

# Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

Vol. 16, No. 6

February 5th, 1955

Threepence

## THE PHONEY FORMOSA CRISIS

THE Formosa crisis has not, we trust, caused anyone to start digging air-raid shelters in their back gardens or settling-up their affairs in readiness for the call-up, or even distracted them from those topics, such as the rearmament of Germany, on which until a few days ago the Press and politicians were concentrating the spotlight of urgency and importance. The Formosa crisis is a crisis of words, a diplomatic indigestion—desired or accidental we cannot tell since we have no direct contact with the master minds in Downing Street, the White House, the Kremlin or Peking. The world situation remains unchanged; there may be a knotty problem to unravel at a diplomatic level, but then how much more important and necessary will appear the army of politicians when they finally succeed in unknitting the knots of their own creation!

★

A CAREFUL reading of the published facts of the Formosa "crisis" reveal only one new factor: President Eisenhower's Special Message to Congress on Formosa which, in the words of the *Manchester Guardian* is so "clumsily constructed" and "deplorable" for all its "ambiguities" and "a gross blunder" that it can be interpreted as giving "apparent credibility to some of the Communist propaganda claiming that the United States is planning an attack upon China".

That Peking is threatening to "liberate" Formosa is not a new development; it has been repeated as frequently as Chiang Kai-Shek has promised that he would wage war on the Chinese mainland. The sporadic shooting and bombing that has been taking place between the Nationalists and the Communists

since last August has in itself no international significance. It need never have started had not the United States armed Chiang, and could soon be stopped if the American government withheld arms and money from him. The concern shown by such papers as the *Observer* for Chiang and his men if they "are abandoned to Peking's vengeance" could easily be solved by transferring all those who fear reprisals to the American mainland, where Chiang can join the other pretenders to the thrones and Ministries of a "liberated" Europe and Asia. China's interest in Formosa only appears to date from the time the United States became interested in the island. For ninety-five years during the Japanese occupation they appeared singularly indifferent to the island's fate, or to any possible threat from its masters.

Formosa has, in fact only assumed such vital importance to the "free world" since the end of the Korean war. As recently as five years ago Mr. Dean Acheson left it out of the American "defensive perimeter" as having "no special military importance", and declared that it was essentially a Chinese

question, an unresolved battle of the Chinese civil war. But with the intervention of the Chinese communists in the Korean war it was felt in "responsible circles" in America that if the Chinese took Korea and Formosa the Philippines would be threatened. And this view coupled with the warning uttered by that war-monger MacArthur (who now, in what might have been his moment of triumph, has come out as a 100% peacemaker) that with the loss of Formosa and the Pescadores the real American defence perimeter would be the coast of California, Oregon and Washington, resulted in Congress voting substantial military aid to Formosa and the promise of a mutual security pact with Chiang Kai-Shek.

★

IT is now said that Eisenhower has decided to abandon the offshore islands which the Chinese might use "to bait the United States into a big war". The hypocrisy of this Christianlike gesture is exposed when one considers that up to last week Chiang was still counting on Ameri-

Continued on p. 3

### SYNDICALIST NOTEBOOK

## DO-IT-YOURSELF THREAT TO BUILDING WORKERS

IN a competitive economy, any improvement in one's way of life is nearly always achieved at someone else's expense. We live all the time through the exploitation of others as well as ourselves, and short of withdrawing to a hermit-like existence on the poverty line, one cannot escape from the vicious circle of exploitation.

Even by becoming more self-reliant we are hitting at the economic stability of others. The "Do-it-yourself" drive, which is beginning to catch on in Britain as it has in America, is an example.

The householder who decorates his house himself, builds his own garage or radio set, or makes his own furniture is, of course, taking work away from the building tradesman, the radio engineer and the cabinet maker.

This "threat" has been spotted by the National Federation of Building Trades Employers, who, in their annual report, have expressed the fear that a buyer's strike may cause a slump in the industry.

The Federation recognises that the cause of such a strike would simply be the soaring prices of all building, and it brings forward suggestions for bringing prices down. Guess what the main line of their suggestion is? Of course—more work out of the workers. But not a word about voluntary limiting of profits.

To return to the Do it Yourself

"Civilization has accomplished improvements in every direction except that of politics, which continues to be a field for the display of deceit, intrigue and contempt for right and liberty."

—L. PROAL, ("Political Crime").

'threat' however, we must admit that it presents a dilemma. We don't want to see a slump in the building trade, but at the same time we feel that it makes for a healthier society if people are more self-reliant and creative with regard to their own needs. As in so many things, the demands of a capitalist economy conflict with the needs of a healthy society.

Once again the answer lies in divorcing the means of life from the profit motive and the wages system. In an anarchist society the organisation of building workers would provide the means by which society's needs for houses, hospitals, theatres, buildings of any kind, would be met, but the natural desire of the people who were going to live or work in those buildings to play a part in their creation or maintenance would be recognised as a good thing, and, since work would not be tied to wages, would not in any way threaten their livelihood.

### 'Middle Classes of the World - Unite!'

LAST week we drew attention to the National Union of Bank Employees, and its plans for a 'dignified' campaign for higher wages.

This week it seems that the entire middle class is on the march, for now we hear of a 'Middle-Class Union' that is being launched by a Mr. Jack Hildred, of Tadcaster, Yorkshire.

Poor Mr. Hildred, who at 50 is earning a mere £14 a week (national average: about £8. 10. 0.) as a bank cashier, says: "The middle-class standard of life is declining rapidly. We are on our way out."

And he puts forward as the justification for the continuance of the Middle Class Way of Life:

"But it is still the middle class man who does a bit more for the boss without being paid overtime."

This being the case, we can only ask who is to blame for the present parlous plight of the petit bourgeoisie? Mr. Hildred has had hundreds of letters of application for the Middle Class Union, and apparently all tell of the hard times the middle class are having: of too small pensions; of possessions sold to buy food; of hardships caused by heavy mortgages; of the struggle of living on salaries that have increased by only two-fifths since pre-war days while the cost of living has more than doubled.

But, we may be sure, the good old M.C. will remain loyal, patriotic, faithful and dignified—behind the worn lace curtains. There's little else they can do, for unlike the upper class they cannot manipulate society in their interests and unlike the working class they have no economic power with which to fight back.

And while they boast that they do 'a bit more for the boss without being paid overtime', they can hardly expect the boss to come forward to better their conditions for them. If they remain crawlers they must expect to be stepped on.

### 'Economy' Begins on the Railways

IT hasn't taken long for conflict to begin between railway workers and the 'streamlining' experts who are going to be economic at their expense.

At Southport, Lancs., a guard was posted to take over a ticket-collector's job for 40 minutes last Sunday while a barrier was unmanned, but on instructions from his branch secretary, he refused.

A 'streamlining' committee had decided that five collectors and one shunter at Southport were redundant. Three collectors who retired were not replaced and two others were kept off Sunday work—which carries overtime rates.

These, as we warned last week, are likely to be the methods by which the 'experts' of the British Transport Commission will economise—by cutting down on workers and pushing more work on the remainder.

