

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"It is not the State, but the community, the world-wide community of all human beings present and future, that we ought to serve."

—BERTRAND RUSSELL.

The Lib-Labs Breathe Again

ALL'S WELL IN FORMOSA!

IF FREEDOM did not go to Press so early in the week, our last article on the Formosa "crisis", and ending with the derisive exclamation "Friends, it's all a lot of bunkum!" might have been modified, in the light of subsequent events, to something like: "Friends, Thank God and Mr. Dulles that it was all one big misunderstanding after all. War has been miraculously avoided!" As we write (Monday) the morning papers are festooned with the headline announcing a "Quemoy Cease-Fire". How did it all come about?

Last Saturday week Mr. Dulles was telling the Atlantic Treaty Association in Boston that America's firm line in the Far Eastern crisis was determined by her belief in the principle of collective security, and though the "present effort at destruction was concentrated at a point geographically on the other side of the world", nonetheless the principles at stake in the Formosa area were the principles upon which N.A.T.O. rested. "If they were not valid and sustained in Asia, Mr. Dulles concluded—it could not confidently be assumed that they were valid and would be sustained in Europe".

On the following Tuesday at his press conference however he revealed that the Eisenhower Administration had always thought it "rather foolish" for Chiang Kai-shek to commit one third of his forces to the defence of Quemoy and Matsu. He added that in the "military and political judgment of the United States" it would be neither "wise" nor "prudent" to keep these forces there once a cease-fire had been arranged. Nationalist China had chosen to disregard American criticism of its policy and since the Americans had not tried to apply the veto when persuasion had failed, their "position rested on a policy of acquiescence rather than of consent". Mr. Dulles also told the Press that

the concept of a renunciation of force in the Formosa area had always implied

the acceptance of the principle of reciprocity. It would be quite wrong to demand that Communist China must renounce force while Nationalist China remained free to molest it. Renunciation meant reciprocity, subject to the inherent right of self-defence.

When a newspaperman suggested that these statements represented a change in policy Mr. Dulles hotly denied the suggestion and referred him to the record of the earlier Formosa "crisis" of 1955.

There was, he said bluntly, no commitment of any kind to aid Chiang in any armed attack on the mainland of China. In the exchange of letters with the Chinese Nationalist Foreign Minister after the Formosa treaty of 1954 was negotiated, it was mutually agreed that no force will be used in the treaty area except "in agreement with us." Neither Formosa nor the United States was free to use force against the Chinese mainland without consultation except as part of the inherent requirement of self-defence. The United States had no legal commitment at present to defend Quemoy and Matsu, nor did it want any such obligation.

So what was all the war scare about? And, indeed, what inspired his concluding remark of the conference, that

he thought there was some reason to believe that the situation was slowly being stabilised, and he was less apprehensive of war arising out of an incident in the area than he had been two or three weeks ago.

★

"MISUNDERSTANDING" No. 2 is the widespread belief that Chiang Kai-shek has held on to the off-shore islands, as a convenient stepping-off platform in the event of an invasion of the Chinese mainland. It now turns out that the opposite is the truth! In an interview with the *Sunday Times* (Oct. 5) Chiang declared:

"Quemoy is our last line of defence, and the farthest outpost of the free world in the Far East. We must hold it as a shield for Formosa. We have no

plans for using it as an offensive base; it is completely unsuited for any such rôle."

It should of course be borne in mind that Chiang was speaking after the Dulles press conference!

And Chiang's statement, according to the *Sunday Times* correspondent in Taipei has apparently had the effect of making Nationalist officials talk "with surprising candour" as though "suddenly released from an intolerable burden. From one "ranking military spokesman" he learned

"We haven't seriously considered invading the mainland for at least five years now. We have had to keep up the pretence, of course, largely for domestic consumption—a matter of morale and discipline."

"Misunderstanding" No. 3 is the widespread belief that the Chinese Communists were aiming at driving the Nationalists from the off-shore islands. Last Sunday night when, according to most reports, the food situation on the islands was reaching a critical position the Defence Minister announced that for a week from Monday they would stop shelling the islands "out of humanitarian considerations" and allow supplies to go through provided there was no American escort. Why then had the Communists poured hundreds of

thousands of shells into Quemoy these past weeks if when it might have started to give results they suddenly stop and allow the Nationalists to replenish their stocks? The "answer" is contained in Defence Minister Marshal Peng Teh-huai's message addressed "to all compatriots, military and civilian in Formosa, Penghu, Quemoy and Matsu."

"We all are Chinese. Of all choices, peace is the best. The fighting round Quemoy is of a punitive character. For quite a long time your leaders have been far too rampant. They have ordered aircraft to carry out wanton raids on the mainland, dropping leaflets and secret agents, bombing Foochow and harassing Kiangsu and Chekiang, reaching as far as Yunnan, Kweichow, Szechwan, the Kangting area and Chinghai.

"Can this be tolerated? Hence the firing of a few shells, just to call your attention: Formosa, Penghu, Quemoy, and Matsu are Chinese territory. They are part of China, they do not constitute another country. There is only one China, not two, in the world."

"Misunderstanding" No. 4 was cleared up by Mr. Khrushchev himself at a press conference last Sunday when he said that

the Soviet Government had "openly and unambiguously stated" that if the United States should start a war against the Chinese Peoples' Republic "the Soviet Union will fully honour her commitments" and that "an attack on the Chinese Peoples' Republic is an attack

on the Soviet Union." This did not mean, as President Eisenhower would have it, the Soviet Union was ready to take part in a civil war in China?

"We state something quite different," said Mr. Khrushchev. "The Soviet Union will come to the help of the Chinese Peoples' Republic if the latter is attacked from without: speaking more concretely, if the United States attacks the Chinese Peoples' Republic."

"We have not interfered in and do not intend to interfere in the civil war which the Chinese people is waging against the Chiang Kai-shek clique. It is common knowledge that the islands belonged to China long before Columbus discovered America.

★

SO three Powers and a Puppet have declared that they have no aggressive ambitions in the area. They are all motivated by honourable intentions. Russia will, in Mr. K's words, honour her commitments" if Communist China is attacked by America; America, in Mr. Dulles' words, is doing no more than defending "the basic principles upon which N.A.T.O. is founded" (i.e. "collective security arrangements"). Chiang Kai-shek is only defending the "farthest outpost of the free world" and Mao, in the words of his Defence Minister, seeks "the unification of our country" and laments that there are "flames of war" between the mainland and their "friends in Formosa" which "should be stopped and extinguished". (Hence the "firing of a few shells just to call your attention" to the fire?).

Continued on p. 3

After the Referendum

De Gaulle out to Boost French Power

AMIDST the cheers of a 100,000 crowd in Lyons last week, General de Gaulle informed the world at large: "The new Constitution launches France in a new era of greatness—and I can guarantee it."

