

Freedom

ANARCHIST FORTNIGHTLY

Vol. 11, No. 19

September 16th, 1950

ANARCHISM: The philosophy of a social order based of liberty unrestricted by man-made law; the theory that all forms of government rest on violence, and are therefore wrong and harmful, as well as unnecessary.
EMMA GOLDMAN.

Threepence

Wage Freeze Rejected, Equal Pay Accepted, But T.U.C. Sanctions Sacrifice

THIS year's Trade Union Congress at Brighton, turned out to be a rather more stormy affair than usual. The General Council, encouraged by their smooth passages in recent years, apparently looked forward to a rubber-stamp congress again this time, but misjudged the depth of feeling engendered by nearly three years of wage freeze in a period of rising costs of living.

Why SHOULD Miners Risk Their Lives?

THE mine disaster at New Cumnock, Ayrshire, draws attention to the two basic facts about coal mining. Firstly, that it is the most dangerous occupation in Britain: the average number of men killed each week is nearly eight. Secondly, that it is the industry upon which the whole economic structure of the country is built. Sir Harold Hartley told the British Association in his presidential address to its recent meeting that by grace of our magnificent coal industry we live and indeed flourish.

But is it in fact a matter of pride that we "flourish" at the expense of an occupation which inevitably kills and injures many who work in it?

The National Coal Board's official journal, *Coal*, recently warned that a coal shortage is threatened by the fact that coal consumption is rising steadily—and will rise still further when the arms programme gets under way—while the number of employed miners continues to shrink. *The Observer*, 3/9/50, commented that "with full employment it is about as hard to get volunteers for the pits as for the Services," and suggested that, "one remedy would be to invite more mining recruits from abroad, perhaps from Italy, where unemployment is severe."

In other words, since men are not fools, and will not, when the fear of unemployment is reduced, willingly enter this hard and dangerous occupation, we should look abroad, to countries where plenty of unemployment means plenty of men who cannot afford to be concerned with their own safety and comfort, and import them, as though they were a commodity to do the work for us, and our armament programme, and our export drive.

If ours were a society which valued human beings more than balance sheets, would we not be devoting far more attention to developing other sources of power—hydro-electricity and the harnessing of tidal and wind power and of solar heat? And to the invention of more efficient methods of storing electricity and of transmitting it over long distances, inventions upon which the effective use of these insufficiently used natural sources of energy depend.

But the brains and the research funds which might be used for these programme are too busy perfecting the application of atomic energy to the problems of efficient mass-destruction.

Meanwhile, coal miners continue to be killed and injured.

However, in spite of a lot of noise and confusion, nothing very unexpected happened. The T.U.C., as already reported in *Freedom* (8/7/50) had recognised that with the post-election burst of de-rationing and the rise of prices following last year's devaluation of the pound, the wage freeze could not be continued much longer, and had sought to replace it by a policy of "flexible restraint". The surprise for the General Council came from the fact that this policy was rejected in no uncertain manner, but since at the present moment there are wage claims outstanding or in the offing for no less than four million trade unionists, the rejection of restraint was really only to be expected.

The only decision which is likely to cause any real embarrassment for the union leaders

is that which demands equal pay for equal work for women. This principle was first accepted (in principle) by the T.U.C. in 1882, had been underlined (in principle) by the present government, but perpetually avoided in practice. This year, Betty Jones, vice-president of the Civil Service Clerical Association, warned the General Council and the Government that they could expect a repetition of the suffragettes' campaign of direct action if the principle was not implemented in fact. Her resolution was passed by the Congress with a 2 million majority, in spite of Arthur Deakin of the General Council leaving the platform to direct the delegation of his union (Transport & General) how to vote. Since the General Council had asked for this resolution to be referred back to them, his action deserved the jeers it drew from the other delegates.

"NOTHING LESS THAN THE BEST"

It is often remarked upon that trade union leaders are very much out of touch with their members. Two sentences used by Herbert Bullock, T.U.C. President, in his opening address, showed that he at least is very much out of touch with present-day realities as well. Calling for a minimum wage of £5, representing a raise for lowest-paid workers, he went on to say, "The workers of this country are worth nothing less than the best." The best—on £5 per week to-day! It is no doubt a very long time since Mr. Bullock had to keep himself and possibly a family on £5 a week. In his exalted position as leader of the giant National Union of General and Municipal Workers he earns several times that sum, and the very fact that there are trade unionists to-day earning less than £5 a week is due to Mr. Bullock and his ilk toying the Government's line on the wage freeze for so long.

Certainly the workers, who produce all wealth, deserve the best, but please Mr. Bullock, don't pretend they will get it on £5 per week!

ACCEPTANCE OF WAR ECONOMY

The real task facing this year's Trade Union Congress, however, was to line the unions up solidly behind the Government on international questions, to begin the softening-up process which paves the way for acceptance once again of a war economy and its consequent austerity. This the Congress very successfully accomplished, from rejecting a resolution to ban the atom bomb, to passing a resolution welcoming higher production—although what the point is in producing more goods to be destroyed

PAGE FOUR

MILITARY JUSTICE

"It is ironical that in the same week that the Prime Minister appealed for volunteers to defend democracy, three British soldiers should be hung after being convicted by a court full of amateurs in a trial of which only the scantiest details have appeared in the press, and under conditions which denied them the right of appeal to a judicial body."

THESE were the opening words of an article in *The Tribune* last week on the courts-martial system by a former court-martial officer. This scandalous aspect of the case mentioned has been discussed in the press, together with the macabre and pathetic details of the visit to the condemned men by their mothers, and the War Office's remarks on the "stoic" behaviour of the men and the "remarkable self-control" of the mothers.

It was certainly a feast for the sensational daily papers, but there are further points bearing on the hypocrisy of the authorities which were not mentioned.

The three soldiers were found guilty of the murder of an Egyptian garage watchman in Cairo—a brutal and premeditated killing. Now anyone who has served in the forces in the Middle East will confirm that there is an "unwritten law" in the army: "If you run over a Wog, go back and run him over again to make sure he is dead." You won't find it in army orders—the War Office will vigorously

deny it, but it is an inculcated attitude nevertheless and there are a lot of people who have seen it done.

Talks are now going on between the British and Egyptian Governments on the future of British forces in Egypt, the Suez Canal Zone and on the future status of the Sudan. The British Government, for reasons of strategy, is anxious to dissuade the Egyptians from insisting on the complete evacuation of British troops. Mr. Bevin wants to place the arrangements with Egypt "on the basis of a free partnership between equals".

