

AN EYE WITNESS REPORT ON THE "PARADE OF PEACE"

SUNDAY IN BERLIN

On August 12th, I followed the big "Parade of Peace" in the Russian sector of Berlin. This was to be the culminating point of the "World Youth and Student Festival", more commonly known as the "Mobilisation of Youth in Honour of the Great Stalin". That Sunday one of the leaders of the German Young Communists gave a speech in which the ritual expression "the Great Stalin" was repeated fifty-two times. As to the number of Great Stalins on cardboard carried in the march-past—I soon gave up trying to count them. Contemplating these enormous uniformed ikons, carried by groups of sixteen youths bent double the weight—tired and sullen—it seemed to me that the organisers had involuntarily given to the world the most striking symbol of the burden which weighs down upon these frail shoulders and which prevents them from becoming straight again.

All these Stalin faces of gargantuan dimensions, each escorted by half a dozen photographs of the same person straddled aloft on poles, gave to the procession passing down the Unter den Eichen, the appearance of a lugubrious circus, a joyless carnival, and made me think of certain processions of the time of the French Revolution when freshly severed heads were carried along stuck on pikes. One scene in particular, seemed like a surrealist dream. This was the juxtaposition of three detachments marching to the rattle of drums and the sound of trumpets. To the front: twenty heads of Thaelmann, the German Communist chief who died in a Nazi concentration camp because he refused to sign a pact with Hitler, forgot to save him, followed by large banners bearing slogans like "Learn from Thaelmann how to fight and conquer," or "Come, with Thaelmann to the school of the genius Stalin."

Down the middle of the road came the heads of the leaders of Roumania, Albania, etc., all obviously unknown and meaningless to the young Germans who carried them, surrounding the delegations from the People's Democracies. The bald head of Rakoszi looks astonishingly like that of Edgar Wallace. An elderly man next to me says in a very high voice: "If we must already have Führers, the Nazi ones were better."

Finally, on the left marched culture. The official poets of the régime, Hermlin and Becher led the procession, docilely followed by Goethe, Lessing and Heine, considered to be the precursors of the progressives of 1951. Goethe, with a surprised look and wrinkled forehead, made curious company for the solemn and empty faces of the contemporary poet-laureates.

Chopin, who followed, seemed ill at ease amidst the cacophony of trumpets and loud-speakers, while the wind inflated the fat cheeks of John Sebastian Bach, who was also called up for the parade in honour of the great Stalin. Finally, the culmination and summit of all human culture, a poster reproducing the cover of *Questions of Leninism*, the holy book, born from the pen of the living God.

The radio commentator meanwhile made valiant and vain efforts to communicate to his distant audience the excitement and jubilation which this dismal cortege never succeeded in arousing.

How, indeed, could it, when the young Germans in the parade, since their

arrival in Berlin, had not had a single hot meal? Many among them billeted far from the centre, and setting out at four in the morning for the parade, were visibly at the end of their strength. The inequality between their rations and those of the foreign delegations, four or five times better nourished, could not but confirm them in feeling treated like Pariahs; as would the "results" of the previous day's football match when a Soviet referee had given the victory to the Russian "Dynamos", cancelling the two goals scored by the German team.

In fact there was little to exalt over in the unceasing slogans of the loud-speaker vans, for instance, this one which I noted: "German youth salutes the Germano-Bulgarian commercial treaty with three cheers." It was at this precise moment that the festival became for me like a chapter of George Orwell's dreadful utopia 1984.

By my side a woman suddenly exclaimed: "See the balloons! They come from the West, they are carrying leaflets," and suddenly everyone turned from the parade, their eyes following a little far-off balloon—the police, too, in a bad temper, for this would mean more work for them. These "Peoples Police" were everywhere, posted on the roofs, at windows and along the route. In their grey-green uniforms they had a convincingly severe and coldly resolute air. I had to make an effort to remember that all this was only a mask and yet how many members of the "People's Police", even "political commissars" (known as *politrouks*), had I not seen arriving at the Western reception centres, preferring to escape from the régime which gave them all the privileges?

It seemed to me that the boys kept their cheeks for the sports champions, but many marched, mostly the youngest, rhythmically clapping their hands above their heads, and this appeared to amuse them. On the other hand, many of the boys and girls dodged down side-streets, leaving the photographs of their genius-leaders face-downwards on the ground at the end of their poles, so that the pavements were in the end, strewn with them.

More than a hundred thousand young people ventured thus into the Western sectors of the city; they crammed the *Titaniapalast* Hall to a meeting organised by the Congress for Cultural Freedom, the League to Combat Inhumanity, the Europeans Federalists, etc. Why did

these masses of young people go there in spite of all the intimidations, in spite of all the propaganda which sought to head them off? Curiosity? Spirit of contradiction? Quite simply it was the pangs of hunger, for the youth hostels were distributing hot meals, and this news soon spread from mouth to hungry mouth. The cinemas and theatres gave free seats to the truants, cabarets and exhibitions were held for them. The possibility of relaxation and amusement far from the trumpets, the banners and the fetishes, of unorganised walks, the sight of unknown books in the shop windows, all contributed to attract youth towards the West.

