

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"Men carry their religion in other men's heads, and their morality in their own pockets."
—THOMAS LOVE PEACOCK.
Melinecourt. (1817).

BRITISH IMPERIALISM

STILL A DOMINANT POWER

THERE is a tendency in Socialist circles to discount the power of the British empire. They talk about the "old lion" and stress the "bogey" of dependence on America. The trend of thought seems to be that "the old nineteenth century capitalist order in Britain was founded on imperialism: that order is changing, and since we dislike it, we must think of it as decaying while we socialists get stronger: collapsing imperialism must give way to socialist policies." This is a rough account of a way of looking at the modern British world which is very common in socialistic and pacifist circles and is not unknown in anarchist ones.

Now it may be true that imperialism is a waning force, for capitalist economics tends to destroy itself. But even if it is on the wane that does not mean that the process is rapid, or has progressed very far. Indeed one may wonder whether the parliamentary socialism of to-day does not represent a more rapid decay of the more dynamic socialism of the nineteenth century than the same alleged process in the case of British imperialism! Certainly it is quite misleading to regard imperialism as a spent force which does not require serious combating. Nor should it be forgotten that it is not merely its economic power that constitutes its strength but also its ideas—what is called "the philosophy of empire". In this respect, imperialism has secured some signal victories, for it has succeeded to a remarkable extent in infecting socialism with its own ideas and outlook, for the Labour Party in power has conducted the empire with very much the same philosophy and outlook as the Tories.

The idea that the advent of American imperialism has sounded the death knell for its British parent is also founded largely on socialistic wishful thinking. Without minimizing the serious effect of American competition—not by the way any new thing, as the history of the invasion of European markets by American wheat in the eighteenth-eighties recalls—it is a far cry to see in it the dissolution of British im-

perial power. The British Empire is founded on competition, on the capturing of markets, and is not likely to be worried overmuch by increased U.S. rivalry, nor to lack reserves and elasticity to meet it, yet such a nervelessness seems to be assumed by the "dying lion" school.

An example which ought to provoke thought is the Persian oil crisis. The Anglo-Iranian company, in which the British government have interests, lost at a stroke an enormous capital asset, an enormous annual income, and for two years experienced a complete drying up of its economic life. Yet when there is a possibility of resuming work at Abadan it transpires that the loss of Persian oil has been made good, and that there is likely to be as much difficulty in finding room once again for Persian oil as there was at its sudden loss.

It is not the first time British oil interests have shown themselves capable of tremendous elasticity and tremendous strength. Francis Delisle wrote (for the Labour Party) just after the first world war an account of British businessmen's reaction to the entry of oil into world economics, which was most revealing. In 1914 the British Empire was founded upon coaling stations throughout the sea highways of the globe. In 1918 half the world's ships were powered by oil, and the war had permitted the United States to secure a seemingly impregnable hold over world oil resources. Yet in a very few years British business had acquired a secure foothold in oil, and had an effective say in the councils of American oil companies.

Recently the Petroleum Information Bureau has issued a survey of the present position of the British oil industry which makes informative reading—especially to those

JUDGES ON STRIKE

Bolivian judges on a sit-down strike for higher salaries, are refusing to try any cases. The Government says it is illegal to increase Government employees pay.

—News Chronicle, 26/9/53.

DECLINE OF THE CHURCH

ON matters of the Church, the second highest authority in Britain is the Archbishop of York—Dr. Cyril Garbett.

We therefore should not argue with him when he tells of the condition of the Church to-day, and indeed we are, in this respect, only too pleased to accept his words as gospel.

In a speech recently at Selby, Yorkshire, Dr. Garbett spoke of the "general retreat from Christianity" in England, as seen in the decline in church-going. As a result of this, bemoaned the Archbishop, "Neither national nor local opinion pays the same heed as once it did to the voice of the Church".

Pointing out that theft is no longer regarded as a serious crime provided it is not on too large a scale and is undetected, Dr. Garbett went on:

"Equally disturbing has been the departure from the Christian teaching on marriage as a life-long union between man and woman.

"One of the foundations of national character is the building of the Christian home on the permanency of marriage. But it is now attacked and undermined as it never has been since Europe was converted to Christianity.

"The Christian teaching on chastity has become for many a target of scorn. Some of our present-day novelists are almost fanatical in preaching a new gospel of sexual licence, and their autobiographies too often show that they practise what they preach.

"To-day sexual licence is widely assumed as necessary for self-realisation or as praiseworthy because it gives pleasure."

The Archbishop commented on the part industrialisation played in undermining religion but then went on to maintain that in some directions the moral standards of our time showed an advance on the past. There was a far stronger sense of the necessity of social justice, he said.

The Anarchist movement can congratulate itself on having played a part in both the destructive side of undermining the Church's grip on people's minds and the constructive side in helping to develop the concepts of social justice.

The social ethics of Anarchism are based upon humanism, and as such are far more deeply rooted than those of Christianity, based on authority, obscurantism and superstition.

who discount the economic power of the Empire. The following quotations are taken from the *Times'* summary of this survey:

"It used to be said that the wealth of Britain was founded on coal. It is probably still the case that coal is the greatest source of energy even if an increasing share now emerges as electrical power. But coal is being rivalled by oil. . . .

"Oil powers and lubricates Britain's 4,500,000 road vehicles, her aircraft, most of her merchant ships, her farm tractors, her industrial machinery, and plant. Oil provides her with hundreds of derivatives on which industries as diverse as synthetic soap powders, insecticides, plastics, and paint are based. To meet this tremendous demand, British oil companies, in association with Dutch interests, have extended their activities all over the globe, and now produce 100 millions tons of crude oil a year, or more than a third of all oil entering into world trade. They have wells in all the main oil-bearing regions outside the Soviet territories, notably in the Middle East and Venezuela, where they account for about one-third of all production, and in the Far East, where they account for about two-thirds. Their stake in the marketing of oil is even greater, for they handle up to 50 per cent. of the world's trade, and have even been forced to buy crude or refined oil from American companies to keep abreast of demand. Refining capacity is over 100 million tons of crude a year, with additional plant under construction. To move this torrent of crude and refined oil they rely on a tanker fleet which, with a carrying capacity of 6,500,000 tons, is second only to that of the United States, and represents about 20 per cent. of world tanker tonnage, while at the beginning of the year over 50 per cent. of all tonnage on order in

Continued on p. 4

PAUL ROBESON REFUSED PASSPORT FOR WALES

THE world-famous American Negro singer Paul Robeson has been refused restoration of his passport. He had accepted an invitation to attend the South Wales miners' annual Eisteddfod at Porthcawl on October 3, but the American State Department has made it impossible for him legally to leave America.

The State Department asked Mr. Robeson in July, 1950, to give up his passport because it was considered that any trip he might make abroad "would not be in the interests of the United States." A spokesman of the Department said Mr. Robeson had made speeches disparaging the policy of the United States and praising Russia. A suit seeking the restoration of the passport was dismissed in 1952.

Mr. W. Paynter, South Wales Miners' president, said that the executive intended to ask their M.P.'s to try to get the decision reversed. It is difficult to see, however, just what influence British Labour M.P.'s are likely to have with the all-mighty State Department of America.

Mr. Paynter went on to say: "This action by the American State Department confirms the doubts of many people as to its conduct in relation to Negro subjects and reveals that liberty and freedom for the individual as practised in the States is far different from what they preach abroad."

