

# Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

Between the government which does evil and the people who accept it there is a certain shameful solidarity

VICTOR HUGO

Vol. 17, No. 37

September 15th, 1956

Threepence

## THE REAL CRISIS AHEAD IS

# WORLD WIDE INFLATION

THE Suez Canal "crisis" has surely outlived its "interest value" and something should be done to put Sir Anthony out of his misery. For after all the struggle, as it has resolved itself, is not one of Western Europe's survival. Nobody, for instance, now seems to be over-worried about oil supplies being suddenly cut off. Indeed it has (at last) dawned on those acute political "observers" of Fleet Street that the rulers of the Middle-East countries, however fond they may be of their blood-brother Nasser, have no intention of cutting off their noses to spite their faces, which is what they would be doing if they entertained the idea of stopping the flow of oil. Oil is the milk and honey of the Middle East on which the ruling classes get fat and without which they could not gratify their every whim. They have power and a royal welcome at Buckingham Palace (and in every Chancellery of the world) so long as the oil flows. Their armies are a military joke; their oil-wells the shrine hallowed by Wall Street and the Stock Exchange.

★

IT is not without interest to note that while the Suez "crisis" was at its height, in Persia, the Government-owned National Iranian Oil Company was gushing with pride over its newly discovered well, 75 miles south of Teheran, which was flowing at the rate of 80,000 barrels a day (according to *Reuter* "one authoritative source in Teheran, however, estimated the flow at 150,000"), compared with the best well in Persia operated by the international oil consortium at Aghapari which produces a mere 50,000 barrels. Now, the Middle-East countries can use only a minute fraction of the oil they produce. The fact

that they sink new wells is surely a proof of their intention that more and more oil should find its way to the industrial nations of the world and not the contrary, as the war-mongering politicians and Press would in effect have us believe!

The Suez "crisis" is a crisis of politicians, a struggle of personalities, but for this very reason we have maintained all along that in spite of the military preparations, magnified and dramatised by the Press and the mass-communication sensation-mongers, there will be no war. Not because Eden, Mollet and their *entourages* are not prepared to sacrifice lives for the sake of their prestige (and the fact that they are should make people in this country and France think a little more deeply as to what are the essential differences between *democratic* and *totalitarian* government). There will be no war in the Middle-East because (a) Nasser, unlike Hitler, is a professional soldier and is aware that, he has, unlike Hitler, the worse army in the world with which to defy the world (and megalomania at the highest political levels is tempered by political realism\*) and (b) because the International Oil companies will not allow Sir

\*Hitler's tantrums it would seem were not particular to him, but are rather the disease of all leaders. We are at present in the process of exploding the Churchill myth with the publication of Lord Brabazon's *Memoirs*. The *News Chronicle's* "Londoner at Large" (Sept. 10) refers to the "debunking" of the Churchill legend", and quotes from Lord Brabazon in which he writes that Churchill "behaved as if he were a bullying schoolmaster. Everyone in his opinion, was a half-wit; and if anyone said anything he was jumped on and snubbed . . . the general cursing of everyone was not the best way of inspiring incentive and imagination".

Anthony to upset the present smooth flow of oil from the Middle East for reasons of personal pride. Politicians in the twentieth century are the mouthpieces of powerful interests (and these in certain circumstances may include the Trade Unions). Ultimately Sir Anthony will be obliged to toe the line dictated to him by the oil companies.

We would even make a practical suggestion, that the Royal Dutch Shell Company whose sales income in the first half of this year showed an increase of £100 millions, from £983m to £1,095m, over the corresponding period last year, should elevate Sir Anthony (by his Garter) to the House of Lords and offer to lend Nasser, interest free, the £84 millions profit they have made in the first six months of 1956 to buy out the Suez Canal Company shareholders and to devote the £14 millions left over to widen and deepen the canal to accommodate Mr. Onassis's latest 100,000 ton tankers at present under construction. Everyone would be happy as a result. More oil would flow to the delight of the Middle East potentates. More revenues would flow into Nasser's coffers and those of Royal Dutch Shell. And Viscount Eden of Suez, following in the footsteps of Lord Attlee, would be kept busy writing for, and delighting the readers of, say, the *Daily Telegraph*, with his thumb-nail sketches of the "men I have known"!

★

WE must apologise to our readers for allowing ourselves to be sidetracked at such length by the Anthony Eden crisis when it was our intention to discuss a crisis much more vital to the lives of all

mankind. Perhaps our own shortcomings underline the artificiality of the "crisis" which still dominates the headlines of the world Press and of the values on which public opinion (to judge by the results of Gallop Polls) is based!

The real crisis, which should be engaging the attention of the people and raising their temperatures, is the economic one, which was dealt with by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. MacMillan, in a vain appeal to the T.U.C., as a national problem, but which is, in fact one affecting all mankind. Not for the reasons given by Mr. MacMillan but because world economics is capitalist economics. The world problem as we have so often pointed out, is the paradoxical one of "over-production" in a world in which half the population is at starvation level (see *Reuter's* report, elsewhere in this issue, on Hunger Marchers in Pakis-

tan). MacMillan's appeal to the Unions to freeze their wage demands presupposes that Britain's economic "crisis" is due to the fact that earnings are rising faster than production. Since 1953, he declared they have increased by 20 per cent, whereas output has only increased by 10 per cent. And by way of comparison he referred to Germany and the United States where the corresponding figures were 15 and 15 and 10 and 10 respectively. But what he did not add was that in spite of the fact that earnings and production had increased equally in these two countries the "writing on the wall" was as plain on their walls as on ours. The price index in America—according to the *N.York Times* (Aug. 25), has risen to a record, and is officially expected to go still higher. In an attempt to curb inflation the bank rate has been increased to 3 per cent. (the second

## 'STARVATION' & STARVATION

"STARVATION" . . . .

The Prince of Berar, eldest son of the Nizam of Hyderabad, claims that his household of 100 dependants and servants faces starvation.

He told a civil court in Hyderabad that his father—reputed richest man in the world—is withholding £2,180 of his monthly £3,750 allowance to meet his debts.

The court ordered the Nizam to show cause why the prince should not be paid in full.

The Arabian Nights wealth in gold, diamonds and other gems of the 71-year-old Nizam is incalculable, but he cracked down last year on his son's extravagance. (*News Chronicle*)

(News Chronicle)

. . . . AND STARVATION

DACCA, SEPTEMBER 4.

Two people were killed when police opened fire in this East Pakistan town to-day on angry crowds who were defying a ban on the assembly of more than five persons. Since Monday, hunger marches have been taking place in the city. Villagers have been trekking to

the capital demanding rice—the staple food in East Pakistan. Earlier to-day, the police used truncheons to disperse a crowd and five people were taken to hospital after incidents in two other places.

The ban on meetings of more than five people was imposed on Monday to maintain order during the protest marches and meetings. Women and children in tattered rags are among the hungry people who trekked to Dacca from the villages. The English-language daily newspaper *Dawn* reported that on Monday a big procession "practically besieged" the gates of Government House, protesting about the price of rice. The paper said they demanded rationing in the villages—and were assured of immediate relief.

*Dawn* said anxiety on the food front seemed to be mounting after a recent announcement by Army authorities that they were no longer connected with the provincial food administration. The Army had been in control since the food shortage in East Pakistan worsened some time ago. (*Reuter*)

## AT THE BRIGHTON T.U.C.

# Cousins Toes the Line

THE man whose sudden rise to power has raised a big question-mark over this year's Trade Union Congress came to heel in the closing stages at Brighton last week.