The American radio station RIAS received hundreds of visits a day from young people who wanted to meet their favourite speakers, whose voices on the radio were the most direct link between the non-Communist world and the other—it was thus during the war under another régime—but the spontaneous conversations between Berliners of the West and the young Blue-shirts did more than all the concerted propaganda could have achieved. The spontaneity, the unexpected, the complete freedom of all these discussions was remarkable; the *Kurfürstendamm* and the *Kantstrasse* were like an ancient "polis" in which the citizens debated in the public square

TO PAGE FOUR

Americans Whitewash Franco

Criticism deleted from Senate Report

The United States Senate Foreign Relations Committee has deleted criticism of the Franco régime in a report on European defence and foreign aid published by a sub-committee this month. The section said:

"No one questions that Spain would be a useful ally in the event of a Communist attack in Europe. Yet many people do question whether the acquisition of such an ally is worth the price that would be exacted by way of compromising the moral and spiritual values shared by the free nations of the Atlantic area.

"One of the enigmas that struck the sub-committee as it examined the Spanish situation was that any American assistance to Spain would in fact strengthen General Franco, thereby reducing the likelihood that the Spanish people would regain such freedoms as those of religion, assemblage, and press."

The full committee also deleted a section of the report which linked Yugoslavia with Spain with the assertion that both countries were "governed by dictators". Senator Owen Brewster (Republican), an advocate of aid to Spain, told a reporter that he led the fight for

revision of the Spanish section. The committee left in the report a recommendation for \$200 millions in military aid and \$200 millions in economic aid to Spain.

And the Archbishop who Met the Business Men

The Roman Catholic Archbishop Crushing, of Boston, Massachusetts, who returned from Europe, said: "Spain is the only country in Western Europe with a will to fight. They are ready to go at any time against the Communists and they are good soldiers."

There was considerable opposition to Franco. "Some do not like him personally and some do not like his methods, but they consider him a necessity. The Archbishop said he conferred with Spanish business men and that they told him, 'It's either Franco or chaos.'"

We wonder whether the Archbishop talked to the workers in Spain. When people talk of men "ready to go at any time" to be killed, it generally means that they have been informed of this "willingness" by those who will stay at home and wave flags. And we notice that it was the business men who told him that "it's either Franco or chaos."

STEEL PURGES

CHANGES AT THE TOP

MANY staunch supporters of the left wing (!) of the Labour Party were no doubt very bucked last week at the news that seven directors of a great steel firm had been sacked by party member Steven Hardie, now chairman of the Iron and Steel Corporation.

It was a sign, perhaps they thought, of a clean-up of the old reactionary elements in the steel industry; an indication that Iron and Steel were really to be produced according to socialist principles, and that the old bosses were not to be retained to sabotage the social revolution.

Perhaps that is how they reasoned. (It is rather difficult to fathom accurately how Labour Party rank-and-filers think, except simply on the "lesser-of-two-evils" fallacy.) But if so, it was wishful thinking on their part. The seven sacked directors were on the board of Thos. Firth & John Brown, Ltd., of Sheffield, one of the country's biggest makers of engineering steels, but the reason given by Mr. Hardie was that they had too many outside interests.

Five of the seven were also directors of the Scottish ship-building empire, John Brown & Co. Ltd., of which Thos. Firth & John Brown Ltd., was a subsidiary. Ship-building has not yet been nationalised, and so those directors were on the boards of a nationalised steel producing firm and of a privately controlled steel using firm!

Obviously, the advantages this would give to the ship-builders created an im-

MINERS OBJECT TO ITALIAN WORKERS

THE miners of eighty-seven Yorkshire collieries have objected to Italian miners, already trained under an immigrant scheme, being drafted to join them.

We can have no sympathy with the miners on this issue. If they are afraid of unemployment—and that is rather unlikely now—they should fight the system which creates the fear rather than fellow-workers who were sufferers from it in their own country.

If it is just prejudice against "foreigners", it betrays a smallness of mind and lack of internationalism in outlook which does the Yorkshireman no credit and is by no means traditional among miners.

nationalised industries are being quite generously rewarded in the matter of compensation, the seven Sheffield martyrs will not lose financially—as workers do when they are sacked. And we are sure that for all the lack of opportunity that, the Tories tell us, Socialism brings, they will find scope for their talents (and their capital) elsewhere.

For steel workers on the "lower levels" these changes at the top will make little difference. They will still have to sweat in the glare of the furnace, finding, as the miners and the railmen before them, that nationalisation means no change of status for them. It means simply—changes at the top.

P.S.

SQUATTERS AGAIN

Sixty Families Seize Camp

WITH housebuilding failing even to keep pace with waiting lists, let alone catch up with the arrears, homeless families are once again resorting to direct action to house themselves.

Last week, sixty families occupied a former prisoner-of-war camp near Stafford. An official of the Stafford Rural District Council said that they had no authority from the Ministry of Local Government and Planning to take action against the squatters. The Birmingham Regional Hospital Board which, it is stated, had planned to convert the camp into an emergency hospital declined to say whether any action was contemplated.

At a meeting on August 13th in a hut which the settlers intend to use as a recreation centre, a camp committee was formed. Mr. D. W. Halden, a Post Office driver from Rugeley, the first man to move in, said that the families were determined to stand together and "make a go of the place".

"If we are forced to leave, we shall pitch tents on the roadside," he said. "We have nine expectant mothers here and every wife and mother is behind us all the way."