And so apparently without regret 82 per cent. of the French and Overseas voters (excluding French Guinea) bid farewell to the Fourth Republic, which had lasted for only twelve years, and hailed the advent of the Fifth in greater numbers than could possibly expect its success. The French it seems are a morally defeated people, so much so that they will now vote, almost in despair, for anything which promises better things, even though they do not believe it.

The cynics (and anarchists) would argue that the French have voted for de Gaulle so that all responsibility may be taken from them as quickly and completely as possible to allow for the immediate continuance of business and pleasure as usual. It could also be argued however that they saw no alternative but national bankruptcy at least, or civil war at worst.

In Algeria the referendum can hardly be viewed in the same light as in Metropolitan France. The figures of acceptance were even higher, 96.5 per cent., a curious situation in view of the Algerian war, but not so strange if the *Observer* editorial for October 5th states the facts correctly:

"It (the referendum) certainly proved the hold which the French Army has over most of the country and perhaps showed that the Muslim population are now more frightened of the Army than of the F.L.N. It proved nothing else. No possible conclusions can be drawn about the will of the Algerian people from a vote which, though technically free, was in fact as carefully managed as any plebiscite in Nazi Germany or Soviet Russia."

★

On November 18th the first ballot of the General Election is to be held, the two Assemblies will then elect a new President—General de Gaulle. Until that time, and for that matter after that time also, de Gaulle will rule as dictator by decree.

Much has recently been said of de Gaulle as a man of great ideals and stature, with a breadth of vision calculated to make of France a great nation . . . etc. And it has been duly noted that he has not yet taken advantage of his supreme position to impose authoritarian measures upon

the people. (Excluding of course the Algerian terrorists in France, against whom he has decreed additional penal measures).

The cynics might add that one does not take conceivably unpopular measures without first making quite sure of continuance in power.

For the present de Gaulle has contented himself with a general outline of his intentions towards Algeria which has been received by all but the Algerian settlers with some enthusiasm. He has described a five-year-plan to raise the Muslim standard of living and education, which augurs all things but independence. He offers equal political rights and equality in all things with the French people, and proposes to open the prisons" (a form of amnesty), and is no doubt looking to the possibilities for negotiation with the nationalists to end the war.

Needless to say the impact of de Gaulle's plan has not as yet made itself felt in economic terms upon the French. When the cost to themselves is realised the General's plan may not be so popular, but by then it will not be so much in the forefront of the General's mind.

Patently the key to the future of France lies in a swift ending to the war in Algeria, for it has proved an expense which France can ill afford. But it would only be the first economic step forward, for the problem of unemployment would immediately loom even larger than at present. The return of many thousands of soldiers would no doubt be difficult to handle in the present economic situation, aggravated as it is by a steadily increasing labour force of 90,000 men per year as a result of

Continued on p. 3

20th Century Obscurantism

RELIGION & BIRTH CONTROL

One of the patients in Kings County Hospital in Brooklyn last July was a mother suffering from severe diabetes. Two of her three children had been delivered by caesarean operation. The director of obstetrics and gynecology, Dr. Louis Hellman, felt another pregnancy would endanger her life. He prescribed that she be fitted with a contraceptive device.

In doing so, Dr. Hellman was deliberately challenging an unwritten but long-standing rule against the prescribing of birth control to patients in city-operated hospitals. Commissioner of Hospitals Dr. Morris A. Jacobs invoked the rule to prohibit Dr. Hellman from treating his patient as planned.

The Brooklyn incident brought to a head a long-smouldering dispute over the birth-control ban. On one side of the controversy is the Roman Catholic Church, which believes that artificial birth control violates natural law "obliging on all men." Almost one-third of the city's population, including Mayor Wagner, is Catholic. The Mayor said he was "personally" against contraception, but would leave the decision to Dr. Jacobs.

On the other side is the New York Academy of Medicine, with 3,000 member physicians, which argued that contraception is accepted medical practice in

cases where pregnancy is regarded as dangerous. The academy was joined by Protestant and Jewish groups which opposed the ban on the ground that their religions do not prohibit contraception and consequently non-Catholic patients and physicians should not be bound by it. (The diabetic mother whose case precipitated the controversy is a Protestant.)

With the controversy engendering increasing heat over the past two months, Dr. Jacobs said he would leave the decision up to the city Board of Hospitals which he heads. Last week the board recommended that birth control measures be prescribed in city hospitals for patients whose life and health "may be jeopardied by pregnancy and who wish to avail themselves of such health services." The vote was 8 to 2, with Dr. Jacobs abstaining. The board's resolution said "hospital personnel who have religious or moral objections should be excused from participation."

Proponents of birth control hailed the board's action. The Catholic Church protested that the new policy "uses public funds for corrupt purposes," and warned its members "to in no way cooperate with such procedure." But Dr. Jacobs accepted the recommendation and said it would be put into effect "as soon as possible."

New York Times (Sept. 22.)

Look! It's Going Down... at Last!

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT!

WEEK 40

Deficit on Freedom £800

Contributions received £544

DEFICIT £256

September 26 to October 2nd

Glasgow: L.B. £5/0/0; N. Sydney: L.D. £3/0/0; Amsterdam: G. 10/-; Wolverhampton: J.G.L.* 5/-; Warrington: J.H. 10/-; London: L.C.W. 15/-; London: P.M. 10/-; London: Malatesta Club £1/2/0; Parma: H.P. £2/5/5; Hartford: M.G.A. 10/-; Merriott: Anon. 10/-; Los Angeles: Part proceeds Social, per A.S. £17/10/0; Albany, N.Y.: G.T. £1/15/0; London: W.F. 9d.; London: S. 5/-.

TOTAL ... 34 8 2

Previously acknowledged ... 509 17 11

1958 TOTAL TO DATE ... £544 6 1

Gifts of Books: London: C.W.; London: C.F.

*Indicates regular contributor.

VIEWPOINT

DEMOCRACY OR ANARCHISM

MANY people may wonder at this title, and ask whether any comparison is possible between Democracy and Anarchism, or whether the two terms are incompatible. The title was suggested by Eugene Kamenka's article "What is Democracy?", which appeared in *The Australian Highway*, July, 1958.

The article, according to the author, is the text of a talk prepared at the invitation of Radio Malaya, but never delivered because "it was considered politically inopportune". And certainly such a procedure of so-called great democracy is well known to us.

I should like to say at the outset that the remarks which follow express my own views, not those of any organisation or movement. I hope that this article will arouse the curiosity of the supporters of democracy. Or, rather, of those among them who are genuine and honest thinkers, who from time to time read FREEDOM, not those who hide their hideous and dishonest faces under the veil of democracy. They may find some interesting material to awake in them a desire to learn something about Anarchism, which may after consideration lead them to the libertarian proposition that democracy cannot solve the social question.

