

# Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

Vol. 16, No. 3

January 15th, 1955

Threepence

"To know what you prefer instead of humbly saying 'Amen' to what the world tells you you ought to prefer is to have kept your soul alive."

—R. L. STEVENSON.

## RAILMEN'S RISE: THE THREAT WAS ENOUGH

AS we indicated last week, the Court of Inquiry offered the Transport Commission the hoped-for opportunity to get out of its dispute with the National Union of Railwaymen without too much loss of face.

It also gave the N.U.R. the chance to avoid strike action, which the leadership wanted to do, and has given the official union a much-needed boost.

Strangely enough, the man who has come out of the dispute with the most praise for the avoidance of a national strike is Sir Walter Monckton—the Minister of Labour. The London evening paper, *The Star*, even gave him a headline 'The Monckton Magic Works Again', and gave to this Conservative lawyer the credit for averting the strike.

### Determined Rank and File

In fact, of course, there was only one factor which swayed the issue, and that was the plain determination on the part of 400,000 essential workers to stop work at midnight on January 9th unless their demands were met.

It was, after all, the rank-and-file railmen who compelled the executive of their union to repudiate the agreement made with the Transport Commission in October, when the leaders were quite prepared to settle the long-standing wage claim for merely another shilling or two on top of last winter's interim award.

And just as the executive had to jump to it and put up a militant show, so did the Transport Commission know that they were beaten when faced with 400,000 determined workers.

### Futile Precautions

Precautions were taken in advance to deal with the distribution of vital supplies in the event of a strike: large firms hired whole fleets of coaches to get their workers to

work; the Coal Board ensured as many empty trucks at the pit heads as possible and cleared their dumps to make room for continued production, but all the time everybody knew that within three or four days the country would have been very seriously affected. And when the N.U.R. announced that it would also call out the London Underground workers, with the resulting chaos and impossibility of transporting London's millions to work, it was perfectly clear that the men's demands would have to be met.

The railwaymen are tremendously strong on their own. But they weren't on their own. The dockers announced early that they would refuse to handle goods switched from rail to road transport. Other workers would have soon supported their struggle by similar action, and the railmen already had a considerable amount of sympathy from the general public, who recognised how niggardly was their pay for the essential work of running the railways.

"The settlement of the dispute and the avoidance of the strike, then, had nothing whatever to do with that old 'Monckton Magic'. It was a pure and simple struggle for power, and the Transport Commission recognised the weakness of its position. What the Court of Inquiry was able to do was to give a veneer of respectability and constitutional propriety to the proceedings, and provide the face-saver for the Commission.

### They Stalled If Off

What the Commission has gained, however, has been a further year's cheap labour from the railway workers. The original 15 per cent. increase was asked for nearly 18 months ago. The threat of a strike at Christmas 1953 won an award of 6 per cent., grabbed at thankfully by the N.U.R. leadership, and it was only the astonishing patience of the rail workers which allowed the protracted negotiations, talks and promises to stall off their getting the remainder for so long.

Now it has been won, but so late that the rises in the cost of living over the past 18 months almost eliminate its value. And how grateful are we supposed to feel that a fellow-worker performing an essential service to society in the second most dangerous industry earns, as a basic wage, £6 15s. per week?

For the railway worker, and indeed for workers in all industries, the lessons of this dispute are important even if they are obscured by

extraneous procedures. Firstly, there is the underlining of the oft-disclosed fact that nationalisation does not alter the position of a worker in his industry. He still has to struggle against the managers, and finds the dead weight of union officialdom and constitutionalism a barrier against his aspirations.

### The Dynamic that Matters

Secondly, the railman can plainly see that it was the threat of direct action which finally won his claim for him, and that it was his own determination to use the strength that solidarity gives him that was the dynamic that really mattered. And this dynamic is only engendered by the men themselves and should be used by them directly through their own initiative.

In simpler words: it was the railmen's readiness to use their strength through direct action that finally won what had been withheld from them while they relied on legalised negotiation. If this strength were consciously organised throughout the working class, we could build a new world.

## RAILWAYS—THE REAL EFFICIENCY

IN return for the wage award to the railway workers, the N.U.R. has once again affirmed its readiness to support means of making the industry more efficient. The Transport Commission has drawn up plans which, if implemented, will cost £1,200 million, for making British Railways one of the most modern and efficient railway systems in the world.

The vast network of railway lines which straddles this country was first begun over 100 years ago. The great expansionary period of the industrial revolution led to the springing up of dozens of railway companies competing for traffic, which only gradually merged into four main companies that were nationalised in 1948.

When British Railways then came into existence, it took over an industry in decline, whose structure reflected its chaotic origin and whose motivation had been the making of profit. This last, however, served only further to underline the run-down nature of the industry, for in fact the railways had not been showing a profit for a long time.

Dividends had been practically non-existent for years before the war, and during the war the only way in which the military requirements of the State could be satisfied was through subsidising the railways to the tune of £40 million a year.

Nationalisation, however, came to the rescue of the investors in private enterprise, for one of the first calls made to-day upon the takings of British Railways is for compensation to shareholders, who enjoy a security of dividend from their investments which they never knew before. One can imagine the enthusiasm, therefore, with which railmen face up to their arduous tasks when they know that a prior claim on the fruits of their labour in what should be a public service is allowed to investors for profit.

### Profit the Measure

And profit is still the measure of efficiency. Irrespective of the service rendered to the community; regardless of the chaos that would ensue under present circumstances if the railways stopped running (as most people dimly realised when the strike threat made them think about it) the general opinion seems to be that unless a money profit can be shown in the ledgers at the end of a financial year, the railways are a failure.

This, in a money economy, where property is the measure of a man's worth and profit-making the proper motive for progress, is understandable enough. But the arguments for nationalisation were not based on these concepts. They were based on the recognition that it was necessary for essential public services to be maintained for the benefit of society as a whole precisely without profit being the first consideration.

On this concept, the Labour Party has been gradually worn down by the nagging Tories, who have made great play of the losses sustained by nationalised industries. From the anarchist point of view, however, neither profit nor loss should be the consideration, but service to the community.

This is not generally recognised by the money-grabbers to be a motive for

Continued on p. 4

## AN ANARCHIST'S NOTEBOOK THE POPE'S ROPE

WHEN our opposition to religion is criticised on the grounds that religion is a personal matter and therefore out of our range of attack, we agree that belief in a divine being should be a matter for the individual's own conscience, but when organised religious groups, as they so often do, seek to impose their codes and teachings by force or fear we hold the right to oppose them by reason and ridicule.

There are quite a number of "cranks" in the Christian Church who have the temerity to carry out the teachings of Christ to the letter, but if they believe in the ultimate authority of the hierarchy they can usually be whipped into line when their brand of Christianity becomes an embarrassment to the Church.

The latest order from the Vatican addressed to Catholic members of the *Council of Christians & Jews*—an organisation with the Queen as its Patron, set up to combat religious and racial intolerance—to resign from the Council has prompted the comment from the Catholic weekly, *Tablet*, that "the reasons should have been stated fully and carefully. Decisions without reason are far removed from the spirit of Government in this country." The reason given for the Vatican order is that the Council is responsible for encouraging Catholics in the error of belief that one religion is as valid as another. In spite of the protestations from some Catholic quarters in this country, according to reports, the Catholic membership have dutifully resigned from the Council.