This, of course, goes for all governments, but we wonder why Mr. Paynter should have stressed the colour of Robeson's skin rather than that of his politics. It is because Robeson is a fellow-traveller, to say the least, that his passport is withheld, not because he is a Negro, although that certainly adds an extra reason for the defenders of the Free World to show they have as much contempt for freedom as their opposite numbers behind the iron curtain.

FOREIGN COMMENTARY

EUROPE: AN ARMED PRISON?

IF the Americans get their way—and they seem to be—Europe will be converted into a fortified camp, in which we shall be as much the prisoners on the outside of the Iron Curtain as are the unfortunate people who now live behind it. The agreement with Franco for the establishment of naval and air bases in Spain which was signed in Washington last week-end is yet another step not only in the encirclement of Russian dominated Europe but of Europe itself. Welcoming the pact, the *New York Herald Tribune* (N.Y. edition) describes how this new "link" is fitting into the rest of the chain:

"Now the whole northern shore of that vital inland sea [the Mediterranean] has been linked, in one form or another, in a defensive alliance, guarded by ships and air bases and by a substantial ground army. The structure of Mediterranean guarantees is complex: Turkey, Greece, Italy, France, Great Britain and the United States are joined in NATO; Yugoslavia has less formal ties with members of this combination and now Spain is brought in solely by agreement with America. There are sources of friction, too, within the combination, since Franco's Spanish government is far from popular with several of the NATO nations, Italy is at odds with Yugoslavia and the unresolved problem of the Arab peoples on the southern coast of the Mediterranean presents possible difficulties."

At the same time as this link was being forged, the North Atlantic Council was approving a programme for the production in Europe of more than \$1,000 million (£340 million) worth of ammunition. Every member State of N.A.T.O. (with the exception of Luxemburg) will be busy turning out every type of ammunition from small arms bullets to heavy calibre shells. Contemporaneously with this plan—"the largest so far prepared for a single category of military equipment" according to N.A.T.O. Secretary General, Lord Ismay—will be another \$1,000 million plan for the construction of aircraft and ships.

With conscription in force in all countries, the picture—or rather, the nightmare—is complete. Though not quite. If Rep. Charles Kerston has his own way all fugitives from behind the Iron Curtain should be "formed into national military units to encourage resistance to Russia"

And whilst this orgy of waste proceeds unchecked—wasted industrial effort, wasted man-power, wasted raw materials and natural resources—seven tenths of the world's population, on the United Nations own admission, have not enough to eat to keep them in "health and strength".

Trading with the "Enemy" Controversy BUSINESS IS BUSINESS

THE High Commissioner for Ceylon in Britain did not mince his words at a conference in Glasgow last week when he justified his country's flagrant disregard for Senator McCarthy's threats that America should cut off with a penny those countries that dare trade with the Iron Curtain nations.

He pointed out that whereas the United States could offer no more than the world market price for rubber, China was paying eightpence a pound more; and whereas the United States would not sell rice in return to Ceylon at less than £70 a metric ton, China was asking only £54. Rice was needed to save starving people in Ceylon, and China would provide 200,000 tons a year on these terms. Ceylon had been unable to get fair and equitable terms from the United States.

And he concluded, with the unkindest cut of all, when he attacked those Governments which are ready to give from abundant coffers "provided that we agree to their terms, and agree to be camp-followers of an ideology and a way of life." Ceylon, he said, did not want any assistance if there were conditions attached. "We refuse to be intimidated by international thuggery."

Tut! Tut! Sir Edwin. "International thuggery" is really not a very polite way of referring to what we always understood to be "democratic aid"!

On the other side of the Atlantic that spokesman for American democracy—or "thuggery" to use Sir Edwin's terminology—was calling on the government to withhold further aid from Britain until she toed the line, and stops shipping goods to China. One can imagine the Senator quite purple in the face as he declared that action should be taken immediately to warn nations supplying Red China with "economic and military strength" that they would not receive "one cent or one farthing" of American aid unless they end traffic with the enemy."

"Of course, appeasers will scream that this means we will have to go it alone," he said. "We don't want to go it alone. We want allies. But if you must fight in a dark alley you do not want as your

helper a man who sticks a knife in your back and hands weapons to your enemy.

"We hope we shall never have to go it alone. At the same time we don't want allies who cringe and surrender in face of an enemy threat or who lick the enemy's hand and furnish him with the weapons of war.

"A nation cannot be half-loyal to the free world. Those allies—alleged allies—must be for us, or against us. We can't take half-way."

There's the problem in a nut-shell: "You are either with us or against us". To our mind such a world can hardly be called a "free" one. Sir Edwin referred to it as a world of "camp-followers".

Man's Inhumanity to Man

DEATH has ended John Pipala's nineteen-year struggle to be re-united with his wife and son. It was a struggle against that part of the Machine called Immigration Laws. In 1934 Mrs. Pipala and her son left America for Poland in a voluntary effort to rectify her earlier illegal entry into the United States. Subsequently, United States consular authorities in Poland declined to approve her return to the U.S. on the ground that she had violated the immigration laws.

In the intervening years Mr. Pipala was aided by friends, lawyers and legislators but their efforts were in vain.

The long fight to bring his wife and son to America seemed near success last February when he finally obtained entry permission from the Government, but a new barrier faced him: His kin were behind the Iron Curtain and it was impossible to get them across the border.

Have you renewed your
Subscription to
FREEDOM?

An Important Freedom Press Publication: THE EXPANDING ENVIRONMENT by Dr. E. A. GUTKIND

"LIFE," declares the author of this book, "is not a shuttle-service between the sleeping berth in a suburban desert and the work-place in a factory or office. The resignation with which innumerable people tolerate that their life is reduced to this miserable dullness and drudgery is pathetic—but excusable. Our civilization has not understood how to free the creative impulses and the imaginative spontaneity in the common run of men. It has let them become stunted."

What stunts a tree is an unsuitable environment, and Dr. Gutkind sets out to show in this book why our own environment tends to stunt people and what sort of environment will tend to set people free.

It is a characteristic of many human institutions that, springing from social need, they persist after society and its needs have completely changed. They outlive their usefulness. In this category Gutkind places the whole of our man-made physical surroundings.

"The old forces which have shaped our environment as we know it have lost their formative power, and the most momentous of the agencies which have given idea and form in the past to our cities and buildings are also those which are in the most advanced state of meaninglessness and obsolescence. They are the Church, the State and Tradition.

"This trinity was, and still is, for millions the outermost limit of their spiritual aspirations, of their earthly ambitions, and of their intellectual and emotional advancement. These protective shells are now cracking under the impact of new forces from inside and outside. From creative ideas and high ideals they have degenerated into idols and finally into institutionalized habits."

In his introduction the author relates our man-made environment to the cosmology of Sir James Jeans and Sir Arthur Eddington. On the "astronomical time-scale" mankind is in its infancy.

"... we are still very young, still beginning to move about in our play-pen and to try to stand erect by holding fast

THE EXPANDING ENVIRONMENT, by E. A. Gutkind. (Freedom Press, 8s. 6d.)

THE SHAPE OF OUR SURROUNDINGS

to the railings. It is precisely this intermediate stage between the utmost dependence on others and the very beginning of independent and individual movements which is also characteristic of our relation to the State. A growing number of people become conscious of their own individuality but are still too deeply attached to the old tribal habits and customs of thinking and acting, to evolve an independent mode of behaviour, not as mere non-conformists but as stimulating members of a non-tribal society."