Barricades at Thornton-le-Moors

Farm Workers Warn Council

IT is often thought that the building of houses for farm workers by local councils puts an end to the evils of the "tied-cottage" system by which a land-worker loses his home when he leaves his job.

That this is not necessarily so is shown by the experience of Mr. Bill Stocker, of Thornton-le-Moors, near Chester. He wears a steel jacket as a result of spinal injuries during the war and was a farm worker until last month when a specialist ordered him to get a lighter job. The Council's "get-out" order followed a few days later. It said his pound a week cottage was intended only for an agricultural worker.

"I explained I was only leaving farm work because I had no alternative. It made no difference with the Council officials," he told Harry Loftus of *Reynold's News*, who continues:—

"It was the signal for Mrs. Newton, farm worker's wife, to mobilise the 150 villagers and to make plans to put up the barricades. She told me: 'The Council's attitude seemed so unjust we

decided they would have to climb over our bodies to get at Bill Stocker's house.'

"On her old bicycle she rode along 150 miles of Cheshire lanes to collect 600 names to a protest petition. Farm labourers were persuaded to hold meetings in harvest fields. They were ready to go on strike throughout Cheshire. It must be the first time in a century they have felt that way," Mrs. Newton said.

"In the Chester R.D.C. offices here there have been anxious conferences about the future of 38-year-old Bill Stocker's lime-washed cottage at Thornton-le-Moors.

"Finally, a Council official told me: 'It has now been decided to suspend service of an eviction order. The matter will be reviewed at the Council's September meeting.'

"In the kitchen of her cottage, six miles away, Mrs. Newton said aggressively: 'If they think they can gain by playing for time they are mistaken.'

"If the Council tries to evict the Stockers next month we will barricade the village against them."

AUTARCHY AT PECKHAM by G. SCOTT WILLIAMSON

MAY I register a protest against the label or libel you have affixed to my name and Peckham? I am not an anarchist, nor do I believe in anarchy—not even the Kropotkin type. I do not find anarchy in Nature. Nature obeys her own Laws as the physicists have demonstrated.

On the other hand, equally I do not believe in "leaders", not even in those persons who have acquired diplomas in Leadership. There is, of course, such a thing, or force, as leadership, but I find from experiment that it is not the attribute, sui generis, of any special type of person. Leadership is, in fact, no respecter of persons and seems to be a function of the environment; that is to say it appears to grow out of genius; nor should it be mistaken for the itch to be first. Both of these, I regard, as symptoms, each of its own fell disease.* The man with the carrot is hardly to be called a "Leader", though he has a following of those whose staple diet is carrots.

Our Experiment in Peckham has demonstrated to us that Man, like his fellow animals, follows or is led, by his instincts. Any pack will spread itself out in accord with the degree of acuity of the instinct of each individual within the pack,

*My staff labelled these two disorders—Leaderism and Leaderitis, the latter being both contagious and infectious.

though all the pack keep their noses to the ground. Man has all the instincts of the animal, but unlike those of the animal, few, if any, are tropistic compulsive instincts. Man has a greater Autonomy. He has the Choice through Will to respond, or not, to the instinct and also, the choice of How to respond to an instinct. It is not that Man has lost his instincts but that instincts, which were once automatic and involuntary, are now become for him autonomic and voluntary.

Pavlov, you may remember, discovered in his "conditioned process" a means of transferring an autonomic willing response into the more primitive automatic will-less reflex.

In the Peckham Experiment we were studying the autonomic responses and the autonomy (freedom) of the unconditioned and spontaneous responses. The foolish concept that autonomy results in anarchy has, I think, been completely disproved by what happened in Peckham where autonomy resolved itself into autarchy—self-government through self-discipline. This is a more complicated and highly intelligent procedure which we have only begun to study in Peckham.

In an atmosphere and environment of complete autonomy we discovered that our member-families, and the members of the family through their associated family,

taught themselves (i.e., autonomously, hence without teachers) to look after their own affairs, both private and public. All the staff were required to do was to dispense knowledge and information

LINGUISTICS: A MATTER OF CHOICE

ANARCHISM, from Greek anarchia (non-rule), a political doctrine standing for the abolition of every organised authority and State machinery, and the creation of a Stateless society instead. The anarchists hold that every form of government, whether a monarchy, a republic, or even a socialist republic, is equally evil and tantamount to tyranny. They want to substitute for it a free association of individuals and groups without any coercive organisation, without armed forces, courts, prisons or written law, merely based on voluntarily respected mutual treaties. Anarchism covers a great variety of currents which may be divided into the individualist and socialist schools as to their ends, and into the peaceful and revolutionary schools as to their means. There is, however, no anarchism advocating anarchy in the sense of dissolution of every social order.

—The Penguin Political Dictionary.

AUTARCHY, from Greek autarchia (self-rule), means economic self-sufficiency, that is the idea that a country should produce at home everything she requires and cease to depend on imports. The drive for autarchy has been most outspoken in Nazi Germany, being based there primarily on military considerations, with a view to making Germany blockade-proof.

—The Penguin Political Dictionary.