These pronouncements that come from time to time from the Vatican and startle the laity into remembrance of their obedience to the hierarchy are obviously designed for this reason. So much rope is allowed but when it stretches too far the Catholic is jerked back into line.

The Vatican would do well to remember, however, that this is a double-edged tactic; sudden jolts often have the result of making people see reason.

### GI'S AND THE CHURCH

The military alliance between Spain and America has resulted so far in an advance guard of 5,000 servicemen to man the air and sea bases in Spain. The inevitable "fraternizing" seems to be alarming the authorities. *Time* reports that:

"Spain's Catholic bishops, fearing that the U.S. servicemen (the present contingent is roughly 65% non-Catholic) might prove a wedge of Protestant proselytism, demanded legal 'protections' for Catholic señoritas who might fall for the Ameri-

cans. The bishops pointed out that Roman Catholicism is the state religion in Spain, and that canon law is the law of the land so far as marriage is concerned. Lieut. Colonel Raymond M. Stadta, a Reno priest serving as chief chaplain to all U.S. forces in Spain, worked out an 'administrative covenant' with Spanish church and state authorities. Stadta's covenant forbids U.S. servicemen or women to enter into 'mixed marriages' (between Catholics and non-Catholics) with Spanish nationals, unless the Spanish church approves. . . . With the approval of Major General August W. Kissner, chief of the U.S. military mission, Stadta agreed that American men and women serving in Spain would also be forbidden to contract 'mixed marriages' among themselves, unless the church agreed. Stadta's intention was that approval should be sought from the Roman Catholic Military Vicar of the U.S.—New York's Cardinal Spellman. But as reported from Madrid, his covenant seemed to say that the Spanish Catholic clergy could veto a marriage between a Protestant G.I. and a Catholic WAC or WAVE."

The outcry from the American and British Protestant Churches impresses us not at all. They are usually only concerned with "our precious heritage, religious freedom" when they are the subject of attack. When it comes to other issues, such as civil rights for American negroes, we find that the Protestant Church is not very concerned with rights, or freedom. A report in the *Manchester Guardian* tells us that the Missionary Baptist Association of Texas is the first large religious group to protest against the Supreme Court decision banning Segregation in the Public Schools. A resolution against the plans to integrate black and white children in the public schools reads:

"God made the races and appointed the bounds of their habitations, and since attempts to force racial union in social life would lead to the Communist hope of producing a 'one world hybridised human' against the word and will of God, we pray the people of our country to join us in speaking for the preservation of our historic past position on segregation."

"God made the races and appointed the bounds of their habitations, and since attempts to force racial union in social life would lead to the Communist hope of producing a 'one world hybridised human' against the word and will of God, we pray the people of our country to join us in speaking for the preservation of our historic past position on segregation."

### THE U.S. AND JAPAN

From this high plane of Christian ideals we have to return to the materialistic world. We find that in Asia policies are following the familiar road of capitalist necessity. Some time ago we discussed in *FREEDOM* the relationship between Japan, her need to find markets for her goods, and America. We drew attention to a trip to Japan made by a

Continued on p. 4

## Investigation Piece

This extract from the minutes of a meeting of a U.S. Investigation Committee during the Korean War was translated from the German as it appeared in *Vaterland*, June 1954 and published in *Peace News* last week.

CHAIRMAN: You are a Chaplain in the Army?

CHAPLAIN: I am.

CHAIRMAN: You believe that before God all men are equal?

CHAPLAIN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Would you therefore say that our greatest enemies, the Communists, are just as pleasing to God as we who are Christians?

CHAPLAIN: That is for God to decide.

CHAIRMAN: But you are a servant of God and claim to preach His word.

CHAPLAIN: (Makes no answer).

CHAIRMAN: Answer me. Are you of the opinion that we should love all men?

CHAPLAIN: That is God's will.

CHAIRMAN: Do you, then, love our enemies, the Communists?

CHAPLAIN: I preach the Bible.

CHAIRMAN: That's what you say. If, in your view, all men are equal and if you are bound to love all men, do you as an Army Chaplain love our enemies?

CHAPLAIN: I am concerned with souls. It is not my job to discriminate between them.

CHAIRMAN: Indeed! So it is not your job. We are in a war, and you maintain that it is not your job to hate our enemies. You are not worthy to be a Chaplain of our Army. You are either a complete nitwit or a traitor, and as a subversive element you deserve to be dismissed the Army with ignominy and to be deprived of your Holy Orders.

## Only Franco Loves Them!

WASHINGTON, JANUARY 9.

Brigadier-General Julius Klein, special consultant to the Senate Appropriations and Armed Services Committee, believes that European statesmen should travel to the United States for consultations because of the position of the United States in world affairs.

In a report to the committee on a recent tour of Europe, he says that he "found that many Europeans view the United States with neither gratitude nor admiration." He goes on:

"We have cut the ground out from under our Ambassadors by the alacrity and frequency with which our Secretaries of State have visited Europe to conduct personally our foreign relations. America to-day enjoys 100 per cent. popularity in only one European country—Spain."

## And Now The German Stock Exchange

BONN, JANUARY 3.

German stock markets have started in a buoyant mood in 1955 after a year in which many industrial shares have appreciated in value by between 60 and 80 per cent. and some have more than doubled their face value. This has been the first great post-war boom on the German stock exchanges and it shows no signs as yet of coming to an end or of modifying itself.

Among the leaders in German industrial shares the three principal components of the former I. G. Farben Chemical Trust have done exceptionally well. Bayerwerke Leverkusen shares stood at 127 a year ago, those of Höchst Farbenwerke at 129, and of the Badische Anilinwerke Ludwigshaven at 124. To-day the shares of these three companies stand at 257, 266, and 254. The shares of the smaller Cassella Dye Works, which once belonged to I. G. Farben, have moved from 146 to 410. . . .

One of the factors contributing to increased stock exchange activity is the sudden interest of foreign buyers. Most of their buying is done in Zürich and it is probable that, as yet, less than one hundred million marks worth of German securities have been bought by foreigners. Much of this money, moreover, represents "interest buying" and not normal private investment. The buying of blocks of shares in individual steel works and coalmines comes under this heading.

Behind the stock exchange boom is undoubtedly a general feeling that the danger of war has receded, and this is supported by the informed view that German rearmament for defensive purposes will produce a new "high" in industrial activity. An interesting pointer to dividend policy will probably be forthcoming shortly if the Bayerwerke, as expected, expands its share capital by offering shareholders three new shares at par for every ten that they hold. The movement of the Bayerwerke shares may show whether values have much prospect of further appreciation.

(Manchester Guardian).

“FREEDOM’S” BOOK CHOICE FOR JANUARY

# The Story of a Co-operative Settlement

IN discussing the Jewish communal settlements in Israel with their critics, I have often used as an illustration an imaginary East European Jewish family of four brothers at the beginning of the century. One emigrated to America and made good in the ladies' garment industry. He has stomach ulcers and his children who are grown up now, don't often visit the old people. They are hundred per cent. Americans, and are embarrassed by the queer accent and strange food. The second brother also emigrated and was active in the political movements of the left. He was deported back to Russia in 1918. In 1921 he was arrested. Perhaps he faded out of sight in a Bolshevik prison, perhaps he was extradited and wandered through a life of political meetings and manifestos, Berlin in the nineteen-twenties, Paris in the nineteen-thirties. Who knows what became of him? The third brother stayed at home and died at Auschwitz. The fourth brother emigrated to Palestine and worked on the land. He worked desperately hard for years; he survived malaria, sunstroke, and the bullets of Bedouin raiders. To-day he looks around and in a lot of ways is a disillusioned man. He was a freethinker, a socialist and an internationalist, and as he looks at the nation he helped to create, he is worried by religious bigotry, commercial opportunism, the possible growth of a new depressed class of Oriental immigrants, militarism at home and hatred beyond the frontiers. But he feels at the same time that he has made something with his life, he has watched his village grow from a desolate valley which, when he came, could not even support a family of nomads, he is proud of what he has achieved, of his children and grandchildren, of the refuge he has been able to give to those who fled from oppression, he feels, in fact, that he has added to the quality of life.

