

# Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"Liberty is not a means to a higher political end. It is itself the highest political end."

—LORD ACTON.

Vol. 15, No. 7

February 13th, 1954

Threepence

## LANCASHIRE AND JAPAN

# A SYMBOL OF CAPITALISM

IN Lancashire towns where textile workers swell the dole queues the shops are selling cheap Japanese cotton goods; and in this paradox the whole destructive, mindless, mirthless cruelty of capitalism is symbolized. The textile industry has been spotlighted again with the signing of the government's trade agreement with Japan. But the government defending the pact and the Lancashire mill owners who condemn it, succeed in fact in condemning utterly the system of economics which they both practice.

"Lord Woolton said in Manchester that the Government were wide awake to the issues involved in Japanese competition, but the new agreement with Japan should prove advantageous to Britain. He asked Lancashire manufacturers to look at the problem from a national standpoint and to have faith in their own capacity.

"Lord Woolton, who was opening Woolton House, the north-western area Conservative and Unionist headquarters, said that Britain needed to trade with Japan, and had made an agreement by which she would sell to Japan more than she (Britain) would buy. That seemed to him to be good business. Japan had no sterling reserves and could pay for her imports only out of receipts from her exports.

"If this agreement had not been made, this country would have lost the new, important, and growing markets which many of our industries had been building up in Japan. Japan would have been forced to cut purchases not only from this country but from the rest of the Commonwealth.

"Japan would not have been able to buy wool from Australia. Deprived of this revenue, Australia in turn might have had to cut her imports from this country. Lancashire had particular cause to remember what happened when Australia was forced to put on restrictions in 1952.

"Much of the increased trade now open to Japan might well be secured at the expense of our other competitors in the sterling area, and not at the expense of the United Kingdom. The agreement would create profitable trade and employment in this country. In the past Lancashire had overcome competition vastly more extensive in volume and much keener in price than anything which was likely to be a result of the recent agreement."

(Times, 6/2/54).

Lord Woolton's idea of good business (the italics in the above quotation are ours) is of course perfectly orthodox. So also is his pious hope that it won't be Lancashire that will be hit by Japanese competition, but other rivals in the textile trade. One may guess that the Lancashire mill-owners and their M.P.'s will shed few tears over the dole queues in other textile centres abroad, unhappily, the trade unions, which used to have an international outlook, will be equally unconcerned . . .

Lancashire demands preferential treatment and the disallowing of Japanese competition, but it has been pointed out that advanced economists in both the Conservative and Labour Parties regard such protection as unrealistic.

"In the Labour Party's policy statement, 'Challenge to Britain,' it was rightly said that 'all countries are tending to become increasingly self-sufficient in manufactures of the kinds which are simplest to produce. Some of our oldest export lines, particularly textiles, have been hit by this trend. Our best prospects lie in the export of goods which require a high degree of technical skill and experience. This means that we must change the whole emphasis of our production and export effort.'

"Although 'Challenge to Britain,' treading warily, did not say that the expansion in engineering and chemical production which it advocated would have to be accompanied by a steady decline in the Lancashire cotton industry, that is in fact the implication of its policy.

"The statement did not add, as perhaps in honesty it might have done, that

a Labour Government aiming at shifting the emphasis of British industry could not afford to give protection to an industry whose share in world trade is shrinking, while world trade in cotton goods is itself declining, chiefly because more countries are starting to make such goods for themselves."

(Observer, Editorial, 7/2/54).

"More countries are starting to make such goods for themselves." This pregnant sentence deserves study. One wonders for example where the Japanese cotton mills got their machinery from? The government now urge Lancashire to concentrate on those textile goods which other countries cannot make, but anarchists might say "which other countries cannot make—yet." For if certain aspects of production are not yet open to certain countries, why, those countries provide by that very fact a market for the makers of machinery, and the British manufacturers will scramble to secure the orders as vigorously as any regardless of the effect on their customers among the Manchester textile mill owners.

It might be said that they should abstain from cutting their fellow countrymen's throats. But such an action would be quixotic in the extreme, for what would be the virtue of standing aside merely to let a foreigner cut the textile throats while English machine plants lie idle in moral abstention. The logic of capitalism sweeps aside quixotic morality and long-term vision all at a stroke.

### Decentralization of Industry

In effect the wheel is coming full circle. One hundred and fifty years ago the British flag in Industry followed the

textile trade and suppressed the village spinning wheel and Indian peasant textile production. From that time on India became a vast market for Lancashire cottons. Now however the dissemination of machinery to the "backward" part of the world has broken the Lancashire monopoly and is decentralizing the textile industry. And the same applies to other processes of manufacture. "More countries are starting to make such goods for themselves." Meat no longer comes in quantity from Argentine because they now make for themselves the machine goods which before the last war they bought from Britain.

Britain herself unable to trade so freely with former agricultural but now industrialized countries, is being driven to grow her own food. The process envisaged by Kropotkin, of decentralization continually gnawing away at the concentration of industry so basic to the Marxist Church, is now becoming manifest.

### The Grindstone

In the process however the faces of the poor get ground into the dole queues. Temporary successes are achieved at the expense of competitor countries to that financial success here is achieved because of poverty and misery there. Maintaining oneself in the world's markets is achieved by a process which cuts the ground away from beneath one's feet because countries start "to make such goods for themselves".

Nor should one forget that this trade war forms the backcloth for all the wage struggles. The same instability and insecurity which afflicts a given trade afflicts also its wage earners, and founds their wage negotiations on shifting sands. The same trade war and the financial basis for it provides the causes of world war. An economic system which is clearly seen to bring poverty and insecurity and war in its train does not readily commend itself to thinking or humane people. In its stead it seems reasonable to put a system of mutual co-operation unhampered by competition for markets and the war of prices. A system in which the world's needs become the basis for production, and the decentralization of industry revives pride and satisfaction in work instead of the frustration of producing shoddy goods at piece-work rates.

## These Workers are Very Wrong

WE are often enough accused of adopting an attitude of "the-workers-are-always-right". Therefore we had better lose no time in stating our case when we believe workers to be completely wrong.

The busmen and women of Birmingham have created a situation which amounts to the colour bar. For various reasons, they believe it is "inadvisable" for the corporation to employ coloured conductors or drivers on the city's bus services.

The Corporation is short of staff on the buses, but the union district secretary, Harry Green, maintains that if coloured workers were taken on, a number of the existing staff would leave.

This—believe it or not—is because "a number of parents and husbands of conductresses would object to their having to work on late nights with coloured people".

On top of this we find that it is considered that the work of issuing tickets and writing out reports would be too much for "coloured people"—and also that the difficulties that bus workers occasionally have with drunks on a Saturday night would be aggravated by a coloured man on the platform.

This latter point has, unfortunately, some truth in it. Ignorance is bad enough on its own, but coupled with drunkenness it becomes a formidable barrier to reasonable behaviour. But if any worker is prepared to face that hazard, it doesn't seem to be a good reason for refusing him employment.

In fact, there isn't a good reason. The other reasons given are an insult, not only to the coloured workers, but to our intelligence—and that of the Birmingham bus workers themselves.

It seems that the colour bar doesn't operate in all jobs in the bus service. A large number of coloured men are employed in other jobs, presumably cleaning and maintenance work—safely out of sight of the public and out of reach of the clippies—and also presumably on a scale of pay beneath that of drivers and conductors.

The attitude of these white workers is based on prejudice and ignorance. It betrays a contemptuous attitude to some fellow workers by regarding them as unintelligent, illiterate and not safe to be out with at night—purely because of the colour of their skin.

