

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

Those who expect to reap the blessings of freedom must like men undergo the fatigues of supporting it

TOM PAINE

Vol. 16, No. 28.

July 9th, 1955

Threepence

THE BIG FOUR & YOU

MOST of our readers will, we feel sure, be surprised to learn that they have been instrumental in forcing the Big Four powers to hold their forthcoming top-level conference. Yet this is what Alex Comfort would have us believe in an article splashed over the front page of last week's *Peace News*! His theme is contained in the opening paragraph of an extraordinary article:

"It is important that you should be there. It was you who made them happen. These talks have been forced on the 'Great Powers' by public opinion. By us—and if they are going to succeed, WE MUST BE THERE WHEN THEY TAKE PLACE.

Now, if there is one thing intelligent intellectuals should steer clear of, it is dabbling in power politics! For whether it is an Orwell, a Bertrand Russell, an Ignazio Silone . . . or an Alex Comfort, they invariably make asses of themselves the moment they forget they are warm human beings and join the ranks of the politico-military strategists. What is even more serious is that in the process they not only fail as politicians but also lose the moral influence they may have exerted in society as humanists.

Comfort has no illusions about Government *per se* even now. His illusion is in assuming that at the present time "public opinion" is forcing governments to hold these

"talks at the summit" and that "if we keep on forcing them, they may actually attempt to negotiate". Not only does Comfort believe that this forceful "public opinion" is operating here but also among the countries of the Eastern Bloc: "We need not imagine that the Communist governments aren't under the same pressure—from a public which, like us, prefers butter to guns". It is a curious kind of dumb pressure as we shall see: "If that public cannot say much, we can. We owe them a duty".

Comfort warns us of the American lunatic fringe, of the possible attempts by certain sections of the Press "to confuse you" when the talks open. We must on no account be taken in by the deviationists and the "madhouse party". And though politicians may be "sincere" they "can never be trusted" and for this reason

"You must be there at the Four Power Talks; as the force of public opinion demanding diplomacy, not buffoonery, and genuine negotiation, not suicide pacts. They won't do this for you. But if we stand close enough at their elbow they will have to do it.

You forced the politicians to hold these talks.

You can force them to succeed."

This is undiluted demagogic nonsense, and it is sad to think that a man of Alex Comfort's intelligence should have abandoned the anar-

chist 'ivory tower' in order to join the Fleet Street hacks and the political fakirs of the Strand.

OF course the people of the world "prefer butter to guns", not only in July 1955 but also in July 1939 and every July since! Then what beat in the public pulse has Comfort observed in 1955 (which appears to have escaped the attention of those of us he has relegated to the ivory tower) that has sent the politicians scuttling, that has forced the foreign ministers into a huddle, and the summit-leaders onto their toes? We would, most humbly suggest that the forthcoming "summit talks" are no more the result of public pressure than was the recent settlement of the Austrian deadlock (see "Top-Level" *Twaddle*, *FREEDOM*, May 21), or the "easing" of tension in Formosa (indeed, read your papers to-day and you will hardly see a word about Formosa, yet less than six months ago we were, according to the Press, the politicians and echoed by the politi-

Continued on p. 3

MICHAEL FOOT SIGNS FOR COMMERCIAL T.V.

ONE of the BBC's most popular television series was "In The News", a panel feature with a bunch of controversial speakers on political subjects. These were Bob Boothby, Lord Hailsham (ex-Quintin Hogg), A. J. P. Taylor and Michael Foot.

About three years ago the success of this team was such that both the Labour and Conservative parties began to object to the BBC. The trouble was that none of the speakers were party-liners, so both parties were uncomfortable at their heretics' growing influence.

Eventually the BBC, in its usual weak and fearful manner, gave way to the party machines and the programme was tamed, the quartet dispersed and its members appeared only with "safe" colleagues so that their unorthodoxy could not be mistaken for the gospel.

Meanwhile the Bevanite journal *Tribune* attacked the Tories on their plans for introducing commercial, sponsored TV to Britain. Pointing to the horrors of American TV, with its gross lapses from taste (*Tribune* was suitably indignant about the appearance of the chimpanzee Alfred J. Muggs during the relaying of the Coronation ceremony in America), they have fought the idea of

monopoly capitalism competing with the monopoly of a public corporation for our attention.

Come to think of it, though, *Tribune* does not seem to have been so vociferous lately. There may be a reason for that, apart from the large amount of space taken up by the Leader.

The four just men of "In The News" have signed contracts with Norman Collins, boss of ABC, the commercial TV company even now preparing its delights, its lapses of taste, its advertising, its popular controversialists and—who knows—its chimpanzees, for our approval when the new stations open up.

Putting it briefly: Michael Foot, of the Editorial Board of *Tribune*, has now signed a contract (and not for peanuts, we surmise), to appear on sponsored television.

We don't know yet who the sponsor of the programme will be—perhaps Mr. Foot doesn't know either. ICI would be an appropriate concern.

We wonder now what *Tribune's* socialist attitude will be. A public corporation, virtually State-controlled, the BBC gagged controversial speakers. Private enterprise offers them its facilities.

Interesting, isn't it?

INTERNATIONAL STRIKES

Indian Textile Strike in Third Month

Cawnpore, July 3.

A strike of 46,000 textile workers entered its sixty-third day here to-day, making it the longest stoppage in the history of the Indian trade union movement. The longest hitherto was a Bombay mill dispute which lasted 62 days.

The Cawnpore strike started on May 2 in protest against the "rationalisation" of certain mills which the strikers allege would throw many out of work and in support of demands for the redress of grievances. The strike has stopped or seriously reduced production in ten cotton textile and one woollen mill. Another 5,000 workers from two jute mills are out in sympathy. Since the dispute began about one thousand trade unionists have been arrested for various offences.—*Reuter*.

Threat of General Strike in Chile

Santiago (Chile), July 1.

More than 36,000 workers on the Chilean railways, urban transport, and post and telegraph services went on strike to-day, demanding wage increases of 60 per cent, special cost-of-living bonuses, and other benefits. Army units have occupied railway stations and railway repair shops throughout the country to prevent sabotage.

The strike has been called by the Central Unica de Trabajadores, the major Chilean labour organisation, and is considered to be a prelude to a nationwide general strike designed to bring all other vital services to a standstill within a week.

A message from Rio de Janeiro says that thirty thousand dock workers in the major Brazilian coffee ports of Santos went on strike to-day in support of their demands for an increase of 30 per cent in wages.—*British United Press*.

Santiago (Chile), July 3.

A bomb has destroyed the editorial offices of the independent liberal evening newspaper "El Debate," noted for its strong attacks on the Chilean Government and the Peron régime in Argentina.—*Reuter*.

600,000 American Steelworkers Strike

The strike of 600,000 United Steel Workers started and ended on July 1. As a result of the capitulation of the United States Steel Corporation to the workers' wage demands this was the shortest steel strike in American history. The steelworkers are to receive an increase of 15 cents (one shilling) an hour and at the same time the price of steel was raised by an average of \$7.50 (52/6) per ton.

Bus Strike in Washington

Washington, July 1.

A bus and trolley strike brought a jam of private cars to downtown Washington to-day. No settlement of the dispute was in sight.