I was reminded very forcibly of this hypothetical fourth brother by Mr. Joseph Baratz's book *Village by the Jordan*. A lot has been written about the *Kvutzot* and *Kibbutzim* by visiting journalists, sociological investigators and Zionist propagandists, but here is the history of Degania, the first of these settlements, told by one of its founders; it is also its author's autobiography, and his goodness, bravery and tolerance shine through his pages.

BARATZ was born in the Ukraine and when he was eight his parents,

who were innkeepers, moved to Kishenev, the capital of Bessarabia, where the law which prevented Jews from owning land was less strictly applied than in other parts of Russia. . . . there were several Jews round Kishenev who cultivated their own land and this made our community more rural, less stuffy and abstract in its way of thinking than that of almost any other Russian-Jewish town. We were also different from other communities in that we were influenced by the peculiar historical tradition of Kishenev. It had been the custom of the Russian Government for over a century to send its political exiles to the rural South where it was thought that they could do less harm than in the big industrial centres. But such people could do 'harm' anywhere; few Russians did more by their writing to stimulate the independent spirit of the Caucasus than the exiled poet, Lermontov, and in Kishenev, starting with Pushkin, there had lived a succession of spirited critics of the Government who mixed with the persecuted minorities and heartened them by their sympathy. I think it was partly because of this that the Zionist Movement took so early and so strong a hold on us in Kishenev. . . . Our conditions were indeed uncertain and hard. Except for a small, wealthy minority we were not allowed to leave the Pale (this was an area in South-West Russia which included Bessarabia and the Ukraine, and even there we were forbidden to settle in the larger cities such as Kiev); we were kept out of Russian schools and universities and we were surrounded by legal restrictions and were at the mercy of corrupt officials—so were Russians with full citizenship, but to a lesser degree."

Feeling choked by the narrow segregated life, dominated by traditional religious observances, the younger people were restive. Thousands emigrated to America and Western Europe, some "join-

ed Russian political parties in the hope that a change of régime would bring a millennium in which all could live in brotherhood; but the crushing of the Liberal Revolution of 1905 was followed by pogroms more savage than had yet been known while a wave of reaction spread all over Russia". Other young people became members of the Zionist Youth Movement.

"There had always been religious Jews who had gone on pilgrimages or to die in Jerusalem, but in 1881 a group of students from Kharkov had emigrated to Palestine with the intention of founding a Zionist settlement; they were members of a society called B.I.L.U.—these are the first letters of the Hebrew words which mean 'Let us go forth and build the House of Jacob'. Few people had followed them across the sea but the society spread and others were formed as the aspiration grew towards a Jewish way of life which should be not a protective and confining wall, but should develop freely on its own soil, and towards an independence and security which seemed unattainable in the Exile. Now, all over the Pale, at home or in secret meeting places, over interminable evenings and innumerable cups of tea, young people were talking, planning, arguing and learning Hebrew. . . ."

★  
"WHEN I was about fourteen I began to feel that all this talk about Zionism wasn't really Zionism. I began to want to go to Palestine, and I intended, when I got there, to be a peasant. This was a new idea among us and I can't exactly explain how it first came to us. In the early days Palestine had been thought of mainly as a refuge, though much had been written about the new country, and the new culture we were to build; now we felt that in order to construct our country we had first to reconstruct ourselves. We had been

intellectuals, semi-intellectuals, middlemen for too long. We had to work with our hands and above all we needed a peasantry—that had to be the foundation of it all. This wasn't what was generally thought, but that was what we felt. Perhaps we were reacting against our upbringing, or perhaps we were influenced by our reading of the early socialists and of Tolstoy—though the idea of manual labour has always existed in our religious tradition, only it had been neglected."

When he was sixteen, in 1906, he overcame his parents' objections and embarked from Odessa for Palestine. On arrival at Jaffa he and his fellow *halutzim* set out for Rishon Le Zion, the vineyard colony of the Bilu, subsidised by Baron Edmund de Rothschild. " . . . In a moment we would see a Jewish village. But we thought that to talk with the Biluim we would have to wait until sunset—we imagined a village like in Russia—hens pecking in the road, children shouting by the river, and not a soul in sight while the sun is high and all the peasants are in the fields. But what was this? We were in a pretty street of neat brick houses with red-tiled roofs; from one of them came the tinkling of a piano. The street was full of people strolling up and down. We couldn't believe our eyes. We asked:

'Who are these?'  
'Bilium.'  
'And who does the work?'  
'Arabs.'  
'And what do the Jews do?'  
'They're managers, supervisors.'

It was a great shock to us. I said to myself: 'This isn't what I've come for,' and I could see that the others were disappointed as well."

★  
NEXT morning they walked on to Rehovoth where the citrus-growing farmers were willing to employ Jewish

immigrants as well as Arabs. There he learned how to work on the land, and soon afterwards went to Jerusalem to learn the work of a stone-mason. From there he went to work on the building of the new town of Tel Aviv and then he heard that a new Jewish settlement was being built at Athlit in Samaria. "At last! I thought. It wasn't farm work but at least it was not in town, and Athlit would be the first Jewish village built by Jewish hands." When the job was done he moved on to Zikhron, another 'Rothschild colony', where the conflict was going on between the old settlers and the *halutzim*, the new pioneers. "To many of the farmers our ideas of becoming new and better through work made so much nonsense. But even putting this aside, what could they do with their methods, even with all the millions that were being spent by Baron Rothschild on Jewish settlement, so long as the Jews in Palestine were like proud colonials who needed lots of Arab wage-earners to work their places?" At Zikhron he became a ploughman. It was there that he met Miriam, his wife.

They worked for a year on the new land which had been bought by the Jewish National Fund at Hedera in Samaria. "We worked for individual farmers but we lived as a community, a *kvutza*. We pooled our earnings and every week we gave them to Miriam—she had left her work in the orange groves to look after us—and she bought whatever she thought proper, food and boots for one or two trouses or a shirt for another." Meanwhile Dr. Arthur Ruppin, the head of the Palestine Office of the National Fund decided that a tract of land should be handed over to the *halutzim* to develop on their own responsibility. And this was the land, 750 acres in the Jordan valley close to where the Jordan flows out of the Sea of Galilee, where in 1911 the group of twelve, ten men and two women, settled. They called it Degania which means cornflower. The land had been sold to the National Fund by the absentee Persian landlord. The settlers were on good terms with the neighbour-

Continued on p. 3

## FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

OPEN DAILY  
OPEN 10 a.m. to 6.30; 5.0 SATURDAYS  
Our latest list of second-hand and remaindered books is now ready. Let us know if you want it. All books are now sent post free so please get your books from us. We can supply any book required, including text-books.