At the present delicate stage in the negotiations, it was necessary not to remind the Egyptians that the army regards them as an inferior race. Consequently, the three soldiers must die. In other "occupied countries" reprieves are the accepted thing for military racketeers who murder one of the inhabitants. But other occupied countries can't turn the army out. It will be recalled that one of the three soldiers shot the unfortunate Egyptian, but they were all hanged. Presumably it was decided that they were all responsible. But when apportioning the responsibility, why stop there? Is not

the military system, which brought the three soldiers to Egypt in the atmosphere of idleness alternating with meaningless activity, and continual personal irresponsibility, and which inculcated in them an attitude of contempt for "the natives", responsible for the deaths of the four men—the three soldiers and their victim?

THE RIGHTEOUS HYPOCRITES

THE following letter (from Alex Comfort) recently appeared in the *Manchester Guardian*.

"The level of unreality at which the House, as well as British and American propaganda, has discussed the Korean war is an index of the degree to which we have become hypnotised by the inspection of our own righteousness. Some prominent Allied politicians seriously believe that the Anglo-American reoccupation of Korea on behalf of the Syngman Rhee regime will be greeted with enthusiasm there—the din of propaganda makes it wholly impossible to assess the support which either competitor actually commands, but a return of the fighting across a peasant country, prepared by heavy bombing of towns, and ending in a reversal of the expropriation of local landlords, may speak a good deal louder to the Korean public than Mr. Acheson or Mr. Lie.

"We are only entitled to denounce Communist peace petitions as a fraud if we are equally critical of our own pretensions. If one is fraudulent, so is the other, at least in the eyes of a large part of Asia. We may think that in supporting the United States to-day we are securing our own prestige as liberators to-morrow; in fact, we are helping to identify ourselves with two of the most unpopular and undesirable policies of the present time—support for the landlord and the yamen, and the use of indiscriminate massacre, in threat or in fact, as the prime weapon in any conflict. Most of our defeats in Asia come from the first of these associa-

tions, and the growing disquiet of Europe, as well as the strongest Communist argument against the West, comes from the disgraceful example of the second which we set during the world war.

"In spite of the arguments about Russia's alleged intentions and the façade of legality at Lake Success, we can only regard Korea, as well as the rest of the cold war in all its manifestations, as part of a conflict between two totally irresponsible power groups, both in a psychopathic state of fear, both prepared to commit unlimited atrocities if war comes, and both meriting our whole-hearted resistance. As inhabitants of an increasingly vulnerable island we can ill afford the illusions which our foreign policy embodies. The Atlantic Pact converts us into a target area without offering any protection more tangible than the promise of subsequent liberation. It is not enough for Mr. Attlee to give unreserved public support to President Truman in Korea while frantically plucking his coat-tails over Formosa in private. If we find ourselves on the wrong side in Asia, or even, to-day, on the worse of two almost equally objectionable sides, we shall have dug our own grave, as well as that of any Anglo-Asiatic co-operation in the future. The only answer to Communist charges that we support reaction is to repudiate it in fact, a repudiation which extends to American satellite Governments and to Russian police methods with equal force. The only answer to the peace campaign is to dissociate ourselves from civilian massacre as a policy. It is high time we did both."

Direct Action Frees Miner!

PROMPT action by 2,000 miners won the freedom of one of their mates last week in St. Helens, Lancs,

John Horrocks took part in an unofficial strike last March, and, as is now usual under nationalisation, was, with 24 fellow strikers, subsequently summoned by the National Coal Board and fined £10 for breach of contract. He refused to pay, and so was arrested and sentenced to 28 days' imprisonment.

Immediately, 1,200 miners at Sutton Manor and 800 at Bold Collieries refused to work until he was released. The N.C.B. rapidly climbed down—while the N.U.M. found the necessary amount to secure his release—then agreeing not to press for immediate payment by Horrocks.

This represents a resounding victory for the miners, and is exactly the way to deal with the totalitarian methods of the N.C.B.!

DELINQUENCY *By Alex Comfort*

Now you'll notice that I have not been talking in specifically revolutionary or anarchist terms about this problem, because most of the work which is being done to-day is not being done by revolutionaries, but by psychiatrists who are trying to work, if not with, at least in, the existing order. Now I think their work is important, and for this reason—delinquency is not limited to crime. The further we go in the anthropology and psychology of delinquency, the clearer it becomes that the mechanisms which make some people into thieves or persistent murderers are not dynamically different from the mechanisms which make people into the other kind of delinquent, the socially-accepted and unpunishable delinquent, with whom we are at odds whenever we criticize power and coercion as institutions. This is not a theory peculiar to anarchists. It has a very wide, and, I believe, an increasing acceptance in psychiatry. As anarchists, the desire to dominate is the "crime" which worries us most. We recognise that at the moment the delinquent activities of governments, and of individual psychopaths in them, are a greater threat to social advance than even the most serious examples of punishable crime. The individual who is clever or lucky as well as delinquent may be able to express his basic character-disorder in an unpunishable form—if he is unlucky or of low intelligence he will express it in what is commonly known as crime. In another context, the aggressive psychopath who bashes people and robs them may well be psychodynamically identical with the sadistic warder who bashes people and is allowed to do so, or the bucket-shop proprietor who goes to prison, with the demagogue who rises to be head of his party.

For this reason, a scientific attempt to ferret out the actual, concrete factors in society, the family, and the individual which lead to "crime" of the delinquent type is in itself a revolutionary activity, if by revolution we mean the attempt to alter inadequate social patterns by deliberate action, and any contribution to this study, even if the people who make it do not realise its wider significance, is of vital importance to us as revolutionaries. And it has another side. We're not always very logical. Most of us, I think, refuse on principle to be indignant, and to react by demands for revenge, against bandits or murderers, because we say that their behaviour is the outcome of defects in society. On the other hand, we are very often indignant, and we may react equally sentimentally, at the activity of power-groups or of individuals like Franco and Stalin who seem to us to be acting brutally or wickedly in their own fields. I don't want to suggest we should lose our healthy social indignation, any more than I suggest we should come to shrug our shoulders when we come across a multiple murderer, but I do feel that any revolutionary movement which is able, as I believe we are able, to ground itself in psychiatry should thereby acquire a balance and a principled approach to social evils which it can get in no other way. I believe that there is only one possible kind of revolution, a revolution based on a scientific study of the things we wish to foster and the things we wish to eliminate, and those are the criteria which we have to fulfil if we are to make a contribution to human progress. And it goes further than that—it is known to-day that not only governmental power but revolutionary activity itself is a very common cloak for psychopathic tendencies in the participants. We all know the psychopathic crank, to our cost, and being a minority party we have to guard against him: for all I know, I may be one. The application and reapplication of rational criteria to our own response and opinions is a positive duty, and an extremely difficult and arduous one. Is our hatred of coercion or authority based on evidence, or is it a discharge of aggressive tendencies which might have landed us in Dartmoor or in the Cabinet? It's a point I won't pursue, but we should mention it in passing. "The Delinquent" or the psychopath is invariably someone else, not the person who uses those words.