The Branch Secretary at Southport, Jack Ormandy, put a case similar to that which we expressed last week. "We have

Continued on p. 4

## JOHANNESBURG FEBRUARY 12th:

(From our Johannesburg Correspondent)

AS far as Europeans are concerned (i.e. the whites), the Western Areas of Johannesburg have jumped into prominence in the last twelve months or so. But for the Africans it has been an issue for a very long time. At the moment the third attempt to remove Africans from the Western Areas is going on. The Rev. Huddleston pointed out that their feeling of insecurity was one of the main causes of crime in this area.

Father Huddleston has himself lived

## Operation Bulldozer

in Sophiatown for six and a half years and it is largely through his efforts that the people in this area have obtained the amenities they have—such things as street lighting, a swimming pool and decent sanitation.

### History of the Western Areas

Fifty years ago this land was bought by a Mr. Tobiansky, who originally intended it for Europeans but the Town Council put sewage works in the area so that it became unattractive to Europeans. Tobiansky decided to sell the land to Africans and it became a very mixed area. By 1917 however, the district was non-European. The Town Council resolved then to put a native location in that area, that is, to set this land aside for Africans working in the city. In this way the Western Areas which incorporate the suburbs of Sophiatown, Martindale and Newclare became a non-European area where the Africans held freehold rights.

Since it is a native location the people in it have paid from the beginning very high rates and taxes. The assessment rates are proportionally far higher in Sophiatown than they are in the European suburb of Melrose.

As the industrial development in Johannesburg grew and the demand for black labour also increased, Pimville and the Western Areas—the two main non-European residential areas there—became overcrowded. Housing lagged behind and Sophiatown landlords were cramming families into single rooms—not for profiteering, but simply because there was nowhere else for these people to go.

### The Vital Question: Is this Area really a Slum?

The overcrowding alone makes it a slum; many of the inhabitants should be housed elsewhere. As property it has a very mixed character: though slummy it is ideally situated for a suburb, possessing beautiful views. Moreover it is only four miles from the centre of the city. With intelligent planning and less overcrowding the district could have been a delightful one for non-Europeans.

It is interesting to note that there are plenty of other African areas where conditions are far worse than in the Western Areas and should definitely go first in slum clearance, for example, Moroka which is a squatted area of lean-to shanties made of sacking and tins which fall apart when it rains or the wind blows. Other shelters have been built in the Orlando Township by desperate people with nowhere to go. The Gov-

Nazis (no, of course, ex-Nazis) who are collaborating happily with a truly democratic People's Government.

If the source, being American, is not too suspect, we should like to quote from *Time* magazine for 31/1/55:

### The Devil's General

Even after the German armies capitulated in World War II, a fanatic *Wehrmacht* general, commanding a force of last-ditch Nazis, held out against the Russians in a Bohemian mountain redoubt. Field Marshal Ferdinand Schörner, 62, had been named by Hitler to succeed him as commander-in-chief of the German army; in the Führer's last testament his name ranked sixth. In pursuance of the dead Führer's wishes, Schörner went on fighting, ruthlessly killing hundreds of his own men who resisted the futile slaughter. He finally deserted his outfit disguised as a Tyrolean peasant, gave himself up to the U.S. 42nd Infantry Division. The Americans turned him over to the Russians, who, it was assumed, hanged him.

Last week Schörner came back from the dead. Released from a brainwashing camp somewhere in the Soviet Union, he arrived in East Germany to take over "a military post." When the Communists formally recognize their "People's Police" as a full-fledged East German army, West Germany now expect that "the Devil's General," as they call Schörner, will become either its No. 1 or No. 2 man.

It all depends, it seems, on where they are, as to whether Nazis should have arms or not.

## No Arms for which Nazis?

LAST week the Communist Party in Gt. Britain pulled off the nearest thing it has got to a riot à la French C.P. since the war.

The lobbying of M.P.'s at the House of Commons was the culmination of weeks of planning and campaigning in the *Daily Worker* and the demonstration that grew out of the lobbying was hailed by the *Worker* as an expression of the people's will against German rearmament.

Now there is no doubt that there is widespread misgiving about the plans for the rearming of Germany—an uneasiness which is not the less real because it finds no articulate outlet. But the C.P. is certainly no mouthpiece for the people of this or any other country—it is purely and simply a stooge organisation for the Russian government.

The slogan the comrats have been painting on the walls for some time now is 'No Arms for the Nazis'. A laudable sentiment indeed—but now sincerely do the Communists hold that policy?

What they should say (if they've enough white paint) is: 'No Arms for the Nazis in Western Germany', for it does not appear that they have the same opposition to arms being placed in the hands of Nazis in East Germany.

How many Nazis found billets for themselves in the semi-military 'People's Police' in the Eastern Zone is anybody's guess. Only now and again news comes of high-ranking

## COMMENT ON LAND THROUGH LOVE

TOWARDS the end of 1951 we commented on the campaign of Acharya Vinoba Bhave for the voluntary redistribution of land in India. At that time he had collected 35,000 acres of the 50 million acres (one-sixth of India's cultivable land), he aimed at collecting by the end of 1957. How easy to smile at the political and economic innocence of this disciple of Gandhi who hoped to solve India's land problem by persuading the landlords to give away one sixth of their land.

To-day Vinoba is the world's biggest "landlord". He has walked 11,000 miles and acquired 4 million acres in free gifts. Whether or not he ever reaches his enormous aim seems beside the point when compared with his extraordinary achievement in the first three-and-a-half years of his movement.

Two articles in the magazine *Encounter* under the title "Land through Love", tell us something about the Land Gifts Mission. Hallam Tennyson writes about Vinoba considered as Gandhi's successor and Minoo R. Masani writes of Jayaprakash Narayan "who had for twenty years been the General Secretary and unquestioned leader of India's Socialist Party", and is now one of Vinoba's assistants in the Bhoodan movement.

MR. TENNYSON explains the origins of Vinoba's campaign. Gandhian village workers held their annual conference in 1951 in Hyderabad and Vinoba, a follower of Gandhi for thirty-eight years set out from his Ashram to go there. "At that time large tracts of Hyderabad were dominated by Communists who had driven out, or murdered, the landlords and distributed their land among the poor. Entering Communist areas where armed police went in fear, Vinoba said, 'What is needed is to keep cool and not to get panicky'. He himself approached the Communists with calm and ruthless affection. 'You are like dotting mothers,' he told them. 'You love the masses and want to ruin everyone else for their sake. But dotting mothers end by ruining their children, too.' With every word that he spoke

the man and the occasion seemed to be drawing closer together. It was in the small village of Pochempelli that they coincided. Forty 'untouchable' families approached him. The Communists had given them land, they said, how could they not give the Communists their support? No one else had shown any interest in their misery.

"That evening, at his prayer meeting, Vinoba appealed to the local landlords: 'If you had five sons and a sixth was born to you, you would give him a portion of your estate. Treat me as your sixth son and give me one-sixth of your land for re-distribution to *Daridranarayan*—God revealed in the poor.' A gaunt, intellectual figure, the village's largest landlord, rose, nervously adjusting his spectacles. He offered a hundred acres, and the forty 'untouchable' families, deciding how they could best divide the gift, said they could manage with as little as two acres each and returned twenty to the donor. It was this double act of generosity that provoked the *Bhoodan Yagna*, voluntary land sacrifice. There and then Vinoba decided to make the same appeal in every village, through which he walked. Such was the unpremeditated, almost accidental origin of Free India's first mass movement."