Congress was getting ready to intervene directly. Bills were introduced to have the Government take over operation of the Capital Transit Company. One, by Senator Wayne Morse, would take away the company's franchise and put it out of business in a year.

The Oregon Democrat said he wanted Louis E. Wolfson, the financier who controls the company to testify next week. If Mr. Wolfson did not come voluntarily, Senator Morse said he would have him subpoenaed.

(*New York Times*)

The list could be added to indefinitely. Those indignant Britishers who have been writing to their newspapers about the scourge of British strikes would do well to ponder on this almost universal problem. Strikes take place under private enterprise as well as in the Welfare State; in the "prosperous" countries as well as in the poverty stricken ones. Strikes even take place in some of the totalitarian countries. But in Russia the only reports of such unrest come from the forced labour camps. Otherwise the country is strike-free. Would the indignant Britishers perhaps advocate the application of Russian methods here when they next write to the editor of the *Daily Telegraph*?

Blue Union Leaders Give Up

FRIDAY, July 1st, 1955, will forever be a significant date in the history of the National Amalgamated Stevedores' & Dockers' Union.

That was the day on which its national executive threw 10,000 of its members to the wolves. It was the day when the dockers of Hull, Birkenhead, Liverpool and Manchester were left high and dry by the union to which they had turned in their hour of need.

After one-and-a-half days of debate, including a delegates' visit to transport House to discuss with the TUC, the thirty-odd members of the executive ordered their members back to work. If they refused to go, from then on it became an unofficial strike.

And they were ordered back on the terms laid down by the TUC: return to work first, then return the 10,000 members 'poached' in the Northern ports from the Transport & General Workers' Union, then, after negotiations, accept the TUC's ruling on the issue.

The deputation which went to the TUC consisted mainly of delegates from the North. They were themselves 'poached' from the TGWU. They were representing 10,000 of their fellow-workers who had left the white union in disgust, after years of frustration and betrayal, to join an organisation which promised to serve them better. They believed in this organisation and wanted it to represent them.

But now these workers find themselves caught in a vice. The mighty Transport & General Workers' Union has them in its grip and does not intend to let them go, however much they may now detest it. Like a nagging, domineering wife, hanging on to her husband although he hates the sight of her, so the TGWU maintains its legal grip upon its docker members. 'Even though you hate me, I won't let you go.'

Leaders Accept

And this disgusting situation has now been accepted by the leaders of the Stevedores' and Dockers'. Since they wish to remain in the

TUC, they must obey its ruling—even though it means their own disintegration. For once the ten thousand go back, they'll be imprisoned inside the TGWU for life. The TUC cannot possibly allow its own Bridlington agreements to be altered, for its two most powerful member-unions, the Transport & General and the Municipal & General, will stand to lose thousands of dissatisfied members if free choice is allowed them.

That is why the TUC had to fight so bitterly against the NASD recruitment. Had they allowed NASD to go ahead, it would have established a precedent for every other small union to start recruiting from the vast, clumsy, amorphous general unions, which offer nothing but the big stick to their members.

In defence of the stability of the official trade union movement, 10,000 dockers have to be treated like 10,000 lumps of wood, over

which lawyers haggle for possession. Their feelings, their courage, their militancy, these are just obstructions. Their desires, their freedom to belong to the union of their choice—these are simply inexpedient nuisances in the way of regulating labour tidily in the interests of the State and the national economy.

Under the Hammer

What a situation these workers are in! Let down by their union executive—what faces them if they return to the old? Clearly they will go under the hammer more severely than before. When the TGWU has established clearly that they cannot get away, what check is there upon its dictatorial careerists, its tin-pot jacks in office, and the powers they wield over the workers?

This must be combatted—intelligently. In the first place the Northern workers have already broken the

Continued on p. 4

... And the Dockers Go Back

AFTER six weeks' splendid solidarity, the strikers at the Northern ports decided last Sunday evening to return to work on Monday.

At a mass meeting in Liverpool, several thousand took the decision, although it meant returning without winning the recognition for which the strike was fought.

In London, a mass meeting called for Monday morning at Custom House Fields was cancelled when the Liverpool decision was known, and there was a general return to work at all the ports involved—with the President of the Stevedores' and Dockers' standing at the gate of the Royal group of docks to see the men safely back with no trouble.

At the Liverpool meeting the TUC's decision was rejected. The men refused to accept the ruling that they must go back into the white union. They are going to remain in the blue, continuing to pay their dues and continuing to press for recognition.

So, thanks in part to the Communists and the Catholics*, to the disunity they

of Bill Dooley, Liverpool delegate, and said, 'We're both good Catholics Bill—let's go back in there and get this thing settled.' Dooley refused, and stayed solid with the strike. Barrett resigned in the middle of it.

created in London and the stevedores' leaders, who had no stomach for the fight from the first, the strike has been lost.

It is a defeat which may have repercussions for years. The solidarity between North and South has been shaken, the unity between men in the same ports has been broken, confidence in the value of direct action has had a blow. The dockers will think twice before resorting to large strike action again—although small strikes are going on all the time.

Those dockers who openly profess anarchist ideas happen to be in the white union. All along they have seen little reason to switch to the blue—and events have proved them right. During the strike they were, of course, solid with their fellow-workers in the blue union and, with many other dockers in the Transport & General, did everything in their power to help the fight for the principle involved. We are glad to say they have acquitted themselves very well and can go back to work with their heads high.

*At one point in the National Executive (of NASD) discussions, during a breather outside the committee room, Dick Barrett put his arm round the shoulders

SAINT ON THE MARCH: The Story of Vinoba, by Hallam Tennyson. Gollancz, 13s. 6d.

IN 1946 while visiting Gandhi in his Ashram at Sevagram, Hallam Tennyson and his wife went to see Vinoba Bhave, one of the Mahatma's followers whom the old man regarded not as a pupil but as a teacher. All they saw was a scruffy figure at the end of a veranda bent over a pile of books. His hour for receiving visitors was passed. They were told by a disciple who reminded Mr. Tennyson of a vacuum-cleaner salesman, with "that coarseness of enthusiasm which always repels me", of the holy man's austerity, how he lived solely on curds, how he had taken a vow of chastity at the age of twelve, how he had taught himself fifteen languages so as to be able to communicate with his fellow humans.

"I wanted to ask: But what can he possibly say to them that they are prepared to hear? For it appeared unlikely that anything effective could ever escape from such a bottleneck of high principles. . . . Besides, Vinoba's asceticism seemed to lack Gandhi's salty and saving sense of fun. In India religious cranks are even more common than in California. The lunatic fringe is a necessary background to the occasional religious genius who emerges from it. On that morning eight years ago we placed Vinoba firmly in the fringe."

Revolution Through Love

Eight years later when he had forgotten the hermit at Paunar, Mr. Tennyson went to Bihar to study *Bhoodan Yagna*, the Land Gifts Mission which was attempting to persuade the landlords of India to part with one-sixth of their land for redistribution among the landless poor. Since its beginning in April 1951, this movement had acquired nearly 4,000,000 acres. Its fifty-nine-year-old leader, wracked by dysentery, chronic malaria and a stomach ulcer had walked an average of ten miles a day in order to obtain land. So far his pilgrimage had totalled 10,000 miles. He had become the largest landlord in the world.

"The man's name? Vinoba Bhave.