Rather astutely, the General Council put up Frank Cousins to oppose a resolution demanding the 40-hour week through industry. The resolution was moved by the tiny Blacksmiths' Society and read:

Congress confirms its support for the 40-hour week and considers that the time is now opportune to achieve it. Congress will support efforts by affiliated organisations tending to shorten the working week.

The General Council agreed with this in principle, but thought, in the well-worn phrase, 'this is not the time'. But Congress thought otherwise, and on the vote the General Council was defeated by about half-a-million votes.

In putting up Frank Cousins to oppose the motion, the G.C. clearly had several aims in mind. The more stolid, 'right-wing' members had been somewhat disturbed by Cousins' militant speech at the beginning of the week, when he had flung one and a quarter million votes against wage restraint. And the emergence of this apparent firebrand on the dependable, responsible General Council of the TUC had caused some uneasiness among em-

ployers and Government circles.

So just to show that (a) Cousins is also, really, at heart, dependable, etc., and (b) that anyway they can control him, the G.C. gave him the job of opposing a popular motion.

And although it was thought from the floor that Cousins' heart was not in his job, he said the right things from the G.C.'s point of view.

He said the 40-hour week was the objective of the TUC. His own Transport and General Workers' Union had already submitted demands for it in some industries. But—

"It would be wrong for the TUC to tell all unions to go out and get it now irrespective of the circumstances in their various industries."

It would be stupid, he said, for the TUC to say: "Go out and get what you can at the expense of anything that arises. That would be wrong."

Similarly, during television interviews on both BBC and ITV, Cousins said that although the TUC has rejected wage restraint, that does not mean an all-out industrial war and that the unions were not preparing for strikes unless provoked by the employers.

He said that if the Government expected the co-operation of the TUC it must be prepared to give attention to trade union ideas.

"It is not good enough," he said, "to tell the TUC 'We will discuss things with you, but take no notice of the things you put up'."

In other words, Frank Cousins will be quite happy to play ball with the Government as long as it treats the TUC with the respects he thinks it deserves.

And when one looks at the settlement of the Austin Motor Works strike, it is clear that the TUC—and Cousins' own union, the TGWU—will be satisfied with very little respect indeed. All they are asking for is consultation before sacking on the issue of redundancy, and that the TU leaders are not made to look silly in front of their members.

In fact all the great show put on at Brighton was calculated to make the rank and file happy and contented. It means nothing. After all, when in the past the G.C. agreed to wage restraint it was the militancy of the rank and file that made it meaningless. All the leaders are now doing is recognising that they cannot keep their members down if they are determined to fight. But we may be sure that in being dependable, responsible, concerned for the national interest, etc., etc., the TUC will still be dragging its feet in any battles to come. And the real strength of the movement is still in direct action at the point of production.

## LIMITS OF C.P. NEW LOOK

# NO REASONING - BY ORDER

IT is a sign of serious disaffection in the Communist Party when some of its members claim the right to think differently from Headquarters.

Following the shattering effects of the anti-Stalin policy handed down by the Kremlin, a considerable number of C.P.ers have expressed lack of confidence in their leadership and are now looking for way and means of bringing more democracy—or at least more discussion at branch level—into the Party.

To this end two Yorkshire university dons—Edward Thompson of Leeds and John Saville of Hull—launched an independent journal, called *The Reasoner*, to provide a forum for discussion outside of the control of the King Street bosses.

Now for CP bosses to talk about liberalisation and the mistakes of Stalinist bureaucracy is one thing. But to allow the liberal practice of free speech in criticism of their own bureaucracy is altogether something else. What the Communist leadership is claiming is that they are strong, bold and honest enough to practise *self-criticism*—i.e. they can criticise themselves. That way they can keep the criticism down to proper proportions. What they will not allow, however, is criticism of themselves by anybody else. And that includes their own comrades in the Party.

So the Executive Committee got a bit agitated about the appearance of *The Reasoner* and have been startled by the response it had among Party members. So much so in fact that they have ordered Thompson and Saville to cease publication—after only one issue!

The two rebels were first summoned

to a meeting of the Political Committee (composed of the top six leaders) where John Gollan, new Party secretary, told them to stop publication because it was an infraction of Party discipline. Thompson and Saville refused and now the Executive Committee have brought their full authority behind the demand to cease publication.

So far there has been no threat to expel the two editors. And the E.C. is clearly reluctant to go as far as that since it would create bad feeling throughout the Party and could lead to widespread resignations. Thompson was himself responsible for a group of prominent members of the Halifax Labour Party joining the C.P. last year, and if he and Saville were expelled not only would they and many more resign but it could have a disastrous effect upon the already shaky Party morale.

We shall see, however, whether the leadership think their authority and the need for discipline out-weighs these factors. They are being put in an embarrassing position through enquiries from the London embassies of Communist countries, who cannot understand how such indiscipline could possibly have been allowed to attain such proportions. In any properly run Communist Party a couple of dissidents like Thompson and Saville would have been spotted and dealt with long before they could have published even one issue of an opposition journal.

Still the office boys of King Street are doing their best to be as dictatorial as their big brothers would like. Whether their own members like it and will put up with it remains to be seen.



# ORWELL AND ORTHODOXY

GEORGE ORWELL'S widespread reputation, outside literary and left-wing circles, came to him by accident. He once wrote that the interesting thing about most best-sellers is the time-factor. It was certainly the time-factor which made his last two books famous. A million copies of each has been published in English, both have been translated into twenty languages, and have been serialised, dramatised, condensed, broadcast, televised and filmed. One owes this success to its publication at just the time when anti-Communism became fashionable again (although it had been written, without finding a publisher, when Stalin-worship was still obligatory, and not only among Communists); the other owes it to the accident of its being cast in the literary form now known as science fiction, which at the time of publication was beginning to gain its enormous popularity in America.

The other fortuitous factor in Orwell's fame was his lamentably early death. When a writer who has lived long enough to gain a certain reputation dies before his time, a wider public than his readers feels a sense of loss—a posthumous recognition of the special place in society of its 'unacknowledged legislators'. This rôle was filled at one time by D. H. Lawrence, it has descended to-day on Dylan Thomas. One result of this sadly-acquired celebrity is a period of exaggerated praise, or of praise for irrelevant reasons, followed by a period of neglect.

In the case of George Orwell this accidental reputation has been the cause of widespread misunderstanding. The impact on people in general of the good television adaptation of "1984", and the very bad film version, has given them an image of Orwell as a tortured pedlar of horror. People better acquainted with him have described him as a 'sort of saint' or a masochist, according to their temperament and vocabulary, so uncomfortable was the rare spectacle of someone who practised what he preached. Literary critics have subjected his work to an intensive analysis and have discovered, not surprisingly, that he was an honest man and a master of English, though a poor novelist. He has often been described as a former Communist who like many such, became a bitterly disillusioned opponent of the left. Neither of these propositions is true. But just as with the wider public his last two books were so successful because they appeared at the very moment when they were most acceptable, so among the 'intellectuals'—the serious reading and writing public, he is viewed as a forerunner of the swing from the left which

has been so frequently noted in the last few years, and there has been read into his thought the neo-conservatism which is characteristic of the political thinking of the nineteen fifties.