WHEN Vinoba was asked whether he seriously expected to obtain 50 million acres of land by the method of loving persuasion, he replied primly: "I shall wait until the method is squeezed

dry before discussing what to do next." But, Mr. Tennyson continues, "in a Bihar Village which he had visited three times without obtaining any substantial gift, I heard him promise to approach the absentee landlords personally on the peasants' behalf. Then I heard him add: 'But if they still hold back, will you refuse to cultivate their fields?' and I guessed at once that Vinoba well knew all the steps that were open to him and that he refrained from disclosing them so that no taint of coercion should damage his present relations with the rich."

Power, says Mr. Tennyson, is "perhaps the one taste for which the appetite grows keener with the years. Yet a man so long content with obscurity, who had in the end to be prodded towards the limelight by his colleagues, is likely to be tempted less easily than most by the sin of Lucifer. There are so many points already at which, almost unnoticed, he could have deviated from principle for the sake of quick advantage. Two years ago the Government offered him ten million acres of uncultivated land which had reverted to the State. They asked him to distribute and develop it as he wished. But Vinoba did not take long to make up his mind. Land that belonged to the Government was the responsibility of the Government, he said. Besides, he had come not to organise but to disperse. He had no faith in institutions. People start institutions which in the end overwhelm their founders . . . who have not the

courage to accept disillusion . . . Majorities are but brute force.' The Land Gifts Mission has no membership and it makes no resolutions—only vows. In spite of the social and economic ideas to which Vinoba gives increasing emphasis, he is clear that his own rôle is merely to bring about a change of heart in the people and to increase their moral power. If that is achieved it will be the duty of the people themselves to influence the existing political parties to an expression of the ideas that they have imbibed from him."

VINOBA has the "reverent support" of the political leaders and describes himself as a "mere human outsider", but in Tennyson's view it has become one of the successors—perhaps the only possible successor—"to a fast-declining Congress. That will be the signal for Vinoba to withdraw and for us to remember that he is not, like Gandhi, a politician-saint, but a saint temporarily on the fringe of politics." Mr. Tennyson makes an interesting comparison of the characters of Vinoba and Gandhi.

Vinoba accepts Gandhi's social and economic ideas—decentralisation, self-sufficient village republics at the base of the pyramid of State power, non-violent non-co-operation in place of armed resistance—but he defends them in a dispassionate and rational voice. "He does not talk of the 'music of the spinning wheel', but rather of harnessing electricity to the villages so that the spindle in every home may be driven by power. He expects the impossible from himself but not from others. He is, for instance, still vigorously free from any entanglement with money—even wealth gifts to

the Bhoodan Movement must be in work or kind, never in cash—but this is a personal witness to the ultimate social good, rather than any immediately practical policy which he expects others to follow. He divides machinery into labour-saving and labour-displacing categories. The first category—Jeeps, microphones, electric torches—he accepts joyfully if not for his own use at least for the use of others; whereas Gandhi extended to them no more than a grudging tolerance."

MR. MASANI describes the Bhoodan village meetings conducted by Jayaprakash Narayan. At one village the mission was met with Communist leaflets that said "Beware of the net of illusion of *Bhoodan Yagna*. Whose friends are Vinobaji and 'Revolutionary Socialist' Jayaprakash?" The leaflet went on to say that they were enemies of the peasants who had come to mislead them and divert their attention from the real class struggle. Jayaprakash described to his audience the evolution of Soviet Russia. Not the peasants and workers, he said, but those who controlled the Red Army and the Secret Police were enjoying the fruits of the revolution. "Jayaprakash then patiently explained to the peasants, perhaps for the first time in their lives, what had been happening in Russia and how on Stalin's death Malenkov, Beria, and Molotov had jointly seized power. He then spoke about their quarrels and about Beria's liquidation, and asked: 'Who decided for Malenkov or against Beria?' It was not the people, but the Red Army tanks which were stronger than the Secret Police. The man with

Continued on p. 2

## A PLEA FOR DECADENCE

ANYONE who cared to inquire into the conditions of the breaking out and success of revolutions can scarcely have failed to notice that a revolution wins the day only when the ruling classes are divided and confused, even tired of ruling, and when, their interest having been taken up by other things, they are slow, clumsy, and half-hearted in resorting to those repressive measures that could still save them from disaster, indifferent to it, and even ready to give it a welcome. The Communist pontiffs, albeit assigning the cause of revolutions to the dialectics of the economic process and crediting all success to the dynamism of industrial workers properly led and organized, acknowledge the fact when speaking of capitalist contradictions, and even more significantly when showing the greatest respect and stretching out a friendly hand to those régimes which, whatever their difficulties, quickly and ruthlessly crush down any sign of rebellion and do not tolerate the faint-hearted in their midst.

So, if revolution is to be considered a desirable thing or the only means to the most desirable thing, and if the classes and governments against whom revolution has to be carried out are too strong and vigilant, the only sensible course of action is to weaken them, and take their attention away from the business of oppression. That can only be done by being a member of the ruling classes or by ingratiating oneself to them, that is by taking the course most opposite to rebellion. What has to precede revolution, in other words, is corruption, in all the possible meanings of the word. With all possible reservations in mind as to the correctness of the analogy of a social body to a living organism, it cannot be denied that no ruling class or group will consciously and graciously give hospitality to anything resembling a disease-carrying microbe, and, therefore, the purposeful carrying out of a work of corruption has to be as secret, underhand and hypocritical as it can possibly be. It has also to be so thorough as not to leave room for any hope of being taken for the seed of a possible regeneration, for that would be a token of strength, and people will turn to it in order to be on the winning side and achieve that kind of revolution that will only demand a new corruption to set in.

CORRUPTION paves the way not only to a successful revolution but also to conquest from a foreign invader. It is because of corruption that Greece fell to the Romans, and the Roman Empire to the Barbarians. It is significant at least, if some historians give priority to other causes writers who saw the end of the Roman Empire approaching singled out corruption as the most obvious and pervasive. Equally significant is that some of them pointed to Christianity as a corrupting element. Fear of foreign invaders, at any rate, is

still the greatest deterrent against corruption both for established leaders of nations and would-be revolutionary leaders, and yet it is towards corruption that every civilization worthy of the name naturally tends.

For all the arbitrariness, in fact, that can be found in theories like Spengler's and Toynbee's it can hardly be denied that once we agree on the description of a civilizational form we can mark out the various phases of its life-story as we do with a man's when speaking of his infancy, youth, maturity and old age. Of the still extant civilizations it is impossible, though it has been presumed, to give the approximate length in years of their present or future phase. It is also by no means easy to determine what actual phase each of them has now entered for not all signs are obvious, and those that are help often to produce a confused and contradictory picture. Then, if civilization happens or believes itself to be in the phase of youth, it will reject any analogy foretelling its decadence and death in the same way as a youthful organism shrinks from the thought of its future sagging and surrender.