At first I could not believe it. How could this be the same person whom we had seen from behind on that veranda eight years before—the faceless figure with whom we had failed to make contact and whom we had placed firmly in India's large lunatic fringe? Yet that frail scholar who lived on liquids and two skinny legs was now leading his country towards a social revolution unprecedented in the whole history of mankind—the revolution which Gandhi had dreamed about and which free India had almost locked in limbo. 'Look here upon this picture and on this'. What possible connection could there be be-

tween the two? What had happened to bring Vinoba into relation with his fellows? How had the new strength fallen on him? Why was India the one country in the world where such things could still happen? And could, even here, such a visionary movement really succeed? . . . A national movement to solve the problem of landownership by voluntary gift in a country the size of India, a country burdened with a complicated feudal system of land tenure and a dense rural population whose land hunger pushed sky high the price of each single acre. Could anyone but a saint—or a lunatic—seriously envisage such a thing?"

★

THESE were the kind of questions Mr. Tennyson sought to answer as he wandered around in the company or in the wake of Vinoba and his followers. He describes his conversations and observations in his book *Saint on the March*, which, apart from its central theme, contains vivid descriptions of the country at the time of Gandhi's assassination, and of the places he went to and the people he met on his more recent journey. In his modest and humorous way, conveys the feeling of appalling heat and discomfort and inefficiency which must overcome Europeans in India, especially when they live more or less at the poor

man's level. As a personal narrative the book adds much to what we already know about the Bhoodan movement, and Mr. Gollancz is not exaggerating when he describes it as a tremendously exciting book. Since 1951 we have several times mentioned in FREEDOM the reports of the growth of the Land Gifts Mission and we have more recently quoted from Mr. Tennyson's articles on it.*

What are the actual results of the Bhoodan movement?

"Three million, two hundred thousand acres given by the end of April 1954, of which some 2,000,000 is reasonably good land, and this from a total of 230,000 donors of whom one-third may have undergone a change of heart. Sixty thousand acres distributed to 20,000 families, mostly in Hyderabad and the United Provinces; distribution in the rest of the country now under way. Thousands of wells, bullocks, implements, many tons of seed also changing hands so that the new owners can begin to cultivate. One thousand workers—half paid Rs.30 a month by the Gandhi Memorial Fund, the other half receiving no more than board and lodging—accompanied by an unnumbered quantity of volunteers slowly spreading a network of faith across the countryside. The first mass movement since Independence and the first nation-wide peasant movement in the history of India beginning to take shape. . . . Statistics apart, what about the more tangible results? The ceiling on land introduced in Hyderabad; the abolition of the zamindaris made law after years of talk elsewhere; land prices falling throughout the country to three times less than they were in 1952; land litigation amazingly reduced (once every disputed yard was solemnly contested in the courts); the ugly rumours of violent revolution dying down; confidence in the future imperceptibly replacing bitterness and apathy; the wealthy soft-peddalling their opposition to social change—has not Bhoodan played at least some part in all these things? The future? Vinoba still has weapons unused in the arsenal of love. He could impose a fast on himself or launch a movement of non-co-operation in areas where the landlords' hearts are stubborn. . . ."

★

What happens when a village adopts Bhoodan?

"By Indian standards, Mangroth was thoroughly ordinary in its composition and background. It was barren, isolated, untouched by more than the merest rumour of the outside world. . . . The village had not been invaded by missionaries, politicians, Communists or foreign armies. . . . In fact, a Mofussil village much like 400,000 others. The twenty-seven villages in Orissa which have given all their possessions to Bhoodan are inhabited by *Harijans* of the same sub-caste, who are either fishermen or cultivators and who already regard their village as an extension of their own family unit. But Mangroth was a

*See *Comment on Land through Love*, (FREEDOM, 5/2/1955).

mixture of all castes, India in miniature. Until Vinoba came on April 24th, 1952, these castes lived separate lives; inhabiting their own section of the village, eating and marrying entirely among themselves, drinking from their own wells. Diwan Singh, the headman and the village's chief landlord. . . . had long lost all ideas of caste and exclusiveness and was a patron of the poor. When Vinoba made his usual appeal, Diwan Singh gave him all that he had—houses, trees, barns, wells, clothing and every single acre of land. 'Do with them what you like,' he said. 'There is nothing in the whole earth I can call my own. All belongs to God.' Vinoba handed the gift over to a village committee and a fortnight later the village held a public meeting, at which every family except one smallholder and one *chamach* (leather-curer), decided to follow the example of their headman. . . . Not that even now life was to be 'one perpetual progress smooth and bright'. In the first place the villagers disliked the Bhoodan worker who tried to make them redeem their pledges. The men started to argue about the theory behind it.

Continued on p. 4

SUBTOPIA

The Expanding Ugliness

THE current issue of the *Architectural Review* is devoted to a survey of English country towns under the impact of suburbanisation.

Writing in the *Observer* on the A.R.'s survey, Sir Hugh Casson says that the 'results build up into one of the fattest and most flesh-creeping horror-comics that can ever have been printed'.

In a passage of fine invective, Sir Hugh goes on:

Once upon a time companionable and intricate, a place where buildings, people and space were comfortably related; no doubt still prosperous, and probably beloved by its citizens—[the English country town] is in fact diseased. . . . victim of that creeping mildew of mess and muddle-headed squalor which, inch by inch and hour by hour, is destroying alike the fabric of our towns and the face of our countryside, smudging the one into the other beneath a mass-produced and uniform scribble of hoardings and road signs, of lamp-posts, shacks and car parks, of abandoned camps and vacant lots, of beheaded trees and dusty evergreens.

Rot in town centres; dump and sprawl at their edges; nibble and litter and spread in between, the annihilation of individuality, these are the symptoms of the blight that is transforming mid-century Britain into one vast and mediocre suburb—wasteful, dreary, and neuter. This mean-and-middle state has been given a new name by the *Architectural Review*, which has devoted the whole of its current issue to the problem. They call it "Subtopia" . . . or making (from Suburb and Utopia) an ideal of suburbia. "Visually speaking, the universalisation and idealisation of our town fringes; philosophically, the idealisation of the Little Man who lives there."

Read: *The Expanding Environment*, by A. E. Gutkind. Freedom Press, 8s. 6d.

Survey of Industrial Bureaucracy

Alvin W. Gouldner: *Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy*. The Free Press, Glencoe, Illinois, 1954, 33s. 6d.

THE advance of knowledge in the social sciences carries with it dangers parallel to those in the physical sciences. Disinterested inquiry into the nature of atomic structure may end in the intervention of The Bomb and the subordination of science to power-hungry politicians. Similarly, the investigation of human behaviour, both individual and social, may result in facilitating the exploitation of man by man. Science, neutral as between ends, may extend the means whereby one group or class controls the lives of other groups and classes. In the social sciences, the dangers are enhanced by the all-too-frequent enunciation of

'laws' or generalisations based on inadequate data and implicitly justifying the *status quo*.

A great merit of the book under review is that it shows an awareness of the pitfalls that beset the sociologist. In exposition and method of treatment it is a model of its kind and may be recommended to anyone who wishes to sample some of the excellent studies made by Americans in recent years in the field of industrial sociology.