If the reaction of the public is to be feared—then the bus workers should set an example of solidarity and common sense and do their best to overcome it, instead of encouraging it by their own stupidity.

But we fancy the public are not so daft as the bus workers in this instance. Apart from the weekend drunk there will be no trouble—and if the busmen got together and appealed to the travelling public to help out any conductor if the need arose, it would very soon be minimised.

So how about the trade unionists of Birmingham's public transport remembering that "an injury to one is an injury to all"—and that applies to the "one" whether he's white or coloured.



## When Will They Move ?

AS we go to press, the Foreign Ministers in Berlin have completed a period of open propaganda on the United Nations model, and are about to enter upon a series of sessions in secret. The 'realists' of Fleet Street see in these secret sessions the possibility of 'real progress' and such like vague optimistic phrases. But anarchists and other historically minded people are likely to remember that the Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam conferences were also secret ones: they laid the foundations for the world as we have known it during the past eight years.

These war-time conferences of heads of States resulted in populations being treated as pawns in the moves of power politics. The present Berlin conference is mainly concerned with the future of Germany and once again the fate of a people is to be decided by the deliberations of four shrewd and mutually hostile men.

It is this aspect of international

power deliberations which we feel it necessary to stress—the fate of millions lying in the decisions of the few. Viewed in this, its true light, the picture is macabre and horrible, for human happiness and aspirations should not be elbowed about by the diplomatic adroitness of politicians.

On June 17th last year the people of Berlin, and the people in the remainder of the Soviet Zone showed that not even the bleakest and most ruthless of all totalitarian rules could stand up to the spontaneous outbursts of the people in revolt. The reality is always that government can only be imposed by trickery and fraud, by a mixture of threats and the dividing of a people against itself. Compared with the strength of a people, if only they can show their strength, the power of government is puny indeed. The diplomats may confer in Berlin, but in the end the peoples of the world will have to throw off their pawn-like status and order their lives themselves.

## WITCH-HUNT NOTEBOOK On the Slippery Slope

THE Daily Mail publishes a report from its New York correspondent (Jan. 28) to the effect that:

"People thought to be 'Communist' have had their names and addresses forwarded to the F.B.I. by the Norwalk, Connecticut, branch of the Veterans of Foreign Wars Organisation.

This was disclosed here to-day when Mr. Charles J. Post, state commander of the organisation, defended the practice as designed 'to waken our own people in this town.'

He said that a special committee formed from men 'of all walks of life' had been created to sift the suspects whose records or activities are deemed to be 'Communist'.

He explained that when the weight of such testimony impresses the committee, it is sent on to the F.B.I. The number of names already submitted has not been disclosed, but it is believed to be about ten. Norwalk's population is 50,000.

This action, according to the local Norwalk commander of the V.F.W. post, Mr. Albert Beres, is in line with national policy to 'fight for a strong America on

a local State and national level. It is the sort of thing being done in other towns across the country.'

According to the News Chronicle's New York correspondent:

"It was the local liberals—the Americans for Democratic Action—who revealed the witch-hunt.

Within hours President Eisenhower was challenged about it at his Press conference.

With calm understatement he said he did not believe it possible to stop anybody from doing this sort of thing—but there are laws of libel and slander, and people who compile such lists must take responsibility."

The implication is that the President doesn't like this kind of behaviour, it has nothing to do with any instructions he may have given. Yet to reporter in Washington, Wayne Richards, national commander of the V.F.W., said: "The F.B.I. several years ago asked us to turn in the names of people who talk against our Government and are a little suspicious. I endorse Norwalk's move as in line with our thinking in ferreting out Communists."

So it appears that the suggestion comes from the F.B.I. (the equivalent of our Special Branch). Has the President no say in what the F.B.I. does? If not who has? Or are they a power unto themselves? Whichever way one looks at it it's not a very pleasant picture!

### So Persuasive

President Peron has added a new word to Argentine Spanish—Peronizar. Definition: "To inspire through persuasive means adherence to the Argentine national doctrine."

BOOK REVIEW

THE UNFAIR SEX

THE UNFAIR SEX, by Nina Farewell. Published by Frederick Muller at 10/6d.

AT first blush this book might glance off as just another lighthearted arrow in the War of the Sexes. Its open message is that Man is dominated by Woman from the cradle to adolescence and from marriage to the grave, but that there is an embarrassing gap in between these periods of domesticated impotence during which the male plays havoc with his sisters in arms. So the battlecry is "Solidarity, girls! Get your man the other side of the altar before you give an inch, and we'll all be sitting pretty." Sounds simple enough. So it is if you accept the three basic principles brandished by the author (allegedly a woman, but as Nina Farewell is a *nom de guerre* and there is a curious twist to the argument here and there, we may be permitted our doubts. It is at least a fair guess that he or she is an American, since the alimony comes fluttering in dollar bills).

These are: (1) Marriage, i.e. exclusive proprietary rights to a man's services, is the laudable ambition of every sensible girl. (2) Man is by nature the hunter and woman his natural prey. (3) In sexual intercourse the man takes and the woman gives.

None of these axioms exactly qualifies as a universal law. To tell the truth they are indefensible. And in fact, in odd paragraphs and between the lines, they are obliquely ridiculed.

Take the first. What is so ethically inspiring about the desire to own another human being? Any sort of property feeling can hardly be described as the most praiseworthy of motives. Some may even find the wish to exploit fellow mortals in this way slightly disgusting.

As for the second and third principles, even a congenital idiot would not be deceived. Cross cultural references—the information that anthropologists have unearthed for us regarding other contemporary societies—have long since exploded the myth of the dominant male. Think only of the Tchambuli described by Margaret Mead in her "Sex and Temperament in Three Primitive Societies" to dismiss this piece of chromium-plated folklore. A brushing acquaintance with the facts of life in our own culture is sufficient to laugh both these axioms out of court. Who hasn't seen a hapless male hounded by a lusty Amazon disguised as a palpitating virgin? And who really believes that women never have orgasms? Otherwise the sustained effort some of them expend in order to sacrifice themselves on the nearest set of bed springs becomes a widespread pathological phenomenon.

How does Nina illustrate the joys and privileges of marriage? Take the chapter "Don't Have an Affair with a Married Man". She points out the disadvantages with considerable conviction. The closing paragraphs, however, throw a casual spanner in the works.

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP OPEN DAILY

- OPEN 10 a.m. to 6.30: 5.0 SATURDAYS
- New Books . . .
- The Great French Revolution (2 Vols.) Peter Kropotkin 12/6
- What is Property? (2 Vols.) P. J. Proudhon 3/6
- Workers' Councils Anton Pannekoek 6/-
- Character Analysis Wilhelm Reich 35/-
- The Sexual Revolution 25/-
- The Cancer Biopathy 70/-
- The Mass Psychology of Fascism 37/6
- Either God or Devil (Second-Hand) 5/-
- Remainders . . .
- William Godwin George Woodcock 5/-
- The Writer and Politics George Woodcock 3/6
- The Soul of Man Under Socialism Oscar Wilde 1/-
- Slavery of Our Times Leo Tolstoy 1/-
- Defence of Poetry P. B. Shelley 1/-
- Garcia Lorca Edward Honig 3/-
- Second-Hand . . .
- Speeches and Documents on International Affairs 1918-1937 2/-
- Essays from Tula Leo Tolstoy 2/6
- The Ego and Its Place in the World Charles Gray Shaw 4/6
- Grey Eminence Aldous Huxley 3/6
- The Letters of Sacco and Vanzetti 12/6
- Periodicals . . .
- Adam (Dylan Thomas Memorial Number) 5/-
- Individual Action No. 5. (January) 3d.