"... As long as the unit of the State, or for that matter of a tribe, a city-state, or a town, was small in scale and dense in structure, as long as State and Community were one, architecture and the design and building of cities grew out of a cultural unity of everyday life and spontaneous creativity which were ever present and never artificial. But as soon as State and Community began to fall apart the decline of creative spontaneity sets in till it disappears almost completely under the impact of the impersonal forces of a State which could not any longer be experienced directly. It had grown in scale and com-

plexity to such a degree that it became a mere fiction—though a fiction in which most people believe rather uncritically and therefore the more sincerely.

"The present State has all the disadvantages of a tribal régime without the fertile integration of an original tribe... The tribal State needs centralization. The essence of a non-tribal society is decentralization and dispersal."

★

DR. GUTKIND seeks first the answers to the questions, "Why do people live in cities?" and "Why do people live in the country?" To find these answers it is necessary to ask a further question: "What needs can be provided for only in cities and what needs elsewhere?" and to analyse these needs he uses the terminology of the anthropologist B. Malinovsky who in *A Scientific Theory of Culture* listed "Universal Institutional Types", juxtaposing seven "Principles of Integration", by which he meant the different purposes for which people associate together, and the "Types of Institutions", from the family outwards which arose to satisfy these needs. "Are

there any of the Institutions", Gutkind asks, "which can operate in cities only, that is to say, not in cities as we know them to-day or, to put it more generally, in localities the characteristics of which are (a) a considerable number of people and (b) a conglomeration of these people within a relatively narrow space? The reply can only be: there are none."

In order to demonstrate the obsolescence of the city of to-day, Gutkind conducts a brief survey of twenty centuries of city building. This section is illustrated by a series of brilliantly captioned pictures of cities from those of Greece and Rome to those of to-day which he declared are "the product of a misguided and misunderstood direction of economic forces which exert a totalitarian dictatorship over our lives. The growth of cities is comparable to a self-propelling movement. It is an accretion for accretion's sake."

What of attempts to reform the city? The first of these are the Garden City movement originated by Ebenezer Howard and the New Towns of to-day which he describes as a slightly revised edition of the Garden City. If, he declares, "it is a more or less self-contained town

with a sufficient diversity of industry so that at least a considerable portion of the local population can work there, it will inevitably develop the provincial narrowness and frustration which are the unavoidable by-products of small-town life as long as physical decentralization is not accompanied by cultural and social decentralization. If a sufficient number of industries cannot be attracted, it will become one of the numerous dormitory towns entirely dependent on the city for which it was expected to act as a draining-off reservoir." The Garden City—and the New Town are, "an end, not a beginning. They are not communities but artificially created units of living within the old pattern of social and economic environment."

So much for the external reform of the city. Its internal reform "consists in the loosening up of densely built-up areas and the erection of high buildings. This has been called 'the discovery of the third dimension' of height as an efficient means of introducing a maximum of air, light, sun, and verdure to previously crowded districts. To every city its pruned Manhattan!" Gutkind points out that despite the merit of le Corbusier's work as architecture, if an opportunity were found for the applica-

Continued on p. 3

The Ideas of Karl Jaspers

TRAGEDY IS NOT ENOUGH, by Karl Jaspers. (Victor Gollancz Ltd., London).

NONE of Karl Jaspers' major works has been translated yet into English, and so there must be very few people in this country who know the whole of his philosophy first hand. But even if his major works were made accessible I don't think that his ideas would achieve wider or more telling popularity. It is in the nature of an existentialist philosophy to lose poignancy for any other than his creator as soon as the primary intuitions from which it springs are universalized and more or less successfully harmonized in

the logical or dialectical structure of a system. So Karl Jaspers is and will probably remain the man who has best formulated and given inspirational and formative priority to a set of truths by which spiritual life is illumined and sustained. Contrary to that of other existentialists his philosophy is in the nature of a consolation, like that of the Stoics or a Boetius, who wrote in times of cultural decay not unlike our own.

Among these truths the most important is that of the all-pervading presence of mystery which he calls "the Encompassing", the awareness of which is the surest guarantee of veneration for life, the friendliest corrective of the pride of knowledge, and the channel through

which deep, intimate and loving communication can be achieved. It is through communication of what is vital to each, and by laying bare to each other in the sincerest manner our fundamental feelings and guessings at the metaphysical realities of Being, Nothingness, Destiny and Self that the bleakness of our human condition is redeemed, and other existential experiences such as nausea and guilt are prevented or assuaged. To be capable of communication it is necessary to lay down all pride, all false pretensions to strength and invulnerability, and to have enough courage and understanding to confess our failure. "Breakdown and failure," writes Karl Jaspers in this English translation of a section of his work on Truth, "reveal the true nature of things. In failure, life's reality is not lost; on the contrary, here it makes itself wholly and decisively felt" (p.41).

Jaspers' ideas on tragedy, in spite of his claim to be a re-experiencing of original visions and perspectives of the type we have mentioned, are often the fruit of a far-drawn analysis, contain much that is purely speculative, and bear in parts the imprint of polemical preoccupations. When he says that tragedy occurs whenever awareness exceeds power, and that awareness may also exceed the limits of man's self-preservation, he is referring to a universal something which Santayana called Spirit. But when he writes that "genuine awareness of the tragic is more than mere contemplation of suffering and death, flux and extinction [and that] if these things are to become tragic man must act," (p.42) or that "we find genuine tragedy only in that destruction which does not prematurely cut short development and success, but which, instead, grows out of success itself," I feel that he is arbitrarily giving centrality to a contingent aspect of the tragic, and that rather than the genuine tragic it is the heroically tragic he has in mind.

"I have to meet my destiny in silence," says his tragic hero, and on his courage to live and die with dignity depends the spiritual value of tragedy which is man's preservation of his essential identity (p.77). "His resistance, stubbornness, and pride drive him into the 'greatness of evil'" (p.56) These and similar passages are rather difficult to reconcile with Jaspers' contention that tragedy is not the privilege of an aristocracy. There is no doubting his sincerity when he attacks what he calls the perversion of tragic philosophy which dominated the German people during the war, and was responsible for a "delight in meaningless activity, in torturing and being tortured, in destruction for its own sake, in the raging hatred against the world and man coupled with the raging hatred against one's own despised existence" (p.101). His condemnation of an aesthetic interpretation and justification of tragedy can likewise be endorsed, but not so his verdict on the pantragism of Bahnsen and Unamuno, for in spite of the strictures these two authors can be subjected to, doubts linger as to whether Jaspers has something clearer and deeper to offer.

Doubts as to the merits of the tragic knowledge he propounds remain also when he speaks of pre-Buddhist China where this knowledge was lacking, and his giving us Lessing's "Nathan the wise" as an example of great tragic drama, call for many reservations, espec-

ially as he fails to see the tragic depth of the "Bhagavadgita", and denies that tragedy is possible within the Christian world-view. He seems not to be aware of what belief in hell and predestination may mean to a Christian soul, and he has probably never read "El condenado por desconfiado" by Tirso de Molina.

The various thoughts of the book are not easy to link and harmonize. It is often impossible to see to what they refer. Direct experience of the tragic, the knowledge and contemplation of tragic events, the views determined by intuitions of the tragic as expressed by poets and philosophers or moulding a man's thinking and behaviour, are all radically and existentially different things, and Jaspers' dealing with them ambiguously and promiscuously often perplexes the mind, and rarely touches the heart.

Perhaps this judgment is due to the fact that in my personal experience of facing extinction I saw the essence of tragedy as the utter breakdown and uselessness of all philosophy and faith. If in facing extinction man, powerless or deserted by his will to live, can still hold to a philosophy or a religion, he is a tragic hero and not a tragic victim. True, bottomless tragedy is experienced where heroism appears ludicrous or is simply not there. Existential, as distinguished from buskined tragedy, is in the death of the hopeless and humble, not of the strong and great, in the man who cries and trembles and refuses death as his fate, and not in the man who can be strong with the vanity of dying in dignified silence.