IN the six years since Orwell's death dozens of articles and essays about him have been published; he has been explained away by Mr. Tom Hopkinson in a British Council pamphlet, his style has been praised and his politics misunderstood in Mr. Laurence Brander's book, his works including his journalism have been very carefully and sympathetically studied in the much better book by Mr. John Atkins, and now, while we are waiting for the 'official' biography of Mr. Malcolm Muggeridge, there has just been published *A Study of George Orwell* by Christopher Hollis, (Hollis & Carter, 18s.).

Mr. Hollis is a Catholic and a former Conservative member of parliament. Orwell was a socialist and a freethinker. We should not infer from this that Mr. Hollis (an unorthodox Tory who complains that when the Conservative party 'came to boast that it was a party of progress and capitalism, there was no force left in the country that could fight for decency'), is necessarily the 'wrong' person to write about Orwell, but it does mean that the reader who is at all familiar with Orwell's work will be alert to notice when Mr. Hollis makes assumptions and draws conclusions which seem to derive from his own political and religious outlook rather than from that of his subject. He was at school with Orwell (at Eton), met him again in Burma, and continued to come across him at intervals until his death. They had, Mr. Hollis says, "enough in common and enough in difference to make argument between us stimulating".

His book is, in a way, rather tedious since he works his way, like the other

commentators on Orwell through the plots of his novels, good and bad, and there really is a limit to the amount of critical interpretation these works can stand, without boring the reader. His personal anecdotes about Orwell are largely about their schooldays, and as most people went to schools vastly inferior to those attended by Masters Orwell and Hollis we get tired of speculating whether or not they enjoyed them, just as we cannot really sympathise with the heroes of the current 'movement' of young writers, who have a chip on their shoulder because they went to a red-brick or even white-tile universities instead of the ancient seats of learning. As most of us went to neither, their

resentments leave us cold. Mr. Hollis describes as 'penetrating', Laurence Brander's remark that to anyone who knew Orwell "it was obvious where he had been to school", which is in fact a remark as silly as Mr. Hollis's own dictum that "An Old Etonian is far more likely to 'dare to be a Daniel' than is a Non-conformist".

ORWELL'S political thought is so full of inconsistencies for those who like their ideologies cut-and-dried, that a whole lot of implausible labels have been tied on to him. Some people, not ourselves,\* have described him as a 'natural anarchist'. Mr. Hollis regards him as a natural conservative: "He was in many ways a profoundly conservative man. Indeed his main complaint against the Conservative party is that it has failed to conserve". He also declares that "Orwell despaired of the Conservatives because the Conservatives despaired

of Conservatism." Presumably, since there is no evidence in Orwell's writings that he ever had any illusions about the Conservative Party to despair of, Mr. Hollis makes these assertions because Orwell was a patriot and a lover of what is known as the English tradition. But Orwell himself writes in *The Lion and the Unicorn*, "Patriotism has nothing to do with Conservatism. It is actually the opposite of Conservatism . . ." As to the English tradition, Mr. V. S. Pritchett commented a good many years ago:

"The word 'conservative' sums up the general implication. But, a moment's reflection shows what a lopsided view of tradition this is. It is just as true to think of the English tradition as the tradition of rebellion. The English rebel, sometimes bleak, sometimes flamboyant and fanatical, always unflinching, unbendable and individual is a constant figure in our life. Take names at random: Bunyan, Milton, Defoe, Cobbett, John Stuart Mill and Wells, and dozens more; \* Continued on p. 3

## DEAD IDOLS CANNOT FALL

ABOUT a year ago a young and extremely promising young actor called James Dean was killed in a car crash. He had made three films only; *East of Eden*, *Rebel Without a Cause* and *Giant*; the first two have been shown in this country. Both dealt in a sympathetic way with the problems of young people in American society who find themselves unable to accept all the contradictions and compromises which it is necessary to accept in order to be "normal" in that society. James Dean played the part of an insecure and genuinely troubled youth, desperately searching for something or somebody to help and understand him.

When he died he had hardly reached stardom in the strictly Hollywood sense. Last week news-stands in America were selling four magazines devoted exclusively to James Dean. (Title: *Jimmy Dean Returns!* "Read his own words from the beyond.") He receives 1,000 fan letters a week, ("Dear Jimmy, I know

you are not dead."), more than any live actor at Warner's Studio. He ranks No. 1 in popularity polls and is featured in all movie magazines. Advice columns in women's magazines receive letters such as this: "I am 15 and in love. The problem is that I love the late James Dean."

One has become accustomed to the appearance of curious phenomena in the United States, and such things are now an accepted part of the "American way of life". Airy explanations in psychological or other terms are put forward: the inherent insecurity of Americans generally and certain groups in particular, induced of course by the ever-increasing tempo of American life, the lack of a stable tradition, the difficulties of welding together a nation of so many races, creeds and colours . . . etc.

Perhaps the problem is even more basic than that, perhaps it comes down to such straightforward things as paren-

tal love and an understanding of one's own children—the attitudes of teachers towards their pupils—the general responsibility which all adults have towards all children to try to understand and explain in an honest fashion those things which worry children.

How insecure must youngsters be before they find it necessary to be the fans of a film-star who is not even alive? And why this particular star? Is it because they can so easily identify themselves with him? He represents in romantic terms that which they feel themselves to be; and better still—he died for his and their cause. He has escaped the confusing complexities of living in a world which defies rationality and will not explain the reasons why. The dead have few imperfections, and they can never of their own accord fall from the pedestal on which they have been placed. Surely there is something terrible in such a need to escape from reality? H.F.W.

## THE WELFARE STATE AND I (Conclusion)

### Making the Poor Keep the Rich

As a child I had a great admiration for the legendary figure of Robin Hood who robbed the rich to save the poor. With such a romantic emotional background I have therefore a prejudice against the false Robin Hoodism of the Welfare State. Its whole machinery is redistributory; it redistributes income from the healthy to the sick, from the employed to the unemployed, from the working adult to children and the aged, from the childless to the fertile woman. But not, most definitely not, from the rich to the poor. On balance, it robs the poor to save the rich.

It is of course a platitude that the poor keep the rich. It hardly needs pointing out in an anarchist journal that the essence of capitalism is the unequal distribution of goods, services, privileges and opportunities. The aim of the State is to back up the imperfections of the economic system with legislation which ensures that the poor stay poor and the rich, rich. That great body of administrative institutions which I have been referring to as the Welfare State is no exception: its function is that of Robin Hood in reverse. The extremes of riches and poverty have been ironed out; no one is permitted to acquire really fabulous wealth to-day, and among the poor few people die of malnutrition. Yet the Welfare State accepts the dichotomy of poverty and riches and makes provision for the positive perpetuation of such dichotomy.

The problem of social dependency used to be largely connected with the problems of an over-young population. The high birth-rate of the last century meant that there were too many children. Children were considered as rather a burden to society; they sent up the rates, overflowed the workhouses, schools and prisons and reduced their own parents to destitution. The spread of contraception after the 1870's changed all this; by 1948 there was serious concern that there were too few children, for an ageing population must look to its young to support the national economy. The problem now is that there are too many old people; for by the very success of medical science we have cut down the mortality of the acute diseases of youth and middle age, and are left to cope with the slow degenerative diseases of old age.