When the shrewdest brains in the Kremlin and those at its dependence, whose job it is to judge of the crests and troughs of revolutionary possibilities in this or that country, have often made mistakes, as they dutifully acknowledged each time a recommended policy failed or a few scapegoats were needed to present the Communist Party with a clean sheet to the infinite gullibility of the masses, I may be excused if I am proven wrong in stating that at the present juncture there is no sign of any revolutionary possibility in any country, and that governments all over the world are strengthening their grip over the masses they rule while the masses have lost practically all faith in themselves, and whatever hope they entertain is placed in the strength and good will of foreign intervention. Except perhaps in Asia, revolution is nowhere romantically believed in as an act that will bring all oppression to an end. Where it is still cordially auspicated it is only to end one particular form of oppression, the one under which one happens to suffer, and even more than that it is a will to remove one particular class of oppressors, with no concern about the one that will follow, and with a sly reckoning that if there will still be some oppressed people one will not be among them nor will they be given the chance to point to one as belonging to a new class of oppressors. Too many revolutions have taken place for any future one to present itself with the promise of a foolproof virginity. The communist parties who have assumed the rôle of incubators of future revolutions have also made it their business to sterilize their matrix wherever they have established themselves into power. While thus following the same policy of other reactionary governments

they have provided them with more than one useful tip not to hand out the rope by which they might be hanged. So that all history one can reasonably attempt to foresee is one of conflicts among rulers and not between rulers and ruled, a history of wars and not of revolutions.

Summing up, further, all past revolutions from an axiological point of view, their clearest effect turns out to be a progressive ruthlessness and mastery in the means of oppression, so that, quite apart from the oppressive measures that a revolution necessarily adopts to establish itself, it finally serves the cause of

oppression in that it aims not so much at making another revolution unnecessary as it does its best to make it impossible. The axiological point of view will be dismissed by all who consider history as a fatal repetitive struggle of changing interests, but it is nonetheless the point of view of all who freely risked their lives for the sake of a revolution, and it is also, in sympathy with them, the point of view of the anarchists—these incorrigible people who have repeatedly been proved to be living in the clouds, yet obstinately persist in disturbing the course of history with their illogical and undialectical presence.

GIOVANNI BALDELLI  
(to be concluded)

## CINEMA

### A CURIOUS SPANISH FILM

IT is practically impossible to conceive of a totalitarian country like Franco Spain producing a film in the tradition of the French or Italian school of village comedies. But in *Welcome Mr. Marshall* (at the Curzon Cinema, London) this has almost been done.

In a totalitarian State films without a purpose are never made, for the film industry is co-ordinated into the corporate State and the film is propaganda. In this case the propaganda is anti-American, and the Spanish way of life is exalted above that of the materialistic Americans—and their European protégés.

The scene is Villar del Rio, a typical Spanish village which is thrown into panic by the sudden arrival of the Delegate who has come to inform the Mayor of the imminent visit of a Marshall Plan commission. The Mayor is relieved that it is not the general assessment for taxation (to forestall this, everyone has been rehearsed in the story of a bad harvest) nor an audit; but he is dismayed that the delegate is not prepared to implement his promise of a railway to the village. The delegate loftily replies that he has always promised a railway to the village and implies that he will always go on doing it. He has by this time become a little confused and insists on calling the village Villar del Campo—for after all it is just another village to him. He leaves and the Mayor has a series of conferences on what to do to welcome the Marshall Plan commission. They decide to enlist the services of a cabaret artiste who hires Andalusian costumes and properties to give a Ye Olde Spanne atmosphere for that is what all Americans expect all Spain to be.

The day before the Americans arrive the whole population is at the Town Hall to list their needs which are limited to one item each, and the list is pathetic in its simplicity.

The night before the arrival all the villagers dream of the Americans. The priest and squire dream fantasies of American oppression by the Klu Klux Klan and third degree, and of capture

of Spanish conquistadors by Indians. The mayor dreams of his installation as a Wild West sheriff whilst the peasant John dreams of the tractor which the new-style Father Christmas will bring.

The dreaming done, the day of the Marshall planners dawns, everything is once more rehearsed. There is a false alarm and a welcome is wasted upon the Spaniards who with steamroller and truck are re-laying the road for the Americans. However, eventually the American cars sweep into sight the band plays vigorously, speech are brought out, addresses of welcome are fingered but the cavalcade of cars does not stop. The last car bears across its rear "Good-bye". That's the Marshall Plan—that was!

Whether the Americans had considered their passing-through sufficient, whether the village was crossed off the list by the delegate, or whether there had been confusion with Del Rio and Del Campo is not explained. Suffice it that the hopes of the villagers are not realized, moreover they have to raise money to pay for the costumes and properties which they bought to entertain the Americans. This is done by the whole community contributing and it is realized that it is only by individual effort that the village can prosper.

In an Italian or French film such a theme would have been entirely enjoyable and praiseworthy but with the background of Franco Spain one has doubts of the validity of the arguments. There is the hint of foxy Franco telling his starving cubs that the Marshall grapes (which Franco couldn't reach) are sour anyhow and the little cubs better take in their belts another notch.

But despite all reservations and a rather oily commentary, humanity and good acting keep breaking in. All the parts are excellently played and one feels that the director Luis G. Berlanga has a liking for the individual which Franco's rule cannot crush out of the Spanish character.

On the same programme is *Umberto D* by de Sica which I have not yet seen but which is said to be excellent.

J.R.

## 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 . . .  
In the Workshop of the Revolution I. N. Steinberg 18/-  
Reprints & Penguins . . .  
The Human Use of Human Beings Norbert Wiener 18/-  
Rationalism in Theory and Practice J. M. Robertson 2/6  
Microbes and Us Hugh Nicol 2/6  
Man on His Nature Sir Charles Sherrington 2/6  
Electricity Eric de Ville 2/6  
William Blake: the Man without a Mask J. Bronowski 2/6  
Herself Surprised Joyce Cary 2/6  
William James Margaret Knight 2/-  
Eugenie Grandet Honore de Balzac 2/-  
Second-Hand . . .  
The Ego and His Own Max Stirner 17/6  
Crainquehille Anatole France 2/6  
Under the Axe of Fascism Gaetano Salvemini 2/6  
Women Who Work Grace Hutchins 3/6  
Tales of Modern China O. Erdberg 2/-  
Shorter Stories Honore de Balzac 2/-  
The Sea Wolf Jack London 2/6  
Life of William Morris J. W. Mackail (2 vols.) 3/-  
Love's Coming of Age Edward Carpenter 2/6  
The British General Election of 1951 D. E. Butler 6/-  
Pamphlets . . .  
Morality Without God Chapman Cohen 2d.  
Did Jesus Christ Exist? Chapman Cohen 2d.  
The Camp of Liberation A. J. Muste 6d.  
Periodicals . . .  
Orgonomic Functionalism Vol. II, No. 1 2/6  
Folk January 2/6  
Literary Guide (February) Margaret Knight, etc. 1/-  
Resistance December 3d.  
Postage free on all items  
Obtainable from

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

# Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

Vol. 16, No. 6 February 5, 1955

## PHONEY FORMOSA

CRISIS **Continued from p. 1**

can support for an invasion of the mainland—and there was no shortage of support for such lunacy in influential American circles—and the islands within shooting distance of China were obviously considered valuable spring-boards for such a venture. The decision to withdraw coincides with Eisenhower's abandonment of his support for Chiang's war plans.