Postage extra on all items. Obtainable from 27, RED LION STREET, LONDON, W.C.1

"There was one girl, however, who claimed she actually preferred sharing some other woman's husband to having one of her own. 'A wife,' she declared, 'has the burden of taking care of his household and his petty needs. To her fall the menial tasks of seeing to his socks and his shirts, his meals and his stomach aches, and all the other drab day-to-day chores of making him comfortable. Happy and well-fed he comes to me for his lighter hours. I get the best of him—the playmate, the sweetheart, the lover.'

"Obviously this is a rationalization. In her heart of hearts every woman longs for the socks and the shirts. If you settle for less, you will always feel cheated." Do I detect a cynical smile beneath the scornful laugh?

Or again, what are we to make of this excerpt from the chapter on "The Pangs and Pains of Giving"?

"The ease with which an affair can be ended is one of its most unfortunate aspects. Having transgressed once, no matter how unsuccessfully, a woman has less resistance to making the mistake a second time. She may, indeed, become addicted to this sort of thing and be tempted to spend her life hopping from one unsanctified honeymoon to another. This is comparable to the habit of selecting only the choice bonbons from a box and throwing away the remainder. Such wastefulness and self-indulgence indicate a sad lack of character, and one instinctively disapproves of the woman who takes the best of a man and can find no use for the rest of him."

The remaining axioms are comprised in a similar way. In the same chapter we find the advantages of marriage as contrasted with the pangs and pains of an extra-marital affair summed up thus.

"You are deprived of the opiates of cooking and cleaning and marketing, of bearing and rearing children, of visiting and being visited by his friends and relations, and all the other blessings which help so much to alleviate the boredom of marriage and make for a full empty life."

Is this the satire of the century? In ostensibly presenting a gay handbook for the protection of innocent girls is she subtly spreading the gospel of free love? How else are we to interpret her com-

ments on "Virtue"? While praising chastity to the skies she manages to make the alternative sound far more attractive. Take this dry aside, for instance.

"However, I am told that good women find a deep inner peace and satisfaction in the knowledge that wrongdoers will be tortured in Eternity. If it were not for this comforting thought, many would find the virtuous life unbearable."

Again the chapter ends on a merrily impudent note.

"In short, it is necessary to be serious, stingy, calculating, stubborn, sceptical, cynical, and indifferent to men.

"And the rewards?"  
"Virtue Is Its Own Reward."

This book is certainly a cheerful attack on something or other. But on men?—or women?—or the current two-faced sexual code? With a shattering candour it exposes a whole armoury (and museum) of the low tricks to which men often resort in order to get their wild oats sown before they are snared by the hardly less despicable wiles of womankind. No direct mention is made of the hypocritical double-standard that is in vogue—conventional arguments for chastity are blithely tossed aside and a purely practical attitude fostered.

Throughout there is a delicious blend of penetrating insights, spiced with half-truths, salted with downright untruths. Perhaps the selections quoted make it seem obvious that Nina's tongue is stuck firmly in her cheek, but there are other sections which are delivered so dead-pan that the reader is left wondering how many tongues are competing for how many cheeky positions.

If you still have a book token left over from Xmas and nothing uplifting in view like Louisa May Alcott's "Little Women and Good Wives" to spend it on, then let me recommend this little gem. After you have read it you may still be left wondering which side of the fence is being bombarded and whether you yourself may not be in the direct line of fire. But you will be sure of having enjoyed several chuckles per page and at least one good belly-laugh a chapter. Which, all considered, is a rare enough bargain in this gloomy era to start a stampede.

R.T.G.

Is this an Anarchist?

THE key word is freedom. I want this for myself, and I want to take part in transforming the world so that it may exist in greater abundance for everybody. "Every man is a special kind of artist", said Eric Gill, yet it is only in freedom that the artist can create. "Freedom", said Engels, "is the recognition of necessity." This should be emblazoned in the mind of every so-called teacher or guardian of the young, for it is at once a statement of an ideal and the means of attaining it.

The State is incompatible with individual freedom, for it is based on coercion and a centralisation which assume that people need to be told what to do.

That modern warfare can only be carried on by a State is sufficient reason for doing away with States. But the immediate question is what are the conditions that will make the State wither away? What is preventing this from happening in the Soviet Union? Did Lenin expect that the proletariat would still cling to their dictatorship thirty years after the revolution? What are the forces in the character of man that tend to preserve the State system, and what to make an end of it?

To me it seems that those who wish to retain an authoritarian government are either not ready for freedom themselves or wish to deny it to others. As an ideal I see men living co-operatively; by mutual aid they reap the benefits of the earth; they make their work a pleasure instead of a routine drudgery to be avoided, and their contacts with each other a joy instead of a fearful competition. There are neither servants nor masters. No man exploits another; no-one lives on inherited wealth.

Respect for conscience is of the greatest importance. A man should do what he conscientiously believes to be right, and have the toleration to allow others the freedom to do what they think is right, no-one using violence to enforce his opinion. This implies loyalty to no superior authority be it in the form of a government or of a God; it implies that man is a moral creature capable of acting nobly and taking decisions himself. Whether it implies the doing away with religion I cannot say, because I do not understand what religion is. It means

doing away with the absurdity of the present day Church and its twisted dogma, which says on the one hand: "Love your enemies", and "Return good for evil", and on the other supports warfare as a means of settling disputes. It does not mean doing away with the inspiration and contemplation of beauty, in which the essence of religion may be contained. If we are not artistically engaged our social responsibility must be to share in the task of reforming the world—and the better our room in it the higher the rent.

"The world's a stage and men and women only players". Thus Shakespeare hinted that the drama of our lives is moved by the unconscious powers which Freud did so much to discover. Ian Suttie showed the evil consequences of the taboo on tenderness; for his emotional security man has as much need to love as he has to be loved. Reich has explained that self-government pre-supposes a gratifying love life. For the children's sake, I do not uphold the conventional family structure, which is possessive, exclusive and competitive. I would share Godwin's description of an ideal relationship:

"The frankness we exercised was perfect. We talked to each other, as a man talks to his own soul. We did not utter all our thoughts: for thought is endless; its process is such as no words can follow; but we uttered everything worthy to be recited, and to which a precise or intelligible form could be given. The sound of our own voices encouraged us; our mutual answers, replies and rejoinders gave an indescribable animation to our dialogue. We led each other on; we gave breath to each unfinished conception. There was no fear on either side that an uncandid advantage would be taken of trips and mistakes that might be incurred. The habit of entire and unhesitating explicitness which we cultivated towards each other, removed us as it were into another class of beings from the human creatures with which we were surrounded. We had no distrust. Our hearts were ever on our lips. We considered the faculty of speech as given to us to express our thoughts."

Such a relationship is entirely unpossessive, jealousy or domination does not enter in, there is no thou shalt or thou shalt not, for each beholds the other with wonder and amazement.

"The true object of education," said

The Ethics of Enchantment

AN ethos is a way of living and a code of behaviour peculiar to a nation, a tribe, a class or a sect. It moulds and defines the historical personality of the society which it inspires, and it is the main factor of its preservation. It is closely dependent on methods of production, but it strongly influences them in turn, if in no other way by preventing their expansion or transformation. We can thus speak of a capitalist, a feudal, a Prussian, a Puritan, a Castilian, a Jesuit, a Bolshevik, a Maori or a Zulu ethos.