In 1941 12% of the population was over the age of retirement. It is calculated that by 1971 21% of the population will be over the age of retirement. This is the problem of the Welfare State—how to cope with an increasing burden of people past the age of economic usefulness. The aged are maintained out of current production, i.e. those of working age produce enough to keep them. This is done in two different ways: "insurance" contributions are a tax which cuts down

the consumption of the working population, and such consumption is passed on to the aged through the mechanisms of the retirement pensions health service, N.A.B., etc. The second method is that by which the aged of the upper income groups are supported. They are supported at a far higher standard of living through the mechanisms of private assurance and occupational pensions. This comes out of the Treasury by the simple device of allowing the heavy premium payments in private schemes to be tax-free. Millions a year are therefore provided by the Treasury to support the old age of those who, when they were working, enjoyed reasonably high salaries and contracted into such schemes.

If we are to accept the Welfare State as a whole, which implies acceptance of the principle of income tax, we cannot seriously claim that the upper income group pensioners are living on "their own" money which they have "saved". They are being supported by the Welfare State out of current consumption, just like working class retirement pensioners, but consuming perhaps ten or twenty times the income of the latter class per head. This is not a matter of capitalist economics; it is a matter of carefully planned welfare policy which acknowledges the right of the rich to stay rich in retirement as well as in work.

Lest the above should be thought the ravings of an embittered anarchist, let me quote Professor Titmuss, who is not exactly an irresponsible bomb-thrower:—

"Private pensions in the future may outweigh in importance national insurance pensions. If the recommendations of the Millard Tucker Report are accepted by the government they are likely to become even more important. This report, perhaps the most significant social document since the Beveridge Report, proposes that the 'special indulgences' accorded to a privileged group in the form of tax-free lump sums, special contribution reliefs, 'back service' allowances, tax-free investment income and other pension concessions should be extended, as a matter of justice to the self-employed, controlling directors, part-time directors and employees not at present covered by any scheme arranged by their employers. The total cost of all recommendations for this element of 'retirement justice' is guessed to be £70m. This would raise the total Exchequer cost of private pensions to over £170m. in comparison with the present Exchequer cost of national insurance pensions of approximately £80m. . . ."

Already it is possible to see two nations in old age; greater inequalities in living standards after work than in work; two contrasting social services for distant groups based on different principles, and operating in isolation of each other as separate, autonomous, social instruments of change."

#### A Diet of Bitter Lotuses

For some people who like to represent contemporary history in dramatic terms, the development

of the social services in the post-war era is a "social revolution". Thus it has been described in *The New Statesman & Nation*. I daresay every social change is a "revolution" to some people who weary of the mundane march of events. As far as I can see the old reaction is doing very well. What is not yet realised by the "progressives" is that whereas the embryonic social services of the past relieved poverty and suffering out of both simple compassion and fear of the gathering wrath of the dispossessed, the modern social services are dynamic, they are bent upon creating the structure of future society. Titmuss, in the statement quoted above, has pointed out how the Welfare State arranges for there to be "two nations in old age". If we turn from the problem of the ageing population to that of the young, we see the same process in operation.

Too much has been written about the screening processes practised in the schools to leave anyone in doubt as to the dynamic force of national schooling in creating two nations. Previously I have referred to the established dichotomy between the "rich" and the "poor", using these words for convenient simplicity. But it must be emphasised that the dichotomy is more subtle than a simple matter of comparative income levels. Increasingly the dichotomy becomes one of power. The "educational" system, by emphasising certain mental skills is bent upon dividing society into the rulers and the ruled. The "poor" may have their televisions—it is a wonder the I.T.A. do not present a free set to every working class household—but their destiny is to remain poor in spirit, poor culturally, and poor in social esteem, as far as their rulers are concerned. If the "rich" had any compensating richness in these matters, a case for such a dichotomy could be made; but their wealth, is in power, a power stemming more and more from an empty-hearted Leviathan.

Anarchists must face the fact that the growth of the Welfare State has cost them many allies. Were the social conditions now as they were in the 1930's we would have many bread-and-butter allies. But their pay-packets are full and the State appears to be their wet-nurse; shall they not rather support the Tories or Labour, just as they support Chelsea or Arsenal? Only in the rumblings of wars and rumours of wars, do they sometimes get the suspicion that there is a gang of loonies at the helm. Alas, my bread-and-butter friends, I must leave you to the deep, uneasy dream of your T.V.-lit half-life. I cannot even wish to join you in the eating of bitter lotuses. To be an anarchist is to have eaten of the tree of knowledge which necessitates a rebellion against that which claims to own us. The Welfare State is not a new phenomenon; it occurs in different forms throughout history. Sometimes the bounty of free bread and circuses presages a change far greater than its recipients imagine.

## FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

### OPEN DAILY

#### New Books . . .

- Sexual Behaviour in the Human Male A. C. Kinsey 52/6
- Sexual Behaviour in the Human Female A. C. Kinsey
- Still a few left at 52/6—now 56/-
- The Outsider Colin Wilson 18/-
- Extraordinary Popular Delusions Charles Mackay 45/-
- From The Ground Up Lewis Mumford 10/6
- The Human Prospect Lewis Mumford 21/-
- Pan Africanism or Communism George Padmore 25/-
- Black Power Richard Wright 25/-
- The British Labour Movement A. L. Morton & G. Tate 15/-

#### Reprints . . .

- The Fiends P. Boileau 2/-
- The Golden Apples of the Sun Ray Bradbury 2/-

#### Second-Hand . . .

- The Whip and the Rod R. G. Van Yelyr 10/-
- The Two Germans Kurt von Stutterheim 3/-
- Searchlight on Spain (Penguin) Duchess of Atholl 2/6
- Spain in Revolt Harry Gannes & Theodore Repard 3/-
- Walden H. D. Thoreau 2/6
- Civilization Clive Bell 3/-
- The Red Fleet and the Royal Navy Mairin Mitchell 2/6
- Russia in Flux John Maynard 3/6
- Soviet Art and Artists Jack Chen 2/6
- Down and Out in Paris and London George Orwell 7/6
- Raggle Taggle Walter Starkie 3/-
- Britons in Spain William Rust 2/6
- Before the Deluge Mark Aldenov 3/-
- Warrior Bard (William Morris) Edward & Stephanie Godwin 3/6
- Who Lie in Gaol Joan Henry 3/-

Postage free on all items

Obtainable from

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



## INFLATION

Continued from p. 1

increase since April of this year\*. According to the *N.Y. Times*:

The roots of the present inflationary problem are clearly visible. Wholesale prices have been moving upward for some time, with the sharpest increase this year coming in agricultural prices. Rising wages are also making their impression felt on production costs and then on prices. The full price impact of the last steel settlement is still to be felt in all its ramifications throughout the economy. Consumer credit rose five billion dollars between May, 1955, and May 1956. Corporate expenditures on capital investment appear to be at record levels. Meanwhile we hear complaints of inadequate saving, and the upward trend of prices becomes ever more apparent to the housewife as she makes her daily shopping rounds.

It is also pointed out that:

From both the housing and the automobile industries this past year has come complaints that earlier moves to make money tighter have hurt their business and are unwise. But the continued rise in the Consumer Price Index, our best available measure of the cost of living, will undoubtedly strengthen the hands of those who believe we must keep a tight rein on credit, and therefore on the demand for those commodities in whose purchase credit is most significant.