In content it is a partial report of an investigation of a single factory—a gypsum plant—seen in the light of Max Weber's theory of bureaucracy. The empirical data is marshalled for the purpose of evaluating the theory and of modifying and redirecting it in keeping with the observed facts. Weber's theory which underlies much of the more serious thinking on politics in recent years, took for granted the increasing development of bureaucratic administration in our society. To Weber bureaucracy—the governments of experts according to general, abstract and clearly-defined rules—appeared as the most efficient form of administration and one destined to lead to the suppression of the amateur by the qualified specialist. Couched in impersonal terms, it has lent support to the pessimistic idea that democracy, in the sense of a society based on consent, is a utopian and unattainable vision and that the rule of the few—in this case, those with expertise—is the destined and inevitable lot of mankind.

The bureaucratic, and especially *techno-bureaucratic*, trends of our own society need no underlining. The evidence in all spheres of social life is too overwhelming and, certainly, Gouldner makes no attempt to blink the facts. What he does do—and here he makes an important advance on Weber—is to outline a provisional typology of bureaucracy. Instead of a single undifferentiated type we are confronted with three significantly different types—what Gouldner terms 'mock bureaucracy', 'punishment-centred bureaucracy' and 'representative bureaucracy'. The first, it may be surmised, is relatively unimportant: it is the two latter types which have widest application. Briefly, punishment-centred bureaucracy is characterized by imposed rules, punishment for their violation, and a relatively high degree of tension and conflict, while the characteristics of representative bureaucracy are rules commonly consented to, mutually supported by informal sentiments, and relatively few tensions and overt conflicts.

To the revolutionary these distinctions may appear trivial and unimportant: the end-result in either case is bureaucracy, and bureaucracy is a bad thing. It is like distinguishing between government by a single-party system and government by a multi-party system when government itself is the objectionable feature.

This reaction, however, misses an important point. As Gouldner insists, the choice that faces mankind is not simply between 'what is' and 'what ought to be'.

There is a third option: 'what can be'. In the past, 'realists', from Machiavelli to Burnham, have insisted, with ill-disguised glee, on 'what is', while the revolutionaries and 'utopians' have insisted, with righteous indignation, on 'what ought to be'. The vices of the 'realists' need no spotlighting: the vices of the 'utopians' are not so readily discernible.

The advocacy of righteous causes has, at the worst, earned the epithets of 'impracticable idealist' and 'hopeless visionary'. To be an 'impossibilist' in a world peopled by opportunists and worshippers of the 'hard facts', appears to some at least a not unworthy rôle. Nor indeed is it. But it is not necessarily the most worthwhile rôle if there is in fact a third realm, the realm of 'what can be', which, if not the same as 'what ought to be', is at least better than 'what is'.

The vices of 'utopianism' are to be found precisely at this point. If utopia really is impossible—and the possibility of the impossible should always be borne in mind!—then we are left, on the old bifurcated view, with only the miserable present. The void left by 'utopian idealism' is filled by disillusioned and cynical 'realism'. Is it surprising, then, that frequently the blindest reactionaries are the erstwhile revolutionaries? It is not for nothing that the Catholic holds that only the greatest sinner can become the greatest saint.

Recognition of the third option, the choice of 'what can be', does not necessarily imply the rejection of 'what ought to be'. It is possible to recognise that, say, the British two-party system of government is preferable, for a variety of reasons, to the single-party totalitarian system without accepting the former as the best of all possible political arrangements. Similarly, it is possible to recognise that what Gouldner calls 'representative bureaucracy' is preferable to 'punishment-centred bureaucracy' without accepting bureaucracy of any sort as the ultimate and desirable end of mankind. At the present time, when most of the tendencies are towards bureaucracy, it is not absurd, therefore, to try to make it one sort rather than another. The lesser evil is, by definition, always preferable to the greater evil. In the world of men, in contrast to the world conjured up by the moral absolutists, the good is never the enemy of the best.

Gouldner by his study of bureaucratic manifestations in a concrete situation has performed a singular service. We do not need to be told that bureaucracy is not inevitable. There have been, and still are, organisations which are not of the bureaucratic type—certain anarchist organisations, to wit. Their existence has demonstrated, therefore, that 'non-bureaucracy' is an available policy alternative. But if, as seems likely, men opt for bureaucracy rather than for our own alternative, it is important to know that, even within a bureaucratic order of things, men still have an important choice to make.

GASTON GERARD.

A NEW industrial revolution is taking place. Science has taken a hand in welding the industrial future of society. Millions of people all over the world will be, in time, replaced by hundreds of robot devices, electronic computers and machines of all types, which can reduce time factors to a minimum, and increase standards of accuracy.

But this will cause large problems. Living as we do in a competitive economic system in which the means of production and distribution are in the hands of a minority, the world's workers are in a very uncomfortable position. In order to exist, they have to sell their labour power. As long as there is a market for them, they eat. But as soon as there is no demand for their labours they don't eat. It is as simple as that.

Whoever imagines that employers are going to use Robots, solely to make working conditions easier for their employees, is very naïve. And those who think they will still pay wages to their obsolete human wage slaves had also better think again. Those who suppose that employers would rather use human labour able to go on strike at will rather than machines which cannot, had better try to understand capitalism better.

All the time the economic system exists with its competition, and the monetary system with its privilege and differ-

entials and the authoritarian system with its coercion, these machines represent a menace to mankind.

So why not ensure their usefulness? Why not do away with the economic system and all its appendages? Why not put these robots to work for our benefit, and make conditions easier for workers, instead of expenses lower for the capitalist?

The only cry against these robots comes from the trade union leaders. They see a danger in becoming useless, because as men become redundant so will their unions. Unions exist as bargaining media, only so long as the men are needed in industry. And when men become obsolete so will union leaders. All the time the working class remains unenlightened, so they will remain downtrodden. And the irony of it is, that the labour leaders who should welcome improved conditions for their workers and more leisure as a result of robotization cry out against it.

In an Anarchical free society robotization would be more than welcomed and working people could then enjoy the leisure and live in the dignity they deserve. Before we welcome Robots let us welcome the free society. Clear away the existing systems and then let us talk about Robots.

MONTY.

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

OPEN DAILY

Postage free on all items

New Books . . .

Morals Without Religion and other Essays Margaret Knight 6/-

Reprints . . .

Cup of Gold John Steinbeck 2/-
My Life and Thought Albert Schweitzer 2/6

Second-Hand . . .