★  
New Books . . .  
Sexual Behaviour in the Human Female Kinsey, Pomeroy & Martin 50/-  
Nationalism and Culture Rudolph Ricker 21/-  
Reprints . . .  
Animal Farm George Orwell 6/-  
Scarlet and Black Stendhal 3/6  
The Aztecs of Mexico E. C. Vaillant 3/6  
Jazz Rex Harris 2/-  
Outline of European Architecture Nikolaus Pevener 3/6  
A Vocabulary of Politics T. B. Weldon 2/-  
Second-Hand . . .  
Education for Peace Herbert Read 3/-  
Soviet Policy and its Critics J. R. Campbell 3/6  
Can Capitalism Last? Frederick Allen 2/-  
The Fear of Freedom Erich Fromm 10/-  
Changing Man Beatrice King 2/-  
Education, Intellectual, Moral and Physical Herbert Spencer 1/6  
The Development of Political Ideas F. J. C. Hearnshaw 2/6  
The Objector Job Stuart 2/6  
Sexual Behaviour in Society Alex Comfort 6/-  
Meet Yourself on Sunday Mass Observation 2/-  
India To-day (1940) R. Palme Dutt 3/6  
The Problem Family A. S. Neill 3/6  
City Development Lewis Mumford 2/6  
"Draw the Fires" Ernst Toller 2/-  
Salome, etc. Oscar Wilde 3/-  
Postage free on all items

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

## Anarchism: Faith or Despair?

IF there is one general and set line of interpretation of political development and events in the anarchist movement it could be said to lead to an unflinching denunciation of all the abuses and crimes legally and illegally committed by those in power. It leads also to constant warnings against hidden schemes, obvious limitations and harmful repercussions in anything seemingly good that those in power happen to effect or publicize.

This is the great spirit and historical function of anarchism. It should be appreciated by any wise statesman who, although rejecting the anarchist principles and fearing the consequences of their application, yet has the good of the commonwealth at heart. Wary not irreparably to block the creative possibilities of his people by excessively pig-headed and repressive measures, he would do well to see that anarchists always enjoy sufficient freedom to develop and exercise their point of view. Political necessity has institutionalized Her Majesty's Opposition, but the principle of an opposition being recognized as an integral part of the government is a wise one, and it is the same that should inspire society with tolerance for its anarchist members. Anarchists do tolerate the society in which they live, and it would be fine also on their part if they did it not only out of necessity but out of a feeling of belonging. If they have a sense of realities and are set not merely to play the rôle of a spoil-joy, a Jeremiah or a sulking Sally, they must feel they are actively and responsibly participating in the historical praxis of their society. An "Athanasius contra mundum" as each of them may be, the whole of society would not be quite what it is and go the way it goes if anarchists kept silent or were simply not there.

It is already a heresy on my part, from the viewpoint of the general set line mentioned above, to think of a statesman as being wise or having the good of the commonwealth at heart. It is one, however, which both the orthodox and the heretic can look upon with a smile. But the orthodox might feel his basic attitude to life attacked by my advancing that anarchists participate or should participate, even only catalytically, to the life of the society to which they belong. This participation, in fact, would, as soon as it became conscious, reveal some kind of faith in society such as it is, with all the powers to which it is enslaved, but without which on the other hand it would not be what it is. The orthodox might be horrified at the thought of having to admit that only by

such faith, however qualified, could all his activities be reasonably justified.

★  
THE question of faith and despair or, as the lukewarm like to put it, of optimism and pessimism, is fundamental because action and inaction depend on it constantly and directly. One reason why new adherents to anarchism are few is because its general line offends them in the measure that they feel or wish themselves to be participating in the life of their society. The impression they gain when the general line is presented to them is that according to it everything which is not anarchist is wrong, that any movement, institution, vocation and avocation, insofar as it is actual is tied up with the present system, and that the present system is rotten root and branch. On the other hand, faith in the essential goodness and spontaneity of the masses, or in the blue from which the anarchist revolution will come, cannot be improvised. This revolution, besides, has lost the novel engaging colours with which it shone some fifty or a hundred years ago. Few anarchists themselves still cherish this faith, and in the case of those that do it is probably a bad faith. If it were possible to analyse it, it would not be difficult to show that it is like a medicine they keep by their bedside but do not take because they are too fond of the illness which it is supposed to cure. It is a façade to cover a comfortable pessimism, not free perhaps from masochist justifications.

What other conclusions, in fact, can be drawn from an attitude and a criticism which, whatever the political scene or problem it is turned to, sees only badness and not a glimmer of hope from any quarter? The East is bad, the West is no better, their clash will be catastrophic; capitalists are only bent on exploitation, workers resigned to it, politically manoeuvred or fighting for partial interests generally harmful to other workers; governments, whether sadistic or paternal, do violence to the individual, and individuals grow more and more afraid of not being governed, teachers, authors, and artists are mercenary, and the public judges of their products according to the money they fetch; science is divorced from any concern for values, and scientists are at the beck and call of those who pay them; those who prepare for war are criminal, and those who think that they can prevent it are their dupes; anybody who can do something is bad, and the only good ones, the anarchists, can do nothing. Not to be bad, therefore, one must do nothing. Conversely,

not daring or being unable to do anything one may as well console oneself by attributing one's inactivity to goodness. Fully to enjoy doing nothing one must further never admit that anyone is doing any good.

★  
I BEG my readers to credit me with no nasty intention in this simplified and brutal exposition. If a few truths go home it is because they know their way home, and, to stretch the idiom even further, they know their way home because they went first to my home. Too little is done for anarchism by anarchists, but that is a personal problem. The general problem is: what can anarchism do for the anarchists or for any one, since it is meant for all? I think all answers will be partial and all but useless if not framed within the context of the present historical moment or drawn from an interpretation of history susceptible of being inserted into the dynamism of history itself.

Of course, I have anarchism in mind, for its success cannot be denied. The point of interest, however, is not how or why it has succeeded, but the fact that it has succeeded where and when anarchists should have, and in such a way as to make any future revolution that is not communist-sponsored a matter of sad or academic reflection. I do not think for a moment that anarchists should set about to provide a "scientific" interpretation of history, but an interpretation they must give, were it only to state that anarchism is that presence in history which condemns it wholesale. In its present shape anarchism can easily be assessed as just one more symptom of the decadence of the West, exhibited by one more section of disillusioned intellectuals all made powerless by the persuasion that only evil succeeds. In its constantly siding with the lost cause, the victim and the conquered, it seems to be further convinced that success is evil in itself. Would then the good be what is fatally defeated or what is so insignificant and ineffective that evil can leave it undisturbed? Obviously anarchy is not such good, but if any historically successful force is evil, which one of them will be the tree suddenly to bear good fruit?

I am not trying to force anarchism into the straitjacket of a crude or refurbished manicheism. Though the issues of good and evil will always haunt anarchism until anarchy and anarchism are one, I auspicate an interpretation of history and current politics which will sort out trends and events according to their

being for or against the coming of anarchy, independent of their being ethically good or bad. Anarchist practice, however, will not be indifferent to good and evil, it will not do the evil for the sake of the good, nor justify the evil which wittingly or unwittingly has made room for the good.

Is it fear of the most gloomy constations and perhaps no faith in anarchism which prevents this task from being serious-heartedly done?