Now the crucial question for us is this—can we hope to interfere effectively to prevent the development of the delinquent type of behaviour disorder? Is it, as Lombroso suggested, and as a very few penologists still suggest, an innate defect? I think we can answer that with an unqualified "No." There is no significant evidence whatever to support such a view, except in a very limited number of mental defectives and organic psychotics who are destructive or troublesome, and even these can to some extent be trained as well as restrained. Is it, then, an economic effect? Does poverty breed crime to the extent we formerly believed? Up to a point it does, though some of that crime is hardly delinquency—crime, as I hope to show in a minute, is a breaking-down or breaking-out process, and like other explosive forms of behaviour many non-specific stresses can contribute. But poverty is by no means the only cause, and any simple economic view is not enough.

If you read the press, you will see that the causes of crime, especially juvenile crime, are known to practically everyone—bishops, magistrates, doctors, social workers, postman, and editors. Unfortun-

ately, no two of these agree what they are. The most commonly cited are low moral standards in the home, either through lack of religious teaching or through the supposed growth of pilfering, fiddling and so on, lack of what is termed parental discipline, and the notorious fact that children steal because they want things—if they pinch sweets it is because they want sweets but won't save up for them, which is the spiritual-commensense theory in another form.

The only way to deal with this kind of assertion is by proper observation, to see if it is true. I'm going to devote the rest of my time to one particularly important study on these lines which has just been published, that undertaken by Stott for the Carnegie Trust. So far as I know he is no anarchist, so I can quote him without any charges of special pleading. His series of cases covers 102 youths between 15 and 18 in English approved schools—this is a smallish

any major stress which impairs the stability, the confidence or the affection in a family can, under the right conditions, produce delinquency, some more than others, but in every case the aggression, irresponsibility or cruelty of the delinquent is the "outcome of learning—it is a response he has acquired, not a character-trait, but a way of reacting to a situation. And the treatment which is required, this being so, is one of deconditioning, of "placing the delinquent in an environment in which his emotional wounds can best heal". How far this is from the orthodox legal idea of punishment I need hardly stress.

I have neither the time, nor, I think, the authority to try to apply the lessons of what I have been saying to our ideas of changing society, except to point out to you once again that the family, in view of its part in character-formation, and the whole nexus of personal

In the second half of his Summer School address, Alex Comfort describes the results of a very close study of the social and family backgrounds of a group of boy delinquents. The extent to which such studies bear out the intuitive analyses of the earlier anarchists is of extraordinary interest.

In his final section, Comfort turns attention to the way in which modern psychiatry can assist the problem of how, and in what circumstances, free men arise. His whole lecture is an eloquent plea for the use of the observational and analytical method in the forming of the sociological views of a revolutionary movement.

sample, but the results and the method were both of great general importance. I can't unfortunately do more than summarise Stott's findings, but the book can be obtained from public libraries under the title *Delinquency and Human Nature*, and I commend it to everyone here.

Stott's primary finding is that in almost every case the actual offences, whatever they were, whether sexual, larceny, or other, represented breakdown-reactions to enormous internal stress. In no case did a boy steal because he wanted something—unwanted objects were stolen, stolen objects given away. Parental discipline ranged from very severe to absent. Religious upbringing was indifferently present or absent. In Stott's own words, delinquent breakdown is an escape from an emotional situation which, for the particular individual and with various conditionings of his background, becomes at least temporarily unbearable. The motives of the offences Stott summarises as avoidance-excitement, which is apparently particularly associated with housebreaking, inferiority-compensation, delinquent-attention, resentment against parents, desire for removal from home, in that order. One important deduction from this finding is that criminal parents are not an important determinant, for this reason: the satisfaction or relief which the delinquents got from their offences were not concrete ones, like gain or advantage, but depended almost wholly on the fact that crime is something which society rejects, which brings punishment, gets them sent away from home, or scandalises parents. The boy whose father is a burglar does not try to spite him by stealing. The largest number (53%) engaged in crime as a means of forgetting their home problems in a round of adventure. Others deliberately courted detection to spite their parents or to escape from home. I think that a reading of the 102 detailed case histories here gives us a truer picture of what we are up against in dealing with the persistent criminal than does any examination of the later part of the process. The old lag has a hard shell—he is in equilibrium with himself, and one can't easily break in. But he is the end result of the same process. Stott shows very clearly that delinquency is a neurosis, if by a neurosis we mean a repetitive kind of response to a situation we cannot cope with, which is in itself inappropriate and useless, but which has become fixed as a habit.

For our purposes, we need to go further, and see what the stresses were which produced this pressure. They were all in essence tensions within the family. Summary gives little idea of them—to realise what these boys had to contend with, in "good" (respectable) homes for the most part, one has to turn to the case histories; Stott gives us broad headings which indicate the type of anxiety source, but not its intensity or the total absence of any real means of escape for the victim: anxiety over parents' health, desertion threats, being unwanted, estrangement from parents, unsatisfactory parents, neurotic, hysterical, stupid, over-severe; homes upset by quarrelling, separation, remarriage and so on. Under these one can make out, if one wishes, some of the more classical Freudian outlines. There is no one paramount cause—