What gives ground for serious thought, however, is the possibility that the key inflationary pressure we are facing may come from sources which cannot be adequately controlled by purely monetary measures such as the Federal Reserve is using. A wage-price spiral is one such possible source of inflationary pressure, and there can be little doubt but that other unions will be seeking to match or exceed the recent gains of the steelworkers.

It is significant that the arguments are the same as those applied by the British Chancellor! Western Germany's "recovery" has been given as an example to the workers in this country of the rewards for hard work. Yet in spite of the hard work and Germany's success in world markets we learn in a *Reuter* report from Bonn (Aug. 28) that two motor vehicle firms there are now working 32-hour weeks instead of the normal 48 as well as having dismissed several hundred workers. This in spite of the fact that Germany has been capturing many of Britain's markets for cars. Another paragon offered to the bone-lazy British worker are the industrious Dutch people. Yet a *N.Y. Times* report from Amsterdam reveals that the Netherlands Bank has also increased the discount rate. And for good measure we would add that even in Iceland as a measure to "combat inflation" which has "increased sharply during the last twelve months", the government had decided to freeze wages and prices until the new year.

For those in the Labour Party in this country who maintain that inflation can only be cured by a decrease in "defence" expenditure, the case of Australia exposes the artificiality of this argument. Defence expenditure is £A190m in a Budget of £A1,121m, that is 17 per cent., a much lower proportion of public expenditure than either in Britain or America. Yet Australia is struggling with "inflation", and, in the words of the Federal Treasurer in presenting his Budget last month, though the present policy of severely restricting imports if continued for long "must be damaging to our economy"

yet unless there is a major improvement in export earnings or unless the capital inflow is much larger than recently, it is difficult to see the position being alleviated in the immediate future. Australia cannot afford a reasonably flow of imports unless and until her export earnings rise much higher.

The argument is not unfamiliar! In India too the "inflationary

trends" are marked. In a year the wholesale price index has risen by 54 points from 355 in July 1955, to 414 in the first week of August, and is rising at the rate of four points a week. It is alleged that "Food and industrial materials principally contributed to this spiralling". While India signs a \$360 million pact with the United States to take over American food surpluses, it is revealed that production of food grains in India in 1955 was 5,000,000 tons less than in 1954, for no other reason than that the acreage under cultivation has decreased in the past three years by 3 million acres. We cannot understand the logic of this, but we have long suspected that logic is not a strong point in the workings of capitalist economics!

★

IT is clear from the foregoing examples that inflation is a widespread disease in the world to-day and need have no connection with productivity or the relation between wages and output. In Britain for instance, it had been assumed that the rise of exports this year had been possible by a "running down of stocks". Instead, the Board of Trade estimates that stocks increased by 3 per cent. in the second quarter of 1956, and it follows that raw materials and fuel in industry's hands have gone down. A similar situation probably exists in most of the industrial nations. But to keep industry (and employment) going at full speed, raw materials must be imported. And these imports are in many cases being curbed "unless and until" the "export earnings rise much higher". How is this crisis to be overcome?

We do not believe in capitalism's inevitable self-destruction any more than we accept the "determinism" of the revolutionary socialists and anarchists of the nineteenth century. Capitalism will only be destroyed when the working classes of the world refuse to accept it as the regulating system for production and distribution and have a more equitable, ethical and efficient system with which to replace it. Until then the economists of the world will evolve their theories and advise (or even shout in the wilderness) in order to adjust capitalism to the times in which we live. *But their task is always to make capitalism work, never to make economics subservient to the basic needs of humanity.*

Only last week a congress of the International Economic Association met in Rome to discuss . . . the best ways to make capitalism work! It is reported that "leading economists" of the Western world—among them Sir Denis Robertson of Britain—are now inclined to doubt that "a little inflation is a good thing" for industrially advanced countries. According to the *N.Y. Times*' Rome correspondent:

Sir Dennis' point was that the evils arising from inflation to-day seemed to outweigh the possible advantages. The principal evil was said to be the destruction of confidence in fixed-yield investments and finally in money itself.

He also pointed to the fact that the distinction between "left" and "right" among the professional economists has increasingly formed around attitudes towards inflation rather than attitudes toward Government intervention in economic life, the nationalization of industries or other questions that formerly divided them.

If the professional economists are right then the present inflationary trends in the world to-day reveal the capitalism system vulnerable to attack. But who to-day, apart from a few anarchists and revolutionary socialists, questions the very foundations of the economic system? There are a lot of people who apparently view our cause with sympathy but who, on the grounds that first things come first (and sometimes one wonders whether even their reformism is not in aid of themselves rather than of the "humanity" they profess to defend!) engage in the political struggle. The tragedy is that not only do many of them become so

## AMERICAN COLONIALISM

IT has been easy for Americans to adopt a rather superior attitude towards the repressive behaviour of imperialistic powers in their colonial territories, since the USA has virtually no empire of the same kind as, say, the British and French.

America has been able, with detachment, to realise that the measures operated by the British in Malaya, Kenya and Cyprus, and by the French in Algeria, accord ill with the protestations of the 'free world', to say nothing of such wartime aberrations as the Atlantic Charter and the Four Freedoms. (Younger readers may well wonder what on earth we are talking about).

This is not to say, of course, that America is not an expansionist power. It is just that her domination of smaller countries is operated by other, less naked, means than the bayonet and bullet. The dollar is America's imperialist weapon, and she was boasting during the war that she had no territorial ambitions.

Unlike the Axis powers, who were fighting to grab more territory, or the British, who were fighting to hang on to what they grabbed long ago, the Americans could appear to be free from any such sordid motives.

There are, however, one or two spots in the world where, when peace broke out, the US Government thought it would be prudent to remain. All in the interests of the free world, you understand.

One of these is the island of Okinawa and the Southern Ryukyus (330 miles south of Japan), dearly bought by American fighting men, where the powers that be have decided to build the 'nerve centre' of the American defence network in the Western Pacific. The US has announced its intention of staying on Okinawa 'so long as conditions of threat and tension exist in the Far East'.

### Soviet Refugees

LIBERALS, liberal-minded people of all shades of opinion and fellow-travellers may discern trends towards a liberalization of the Soviet régime, but not the common men and women who have to live within the Soviet Empire.

The urge to escape from the stifling atmosphere and the daily grind of ill-rewarded toil prevailing everywhere under Bolshevik control keeps the stream of refugees still flowing. In the past month of August this movement towards freedom—some kind of freedom other than the freedom from *not* having to choose—has increased. In West Berlin alone 15,200 refugees were registered. This is 1,000 more than in July.

A noticeable feature of this movement westwards is the increase by 20% of young men. They see no future of any kind, apparently, in Eastern Germany; they fear drafting into mines and police, constant supervision both in work hours and in their leisure time.

Altogether some 115,000 persons have fled the Soviet Zone of Germany this year. This is, in sober figures, the equivalent of a fair-sized town's population.

#### Poles as Well

Following on the visit of Russian tourists to London this summer, Soviet Poland organized a round trip of the Baltic. Of these Polish tourists (whom, one must reasonably assume, the Party carefully screened) a small number seized the chance to escape altogether when they were allowed ashore at Stockholm. Leaving literally everything behind, both at home in Poland and on board ship, they are seeking political asylum of the Swedes. They hold that imprisonment for a time on the Baltic's northern shore is preferable to life under "Communism". I.P.

absorbed in these activities that they are eventually swallowed up by the State machine but at the end of it, all they leave behind them is a trail of apathy or cynicism without even the germ of a new idea having penetrated the minds of the man-in-the-street.