GIOVANNI BALDELLI

## Community

In July 1953, a letter was published in FREEDOM from Alan and Joan Albon, proposing a community venture with the following aims:—

1. Establishment of own-employment and self-sufficiency in basic commodities.
  2. The ability of all members to lead creative lives.
  3. The creation of a free and unhibited atmosphere for the children.
  4. Provision for the physical basis of high level health, by rational methods of agriculture and dietetics.
- They concluded: "Possibly the project outlined would first be confined to mutual aid, while capital is accumulated to launch the plan on a satisfactory economic foundation. Finally, that if our individual legacy, of unconscious emotional and material possessiveness can be overcome, despite present day conditions, such a scheme could be successful."

We are glad to report that a small beginning has in fact been made, the community now comprising five adults and five children. We have been fortunate in securing spacious (though unpretentious) premises with more cultivable land than we are at the moment able to utilise. The three men are engaged in outside jobs and our immediate objective is the accumulation of capital for the purchase of a farm as a permanent home and the basic economic activity, to which we hope others will be added. A nursery and infant class has been started, with an ex-Summerhill teacher and we hope this will develop into a community school as more families join us.

We are in need of further members to share in the life and work of the community. Fuller details are given in our duplicated newsletter (which we plan to issue occasionally); a copy of the first issue will be sent on request to: *Communitas*, Eastleach, Cirencester, Glos.  
ALAN & JOAN ALBON,  
DEREK & KAY EASTMOND,  
ROBERT SALE.  
Cirencester, Dec. 30, 1954.

## EFFICIENCY

"EFFICIENCY" is, in mechanical terms, "the ratio of useful work or the effect produced to the energy expended in producing it". It is also "the quality that produces the best business results or the most effective service".\*

Thus, the bus service which is cancelled when there are insufficient passengers to fill the bus and the one which strictly adheres to its timetable irrespective of the number of passengers can be equally efficient; the former produces the "best business results" (profits), the latter may not make profits, but no one who has been stranded as a result of the former "quality" will deny that it provides the most "effective service".

Clearly the wise compilers of our dictionary realised that it is difficult to reconcile the efficiency which makes for increased profits with that efficiency which has as its aim the public welfare. It is rightly said that "business and pleasure don't mix". The efficient business man is not interested in better relations in the factory or the office because of his love of humanity, any more than he offers better working conditions and wages because he even intellectually believes in the equality of man, but because the experts advise him that better relations and conditions and higher wages are conducive to greater efficiency, greater output per man—that is, higher profits.

The efficient business man introduces mechanisation in his factory when it operates more cheaply than man-power, not because he cannot sleep at night thinking of the heavy and exhausting nature of the work his men have to do. After all, he is not concerned if his machines put a few or many workers out of a job altogether, or whether the heavy toil is replaced by soul-destroying work on the belt-system of mass production.

Capitalism's "New Look", with its welfare-State and its full (or almost "full") employment programme, does not represent a change of heart, an unfreezing in the attitude of the controllers of the Machine towards its operators. It is, in fact, business efficiency, up to date and looking forward; facing the problems of potentially limitless production in a world of limited markets. In a not very distant future the "vicious spiral" of wages and prices, about which Trade Union bosses and employers are in such agreement, will be no more vicious than the spiral of *productions and markets*. Viewed in this light, even the most naive and sentimental of our brethren may come to question the real motives behind the "generosity" of Marshall Aid and other apparently free injections of dollars, consumer and capital goods, and Coca Cola.

(Those readers who at this stage may be tempted to turn to what they consider less "cynical" and less "agin everything" contributions in this issue of FREEDOM are earnestly asked to go on reading since we propose to substantiate all we have written so far!)

★  
ACCORDING to the figures published in the annual report of the *United States National Planning Association* the gross national product, that is, the total production of goods and services, in the United States last year was just under \$360,000 millions (£128,571 millions). The Association however issues a warning that if the country's working force is to be kept fully employed (and presumably this

means that the total number of unemployed does not rise above the average of some three million?) production would need to increase by at least \$25,000 millions (£8,928 millions) in 1955.

The report said that even though a general business depression failed to develop out of last year's recession, the fact remained that "over the last year our economy has failed to grow in accordance with the growth of the labour force and the rise in productivity. The actual level of economic activity is at present about \$15,000 millions to \$20,000 millions below a level of reasonably full employment." The report said that an increase of at least \$25,000 millions should take place in the next twelve months and an increase of 40 to 50 per cent. in the next decade.

And the outlet for this ever-increasing productivity? What is not uselessly absorbed by the needs of the cold war must, presumably, find a market somewhere in the world, and America's new, and less intransigent attitude towards trading with the so-called "enemy" powers, is perhaps not unconnected to the new "vicious circle" to which we have referred. And what of the "unearned income", the dividends and the profits?

On this question the Citizens' Advisory Committee of the Senate has recommended that United States capital should take over the major share of financing economic development abroad. Among the "conditions" suggested by the Committee to attract private capital were:

1. "Clearly defined legal property rights for the owners of that capital."
2. "Management rights", including the right "to select management and technical personnel, the right to non-discriminatory treatment under the law; the right to remit profits to the ultimate owners of capital in the home country."
3. "Positive inducements," such as tax incentives, Customs privileges, treaty negotiations with the United States Government to provide "explicit safeguards" to investors, and others.

This, incidentally, is a most realistic description of New-Look Imperialism, and completes our illustration of the definition of efficiency as "the quality that produces the best business results".

★  
THROUGHOUT the world productivity is increasing yet there is no more leisure than say five years ago. We are, by the mechanical definition of efficiency, more efficient and according to the production experts we shall go on becoming more and more efficient and consequently more and more mechanised in the home as well as in the factory. And the simple-minded, inefficient little human worm who can still wriggle will venture the question: "And when do we stop?"

The answer he gets will depend on the quarter to which it is directed. The efficiency experts of the *United States National Planning Association*, for instance, will give him hope for the wrong reasons. They declare in their report that

Gains in productivity could also be obtained by reducing the amount of work by each individual during his lifetime.

Imaginative thinking now on this subject could lead to more constructive uses of our abundance and leisure in time to come.

In other words, for them man may work less as a technique for producing more. For us man must work less so that he may enjoy life more. For them efficiency is measured by productivity and profits. For us anarchists, efficiency is a term applicable to machines. The value of human activity can only be measured by the extent to which it contributes to the sum total of human happiness.

### The Political Game

"No, this won't be a year of much disagreement—this is a year without any elections. In 1956 it will be different". Senator Walter George in an interview with the *Sunday Times* Washington representative (Jan. 9, 1955).

## CHILDREN AND FREEDOM

IT is unfortunately true that there has been very little written on the subject of self-regulation which gives practical advice on the day-to-day problems facing parents. This is not to suggest that a manual of directives is required—that would scarcely be in keeping with the principles of self-regulation—but some guide in the form of a record of actual experience, suggestions and ideas from some of the few people who have consciously applied these principles, could prove useful.

Self-regulation is the natural way of bringing-up children. It does *not* mean allowing the child to run completely wild—to use one's first editions as scribbling pads or to walk across the dinner-table; but it *does* mean allowing the child to develop without any conventional and inhibitory moralising from the parents. An upbringing without rigid timetables for feeding and going to bed; where the growth of sexuality is regarded as a natural phenomenon and not either ignored or over-emphasised; where the doctrine of original sin is rejected; where there is a positive belief in human nature. Self-regulation implies the right of the child to live freely and to be loved. Love and understanding form the basis: a love that can enable the adult to be 'on the side of the child' in Homer Lane's phrase.