Deliverance from tragedy is an act of grace, for nobody can be sure of being a hero in his last moment. Philosophy on one plane and dramatic performances on another can, however, do something to prepare for death, and to integrate the intuition of death to other intuitions of reality so as to prevent it from becoming an obsession and a pit likely to open at any moment and crack the sutures of one's very being. In this sense Jaspers is right in saying that tragedy is not enough. Tragedy ends all life, but intuition of tragedy in life is limited both by the condition in which power exceeds awareness, and by thinking and behaviour squarely facing the tragic predicament and aiming at its dissolution. Tragedy is real, but it is not all the real. On the same plane of awareness there may be joy, refusal of complicity, and even innocence.

Optimism, utopianism and hedonism are found in many anarchist writers as characteristic features of their thought, and reveal it as shallow and existentially irrelevant. But there are at least three distinct answers the anarchists may give with deep awareness and with as much knowledge of the tragic as Jaspers puts before us. One is to vindicate joy as primary and real as death, and to cultivate readiness for it, a receptivity to the message of joy which finite things can bring through grace from the encompassing reality which is fullness of being as well as nothingness; the second and least likely to be authentic is to writhe, however powerlessly, in rebellion against reality, condemning Being as evil; and the third is to reduce to a minimum all wilful and conscious participation in evil so as to be free from guilt, to love all the persons one can and as deeply as one can because of fellowship in mortality. By these answers anarchism can prove itself existentially meaningful.

GIOVANNI BALDELLI.

PAGES OF REVOLUTIONARY HISTORY

THE COUNCIL REPUBLIC OF MUNICH (continued from last week)

This government in North Bavaria had been set up in March by the social-democratic minister Hoffmann. Together with the Rightist Colonel Epp he got ready for the fight. The colonel hired mercenaries for the fight, because former regular soldiers refused to take part in it. Many future Nazis joined this movement under Col Epp. In January, 1919, the Communist Party was established in Germany. Soon after that an agitation group of this party reached Munich. Their leader was Levine.

This party from the start had pretensions to lead the revolution—everything had to be managed according to its orders, otherwise it refused to take a hand in it, or even put obstacles in its way. In its programme was of course the Dictatorship of the Proletariat.

Because of the esteem which the Party had amongst the workers in those days, it was joined by many in Munich. It took its directives from Moscow, and the revolutionaries being confused by the success of the Bolshevik revolution, and not yet informed of what had since transpired, agreed to its leadership.

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP OPEN DAILY

OPEN 10 a.m. to 6.30; 5.0 SATURDAYS

New Books . . .

The Uprooted (The story of refugees' new lives)

Oscar Handlin 15/-
Townsmen's Food (What happens to food before you eat it)

Magnus Pike 15/-
Hanged—and Innocent (On Evans, Bentley and Rowland)

Paget, Silverman & Hollis 12/6

Reprints . . .

PENGUINS

Greeks and Trojans Rex Warner 2/-

Between the Acts Virginia Woolf 2/-

Scarlet and Black Stendhal 3/6

Note:

Kinsley Report on Human Female will be 50/- not 60/- as advertised last week.

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

Mühsam and Landauer struggled against it, desiring to keep the federated "Workers-Councils" in function. But they and the other revolutionaries were forced by circumstances to accept the "Dictatorship of the Proletariat".

They believed of course that in the course of time, when the revolution was victorious, the dictatorship would "die away" automatically. They had not yet the practical experiences we have. For them it was only a theory, and they could not afford to have a split in the revolutionary movement. They were surrounded by traitors on the side of the social-democrats, and by enemies on the side of the reaction, and in the North of Bavaria the enemy was preparing an attack on Munich.

Landauer, Mühsam and the other anarchists in Munich were of course opposed to the dictatorship, but they were helpless and the revolution took its course. When the workers saw the great danger which was menacing in the North, they wanted to arm themselves, but unfortunately no arms could at that moment be found in Munich. The social-democrats and the reaction had them hidden away, and only by employing force against these traitors could the workers get possession of arms. But there was also friction on the part of Landauer and Mühsam on the one side, and the Communist party on the other. The reason was the claim of the party alone to determine the events which concerned the revolution. The anarchists objected to that. They intended to save as much as possible of the "Workers Councils". Against this claim of the anarchists the Communist party opened a defamation campaign, and called the anarchists traitors and counter-revolutionaries. In a meeting, in which Mühsam attacked this slander, he was beaten up by the communists. Mühsam as well as Landauer faced arrest and insults from the traitorous social-democrats, and beatings from their "comrades" for the sake of the revolution for which they worked day and night.

Even during the revolution Landauer introduced reformed schools in Munich, after the model of Francisco Ferrer.

During the last month of the existence of the Munich "Council-Republic" the Communist Party was in absolute power. Munich was ruled according to

the orders received from Moscow.

In North Bavaria the reactionary forces were ready for an attack on Munich. But these forces considered themselves not strong enough to be victorious in a fight against Munich. In spite of that, Colonel Epp was active hiring mercenaries for the fight. So the commanders of the Bavarian white guards were forced to ask for help from the various social-democratic governments, which existed in those days in almost every former principality of Germany. The government of Wurtemberg agreed to send troops for aid. Likewise the social-democratic government at Berlin agreed to send Noske with his mercenaries to fight Munich. When everything was ready the army was set to march against Munich.

But in Munich the workers had not been lax in defending themselves. In the second half of the month of April they declared a General Strike. In the first days of May came the battle of Munich, which lasted for several days in the streets of Munich, and in which the workers defended themselves heroically against the overwhelming numbers of the white guards. Almost all the leaders of the revolution died in the battle, which was under these circumstances better than being made prisoner by the White Guards. All the prisoners made by the White Guards were killed with refined brutality. Amongst them was Landauer.

The White Guards never forgave Landauer and Mühsam their activity during the revolution in Munich. Almost all these White Guards later became Nazis. And when the Nazis came to power in 1933 they would not let even the bones of Landauer lie in peace in his grave. They dug them out, put them in a bag, and sent them to the Jewish Community of Munich.

Mühsam was arrested by the Nazis as soon as they were in power, and killed by them a few months later in the concentration camp of Oranienburg, with terrible tortures.

Zensl Mühsam, the companion of Erich Mühsam, attempted to save her life from the Nazis, after the death of Erich Mühsam, and she fled to Russia. There she has disappeared in the prisons of the N.K.V.D. and nobody knows what has become of her.

Hamburg. WILLY FRITZENKÖTTER.

RITUAL MURDER

HARD upon the controversy aroused by the Evans report has now come the Report of the Royal Commission on the Death Penalty. And at the same time two lawyer M.P.'s have published a book analysing not only the Evans case, but that of the nineteen-year-old Derek Bentley and of Walter Graham Rowland as well. Potentially, therefore the public is faced with a considerable mass of material regarding capital punishment and the reliability of the Courts as a means of assessing innocence or guilt without the possibility of mistake.

It is not proposed here to deal with the main issues—they require to be considered in detail and at greater length. But it is opportune to consider the vehicle whereby much of the relevant information reaches the public at large. Few enough people will read the Royal Commission's report, and Sidney Silverman and R. T. Paget's book will probably not have an enormous sale: hence the main channel of information remains the daily press.