As things are at present it is decided to withdraw only from some of the islands, mainly to the North of Formosa. The island of Quemoy has been singled out as of strategic importance to the defence of Formosa (as Formosa is to the defence of the Philippines; as the Philippines is to the Marshall Islands; as the Marshall Islands are to Hawaii; as Hawaii is to San Francisco; as San Francisco is to Coney Island . . . where does such argument end if not in a lunatic asylum or somewhere in the middle of China?) How important in fact? Admiral Felix Stump, commander of United States naval forces in the Pacific stated, according to *Reuter* reports (30/1/55), that he did not think the islands of Quemoy and Matsu vital to the defence of Formosa but added "we certainly don't want to give away more free territories to the Communists", modestly taking it for granted that these islands were American! But this is what will probably happen, and it will be called "hard diplomatic bargaining" though more accurately it should be described as a horse deal.

According to Max Freedman, the *Manchester Guardian's* New York correspondent (28/1/55):

American sources have made it clear privately that the decision to hold some of the off-shore islands rests less on military grounds than on two diplomatic reasons. The first of these reasons is that to give up all the off-shore islands at once would destroy the morale of Chiang's forces. The second is that the islands might turn out to be useful trading points in a cease-fire with the Communists.

The same correspondent also points out most revealingly (M.G. 29/1/55) that the United States, even while welcoming a ceasefire, has been required by domestic politics to issue new threats to China. Thus a great gamble has been undertaken.

To our minds this is no gamble at all. The Chinese communists will not risk a war with the United States over Formosa. And in spite of her lunatic fringe, America is not yet so drunk with power as to entertain the idea of becoming involved in a war over a vast continent in which Chiang is more hated than Mau, and in which even the Atom bomb will not be decisive. But above all America realises that she might easily have to fight such a war alone, her allies remaining neutral or waiting for the right moment to intervene (a reversal of rôles, as it were and America knows to what economic advantage for those who wait!)

Thus it appears that we are due for a period of intensive diplomatic haggling, official pessimism or optimism, newspaper scares and crises, with, in the end, the triumph of negotiation. Eisenhower will resume his fishing holiday, Chiang will temporarily retire to a monastery, and Sir Anthony Eden will be proclaimed (just in time for the next elections) the hero of the day, and, by special dispensation of the Queen, will be given a rosette to add to his Garter, won, as we all remember, on the diplomatic battlefields of Indo-China!

# PREVENTING WAR

THE destruction of the weapons of war and the disbanding of armed forces is often put forward as the first condition for ensuring universal peace. Unfortunately, partial disarmament is the most one could hope for within the structure of our present society—only the most sanguine of pacifists (*pace* 'Peace News') can imagine that any State would be so naïve as to disarm totally.

In the past there have been attempts, some successful, at partial disarmament by agreement between countries. It is a method often suggested by sincere persons for reducing the chances of war: it is regarded as a step in the right direction—if the important Powers of the world can agree to reduce their armed forces by, say, 10% then surely the risk of war is lessened by that amount.

But this does not necessarily follow. If, for example, Flatland comes to an agreement with Lineland that they shall each reduce their armed forces by 25% then the 100 men of the Flatland army will now be 75 and the 200 men of the Lineland army will become 150. What, in fact, has been achieved? Precisely nothing as far as reducing the risk of war is concerned, because the ratio between the two armies remains the same. In previous centuries wars were not less frequent because armies were smaller: if anything probably the reverse. With smaller armies there is less to lose in the event of defeat, they have greater manoeuvrability and — an important point for winning popular support—their cost less.

Partial disarmament is too often discussed in a vacuum. On paper it may seem desirable, but practically the proposal bristles with difficulties. There is, for instance, the question of new inventions. If Flatland and Lineland are going to agree on partial disarmament, are new military techniques and inventions, although not put into actual production, to be abandoned? A discovery which occurs in quite disinterested scientific research may open new fields for the invention of destructive weapons. Such inventions and discoveries will increase the potential strength of the armed forces—possibly by more than the original reduction—while still not adding to their actual strength. Or the balance may be upset by the conclusion of a treaty by one country which again may increase its potential strength.

The weapons of mass destruction present another difficulty: unless the number of these weapons in existence is small, a percentage reduction will not affect the State's power to destroy populations wholesale. But even if there was a total ban on such weapons it would not limit each side equally. Take, for instance, the present world situation. The power bloc of the East has a considerable advantage over the West in manpower; while the West has the advantage in technical progress and the development of 'unconventional' armaments. The total abolition of atomic

weapons, which the U.S.S.R. has been insisting on as a condition before cooperating in other forms of disarmament, would serve to tip the balance of military power in favour of the East.

Piecemeal disarming can provide no answer to the problem of war. One of the few occasions when it has been tried in recent years came about as a result of the Washington Conference of 1922.

★

IN that year the major world powers who had interests in the Pacific Ocean and eastern Asia (with the exception of Russia and Germany) met to discuss the limitation of naval armaments, and to prevent the dismemberment of China which was at that time in a very unsettled state. The powers agreed to limit their tonnage of capital ships to a ratio of 5 (U.S.A.)—5 (Gt. Britain)—3 (Japan). The result of this, and of other treaties concluded at the same time, was to leave Japan the dominant military force in the Far East in return for pledges not to take advantage of conditions in China for gaining trading and other concessions for herself. Japan, of course, had no intention of keeping her promises if there was a chance of easy conquest. She saw the chance in 1931, at a time when the West was suffering from economic depression, and pro-

## Public Funds for Private Profit

On 17 December, President Eisenhower issued an Executive Order clarifying the Buy American Act; this Act was passed to ensure that, as far as possible, Government contracts are placed with American firms.

The heads of U.S. Agencies are now required to determine, before purchasing materials outside the U.S.A. (a) that the price of like materials of domestic origin is unreasonable or (b) that the purchase of like materials of domestic origin is inconsistent with the national interest.

The key word is, of course, 'unreasonable'. To be reasonable a domestic bid should not exceed the foreign bid by more than 6%, or alternatively, should not exceed the foreign bid plus 10% of the bid excluding duty and U.S. costs—which in effect means between 8% and 10% of the total bid. If this is not sufficient to award the contract to an American firm then the head of the Agency may reject the outside bid on the grounds that it would not be 'in the national interest'.

It is interesting to see the champions of free enterprise standing so prettily on their heads. How often have we been told that the mechanism of capitalist competition ensures that the customer gets the best value for his money? It seems he gets nothing of the sort, if it is going to hurt the domestic business interests.

## LAND THROUGH LOVE **Continued from p. 2**

the biggest gun won. Even wealth was not distributed. One man got a hundred times as much as another. Inequalities had increased. A new caste system had sprung up, and new exploiters ruled in place in the old."

★

IN one village although a lot of *danpatras* (gift deeds) were signed the amount of land given was very little, not a sixth but in some cases not even a twentieth of the donors' land. Jayaprakash said to the people that if they were making these gifts not from their hearts but just to get rid of him, he would return their *danpatras* and ask them to think the matter over quietly when he was no longer with them. On the way to the next village Mr. Masani asked Jayaprakash whether those whom he had thus reproached would not be only too happy to get back their *danpatras* and to call it a day.