Readers should decide for themselves which of these definitions is most appropriately applied to those aspects of the Peckham experiment which were illustrated in our issue of 11/8/51.

movement, but Money-Kyrle's book gives yet one more warning to those who advocate a free society of the pre-eminent importance of removing, or at least understanding, the emotive factors in their own thinking. The anarchist for whom a dictator is an "evil father-figure" has no moral and little political claim to superiority over the fascist whose ambivalence expresses itself differently. The need is for adjusted observers and individuals themselves psychologically "free", who can comprehend and intervene without guilt and without unconscious motivation. That is a hard saying, but worthy of acceptance. To the psychiatrist, Freedom, the Daily Mail and the Daily Worker too often speak in dialects of the same psychological tongue. It is with this in mind, rather than a one-sided emphasis on the lessons of psychiatry in condemning our opponents, that we should read Money-Kyrle's extremely well-thought-out book.

AN EYE-OPENER

THE new exhibition at the Whitechapel Art Gallery isn't instructive, elevating or improving. It is, in the words of its instigator, Miss Barbara Jones, "a collection of the most beautiful, charming and amusing things people have made for their own and others pleasure".

For Black Eyes and Lemonade is an exhibition of British popular and traditional art, the unsophisticated art "before which most art lovers quail in alarm," but which sanctified by time become first quaint, then charming, and ultimately good.

Here, in a show as bright as a fair-ground, are ships' figureheads, canal-boat furniture, horse-brasses and rosettes (including a false tail worn by horses in funeral processions if their own tails are inadequate), children's toys, model animals, china figures, pictures in wool, seashells and sand, decorated loaves, butter moulds and agricultural instruments, valentines, fireworks, fairground engines, circus and theatre posters, toy theatres, beer-handles, seaside souvenirs, and a pavement picture drawn on the floor by Mr. George McErnean, pavement artist of Great Russell Street.

Miss Jones warns us against drawing bogus sociological implications from the objects displayed at the exhibition so we will not do so, but will merely recommend it as a delight to the eye and a stimulus for the imagination.

"Black Eye and Lemonade" is open at the Whitechapel Art Gallery (by Aldgate East Station), until October 6th. Daily 11-6, Sundays 2-6, closed Mondays. Admission free.

on request. First, the members sought knowledge from other fellow members; when that failed they then turned to the staff. It must be recalled that in a mixed community the amount of special knowledge available is astounding; it cost nothing and it is always pleasant to have something to give away. In our consulting rooms, unlike doctors to "patients", we gave no advice—a technique which needs long and watchful practise. We find advice, in fact, a dangerous drug to those who are not "patients"—a drug idiosyncratically lethal and hence without a posology.

Knowledge and information being available for the taking, we discovered that the man in the street and the woman in the home did not need advice as to how to use them: they taught themselves by experiment. It is after all only by "experiment" that "experience" can become one's own and carry one's fingerprints—the mark of its own genesis. Indeed, we discovered that secondhand experience is a hypnotic paralysing anaesthetic.

It is comforting to know (from our experience in Peckham) that 60% of the members of the families are perfectly capable of managing their own affairs—both private and public. Furthermore, and this is of the utmost importance, the 40%

who were not so capable of managing their own affairs—were all of them patients or potential patients, who should be in the General Practitioner's care. These were the people who lagged behind and so fell into the sphere of the shepherd following behind the people with his crook and his dog. Of these 40%, half could be cured of their pathological conditions and they then returned with avidity to the management of their own affairs.

Without teachers to tell them what they were allowed to do and without policemen to tell them what not to do, the members of the Peckham Health Centre established an ordered working autarchy by following their own instincts.

Any organisation, such as Peckham, which seeks to find out by experiment if people have capacity to look after their affairs—private or public—is unusual and can hardly be in favour. Indeed, it can only be a thorn in the flesh of Authority whose practise is firmly based, willingly or unwillingly, on the scientific work of Pavlov, reducing all action to the primitive level of the automatic conditioned reflex. The hysteria and neurosis which is prone to arise out of such a procedure, even in Pavlov's domain, it is convenient to ignore.

(Editorial Comment: see page 3)

The Extent of Sexual Abnormality in Society

IN an article in the last issue of Freedom on child murders, it was suggested that not merely were such acts psychopathological but that the attitude of society towards them was also abnormal. Abnormal in its superficiality, and in the scarcely concealed fascination, amounting almost to gloating, with which accounts of such murders are devoured.

It is not difficult to see that child murders and violation are a manifestation of sadism. And after half a century of study of sexual abnormalities the proposition that sadism is not simply cruelty but contains a distorted sexual element (to put it no more strongly) is almost self-evident. That the fascination of such abnormalities for so large a proportion of the newspaper-reading public—even the most apparently respectable—represents a vicarious satisfaction of repressed sadistic impulses in the readers is a reasonable deduction. And if one looks dispassionately at people when they are discussing these matters all doubts will be dispelled. Often they are abnormally bland about it; or they are altogether too avid, and the emotion they show is partly suppressed as though (as is indeed the case) it contained a guilty element. A normal response to tragedy is quite rare.

Perhaps it may be thought that too much is being made of the public response to events which are not only abnormal and extraordinary, but also very infrequent, for all the publicity they receive. But as we have suggested in the last issue, the same non-adult response is also seen in regard to the enormous and overwhelming tragedy of war in general, or of its particular enormities as at Hiroshima and Nagasaki. This point of war could be insisted on in detail, and extended to include wars in which the English public were not directly involved, such as the Sino-Japanese War or the Spanish Civil War. The same indifference-fascination was apparent in the case of Nazi anti-Semitic enormities.