Ethics are something else. They usually arise when an ethos breaks up, and they claim to be valid for every man in every time, country or condition. If an ethos has found what is good and right for a particular people or class at a given time, ethics endeavour to find what is good and what is right everywhere and in an absolute way.

Ethics, of course, are born or cut off from some existing ethos, and are particularly numerous and successful in times of great movements of races and deep social changes. They are in turn absorbed into or promote a new ethos, but have, nevertheless, or strive after an independent form.

Their ambition not to be tied down to special conditions of time and place, social position and race, may be a first reason why they contain more condemnations than exultations, more don'ts than dos, and why their emotional tone is usually one of sadness or anger, of resignation and impotence, very seldom of joy.

Another reason is that they are the product of people who because of defeat, disappointment, slavery of some sort, and especially of age, have abandoned or have been abandoned by, desire and will to power. They all are, in varying degrees of consideration for the frailty of human nature, for the taming of desire and the suppression of the will to power are the same thing as evil. But can there be life without desire or will to power? Buddhism with great logic says that to abolish evil you must abolish life, and Nietzsche called the preachers of renunciation preachers of death.

The question now is: can there be ethics other than of renoucement? Of course, there can, but on condition that ethics be supplemented or mixed with sources of energy and directions which in themselves are, to say the least, ethically neutre. We can thus have ethics of love and ethics of joy, but love and joy are gifts that come and go, that cannot be manufactured or preserved. Ethics based on love when love is not there produce monstrous monuments of hypocrisy scarcely more revolting than those pro-

duced by reversal of values or identification of opposites. Official and triumphant ethics in ours as probably in other times as well, have a trick of treating virtues as crimes and crimes as virtues with the result that honest and decent people are bound to look for genuine ethics in crime.

So it seems that in order to preserve their purity ethics should never be official or triumphant, another way of pointing out that they should be ethics of renoucement. Life is based on conflict, and conflict can be avoided only by superabundance of things wanted or reduction of wants. In conflict there is harming and being harmed, that is evil, and the cases are relatively rare and historically unimportant where our freedom does not limit the freedom of others, and our right is not somebody else's wrong.

But renoucement need not be a melancholy and painful affair. On the contrary, if peace of mind is the condition and reward of an ethical life, renoucement should not be practiced when painful and melancholy, but when cheering and enhancing in its global and final effect, though it is bound to be painful initially and in detail.

Similarly, ethics of renoucement need not be the outcome of a gloomy philosophy or a psychology of defeat. There may be plenty of temptations to see the universe as absurd, man as an accident, and goodness a hopeless, impossible cause. Yet ethics are not out of place. They seem to go against life, but what are they if not themselves a product of life, and how do we know what is in their power finally to achieve when they can, as they do, seize such a strong hold of the human mind?

In ethics, then, there is no negation of life, but enhancement of life, certainly in one of its rarest if not also its highest forms. To say that they smell terribly of death is further proof of their highly evolved and integrating quality, because death is a condition of life, and every philosophy is false and finally defeated that does not take death into account would be charitable to the evil-doers but when these have been led first to be charitable towards their victims. They would encourage renoucement out of life's hate but for life's sake. They are mindful of the living, especially of the harmless, of the weak, of the life-bearers, and not of the life-destroyers. There are values for them to be preserved and developed, and other to be resisted, disciplined or discarded. More important still, their task is to defend value against power, and to aim at an ethos which will be one with ethics when society and mankind will also be one.

GIOVANNI BALDELLI.

Exhibitions

PAINTERS FROM CEYLON

THERE are currently in London three exhibitions of the work of modern Ceylonese painters: George Keyt at the I.C.A. Gallery; Justin Darayinagala at the Beaux Arts Gallery; and six Ceylonese Painters at the A.I.A. Gallery.

All these artists are members of the "43 group", founded, as its name implies, in 1943. "But," we are told in one of the beautifully produced leaflets given away at these exhibitions "the attitude of which it was an expression was much older." The group's official history, told in various words by various writers, but basically the same, tells how Keyt, Darayinagala and others struggled, in the 20's and early 30's, against the officially supported academic painting, "an imported, if not imposed art, . . . deriving from nineteenth century English traditions with an exotically 'oriental' overtone added" and how they found "stimulating similarities between . . . Picasso and Matisse and their own Buddhist traditions."

The result of all this struggling and stimulation looks like an imported art based on early twentieth century French innovations, with an exotically oriental overtone added. If Matisse had migrated

to Ceylon (as Gauguin migrated to Tahiti) changing his formalized figures to fit the local, and his palette to suit the local light, I imagine he would have produced paintings like Keyt's, and if Rouault had gone to Ceylon, acquiring a sense of humour on the way, he might have painted like Darayinagala. I do not believe either of these artists are conscious imitators of individual Europeans, or that the six younger men exhibiting at the A.I.A. are not also original artists. But they all unfortunately have the European (and in fact almost the English) painters' approach to their art.

They have struggled against, and overcome, the academic tradition, but failed completely to rid themselves of the Picture Gallery idea. The Picture Gallery, and much more so the painting designed for the gallery, is a product of industrialization, an attempt to impose "culture" on a culturally decadent society, evidence of a division in people's minds between "art" and "real life". It is a pity such an institution has spread Eastwards, so that even nationally conscious Ceylonese artists cannot avoid it.

However, a work of art should be judged not by its intention, but rather by how well it fulfils its intention. As gallery paintings, all these are excellent. Keyt is a wonderful painter with brilliant tropical colours, but without any clichés in his colour schemes. Darayinagala has a magnificent sense of humour and is not afraid of showing it in some very careful compositions.

The paintings of the six young men at the A.I.A. Gallery are not so able as those of their older compatriots, but all are capable of acquiring such ability. All the paintings, in all three exhibitions, are worth exhibiting, and many of them worth keeping, in far less remote galleries.

ANTHONY WEAVER.

D.R.

## SHELTERING THE HOMELESS

WHILE the B.B.C. were appealing to listeners to feed the birds during the cold spell, cynics remarked that the Paris radio was appealing for help for the homeless families of the French capital. The picture of a realistic French administration putting first things first however does not really bear scrutiny. As is too often the case the truth is almost the reverse, for in fact an indolent public authority has been galvanized into shamed activity by the initiative of one man and the voluntary workers who flocked to his call.

That man is a priest, the Abbé Pierre, and his campaign to give shelter to the homeless on the Paris streets has rallied tremendous support from the public. He asked people to take the destitute into their houses and by bringing home the plight of these people he succeeded in awakening that spirit of human solidarity which Kropotkin saw everywhere in living institutions under the name of mutual aid, but which administrators and other boneheads treat as if it did not exist.

The Abbé Pierre also exposed the magnitude of the problem for he estimated that there are no less than 10,000 homeless families living or existing on the streets. But he also insists that there is a comparable number whose housing is so poor that only thin boards separate them from the cold. These destitutes whose situation has been rendered desperate (and in several cases, fatal) by the cold, consist of various sections of the populace. There are the old folk whose incomes have been whittled away by successive devaluations: there are young married couples with children, hit by unemployment, or those discharged from the army who have not yet been able to find a place in the earning world: and there are Algerian immigrants arrived in France in the hope of finding work. It is a commentary on the French Government's social welfare schemes that these people are left uncared for.

The Abbé has been offered a Paris hotel as headquarters. Hundreds of volunteer helpers have enrolled and tens of thousands of parcels of food and clothing are pouring in. Owners of cars have helped to bring the homeless in off the streets into the temporary shelters which have been opened.