relationships which contribute to it, is the key not only to the problem of delinquency in its limited sense but in all the wider social and political contexts which interest us in our desire to found a non-coercive society where individuals respect one another without external sanction. There is plenty of room here for discussion and study. There are two points I would like to make. First of all, modern work in this field seems to me to give us extremely strong ground for encouragement. The political field, and the type of revolution by a *levée-en-masse*, which earlier radicals looked for, have never been bleaker in prospect: the new knowledge and study of the machinery of human societies and of individual character-formation gives us, I think, not only a field in which to work with every hope of success, but also an assurance that the ideas which we have espoused, for various reasons, conscious or unconscious, since the time of William Godwin, are becoming increasingly the currency of scientific thought. Secondly, I want to stress the importance of our keeping up with the work which is going on, of seeing all the results, whether they support our preconceptions or not. It is not good enough to read A. S. Neill because we like his ideas and not read those who criticize him. Personally, I would like to see more of us, those who can, taking training in social sciences or engaging in research in this field. I do not want to try to turn anarchism into a sociological Fabian Society, from which non-scientists are excluded. I want to see something done which has not been done before—a concerted, unbiased, and properly documented attempt to disseminate accurate teaching of the results of modern child psychiatry, social psychology and political psychology to the general public on the same scale as we have in the past tried to disseminate revolutionary propaganda. That most certainly does not involve any split between "worker" and "intellectual"—the worker wants the information, and wants it now, exactly as he wants the doctor, or as the intellectual wants food and coal, and in terms of mutual aid each relies on the other to deliver the goods. I think this is the complement of what other comrades are doing in industry by pressing for such things as workers' control and local autonomy—the two go together. And there is another side to this—most of us may feel depressed from time to time at the complacency of the public in the face of economic and industrial issues and of political injustice: we should have to be radiant optimists, I think, to anticipate any mass movement toward our ideas at the moment, or, if such a movement did miraculously occur, to believe that the English public, conditioned to live as it does and think as it does, could be translated at all suddenly into a higher level of individual responsibility. As a minority movement, our best chance lies in our power of forming opinion. By learning how free men are made, and why they are in short supply to-day, psychiatry seems to me to be filling a rôle which is not less revolutionary for being unspectacular. I want to suggest to you that it is here, where power, delinquency, and most of the other maladjustments which we want to see removed, can be attacked by the methods which got rid of epidemic disease that we may perhaps be able to make our most effective contribution to the kind of world we want.

Exhibition of Children's Pictures

HERBERT READ, in opening the third National Exhibition of Children's Art, criticised the scornful reference "obviously directed at this exhibition" made by Mr. Robert Birley at this year's Royal Academy banquet.

"He charged the organisers," said Mr. Read, "with encouraging the belief that the

children chosen for the exhibition were a lot of little geniuses, who would one day become Associates of the Royal Academy. He suggested that only a very small minority of children were gifted for painting, and that these few only should be trained and their works exhibited."

Mr. Read said that behind all this, were two fundamentally different conceptions of education. One, represented by Mr. Birley, regarded the child's mind as an empty sack into which the schoolmaster must stuff solid layers of knowledge and, if there were any room left at the top, a little poetry or art.

"The other conception which we hold," Mr. Read went on, "thinks of an infant mind rather as a seed containing infinite potentialities, germinating under favourable conditions and sending out a number of tender shoots."

*—his ideas are developed in "The Education of Free Men" (F.P. 1/-).

JOHN OLDAY'S DRAWINGS

THE many admirers of John Olday's work will be glad to hear that an exhibition of his drawings and paintings is being held from September 17th until October 31st, at 28A, Tavistock Road, W.2 (near Westbourne Park Station).

His exhibition is open daily from 12 to 6 (including Sundays, except Thursdays).

The exhibition which is at the Royal Institute Galleries, Piccadilly, London, is open every weekday from 10 to 5, until September 29th.

GOLDEN ASSES

A big consignment of a new translation by Robert Graves of *The Golden Ass*, by Lucius Apuleius, the second century philosopher, is being held by the Customs at Sydney, pending a decision whether it should be banned.

The owner of a bookshop said that expensive editions of the book are on sale. "The Customs may object to the book being sold at a price (2s.) which would bring it within reach of the general public."

News-Chronicle, 22/8/50.

Erudite readers will recall that Godwin's "Political Justice" escaped prosecution by reason that it appeared in a form too expensive for general acquisition. Pitt observed, when the question was debated in the Privy Council, that "a three guinea book could never do much harm among those who had not three shillings to spare."

From our stock . . .

Authority and Delinquency in the Modern State
Alex Comfort 8/6
The Colossus of Maroussi
Henry Miller 1/6
A Field of Broken Stones
Lowell Naeve 12/6

A Home of Their Own K. E. Barlow 4/6
Unpopular Essays Bertrand Russell 8/6
Hereditary Genius
Sir Francis Galton 10/6
The Bolshevik Revolution, Vol. I
E. H. Carr 30/-
Seven Fallen Pillars John Kimche 15/-
Fred Bateson's Diary 8/6
Socialism Over 60 Years
Fenner Brockway 16/-

The Naked and the Dead
Norman Mailer 15/-
The Death Ship
B. Traven 2/-
Journal of Sex Education,
August-September 2/-
Poetry London, August 2/6
Resistance (U.S.A.), June-July 3d.

Don't forget to order your Penguin, Pelican, Thinker's Library and Everyman's Library books from Freedom Bookshop!

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP
27 red lion st. london. W.C.1

Trade Unions in India — Pillars of Capitalism

THE British Labour Party and the American Federation of Labour have nearly succeeded in roping in the Indian socialist trade unions. They have established a so-called "Free Trade Union Committee" in the best hotel here in charge of Mr. Richard L. G. Deverall, and have issued several pamphlets. (Unless one sits in the best hotel, nobody will believe it is the Free Trade Union.) They go about like Y.M.C.A. missionaries telling us nice things—that the Free Trade Union International is free from government control, although they freely support their governments, just like the Indian National Trade Unions, sponsored by the government here. Whether they are controlled or not, their policy is that of their governments. The Socialist Party Unions are opposed to the Indian National T.U.C., but they hobnob with the A.F. of L. and the British Labour Party, since both of them pretend to be against capitalism. The whole question is one of swelling membership and misusing Labour unions for government and war purposes. The chief unions that will benefit by their connections and activities will be the munitions, transport, and essential services unions. They will get some bonuses to make them feel "aristocrats of labour".

Of course, the object of trade unions is not to abolish capitalism but get the best out of it for certain, state-essential categories of workers, keeping them wage slaves. All grand trade unions are out to maintain the wage system, both here and anywhere, for otherwise the leaders and organisers will have no rôle to play. They do not want workers' ownership of works, but only to play a secondary rôle to capitalism, state or private. No wonder, trade unions have only been able to keep workers subordinated to the exigencies of capitalism and war and state throughout history, not to emancipate them from these as the whole class struggle of centuries thought it would do. Accepting the

wage system is subordinating oneself to wage slavery. Today trade unions are absolutely at the mercy of capitalism, workers are kept slaves of capitalism both by private employers and states, which in Russia are the same as the Communist Party. If capital—state or private—cannot make profit, the workers will have to go without eating even when working, e.g., Russia. Trade unions are interested in capitalist profit, in order to maintain the unions, although of a part of workers. They are agencies of capitalism, employment agencies. This they call "free trade

LETTER FROM INDIA

unions"—freedom to bargain. Bargain you may, but may not get anything, except for the most essential—essential to state and capitalism—workers, to keep down all the rest.