The growth of reformism has made man insensible to or even unaware of the things he dislikes. The task of the libertarian is to make Man again conscious of the oppressiveness of authority, the injustice of the exploitation of man by man and the falseness of the values with which happiness, success and dignity are measured to-day. For only when men and women will have liberated themselves from these preconceptions will they be in a position to create values based on freedom and dignity for themselves and in their relations with their fellow-beings.

This is parallel to the British occupation of Cyprus. And similarly the Americans are not merely having a base on Okinawa, they are making a base of Okinawa. To this end they are swallowing up the islands for their military requirements. Already 42,000 acres, or approximately 12 per cent. of the total area of the islands, have been taken over by the US Forces, and the Marine Corps are preparing to grab another 12,000 acres.

### Resentment

This has quite naturally aroused considerable resentment among the Okinawans, for whom land has strong religious significance (tied as it is to ancestor worship) quite apart from its meaning in terms of economics and independence.

Just published in the USA is the report of the Price Investigative Subcommittee which was sent to Okinawa to look into the circumstances and make recommendations on how the American Government can best get its way there. This it has done, but, because of its purpose, its recommendations are not acceptable to the Okinawans.

The main recommendation of the committee has been the 'blanket' payment of rents to enable the US Forces to acquire permanent land rights—which is precisely what the Okinawans will resist most, since their lands have been handed down from generation to generation and represent a sacred link with their ancestors.

The scale of payments offered by the Americans are, by Asian standards, generous, but in the existing economy of the islands cannot be used to any great advantage. Further, the land which is left to the islanders is poor, desolate and un-cultivable. As usual, the land most suitable for airfields and military bases is the land which is also most suitable for farming.

The publication of the Price Report has sparked off the smouldering resentment of the Okinawan people, and an active opposition movement has been formed composed of representatives from the Legislative Assembly, Administrative Government, Committee of Heads of Cities, Towns and Villages, Committee of the Federation of Lands Used by the Military, and the Committee of the Speakers of the Assemblies of Cities, Towns and Villages.

A Committee for Promoting the Settlement of the Okinawans residing in Japan, has petitioned the Prime Minister's Office and the Foreign Office with a resolution adopted by the Ryukyu Legislature.

This resolution demands:

1. There shall be no permanent use of lands through outright purchases or blanket payment of rents.
2. Appropriate rents and full compensation shall be paid for the lands presently being used.
3. Appropriate compensation shall be paid for all damages inflicted by the US Forces.

### Orwell and Orthodoxy

Continued from p. 2

the spirit of rebellion, non-conformity and attack stands out in them."

There can be no doubt that Orwell is to be found in this tradition, rather than the conservative tradition of Royalty, trooping the colour, the hanging judge, and the squire and his relations.

★

WE find equally unconvincing assumptions in Mr. Hollis's religious argument. For him the central fact of Christianity is personal immortality:

"Christianity promises a future life. That is what it is about. There can be no half-way house. Either its promises are true or they are false. Devotion to any of the humanitarian causes cannot of its nature be a substitute for or alternative to Christian faith. It is something quite different, for no humanitarian gospel can tell us anything about a future life."

It is a little disappointing to learn that pie in the sky is the most important thing about the Christian faith for Mr. Hollis. How ignoble compared with the declaration of St. John of the Cross, "*No me mueve, mi Dios, para quererte el cielo que me tienes prometido!*" Mr. Hollis insists that Orwell's view of the 'unspeakable wrongness' of capital punishment (a view which he certainly shares, as his part in the campaign for its abolition shows), "is only tenable if man has a destiny beyond this world. Here was one of a number of his opinions which only made sense on the assumption of an implicit acceptance of a future life". He asserts too that Orwell's 'self-identification with the oppressed' "only makes sense within a religious framework", and elsewhere he says:

Not only was the concept of honour real to him, but man's honour was his most important possession—far more

5. Unnecessary lands shall be released as soon as possible and new lands shall not be requisitioned.

### Ingratitude

As is usual in these circumstances the Americans now point to what they have done for the Okinawans. Just as the British proudly point to the roads, railways, dams and hospitals they have 'given' to the people of the colonies, the Americans draw attention to the university they have provided for Okinawa—the first ever.

The US Government lavished funds on creating the university and encouraged healthy contributions from private US groups. Michigan State College supplied teachers and equipment. It was soon flourishing, with 1,760 students and 125 faculty members.

This, however, has not compensated the Okinawans for their continued occupation. Students, probably encouraged by Japanese-educated faculty members, began to agitate for the return of the islands to Japan. Some students supported the Communist-front Okinawa People's Party, sent a party spokesman to Tokyo to complain of US seizure of the farmlands. Anti-American articles sprouted forth in the university's literary magazine. Last month 250 students staged anti-American demonstrations, shouting "Yankees go home."

All this has been very disillusioning for the US Director of Education on Okinawa, Henry Earl Diffenderfer, who has worked so hard to create the university. And he feels very hurt at the ingratitude of his students—after all he has done for them, too.

"All the students complaining about oppression," lamented Diffenderfer, "were sleeping in beds provided by American money, using equipment bought by American money, and reading books bought with American money."

Mr. Diffenderfer then wrote an angry letter to the university's president, Genshu Asato, telling him that all funds would be withheld until 'you can honestly assure us that anti-American and pro-Communist personnel of your student body and faculty have been removed.'

The president, knowing that without American funds the university would collapse, apologised and sacked six student leaders.

But do the Americans think that by this blackmail they are going to buy the gratitude or loyalty of the dispossessed people of Okinawa? They should put themselves in the position of the Okinawans; they should look at the history of British imperialism; they should realise that you cannot destroy a people's way of life, ignore their traditions and culture, occupy their country and claim rights just because you have the might—and then expect to buy them off by providing facilities with strings.

For some people their own conceptions of dignity count more than charity or money.

important than his material standards—and yet Orwell could never find any clear answer to the question whence that sense of honour came."

Orwell himself made his position quite clear on these points. In his essay on Tolstoy, he wrote:

"Most people get a fair amount of fun out of their lives, but on balance life is suffering, and only the very young or the very foolish imagine otherwise. Ultimately it is the Christian attitude which is self-interested and hedonistic, since the aim is always to get away from the painful struggle of earthly life and find eternal peace in some kind of Heaven or Nirvana. The humanist attitude is that the struggle must continue and that death is the price of life. . . . Often there is a seeming truce between the humanist and the religious believer, but in fact their attitudes cannot be reconciled: one must choose between this world and the next. . . ."

and he pushes the point home in his *Reflections on Gandhi*:

"But it is not necessary here to argue whether the other-worldly or the humanistic ideal is 'higher'. The point is that they are incompatible. One must choose between God and Man, and all 'radicals' and 'progressives' from the mildest Liberal to the most extreme Anarchist, have in effect chosen Man."

Surely there is a certain arrogance in looking for some external political or religious sanction to explain away Orwell's goodness when all he did was to 'choose Man'? The important thing about Orwell was that he pursued that choice, however waywardly, with a reckless tenacity which others, with more complicated or sophisticated creeds, could only regard with admiration.