At the Dawn of a New Reign Stepniak 6/6

Secret China Egon Erwin Kisch 2/6

China and Britain Sir John Pratt 3/-

Between Tears and Laughter Lin Yutang 2/-

The Gay Genius Lin Yutang 3/-

New China: Friend or Foe? Alun Falconer 2/-

China Looks Forward Sun Fo 2/6

China Moulded by Confucius F. T. Cheng 5/-

Sceptical Essays Bertrand Russell 5/-

Power Bertrand Russell 4/-

The Hoax Italo Svevo 3/-

Liberalism L. T. Hobhouse 2/-

History of our Time: 1885-1913 G. P. Gooch 2/-

Form in Civilization W. R. Lethaby 3/-

The Man Who Was Thursday G. K. Chesterton 3/-

Fifty Years of International Socialism M. Beer 5/-

The Soldiers' War (ed.) John Brophy 3/6

Across the River and Into the Trees Ernest Hemingway 3/-

The Fields at Evening Ethel Mannin 3/-

Chapters from Childhood Juliet M. Sockice 3/-

Extraordinary Popular Delusions and the Madness of Crowds Charles Mackay 5/6

Road to Survival William Vogt 4/6

100,000,000 Guinea Pigs Arthur Kallet & F. J. Schlink 5/-

Obtainable from

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

THE BIG FOUR AND YOU

Continued from p. 1

cians of *Peace News*, on the verge of war! We called it "The Phoney Formosa Crisis" (FREEDOM, Feb. 5). They are, if anything, the façade, the perpetuation of the myth of government, of tensions between nations, of the need for the inspired leaders who can, by their wisdom and their super-diplomacy, resolve "the tensions that divide nations". To have frequent meetings at "the summit" would help to destroy the myth. Hence the need for an elaborate Press conditioning, with the emphasis on the tremendous difficulties involved in bringing about a meeting of the great men so that when it is finally arranged it can be viewed by the gaping public as an event of the utmost transcendence, of world-shattering significance (in this respect the American politicians are more stupid than opportunistic as the publication of the Yalta minutes shows. To publish verbatim the cheap and banal remarks of the supermen simply ruins the whole illusion, and tends to reduce the awe with which we are expected to view these super-meetings!).

If we are told that our thesis, that diplomacy is an elaborate game, in which the "tensions" are created by the very people who later "resolve" them, is an over-simplification of a very real problem, then we would refer back to Comfort's view, which we share, that the peoples of the world prefer butter to guns. Yet how does one explain the curious fact that the Four Power talks which we are told will take place as a result of "public pressure", will be symbolised by guns and not by butter?

★

WE are anarchists because we believe in the expression and direct implementation of public opinion. We attack the ideas put forward by Comfort (which, judging by the prominence given to them in *Peace News*, are endorsed by the pacifist leadership), because they are based on reactionary and false premises. Namely: (1) that in present society an informed public opinion exists as well as the channels for its expression; (2) that "summit talks" have been forced upon the governments concerned by public opinion; (3) that the national "tensions" are real—that is between the peoples of the world as distinct from the struggle for power among the rulers; (4) that peace will be established through the intervention of governments; (5) that the rôle of government is not to govern but to express public opinion when that opinion is sufficiently strongly voiced; (6) by omission, that the economic and class structure of society—East and West—is not one of the fundamental causes of war.

We believe that an objective examination of these six points must lead to the conclusion that there is no lasting or satisfactory solution to the problems of our time within the framework of power politics. The anarchist way may appear "utopian", "desirable but unattainable"—to quote the sympathisers and "practical" ex-anarchists. But the alternative of the progressive leftists when it is not mere fantasy ("government by the people") is sheer slavery (nationalisation, world government, new-look Capitalism, etc.).

For you to choose. The anarchist road may be a long and difficult one. But we would suggest, in all modesty, that the road taken by the "realists" leads nowhere via the H-Bomb and a permanently divided class society.

INTERNATIONAL P.E.N. CONGRESS

(From our Correspondent)

Vienna, June.

IN Vienna they made a lot of the fact that the International PEN Congress was taking place in an Austria suddenly free and independent. And the third week of June was really summer and the Chancellor himself kindly entertained the writers and poets at Schoenbrunn Castle while the Mayor arranged a Ball at the Rathaus. The Austrian PEN Club, the hosts, made plans for sight-seeing trips and an official dinner, an evening at the 'Heuriger' and an outing to the Wachau. Everything was done with an eager and kindly generosity, though somewhere in this crowded week time had to be found to discuss the theme of the Congress—The Theatre as an Expression of our Time.

With a little more determination, and an occasional reflection that there was a theme to be discussed, this Congress might have developed into a useful and enlightening occasion for the exchange of ideas—between East and West, non-communist and communist, experimental and traditional—and certainly providing a positive reason for this gathering in Vienna. Instead, a few papers were read, formal little pieces that were presented with the respectful soberness of a company chairman's report or a gov-

ernment official's speech at the opening of a hospital. The pointlessness of all this gradually became apparent, however, because at one of the final sessions suggestions from non-communist and communist members alike were enthusiastically received. These suggestions called for the opportunity to have real and lively discussions, a positive spirit of debate and a programme that would give the Theme of the Congress the importance it deserved. The next Congress is to be held in London and it remains to be seen whether the Committee is prepared to acquiesce to this widespread desire for something more positive.

If the theme of the Congress remained a quiet affair between gentlemen, that which should have had no place at the Congress made its introduction with Charles Morgan's opening address. It is accepted that PEN is above (or outside) politics and that the platform should never be used to create discord or argument on questions outside the immediate field of a writer's professional activities. Instead, as President, Charles Morgan used the occasion to bring up the question of whether a Soviet Centre should be allowed membership and, with Churchillian emphasis, spoke of secret police, totalitarianism and the rest. Speaking of the various attitudes one

could take on this subject, he said, 'Secondly, there is the point of view of men who are themselves very far from being communists but who, just because their ideals are liberal and international, are reluctant to exclude from PEN any writers on the grounds of their political opinions. These liberal-minded internationalists argue that it is desirable and in accordance with our principles to meet Communist writers and to enter into discussion with them in the hope that they may become reconciled with us and genuinely accept our common basis of liberty in writing and in thought. This may or may not appear to you to be carrying optimism to the point of naïveté.'

From numerous personal discussions during the course of the week, the number of members who had carried optimism to the point of naïveté was surprisingly large.

'Finally,' said Morgan, 'you will have to recognise that if one new totalitarian Centre is admitted to our company, it will not come alone. If one Centre should come to us with the Charter in its hand, there is no reason in principle that others should not follow. You will have to ask yourselves what in such circumstances the ultimate condition of PEN would be, and whether you desire it.'

This remark was completely illogical for the following reason. At the moment as members are Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Poland, East Germany and Estonia. If we assume that writers in these countries work under similar conditions to their Soviet colleagues, and the PEN Charter is so interpreted as to exclude a Soviet centre, then should it not be invoked to expel those Communist countries which are members already?

From Morgan's opening address, the Congress never recovered its aim of being an occasion for enlightening and unembittered discussion. One Communist member pointed out that as writers they were individuals and should and could be judged only by their written work. Another mentioned that he had been a PEN member for seventeen years while the President himself was a newcomer of two or three years. Stephen Spender called for an end to the dictatorship of the Committee which had successfully suppressed certain resolutions before they could be presented to the Assembly;

Silone, after a day or two of enlightened battling among the delegates, seemed to give up the unequal struggle and for the latter part of the week was rarely seen. Finally, came the mediating voice of Roger Caillois, the UNESCO representative, tactfully taking the sting out of Morgan's speech and somehow interpreting, in the spirit of hopefulness and conciliation, everything that had happened. An eloquent bit of diplomacy.

As is evident from this account, the real advantages of the Congress were not to be gained at the various conferences. More real than charters, politics and the manœuvring of delegations, were the quiet individuals, their ideas and their problems, their work and their purpose, things to be discovered by informal chats at meal tables, in hidden corners, over a glass of wine. This, one feels, was the exciting, the unexpected, the richest aspect of the Congress.