It was recently pointed out in *FREEDOM* that when the Scott-Henderson report claiming to establish Evans' guilt was published, the press heaved a sigh of smug relief. But when M.P.'s attacked the report and its less satisfactory aspects were exposed, it became sensational news again. One can only feel that if an acquaintance were to exhibit similar reactions to that of the "responsible" press one would regard him as a person of very unstable opinions indeed, whose advice on any important matter would not be worth seeking.

Interesting, too, is the attitude shown by the educated intelligentsia in the press. Lord Hailsham, for example, wrote in the *Evening Standard* a week or so back defending the Evans Report in a highly dogmatic manner. He now denounces the Silverman-Paget book on Evans-Bentley-Rowland in the same journal as "a libel on British justice" of which the authors "ought to be thoroughly ashamed".

"Pendennis", a pseudonymous columnist in the *Observer* wrote of Silverman and Paget in a most unpleasantly sneering and hostile way which reduced his usually staid column to the level of a gossip writer's in the gutter press. This reaction surely stems from the sense of injury and insecurity that is aroused whenever it is suggested that in a matter which we are all responsible for, like the death penalties, we may be condoning gross miscarriages of justice. (That is the surface of the matter: there is also the less respectable question of the unconscious psychological pleasures and satisfactions involved in execution—for it is not only the crowd outside the prison gates on execution mornings who get vicarious satisfaction from this barbarous ritual).

Unfortunately abuse of those who criticize is a poor rebuttal of their charges. Lord Hailsham's attack is full of accusations that Silverman and Paget have "ignored" inconvenient evidence. But when he comes to describe the case of Rowland, he upholds the Appeal Court and the special enquiry which rejected the evidence of the man Ware who came forward and confessed that he had done the murder for which Rowland was found guilty. But Lord Hailsham does not so much as mention that four years later Ware was found guilty of attempted murder of a woman by exactly the same method—repeated blows on the head with a hammer—that Rowland is said to have used. And it is surprising how many public people are willing to accept the coincidence of two stranglers at Rillington Place.

In short the press has shown its

Soviet Admissions in Agriculture

SEVERAL weeks ago *FREEDOM* commented upon a change in Soviet agricultural policy which bore some resemblance to the New Economic Policy (N.E.P.) of 1923. After many years of intensive pressure to proletarianize more and more of the Russian peasants by forcing them into collective farms, the new line gives some respite and is encouraging peasants to grow food and raise stock on their own small-holdings. Of course concessions have been made to the peasants before when the harshness and unpopularity of the collective methods in agriculture had raised so much opposition or produced so much economic chaos that the central control of the government was threatened. But the present changes are more far reaching than any since the N.E.P. ended in 1928 with the introduction of the First Five Year Plan. They are also more far reaching and more widely applied, since similar changes of policy are reported in the satellite countries, and hints that something similar is happening in China.

Since further theoretical interest attaches to these changes also in the fact that the crisis in Russian agriculture is not nearly so severe as it was, for example in 1932 and 1933, when despite widespread famines carrying an enormous death toll, the government ruthlessly continued the collectivization of agriculture with only minor concessions to the peasants. The present changes therefore suggest that there has been a change in the theoretical approach to agriculture. It has been widely suggested that such changes are connected with Stalin's death and represent a revision of Soviet theoretical concepts. However, it seems wiser to take a more cautious view, partly because N.E.P.-like concessions have from time to time been made in the past; and also because the changes may not in fact represent so serious a revision of Marxism applied to agriculture as may at first sight appear.

Deficiencies in Collective Farms

At all events, the change is based on certain declared deficiencies in agricultural production under the collective farm system—a system which is linked with the policy of forcing industrialization as rapidly as possible upon the economically backward communities of Eastern Europe and Russia itself. The Czech Prime Minister Siroky two weeks ago admitted a fall in food production, and promised to cut government investment in heavy industry by 16.5 per cent, while investing an extra £73,000,000 in agriculture. A similar concession had already been announced in Hungary where it was even suggested that the principle of collectivized farms was wrong.

The Rumanian Prime Minister, Gheorghiu-Dej, on September 14, declared that "All deliveries from peasants due to the State for 1952 were being

usual irresponsibility and sensationalism, despite the gravity of the question at issue.

As a contrast, an Italian journal is campaigning for world wide abolition of capital punishment (Italy has no death penalty), and declares that such a step would be a first move towards world peace. It demands not merely the abolition of execution for crimes such as murder, but also of the death penalty for political "offences".

If one looks at the world one sees that far more people are killed by the State for political reasons than for crime, and though this is commonplace behind the Iron Curtain it is also widespread in the "free" world. It has become regular reading to see reports that 10, 20, or 30-odd alleged Mau-Mau leaders have been condemned to death in Kenya. In Malaya a girl of 22 was condemned to death last week for carrying a rifle, and it makes little difference to the essential barbarity to label her a terrorist.

Nor has public opinion been stirred overmuch by the fact that the former Prime Minister of Persia, Mossadeq, now lies under the threat of hanging. In the political world more and more the tendency is to treat opposition by liquidation.

FREEDOM once again reiterates its view that the death penalty is a barbarous, brutal ritual, maintained by ugly but concealed psychological satisfactions: and that it ought to be abolished whatever "practical" considerations are involved, as simply unethical and wrong.

cancelled. There would also be a reduction of taxation for small-holders as well as for collective farms. Peasants with large families would be exempt from taxation, as well as farms belonging to old and infirm persons or those having sons in the Army. Considerable tax reductions, and in some cases, exemption, have been announced for livestock breeders, silk-worm breeders, growers of industrial crops, newly planted orchards and vineyards." (*Times* 15.9.53).

He admitted that "75 per cent. of the marketable grain in Rumania still came from private cultivators, and said that this category of peasants must receive due consideration. He also admitted that so far only about 300,000 peasant families had joined the collective farms, which to-day numbered about 2,000" (*ibid*).

Russian Figures

The most detailed and interesting figures come from Russia, however. In his report to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Khrushchev, gives figures for Russian production of livestock over the whole period of Leninist rule, and these figures are very illuminating. They show that Russian agricultural output has been never substantially higher than in Tsarist times, although according to government claims, the population is much greater. Khrushchev gave the following figures for stock populations (in millions):—

| | 1916 | 1928 | 1941 | 1945 |
|--------------------------|------|-------|------|-------|
| Beef & dairy cattle | 55.4 | 66.8 | 54.5 | 56.6 |
| Cows (included in above) | 28.8 | 33.2 | 27.8 | 24.3 |
| Pigs | 23.0 | 27.7 | 27.5 | 28.5 |
| Sheep & goats | 96.3 | 114.6 | 91.6 | 109.9 |
| Horses | 38.2 | 36.1 | 21.0 | 15.3 |

Khrushchev said that in recent years livestock have been increasing very slowly and the number of cows in Russia has still not reached pre-war level.