This activity, spontaneous and called forth by the fervour of one man, has compelled the authorities to show increased activity in order to save its face. But in doing so it inevitably reveals its inertia before the campaign burst into sleepy official activities. Thus, the finding of shelters enough to house these destitute people shows that they existed already but were unused. No wonder it is reported that the Prefect of Police and the Minister of Reconstruction are pleased to be seen publicly in the company of Abbé Pierre in order to prove that they, too, are not backward in helping to do—what they ought to have done long ago.

The whole campaign shows that when public opinion is roused and appeals made in the name of humanity and human solidarity, spontaneous and voluntary organizations can in a few days deal with a problem which is the permanent preoccupation of official administrative departments.

No doubt the Abbé Pierre relates his actions to Christian beliefs, but many of his helpers must be atheists and anti-clericals and simple indifferents. His appeal is to the instinct of mutual aid and it succeeds. One is reminded of that letter of Malatesta's printed in a recent issue of FREEDOM, where he spoke of that

# MORE VICTIMS FOR FRANCO

AN agency report from Madrid (Feb. 5) gives the results of the trial of seventeen alleged anarchists and a prominent monarchist by court martial. Sentences ranging from fifteen years to one year's imprisonment were imposed on the seventeen anarchists, among whom were two women; the monarchist, Jose Andrade, a former major on Franco's staff during the Civil War, was sent to prison for six years and four months.

According to the report: The prosecutor, Captain Amado, who asked for a sentence of twenty years on Andrade, said he was accused of having made contact with the Anarchist National Labour Federation for purposes hostile to the Franco régime and had given 35,000 pesetas (about £300) to one of the other accused.

Andrade's counsel, Major Manuel Montoto, said Andrade did not know at the time the money came from anarchist organisations abroad.

Andrade said he made contact with the Anarchists to discover whether as a Labour movement they would support the Monarchy. They had told him they would in order to restore the peace of the nation.

For the defence Captain José Garcia denied that the Anarchists were guilty of military rebellion. Some could, he said, be accused of no more than illegal propaganda. Instead of receiving heavy sentences for their social ideas, they should be treated by "methods of Christian persuasion." They were "dreamers like Sir Thomas More." They belonged to a "collaborationist" and anti-violent sector of the Anarchist movement, which had social ideas not far removed from those of the "Syndicalist movement which forms part of the present [Falangist] régime."

Captain Amado declared that the defence had tried to "clothe wolves in sheep's clothing." For years the Anarchist movement's history in Spain had been one of continual violence.—*Reuter.*

★  
ONE hesitates to comment on such a scanty report of the trial. On the other hand a trial involving eighteen people which is speedily disposed of in less than a day—though the prisoners were held in prison a year while the prosecution formulated the charges!—is a tragic farce and not a trial except by Moscow and Madrid standards.

However, certain revelations contained in the report can we believe be clarified. We know that even before the end of the 1936-1939 struggle against Franco the revolutionary movement in Spain was divided. At the important National Plenum of Regional Committees of the

Libertarian Movement held in Barcelona 16-30 October, 1938, though there was complete agreement as to the policy to be followed by the Movement (at least so far as public pronouncements were concerned), the discussions revealed deep cleavages. Jose Peirats sums up the position in these terms (in the third volume of *La C.N.T. en la Revolucion Española*—published last month): The tendency represented by the National Committee of the C.N.T. (the revolutionary Syndicalist workers organisation) was largely fatalistic; that of the Peninsular Committee of the F.A.I. (Spanish Anarchist Federation) represented a tardy reaction against this fatalism. But between these two positions was a third represented by Horacio Prieto which was not a circumstantial but a permanent position calling for the complete revision of the movement's tactics and principles.

So far as it is possible for an outsider to interpret the attitudes of the Spanish revolutionary movement it would seem that in exile the movement is divided into two camps: the "purists" who now believe that the cause of Spanish liberation is best served by the revolutionary movement returning to its historic position based on anarchist principles; while the "collaborationists", (if we are permitted to make an assessment of their position from reading their journal *España Libre*, and from conversations with their representatives in this country) have quite openly abandoned anarchist principles while still paying lip-service to anarchist ends. They appear to be agreeable to political collaboration with all the opponents of Franco's régime with perhaps the exception of the Communists. Having become politicians one cannot be sure whether their shunning of Communist collaboration is the result of their bitter experience of "unity" with the C.P. in Spain or is motivated by considerations of expediency where the Western powers are concerned, from whom they might be expected to seek support in the event of a *coup d'état* in Spain.

★  
BUT while this is the position in exile as we see it, the situation in the Resistance in Spain itself is much less clear. There, in any case, desperate men and women are still, fifteen years after the establishment of Franco's dictatorship, risking life and limb to overthrow the régime. Nowhere in the world in living memory has a people displayed such courage and determination in refusing to admit defeat, and it would indeed be churlish to criticise from our position of safety the effects being made in this direction. We can even understand that in the circumstances all enemies of Franco

should unite in their efforts to get rid of him. What we think unlikely is that the revolutionary underground movement—"collaborationist" or "purist" would or could commit itself to support the restoration of the monarchy in Spain. Isolated groups might, but to commit the whole movement would imply an organisation and co-ordination of the revolutionary elements throughout Spain which we are inclined to believe cannot exist under present conditions. In any case as one has seen in the past, individuals have attempted to commit the revolutionary movement to all kinds of alliances which have forthwith been repudiated by that movement, in its congresses, the moment it was able to function legally.

In saying this we cannot conceal the belief that the experiences of 1936-1939 and these long years of resistance and exile will not be reflected in profound changes in structure of the Spanish workers' organisations and parties once Franco's régime has been overthrown and the freedom of the press and of organisation are re-established in Spain. We cannot see how the deep breach in the revolutionary syndicalist movement can be repaired (and this equally applies to the Socialist movement) except in the name of "unity" which, as has been seen in the past, is simply a surface unity, the fundamental differences eventually being bound to express themselves.† Furthermore it seems clear to us that every effort will be made in a future reorganisation in Spain to bring about a fusion of the two workers' organisations C.N.T., U.G.T. the consequences of which, so far as the revolutionary movement is concerned, are difficult to foretell.

★  
BUT whatever the future may hold for our movement in Spain, the recent trial, one of hundreds that have taken place under Franco's régime, is a clear indication that our faith in the determination of our Spanish comrades to go on fighting for their freedom is more than justified. And if it is true that there is little we in this country can do at present to help them in their struggle, the very least we can do is to encourage the general hostility to Franco's régime which exists here and which, it would seem, has so far made both Labour and Conservative governments unwilling to risk appearing too friendly or co-operative in their dealings with Madrid. One

†We have in mind the scission in the C.N.T. in 1931, patched up at the Congress in May 1936, but which revealed itself once more during the Civil War and continued in exile. See *Lessons of the Spanish Revolution* (Freedom Press).

## Colour Bar in Bermuda

"It is true that, as a select committee of the Bermudian House of Assembly reported last week, racial tension has seriously increased in Britain's oldest colony. The few practical proposals made by the committee are admirable: for instance, the admission of coloured people to the civil service and the training of coloured nurses. But they are also long overdue in a country where the Negro population is culturally as advanced as the white population.

"On the whole, the report is timid. In one respect, it is misleading: the American tourist trade is implicitly given as an excuse for maintaining the colour bar. This excuse was recently accepted by Mr. Lyttelton, but its falsity is shown by the much larger number of American tourists who flock to the unsegregated West Indies. Such allegations are neither flattering to the Americans nor do they convince coloured people, who know that conditions for their kind are far better in the United States than in Bermuda.