C.W.

\*In April 1955, the Bank rate in America stood at only 1½ per cent. This it has doubled in the space of eighteen months.

(see the series of five articles on *Orwell and Anarchism* in *FREEDOM* from Feb. to April, 1955).



## The British Association The Scientists Talk to Us

THE British Association for the Advancement of Science exists primarily to fulfil a vital function—that of keeping the layman informed of developments in the various fields of science. It is unfortunate that most of us are dependent on the daily newspapers for this information because the reports which appeared in the "popular" papers of this year's meeting (held at Sheffield earlier this month) were pathetically inadequate.

The *News Chronicle*, for example, which has the reputation for being the most responsible of the cheaper papers, gave a good half-page to reporting the speech of the President, Sir Reginald Priestley. His subject was *Twentieth Century Man Against Antarctica*: he described the various explorations made and discussed the potentialities of the area. The *Chronicle* devoted nearly all its space to Priestley's blaming of Scott, the hero of the Antarctic for the disaster of his last expedition. The highlighting of sensational, but essentially irrelevant, points was noticeable in the reports of the *Chronicle* and of all other papers.

★

THE history of Antarctica since the Second World War is a sorry example of the manipulation of science to serve the end of power politics. Sir Raymond Priestley's hopeful remark that the increased interest in Antarctica in preparation for the International Geophysical Year (1957-8) has "science for its main drive" is rather wide of the mark. Governments do not spend huge sums of money on polar exploration and research through the love of knowledge for its own sake (it is estimated that the USA alone will spend over £100m. on Antarctica during the International Year) but for the uses it can be put to. The possibilities latent in an uninhabited and largely unexplored continent are immense. Sir Raymond mentions, for example, the "great and valuable mineral deposits there must be in any continent of this size" and prophesies "the construction of underground engine rooms, hoisting gear and mineral dressing plants" for their processing.

It has also been suggested that the Antarctic "might have a future use as a vermin-free store for the world's periodical food surpluses, where these might be preserved against the needs of future generations" since "widespread crop failures might otherwise spell disaster to a world whose population seems destined to increase". Again atomic power might be used to develop the deserts of the region.

But perhaps the most important factor to those States who are becoming so interested in the area, is its strategic value. If there should be another world war it is likely that both the Panama and Suez Canals will be destroyed in which case all shipping will be forced to travel round Capes Horn and Good Hope. In this event, the position of Antarctica makes its importance obvious—apart from its permanent value as a base for aircraft, submarines, and surface-craft. And in fact a recent US expedition announced that they were going to test men and equipment in case of the outbreak of a "hot" war.

### Reports from the Sections

The Association's meeting is divided by subject, into a number of sections, each section being under a president who gives an address on some aspect of his

subject. During the first week there were several addresses of interest: notably those on Zoology, Psychology and Agriculture.

### Zoology

For Zoology it was stated that as a result of recent work on instinctive behaviour and the percipient learning abilities of animals some apparent lines of demarcation between man and animal nature have become blurred. Behaviour study seems to be reinforcing physiology in stressing the basic unity of the living system in more and more of its manifestations. Some of the fundamental thought-processes of animals seem far less dissimilar from ours than we once thought, and we now see that even the bees have a propositional "language".

Ethology has as yet little to say on the fundamental issue of the relationship between living and non-living states; but it does make an impressive contribution to the chorus of voices which are emphasizing the essential unity of living things and the similarity, in much that is fundamental, between animals and man.

### Psychology

*Psychology and the Humanists* was the title of the address given to the Psychology section by Professor Drever. He discussed the misgivings aroused because of the supposed implications of a science of behaviour for everyday life. These misgivings on the part of humanists and others concerned with values seem to depend on two assumptions: (1) that science is an attempt to supersede ordinary thinking rather than supplement it; and (2) that in setting out to establish a science of human behaviour the psychologist is somehow claiming that human beings are predictable in the way that atoms or billiard balls are predictable. In point of fact, neither of these assumptions seems to be justified. The former is a result of over-simplification, and arises from a belief that in any situation there is always some one statement or theory which is "really true", all others being partial or false. But even within science this does not hold.

The second assumption, Prof Drever said, arises from the widely held view that science is mainly concerned with causes; but this is not the primary concern of science. The search for causes is a diagnostic enterprise carried on by the practical man—the medical practitioner, for example, or the engineer—rather than the physiologist or physicist.

### PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT! WEEK 36

Deficit on Freedom	£720
Contributions received	£595
DEFICIT	£125

August 31 to September 6

Sheffield: G.P.* 5/-; London: A.H. 18/6;	
Bakewell: D.M.* 5/-; Rhyney: D.H.E. 2/6;	
Sutherland: R.W. 5/-; London: D.R.* 10/-;	
London: H.M.* 2/-; London: J.S.* 4/6;	
London: Anon. 1/-; London: A.S. £6; Glas-	
gow: S.M. 4/6; Patricroft: A.G. £1/10/;	
Kettering: E.N. 4/6; Oxford: Anon.* 5/-;	
London: A.M. 4/-;	
Total	10 12 6
Previously acknowledged	585 5 7

1956 TOTAL TO DATE	£595 18 1
--------------------	-----------

GIFTS OF BOOKS: London: C.W.; London: S.H.; London: Anon.

\*Indicates regular contributors.

## FREEDOM PRESS

### SELECTIONS FROM FREEDOM

Vol. 2, 1952, *Postscript to Posterity*  
Posterity  
Vol. 3, 1953, *Colonialism on Trial*  
Vol. 4, 1954, *Living on a Volcano*  
Vol. 5, 1955, *The Immoral Moralists*  
each volume paper 7s. 6d.  
cloth 10s. 6d.

### VOLINE :

*Nineteen-Seventeen (The Russian Revolution Betrayed)* cloth 12s. 6d.  
*The Unknown Revolution*  
(Kronstadt 1921, Ukraine 1918-21)  
cloth 12s. 6d.

### E. A. GUTKIND :

*The Expanding Environment* 8s. 6d.

### MARIE-LOUISE BERNERI :

*Neither East nor West*  
cloth 10s. 6d., paper 7s. 6d.  
*Workers in Stalin's Russia* 1s.

### ERRICO MALATESTA :

*Anarchy* 6d.  
*Vote—What For?* 1d.

### GEORGE WOODCOCK :

*New Life to the Land* 6d.  
*Homes or Hovels?* 6d.  
*Railways and Society* 3d.  
*What is Anarchism?* 1d.  
*The Basis of Communal Living* 1s.

### F. A. RIDLEY :

*The Roman Catholic Church and the Modern Age* 2d.

### M. BAKUNIN :

*Marxism, Freedom and the State.* cloth 5s.

### 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.

### TONY GIBSON :

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

### K. J. KENAFICK :

*Michael Bakunin and Karl Marx* paper 6s.

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

Perhaps the real reason for some of the contemporary uneasiness is that with the abdication of philosophy, which has become a specialism among specialisms, the ordinary man is tending to turn to the scientist and perhaps particularly to the psychologist and psychiatrist, for answers to quite general questions. It may be that some are too ready to give him what he wants; but the real solution seems to lie in a bolder and more positive approach on the part of those who at present seem to have nothing to offer as between the rigours of logical analysis and a sort of nostalgic antiquarianism.