Almost the only published writings on the subject (in book form) are to be found in the works of A. S. Neill and Wilhelm Reich. Neill, in *The Free Child*, says 'I never heard the term self-regulation until my friend Wilhelm Reich used it, and if he did not invent it, he, more than any other man, has understood and used the method'. But Reich's books, whilst they are practical inasmuch as he is concerned with the concrete phenomena of experiment and case history and of the practical application of his ideas, can do no more than provide a theoretical base from which to apply self-regulation. The parent who is new to these ideas may find it helpful to know what others think about such problems as whether a fireguard should be used (will not putting up a barrier increase the child's interest in the fire?) or whether a toddler should be allowed to stay up at night until he falls asleep. He will find little help in Reich's books because they are not designed to answer such questions. Neill, in his delightfully discursive books, does discuss many of these everyday problems, but it is inevitable that they should be problems arising from his experiences with his school, and although the discussion of them undoubtedly provides much useful information, they seldom correspond with the problems met in the home. However, this gap has been partially filled by some articles by Jean and Paul Ritter in their magazine 'Organic Functionalism'. The article in the current issue (No.

6) deals with that vexed aspect of self-regulation—the question of Freedom and Licence. It is an argument often used against Neill that the logical application of self-regulation should entail no restraint whatsoever being put on the child; this may be so—where the environment is ideal. But unfortunately for most of us our environment is anything but ideal; quite apart from the natural hazards which may confront a child—such as stairs or open windows—there are the compromises which have to be made with our society if we are not to alienate ourselves entirely. The Ritters classify those things which make the restraining of the child's freedom a necessity as 'the truly dangerous, the anti-social, and the insurmountable limitations of our culture'. Under the truly dangerous they mention motor traffic and electric shocks, to which could be added open fires and various gadgets which a child might not know to be dangerous—such as an electric iron. The anti-social factors are those which encroach on the freedom of others such as (in Neill's example) painting the front door with red ink, or using mummy's best frock for dressing-up. It is, however, the 'limitations of our culture' which will provide the greatest barrier to complete self-regulation.

Compromises (unless one chooses to be completely isolated) are inevitable. 'Say your child is lonely and next door there lives quite a reasonable playmate . . . But one thing the mother of the little girl does not like is nakedness. Otherwise she may well be quite rational and reasonable . . . in such a case, it is well worth while to let your child play there . . . the child would much rather play next door with pants on than at home without'. It is the happiness of the child which is the ultimate consideration even if it involves complying with an irrational taboo. It is often said that the self-regulated child will have difficulty in adapting himself to the outside world. But in fact this is not so. Self-regulation develops a sense of sociality that enables the child, at an early age, to concede that other people may have different ideas on sex or other 'awkward' subjects. This natural sociality is a more preferable attribute to take into the world than the acquired characteristics of the trained child.

The article also discusses the question of schools. For the majority of people this does not present a problem; it is rather a matter of Hobson's choice—the council school. The Ritters rather assume that those parents who believe in self-regulation can all afford the fees of a private school; such schools are often a preferable alternative to State education, which can be quite unenlightened. But some of the reasons they put forward against sending one's child to a State school are a little strange. " . . . one has to beware of inverted snobbism.

Assuming that "classes" of people means merely difference, and not better or worse, it becomes functionally desirable that one should learn to be sociable and to have contact with those with whom one is likely to have much in common. In the first instance, in other words, it is not all sorts but one's own sort one ought to meet'. Apart from the magic word 'functionally' this sounds like an argument from upper-class suburbia! There is little to support the idea that the free or semi-free child is only to be found at schools where fees are paid; the Ritters maintain that there are more violent and aggressive children in a council school than in a private one and that these violent children will force the others to their level. As one who has suffered from being educated with the children of the professional classes I would say they exhibit just as much violence—perhaps cruelty might be a better word—as those from the working class. I suspect that the Ritters' reasoning is as subjective as mine.

★  
THE question of schooling is largely an economic one; and for many of us economic considerations play a large part in how we put self-regulation into practice. For those who have decided to cut themselves off from our society by forming a community, whether it is self-supporting (that is, its members do not have to become wage-earners) or not, this aspect will not be of great importance; but there are many who accept the ideas of self-regulation whilst still living within our society. It is for such people, if they are not well-off, that money becomes yet another limiting factor.

There is, for instance, the matter of food. Ideally, when the child is weaned, one should offer him a variety of dishes from which to choose. In practice this would entail not only considerably more work in the preparation of meals (which a busy mother can ill afford) but also a high rate of wastage. One has to compromise by preparing only one dish, with unprepared foods (such as fruit) as alternatives. Also for those who are dependent on shops for their food a tight budget considerably reduces the choice available. Such limitations are inevitable where money is necessary in order to live.

The discussion of such practical details is of the first importance if the idea of self-regulation is to spread. Most men and women are pragmatic creatures and are more concerned that a new idea be a practical proposition than that it should be theoretically sound. That this is so is shown by the tendency to-day toward greater freedom for the child; and the impetus has not come from any outside authority but from within the family. M.G.W.

## Co-operative Settlement Continued from p. 2

ing Arab villagers who lived in fear of the nomad Bedouin robbers.

★  
THIS is how Baratz describes the aims of the little group:

"What we wanted was to work ourselves, to be as self-supporting as we could and to do it not for wages, but for the satisfaction of helping one another and of tending the soil. We knew that we needed one another's close and constant help because in the harsh conditions of the new country neither a person nor a family could stand alone, and it seemed likely that if we worked more closely together we should produce more.

"But we were not thinking of producing big crops, though this was important since the country must support more people; the fact of producing—growing things—had for us a meaning which was related to the whole of human life. It was this wholeness we had lacked in exile.

"There we had been cut off from nature, from our roots, and everything had been distorted by the need for security—even the family had become a little fortress. We had had to buy security with money and make money with whatever are the money-making facilities of the brain, we had lived on our brains and we hadn't used them properly because we had been cut off from the growing natural side of life. That was why we had become so dry, so barren.

"We had had to use our brains to buy, now we would use our hands to give, and in our communities we would do away with money altogether. We would have among us neither masters nor paid servants but we would give our-

selves freely to the soil and to one another's needs. Thus nobody would have to be ambitious or to worry for himself or his family; the community would protect him, there would always be all the others to help him out. All our strength would go into the land, yet we would be strong in the face of sickness, difficulty or danger. Neither lacking nor possessing anything, we hoped that in this way we would manage to live a just, peaceful and productive life. "We did not want to impose our ideas on others. It didn't worry us that the way which attracted us might not appeal to the 'masses' or indeed to many people (though some of us may have thought that everybody was capable of adopting it). Nor did we set ourselves up as an arrogant and exclusive sect. We hoped that the experiment would succeed and would be tried by others, and we knew that we had a lot to learn. As it turned out we didn't even visualise in those days more than a small part of the problems we would have to tackle."

★  
BARATZ relates how these problems arose and were overcome, the adventures, mistakes and tragedies which attended the growth of the population of Degania from twelve to a thousand, the

changes in the face of the valley. The first world war when the colony was occupied by both sides, the fall of the Turkish Empire and the coming of the League of Nations mandate, the trouble with Arab raiders from Trans-Jordan, the new waves of immigration from Europe, the second world war and the end of the mandate, the war with the Arab States, these were the external landmarks of the story; the development of dairy farming, of poultry-keeping, tree-planting, market-gardening, the birth of the first child, the building of the school, were stages in the colony's internal development, and Degania became a model for later settlements, a place where children were sent for education, with one of the most complete agricultural libraries in existence, so that the old man can end his narrative:

"We know that the land responds to work and to selflessness. It does not give itself in the same way to greedy hands or to rapacious hearts, but to us who, for all our sins and errors, have asked of it nothing but to feed and shelter the hungry and homeless multitudes, it has given itself gratefully. It has rewarded us. We who came to this barren soil of swamp and desert, to this climate that was moody and dangerous, see around us the green valley teeming with life, with children, with rich harvests, and beyond the hills, throughout the whole country, our children are carrying on our work. When we planted our trees we said: 'Our grandchildren shall not be hungry.' But we ourselves are indeed most happy; few people can have seen such fruit of their labours."

