and it is well known how any interest in literature is killed in the process of "learning" it.

No, I think a healthy child knows his own mind better than anyone else possibly can, and knows better what is good for him. Abercarn, Aug. 22 ROLAND LEWIS.

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

OPEN AIR MEETINGS

Weather Permitting HYDE PARK Sundays at 3.30 p.m.

TOWER HILL

Tuesdays at 12.30 p.m.

INDOOR MEETINGS

Watch this column for announcement of new meetings in September.

NORTH-EAST LONDON DISCUSSION MEETINGS IN EAST HAM

Alternate Wednesdays at 7.30 p.m.

AUG. 26.—General Discussion FREEDOM AND THE CHILD.

BRADFORD

OPEN-AIR MEETINGS

Broadway Car Park, Sundays, 8.30 p.m.

MANCHESTER LIBERTARIAN GROUP

Meeting Sunday August 30th at 7.30 LAND O' CAKES HOTEL Gt. Ancoats Street, (by Daily Express)

GLASGOW

OUTDOOR MEETINGS

from now until further notice at MAXWELL STREET, Sundays at 7 p.m. With John Gallwey, & others

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