"How can such a meagre report have been produced by a committee, four out of the nine of whose members are coloured? The answer is to be found in the basic facts that the franchise in Bermuda is based on inherited property, which gives the whites a permanent Parliamentary majority; that life can be made difficult for "awkward" coloured people; and that discrimination can be enforced without overt legal action. The report is an attempt to placate liberal opinion: it does not tackle the real issue." (*Observer*, 31/1/54).

quality that the Christians call Charity, and we anarchists call solidarity. It is in situations and work which engage this quality that differences of doctrine and dogma, of class and politics dissolve away and men and women work for the general good. We may guess that many of the Abbé Pierre's volunteers found a happiness and a sense of purpose in this work which they do not find in their daily life in our society, and in which they obtained a glimpse of the revolution.

## 73 Rebel Priests

FOLLOWING the Pope's decision in November of last year to drastically alter the status of the French worker-priests, a move which was bound to destroy their effectiveness among the workers, 73 of their number have issued a signed protest against the final order to abandon by March 1st any office they may hold in the trade unions and reducing their working day in the workshops to three hours. The fact that the statement was issued to the press without regard to the present state of the Pope's health, may be a pointer to the finality of the decision taken by the worker-priests.

Although sections of the French Catholic Press have all along supported the priests in their various 'indiscretions', it seems unlikely that they can countenance this first known independent move taken by the priests without incurring the anger of the Church. The priests themselves must be aware of the possible consequences of the statement, but certainly the vocabulary with its strong working class influence indicates a decisive move. They declare:

"At the moment when millions of workers in France and abroad are on the march towards unity for the defence of their bread, their liberties, and peace, and while the employers and the Government are accentuating exploitation and repression to halt at all costs the progress of the working class and to safeguard their privileges, the religious authorities are imposing on the worker-priests conditions that involve abandonment of their life as workers and renunciation of the struggle that they have been conducting in solidarity with their comrades.

"... But it must not be forgotten that the existence and activity of the worker-priests have caused dismay in social quarters accustomed to use religion in the service of their interests and their class prejudices.

"If these measures are to be maintained they will trouble the consciences of Christians engaged in the struggle of the

working-class at the moment when so many efforts are being made to withdraw them from the common fight and to cast discredit on their faith. The worker-priests claim for them and for all Christians the right to effective solidarity with the workers in their just fight.

"Militant working men and the working-class trust the worker-priests and have respected their priesthood. This respect and this confidence, while they continue to be shown towards us, forbid us to accept any compromise which would consist in claiming to remain members of the working-class without working normally and without accepting the commitments and the responsibilities of workers. In consequence we affirm that our decisions will be taken with complete respect for the workers' situation (la condition ouvrière) and for the fight of the workers of their liberation." (Our italics).

The remarkable thing about the worker-priests is that they were regarded by left wing Catholics, and even by some bishops, as the *avant-garde* of post-war Catholicism, dedicated to the Christianising of the French workers. In most cases they acted clandestinely, and were indistinguishable from their fellow workers, sharing their problems in the factories and even their skirmishes with the police.

It was inevitable that contact with the rough and tumble of working life would turn some of the priests away from the Church. Some of them were converted to a new faith: an estimated 15 were received into the Communist party and ten others found marriage preferable to the spiritual union of the church.

The 73 authors of this latest protest perhaps feel that they can reconcile their devotion to the church with their peculiar position as worker-priests (they have indicated elsewhere that their life as workers has never prevented them remaining true to the priesthood) but they will eventually have to comply with the dictates of the church or come to terms with it. The tone of their declaration would suggest however that at the

can expect pressure from many quarters now that America has sold-out to Franco, and there is a growing demand for co-operation with Spain on the grounds that if this country can accept Tito's dictatorship why not Franco's. As if two wrongs made a right! V.R.

### 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 SANSOM :  
*Syndicalism—The Workers' Next Step* 1s.

ERRICO MALATESTA :  
*Anarchy* 6d.  
*Vote—What For?* 1d.

M. BAKUNIN :  
*Marxism, Freedom and the State.* 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* 3d.  
*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.

F. A. RIDLEY :  
*The Roman Catholic Church and the Modern Age* 2d.

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

moment they are not prepared to knuckle under.

The Archbishop of Lille, writing in his diocesan magazine, states clearly the position of the priests in relation to work.

"To be a priest and to be a worker-priest are two functions, two different conditions of life, which cannot be combined in the same person without debasing the notion of priesthood. The priest is there to devote his life to God and to the service of souls. The worker accomplishes a temporal task. There is no way of uniting these two functions.

"Even if the method of apostolate as applied by the worker-priests has had some success, this gives no right to alter the priesthood as Christ established it. Furthermore, the time given to manual labour makes it impossible for the priest to fulfil his essential tasks, and puts him in danger of being involved on the temporal plane."

The fact that the Archbishop expects the worker to carry on his "debasement" task and devote his spare time to the Church, is of course, another matter!

The French daily, *Le Monde*, puts a different interpretation on the priests' temporal occupation. They point out, that priests often act as school-masters and are "not only given permission by their superiors to serve as soldiers when the civil law makes it obligatory but, once they are called up, even volunteer for combatant service when given a non-combatant military function, or accept commissions." A timely reminder, after the verbiage, that "temporal tasks" when carried out in the interests of the church need not interfere with the priests' "service to souls".

We await with interest the reaction of the Vatican to the 'revolting' priests. The loss of 73 priests will not radically affect the church. But the loss of prestige in France might be considerable. If these worker-priests are prepared to make a stand on this issue they will no doubt get a considerable following of French workers.

We can be assured that the decision of the politicians at the Vatican will be made in the light of the long term effects on the Church. R.M.

**CHARITABLENESS, NOT CHURLISHNESS**

P.S. says that the withdrawal of labour can only be effectively used, as can any other expression of disobedience, through the recognition that unity is strength. Granted, provided the unity to which he refers is that of opinion and conviction. Where workers agree to strike because it is the wish of the majority this is an evil, for it is the acceptance of action in which they do not believe for the sake of unity, i.e. uniform action without conviction. This is the acceptance and furthermore, where blacklegs are victimised, the attempted enforcement of workers "democracy", that expression so often vilified within these pages.

Crusader P.S. has a "class war" to wage. Employed v. employers. Human beings v. Human beings. Good and bad on both sides. Idleness, prodigality and other vices common to the "Haves" and the "Have nots" alike. According to him any employees not uniform in opinion with the majority are "traitors". His choice of words in this and other contexts is, I feel, to say the least, unfortunate and more appropriate to Communist propaganda than to well balanced Anarchist thought.

I believe that "Sending them to Coventry" (especially when "they" amounted to what was, after all, an insignificant number of dissenters) is an anti-social act comparable to the punishment of crime. It harms a cause by allowing its enemies to use such incidents as have recently occurred for propagandising the divisions among the proponents of the cause, and by focusing attention on the callousness of men towards men (only strikers towards non-strikers, of course) thus depriving the supporters of the cause of a great deal of general sympathy, however intrinsically good their case may be.