### Agriculture

Mr. G. V. Jacks directed attention to the dominant influence of towns on the evolutions of the soil under human occupation.

Man's first action on the soil is usually that of a shifting cultivator or nomad, at which stage he scarcely affects the existing balance of Nature. As population increases and the land fills up, he adopts settled agriculture, which upsets the biotic balance. The first stages of settled agriculture are inevitably soil-exhausting, and human societies tend to develop social systems which keep soil exhaustion under control.

The growth of towns has a powerful influence on the evolution of the soil. Towns create far more wealth than agriculture can create, a rising standard of living and a greater demand for the produce of the soil. To begin with this results in an accelerated exhaustion of the soil; but if the wealth of the towns increases, a stage is reached at which it pays farmers to increase output per acre,

## Danger! Lunatics at Work

HAVING read with some interest the exchanges on FREEDOM and Society in recent issues of FREEDOM I was struck by the following headline in the *News Chronicle* (4/9/56), "Antarctic Atom Bomb Rejected".

"A proposal to explode an atom bomb in the Antarctic to trigger off earthquake tremors has been rejected. This was revealed at the British Association by Dr. David C. Martin, assistant secretary of the Royal Society.

"The plan had been put to the 50-nation committee of the International Geo-Physical Year by Professor Keith Bullen, of Sidney University. He suggested that scientists all over the world could track the shock waves through the earth's crust.

"But the committee rejected the scheme as being too dangerous. Moreover they did not want to mix atomic weapons with peaceful scientific research in which everyone is co-operating. Apart from that, the cost would be prohibitive. Scientists at the British Association found other good reasons why atom bomb upheavals in the Antarctic should be ruled out.

"Such an explosion would disturb the

and, therefore, to increase soil fertility. Every successful mature civilisation has enormously increased the fertility of the soil.

After showing how this pattern has been followed in our own day, Mr. Jacks ended by asking whether the world, a hundred years hence, will be able to feed the 6,000 million people who may then be living in it, and answered yes, provided most of them live in towns and provide enough wealth to pay for the food they require. M.G.W.

## LETTER TO THE EDITORS

### Science and Society

DEAR COMRADES,

REPLYING to Harold Sculthorpe's comments on my article in which I emphasised the use made by a State or capitalist economy of scientific research, the limitation of this use is evident and the dangers real. Indeed Alex Comfort made the point that it was in the areas of knowledge where research was not confined to laboratory that justification of the anarchist case was found. The laboratory is in essence limited and until these limitations are fully recognised application can be dangerous. This is apart from the already limited terms of reference under which research largely takes place.

To substantiate my charge regarding the development of research from false premises, as for instance in agriculture. The correct premise I should say is that

food is for human and animal nutrition, but the premise on which much research is undertaken is that food is a commodity that is produced in order to bring as large a profit as possible to those producing and handling it. Research based on the latter premise could have had results on food as a means of nutrition. In spite of the difficulties much valuable work has been done, but this does not absolve the layman from applying his critical faculties to work done by specialists; in fact by taking the wider view mistakes implicit in the specialist approach can be avoided.

Any stockman will know that the existence of parasites in large numbers on animals is an indication of bad management; while the immediate destruction of the parasites may be necessary the fundamental answer is one of prevention.

There has been a decrease in certain types of acute disease but with this there has been an increase in chronic and degenerative disease. The social factor of higher standards of hygiene cannot be discounted as a major reason for advance in some respects. Although it is sometimes necessary to destroy bacteria there are inherent dangers in this allopathic approach (a) It is impossible to effect particular tissue destruction without harm to the surrounding tissue. (b) That the immediate condition is relieved at the cost of lowering the general standard of health, i.e. people existing longer, instead of living longer.

The theory that bacteria are a cause rather than an effect of a diseased condition is a simple and attractive one particularly to the drug manufacturers whose wonder drugs succeed each other with astonishing rapidity as their inherent disadvantages are revealed. To return people to production as quickly and cheaply as possible is an economic necessity to capitalism, but a far more fundamental approach to health questions is necessary.

It must be recognised that the urge to produce quickly and cheaply dominates the whole method of approach to food production, health and all forms of production under an acquisitive society. The decline in quality is self-evident and the total genetic effect of our approach to health is yet to be felt. The biological meaning of the phrase "struggle for existence" is recognised but this does not alter the fact that the social meaning acquired in a competitive economy has tempered the approach to questions of health and food production.

I am not urging less science but a wider application of scientific method which is impossible if it is only applied to a limited field and without regard for its inherent limitations.

Eastleach, Sept. 8. ALAN ALBON.

atmospheric conditions over Antarctica, which the scientists are trying to study and interpret. The radio-active fall-out might be harmful to the 500 scientists at 56 bases scattered over the continent. (My italics).

"There might also be the risk of "chain reactions" other than atomic ones. For example, the heat might affect the ice cap. As Professor Sidney Chaplin pointed out in a public lecture last night, one of the mysteries scientists want to solve is the behaviour of glaciers. The melting of former glaciers has raised the level of the sea and affected the boundaries of continents."

I feel this has a perhaps oblique relevance to the controversy. Here we have a scheme seriously mooted that might have brought benefits to mankind—or killed large numbers of people. In fact it is recognised as too dangerous and is rejected, but some of the reasons given for its rejection should be noted, particularly the italicised paragraph.

It would have interfered with the researches of other scientists, and would have imperilled their lives. Scientists stick together. Had it merely been the lives of primitive tribesmen or fishermen I think it is fairly certain, whether it was decided to explode the bomb or not, their safety would not have had a great deal of weight in settling the issue.

I suggest that scientists are like everyone else in an authoritarian society. They have the ruthlessness, the obedience to government, the clique-spirit and pre-occupation with gigantic schemes to which the interests of lesser men must be sacrificed, that most authoritarian people have. This must be taken into account in any discussion of the scientist and his rôle in society.

ARTHUR W. ULOTH.

## MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

### LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

#### LECTURE-DISCUSSIONS

Every Sunday at 7.30 at  
THE MALATESTA CLUB,  
32 Percy Street,  
Tottenham Court Road, W.1.

THE London Anarchist Group Sunday evening meetings, which have been suspended since the Summer School, begin a new series on September 23.

The first four lectures are as follows:

SEPT. 23—DEBATE  
MARXISM vs. ANARCHISM  
Speakers: Monty Johnson  
Editor, *Challenge* (Y.C.L.)  
Donald Room, L.A.G.

SEPT. 30—John Smith on  
SWASTIKA IN SOUTH AFRICA

OCT. 7—S. E. Parker on  
POWER & RESPONSIBILITY

OCT. 14—Alec Craig on  
THE OBSCENITY LAWS &  
CENSORSHIP

Questions, Discussion and Admission  
all free.

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.

#### GLASGOW

OUTDOOR meetings at Maxwell Street,  
every Sunday 7.30 p.m.

#### LIBERTARIAN FORUM

813 BROADWAY,  
(Bet. 11 & 12 Sts.)

#### NEW YORK CITY

Round-Table Youth Discussions  
Friday Evenings at 8.30

## FREEDOM

The Anarchist Weekly

Postal Subscription Rates:

12 months 19/- (U.S.A. \$3.00)

6 months 9/6 (U.S.A. \$1.50)

3 months 5/- (U.S.A. \$0.75)

Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies

12 months 29/- (U.S.A. \$4.50)

6 months 14/6 (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