When the meeting was about to begin, two men came panting from Surungapur, the previous village. After Jayaprakash had left their village, they had felt very unhappy and had gathered to take counsel. The result was that they had sent a message to say that they were sorry for what had happened earlier that day and that new *danpatras* were now being prepared which would satisfy Jayaprakash that the message of Bhodan had really reached them.

"What little faith we of the cities have in our fellowmen!" said Mino Masini to himself.

★

INEVITABLY our first thoughts about Vinoba's movement is that it is a

thing which could only happen in India, by which I suppose we mean only in a country where the influence of non-materialist philosophies is still widespread. "The question that one constantly hears in India is: 'Does such or such a thing get you any nearer God?' I am an agnostic, but I know what Indians mean. They mean 'Does something—progress, efficiency, productivity, television, whatever it may be—does it get you any nearer to fulfilling yourself; to achieving a keener awareness of reality, or a better communion with the rest of humanity, or with the Infinite; to justifying in any way your being here?'" There are, of course still plenty of indications that this sense of values is not foreign to the Western World, the spontaneous solidarity offered to victims of natural disasters, the current adulation of Dr. Albert Schweitzer, are indications of the latent urge to express oneself in other ways than by making money.

We are used to thinking of the struggle for Asia as being between capitalism and Communism. John Seymour has suggested, as a result of his experience at the training course for the Indian Community Projects Scheme that the real conflict will be between capitalism and communism on the one hand and the ancient non-materialistic philosophies of the East on the other. We have seen the extraordinary success of the first stage of "land through love", will it in its next phase successfully meet the challenge of disease and hunger in the Indian village?

C.W.

\*FREEDOM, 27/3/1954.

ceeded to attack China. She walked out of the League of Nations, disregarding the League's censures and rather feeble recommendations for an amicable settlement.

This partial disarmament served to precipitate the Sino-Japanese war. If there had been no disarmament agreement, the U.S.A. and Gt. Britain would probably have been in a position to prevent Japan attacking China. The Western powers were scarcely pleased to see their major eastern market captured by their chief rival, quite apart from the threat to naval bases in the area. If they could have prevented the attack they would have done so.

★

ANOTHER attempt to solve the problem of war, without becoming involved in the difficulties of a disarmament agreement, was made in 1928 with the signing of the Briand-Kellogg Peace Pact. The prime movers were a group of American liberals who wished to abolish war by denying it a legal status—the 'outlawry of war'. The idea was taken up by Aristide Briand, the French politician, who suggested that France and the U.S.A. conclude a treaty along these lines. This was received with enthusiasm by the Americans who further suggested that the agreement should be multinational by persuading all the major world powers to participate. The two main articles read as follows:

ARTICLE I. The High Contracting Parties solemnly declare in the names of their respective peoples, that they con-

demn recourse to war for the solution of international controversies, and renounce it as an instrument of national policy in their relations with one another.

ARTICLE II. The High Contracting Parties agree that the settlement or solution of all disputes or conflicts of whatever nature or of whatever origin they may be, which may arise among them, shall never be sought except by pacific means.

Of course the major powers were quite willing to sign. It committed them to nothing: the Pact was purely a legal move to outlaw war; it was a moral gesture by the powers to show how righteous their position was on the matter of war. Few people can have believed it would have any practical effect.

In fact, however the Pact did have a practical result. In 1937 when Japan began to bomb Chinese cities she did not declare war. She had renounced war, and anyway it was illegal. Instead she explained that the bombings were merely 'incidents' in the 'intervention for the restoration of order'.

The Pact had no noticeable effect on the conduct of the seventy-six signatory nations—among whom were the U.S.A., Gt. Britain, Italy, Germany, and Japan. It did not prevent Japan invading Manchuria, Italy attacking Ethiopia, or Italy and Germany intervening in the Spanish Civil War.

These efforts by governments to prevent war, even if they are disinterested, are condemned to failure so long as the interests of power, in whatever cause, are put before the interests of people. It is too great a paradox to expect the State, one of the major sources of war, also to prevent it. M.G.W.

## EDUCATION

# Equality of Opportunity?

DURING the past month 10 and 11 year old children in State schools throughout the country have been performing the annual ritual which they, and the great majority of parents, still refer to as "sitting the scholarship". In actual fact they have been taking the Common Entrance Examination, the term adopted after the Butler Education Act for 1944 for the examination to determine the selection of children from junior schools to a type of secondary school, Grammar, Modern of Technical (where available). The Act also abolished fee-paying places in State grammar schools, thereby approaching to some extent the postulated ideal of "equality of opportunity" within the State education system.

However, the significance in education of factors other than actual schooling is suggested by the Central Advisory Council's report on "Early Leaving", which records the relative progress of children drawn from different social backgrounds who are selected for grammar schools. The following table is taken from this report:

Father's Occupation	% of all children	% of V1th School children	% of V1th children
Professional and Managerial	15	25	43.7
Clerical	4	10.3	12
Skilled	51	43.7	37
Semi-Skilled	18	15.3	5.8
Unskilled	12	5.6	1.5

Commenting on these figures, the *Teachers World* for January says: "The children of professional and managerial families take 25 per cent. of grammar school places although they make up only 15 per cent. of the child population. The children of clerical workers do even better; 4 per cent. of children manage to secure 10.3 per cent. of grammar school places. But the 12 per cent. of children who have unskilled fathers take only 5.6 per cent. of grammar school places.

The entrance exam. is the same for all. So the Advisory Council's conclusion is inevitable—by the time local education authorities hold their allocation examination at 11 the children of certain social groups have as a whole begun scholastically to outstrip those at the other end of the scale . . .

That is only a start. The outstripping

## Man Kicks Horse

IT is clearly understood by every young reporter that whereas 'Dog bites Man' isn't news, 'Man bites Dog' is.

In all the column inches given in the Press, however, to the Communist demonstration outside Parliament last week against German re-armament, only four lines were devoted to the following:

"Two of the police horses were kicked by demonstrators and had to be taken to Cannon Row police station for treatment."

process goes on during the grammar school course. 12 per cent. of all sixth formers come from the 4 per cent. of children of clerical workers—three times more than the 'normal' expectation. But only 1.5 per cent. of sixth formers come from the 12 per cent. children of unskilled fathers—eight times fewer than the 'proper' number.

The children of certain social groups continue to outstrip those at the other end of the scale." In other words, the Managerial class, largely drawn from V1th form grammar and university students, tends to perpetuate itself at a greater rate than that by which it is supplemented by the addition of those from other class backgrounds. This is possible simply because the much-vaunted "equality of opportunity", although a fact within the grammar school itself, is to a considerable extent negated by external factors such as the amount of space and material for and encouragement of study within the home and the necessity for some children to become wage-earners at the age of 16. (It is improbable that "innate ability", so called, can be an important consideration in this respect since local Education Authorities attempt to assess precisely this through intelligence testing at the time children are selected for grammar schools.)