One discovered, for example, S. H. Vatsyayan, an Indian who had spent five years in prison, part of the time with Nehru himself. Of bitterness or prejudice, there appeared no sign. With serene charm he discussed his recent work with the Bhoodan land movement in India. As script writer for a film recently made about the movement, he had the opportunity of travelling from village to village with Vinoba Bhave and making a personal study of a movement which is unique in the world—that of voluntary sacrifices to achieve a more equal distribution of land and wealth. From the original idea of the Land Gift has developed the Labour Gift so that working men and artisans volunteer so many hours of labour for the building of schools, hospitals, etc. Money Gifts take an essentially concrete form—that of constructing much-needed wells and irrigation.

And rewarded, too, were those who shared tables or sat in quiet corners with Chamson, Silone, Kesten and some of the less bigoted writers from Communist countries. Nevertheless, at the end of the week, there was general agreement that the Congress had gone on long enough and that it would be remembered particularly for the hospitality of the Austrian Pen Club, the uneasy proximity of an empty and abandoned Vienna, and contacts at the individual level. But not for the Theme of the Congress. What was it, anyway? Writers as an Expression of their Society? Writers in Search of a Theme? In search of man? How quickly one forgets. C.H.

VORKUTA STRIKERS MANIFESTO

TWO years ago there was a massive strike among the workers in the Russian labour camps in the Vorkuta area, near the arctic circle. We referred at the time when the news first leaked through, to the near-anarchist ideas expressed by the strikers.

WE Libertarians are sometimes accused of being old fashioned utopians out of touch with the realities of present-day struggles. We give you below the contents of a leaflet that was widely circulated in Vorkuta just prior to the great strike that took place in that Russian slave camp in the summer of 1953. This text appeared in the book "Die Holle ist Ganz Auders" by Bridget Gerland, a German prisoner of Marxist persuasion who lived through this period at the Vorkuta camp.

Inasmuch as the isolated young prisoners who composed and distributed the leaflet could have had no access to the writings of Anarchist theoreticians, we feel that it bears witness to the inescapable logic and realism of our position.

Following is the text of the leaflet that roused the slaves to rebel:

"Every resistance movement begins with a negation, with a 'no'. We say 'No!' to the party dictatorship, which has turned the promise of spiritual freedom into a pharisaical lie for all the peoples of the Soviet Union. We say 'No!' to state capitalism, for the Soviet state has become a more tyrannical exploiter than the most merciless private capitalism.

"We say 'No!' to Soviet imperialism, which is in sharpest conflict with Marxist doctrine, for the revolution cannot be carried forward on the points of Russian bayonets.

"Nevertheless, for us the solution is not to make a slavish imitation of Western democracy with its private capitalist

Views & Comments, published by the Libertarian League of New York, has reproduced the text of a leaflet circulated by the strikers. We pass it on to our readers, preceded by the introduction by *Views & Comments*:

economic system, the alternative to Bolshevism. We want to liberate ourselves from every state. In the final analysis the state is but a cunningly contrived machine for the exploitation and suppression of the workers.

"We want to set up a soviet socialist administration truly of the people through workers' and peasants' councils. The governmental apparatus must be replaced by workers' and peasants' syndicates which will direct and administer not people but only the means of production."

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT! WEEK 26

Deficit on Freedom £390
Contributions received £312
DEFICIT £78

June 24 to June 30

London: R.W. 3/-; Luton: C.R.V. 3/-; Wakefield: A.F. 1/-; Torino: G.I. 5/8; Rotherham: R.G.D. 1/6; Falmouth: L.W. 3/6; London: N.B.T.* 4/-; Cheam: J.B. 1/6; London: Anon. 3d.; London: J.S.* 5/-; London: Anon. 4/2; Kidderminster: J.W.H. 11/6; London: J.W. 3/-; London: Anon. 6d.; London: G.O. 3/-; Wolverhampton: N.D. 10/-; Oldham: M.J.G. 2/-.

Total	4	1	7
Previously acknowledged	308	3	2
1955 TOTAL TO DATE	£312	4	9

GIFTS OF BOOKS: Corsock: L.B. Birmingham: A.W.H.

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.

HERBERT READ :
Art and the Evolution of Man 4s.
Existentialism, Marxism and Anarchism 3s. 6d.
Poetry and Anarchism cloth 5s., paper 2s. 6d.
The Philosophy of Anarchism boards 2s. 6d., paper 1s.
The Education of Free Men 1s.

GEORGE WOODCOCK :
Anarchy or Chaos 2s. 6d.
New Life to the Land 6d.
Homes orhovels? 6d.
Railways and Society 3d.
What is Anarchism? 1d.
The Basis of Communal Living 1s.

JOHN HEWETSON :
Sexual Freedom for the Young 6d.
Ill-Health, Poverty and the State cloth 2s. 6d., paper 1s.

PHILIP SANSON :
Syndicalism—The Workers' Next Step 1s.

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

TONY GIBSON :
Youth for Freedom paper 2s.
Food Production and Population 6d.
Who will do the Dirty Work? 2d.

★

Marie-Louise Berneri Memorial Committee publications :
Marie-Louise Berneri, 1918-1949: A Tribute cloth 5s.
Journey Through Utopia cloth 16s. (U.S.A. \$2.50)

★

K. J. KENAFICK :
Michael Bakunin and Karl Marx paper 6s.

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

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

THE ISRAEL CRISIS

DOWNFALL OF A POLITICIAN

A PIECE of news which dominated newspapers in Israel for several days recently, but got very little notice here, was the probable end of the brilliant political career of Dr. Israel Kastner.

Before, and during, the Second World War, Dr. Kastner was known internationally as the leader of the Hungarian Zionist movement. When the Nazis occupied Hungary in 1944, he was appointed head of the Jewish rescue committee in Budapest, and, while he failed to prevent the liquidation of some 800,000 Hungarian Jews during the next few months, he managed to get 600 of the most notable on a rescue train to Switzerland. When the State of Israel was founded, Dr. Kastner became a senior government official. Later, he resigned so that he could be placed high on the electoral list of *Mapai*, the Israel Labour Party.

About two years ago an old Hungarian Jew called Malchiel Gruenewald, 52 of whose family of 58 had been liquidated, issued a private broadsheet making all kinds of fantastic accusations against Dr. Kastner. He said Kastner had collaborated with the Nazis, that he had knowingly and wilfully taken part in the transport of 500,000 Hungarian Jews to Auschwitz for the gas chambers, that he had been instrumental in the arrest of Jewish agents parachuted into Hungary by the R.A.F., that he had shared Jewish loot with *Standartenführer* Becker, and so on. Of course, a man of Kastner's reputation had little to fear from any grief-crazed old man, but the State felt that it could not allow such allegations against a respected citizen to continue, and about eighteen months ago Gruenewald was prosecuted for libel.

On June 22, 1955, after a ten-months trial and fourteen hours of summing up, Dr. Halevi, of Jerusalem District Court, gave his judgment. With regard to his statement that Kastner had shared loot with the *Standartenführer*, Gruenewald was found guilty of libel and fined £1 (Israel). With regard to all his other statements he was found Not Guilty; he had proved his allegations to be true in substance and in fact!