But, coming once again nearer home, the interest in cases of cruelty to children also presents an abnormal face, and once again the reality of vicarious satisfaction of repressed sadistic impulses becomes apparent.

Genesis of Sadism

Now sadism is recognised as a deviation from normal sexual development. What we see to-day in these instances of abnormal public response to open sadism, is the extent of this deviation in a repressed form. The mass gloating, once it is recognised as such, is an appalling vista of the extent of the diversion of sexual impulses from their normal development. It means, in short, that sexual normality is unusual, and that abnormality is the rule.

This conclusion is so extraordinary and carries such far-reaching implications that it would require the most sceptical examination but for the fact that a similar conclusion is reached from quite different approaches. For example, it is common knowledge that most marriages

are failures and that they do not bring sexual fulfilment. Then there is the fact that Freud's view that the neuroses are due to disturbances of the sexual impulse (in the broader sense in which he used it), though frequently attacked, has never been successfully overturned, and still retains its force. Major neuroses are fairly common, but in recent years the widespread extent of minor neurotic disorder has been increasingly recognised so that doctors estimate that between 50 and 80 per cent. of the patients who come to them are suffering from neurotic illness.

Finally, a specific search for sexual disturbances in individuals quickly reveals the appalling extent of sexual misery.

This, then, provides additional backing for the conclusion that the preventing of child murders (to say nothing of the other disasters which provide vicarious sadistic satisfaction to millions of people) involves a re-orientation of the sexual attitudes of society. It provides additional grim clothing to the bare observation, so often made for so many years, that whereas men and women come to sexual maturity around puberty, sexual gratification is socially vetoed till many years later. The limitations which are then placed upon it, and the weight of sedulously inculcated guilt feelings which it is then made to bear, make our general conclusion regarding sexual frustration not merely no longer seem extraordinary but actually inevitable.

The Normal Development of Children's Sexuality

But social prohibitions on sexual activity do not begin at puberty. The anti-sexual attitude of our society presses heavily on its members from the day of their birth. Infants from their earliest years are taught to be ashamed of their genitals, that it is dirty to touch them and that to derive pleasure from them is immoral and perverse and may be followed by disasters of a fairy tale hideousness. A natural free and innocent delight in sex is regarded with more horror and cruelty than the lubricous smuttiness of the lavatory joke attitude to sex. Indeed, to most adults, the latter is regarded as normal though perhaps unmentionable.

The problem is stated thus, because to tackle it requires a sex affirmative attitude to infant sexuality. How such an attitude is achieved in certain parts of the world will be the subject of an article in a succeeding issue of Freedom. J.H.

SIGN OF THE TIMES

An attractive Bungalow Residence, with southern aspect, situated on main road and being within a few hundred yards' walk of the sea front, this unusual property with a unique construction of timber and genuine French Pullman railway coaches.

Price for Freehold, contents, and additional half an acre, £5,500.

—Advertisement in The Times, 18/8/51.

PSYCHOANALYSIS & POLITICS

PSYCHOANALYSIS AND POLITICS. R. E. Money-Kyrle. (Duckworth, Social Science Studies, 9s.)

THE author of this book carries out two important pieces of work remarkably well. He gives a clear statement of the means by which socially orientated sciences such as psychology can, in practice, lay down the ethical implications of "health" without recourse to mystical concepts of Good, and he demonstrates the importance of psychological ideas of motivation, especially those drawn from psychoanalysis, on political thought.

The excerpts already published give an idea of the general quality of the work. Its ideological basis is close to democratic liberalism, and many of its assumptions could and will be questioned. Psychoanalysts often show as great a tendency to underrate historical-political forces as political agitators do to overlook psychology. The decline of the public willingness to engage in "crusades" against aggression between 1914 and 1930, instanced by the author, was surely as much the result of the knowledge that such willingness had been abused by authority as of any less-obvious forces. For anarchist readers who differ from Money-Kyrle's estimate of the State, the most important idea to emerge from the book is not the prevalence of irrational forces leading to authority and obedience, which anarchists accepted before their existence was proven, but the far wider critique of the revolutionary approach which is now implicit in psychological and anthropological studies. Money-Kyrle nowhere states explicitly the exact significance of the "struggle image" (i.e., the tendency to visualise a social or personal problem in terms of struggle, battle, conflict and so on) which still hag-rides all revolutionary thought, Right and Left, but his book, like much other research and comment on the same subject makes it abundantly clear how extremely limited is the field of human activity in which such imagery is of positive value; the seeing of preventive medicine, for instance, or of flood prevention in terms of "struggle" is a valid incentive-mechanism: similar "struggles" against capitalism, communism and so forth become increasingly orientated towards mere emotional projection in proportion as they cease to be analogies and approach reality. Modern Russia is the culture which has made the widest general use of the struggle-image in its thinking, and well illustrates both the advantages and the dangers of such a concept—certain incentive-advantages wherever the attempt is made to direct the "struggle" against nature, and disadvantages, in the inculcation of paranoid or over-rigid attitudes, spymania, and intolerance where the "struggle" image has been too widely incorporated in society. Analogous patterns can be made out in America, where the "struggle" is based in practice upon unlimited status-seeking competition between indi-

viduals, without the common-purpose element inherent in Marxism, but with a rather higher possibility of reaching individual insight, since the conflicts which put the sting and the hatred into the process, converting "endeavour" into "struggle against", are less-solidly projected. (In the "struggle against" Communism exemplified in modern American policy, the projection is, in fact, becoming more rigid, and the insight harder to obtain.) Anarchism, as the first political ideology to recognise the unreality of the Darwinian "struggle for existence", has a large brief to fill in developing techniques of change based on the therapeutic use of common intent.