The dates chosen above are interesting, 1916 is the last pre-revolutionary year, when Tsarist economy was at its most chaotic, and output was at the lowest level. 1928 is the last year of the N.E.P. and no figures are advanced for the catastrophic fall in stock population caused by the First Five Year Plan, recovery from which followed slowly upon concessions to the peasants and relaxation of the collectivization pressure. 1941 is the year of Russia's entry into the war against Germany, and 1945 is the last war year.*

These figures therefore tend to conceal the disasters of Marxist agriculture although in doing so they also fail to show the recovery which did take place. Soviet statistics are always suspect and

*Alexander Werth points out in a letter to the *Manchester Guardian* (29.9.53) that 1945 in the last column is a misprint on *Reuter's* part for 1953 and he has checked this by looking up the Soviet press reports of Khrushchev's report. This only makes the figures more revealing still and Khrushchev's target of 65 million cattle by the end of next year even more ambitious.

statistics everywhere are always used to back particular arguments. Nevertheless Khrushchev's figures agree substantially with those given before the war, for example, by Doreen Warriner (*Economics of Peasant Farming*—figures in millions)

| | 1916 | 1929 | 1932 | 1933 | 1935 | 1936 |
|--------|-------|-------|------|------|------|------|
| Cattle | 60.6 | 68.1 | 40.7 | 38.4 | 49.2 | 57.7 |
| Pigs | 30.9 | 30.9 | 11.6 | 12.1 | 22.5 | 30.4 |
| Sheep | 121.2 | 147.2 | 52.1 | 50.2 | 61.1 | 73.7 |
| Horses | 35.8 | 34.0 | 19.6 | 16.6 | 15.9 | 16.6 |

The upshot is that Khrushchev has in effect admitted that Soviet methods in agriculture have left production at about the same position as it was during the last and worst year of Tsarism. From other figures and from historical accounts we know that when Marxist policy towards the peasants was applied with full rigour as in the period of "War Communism", or the Five Year Plan, production fell to disastrous levels.

Peasant and Proletariat

Marxism is characterized by a hostile attitude towards the peasant. Marx regarded the proletariat, that is the wage working masses thrown up by the industrial revolution in the "advanced" or capitalist countries as the only bearers of revolutionary potential. His attitude is revealed in that appallingly revealing, because half-admiring, remark in the *Communist Manifesto* (1847): "The bourgeoisie has subjected the country to the rule of the towns. It has created enormous cities, has greatly increased the urban population as compared with the rural, and has thus rescued a consider-

How Not to Run Industry

NOT long ago I was talking to a friend who is a fairly junior director of a very large business. I asked him about his problems in the post-war world.

"There's nothing wrong with the post-war world from the point of view of our business," he said wearily. "All that's wrong is that of the three men who really control this outfit, each one would rather see it go bankrupt than let either of the other two do something good and get the credit for it."

Now here the damage done by the mutual jealousies of these three men is largely "indirect". They may, and probably do, make one another unhappy.

But what is far more important, they damage the several thousand other people who work in the business that they control. In order to frustrate one another, they must frustrate everybody else in the organisation.

At the other end of the business hierarchy, I remember an occasion when I had been asked to advise on a certain factory problem. (I was not a member

able part of the population from the idiosyncrasy of rural life."

Even now, and despite his admissions, Khrushchev shows no going back on the Marxist outlook towards the peasants for he declared that "The Socialist agriculture of the U.S.S.R. which has been developed and firmly established under the leadership of the Communist Party, rests on a powerful industrial base and is the biggest and most mechanized agricultural system in the world."

Concessions from this position have always been towards allowing more freedom of initiative to the peasant, and have always resulted in increased production, despite the fact that the incentive has always been profit. (Khrushchev uses the Soviet euphemism, and elegantly refers to the "people's material interest" an incentive to increased output!)

The Political Issue

However, it is a mistake to see either Marx's attitude or that of his modern Russian followers as though it were simply an issue of economic output. The peasants have been always the most powerful threat to Communist rule, and both war communism and the collectivization of agriculture were really directed towards controlling the peasants by turning them into wage slaves. This was done without immediate regard for the food supply and resulted in ghastly famines in 1921 and 1932-33. Such disregard for economic results can only be due to political gains by the government in its perpetual war against the peasants. Concessions may be made when the economic situation is disastrously deteriorating, but political considerations must always dictate that the government seek to weaken the peasantry once again.

of the staff, and was therefore in a more or less independent position).

One day a man working at the bench quietly suggested to me a solution of the problem.

It was one of those ideas which are very simple when you have thought of them. But the fact remains that neither the management nor I had thought of this one. Not wishing for once to take credit for an idea that was not mine, I suggested to the workman that he should put his idea to the management. I would support it.

He shook his head with a knowing smile, and said, "Not me. I know that game."

I said "But why not?"
"Because the foreman wouldn't like it. There's been two chaps who've had good ideas here in the last year, and he's worked them both out within a month. Don't you ever let on that I gave you that idea, or I'll be looking for another job."

—Nigel Balchin on Jealousy.
—*Sunday Express* 23/8/53.

The Shape of Our Surroundings

Continued from p. 2

tion of his ideas on a scale greater than that of the individual building "they could offer no remedy on a large scale for the irrevocable disintegration of our cities. They are cut loose from the forces out of which a new social conscience and a new *elan vital* can grow. Open spaces must be regained by a dispersal of population and industry over wide areas but not by a perpetuation of an even greater concentration within a narrow space."

THIS attack on the city does not imply a defence of life and work in the country as we know it to-day. "About one half of the world's population are peasants or farmers. Their standard of living varies greatly all over the globe but they have in common an attitude that is antagonistic to the cities and a desire to take part in the advantages of a technical civilization." People with romantic ideas about country life have "helped to spread the myth of the peasant as the true pillar of the State, as the prototype of the citizen who loves the State and is deeply attached to it. In reality the peasant loves his pieces of land and hates the State which is for him, the great interferer. He is for the *status quo* and against any change if it is not in his immediate interest." The factors which keep people on the land are emotional attachment to a known environment, protection from complete unemployment and the ability to provide at least the bare minimum of existence, (with the qualification that innumerable landless labourers are in this respect as insecure as the urban unemployed), and finally, the restricted absorptive capacity

of industry. Re-migration from the cities to the country is extremely rare, and in any case rural over-population is the crucial problem in the whole of South-East Asia and many other parts of the world.

How can the disinclination to live and work in the country be explained? Gutkind believes that the main reason "lies in the discrepancy between rural and urban ways of reacting intellectually and emotionally to the challenge which the interaction of man and environment raises ever anew and to which a response must be found. Once man has passed over the threshold where life becomes abstract and speculative, where certain amenities are within easy reach, where working hours keep within definite limits, and where men feel, though this is a mere illusion, that they are not outsiders, once this has happened, he must be an unusual being who would go back to the country."

The world's peasants are on the move. The war and the post-war period "have shown them in ruthless clarity their paramount importance to the survival of mankind. But the soil, the workshop of the peasant, is also on the move. Erosion is spreading at a pace and on a scale which cannot be balanced by bringing more land under the plough." The fear of famine might induce mankind to take the various measures to increase food production and fertility, "but it is difficult to believe that mankind as a whole will be sensible enough to develop all these possibilities to full capacity at the same time in all parts of the world. It is much more likely that the peasant will become something like a pampered child and be told how indispensable he is; how gladly one would do this or that for

him if only he would produce more food; if the financial resources only would allow more money to be spent on public utility services in rural areas; and if this . . . and that . . . or . . . etc., Land reform will be almost fashionable, and birth control will be the theme at hen parties. But what sort of Land reform? Land reform as an emotional outlet or Land reform as a rational proposition? Breaking up of large estates as a political moratorium on the life-time of unimaginative governments, or maintaining large estates and even creating new ones as the mainstay of a mechanised agriculture? And birth control—how to introduce it among the peasantry of China, India and Indonesia, that is the real issue."