It seems there was a bargain between Dr. Kastner and Herr Eichmann, the official responsible for reducing the Jewish population of Hungary. Dr. Kastner agreed actively to connive in misinforming Jews, whom he well knew were going to Auschwitz for extermination, that they were being taken to labour camps; Eichmann, in return, allowed him to send one special train, containing his own family and some 600 Jewish 'elite' to Switzerland. Jews dropped in Hungary by the R.A.F., for the purpose of organising resistance, began their activities by reporting to Dr. Kastner as the local Zionist leader, and he found it necessary for his own safety to inform the Gestapo of their arrival.

Without Dr. Kastner's activities as a decoy, Dr. Halevi said, the Jews would have resisted and many might have survived. There was no anti-semitic feeling among Hungarians to compare with that in Poland. If Halevi's judgment is upheld by the Court of Appeal, as it probably will be, it can safely be taken that Israel Kastner's political career is finished.

Some of his late followers have called him The Greatest Traitor in History; one Israel newspaper, probably at great benefit to its circulation, is advocating his arrest as a war criminal. Naturally, one is horrified by his treachery. But how guilty is he? The Jewish parents of a friend of mine died in a concentration camp, having been betrayed to the Gestapo by another Jew, who was rewarded with a slight increment of rations. After the war, my friend says, he visited this Jew with the object of murdering him, but found him to be such a weakling his hate turned to pity. If Malchiel Gruenewald, and all the other lonely survivors of Hungarian Jewish families, could meet Kastner, their hate might turn to pity too. He betrayed not a couple but hundreds of thousands, and his reward was not a sausage, but safety for six hundred of his pals; but his behaviour was basically the same as that of a little traitor. The reason he did much greater harm was that he was trusted as a leader. D.R.

THE VALUE OF FREE EDUCATION

IF we accept the premise that the world is not going to be destroyed by atomic explosions then we may reasonably assume that since the world is to continue its future must rest with the generations to come—apart, that is, from the contribution we may make during our own brief span.

With this in mind we are faced with the importance of setting our children and their children on the right road to Utopia by attempting to educate them (on all levels), in a proper manner.

This can hardly be regarded as a strikingly original or profound idea for if sufficiently pressed almost anyone will admit to having thought something of the sort at one time or another, but in spite of this we make no apology, for having reiterated the obvious for it is not inconceivable that the point has been overlooked by certain parents and teachers and most educational authorities, in the same way that the most noticeable object may be the hardest to see when placed upon the mantelpiece.

There can be little doubt that the basic fault lies in the general attitude of almost all educationists, in that they continue to treat children in an authoritarian way, with the inevitable result that millions of little 'believers-in-authoritarianism' appear generation after generation. The heavily entrenched theory of disciplining children for their own sakes has many apparent advantages for everyone concerned, hence its popularity no doubt, but since it is based on false premises it need not be considered here.

What has to be considered however is the attitude adopted towards it by those who descend to the level of the well-worn rationalisation that—If we don't bring up our children to respect their betters, the rules (written and unwritten), the system, the authorities and all the rest, how will they be able to cope with their lives in an authoritarian world? Even the educationists concerned know the answer to this, for in effect the answer is implicit in the question. Change the world! Too revolutionary and impracticable they say—what possible effect can we as individuals have upon the present complex system of society built up over the centuries? What right have we to educate children in a manner calculated to produce maladjustment in this peculiar world. Quite obviously they can do a great deal, but having asked this formidable question

Blue Union Leaders

Continued from p. 1

TGWU's grip on the right to work. This was won by strike action last March and now they no longer have to show a white card in order to work. *This situation must remain*, for it is better to have no card at all than one which is nothing more than the badge of a slave. In other words, if membership lapses in sufficient numbers, the dockers of the Northern ports could establish unofficial organisations without having to submit to white union dictatorship, and could rely upon themselves on the job to guard their interests.

Be Unofficial!

We don't think these workers should feel that they *must* show loyalty to a union. Both suitable unions have let them down and there is no point in starting up one of their own on the same lines—so why not simply establish the sort of organisation which they always have done in time of need—unofficial committees for the sole purpose of fighting for conditions here and now.

At the same time, such an organisation, if they have really learned the lesson of leadership, could provide the basis of a genuine rank-and-file portworkers' movement which could set an example to the rest of the working class. Freed from leaders, freed from full time organisers with a stake in the *status quo*, the aim of workers' control could easily find expression.

Anyway, whichever way out they choose, the hard fact is that the dockers of the North must rely upon their own strength from now on. It's a pity the lesson had to be rubbed in so shamefully, but it is one well worth knowing.

the matter tends to remain poised in thin air and the subject is dropped.

If it was continued, perhaps they could be made to see that the two negatives do not produce a positive solution. Because the system is wrong it should not be axiomatic to educate wrongly. Anyone who is in a position to influence anyone else for good should not hesitate to do so just because it will have no world-impact—one never knows who will end up where! A school teacher who may have thousands of young minds coming under his influence over a period, should try to regard each of his pupils as a budding 'power for good'.

It would be foolish to ignore the practical difficulties involved in propagating an 'unusual line of thought'. Unquestionably the raised eyebrow, the lack of response, the derisive comments will leave their mark, and a tendency towards disillusionment and cynicism is bound to appear. The fresh enthusiasm of a young teacher can be and often is dispelled in quite a short time. The other influences, exerted by parents, educational bodies and the pupils themselves would seem to be insurmountable; the impotent feeling of fighting windmills may be overpowering. The 'hopelessness of it all' finally sets in. Discouraged and beaten the enthusiast becomes just another conformist.

But in fact the situation may not be quite so bad as it would appear. The results will come much later, probably unseen by the person most responsible, and this must be hard to take. Indeed it may be almost impossible for the teacher concerned to believe that any good has been done if he cannot actually observe it himself. To overcome these doubts and fears is perhaps the greatest difficulty; only personal convictions can be of any value in the struggle to maintain an integrity which is scorned by the overwhelming majority.

With the remaining minority there rests therefore the knowledge that partly through their efforts a few more socially-conscious human beings are walking the earth—thinking, speaking and acting in a rational way, helping to increase the flow of reason in an unreasoning world, and thereby increasing still further the number of people who will themselves help to educate others.

This may be all right in theory say the cynics, but in fact where are all the 'converts'? It is admittedly hard to discern this rising population of non-conformists; there is no torrent sweeping irresistibly onwards, rather is there a tiny stream winding its way towards an uncertain goal. But the minute proportions of a progressive movement cannot be considered as a detraction from its validity—it should be nurtured until it grows to a size commensurate with its importance. H.F.W.

The Orgone Institute

DEAR SIRS,

We wish to advise you that the activities of Paul Ritter has not only nothing to do with the Orgone Institute or the Wilhelm Reich Foundation but the term "orgonomic functionalism", as used in orgonomic research, does not apply at all to these activities. The term has been usurped against the will and the advice of the Foundation. Furthermore these activities in general are looked upon by the Foundation as well as by the Orgone Institute as harmful to the reputation and the seriousness of the task of Orgonomy, as being irresponsible and tactless.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM MORSE,

Secretary,

Orgonon, Maine,

June 27.

Orgone Institute.

Revolution Through Love

Continued from p. 2

Weren't they really *all* landless now, as the neighbouring villages maliciously suggested? How was the reborn village to be run? First of all, everyone was expected to engage in manual labour... including the twenty or so families, fourteen of whom were Brahmans, who had been brought up to regard agriculture as degrading and had previously farmed their land through the employment of labour. They were parasites who had voluntarily cancelled their own licence for laziness. Imagine City magnates suddenly asked to sow corn and you have a measure of the social and psychological change involved.