Therefore the Managerial class perpetuates itself in this way largely by maintaining those distinctions, economic, social and cultural, which give its children a better chance of benefitting fully from grammar school education than other children.

For Anarchists, of course, the basic premise behind the tripartite education system—that children from the age of 11 should be prepared to fulfil certain types of functions within society and be segregated from those being prepared to fulfil other types of functions—is unacceptable, and the fact that a State reform achieves in practice less than it seemed to promise will occasion no surprise. C.B.

## U.S. Servicemen mean Good Business

Nearly £7,000,000 was spent on British goods and services during the past year by A.F.E.X., the U.S. agency which operates retail shops in Europe and North Africa for American servicemen. It would seem there is profit (for some) in being an advanced bomber base.

## Anarchist Speaker in Leicester

READERS in the Leicester area may be interested to know that the Leicester Secular Society have invited an anarchist, Philip Sansom, to address their Sunday evening meeting on Feb. 6th. Details in Announcements column, page 4.

AN ANARCHIST'S NOTEBOOK

The Status They Have Lost

A LETTER published recently in the columns of the *Observer* was concerned with the problems of retired executives who, the writer thought, by obtaining part-time work might recover "the status they feel they have lost." More than two hundred replies have been received by the writer, Group Captain Williamson, and an Employment Bureau for Retired Executives has been set up in London with the aim of finding part-time employment, of forming teams of specialists in every part of the country to advise small and medium-sized firms on efficiency in production and marketing, and of operating a technical press service, done at home.

Those who have applied include "surveyors, electrical engineers, cost accountants, sales managers, barristers, tea planters, chemists and architects" besides "several oil company men and two former managing directors of newspapers". One cannot easily make a generalisation as to what these men mean by "status". Obviously for some it is a hangover from the days when they enjoyed unlimited power, in the concerns in which they were engaged, to run the working lives of hundreds or thousands of their fellow humans who never were allowed to have "status", who indeed

may have more status when they retire on their Old Age Pension and their meagre savings than they did when they were employed. Others may find that they cannot live at the social level they have been accustomed when they were say, tea planters or oil men. Others, such as the one who wrote saying that he used to earn £4,000 a year and that "I must have something to do", and the people whose job or business was all that counted in life—and at the expense of other pursuits—so that when they retired nothing was left; they have money but no hobbies or interests for which a comfortable retirement could provide just the conditions to pursue them.

We believe in the importance of status, not the artificial "status" which comes through power acquired in most cases at the expense of the freedom and individuality of others, but the status which is generally enjoyed by people without the backing of money or rank, bluff or connections. It is the status of the person who has dignity through independence of mind; it is the status of the craftsman in every sphere of life, who not only knows his job but who refuses to become a hack in return for material gain.

Broken Spirits & Broken Necks

WISDOM, it would seem, does not always come with age. An action was recently brought by an 11-year-old boy who lost an eye in an accident with a handcraft knife. A classmate took the knife from an unlocked cupboard and pretended to stab a girl and instead the blade entered the other boy's eye. The judge, 77-year-old Mr. Justice Vaisey, quoted from the Ministry of Education pamphlet circulated to all schools the following passage: "To live dangerously may be better than to live a life of safety-first. The kind of youngsters schools turn out should be confident and interested in life..." And he added his own views in these words:

"I would like to coin a proverb: It is better that a boy should break his neck than let other people break his spirit."

The boy's mother replied to this extraordinary argument that in her opinion "One can mend a broken spirit but nothing can give my boy his eye back". On the whole, we would say that there was more wisdom in the mother's views than in the judge's.

On the other hand, whilst it is true that there is more chance to-day to "mend a broken spirit", the main point has been missed, which is, that the choice in education to-day is not between living dangerously and having one's spirit broken. Most progressive educationists have been maintaining for years that the purpose of our educational system is in fact designed to break down the rebellious spirit of the young, to

make them conform, to turn them out in a particular mould which will fit them for the world around them. "Living dangerously" is not only a question of letting children play violent games even if they break their necks or lose their eyes in the process. It is also a question of not fettering their minds with outworn prejudices of obedience and conformity; of religious dogma and false patriotism.

For the judge it would "be an impossible burden on schools to make them lock up every knife" but it is obviously not an impossible burden for the State, through its schools, to lock out those ideas which would make rebels of our youth!

LETTER

I think that you will agree that one of the prime essentials of left-wing journalism should be factual accuracy. A slipshod collection of facts leaves us wide open to the criticism of our opponents. It is for this reason, therefore, that I wish to bring to your notice a mistake in the last issue of FREEDOM.

In the very fine article on President Eisenhower's speech, where the writer contrasts Eisenhower's high-flown oratory with sordid American reality, it is stated that Carl Braden was sentenced to fifteen years imprisonment for opposing race segregation.

In the enclosed copy of *The Louisville Times*, dated December 13th, 1954, you will see that Braden was charged with being a communist. The prosecution sought to prove his communist affiliations, not that he opposed negro segregation. Of course, it is scandalous that in America, "the land of the free", people can be jailed for their political convictions, irrespective of what they happen to be.

RAYMOND CHALLINOR.  
Stoke-on-Trent.

M.G.W. writes: 'Raymond Challinor is quite correct. I did in fact, say that Carl Braden "was convicted under a sedition law" because he could not legally be imprisoned for helping a negro to buy a house. The communist smear was the most effective method of ensuring a conviction.'

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT!

WEEK 4	
Deficit on Freedom	£60
Contributions received	£95
SURPLUS	£35
January 21 to January 27	
Bromley: O.D. 3/-; Chicago: T.B. 7/2;	
Sydney: G. E. £2/3/0; Los Gatos & San	
Francisco: New Year's Party per J.C.	
£10/10/0; Los Gatos: per J.C. £5/5/0;	
London: J.S.* 3/-; London: Anon. 3/4;	
Brooklyn: Aurora Club per M. £5/8/6;	
Hyde Park: Sympathisers 11d.; Dublin: G.F.	
3/-; Peterborough: A.W. 9/-	
Total	24 15 11
Previously acknowledged	71 0 3
1955 TOTAL TO DATE	£95 16 2

GIFT OF BOOKS: London: Anon.

Why Keep Foreigners Out?

THE Labour M.P. for West Ham asked the Home Secretary last week "why visas were refused to writers invited by the Authors' World Peace Appeal to attend an international conference of writers to discuss the part which might be played by literature in the creation of a peaceful world."

In his reply Mr. G. Lloyd George said that foreigners could not be admitted to this country to attend meetings organised by bodies which were, consciously or unconsciously serving the purposes of the Communist-dominated World Peace Movement. And he added "I am satisfied that the Authors' World Peace Appeal is in this category."

The last things Governments do is to practice what they preach. They tell us that if only the Iron Curtain were removed and the peoples of the world allowed to meet there would be understanding, world peace and the rest (we quote without agreeing with these arguments). Yet when an opportunity presents itself to let fellow-travelling, or communist writers visit this country the Government puts up its own Iron Cur-

tain. By doing so they do not prevent these people from holding their conferences and they know this. So what is the reason? Surely if we are so anxious to export our kind of "democracy" to the world we should specially welcome these "foreigners", or is our government no different from their totalitarian counterparts who, with few exceptions, allow only the sycophants to visit their countries?