There is really no choice between the four groups of trade unions in India, because they all work merely for better wages, and not for the abolition of the wage system. In fact, they all want to prevent the downfall of the wage system. Of course they won't get better wages, except for that small section of workers which the government wants to use against the others. The wage system can only be maintained so long as export is maintained. Since Russia, for example, is not an export country, the workers can only be sent to labour camps to die giving the last ounce of strength and work without payment. Without foreign markets, the workers will be thrown out of employment since the wages they receive will not buy all the products at their prices which include taxes, rent, interest and profits. The trade unions are a conspiracy between the union leaders and the capitalists and state to plunder foreign buyers.

I was told long ago, by Albert Baumeister, once of the I.L.O., that German trade unions furnished strike funds to Italian textile workers' strike, not because they sympathised with them (although that was the open reason given) but because German textile workers did not want the competition of Italian textiles on foreign markets and dislocation of Italian textile mills would help the export of German textiles. In this both the German unions and Government could go together. Similar things were practised by British labour unions against Indian textile capital: they sent funds in support of striking Indian textile workers. The more strikes in another country, the unions as well as manufacturing capitalists in exporting countries will be safe. All rogues! The workers are pawns of rogues. Mr. Furtwaengler, a German labour leader, had written a book on India in which he said that Indian textile workers, as well as Chinese and Japanese, are a menace to the textile industry of Europe and America because their labour is cheap and sweated. That is a pure capitalist business proposition. When I pointed this out to him, he was angry. The logic of it is that the workers in India, and China and Japan must be encouraged to strike and fight for higher

wages, as if out of brotherhood, but really to make it more easy for European and American textile workers and capitalists to sell abroad. Did they mean that capitalism should be abolished both in Asia and Europe or at least in Asia or in Europe? Not at all. If capitalism is abolished, trade unions and their bossdom are finished.

We also know that when the I.W.M.A. (International Working Men's Association—the anarcho-sindicalist international) asked for sympathy and solidarity strikes to support some strikers, the reformist trade unions always said that it must be referred to the headquarters which later on said it did not want, even did not like to support with money. For by sympathy and solidarity strikes they did not want to dislocate "national business"! No wonder we have more internationals and less brotherhood. The mentality of party and labour leaders is capitalist and national, even international in the capitalist sense. Business first! For without business, they will have no rôle to play. They will become simple producing workers, will have to degrade themselves into nonentities. So I am not interested at all in trade unions which do not want to overthrow capitalism and wage-system but want to maintain them, let them go to hell along with capitalism.

M. P. T. ACHARYA.

KOREA AND THE DOLLARS

IT was reported in the *News-Chronicle* (30/8/50) that:

One nasty setback awaited the Britons in Korea. It had nothing to do with the enemy. It is that old trouble—money.

Korea, like Japan, is in the American orbit and therefore a hard currency area.

British privateers will be allowed to draw only 5 dollars 60 cents a week. On a rising scale, majors will be permitted to draw up to 75 dollars a month.

An American private gets a basic pay of 85 dollars 50 cents a month.

Evidently British soldiers can get killed in Korea in defence of the American Government's prestige, but they mustn't upset the Dollar Gap.

Foreign Commentary

THERE are still plenty of little Mussolinis and Hitlers in the world to-day, that is men who think that the solution of the whole social problem lies in their hands if only they had the power. One such person is Maj.-General Anderson, who has been suspended from his duties as Commandant of Maxwell Field, Alabama, Air War College.

General Anderson was quoted in the Press as having said: "Give me the order to do it and I can break up Russia's five A-bomb nests in a week. And when I go up to Christ . . . I think I could explain to him that I had civilization."

This was one of a number of statements by prominent Americans or in certain sections of the Press to be made recently in favour of an aggressive war by the United States. At present these views meet with official disfavour, but for how long remains to be seen.

Meanwhile, the Church is preparing the field for the moral support of aggressive war. The official organ of the Boston Catholic archdiocese thought that what they euphemistically call "preventive war" against Russia might have to be considered seriously in "the foreseeable future" and that wars of offence can be as moral as wars of self-defence—under certain conditions; and so far as this Catholic guide is concerned these conditions will be fully satisfied—when every other means has failed, of course!—since "the Soviet is guilty of real crimes and is contemplating further ones" and all the innocent Americans will be doing is "to defend basic human rights". So once again we can be sure that God will be with us!

THE Russian pattern is being methodically introduced into the satellite countries, and the usual arguments, so familiar to students of Russia, are being used to justify the measures being adopted. In Eastern Germany, for instance, strikes will in future be prohibited except in "private capitalist works" and the reason for this measure is that exploitation "has been eliminated from works owned by the people, where labour has become a matter of honour and glory". It all depends how one defines "exploitation" and who gets the "honour and glory". For us, exploitation is not only an

UNESCO TO BE COLD WAR WEAPON

THE United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation was founded five years ago "to promote peace and security by means of education, science and culture". It recently issued a 'Statement by Experts on Race Problems' (discussed and quoted at length in the editorial of *Freedom* for 19th August) which affirmed that man is a social being, that "races" in the political sense do not exist, that no "race" is more intelligent than any other, and that there "is no evidence that race mixture as such produces bad results from the biological point of view". There are a number of ways of looking at this statement. At first sight, it seems a little comical that the learned professors of half the world should meet together and after solemn discussion, produce what, to rational people, is a statement of the obvious.

But there is another aspect to be considered. UNESCO is sponsored by the governments of those countries not within the Russian orbit, and the United States contributes nearly half its annual budget of £2,857,000. But its statement condemns by implication the "racial" policies of many of these governments, especially those of America and South Africa, and, as our editorial said, "They condemn as impertinent and superfluous the pretensions of imperialism whereby one group of men impose their domination on another, even when they claim to do so for the good of the colonial people." In fact, UNESCO had become more of an embarrassment than an asset to many of the member-governments. So it is not perhaps surprising that the U.S. Government should be anxious that UNESCO should play a rôle more attuned to its own needs. The new situation is described in a report from the Paris correspondent of the *News-Chronicle* (14/8/50). He says:

"American insistence that UNESCO enter the cold war by spreading pro-Western, anti-Communist propaganda is producing a crisis which may almost wreck the organisation."

"UNESCO's Director-General, Senor Torres Bodet, immediately threatened to resign. Later he said that if UNESCO's Executive Board approved the U.S. 'request' he would either put it into execution or resign. If he resigns many of his

senior staff are likely to follow his example.

"This is not the first time that America made the demand. Mr. William Benton, U.S. Assistant Secretary of State, flew specially to France when the annual conference was being held to try to get UNESCO's support. UNESCO refused."

The correspondent pointed out quite unequivocally that the special meeting of UNESCO's executive board, called to discuss the American demand would decide in effect "whether UNESCO is to continue as primarily a cultural organisation working for world peace through the education of the masses, or whether it is to become a kind of psychological warfare bureau for the Western Powers."