Now, what is democracy? Taking into consideration the fainess and hypocrisy on which our social relationship is built, the question is complicated and difficult. Kamenka is right in suspecting those who often declare themselves democrats. It is a fact that many horrible crimes against society and humanity as a whole are perpetrated in the name of democracy. To quote Kamenka: "Robespierre and Danton helped to murder thousands of Frenchmen in the name of democracy", and so on, showing us how many figure-heads claim to represent the democratic forces of our time. What Kamenka does not realize is that Danton, Robespierre, Stalin or Dulles are or were firm believers in democracy. They acted in the name of the people, and imagined themselves as representatives expressing the will of the people. So that the results of their actions are a logical conclusion of their conception. "Demos" then is but an experimental ground in the hands of its representatives, and the tax it pays

for its ignorance is its own annihilation.

For the sake of fair criticism we need clearly defined concepts, because if someone expresses his idea of democracy by using definitions of anarchism, we can only point out to him that the logical implication of his words is not democracy, but anarchism.

I am inclined to think that one of the best definitions of democracy is found in the writings of the famous French philosopher, Jean Jacques Rousseau: "Each of us must put his person and all his power in common under the supreme direction of the general will, and in our corporate capacity we receive each member as an indivisible part of the whole . . . general will alone can direct the State according to the object for which it was instituted, that is, the common good . . . It follows that the general will is always right and tends to the public advantage. As nature gives each man absolute power over all his members, the social compact gives the body politic absolute power over all its members also, and it is this power under the direction of the general will which bears, as I have said, the name of Sovereignty."

From the above we can deduce that the general will is an idealistic concept which more or less corresponds to Plato's idea, that the individual is but a reflection of the general will. This metaphysical concept is materialized through absolute power. The realization of the general will as distinct from other forms of government we call democracy. At the present time, to the present generation such a term as 'absolute power' is distasteful, and its synonym is representative majority. Its corollary is slavery, because the individual recognises the power of others to govern him and control his activities. His performance in this disguise can at best be described as abdication.

What is Anarchism? Without quoting any particular source, we can accept its popular meaning as negation of the state, law, and external morality; rejection of general will. The basis of Anarchism is

the one real entity, the individual, who according to the physical law of conservation of matter or the instinct of self-preservation, enters into voluntary accepted groups or associations. Or, as John Wakeman pointed out: Anarchism begins where most systems end—with liberty.

What, then, do we mean by liberty? It is, in its essence, the recognition and use by the individual himself of the power he has within him, and of his natural right, of which he must not be deprived, to govern himself and his activities. Such self government has, as its corollary, free and unfettered expression of thought. In a word, freedom is an essential condition of its own becoming.

The two concepts therefore exclude each other, but we must bear in mind that any attempt to find them isolated in order to study their pure manifestation is a difficult task, and in such a complicated social relationship as exists to-day, impossible.

Sometimes Kamenka's statement of facts shows the anarchist view-point: "In what genuine sense can we say that the people of a parliamentary country determine its economic policies, its foreign treaties, its education system, etc., simply because they voted for the government, and could vote against it in the future? On most of these questions, indeed, the voters do not have, and cannot have, any genuine informed opinion."

PLEASE

Don't Forget
the
Deficit Fund!

BOOK REVIEW

Two Plays and a Preface

TWO PLAYS AND A PREFACE by Nigel Dennis. Weidenfeld & Nicolson. 18s.

BOTH the plays are satires, and the preface, while expounding on the value of satire, does so in a satirical way. "The Making of Moo", which attracted indignant comment from every newspaper except *The Observer* and *The Tablet* (see below) when presented last year at the Royal Court Theatre, deals with religion, and for most people's money, it was the Christian religion that was coming under fire. "Cards of Identity" is more tendentious, being directed against psycho-analysis, naming implicitly several distinct schools. However, Nigel Dennis is concerned, besides launching broadsides against these particular doctrines, to make a declaration against any theory or system whatsoever, which tries to fix human beings into "analogy" explanations. As he points out, they only become really dangerous when the adherents of these theories equip themselves with the power to compel everyone else to adhere.

The preface presents his arguments in a manner which is powerful due to their simplicity and straightforwardness. Where St. Augustine claimed to be unimportant and incapable of finding God on his own, Dennis points out that he clearly must have felt himself of great importance, otherwise he would not have bothered looking for God, and that far from being devoid of will, no-one showed greater qualities of self will and determination in achieving his chosen goal of religion. He shows how developments in religion, philosophy and psychology have followed those in natural science. No sooner had the internal combustion engine been developed, than peoples' mental structures began to take on its properties, with cranks and pistons, and traumatic sparks. There is a slight impression of forcing in this. Surely not every psychological idea has come from a background of natural science? Nevertheless, religious and psycho-analytical ideas are made to look their most nakedly stupid, and the sight of them is both humorous and reassuring. As time goes on, all religions become civilised, so they do not represent a serious danger in a democracy. The preface concludes with the suggestion that if anything at all is

to be worshipped, we should erect an altar to Pelagius, the Christian who began the heresy that men have enough good within them to find their own salvation.

"The Making of Moo" is a potted history of religion. It begins when an English colonial engineer discovers that his river dam has destroyed the Water God of the natives. He decides to make amends by creating a whole new religion, and is joined in this by his wife and secretary. Act one shows them inventing the rules and ceremonies of their cult. Act two finds them involved in ghastly human sacrifice and orgies of unreason, and by Act three the religion of Moo has become civilised, and the son of its founder is renouncing him to begin a Puritan revival.

Is it not rather late to draw attention to the brutality perpetrated by religion? It is certainly a good thing that anyone contemplating seeking the peace of the church or the solution to their intellectual worries should be reminded of the facts of the christian tradition, and a satirical play such as this is certainly a better way than for example the lurid tracts produced a few years ago by the American secularists. The efforts of organised religion nowadays are directed like everything else, along psychological lines, in close alliance with the State. Religion is not therefore a separate problem, but just one aspect of the struggle between authoritarianism and freedom, just as in times and places where physical violence is the prevalent expression of the conflict. "Moo" in a way misses the point of this, since it has no direct relevance to the insidiousness of civilised religion as it affects people to-day—the "something greater than ourselves" which helps to make people submit to the earthly powers which are just a little bit greater than themselves. The connection is certainly made in the preface, which needs to be read several times during the reading of the plays. An amusing fact was that *The Tablet*, an example of the worst in Christian intellectual mix-up at all events, could remark that "Moo" was so far distinct from any particular religion, that it could not be considered as a criticism at all.

The plot of "Cards of Identity" is not so definite. It is sufficient that it provides opportunities for humour at the

The anarchist affirmation, that elections are an absurdly futile proceeding, a political farce, and that the majority is but a hidden oligarchy, is not refuted, but reaffirmed. We may assert that the majority is an historical parody covering unpleasant reality in the valley of the shadow of death, and alleviating the grief of miserable ignorance.