★  
IN our next issue we will discuss Joseph Baratz's views on community life, and will mention two other recent books with a bearing on the future of the Jewish co-operative settlements.

A VILLAGE BY THE JORDAN can be obtained from FREEDOM BOOKSHOP at 12s. 6d. post free

\*The New Standard Dictionary of the English Language.

THE VIEWS OF OTHERS

THE ANARCHIST CONTRIBUTION

TO most Americans, life without extensive political organization is practically unimaginable. The genius of American institutions had its origin in eighteenth-century political philosophy, and there is a natural tendency on the part of the people of the United States to turn to law-making for the solution of their problems.

It is here, in relation to the exaggeration of the role of politics, that the thought of modern anarchists and their criticisms of the part played by the "State" in human affairs becomes an indispensable tract for the times.

The anarchists do not oppose organization, although they are extremely skeptical of the latter, being frank to admit that anarchists themselves seem unable to resist the virus of authoritarianism, whenever they organize for political purposes.

The main reason for our deep, resolute aversion to the organization of anarchists into a party lies in the history of organization, and particularly of political organization, which has always been a hierarchical, authoritarian institution in which arrivistes at the apex exercise authority over everyone else.

In practice, those anarchists who organize have followed exactly in the tradition of other organizers, creating the organization first, and the functions to use it for

later. Organization without exact and well-defined aims is organization for its own sake—an instrument without a function.

Anarchists have always insisted that the need must create the means to satisfy it, the necessity for the function must create the organ. . . . In Italy after the war, the only anarchist activity which prospered, which was widely accepted and supported, was that of aid to political victims. And it is clear why: this committee answered to a concrete need everyone felt and was interested in.

I don't know if these undertakings can be called organizations; certainly they are not the paternalistic, total, classical party organizations that the "organizing" anarchists want. But they certainly represent an association of energy, in response to a definite need, existing for as long as the individual adherents consider it necessary and opportune.

This, we think, is fundamental education in the problem of government, which has the purpose of uniting men for common ends without diminishing their freedom in the process. The great contention of the anarchists is that an organization which gains an identity apart from its members, apart from their primary interests and decisions, cannot help but work against human freedom.

proposition, and there is value in admitting it.

The real reason why anarchist proposals are frightening to many people is that an anarchist society could not organize its energies for modern war. There would not even be police power in an anarchist society. As a result, the tremendous importance of anarchist criticisms of modern society is ignored by all those who are unwilling to contemplate even a theory of complete political freedom.

Yet the fact is that anarchist principles will have to prevail in a warless world, and in any sort of human society where there is genuine respect for each other and trust of each other by its members. Even if anarchist programs may be said to suffer from oversimplification of social problems, and neglect of the power of evil, the solution of those problems and the elimination of evil are difficult to imagine without realization of anarchist ideals.

Present-day anarchist writing is largely devoted to criticism of modern reliance on the State as the origin of all human good. David Wieck, writing in *Resistance* (an anarchist review, Box 208, Cooper Station, New York 3, N.Y.), points out in the August-October issue that American believers in the "welfare State" are obliged to trust that the American State will not practice the terrorism of the Russian State. The trust, we think, may not be misplaced, but Wieck's point is that this sort of trust is itself a weakening thing.

The central equation of the anarchist idea of integral emancipation is this: power, expressed in government, corporations, bureaucracy, tends to isolate the individual, to render him powerless and deprive him of the opportunity for growth, while the magnification of the collectivity and depletion of the individual are expressed in imperialism and wars.

The tendency of present-day liberal and so-called radical thinking is to abandon the practice of it now, and to pray that the State and the social institutions founded upon its model can be domesticated and harnessed. Extrapolated to its ideal, this is man-protected and not man-alive; extrapolated in its present tendencies, it is man-soldier.

Since reform movements are generally dominated by the State-hopeful persons, the criticisms of anarchists often make us appear to be the enemies of all reform: we are enemies of reform which strengthens the State, and advocates of methods which will give habits of sociality and freedom a rooting in our society.

The positive value of anarchism lies in its uncompromising faith in the potentialities of unorganized individuals. Whatever men with this faith say is likely to be worth attention.

(Manas, Los Angeles, Nov. 17).

SCIENCE NOTES—2

Physicists, Fishermen & Plumbers

ACCORDING to a recent report in the *Manchester Guardian*, Dr. Ashby, Vice-Chancellor of Queen's University, Belfast, said in a recent speech that the death of a Japanese fisherman in September from the effects of the dust of a hydrogen bomb experiment was the symbol of science getting out of hand.

Since, he said, the hydrogen bomb had been designed by graduates and could not have been designed without them, and since it was a direct outcome of academic research, no university could escape the implications of the death of that Japanese fisherman.

"There is no obvious scapegoat yet I wonder whether universities should not bear some of the responsibility for his death: for they supply not only scientists and technologists, but the civil servants and economic advisers, and many of the politicians."

The decisions these men make, he continued, were limited by their education; there was no doubt that the courses leading to a degree can confer Power without a corresponding sense of responsibility, a knowledge of means without a corresponding understanding of ends.

We are eager to publicise any recognition of the lack of a sense of individual responsibility among scientists and also welcome any signs that scientists are beginning to resist the demands of the politicians, that they prostitute their knowledge in the service of governments, helping them to undertake bigger and better wars.

An outstanding instance of this was the tremendous activity devoted to the development of the atom bomb in America.

In Germany in 1942 the physicist Otto Hahn was in charge of nuclear energy projects. He was the first man to split the atom and his work on its structure put him in the forefront of scientists who had the basic knowledge required to develop nuclear energy for war purposes.

At that time the development of fundamental knowledge had reached about the same level in Germany and America. He claims in his book *New Atoms* to have used his influence in Germany to emphasize the development of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes.

during the war, but they might well have produced sufficient plutonium to make a plutonium bomb. They never did, but to what extent this was due to the attitude of Otto Hahn we will probably never know.

Albert Einstein who initiated the atom bomb project in America is now attacking the growth of bureaucracy. November *Industrial Worker* reports that in a letter to the Reporter magazine he wrote: "If I would be a young man again and had to decide how to make my living I would not try to become a scientist or scholar or teacher. I would rather choose to be a plumber or a peddler in the hope to find that modest degree of independence still available under the present situation."

This sharp rebuke, says the *Industrial Worker*, against the tightening control over scientists and others, whose thoughts may tend to be non-conformist, carries an impact that will be felt far outside high school circles. Einstein's statement is part of a series of broadsides which he has levelled from his influential position as one of the world's most highly regarded scientists.

A few months ago, the noted physicist told a New York school teacher facing a quiz session before the McCarthy committee, that there was a point at which scientists and teachers must be willing to put up a stand against the invasion of the freedom to hold unorthodox opinions. Einstein advised the man to refuse to testify although this might mean jail.