The sequel to this story is not a happy one. It was announced on August 28th that the Executive Council had decided that UNESCO will support the U.N. action in Korea—as urged by the United States Government.

"The Council unanimously instructed the Director-General to come out on the side of the Western Powers with an anti-Communist propaganda programme."

This decision, says the *New York Herald Tribune*, "will to a certain extent take UNESCO out of its neutral phase, wherein it has acted as a perfectly intellectual organisation without a political stand between the democratic West and the Communist East."

Senor Bodet has not resigned.

TITO'S FRIENDS

THE anti-totalitarianism of our labour leaders is shown to be pretty one-sided by the recent visit to Yugoslavia of a Labour Party mission, led by Sam Watson and Morgan Phillips.

Bubbling over with enthusiasm for everything they saw, the Labour opportunists overlook the essential features that Tito's regime has in common with Stalin's, which they attack.

Foreign policy at the moment dictates friendship with all anti-Cominform countries. Tito to-day, Franco tomorrow?

[See *Freedom*, 2/9/50; *Facts for Tito Fans*, p. 3.]

GREEK OFFICERS WANT TO FIGHT FOR FREEDOM—IN KOREA

THE Athens correspondent of the *Times* reported on September 8th that a committee of Greek Army officers on the retired list has called on the Minister of National Defence, begging that their list of 1,200 men "experienced in guerrilla warfare" be given first preference when the Greek brigade for Korea is formed. They stated that as long ago as July 15th they sent telegrams to the United Nations, to General MacArthur, Mr. Truman, and Mr. Attlee offering their services, and that this surely entitled them to precedence.

The same correspondent, on the same day, stated that five men and three women had been sentenced to death by an Athens military court for subversive activities against the State.

As always the fight for freedom, tolerance, Western values, etc., must be fought anywhere but at home.

Through the Press

"FANTASTIC NOTIONS"

What Ehrenburg criticises amusingly in *Julio Frenio* is the anarchist Leftism of the early days, which shrank from the actual hurly-burly of building Socialism in the then conditions of Russia, and which imported its fanatic notions of freedom born of the attitudes of the anarchist petty bourgeois.

—Jack Lindsay in *Tribune*, 1/9/50.

BELOVED CAUDILLO

Too often in our dealings with Spain have we ignored the national character, and it cannot be too often repeated that you cannot attack the Head of the Spanish State in this fashion without every Spaniard in Spain taking it to himself.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
ALAN HILLGARTH, formerly Naval Attaché to Spain.

—Letter in *The Times*, 9/9/50.

GRATEFUL GOVT.

After 40 years' service with the New South Wales police force, an Australian aborigine, Sergeant Alexander Riley, who is due to retire next month, is not eligible for a pension because he is an aborigine.

Labour Call (Melbourne), 6/7/50.

Did he enforce the "White Australia" policy?

NO SHELTER FOR GRADE TWO CITIZENS

Boston scientist Clark Goodman said to-day it would be impossible to provide atom bomb shelters for everyone. And so he thinks that people should be "graded" for admission on the basis of their importance to the nation.

Daily Express, 29/8/50.

PENALTY OF OBEDIENCE

Young Adam was a kindly lad; One vice, and one alone, he had, Which was a tendency to do The things his elders told him to.

"World peace," they said, "should follow from The dropping of an atom bomb."
"Which only cranks and fools forbid;
"So go and drop one." And he did.

Observe the inexperience Of indiscreet obedience, With which conclusion none will quarrel Should any live to draw the moral.

—Competition entry,
New Statesman, 1/9/50.

SAD REFLECTION

All this drives a pacifist-anarchist such as myself back upon the sad reflection, all over again, that all political parties are in the long run (perhaps even in the short run!) worthless!

—Ethel Mannin in

Socialist Leader, 9/9/50.

CHRIST IS ON THE GENERAL'S SIDE

economic question. After all, the nationalised industries in Britain cannot be said to be run for private profit, yet does this give the workers any more say in the running of their industries than under private enterprise?

"Socialistic Competition"

Such terms as "socialistic competition" euphemistically describe the Russian method for greater exploitation of the workers. The increased output by workers is not necessarily a conscious act for the success of socialism or Stalinism or whatever one cares to call the system in Russia and its satellites, since it is rewarded by medals—and increased wages, which, in Socialist Russia, just as in Capitalist Britain—are the means for increasing individual comfort.

In Czechoslovakia the system of "shock-workers" has been introduced in all industry. In the mines however it does not seem to have had the effect of eliminating

absenteeism. The official news agency in Prague states that it is on the increase and has reached from 15 to 17 per cent. in some Czechoslovak coal mines. "Socialist competitions," the agency adds, "have been under way in several mines, but the rate of absence is increasing as well."

To encourage the shock worker's spirit among the young, the Slovak Commission for education, science and art has decided that portraits of the best shock workers are to hang in all Slovakia's kindergartens and elementary and secondary schools commencing this month. "Get them young," seems to be the motto of all those individuals and organisations seeking to control the people's lives. From the Pope to Hitler, from Franco to Stalin and Mussolini—whether it's your soul they want to save or the dignity of your country, these authoritarians all have a common technique: first option on the minds of the young.

LIBERTARIAN.

FREEDOM PRESS

C. Berneri: KROPOTKIN—HIS FEDERALIST IDEAS	2d.
Errico Malatesta: ANARCHY VOTE WHAT FOR?	6d. 1d.
M. L. Berneri: WORKERS IN STALIN'S RUSSIA	1/-
F. A. Ridley: THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH AND THE MODERN AGE	2d.
P. J. Proudhon: GENERAL IDEA OF THE REVOLUTION IN THE 19th CENTURY	Cloth 5/-
John Olday: THE MARCH TO DEATH THE LIFE WE LIVE, THE DEATH WE DIE	1/6 2/6

Charles Duff: A HANDBOOK ON HANGING	2/-
Gaston Laval: COLLECTIVES IN SPAIN	1d.
A. Ciliga: THE KRONSTAT REVOLT	2d.
Icarus: THE WILHELMSHAVEN REVOLT	6d.
"Equity": THE STRUGGLE IN THE FACTORY	3d.
McCartney: THE FRENCH COOKS SYNDICATE	3d.
William Godwin: SELECTIONS FROM POLITICAL JUSTICE ON LAW	3d. 1d.