Kamenka continues: "It (democracy) is rather a specific theory of society and social life as a whole. It is, I think, the rejection of totalitarianism, a rejection of the belief that all social activities should be subordinate to certain controlling powers, whether they claim to represent the people or not. It is an assertion that one should aim at the maximum active and independent participation of citizens in all spheres of social life. . . democracy is something which to a considerable extent is maintained against the State, rather than by it." This statement could be summarized as follows: Democracy more or less keeps going as a reaction to the State; parliament does not necessarily express the will of the majority, and the rights of the citizens depend upon the scale of their direct participation in social affairs.

Even so, Kamenka and other democrats dare not abolish the seed of totalitarianism—the State and the confusion and disorder we call Laws. And we must bear in mind that the rights of the citizens remain theoretical assumptions unless the citizens themselves materialize them, so to speak. It follows that a classless society or economic independence, and political independence, or negation of the State, and the rejection of all "democratic" institutions are indispensable for the realization of the rights of the citizen.

For democracy implies State, and State means power or authority, which through the organs of legislative, judicial and executive powers suppresses the rights of the citizens and controls their lives with the deliberate intention of de-humanising them and preparing them for the coming age of the robot.

But if people, as some democrats assume, are conscious enough to use direct action to achieve their aim, then logically they will not need a State—father projection—to regulate their daily lives. They will no longer be children, but adults. But all democrats, from Rousseau on, and including Kamenka, implicitly or explicitly present and defend authority, even if under a different name. When purges, massacres, dictatorships occur, and the people's rights are restricted or suppressed altogether, such democrats like to rationalize, using different words, but always preserving the mainspring—general will and the State. In this way they consciously or unconsciously lapse back to Rousseau.

Which shall it be then, democracy or anarchism? If we are going to talk about the inalienable rights of citizens, and neglect man—if we pathetically admire freedom, and let our fellow man be exploited by the strong, and depend for his existence on the benevolence of his master—if we talk about the maximum active and independent participation of citizens in social activities, and then let them be governed—that will be democracy.

But if we desire freedom, and to get it we are prepared to destroy this monstrosity called the State—if we are ready to use direct action and free initiative—if we reject all the substitutes no longer needed by humanity—if we recognise the demos as a real force without any authoritarian prefixes or suffixes which hide the eternal social antagonism—if we desire peace, prosperity and tranquility, and repudiate Dachau, Vorkuta, Hiroshima, and the icy caress of death in Siberia—if we wish to establish a classless society and assert our human dignity against the masters—if we wish to live—that will be anarchism. J.G.

University
Libertarian

THE Autumn issue of *The University Libertarian* presents an interesting variety of reading matter. Would-be improvers of anarchist propaganda often point to the short story as a neglected avenue for spreading criticism. Here we have one by Yoti Lane, closely based on fact, taken from experience of social welfare problems.

History receives fair treatment, in an extract from an unpublished autobiography by Karl Walter, commenting on the anarchist movement in the early years of this century, and being topical to the extent of making some dry remarks on the International Anarchist Conference of 1907. Referring to more recent times, George Woodcock discusses the General Strike of 1926 in a review of Julian Symons' book. This is a good example of modern anarchist criticism. Woodcock has consciously discarded all tendency to cling to a mythical approach which might distort history to fit in with preconceived theory, yet for all that does not shut his eyes to the possibilities inherent in any situation, and looks at it from the point of view which desires a liberating outcome.

A very interesting review of socially-committed poetry, and a women's point of view on "Sex and the Unmarried" complete the contents, apart from the entry of the economists. A letter and a short article put their point of view. This is interesting in view of the tendency among anarchists in recent years to play down the economic side of our theories.

This issue has confirmed me in one resolution, which readers can only decide upon when they read and think over it. I am never again going to use "libertarian" as a synonym for "anarchist". P.H.

to logical conclusions, many of the psycho-analytical ideas have made valid contributions, and even though it may be a new heresy, perhaps some of the religious ideas have. The "infallibility" of a doctrine can only be overcome when one is prepared either to accept or to reject a particular aspect of it, or the conclusion to which it points in a special case, independently of the doctrine itself. If an idea is harmful, it is not just enough to be free of it ourselves. Life would be more pleasant if far greater numbers of people could be helped to free themselves from such ideas, and that will not be brought about merely by deriding them.

It will of course, take time and patience, and when the time seems long and patience becomes exhausted, then is the opportunity to sit down and enjoy a book like this, and the more copies it sells the merrier. P.H.

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP
OPEN DAILY

(Open 10 a.m.—6.30 p.m., 5 p.m. Sats.)

New Books . . .

- Neither East nor West
Marie-Louise Berneri, paper 7/6
cloth 10/6
- Waging Peace Richard Acland 13/6
Madison Avenue: U.S.A.
- M. Mayer 25/-
- The Munich Conspiracy
Andrew Rothstein 35/-
- Letters Rainer Maria Rilke 30/-
Nationalism and Culture
- Rudolf Rocker 21/-
- The London Years Rudolf Rocker 25/-
Land without Justice M. Dijas 25/-
- Reprints . . .
- The Brave Cowboy E. Abbey 2/6
- The Track Arturo Barea 2/6
- The Conquered Naomi Mitchison 2/6
- Crime and Punishment
Fyodor Dostoevsky 3/6
- Cup of Gold John Steinbeck 2/6
- The Wild Ones Vardis Fisher 2/6
- Three to Conquer
Eric Frank Russell 2/6
- Theatrecraft Anthony Parker 3/6
- Second-Hand . . .
- A Voyage from Utopia
John Francis Bray 7/6
- Wealth versus Commonwealth
Henry Demarest Lloyd 5/6
- America Conquers Britain (1930)
Ludwell Denny 6/6
- Point Counter Point
Aldous Huxley 5/-
- Disgrace Abounding
Douglas Reed 4/-
- Marat: The People's Friend
E. Belfort Box 6/-
- The Writer and Politics
George Woodcock 5/-
- Lessons of the Spanish Revolution
V. Richards 4/-

Periodicals . . .

University Libertarian No. 7 1/-

Pamphlet . . .

Rudolf Rocker Joseph Leftwich 1/-

We can supply ANY book required, including text-books. Please supply publisher's name if possible, but if not, we can find it. Scarce and out-of-print books searched for—and frequently found!

Postage free on all items

Obtainable from

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

All's Well in Formosa!

Continued from p. 1

Russia declares that she will not interfere in the struggle between Mao and Chiang, and meanwhile supplies guns and airplanes to the former. America tried hard to persuade Chiang not to pack the off-shore islands with troops, or to have aggressive intentions towards the mainland, but meanwhile supplies him with everything from his underpants to his underground fortifications, free of charge. Chiang declares that he has long ago given up any attempts at invading the mainland, yet he and his fanatical followers would involve the world in war if it meant their return to power*. And the Chinese "Communists", half a million of them were assembled last week in the Gate of Heavenly Peace Square to hear their Defence Minister declare, on the ninth anniversary of the Chinese People's Republic,

"We are determined to recover the coastal islands such as Quemoy and Matsu, to eliminate the direct menace to the mainland and the coastal areas of our country; we have every right to liberate Taiwan (Formosa) and the Penghu islands and carry out the unification of our country by all suitable means at a suitable time.