The implication of Einstein's statement, that he places a higher value upon even a "modest degree of independence" than upon the knowledge of the physical universe which his research has contributed, will perhaps have its strongest repercussions among his scientific colleagues.

It is widely understood that two contrasting trends have been agitating American scientists. First, a growing tendency to question the nature and social outcome of the research directions they have been led into taking, and second, the mounting pressure towards conformity, such as that which made itself evident in the recent "purge" of atomic scientist J. Robert Oppenheimer.

Dr. Einstein's words are significant not only because of his reputation as a scientist, but also because he has had personal experiences with anti-libertarian régimes as a former citizen of Hitler's Germany.

Anarchist Notebook

Continued from p. 1

THE U.S. AND JAPAN

group of business men, sponsored by the American Government, resulting in a report to the effect that Japan would have to carry on limited trade with China if her economy was to remain stable. We suggested at the time that a change of tactics on the part of the American Government was inevitable; the tactics are now obvious. Judging from American newspaper reports they appear to deprecate the latest moves on the part of Japanese politicians to woo China and Russia.

In the Middle East trade necessities have effected a mixed marriage between Moslem Turkey and Israel. It is reported that:

"Turkey sends wheat, cotton, cattle and oil seed to Israel and last year got in return \$5,000,000 worth of cars and jeeps (from Israel's Kaiser-Frazer plant). Peasants in remote Anatolia now boil their weekly wash in Israeli-made pots fired by Israeli-made stoves, turned out near Israel's Ataturk Forest and carried to Istanbul in vessels of the Turkish Maritime Bank."

Railways

Continued from p. 1

initiative and responsibility, but in our opinion it is one of the strongest. The trouble is, however, that while the money-grabbing mentality governs the economic life of our world, communal feeling is at a premium, and responsibility a handicap.

The Best Way

Efficiency, by money standards, means making a cash profit. By social standards it means the satisfaction of the needs of society by the least wasteful methods. Wasteful, that is, in terms of materials and human life. There may be ways of doing things which take longer in time but are more enjoyable for the person performing them.

Railways are run by human beings; a point apparently forgotten even by many travellers. And it is the anarchist contention that, efficiency entailing responsibility, the most efficient way to run the railways would be through more responsibility being vested in the people who actually do the work. For the Transport Commission to make agreements with the top officials of the N.U.R. to cut down staff, reduce restrictive practices, get more out of remaining workers and generally tighten up discipline, will only engender bitterness and resentment and do more harm than good.

But if more responsibility were vested in the workers at all levels; if station and depot councils were established through which the workers on the spot could take over more and more of the administration of the industry, a new spirit and dignity would develop—and a new efficiency.

This, however, is likely to be opposed by those already doing the administration, for such a development would soon show where the truly redundant are—not among the people who do the work, but among those who tell them what to do.

Society Should Pay

And the money? Well, it is already recognised that some form of subsidy is necessary to capitalise the railways. This seems to us perfectly reasonable. While money exists it has to be provided for any undertaking, and if society wants an efficient transport service on tap at all times—it should provide the finance to do it. And—who knows?—if the running costs of the railways were met through a general fund, the necessity to buy a ticket with all the wasted, useless effort that lies behind it, could be eliminated. And with that would go the biggest single restrictive practice, the biggest unproductive overhead, the biggest barrier to public enjoyment of what should be our railways.

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT!

Table with 2 columns: Item and Amount. Includes Deficit on Freedom (£15), Contributions received (£53), SURPLUS (£38), and 1955 TOTAL TO DATE (£53 19 6).

Both economies are eager to industrialize, but lack necessary foreign exchange; both produce goods that have difficulty competing in world markets (Turkey's wheat is inferior, Israel's manufactures overpriced), so they swap. Last week, to exchange-short Turkey, Israel granted new credits of \$4,500,000. It was a returned favour; last year it was Israel which was caught short and saved by Turkey.

Out of their dealings with one another, the two nations have discovered likenesses. The Turks are Moslems but not Arabs; their Islamic ties are complicated by bitter relationships with the Arabs, whom they ruled for four centuries. Both Israel and Turkey are virile, modern and westward-looking inhabitants of an old, static and inward-looking region. Turkey admires Israel's compact little army as the region's second-best force (after her own), while Israel sees Turkey as the only other Middle East power of military significance."

We are not opposed to the exchange of goods between countries. In common with many other people who are not anarchists we deplore the deliberate destruction of food, and the conditions that are generally laid down when a country in need has to look to a richer country to fulfil these needs. We reject the motives from which alliances between countries spring. This is more obvious between the triumvirate mentioned first, and deserves greater condemnation because while a public campaign goes on in America, designed to stir hate against Red China among the ordinary people, Government plans at a different level are carried out to encourage trade between America's Japanese ally and China. This is part of the immorality of Governments everywhere, and it is our job to expose it.

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

LECTURE-DISCUSSIONS

Every Sunday at 7.30 at THE MALATESTA CLUB 155 High Holborn, W.C.1. (Nearly opposite Holborn Town Hall) JAN. 16—Jack Robinson on THE CINEMA JAN. 23—Rita Milton on THE FUNCTION OF THE REVOLUTIONARY PRESS JAN. 30—Frank Hirschfeld on THE FAILURE OF PACIFISM?

INFORMAL DISCUSSIONS

Every Thursday at 8.15.

OPEN AIR MEETINGS

Weather Permitting HYDE PARK Sundays at 3.30 p.m.

NORTH-EAST LONDON

DISCUSSION MEETINGS AT MANOR PARK Alternate Wednesdays at 7.30 p.m. Apply to Freedom Press for details

N.W. LONDON

DISCUSSION MEETING AT HAMPSTEAD JAN. 18th at 8 p.m.—Alan H. Bain ANARCHY IS HUMAN NATURE at 27 Christchurch Hill, Hampstead, N.W.3.

GLASGOW

INDOORS at 200 Buchanan Street Every Friday at 7 p.m.

The Malatesta Club

155 HIGH HOLBORN, LONDON, W.C.1. LECTURE 'THE FEAR OF FREEDOM' by ERICH FROMM by Harold Sculthorpe Wed., Jan. 19, at 8.30 p.m.

YOUTH GROUP ACTIVITIES Dancing Every Saturday from 9 p.m. (Guest charge, 6d.)

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 Payne, and addressed to the publishers: FREEDOM PRESS 27 Red Lion Street London, W.C.1 England Tel.: Chancery 8364

FREEDOM PRESS

- VOLINE: Nineteen-Seventeen (The Russian Revolution Betrayed) cloth 12s. 6d. E. A. GUTKIND: The Expanding Environment 8s. 6d. V. RICHARDS: Lessons of the Spanish Revolution 6s. SELECTIONS FROM FREEDOM: Vol. 1, 1951, Mankind is O paper 7s. Vol. 2, 1952, Postscript to Posterity paper 7s. Vol. 3, Colonialism on Trial paper 7s. 6d. cloth 10s. 6d. JOHN HEWETSON: Sexual Freedom for the Young 6d. Ill-Health, Poverty and the State cloth 2s. 6d., paper 1s. Marie-Louise Berneri Memorial Committee publications: Marie-Louise Berneri, 1918-1949: A Tribute cloth 5s. Journey Through Utopia cloth 16s. (U.S.A. \$2.50) K. J. KENAFICK: Michael Bakunin and Karl Marx paper 6s. 27, Red Lion Street, London, W.C.1.