I will not send P.S. to Coventry but will freely and frankly tell him that I cannot agree with him and publish my convictions. If he wants Anarchy, let him first seek it by unequivocally placing means above ends. Ghandi may not have been perfect but the moral esteem with which he must be regarded derives chiefly from the revolutionary manner he set about achieving things. He worked for a "change of heart" within his opponents, British and Indian alike. Like Marcus Aurelius (and this I regard as the greatest of the latter's teachings) he recognised that it is no crime for a man to be sincerely misguided in his beliefs and actions arising from those beliefs. The remedy is not to punish in any way, with or without the hope of changing the beliefs of the dissident, but to work for a change in his beliefs, or simply for the establishment of some beliefs, without a sus-

picion of coercion and, moreover, with the welfare of the dissident primarily in mind. Care for, not curse, the deluded.

To quote further moral authority I recall that somewhere Tolstoy shows how, if villagers are motivated by the feeling of mutual aid to build a bridge over a river running through their community, they should do so by voluntary co-operation. They should allow any person who refused to co-operate to use the bridge hoping that through shame at being the undeserving recipient of charity he may be brought to a realisation of his own anti-social attitude and to reform. By analogy, of course, this means non-union members being allowed to receive and enjoy benefits for which they have made no sacrifices. Such an attitude would, I am sure, have an integrative effect in a ready made Anarchist society and be an indispensable prerequisite to such a society. Because we have no Anarchist society is no excuse for the

temporary abandonment in the affairs of our present social system of the principles to which we are bound. Contrary to P.S.'s opinion there is a principled argument that can draw the line. To take the attitude of no retaliation would be to commit ourselves to anarchism, and our ability to do so would prove our integrity as professed anarchists.

To vindicate himself P.S. finds informers and spies in anarchist ranks. Surely the revolutionary course would be to welcome them, not to deal with them in the accepted authoritarian manner. Giovanni Baldelli says in FREEDOM of the 2nd January, "there will always be an external danger while there is no faith in a society living and developing without external danger." Surely this comment applies equally to internal danger, I further paraphrase G.B. as follows, "this lack of faith, and nothing else in my opinion, distinguishes the militant and realistic anarchist in the street from the

true anarchist in his haven of inependent moral and intellectual conviction." CORRIGIBLE.

**P.S. Replies:**

I think there is little point in continuing this discussion. If it goes on much longer I shall begin to feel persecuted myself!

"Corrigible", I feel, has certainly taken the arguments to their logical conclusion, but since he unconditionally equates Anarchism with pacifism it doesn't add much to our argument.

All that he shows is that he is more pacifist than anarchist—and so, it seems, are the previous correspondents who have agreed with him. It is interesting to note

**SYNDICALIST NOTEBOOK**

**Dockers Ban Overtime**

LONDON dockers holding the blue card of the Amalgamated Union of Stevedores and Dockers have been operating a ban on overtime for over a fortnight.

The ban was instituted as a protest against the consistent attempts by London port employers to regard overtime as compulsory. There have been many instances of suspensions and even dismissals of dockers for refusing to do overtime, through the employer's contention that preparedness to do a "reasonable" amount of overtime is a condition of employment.

The union maintain that all overtime should be voluntary.

Unfortunately the effect of the ban is reduced by the small numbers commanded by the blue union—only seven thousand out of the 35,000 in London. The rest are in the white union, the Transport & General, who are not operating the ban.

This division of port workers is a continued source of weakness. Cannot something be done, by port workers who are conscious of the problem, to create an organisation more representative of the rank and file than either the blue or white unions, or the lightermen's union, and bring them together in one portworkers' syndicate?

**Nonsense**

MR. HAROLD WATKINSON, Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Labour, said in a party political broadcast last Saturday that it is nonsense to think we are in the midst of a great wave of strikes and unrest.

In the last six months, he said, more than seventy pay claims, affecting over four millions workers, have been settled through the ordinary negotiation machinery.

cal opinions varied in a great many things.

"We cannot put this resolution in the river because it may float where others can see it," he added. "Captain Taylor should take his McCarthyism where it belongs—the U.S.A."

Coun. R. E. Way said Nunn May had paid his penalty and his crime ought to be wiped out entirely. "We have heard nothing about Communism with this woman until she married this man," he added.

Ald. Mrs. Rackham trusted the Council would not dismiss Dr. Broda. When the marriage had taken place last August, it had been fully reported in the local Press and there was not a single protest from parents of thousands of children dealt with by Dr. Broda.

She had a sheaf of letters from individuals and the headmistress of the local school for delicate children where important work for spastics was carried on. All of the letters spoke highly of Dr. Broda.

Battered but unrepentant the gallant Captain briefly replied to the debate, which he said had contained many "unallayed and filthy remarks about a member of the Council", Captain Taylor said he had made it clear that he did not think of Dr. Broda as anything other than a highly intelligent woman doing a hard job of work.

He continued: "But we in this country always wait until the horse has gone from the stable and then we lock the door. If there is any possible chance of any danger, any question of young children under her charge being used in the wrong way, then we ought to find employment for her in a less dangerous job. Knowing the associations there, I don't think we should run the risk of employing the lady in a job which she might use as a rod for our own back . . . Or perhaps this country will wake up too late, when a Communist Government takes over."

His fellow councillors however were unmoved by horses and stable doors but much more impressed by the valuable work Dr. Broda had been doing among their children and in decent human feelings.

As gloomy as is the picture of the Peeping-Toms of Norwalk, Connecticut, that of the Councillors of Cambridge, England is bright!

that he is, however, prepared to use pressure of a sort—he hopes that shame will bring the anti-social person back to the fold. But shame drove Alcock to the gas-oven!

"Corrigible" tells us that there is a principled argument that can draw the line—and then draws it behind the situation where we welcome spies and informers into the anarchist movement! I repeat that this is the logical conclusion of all the arguments of my opponents.

"Corrigible" is clearly first-class martyr-material. I am not. Anarchism, to me, is not merely an ideal goal; it is a method of struggle, and the boycott has been one of its advertised methods for years.

What he did not say was whether these claims had been settled to the satisfaction of the four million workers. Nor did he point out that an equal, if not greater, number of workers had been driven to strike or threaten to strike. And how many of the seventy settled claims had had to have threats of direct action to bring them to negotiation? And for how long had they dragged on before being settled?

The previous week the party political broadcast had been given by Wilfred Burke, Labour Party Chairman (who urged "Stop that grabbing" to both sides) and it is amusing to note the similarity of the messages the two broadcasters put across. For example, can you guess which speaker, Labour or Conservative, said:

"It is the idea of team-work, the idea of high earnings linked to high output, and the idea of planning a lively economy, that we offer you to-day as the new and successful solution for the new problems that will face us in the second half of this turbulent challenging century. If you are a trade unionist, then do more than carry your union card. Play your full democratic part in the work of your local union branch."

No prizes offered; answer given below\*

**Strike for a Foreman**

IT'S not often workers will strike for a foreman. This has happened in Liverpool, where 21 electricians have come out because their foreman has been sacked.

The men "have a great regard for Charlie Redmond. We think he is a nice bloke and has been doing his job well."

How do we class this action? A bit of workers' solidarity? Or class collaboration? P.S.

\*It was the Conservative

**MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP**  
OPEN AIR MEETINGS

Weather Permitting  
**HYDE PARK**  
Sundays at 3.30 p.m.

**NORTH-EAST LONDON**

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

FEB. 24.—Ron Wheeler  
"DAM AND BLAST"  
MAR. 10.—Donald Room  
"MAX STIRNER"

**GLASGOW**  
INDOOR MEETINGS  
every Friday

at 7.0 p.m.  
at 200 Buchanan Street.  
FEB. 19—Hugh McKeefery  
CHRISTIANITY—THE MYTH.  
FEB. 12—Mormon  
JUGGERNAUTS IN SOCIETY.