The Chinese love peace, but they are not afraid of the war threats of the imperialists. If the Americans ignore the warnings of the Chinese people and the opposition of the people of the world and impose war on us, the people of our country will definitely do battle against aggression, will do battle to preserve the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the motherland, and will do battle to safeguard Asian and world peace."

... these half million people had hardly heard Peng Teu-huai's rousing martial exhortations when the shore batteries which had been unceasingly pounding the islands suddenly stopped firing!

★

IN spite of, what the *New Statesman* last week called, "the defeat of Dulles", and "Red" China's Cease-Fire "on humanitarian grounds", nothing has changed. The struggle for power goes on. If, as the pundits of Gt. Turnstile suggest, the world was led "to the brink of nuclear war" a fortnight ago, nothing in the real situation has changed in the meantime, though it appears we are no longer on the brink. Then what has done the trick? (Or was it all a trick in the first place?)

After all, Eisenhower has made it clear that Communist China's intentions are to drive the United States out of the Western Pacific, and has made it clear that the U.S. has no intention of clearing out. Mao through his Defence Minister has confirmed Mr. E's forebodings, and Mr. K. has declared that in the struggle for power in that area he stands by Mao (obviously he can afford to ignore Chiang and his private war with Mao).

*Some [Nationalists] say more frankly that only a third world war will restore them to China. "Another war is inevitable—it is better to have it soon, before all the young people are indoctrinated, than later when they will all be Communists". This open yearning for a holocaust sounds suicidal to us, with our minds on the missiles and the hydrogen bombs, but war has not yet become quite so ghastly an abstraction to the Chinese". James Morris in the *Manchester Guardian* (28/9/58).

On the latter point the *M.G.'s* correspondent in Taipei whose report is published on the 3rd column front page was not to know that in the first column of the same issue the results of a Gallup poll show that 41 Americans out of 100 "believe that the United States should not use nuclear weapons in any war with China" but that "42 per cent. believe that nuclear weapons should be used". It makes you think, Mr. Morris, doesn't it?

No, the off-shore island skirmishes will never in themselves provoke a war between the Powers, but on the other hand do keep the diplomatic and political ball rolling. The power struggle is made of sterner stuff; the stakes are much too high to allow something as ephemeral as "prestige" (what is prestige compared with armed might?) or "personal pride" (of what importance is a Dulles' or an Eden's pride compared with the political stakes involved?) to determine policy.

What must be galling Dulles is not that he has been made to eat humble pie, that's all part of the game, but that his bluff has been called by his allies, who were so taken in by it that they really believed he was leading the world to the "brink" of a nuclear war over big and little Quemoy! It is only the fact that China is no more interested than is Dulles in risking war over Quemoy that the *gaffe* perpetrated by the political do-gooding innocents and the much less innocent American Democrats has not done the "cause of peace" more harm than good.

What galls us is not Dulles' feelings of frustration but the false impression created by the Lib-Lab politicians and pacifists that peace has been saved at the eleventh hour by "public opinion" under their direction. As the *Observer* put it in one of its most stupid and sanctimonious Comments last Sunday:

There seems to be no doubt that [Mr. Dulles has abandoned his policy] in response to advice from his allies, including Britain, rather than because of internal American opposition.

Mr. Dulles has not changed his policy. All that he has been manoeuvred into doing, not by his enemies but by his so-called 'friends' is to put some of his cards on the table, and has revealed that what he tried to pass off as aces were only knaves. But no self-respecting power politician will be bullied into changing his policy by friend or foe. Force is the only language politicians recognise. As Vice-President Nixon put it last week (when a leak revealed that the Eisenhower administration were receiving more messages opposing their policy than supporting it).

If the United States indulged in the kind of thinking which assumed that foreign policy decisions should be made on the basis of opinion polls, Mr. Nixon added, "we might as well decide now to surrender our position of world leadership to the Communists and to become a second-rate nation."

"It is the responsibility of a leader to lead public opinion, not just to follow it. A leader must get all the facts before making a decision and then he must develop support for that decision among the people by making the facts known to them."

How right the Vice-President is. And the sooner the public realise that (a) whatever the public proposes it's the government that disposes and (b) the government never tells the people the facts except when it suits their convenience, the sooner will the public develop that "healthy cynicism" towards politicians to which we referred in our piece last week. And only then would one treat the following extract from last Sunday's *Observer*

It is natural, perhaps, to feel some irritation at a Secretary of State who can calmly admit that the principles for which he has twice risked a world war are either wrong or unimportant; but it would be churlish not to recognise the courage and good sense which Mr. Dulles has now shown in virtually abandoning his policy.

with all the contempt it deserves!

★

IN the light of "subsequent events" we don't think we need change that last sentence of last week's editorial after all. There was no misunderstanding. It is all bunkum. And if you find that you distrust the Press and despise the Politicians, you have made two positive steps towards your own emancipation!

Thinking About Workers' Control

THE Congress for Cultural Freedom recently held a conference in Vienna on workers' participation in industrial management. Commenting on it in the *Observer* (5/10/58), Mr. Anthony Crosland asks:

"What has happened to the traditional left-wing demand for workers' control of industry?"

"It is, after all, barely four decades since the Shop Stewards' Movement was sweeping the Clydeside and Guild Socialism was the creed of the younger left-wing intellectuals; while, abroad, the Continental Socialist parties were still ardently syndicalist, and in Russia the workers were actually running the factories. Yet to-day, in Britain, the subject seems a dead issue. Is this also true of other countries: and if so, why?"

The answer he found from the discussion at the conference can be summed up in the axiom: *the stronger the Trade Union movement in the country concerned, the weaker the demand for workers' control*. Thus, he concluded that in Britain, America and Scandinavia there is little interest in workers' participation in management, or even in the formalities of joint consultation, not because of a lack of interest in "the real objective underlying the traditional demand for these things, which is that the worker should have a decisive say in and influence over the major decisions affecting his working life", but because trade unionists now think that they can reach this objective "by the independent exercise, as an outside force, of their collective bargaining strength". This strength he saw exhibited not only over hours and wages, but in the growing range of decisions "which employers to-day will not take without 'first clearing' them either with the union leadership nationally, or with the shop stewards or branch secretary locally".

Admittedly, Mr. Crosland says, "no British union has the extraordinary degree of control over the whole structure and policy of its industry which (say) the building or garment unions have in the United States", but the British unions have achieved a degree of influence over decisions affecting the worker

"which many old workers' control enthusiasts might well have envied; and the old phrases about 'exploitation' and 'the workers being treated as a commodity' have, in consequence, lost their meaning." Why, in this situation, he asks, should the unions press for joint participation, "when they have the reality of what they especially want without it?"