Gutkind goes on to discuss food production and human production the theme for so many current cries of alarm and to demonstrate that the external remedies which treat this problem in a vacuum are mere charlatanism, summing up his argument in these terms:

- (1) a revolution of environment is unavoidable;
 - (2) an integration of rural and urban life on a higher level is essential;
 - (3) a new pattern of living will bring about a new phase of enlightenment;
 - (4) given the realization of these aims a higher standard of living will be the result;
 - (5) in consequence of a higher standard of living birth rates will fall and food production will go up;
 - (6) birth rates will be more dependent on deliberate decisions than on spontaneous or fatalistic urges;
 - (7) no task is more pressing than a peaceful revolution of environment;
 - (8) and this is the only way to reduce external frictions, thus freeing mankind from the fear of wars and famines.
- (To be concluded)

COMMENT

Communal Action Against Colour Bar

FROM Chicago comes a story which makes us believe that the "Windy City" is not inhabited solely by cops and robbers after all.

One seventh of Chicago's population are Negroes, and until 1948 they were largely confined to a single all-Negro district which was in fact a black ghetto. This was achieved by landlords signing "restrictive covenants" whereby they agreed among themselves not to rent or sell accommodation to "undesirable" minority members. In 1948, however, a Supreme Court ruling put an end to these covenants and there were no longer any legal means by which segregation of this nature could be practiced.

Naturally the Negroes began to leave the over-crowded areas into which they had been confined and to move into districts hitherto "pure white". FREEDOM has reported several incidents when riots took place and even bombs were thrown in attempts by infuriated whites to combat the invasion of their neighbourhood by coloured families. For the reaction of the white population, as soon as Negroes appeared on their block, was to move out (sometimes after such violent protest) which meant that very quickly an all-white district became an all-black district and segregation was still there.

City Services Slacken

The result of this was that very soon the district began to deteriorate. Firstly because landlords and estate agents began to exploit the situation by causing panic among the whites as soon as Negroes moved in anywhere. By informing the whites that "the Niggers" would soon occupy the whole area, these business men were able to buy up property cheaply as the whites hurried to move out to the suburbs. The property was then rented or sold to Negroes at exorbitant rates, for they were only too pleased to get away from the slums in which they had been kept so long.

Since the rents were so high, however, several families had to share accommodation not suitable for so many, and inevitably overcrowding began again. The landlords were no longer interested in keeping up the appearances of the property, which began to fall into disrepair. The city services began to slacken off and dustbins were not emptied; garbage began to litter the streets, which were not being swept and in a very short time a previously pleasant area was a slum.

Somebody Acted

This went on in area after area until Negroes began to move into the south side district of Hyde Park-Kenwood, near the shores of Lake Michigan. In this district is situated the unorthodox University of Chicago around which live many Jewish professors and also a strong Quaker element.

These people and others decided that their pleasant neighbourhood was not going to follow the usual pattern, but they determined to try and see that it

became a mixed community with harmonious race-relations. So at the end of 1949 the Hyde Park-Kenwood Community Conference was formed, for the purposes of thrashing out and dealing with the problems which were likely to arise.

And they found, of course, that the problems which did arise were not the result of racial differences or the impossibility of black and white living together, but the problems of racketeering real estate merchants and a corrupt city government.

The conference has encouraged the setting up of "block groups", who have reported to the conference office anything that needed attention. For example, if a house recently occupied by Negroes began to become over-crowded and fall into disrepair, they were able to show that the landlord was breaking many building, housing and sanitation laws.

Corruption—and the Answer

In Chicago, however, corruption is such that strings can usually be pulled and a landlord can either buy his way out of any proceedings or else have them shelved indefinitely. But the conference has an answer to that and brings continual pressure to bear upon the authorities.

When court cases are tried, all the members of a block group may volunteer to go along to the court as witnesses—and once they produced photographs of cracked ceilings, exposed wiring and refuse-crammed elevator shafts.

In another neighbourhood, where garbage collection was not being carried out, the block group amassed a collection of dimes and group members all telephoned the city authorities regularly at five-minute intervals all day until the garbage was collected.

Under this initiative, inter-racial har-

mony is prevailing. On one street, a meeting of tenants was held when it was discovered that Negroes were about to move in. One or two people expressed "No-Niggers-Near-Us" sentiments, but on discovering they were not supported by the rest of their neighbours they calmed down and the meeting ended with constructive decisions to try and persuade the landlord to keep the property in good fettle. The new Negro tenants helped matters by immediately setting

about painting and improving the house as soon as they moved in, and were soon invited to a block group party and are now integrated into the community.

Goodwill and Reason

By their actions the citizens of Hyde Park-Kenwood have set an example which is now being followed all over Chicago, where block groups are springing up to deal with "the problem" in a serious and humane way.

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS Is the National Health Service Reactionary?

I WAS wondering, all the time I was writing my series on "Reform and Revolution", how long I should last without incurring the wrath of Comrade Parker. I take it as a concealed compliment that it was not until the fifth article, out of only six, that he discovered something worth protesting about. I feel I haven't done so badly after all, in tackling a subject which bristles with difficulties, if, out of nearly 5,000 words, our meticulous theorist can only cavil at 81 of them—and then, not on any fundamental point in my argument.

Certainly I was guilty of carelessness in writing "nationalisation" instead of "nationalisation of industry", but I cannot agree with S. E. Parker that the N.H.S. is completely a perversion of that natural mutual aid which anarchists seek to encourage. On the contrary, it is an assertion of social responsibility for individual sickness or inability. For the first time, in this country I believe, since the decline of the mediaeval guilds and the rise of capitalism, has it been recognised that the sick are the responsibility of the healthy.

The National Health Service, as first conceived, gave the right of everybody to free access to such services as their health demanded. Has Comrade Parker forgotten the tremendous rush for spectacles, dentures, hearing aids, wigs, etc., when the scheme was first introduced? Oh yes, we all laughed at the rush for wooden legs, etc.—but that rush showed that vast numbers of people had been deprived of these things before. And all the revolutionary theory in the world will not convince me that it was retrogressive for old age pensioners to have spectacles properly prescribed for them by opticians, than to buy them in Woolworths at only the price they could afford to pay.

This is not to say that I was satisfied

with the Health Service. I won't be satisfied until the doctors, dentists, opticians, nurses, orderlies, research workers, ambulance drivers and everybody else in the Service are running their own functions under their direct control, freely giving their services while the rest of society has really free access to them.

We may resent being compelled to pay for the N.H.S.—but I have yet to hear of anybody being refused treatment at a hospital because he hadn't paid his contributions. On the two occasions when I have gone to hospital for treatment for minor industrial injuries, I have not been asked to prove my eligibility for treatment by showing a fully stamped card. Now that everybody is assumed to be paying contributions, everybody is assumed to have the right to treatment.

Now, since Comrade Parker, who is young and healthy, is so convinced on this issue, will he tell us if he refuses wage increases negotiated by a reactionary union official paid by compulsory dues in a closed shop? Does he forego Unemployment Benefit when he is out of work? Will he refuse the Old Age Pension when he is due for it? Will he in fact express his opposition to anything short of natural mutual aid in practice as well as in principle?

And if he has alternatives which are practicable here and now in place of the N.H.S., will he please expound them for us? P.S.

S. E. Parker surely appears in the rôle of a theoretical dogmatist in his contention that the N.H.S. inevitably is reactionary. Firstly, there can be no question that it benefits women and children to receive treatment free, instead of paying fees as in the old N.H.I. days before 1948. Whatever one thinks of compulsion and State organized schemes one cannot get over this as a fact.

The Tools of Social Science

Giovanni Baldelli (FREEDOM, Sep. 12) sees the social scientist as a spectre of our time, and trembles; well, so perhaps he is, but what are Baldelli's reactions

to the psychiatrist? Is he condemned too?