The problem of "revolutionary" (i.e., purposively therapeutic) action is to achieve the balance between this type of projection, equally common in the writings of anarchists and their opponents, and its obverse, more fully described by Money-Kyrle, the "denial of the real malignity" of a human opponent, leading to a "pacifism incapable of defending itself or its friends". Few examples of such successful resolution are to hand in political history (the Quakers are one of the few known to this reviewer). The cardinal point is that the social therapist ("reformer", "revolutionary") while recognising real tensions and real conflicts of interest and culture pattern ("class struggle") and their possible consequences in violence or irrational thought-patterns, must himself be free from the personal and cultural maladjustments which introduce the fear and hatred components into economic and social conflicts, or (more practically) must be aware of them and capable of compensating for them.

Money-Kyrle's book is of such scope that each of the problems it raises in outline could be discussed in a full-length essay. The analyst does not, in our view, himself attain the necessary scope of insight (he does not free himself entirely from conditioned ideas drawn from his political system, liberal-democracy) but he contrives to be both sane and intensely stimulating on almost every subject he discusses. On the therapeutic uses of psychiatry in international and group conflicts he is perhaps rather too pessimistic. While the spread of scientific ideas of political motivation as widely and as quickly as possible is certainly the most important measure to reduce the risk of war and improve the chance of a free or freer society, little has yet been attempted by individuals possessing the requisite training in the way of direct intervention in international conflicts. The present largely psychopathic conflict of power groups provides an important opportunity for experiments in this field, which calls for considerable sociological experience, the explicit rejection of both force and personal power, and a complete absence of emotive hatred or fear, or of emotive attraction, towards any of the conflicting cultures. Such intervention cannot be given the properties of a mass-

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

Vol. 12, No. 26 August 25, 1951

ANARCHISM AND THE MODERN PIONEERS

IN this issue we print Dr. Scott Williamson's very lucid and expressive protest against our claim—by no means, we think, a libel!—that the great experiment at Peckham is closely related to anarchist thought and philosophy. In making his protest, however, Dr. Scott Williamson shows even more clearly how closely in sympathy he is, however unwillingly, with the accumulated ideas of the anarchist movement.

When a good friend to anarchist expresses discomfort at being identified with anarchism we should be well to ask ourselves the reason, especially so as Dr. Scott Williamson is not alone in desiring to obtain aloofness in this respect. Others concerned with the work-out of new concepts involving human projects requiring organisation and practical day to day measures are usually anxious to avoid identification with any kind of politics. This is true also of Neill and his work at Summerhill and of Wilhelm Reich in the United States. There may have been a time when it was not thought honourable or disadvantageous to ally oneself with progressive political groups. But to-day, even politics had not acquired a smell that penetrates the most insensitive nostrils, the hardening of the party line and that destructive concept, "party discipline", make it most unwise to allow ones ideas to be checked around and soiled in that clean arena. Support for broad human concepts should cut across party barriers. Perhaps more important still, it should claim adherents outside the realms of politics altogether.

Anarchists may ask, in surprise, what has all that do with the unwillingness of these pioneers to associate themselves openly with our ideas? There can be no doubt that this unwillingness arises in part from the fact that, for them, anarchism is a political concept. They may be repelled by Toryism, disgusted with political liberalism and Labour, and—too often—disillusioned by Communism; but that does not make them turn gladly to anarchism. Rather do they adopt a "once bitten, twice shy" attitude.

At this point it is well to consider ourselves. Are our movement and our ideas in fact as free from the political outlook as we would wish? How many anarchists, how many syndicalists nourish half avowed desires for a "mass following" which has little enough to do with the "creative capacity of the people" of Kropotkin, the self-activity of Malatesta, or (if we may risk a repetition of our offence) the "autarchy—self-government through self-discipline" of Scott-Williamson?

It has been said that anarchism is based on the idea of struggle, and struggle for the extinction of social ills is certainly a day to day activity for anarchists, as is also the struggle for better working conditions and better wages. But to be effective and fruitful that struggle must be informed by the best and most progressive human outlook. At its best anarchism absorbs and takes to itself the ideas worked out by the pioneers in other fields. At its worst it is little better than tub-thumping and irresponsibility, justifying the popular misconceptions of anarchy as denoting wildness and an unregarding indiscipline. If this were the general level of anarchism—which, it is not—aloofness would be understandable and advisable.

Pioneers are right to sheer away from politics. But they should be hard-headed about it and should

THE UNESCO Statement by Experts on Race Problems, summarised in the article *Mankind is One (Freedom, 19/8/50)* is being followed by a series of pamphlets on *The Race Question in Modern Science* of which this important statement by the Professor of Psychology at Columbia University is the first.* Dr. Klineberg begins by commenting on the belief, widely and stubbornly held, that some races and peoples are inferior, and that they therefore do not have the same "rights" as others. "Even scientists," he says, "have in some cases attempted to support the argument in favour of a racial hierarchy. It is a curious, although perhaps understandable fact, however, that those scientists who have expressed themselves in this manner, have usually arrived at the conclusion that their own people are superior to all others."