He contrasted this position with that in Austria and Germany, where legislation had attempted to introduce a certain degree of formal workers' control, giving works councils and trade unions varying legal rights to both joint consultation and participation in management. But this legal approach had been the result not of strength, but of weakness (the German worker, said Mr. Crosland, is less militant and the German employer more autocratic), and

"in terms of the effective right to be consulted and effective influence over managerial decisions, the British unions have achieved at least as much, indeed certainly more, by the independent exercise of their collective bargaining strength, without any of the paraphernalia of direct participation in management."

Another country whose experiments in workers' control were the subject of sharp disagreement at the Vienna conference was of course Yugoslavia which has "on paper, by far the most ambitious, radical and large-scale system of workers' control yet seen". The Yugoslav delegates maintained that this was so in fact. Others claimed that 'workers' control' was merely a façade for control by the Communist Party, the experiment being political in origin, an attempt to pose a dramatic ideological contrast between Titoism and Stalinism, and that in fact, in Yugoslavia, "lacking either free trade unions or an opposition party, the workers had no effective defence against a bureaucratic State and an emergent party-dominated managerial class."

★

CROSLAND'S summing up of the evidence which emerged from this conference, in his aphorism: *the stronger the Trade Union movement in the coun-*

Forgotten Men

Tito v. The Nazarenes

Very little attention has been paid by civil libertarians thus far to the plight of the Nazarenes, the Christian-pacifist sect which has been persecuted by a variety of middle-European governments for many years. But they courageously continue, in the best of non-conformist tradition, to remain faithful to their own ideology.

Back in 1933 forty-five young Nazarenes were known to be in Yugoslavian prisons for refusal to train with weapons in the armed forces, and 18 of these were in their sixth year of a 7-10 year sentence. Several were in Srem Mitrovica prison; the majority of to-day's objectors are there too.

"I have no earthly country, neither any party nor political leanings; I cannot take up arms to kill my fellowman", said a young Yugoslav in 1936. By this time the name, age, prison address, number of children and length of sentence (up to 16 years) of 251 Nazarenes had been recorded at the Headquarters of the War Resisters' International, which obtained some reduction in sentences through the good offices of the League of Nations.

(Ten years later (1947) three Jehovah's Witnesses were sentenced to death, but that is another story. After repeated appeals, the death sentences were reduced to life imprisonment. Are they still in prison?)

Twenty-two years have passed since the young Nazarene made his statement, but it still represents the position of the Nazarenes. The attitude of the Yugoslavian Governments also remains unchanged.

Refugees from Yugoslavia tell us that there are only about two thousand adult Nazarenes left in Yugoslavia's German-speaking minority; others speak Serbian. Their pacifism is of the milder variety, which is to say that the young men generally are willing to enter the army, but will not carry weapons. The army's need for non-combatant soldiers, however, does not cause the government to grant the slightest concession.

Case studies are tragic and compelling, but cannot be quoted in detail publicly. Mr. R. actually served as a non-combatant soldier for several years before he was sentenced, in 1946, to four years' imprisonment. Several others were sen-

tenced to carry a rifle. After serving only a few months he was released, only to be called up again in 1949. This time he was sentenced to three years' hard labour. Mr. R. is out again, but he is young so his future is uncertain.

About 200 young Nazarenes are in prison at the present moment, less than half of them for the first time. This figure was mentioned by Nazarene leaders in a recent unsuccessful petition to President Tito. Twenty of these 200 are serving their third prison sentence and at least one, a "four-time loser", is well into his second decade behind bars.

Ten year sentences predominated in the 1940's; six year sentences now prevail. But length of sentence continues to vary widely. Some observers report an apparent connection between long sentences and farm ownership; others are sure that those who are awkward and shy before the military tribunals get shorter sentences. According to this theory, the more eloquent and convincing the Nazarene is, the more dangerous he is to the State. It's a plausible theory.

From the limited comparative material available, one concludes that the length of a second sentence has no connection with the length of the first. For example, of four men now in prison for the second time three have 5-year sentences and one has three and a half years. The first time two sentences were for three years, one for four and one for ten years.

It is high time something was done for the Nazarenes, especially if a more recent report from two reputable sources has not been exaggerated. Apparently 27 particularly unfortunate young men are not with their fellow-Nazarenes in the wretched prisons at Srem Mitrovica or Nis or their counterparts. Instead, they are on a kind of "Devil's Island" in the Adriatic called "Goli otok". It is alleged that men are being bound together, thrown into the open sea, and hauled out again half-drowned and unconscious.

Tito v. the Nazarenes is a rather unfair contest. It is, as I said, high time we came in on the side of the Nazarenes.

ARLO TATUM,
Secretary,
War Resisters' International.

try concerned, the weaker the demand for workers' control, suggests a number of things according to your point of view. To some it implies that as the unions have grown into huge organisations with a vested interest in the preservation of capitalist industry they have 'betrayed' their original aspirations. To others it may mean, as it means for Mr. Crosland, that they have gained more by settling for less, and that, in the United States at least, they have gained a share of *de facto* control that they would never have won by revolutionary intransigence. Others again may question the extent of this 'control' and ask whether it affects anything really significant at policy-making or boardroom level.

And to a majority certainly of Labour Party and T.U.C. leaders, his assessment will appear as a confirmation of the view that "workers' control" is one of those backwoods slogans, like those of primitive Christianity or early socialism, which recede in importance as the movement which gave birth to them becomes integrated and accepted into the social status quo, and finally appeal only to marginal or unsuccessful groups which have not realised their irrelevance to modern life, and in this case, to modern industrial organisation.

The ironical thing is, however, that the very needs of "modern industrial organisation" are those which, if industrial psychology were not tied to industrial management, would lead to a reassessment of the idea of workers' control. In a broadcast talk last week, Professor Norman C. Hunt of Edinburgh, discussing the question of size in industrial enterprises (the principle stumbling-block in arguments about the feasibility of workers' control), remarked that the problems arising from the growth of industrial enterprises were such that

"a number of large companies have recently decentralised their organisations and established smaller, largely autonomous units, each to some extent a managerial entity in itself. A few years ago, the President of the General Electric Company of America, one of the companies which has followed such a policy, said: 'With fewer people we find that management can do a better job of organising facilities and personnel. This results in lower manufacturing costs and better production control'. It may be that the current interest in and apparent tendency towards the decentralisation of large undertakings is a somewhat belated recognition of the importance of people in organisations. One can only hope that at long last we are beginning to think about the pressures which traditional forms of organisation put upon the people who are required to work in them."

He went on to mention the more fundamental questions raised by Professor Chris Argyris of Yale, in his *Personality and Organisation*.

"Argyris argues that there are many incongruities between the needs of the healthy individual personality and the demands of our traditional forms of organisation. He suggests that, in our Western culture, the human being, as he moves from infant to adult, tends to develop from a passive to an active state; he moves from a state of dependence upon others to one of relative independence; instead of behaving in few ways, he becomes capable of behaving in many

Continued on p. 4

De Gaulle

Continued from p. 1

the post-war increase in birth rate. In any event the simple idea of spending the money which would be saved if the Algerian war were terminated, upon the raising up of Algeria from poverty, might not appeal to the Frenchman who objects to high taxes and does not in any case care about the Algerians but merely for the riches which Algeria may bring. De Gaulle will find it hard to avoid an *impasse*.