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

War Office Lunacy

IN an outspoken editorial on the secret military trial recently held at Colchester, the *Manchester Guardian* says:

"Some kind of lunacy seems to be afflicting the War Office. Courts martial have been held on three men charged with offences so serious that they could not be named. The Court actually sat on a

LEAH FELDMAN ARRESTED

OUR comrade Leah Feldman was arrested while selling *Freedom* outside Hyde Park on August 27th, and taken to the police station and charged with "insulting behaviour". Douglas Kepper, of the I.L.P., who was selling *The Socialist Leader*, intervened on her behalf and was told by the police that "unless he remained silent" he would be taken with her. Not remaining silent he was then arrested and charged with obstruction. On the following day, Leah Feldman was fined 7/6, and Douglas Kepper 10/- at Marlborough Street Police Court.

Leah had a small attache case of pamphlets beside her at the back of the pavement, and a policeman told her to shut it. Leah pointed out to him that it occupied no more room open than shut, and the policeman agreed. Then another policeman came and told her to shut it. She pointed out that the first policeman had agreed with her, and when a suitably large crowd had gathered, she was arrested.

As always, the "obstruction" was caused by the police intervention. We wonder how many sellers of daily and evening papers are ever accused by the police with "obstruction" or "insulting behaviour"?

In the London *Star* of 28th August, the policeman is quoted as giving evidence that someone in the crowd called out "Go back to Russia" and the *Star* was content to let the implication stand that Leah Feldman is a Communist. It did not quote her defence as an Anarchist, nor name the paper she was selling.

In point of fact, Leah, who left Russia as a girl before World War I, did go back there after the Revolution—to leave again for ever when she saw the true face of Bolshevism.

Meetings and Announcements

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

Sunday Evening meetings will commence again at the Central Trade Union Club on October 1st. See this column next issue for details.

OPEN-AIR MEETINGS

Every Sunday at 3.30 at Regent's Park (near Zoo South Entrance)

Speakers:

Albert Meltzer, S. E. Parker, Jack Rubin, Philip Sansom

GLASGOW ANARCHIST GROUP

OUTDOOR MEETINGS every Sunday at 7 p.m. at MAXWELL STREET

with

Frank Leech, John Gaffney, Eddie Shaw, J. Raeside

LIVERPOOL ANARCHIST GROUP

Open Air Meetings every Sunday, 7.30 p.m. on Lewis's blitzed site

COLNE & NELSON DISTRICT

Discussion Group held fortnightly, September 17th, at 2.30 p.m. at Twisters and Drawers Club, Cambridge Street, Colne (Lancs.)

NORTH-EAST LONDON GROUP

Discussion Meetings Fortnightly 7.30 p.m. Enquiries c/o Freedom Press SEPT. 19th Round Table "FUTURE GROUP ACTIVITY" OCT. 3rd "THE MYTH OF THE SUPERMAN"

Sunday and not only were the proceedings private but the charges were not disclosed. Two of the men were found guilty and sentenced, one to three years' imprisonment, the other to nine months' detention; a third man was acquitted. . . . On Tuesday, the War Office put out a statement that must be unique even in its long annals of ineptitude:

Reports . . . may have given the impression that these soldiers have been tried for such offences as murder, treason, rape, &c. In fairness to the accused and to the relatives the War Office think it only right to state that these soldiers were, in fact, tried on charges of malicious damage to property.

Does not the War Office see that it has condemned itself out of its own mouth? Who was responsible for giving the idea that the men might have been charged with murder, treason, or rape? Who was unfair to the man and their relatives? Who alarmed the public? And, even more important, who used the extra-ordinary machinery of military law to keep secret something the public had a right to know?

THE METHOD OF DEMOCRACY

EIGHT friends of mine received communications from H.M. War Office on August 15th, concerning their availability for recall to the colours.

None of them seemed particularly entertained at the prospect. Three filled in the information required, and indicated that they would decline any such invitation on a matter of principle. Five ignored the correspondence altogether as the surest method of non-intervention.

On the 30th August, Mr. Attlee, almost doubled the rates of pay offered in the armed forces. On the 1st September, my friends received a repeat communication from H.M. War Office, enclosed in nothing less than a registered envelope.

My eight friends must be very important people to be worth so much expense and fuss.

But I do not think that even that will bury such convictions as they hold. I don't think it was quite what they had in mind in refusing to 'kill or be killed'.

Thanks, all the same, Mr. Attlee . . . It was a sporting offer.

J.S.

FROM PAGE ONE

TUC—The Real Decisions are Ours!

by atom bombs, no delegate seemed to question!

It is precisely on these points that the various reports of the Congress begin to make depressing reading. That every General Council speaker, and many from the floor, attacked Communism and Communism was to be expected, but what began to be obvious is that Communism is now to be the bogey, the red herring across every inconvenient trail, and the contempt with which most workers to-day regard those political twisters is itself to be twisted into support for their own exploitation.

NO SUPPORT FOR C.P.

Liberally sprinkling his speech with talk of "traitors and saboteurs", Sir Vincent Tewson, T.U.C. Secretary, rightly condemned the "phony peace petition" as a tactical political move by the Communists exploiting the people's genuine desire for peace. The T.U.C. supported by nearly 7 million to 595,000 the resolution supporting United Nations' action in Korea—a majority of 12—1. But the Communist-inspired resolution calling for the banning of atomic weapons was rejected by only 3—1.

These figures show that the vast majority of the delegates are not Communist sympathisers, any more than workers throughout the country are. The recent General Election was another indication of the lack of support the C.P. can count on to-day. But this evidence will not prevent the

IS WAR INEVITABLE?

IN *Freedom* for August 19th, you published a letter from Mrs. Gladys Ding, without editorial comment. Your readers also, apparently, have thought it unworthy of reply. But unless some reply is made, Mrs. Ding, and others, may think the arguments in her letter acceptable to anarchists.

She rather misunderstands, I think, the article "Is War Inevitable?" (25/8/50), which she criticises. The argument that war being inevitable in governmental society, the avoiding of war involves the abandonment of the governmental system, may be disputed, but it is hardly "incoherent muttering about revolution", and the point that France, as a nation, was not weakened by revolution "in the field of international rivalries" is not contradicted by the contention that revolution "weakened the French people".

But let me not reprimand her for largely failing to understand your arguments, lest she and her co-believers condemn me for completely failing to understand hers.

"The instrument by which all governments suppress the individual; credit", may mean that the capitalists' appropriation of some of the products of an employee's labour and the taxes taken from an individual by government, can, in a way, be described as debts (or loans?) paid to the capitalist and the government respectively.

If this is what it means, the meaning is not very clear, but I fail to see what else it can mean, unless prisons and gibbets and guns and truncheons are thought of as forms of credit or (like ration books, identity cards, army call-ups, and tax demand notices), "low devices imposed by the rule of debt". I know that, never having borrowed anything or bought anything on tick from any government, I owe no conscious debt to one.