In an attempt to find a more objective method of settling the question of superior and inferior races, psychological tests have been devised, but Dr. Klineberg emphasises the caution that should be observed in interpreting the results of these tests since, "living under different conditions, dissimilar in culture, education and point of view, such groups may differ widely in the test results not because they have an unequal heredity but because they have an unequal social environment."

He quotes some very interesting examples to illustrate this. An investigator was testing children in an isolated mountain region of Kentucky. He asked the question, "If you went to the store and bought six cents worth of candy and gave the clerk 10 cents, what change would you receive?" One boy replied, "I never had 10 cents and if I had I wouldn't spend it for candy, and anyway candy is what your mother makes." The examiner tried again: "If you had taken 10 cows to pasture for your father and six of them strayed away, how many would you have left to drive home?" The boy answered, "We don't have 10 cows, but if we did and I lost 6, I wouldn't dare go home." The examiner made a final attempt: "If there were 10 children in a school and 6 of them went out with measles, how many would

*RACE & PSYCHOLOGY, by Otto Klineberg. (U.N.E.S.C.O., 1/6)

THE EQUALITY OF MAN

there be in school? The answer came promptly, "None, because the rest would be afraid of catching it, too."

Tests were being applied to a group of Australian aborigines, the problem consisting of tracing a pathway through a maze until the exit was successfully reached. "Each subject was, of course, expected to perform the task by himself, without any assistance from others," but these Australian natives are accustomed to solving their problems together in groups. "Not only is every problem in tribal life debated and settled by the council of elders but it is always discussed until a unanimous decision is reached." They were puzzled by the fact that the examiner would give them no assistance in solving the problem, especially one group who had recently made the psychologist a "blood brother" of their tribe.

Doctor Klineberg noted "a similar indifference to the kind of competition taken for granted in our own society" in his own investigation among the Yakima Indians of the west coast of the United States. The tests used consisted of placing pieces of wood of various shapes into the approximate areas of a wooden frame. The scores obtained depend on the speed with which the task is completed and the number of errors made. The subjects are told to put the pieces in their correct places "as quickly as possible". But, he says, "these Indian children never hurried. They saw no reason to work quickly. Our culture places a premium on speed, on getting things done in as short a time as possible; the Indian children had not acquired this attitude. They went at their task slowly and deliberately, with none of that scrambling impatience that is so often found among American children. The Indians, as a consequence, took much longer to finish the tests, though they made somewhat fewer errors than the White Americans with whom they were compared."

Among the Sioux Indians in South Dakota he found that "it is regarded as incorrect to answer a question in the presence of others who do not know the answer: this might be interpreted as

showing off, or as bringing shame to others, and is consequently condemned by the whole group. These Indian children also have developed the conviction that it is wrong to reply to a question unless one is absolutely certain of the answer." Thus they never guess at the answer, and if they are not sure, they keep quiet. Consequently, their test scores are reduced.

Prof. S. E. Asch noted that the Hopi Indian children of Arizona refuse to compete against one another. "One school teacher tried to get them to do so by an ingenious method. She wrote a number of arithmetic problems on the blackboard, lined up the children, each one facing one problem, and instructed them to turn around as soon as they had finished. She observed that as each child completed his problem he looked along the line to see how the others were progressing; only when they were all through did they turn around, together." Miss Margaret Mead, the anthropologist, was administering the "Ball-and-Field" problem to children in Samoa: A ball is lost in a circular field, and the task of the problem is to trace a pathway along which he would walk in order to find the ball. These Samoan children, instead of tracing the most efficient pathway, used the occasion to make a pretty design. Their aesthetic interest was evidently stronger than their desire to solve the problem presented to them.

These diverting examples illustrate how success in psychological tests of "intelligence" depends upon the "cultural background" of the subject. (The word *culture* in the anthropological sense was defined by Dr. M. Read at the British Association as "patterns of behaviour, methods of earning a living, forms of law and government, kinship and family structures, modes of thought and the value-attitude system inherent in any people's way of living.")

A number of illustrations are cited by Dr. Klineberg to show how different educational and economic opportunities and instances tests made of over a million American Army recruits. "The results showed in the first place that

Negroes from the south (where educational handicaps were greater) obtained scores which on the average were definitely inferior to those of Negroes from the north (where such handicaps, though they existed, were much less severe). Even more strikingly, the Negroes from some of the northern states turned out to be superior to the whites from some of the southern states!" The author comments: "It began to appear, at least to some psychologists, as if the colour of the skin were less important in determining success with the tests, than the opportunities given to the individual to acquire the needed abilities."

The section on *Physique and Mentality* discusses the widespread popular beliefs, that, for example, a high forehead indicates superior intelligence, a receding chin means weakness and lack of determination, thick lips denote sensuality, and so on, and concludes that, "There has so far been no scientifically acceptable demonstration of a relationship between anatomical features and traits of personality."