**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

**F.N. or E.M.2?**

ON Monday last the House of Commons spent a great deal of time on debating the very important issue as to which is the better rifle, the Belgian F.N. or the new British E.M.2. To underline the seriousness of the question even Sir Winston Churchill lent his august presence.

Rivalry on the matter was keen, champions of both weapons scoring many shrewd and telling points. One interesting argument put to the House was: what is the value of the butt-end compared with the sharp, or bayonet, end? We were not told whether this was viewed from the point of view of the man behind the gun or the unfortunate recipient. However, that is purely an academic question.

The Premier, favouring the Belgian rifle, stated:—

"It is a better weapon, both with the bayonet and the butt, and capable of giving confidence to a soldier in a melee."

A shrewd observation, but Mr. R. T. Paget (Soc., Northampton) retorted that he would take on anybody trying to hit him with a rifle butt with an umbrella or even his bare hands. Mr. Paget is obviously a very brave man, as the first reaction of the writer on seeing an individual bent on beaming him with the butt of a rifle would be to put as much ground as possible between him and the irate gentleman.

Conceding the point of Mr. Paget's bravery, and admitting our own cowardice, we come to a hot exchange between Sir Winston C. and Mr. G. Wigg (Soc.,

Dudley). The latter was incensed by Churchill's observation that he "didn't suppose the Hon. gentleman had carried a rifle very far." Festooned in medal ribbons, Mr. Wigg jumped up and shouted that he had carried a rifle farther and longer that the whole of the Government benches opposite. This was of course greeted with cheers by his Labour friends, but on reflection the statement may not be as meritorious as first it seems.

Apparently several members of both parties had previously amused themselves by banging away with the Belgian rifle on the Army's Mill Hill rifle range, with varying success. Sir W. C. even condescended to compliment Mr. Woodrow Wyatt (Soc., Aston) on a "most remarkable score".

So the long day wore on. The Government of course, being numerically superior, gained a victory on the debate of 34 votes, so we may assume that the Belgian rifle will be the future weapon for the British soldier to use against any recalcitrant Colonials or other "enemies of democracy".

Another issue vital to the British public had been competently settled by its elected representatives.

It would be interesting to know if any "Hon. gentleman" could tell us the difference between being killed by a bullet from an F.N. or from an E.M.2., and also what would happen to both of them if somebody decided to let off an atom bomb.

Is there a nuclear fission Guy Fawkes in the House?

R. H. LENEY.

**WITCH-HUNT NOTEBOOK** Continued from p. 1

**Attempted Witch-Hunt in Cambridge Scotched**

WITCH-HUNTING is a contagious disease and even if the Atlantic lies between us and the source it offers only little protection. An outbreak on this side occurred in Cambridge only a week or two ago in the council chamber, and it is to the credit of the healthy outlook of the majority of councillors present that the outbreak was defeated without even called for a show of hands!

It was Coun. Capt. Taylor who saw in the marriage last August of Dr. Alan Nunn May (the atomic scientist sentenced to 10 years' imprisonment in 1946 for revealing atom secrets to Britain's gallant ally Russia in 1943) to Dr. Broda, who is Assistant School Medical Officer for the City of Cambridge, a terrible plot to corrupt the City's children with the Communist virus . . . but let us quote extensively what happened from the report of proceedings published in the *Cambridge Daily News* (Jan. 30).

Capt. Taylor urged that Dr. Broda should be sacked since she had not taken a hint, published in the newspapers under the Captain's control, to offer her resignation.

"Last year—continued the Captain—without considering her employment, she married Dr. Nunn May. (Ald A. E. Stubbs: What's wrong with that?)

Dr. Nunn May, said Captain Taylor, was a very fine research worker in a laboratory in Cambridge.

Coun. J. Mole interrupted at this point to ask if Capt. Taylor was going to bring the children of Dr. Nunn May into the debate as well.

Continuing, Capt. Taylor said: "Many people feel this marriage has made them both inimical, not only to the interests of the local government but also to the interests of the central government.

"We consider that in view of the fact that the lady came here as a refugee, with Communist things behind, and this gentleman sold this country to the Communists. I am given further information. He never has had employment in the University since he came out of prison,

but he has been employed by someone I strongly suspect of being a fellow-walker, a strong Communist in this City. He is with the Woosters.

"It is not fair to the lady that she should be put in a position where she may be suspected of indoctrinating the children with whom she comes into contact." (A member: Rubbish!)

Captain Taylor said he had been approached by ratepayers, ex-Servicemen and associations to protest and to ask that the services of Dr. Broda be terminated.

A resolution had been passed by an ex-Service organisation, without a single dissent, calling upon the Council to ensure the dismissal of Dr. Broda.

"I have had ten years of my life serving through two world wars," he went on. "Like thousands of others who have done the same I say: How do you think we feel about the maintenance out of the pockets of the ratepayers of Dr. and Mrs. Nunn May?"

"WHAT PUBLIC HAS ASKED ME TO SAY."

"This is a free country and Dr. Broda can marry who she likes. (Cries of "Hear, hear.") And I have liberty to say in notice of motion of this kind what the public have asked me to say. It is this: We don't like the way you have shown your appreciation of what this country has done for you, and you should leave public service."

Seconding Capt. Taylor's resolution, Coun. R. L. S. Hearn said that as an ex-Serviceman he thought it quite wrong to pay rates to support "the greatest traitor since Judas Iscariot."

Coun. N. H. Ockleston said that all the main religions of the world had a belief in a God or gods. Communism, which was a religion, denied any God. If Dr. Broda was handling adults, he would not have supported the motion. But she was coming into contact with children and was in a position to turn them to Communism.

She could take away all they had of a belief in God. He thought there was no reason why she could not be transferred to some other job.

Coun. A. S. W. Newman said he assumed Dr. Broda had come to this coun-

try because of political persecution. But she had come only to get it again. "We gave her a job, I assume, because she could earn a living. Capt. Taylor forgets English people demand the right to go in any part of the world and work at their occupations and nobody prevents them unless it's behind the iron curtain.

"I DON'T CARE TWO DAMS."

"I don't know if Dr. Broda is a Communist. I don't care two damns if she is and I am more qualified to speak on this than any of the other speakers. Three of my own children attend schools in this county or city and they come under the attention of Dr. Broda. What attention they have had has been good.

"If she indoctrinates my children she will only have the opportunity of doing it five minutes in perhaps six months. I can take care of any five minutes she has with my children in ten minutes I have after."

Coun. T. Mole described the motion as "a dirty, filthy attack." Was there any evidence that she had indoctrinated children or had not carried out her duties with them? he asked.

"Judging by the people who have been seen to me to protest against this crime, parents think she has carried out her job second to none, and is one of the finest medical officers we have ever had in this city. Her whole life is wrapped up in children and their welfare."

"McCARTHYISM" REFERENCES.

Was it Captain Taylor's business to go into private lives or introduce the filthy system of McCarthyism? Dr. Nunn May had served a prison sentence for a crime he had committed. How many more sentences was he going to serve. Was Captain Taylor going to attack his children and say what schools they should go to? Captain Taylor had committed the crime of being a traitor to democracy.

"Turn this wicked filthy resolution into a vote of confidence for Dr. Broda," he pleaded.

Coun. A. T. Shelley said he had been assured Dr. Broda's work was carried out "in a really wonderful manner for the benefit of the children." They could not bring American McCarthyism back to Cambridge of all places, where politi-