"Now that the 800 acres of Mangroth had all been vested in the village community, they were redistributed again to the villagers in amounts which varied with each family's capacity and need. Diwan Singh, who had given all of his 100 acres received back 40, since he was known to be the most efficient farmer in the village. While at the other end of the scale came the potters, shoemakers and silversmiths who, since they have a trade already, only received small plots. All the land, however, whether given to a *Harijan* or to Diwan Singh, was to be held on trust from the village, which could review and change the distribution whenever the need arose. Land-ownership in fact should be determined by needs of efficiency and bonds of mutual confidence rather than by any permanent legal right.

"The Village Committee asked the new proprietors if they wished to form a collective farm. Thirty-two of the *Harijan* families—and Diwan Singh as well—agreed to do so, but the other seventy-one families preferred to continue farming as separate units. The collective was called *Parivar*—the family. Its members received no wages—only food and clothing from the common pool. All farmers, whether private or collective, traded their surplus produce at the village store in return for clothing, household articles and the use of the dispensary and newly established school.

"Not that Mangroth is a paradise of green in the surrounding dust and rock. If it is it would be as unreal and unconvincing as those demonstration farms run by the Indian government on which disproportionate millions have been lavished. What use is sugar-cane 10 feet high if it costs Rs.5 a pound to grow? Even Mangroth's best land produces no more than one crop a year, while half of its 800 acres are still uncultivable—a wilderness of scrub and stone. The villagers have already moved over the scrub, backs bent, baskets on their hips, picking off what they could. They have even had a Government tractor to try and uproot the scrub.

"Dharam Pal, who was responsible for the co-operative shop, was explaining the system of barter which they had set up... Each of the rooms was filled now with a dusty sea of wheat or rice or lentils lapping the window-sills and on the balcony itself there were strings of sandals, piles of soap and bundles of clothing—all made in the village and waiting for distribution as family needed them.

"The shop and the Village Committee, so Dharam Pal told us, now met all the needs of the members of the collective and also any extras required by the rest of the village for funerals, weddings or festivals. They were also responsible for maintaining the village children who passed into the High School at Orai, where they had to live in lodgings during the term. In the two years since the 'rebirth' the moneylender—that scourge of Indian village life almost as deadly as drought or infected water—had scarcely shown his odiously fat face.

"What impressed most, of course, was the complete ordinariness of this village. Since it had dedicated itself to the cause of social justice, it had not been besieged by a battery of camaramen, lectured at by experts, examined by sociologists, nor even exhorted by Government officials. Apart from one visit of a tractor, two lots of improved seeds and the promise of an irrigation canal from the Bettwa River under the second Five-year Plan, Mangroth had received no outside help or encouragement. In one thing and one thing only lay its claim to fame; quietly, hidden from the limelight, it had decided to pull itself up by its own bootstraps. If Mangroth could make such a decision, then every other village in India could do the same."

What are Vinoba's ideas on Industry?

"Vinoba wants each village to become as self-sufficient as possible in food and clothing, not exporting either of these primary necessities until local needs have been met. He opposes the growing of cash crops—coconut plantations for American hair-oil and British soap, jute for sacking, mats and string all made in distant factories—not only because the primary producer gets the merest pittance out of the fat profits of the industrialist (this, after all, could be changed by a revolution of a different kind), but because reliance on cash crops as a main source of income introduces greed, destroys the farmers sense of community, and substitutes no social values in return. What human meaning exists in the fact that an undernourished peasant on the Malabar coast should toil

THE most significant sentiment expressed by Joffre Stewart in *Criticism from America* (FREEDOM 2/7/55) was summed up in the sentence—"At that juncture I felt more kinship to many an arch-conservative than I did to R.M." In other words, whoever is prepared to oppose taxation, regardless of motives, deserves the support of the anti-Governmentalists.

Intelligent regular readers of FREEDOM will know that it has never been stated, or implied, either editorially or from individual contributors that anarchists favour taxation as a *method*. This was made perfectly clear in the editorial of April 23rd, "As ye Sow", where the motives behind the anti-taxation movements in France and Italy were criticised because of their anti-social nature. But, attention was drawn to the pacifist opposition to taxation in the United States, and had our support because it was a conscious social action motivated by human, not "niggardly", sentiments.

The Italian and French anti-tax movements are made up of the petit-bourgeoisie, arch-conservatives no doubt, whose only complaint against Government is that it robs or deprives them of large profits.

The article "Traitors to the Human Race" (FREEDOM, May 14th) referred to by J.S. contained similar criticisms of some of the non-voters during the British Parliamentary General Election. I expressed the view, and I find nothing in Stewart's confused letter to convince me otherwise, that if the conscious opposition to Government robbery had been accompanied by a social consciousness, I may have been more sympathetic to their expressions of distrust of Government, but I in no way implied that Government had a right to enforce taxation. As an anarchist I am opposed to the whole monetary system and propagate its

abolition, but I am also concerned with human behaviour and motives in this society. When therefore, I am faced with two groups of people opposing Government interference and I consider one group does so for the right reason and the other for the wrong, then I make a personal choice and support the group motivated by what I consider to be the right reasons.

This neither makes me a supporter of "forced labour", or conscription for women (or men), as has been foolishly suggested by our American correspondent. Nor does it suggest that if more money from taxation were canalised into the social services that I would change my attitude to Government. Government cannot be changed by tax evasion or by reforms but by the conscious action of the ordinary people on all levels.

Refusal to vote, to be conscripted or pay taxes is, in my view, valueless in social terms unless it is coupled with a positive attitude to society as a whole, presenting a reasonable alternative.

In the meantime it seems to be that we must seriously consider the value of social services in this society, and the only way it seems that these services can be maintained under capitalism is through taxation. Unless therefore, we have a workable alternative here and now the only possible answer is to abandon any such schemes, which will be a partial victory* for the tax evaders and the death of a good social idea that the aged and the people unable to work in our society are the responsibility of society. R.M.

*Since it is inconceivable that Government will abolish taxation needed for war weapons.

Have you seen the
"Progress of a Deficit"
on page 3
IT'S GOING UP!

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)

JULY 10—Jack Robinson on WHO PAYS TO ADVERTISE?

JULY 17—Donald Rooum on ANARCHISM & CLEAR THINKING

JULY 24—Edwin Peeke on Subject to be announced.

INFORMAL DISCUSSIONS

Every Thursday at 8.15.

OPEN AIR MEETINGS

Weather Permitting

HYDE PARK

Sundays at 3.30 p.m.

MANETTE STREET

(Charing X Road)

Saturdays at 5.30 p.m.

The Malatesta Club

155 HIGH HOLBORN,

LONDON, W.C.1.

Thursday, 7th July:

Discussion opened by S. Fanaroff on THE ANARCHY OF ANARCHISM

Saturday, 9th July:

Social Evening

Thursday, 14th July:

Discussion opened by T. Gibson on FUNCTIONALISM AND SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS.

Saturday, July 16th
THE UNITAS Old Nic Company
presents a play
'Is Monogamous Marriage Conducive to Sexual Happiness'
or—'Glamorous Night'.

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