But how interested in fact is de Gaulle in lifting the French from the moral decadence in which he finds them? How much more interested is he in raising the prestige of France by a Joan-of-Arc-like miracle, the power and the glory of which will have been his? De Gaulle's ambition is for the France of de Gaulle to "reassume the place she merits . . . in the first rank of the world powers". He will not be too particular about the methods he will have to employ. He is an authoritarian who believes that France is more important than the French—he believes in sacrifices for *la Patrie*—and above all he believes in the infallibility of de Gaulle.

Cyprus

Stop the Violence by Seeking the Causes

LAST week-end the wife of a British service-man was shot dead in a Famagusta street. This occurred after reports had reached this country that civilian Cypriots, men and women, were being terrorised by members of Her Majesty's forces. The killing therefore, could be, however senseless we think the act, a form of reprisal either by members of the official resistance movement or by individuals who had suffered directly or indirectly at the hands of the occupying forces—recognised practise, we might add, in a state of war.

The subsequent behaviour of soldiers ordered out to find the culprits will hardly console the family of the dead woman, and can only inflame an already embittered civilian population. But "justice" must be done, so for more than an hour British troops sent out to enforce the curfew which was imposed after the woman was shot "were out of control". According to an *Observer* report reprisals were the ugliest in the three-year history of the Cyprus struggle.

From 600-1,000 people were arrested according to different sources, 90 of whom are in hospital, some with broken skulls, some with minor injuries, one with a bullet in the stomach and one dead. A child of twelve was admitted to hospital and later died of heart failure. An official report states that she had a heart attack while running away. So the soldiers and authorities should be satisfied that the death of Mrs. Cutcliffe has been avenged!

There is little point in adding to the horrified outcry which followed the incident in this country. We are consistently shocked at senseless killing whether it is one woman or thousands of men, women and children wiped out or maimed in war. We do not shed our tears only for the innocent who happen to be on "our side", but extend our sympathy to all people who suffer in conflicts which are engendered by governments and ambitious men. And what is happening in Cyprus is the result of British military need as well as the political ambitions of Makarios—an impulse which all politicians will understand and with which British leaders could sympathise, and encourage, if only Makarios would dance when they play the music.

Leaders on both sides will use the death of this woman for their own repugnant ends, and we can be sure that the government will attempt to enforce measures which might be

criticised under different circumstances. The people in this country will forget that British troops are arrogantly using force on civilians before the woman was shot, and the more recent brutal behaviour will be seen as the natural reaction of angry men incensed by the death of a comrade's wife. The uneasiness which even some Tory supporters have been feeling over the Government's policy in Cyprus, because we might lose prestige throughout the world, will now no doubt be dispelled with the happy illogical thought that, "well, it seems the government has been right after all."

It is this inability to look at events objectively, but to see the "truth" from one side only as a series of immediate isolated events which frustrates any rational person trying to explain political cause and effect. We are not helped on these occasions by the newspapers which, without exception, have been emphasising the horror of the killing, instead of explaining the cause.

All killings of this kind are horrible, but why did the newspapers not point out as they have done on other occasions, that death, even of the innocent (and how few are not guilty to some extent?), is part of war, and whether it has been declared officially or not the British government is at war with the Cypriot people, and we must therefore accept the consequences?

It is foolish to pretend that the

field of war is always restricted to military targets especially under the conditions of conflict which exist in Cyprus. If however, newspapers or official sources honestly pointed this out to the public the result might seriously impede future government policy. Serving soldiers and their families have to feel that their sacrifices are duly appreciated, and it is part of the technique of ruling to extol the virtues of the ruled when their services are needed.

Without a loyal military force no government can impose its will on people who are prepared to fight against it. Alternatively, if the glamour was taken out of war by stating publicly the obvious truth fewer people might be willing to make sacrifices. It is for these, as well as the political and military reasons, often discussed in *FREEDOM*, that we do not really expect biased newspapers or any official source to encourage honest thinking when false expressions of shock serve their purpose so much better.

One can only hope that some people might see through the more obvious contradictions and ask themselves if it was the death of an innocent civilian which shocked so much why did not the newspapers splash across their headlines the following day the deaths of civilian Cypriots; the little girl who died of heart failure while running away from British troops; the body of a man found in the back of a truck

who had died from the same cause? There is no shortage of bloody material which could be used to awaken the conscience of people by those who are genuinely indignant about the suffering caused by the folly of political policies, but they would have to admit that in this instance there is more blood being spilt on the "other side".

There have been other occasions when innocent civilians were sacrificed to the greater glory of Great Britain. The French patriots, among them women and children, actively opposing the German occupation, were not rescued from France before the allies dropped bombs there. We cannot remember any newspaper protesting against the killing by bombs of civilian allies. No doubt we could find solemn editorials praising the courage of the French patriots and realistically pointing out that in war the innocent die as well as the guilty. These arguments as we can see are only emphasised when it is expedient for a government and its supporters to use them.

Similarly, collective punishment was a weapon used by the Nazis in occupied Europe as a means of getting information and to discourage civilians from forming themselves into resistance groups. The British journalists adopted their usual moralistic stand when the crimes against the people are carried out by the enemy, but when the State with which they identify themselves is concerned in similarly atrocious behaviour, they either try slimy justifications or remain silent. Hypocrisy can hardly be more irresponsible.

R.M.

Troubled Waters in the North Sea

ACT One of the dispute between the governments of Britain and Iceland over fishing rights has passed without serious discomfort to either side. There has even been a suggestion of humour in the possibilities conjured up. A miniature war in the North Sea between British destroyers and Icelandic gunboats, although the latter seem considerably more miniature than the former. The American soldiers and airmen stationed on Iceland, are legally required to resist any outside aggression. Would they take arms against the British navy?

The question which was of serious import in political circles was whether or not Iceland would withdraw from NATO. Two years ago the Althing were on the point of carrying a resolution requiring the withdrawal of the American bases, but the Russian intervention in Hungary made the Social Democratic party revise its views, and the resolution was dropped. To whatever extent the Reykjavik government is in the right in the present

question, the Americans have not been of any assistance to them, and so perhaps it is not too much to hope that they will be sent home in the near future.

Much has been made of the fact that the Minister of Fisheries is a communist, and hints of dark subversive Russian influence are heard, but on this issue all parties, Conservative, Socialist, Liberal, Communist and Isolationist are united and held the first all-party demonstration for 137 years on this issue.

The political issue is however of secondary importance. What matters far more is the economic question of who is going to get the fish, and whether they are going to get it in peace and quiet, or whether fishing is going to be carried on between the shadows of gunboats and protection vessels.