I think Baldelli has made an error (a quite excusable one). Can one condemn a science because it appears to have no moral justification? or because its findings may be used for amoral ends? Have moral judgments passed against the sciences ever been shown to be correct? Is any science not 'misused'?

Baldelli makes the point, if only by implication, that the social scientist has to live, that he has to show the people who pay his salary that he can provide returns for their outlay. He has therefore (and this is the point Baldelli does not make clear) to act not only as 'scientist', but as 'engineer', in order to fulfil his obligations to employers. And, before he can make the employers' machine work, be it ever so indirectly, he must find out the truth, and this part alone is the science, the 'discovery', and this is the fundamental.

Should we be afraid of the truth? No, of course not; practically the whole anarchist philosophy is built on what can only be called scientific 'truth'—the true nature of man. Our proofs are very scattered, however, so can we afford to tremble when a new scientist appears who says he is going to find out one way or the other (i.e. men are anarchists or men are 'slaves') as he is heartily sick of moral levers and moral conclusions.

So far, in fact, very few of the findings of the social scientist (I don't include productivity experts and so on) are contrary to our own, and more often they are our only supporters in the field of 'what does man require for happiness?'

Who knows? Perhaps social science is Anarchism starting at the other end of the tunnel?

London, Sept. 15. G. CARSON.

Special Appeal

Sept. 13 to Sept. 25

London: L.B.S. 3/-; London: R.H. 7/6; London: J.S. 3/-; London: E.P. 2/6; Ashted: M.D. £1/6/6; Worthing: R.G.A. 2/-; Glasgow: S.M. 4/9; Westhoughton: J.M. 10/-; Stockport: F.O. 3/-; Menlo Park: O.R. 11/6; London: F.E.D.* 10/6; Stratford on Avon: C.C. 4/-; London: M.M. £1/1/0; Leigh on Sea: M.P.R. 11/6; Copenhagen: A.H.R. 4/6; Edenbridge: N.E. 3/-; London: K.L. 3/-; Camberley: S.S.D. 3/-; Greenford: K.N. 1/-; Bletchley: W.S. £1; London: S.W.T. 6/-; Denver: R.B. £3/18/0; Montreal: H.M. 14/-; Hyde Park: B.R. 2/-; London: W.S. £25/5/0; London: V.R. 10/-; Leeds: P.T. 2/-; Ipswich: W.D. 2/6.

| | |
|-------------------------|-----------|
| Total | 38 14 9 |
| Previously acknowledged | 310 11 11 |
| 1953 TOTAL TO DATE | £349 6 8 |

GIFT OF BOOKS Croydon: A.U.
* Readers who have undertaken to send regular monthly contributions.

British Imperialism Continued from p. 1

British shipyards was tanker tonnage.

"Turning more specifically to Britain the Bureau points out that between 1947 and 1953 United Kingdom refining capacity was raised from 2,500,000 tons a year to over 25 million tons, the largest in western Europe. This has saved foreign exchange formerly spent on importing refined products, and it has begun to earn exchange through the export of refined products—in 1952 the value of exports of such products was £50m. Last year also orders placed with British manufacturers for petroleum equipment—including drilling, refining, and pipeline equipment formerly obtainable only in America—reached nearly £100m.

"The Bureau ventures into an assessment of the future, as distinct from the present, significance of the industry to this country only to the extent of suggesting that there seems little doubt that Britain will be able at least to keep abreast of any other country in the expansion of facilities to meet the still rising demand for oil, in spite of the huge capital expenditure involved—estimated at no less than £40 for every ton by which the annual output of finished products is increased. Certainly the industry is still very much in the growth stage."

It may seem odd that a "defence" of the British Empire's strength should appear in an anarchist journal. But for convinced opponents of imperialism there is something intensely irritating at the wishful illusions of socialists about the

"decay"—especially since their major party, when in power, show themselves to be just as imperialist as the unashamed conservative champions of empire.

But when one has discussed the factors which enhance or reduce the economic strength of imperialism, there yet remains the ultimately more important ideas of imperialism. We have seen that these have successfully infected the reformist socialist movement (which is practically to say, the socialist movement). Even if economic circumstances compelled a radical change in the structure of imperialism, the potential advantage from a human point of view would be lost if the philosophy which inspires imperialism were carried on into whatever modification followed it. The good society will not come because capitalist economics as we understand it may have to be replaced. This is the central illusion of the majority socialists. The imperialists of the nineteenth century would hardly recognize the economic order of the post-war world, yet that world still has the same dominant ideas and they would feel fairly at home in it.

Anarchists would be well advised to recognize the continuing strength of British Imperialism, to remember its history, its diplomatic experience,

and its ability to withstand shocks. But also to remember that weak or strong it is the ideas, the ideology of imperialism, and the way of life founded upon it that must chiefly be attacked. The idea that competition is healthy, even though in practice it means business ethics, business methods, cut-throat commercialism and all the shoddy behaviour that goes with it. The idea that inequality of wealth is salutary and that "the best always rise to the top", when in fact the majority live in misery, without hope or initiative or responsibility, and themselves infected by the ideas of the business rulers. The idea that the white administrators must dominate the black or the brown or the yellow mass, with all the injustice, the *herrenvolk* ideas and the cant that goes with it.

Finally, all these ideas are rooted in the conceptions and prejudices of everyday life. The lack of social cohesion, the irresponsible attitude to work, the denial of sex and of enjoyment which go to make up the European world of the late Christian era. All this complex of conceptions must be made to give way to a revolutionary and humanist outlook. But it will not do so without constant struggle and constant awareness of the disparity between the unrealized world of human wishes and aspirations and the actual sordid world of history.

These community groups are showing the power of people getting together, and how goodwill and reason can combat prejudice and the machinations of greedy estate agents and corrupt city authorities—who benefit from prejudice.

They are showing that segregation is pointless and harmful; they are proving that black and white can live harmoniously together, and they are demonstrating that even in Chicago, a city with a reputation for violence and corruption, decent human behaviour can operate for the common good—when people desire it.

Secondly, there is a serious limitation on voluntary mutual aid schemes under a money system—that the poorest districts must have a poorer service than the richer if they are financed by local voluntary contributions. The only way to iron out this injustice is to make the contributions nation-wide, and this the N.H.S. does. (Of course, it remains true that a richer country will be able to "afford" a better standard of N.H.S. than a poorer, and the inequality ought to be internationally ironed out. But to carry it thus far is to expose the absurdity of "making it pay" at all!)

Finally S.E.P. has surely missed a point that Kropotkin noted in other connexions—that in the N.H.S. broadly speaking service is according to need and the idea of giving an equivalent exchange for it, (which still obtains in regard to necessities such as food and shelter) has long since been abandoned altogether. Altogether these practical and theoretical advantages more than offset the question of compulsory contributions. I doubt if there is any solution to these objections in a money system.

JOHN HEWETSON.

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 October*

NORTH-EAST LONDON

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

OCT. 7—S. E. PARKER
ANARCHISM, WORK AND
INDUSTRY.

W. LONDON

ANYONE INTERESTED IN FORMING A DISCUSSION GROUP IN THE WEST LONDON AREA, PLEASE CONTACT:

S. E. PARKER,
79 WARWICK AVENUE,
LONDON, W.9.

BRADFORD

OPEN-AIR MEETINGS
Broadway Car Park,
Sundays, 8.30 p.m.

GLASGOW

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

LECTURE IN SLOUGH

Our reader Douglas MacTaggart writes to tell us that he is giving a lecture on Anarchism in the Labour Hall, Chandos Street, Slough next Tuesday, October 6th, at 8 p.m. "Freedom" readers in the area are invited to attend.

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