Incidentally, we wonder if the Labour M.P. for West Ham will now ask the government to be a bit more specific as to which are organisations which "consciously or unconsciously" serve the Communist-front movements. We had not realised that there was a list of proscribed organisations. The government should be asked to "come clean", that is be less hypocritical, and do as the Americans have done and publish a list, even if it is a question of reprinting the American list. And then perhaps we shall hear less about the Iron Curtain from those democrats who delude themselves that they are on the outside.

Iron Curtains on the Mind

IRON Curtains are not only invisible barriers to movement. They exist in the realm of thinking as well, and not only in Russia and the satellite countries. According to the *New York Times* (26/1/55):

"Seven hundred authors, critics and book publishers responded with a rising ovation here yesterday when Senator J. William Fulbright, Democrat of Arkansas, assailed to-day's "remorseless pressures to conform."

He was the principal speaker at the sixth annual National Book Awards ceremony, held at the Commodore Hotel.

Examining "the degree to which freedom of opinion and expression has been curtailed in our country," he referred to Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, Republican of Wisconsin; "concentration of managerial control of the press, the radio, the movies; "the Reece Special Committee

to Investigate Tax-Free Foundations; the ban on debating recognition of Communist China in the United States military academies; and a personnel pamphlet of "the powerful Socony Vacuum Oil Company."

That this is not as bad as it is in Russia in an undisputed fact. It is not, however, a cause for much satisfaction when one takes into account that in the totalitarian countries where the State is also the employer of all labour, the pressures, as well as the penalties for non-conformity are much greater. In America, what the State cannot do other groups within the community are readily found to do unofficially on its behalf. All kinds of professions, for instance, have instituted their own witch-hunts; groups of citizens banded together to prevent the showing of certain films, and freedom of discussion is hampered by the feeling that an amateur F.B.I. nark may be noting one's heretical utterances. One can say of the totalitarian countries that conformity has been forced on them by the threat of violence and the forced labour camp. But where it exists in America it is by a kind of consent. And to that extent it is more pernicious, and depressing to observe.

THE MARCH OF COMMERCIALISM

PAINTERS and sculptors who have their studios in Rome's via Margutta, just off the Piazza di Spagna, staged a sit-down demonstration one day last month to protest against commercialism, movies, motor traffic and noise. They complain that the street is rapidly losing its charm and atmosphere; that quaint shops selling paints and canvasses have been replaced by noisy garages and the street as a result is jammed with traffic all day. It also appears that rich people have been conspiring with landlords to evict the penniless artists and convert their studios into expensive flats. And now the Artists Club has been bought by a Film Company for use as a cinema for holding the premieres of its films.

So one morning scores of men and women painters, defying the elements and the traffic, set up their easels in the via Margutta and starting painting, seemingly unaware of the growing chaos around them. Signs all around carried such slogans as "Let us work in Peace", "Keep cars out of the Artists' Quarter". The police, adding insult to injury, turned up in jeeps to disperse them. Five who would not move on were arrested but later released. Meanwhile the demonstrators who had retired in good order to a near-by café are reported as saying "This is only the beginning".

THE FACADE

IT would never do for such a well-brought-up young lady as Princess Margaret to see the reality of life for the ordinary people of the idyllic islands of the Caribbean.

So, according to an *Exchange* report, Shanty Town—a collection of 300 huts on a bed of garbage—had to be given beauty treatment before Princess Margaret passed through it from the Trinidad airport to Government House on February 1.

Shanties facing the road were smartened up—the rest got a coat of paint.

SELECTIONS FROM FREEDOM  
Volume 3—1953  
**Colonialism on Trial**  
230 pp. paper 7/6; cloth 10/6  
Still available:  
Vol. 1.  
MANKIND IS ONE  
Vol. 2.  
POSTSCRIPT TO POSTERITY  
NOTE: The paper editions of the three volumes are offered to readers of FREEDOM at the special rate of  
FIVE SHILLINGS  
per volume by ordering direct from F.P.

32,000 AFRICAN MINERS DISMISSED

FOR nearly a month 32,000 African miners in the Northern Rhodesian copper mines have been on strike for a wage increase of 10s. 8d. a shift. Last Saturday the mining companies announced that they were all to be dismissed.

This followed an ultimatum by the companies that if the men did not return to work they would be sacked.

The total labour force in the copper belt is about 37,000, and 3,000 Africans had been still at work, engaged in essential maintenance services (in agreement with the companies). These 3,000, however, will now present themselves for dismissal, and the whole of the copper belt will be left with no labour.

The Mineworkers' Union, in a memorandum to the Chamber of mines, says that this will lead to the funeral of the copper-mining industry in Northern Rhodesia. For this number of men cannot be replaced. Africans would not do it—unless imported as semi-slave labour from other territories, when they would be unskilled and inexperienced, and white labour would be too expensive.

So the European mine owners would rather see the industry die than meet the workers demands. The answer is for the workers to take over the mines themselves—but is that possible where the labour force is divided by colour?

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)

FEB. 6—Bonar Thompson on MYSELF & LITERATURE.  
FEB. 13—Philip Sansom on ANARCHO-SYNDICALISM  
FEB. 20—Claudio Veliz on TYPES OF FASCISM TO-DAY  
FEB. 27—Emile Boin on TAOISM AND ANARCHISM

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

HAMPSTEAD  
at 27 Christchurch Hill,  
Hampstead, N.W.3.  
Discussions Meetings Mondays  
at 8 p.m.  
MON FEB. 7.—George Steed on THE CASE FOR THE S.P.G.B.  
FEB. 14.—John Holderness on SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT IN W. AFRICA.

GLASGOW

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

The Malatesta Club

155 HIGH HOLBORN,  
LONDON, W.C.1.

YOUTH GROUP ACTIVITIES

DEBATE  
Wednesday, Feb. 9, at 8.30 p.m.  
"That the Free Society, by supporting the Artist has the right to direct the expression of the Artist".  
Proposer: DONALD ROOM  
Opposer: FRANCIS SOKOLOFF.  
Saturday, Feb. 10, at 9 p.m.:  
"A Programme of Insignificant Waffle"  
Dancing Every Saturday from 9 p.m.  
(Guest charge, 6d.)

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

Informal Discussions Every Thursday,  
at 8.15 p.m.  
Lecture-Discussions Every Sunday  
at 7.45 p.m.  
(See Announcements Column)  
ALL WELCOME

LEICESTER

LEICESTER SECULAR SOCIETY  
PUBLIC MEETING  
at Secular Hall Humberstone Gate,  
on Sunday, Feb. 6th, at 6.30 p.m.  
"FROM FREE THOUGHT TO FREE ACTION"  
Speaker: PHILIP SANSOM.

LONDON

DEBATE:  
"THAT CHRISTIANITY CANNOT SOLVE THE INTELLECTUAL OR MATERIAL PROBLEMS OF THE COMMON MAN IN THE 20TH CENTURY"  
Proposer: F. A. RIDLEY  
Opposer: CANON T. J. FITZGERALD.  
at University House Debating Club,  
Victoria Park Square, Bethnal Green,  
London, E.2.  
on Friday, Feb. 11th, at 8 p.m.

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