The "shelf", covered by shallow water, extends for about sixty miles from the shores of Iceland, and is a rich fishing ground which has been traditionally exploited by British trawlers. The particularly rich areas are very close to the coast, and it is thought that they contain the chief spawning grounds.

At the international conference held in Geneva earlier this year to discuss "The Law of the Sea" the Icelandic delegates led the proposition that territorial waters should be extended from three to twelve miles from the coast. This would mean in particular that many of the grounds now fished by English trawlers would be the preserve of the Icelanders. The idea behind this, and its probable consequence, was not to deprive Britain of fish, although it would seem inevitable that a larger proportion would go to the home market. It was to support the economics of the Iceland fishing industry.

This is purely speculation, but many Icelanders are now in employment connected with the American bases, a fact which weighs with the Socialists. Has the government got an eye on provision of alternative employment? Its intention, if the extended limit has been peacefully acquiesced to, was that its own trawlers would catch the fish, and land and sell them at British ports. This, although guaranteeing the uninterrupted supply of fish to British shops, would have had a serious effect on the English trawler fishing industry and so possibly have led to a rise in prices, as well as causing hardship to the workers.

Since the "Law of the Sea" produced no settlement, the rival governments proceeded in their own ways. On Sept. 1st, British destroyers took up positions to defend the trawler fleet, and Icelandic gunboats began operations of a non-violent kind. At first they claimed some

success, in that the back and forward chasing of the destroyers, as they went from the defence of one trawler to that of another, churned up the water and diminished the catches. The captains however, report their catches as being only slightly below the usual.

Both the governments are using gunboat diplomacy, and the rest of NATO and the neutral powers are looking on with horror. The most unfortunate part of the question is the way in which the actual fishing people are letting themselves be used by their governments. The East Coast trawlermen have actually asked that the government provide them with more armed protection in the future. There was supposed to be a tradition of friendship between non-military seamen, but perhaps the war finished with that.

If the men were interested solely in getting food to people, it would be the easiest thing in the world to come to an arrangement based on sharing the work and the financial rewards. No doubt such interests and ideas do form a factor in their minds, but it is not the only one. "Free Trade" is no longer a possibility. The restrictions which governments find it necessary to impose on production and exchange, in order to ensure their own survival in world economics, rule out independent solutions in special cases. The trawler owners being part of the capitalist system must fall in with the government's regulations, and the workers, being tied as usual, cannot do anything effective in a dispute which could affect their livelihoods.

Matters look like taking a turn for the worse. The Icelandic coastguards have announced their readiness to pursue fishing boats which enter the 12 mile limit, and there is a possibility of increased British destroyer support. The ministers claim that while they are ready to consider claims for extension of limits they will not, on principle, tolerate "anarchy". Surely the extending of jurisdiction over open sea is an example of government, not of anarchy. Another interesting fact is that it is not fully known where the fish breed, or whether the grounds are being overfished. No doubt such a study is within the scope of the Food and Agriculture Organisation, which does not receive the largest slice of the UN's financial cake. The only way towards a sensible solution involves the dropping of all threats to use armed force, and the development of a public opinion in Britain (and in Iceland) which will urge a non-governmental settlement between the fishermen based on the most effective way of achieving their productive work.

P.H.

People and Ideas

Thinking about Workers' Control

Continued from p. 3

ways; his interests deepen and he becomes more ready to do things for their own sake; his time perspective lengthens, that is, he is more affected in his behaviour by the past and the future; he becomes less subordinate and aspires to equality or super-ordinate positions; he becomes more aware of himself and of his worth."

★

WITH this in mind, comments Prof. Hunt, "we may question whether the tensions and problems which arise so frequently in our industrial organisations are the result of 'misfits'; it may well be that there is something inherent in the organisational patterns which causes resistance and makes tensions inevitable". For, by contrast with his picture of the needs of the healthy individual personality, Argyris writes of the actual industrial situation:

"the employees will tend to work in an environment where they are provided minimal control over the workaday world, where they are expected to be passive, dependent, subordinate, and to have a short time perspective, where they are induced to perfect and value the frequent use of a few superficial abilities; (where) they are expected to produce under conditions leading to psychological failure."

Professor Hunt concluded his comments by reflecting on the possibility of reversing the trend of so-called scientific management; "decentralising rather than centralising; increasing the significant content of jobs rather than sub-dividing them further; harnessing group solidarity rather than trying to break it up; putting more satisfaction into the work situation rather than expecting workers to find it outside their jobs; in short, making it possible for workers to utilise their capacities more fully and thus truly to earn their keep."

Notice his last phrase, which tells us why the industrialists employ the industrial psychologists. But if the industrial psychologists were employed by the workers' side instead of invariably by the employers, where would this line of thinking lead? Surely to the conclusion that the "work situation" should be controlled by the people involved in it?

C.W.

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

Owing to the expiry of lease at the Malatesta Club no L.A.G. meetings will be held till further notice. New premises are being sought for the winter series of Lecture-Discussions.

CROYDON AREA

Will all comrades and sympathisers interested in libertarian activity in the Croydon area please communicate with:

S. E. PARKER,
228, Holmesdale Road, London, S.E.25

COMMUNAL LIVING SCHEME

Will those people, whether anarchists or not, who would like to contribute to social evolution and to their own enjoyment of life by trying out some form or other of community living please contact: J. D. COOPER, 54 Hillfield Road, N.W.6?

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

FREEDOM PRESS

SELECTIONS FROM 'FREEDOM'

Vol. 1, 1951, *Mankind is One*
Vol. 2, 1952, *Postscript to Posterity*
Vol. 3, 1953, *Colonialism on Trial*
Vol. 4, 1954, *Living on a Volcano*
Vol. 5, 1955, *The Immoral Moralists*
Vol. 6, 1956, *Oil and Troubled Waters*

Vol. 7, 1957, *Year One—Sputnik Era*
each volume paper 7s. 6d.
cloth 10s. 6d.

The paper edition of the Selections is available to readers of *FREEDOM* at 5/- a copy

E. A. GUTKIND:
The Expanding Environment 8s. 6d.

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

V. RICHARDS:
Lessons of the Spanish Revolution 6s.

PETER KROPOTKIN:
The State: Its Historic Role 1s.
The Wage System 3d.
Revolutionary Government Organised Vengeance 3d.
Called Justice 2d.

MARIE-LOUISE BERNERI:
Neither East nor West
paper 7s. 6d.; cloth 10s. 6d.

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.

The Education of Free Men 1s.

RUDOLF ROCKER:
Nationalism and Culture cloth 21s.

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

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

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

TONY GIBSON:
Youth for Freedom paper 2s.
Who will do the Dirty Work? 2d.

★
Marie-Louise Berneri Memorial Committee publications:
Marie-Louise Berneri, 1918-1949: A Tribute cloth 5s.
Neither East nor West
Journey Through Utopia
cloth 18s. (U.S.A. \$3)

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