International DEBT (Mrs. Bing's capitals), goods or money owed by nations to nations, is, I agree, disgusting. Using the "payment of debts" or the "establishment of credits" as an excuse, merchants and governments export as much as possible and import as little as possible, to their own benefit and the detriment of the poorer classes. But I cannot agree that wars are arranged solely to perpetrate such debt, or that social injustice would be ended by the abolition of such debt. Unless, of course, the property system was abolished entirely, which Mrs. Bing does not advocate, does she?

ABC OF AUTHORITY

(Continued)

X is for Xenophobia, the hatred of foreigners. One of the subtle ways in which Authority maintains the support of the people, is by working up enmity towards other peoples, and diverting towards them the hostility which would otherwise be directed against itself. The alleged enemy may change but the Authorities always make sure that there is one. In reality the only enemy is Authority itself.

Y is for You. Do you believe in Authority? If so, you will always suffer from it. To destroy people's faith in Authority and build up their faith in themselves, is the most valuable and useful task that an anti-authoritarian can perform.

Z is for Zeno. Who was he? Zeno of Kittion (340-265 B.C.) was the first anarchist whose teachings have survived. According to Rudolf Rocker, he 'rejected all external compulsion and taught men to obey only the voice of the inner law' which was revealed in nature itself. This led him to a complete rejection of the state and all political institutions, and he took his stand upon complete freedom and equality for everything that bears human form."

The history of the world since Zeno's time has been a continual proof of how right he was. Let's do something about it!

D.R.

Letters

Perhaps I am accidentally misconstruing Mrs. Bing and the Social Credit Movement, but it seems to me that they try to cure the evil of society, by attacking, not the evil itself, but some of its manifestations, like a doctor with a small-pox patient, putting plasters on the larger spots.

D.R.

BUILDERS' CO-OPERATIVE

WE rightly criticise the worst features of Capitalism and State Socialism and their inability to provide the basis of the good society we seek, but we do not encourage the interest and support particularly of the younger people, who we must attract to build up a virile, active movement. This would be accomplished if it was shown that we "meant business" and made some attempt, as has been made in France and in Palestine, to work in a very limited manner in the first instance according to the economic principles that are accepted.

The building trade seems a very suitable industry in which to begin, covering many trades and fulfilling an essential need, particularly at this time. I would suggest that we start by establishing a workers' co-operative in the building industry with those interested able to take part. That would provide a sound, useful basis and from our experience we could profit when we wished to proceed to the next aspect of the economy we decided to tackle.

Let us get together and see what can be done in working out an alternative to the systems which we reject. Surely we have sufficient knowledge, skill, interest and goodwill to organise in the North a building group which would successfully work a system of workers' control. I should be very pleased to hear from any who are attracted by the suggestion and feel it is worth discussing further.

H. LESLIE KIRKLEY.

11, Gledhow Wood Avenue, Leeds 8.

ESPERANTO

THE article by "A.P." headed "Esperanto or Desperanto" (Paris Letter) demands comment.

First, this year's Universal Congress of Esperanto had not 700 but over 2,000 members—"delegate" is not quite the right word as there is no authority delegated to a Congress member (Kongresano) by his local group, if any.

As to the obligatory teaching of Esperanto in all schools: it is nonsense to imply that all Esperantists are in favour of this, as the Editors indicate in a footnote. I would say, as a personal opinion, that the real need is for a much more widespread use of the language as an examination subject, while we have exams. (of which I disapprove); and while we have compulsory teaching of languages in schools (of which I totally disapprove) Esperanto ought to be the first of such. The reasons are obvious: the child can get a working knowledge of Esperanto in a fraction of the time necessary in the case of any of the usual national languages; he can then correspond with and probably meet children from diverse lands and has a very good chance of acquiring a wide non-national outlook. Also he has a basis of language learning equal in value to that of Latin as a stepping-stone to further languages. Moreover, Esperanto has considerable literary value. I agree, however, that there is no need to compel a child to learn languages at all—interest or perhaps need are sufficient spurs; and the advantages of Esperanto are sufficient to ensure its rapid spread in a free world.

Esperanto was rightly described by Gilbert Murray as "a beautiful and delicate creation", and is living, expressive and a joy to use. This seems to surprise some linguists who forget that Hungarian and Hindustani too were created languages, yet went on living after creation.

It is a fact that the linguist tends to underestimate the difficulty of language study for the great majority. In Britain it is quite normal for several years of study of French at school—whether willingly done or not—to bear no fruit: the boy or girl cannot converse in French. Esperanto is for everyone who wants international contacts—not just for the linguistically clever ones or those with unlimited leisure.

It may be true that the Esperantist tends to oversimplify certain problems; but certainly Esperanto does help friendship across frontiers, as well as toleration. I dispute in the friendliest manner on any subjects with French, Czech, Japanese and Irish correspondents. The Esperantist disagrees with his Esperantist friends. Most people (present company excepted!) disagree with "foreign swine, devils or bastards."

J. Cox.

WHAT TO DO WITH FREEDOM

DEAR Sir, I trust that neither my sister nor myself will receive from you any further sample of the publication with which you have seen fit to favour us, a publication which, as Catholics, we cannot but find repugnant in its every aspect.

Both sample copies have been destroyed since I consider them unfit reading for a Catholic household.

Yours faithfully,

PRESS FUND

August 26th to September 7th:

Glasgow: A.McD.* 4/-; Anon* 2/6; Queensland: S.T. 3/9; Felinfoel: E.G.R. 2/6; L.A.G. Summer School: £5/7/4; Bradford: D.R. £1; Smethwick: E.W. 5/-; Edinburgh: B.G. 5/-; Ann Arbor: A.L. £1/15/0; Cambridge: C.L.D.* 5/-; London: L.G.W.* 5/-; San Francisco: C.S. £1/1/6; London: F.E.D.* 5/-; Purley: A.W.U. 10/-; Bredhurst: W.S. 7/2; Anon* 2/6; Gosport: F.G.* 5/-.

Total ... £12 6 3
Previously acknowledged ... £174 19 4
TOTAL TO DATE ... £187 5 7

*After initials indicates contributors to the 5/- a month scheme proposed by a London reader.

The Freedom Press and the M. L. Berneri Memorial Committee, each acknowledge with thanks £5 7s. 4d., proceeds from the recent Anarchist Summer School.

FREEDOM

Anarchist Fortnightly Price 3d.

Postal Subscription Rates
6 months 4/6 (U.S.A. \$1).
12 months 8/6 (U.S.A. \$2).

Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies
6 months 7/6 (£1.50).
12 months 15/- (£3).

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.