Considering these beliefs from their racial aspect, Dr. Klineberg says, "We are justified in concluding that the anatomical or structural differences between racial groups are not necessarily accompanied by corresponding psychological differences." On the question of comparison of ethnic groups in terms of the frequency of men of "genius" among them, he points out that "One cannot expect a Beethoven to emerge suddenly in the Fiji Islands without the background of European music which serves as his heritage, or an Einstein to develop a theory of relativity in Nigeria without a knowledge of what his predecessors in physics have discovered. In terms of their own cultural background, there have undoubtedly been inventors, innovators, 'men of genius', in all societies."

He mentions the case of a Negro girl who, at the age of nine, was found to have an "Intelligence Quotient" of 200—a result reached by very few children anywhere in the world.

The crushing of the intelligence of children by their environment as they grow up has been revealed by a number of investigators. "As children—white or Negro—grow up in an inferior educational and social environment, their relative mental level (as compared with other children of the same age) tends very definitely to drop."

[An interesting comment on this phenomenon was made by Dr. J. Maxwell of Edinburgh at the British Association Conference who said that "the average intelligence of children dropped as social conditions in home life became worse. But there was a considerable number of very intelligent children living in the poorest social conditions, and a relatively large number of dull children came from homes where good conditions prevailed.]

The racial question which arouses most passion is that of race mixture and here Dr. Klineberg's conclusion is that: "The effects of race mixture are neither good nor bad in themselves; they depend on the quality of the individuals who have entered into the mixture, and on the manner in which the hybrid is accepted or treated by the community as a whole. This last point becomes clear if we contrast the descriptions given of Chinese-white crosses in Shanghai and Hawaii, the former are described as maladjusted unfortunate individuals who are found mainly in the less savoury occupations of the city; the latter are spoken of as achieving a healthy integration with every aspect of life in Hawaii. It is clearly the attitude toward the hybrids, not any special hybrid biology, which determines their place in the community."

The final words of this very valuable and illuminating pamphlet are: *The scientist knows no relation between race and psychology.*

Nobody Missed the Government

We reprint from the New York Times (6/8/51) a report from its Damascus correspondent on the recent strike of civil servants. It reads almost like a parody. Whether it shows "how superficial in many ways modern state institutions are" in that part of the world only, as the N.Y.T.'s correspondent suggests, or whether one could use it to illustrate similar examples in other parts of the world (e.g., in France, where governments come and go, and are even non-existent for considerable periods) we leave to the reader to judge.

SYRIA emerged partially to-day from a period of harmless and orderly anarchy that would have delighted the theoretical anarchist.

The civil servants, who had been on strike for a week, agreed to come back to work for ten days after the Civil Servants Central Committee had received a promise that a parliamentary financial committee would study their demands.

Their demands had not been receiving any attention because Parliament had been in effect on strike against the Cabinet, which resigned at the beginning of last week without bothering to put it in writing, just as Parliament did not bother with legislation.

Several Ministers had previously ceased to carry out their functions. The Minister of National Economy had not been in his office for five weeks. The Minister of Public Health had resigned. Others had drifted away. The Premier had taken to spending most of his time at his house outside Damascus. The strike of the civil servants had made it unanimous.

As of to-night Kaled el-Hzam's Cabinet was still half in and half out of office, carrying on a few routine duties in desultory fashion. It was generally understood that the elder statesman, Faris el-Khourri, had more or less accepted a bid to try and form a new Cabinet now that the civil servants' strike had been temporarily disposed of.

avoid the illusion that government may be good however contemptible the statesmen and the politicians. If they do not, they may find themselves and their ideas, willy-nilly, the tool of party manoeuvres.

The pioneers of Peckham are immune at least from that, for the findings of their experiment, as Dr. Scott Williamson shows, tell unequivocally against "leaders" and direction from above.

He was expected to start his negotiations to-morrow, but no one was quite sure.

Mail Was Not Delivered

Outside of the fact that mail was not delivered, no one seemed particularly disturbed by the strike of the civil servants. Officials were, it is said, a little astonished to discover themselves how unimportant they were.

Local bodies in the municipalities had kept on, as they were not a part of the civil service. Few people noticed that the entire administrative system of the republic, together with the Government, had been out of action.

What the situation amounted to was a demonstration how superficial in many ways modern state institutions are in this part of the world. The age-old society that had carried on through wars and catastrophes simply went along as usual.

The whole situation was unusual. The Cabinet, which had died of anemia rather than had officially resigned, had never had the following of a majority in Parliament. Its one vote of confidence was secured when the single large party in Parliament, the People's party, had agreed to withdraw half its Deputies so that a majority could be obtained.

Three years ago, the Army had taken action on its own and at that time sent the President into exile. The decision

of the civil servants to take action on its own was along the same general line. There had been bitter protests in Parliament that contrary to the stipulations of the new Constitution, which provides for land reform, the large landowners had been simply moving into all available land to raise cotton because of the present cotton boom in Syria.

The People's Party, whose ideal is parliamentary government as a real basis of the nations life, deplores incessantly in its press what it calls "veiled government". This is a reference to the powerful families, merchant groups and large landed interests that rule in their own way. It is a reference also to the situation that persisted ever since the events of three years ago, resulting in the existence of a passive veto right, which is one of the instruments of the state over the policies of government.

The events of the last week have shown up more clearly than before that the constitutional republic, with its nice modern institutions, was a sort of topcoat that could be laid aside at least for a while with no particular harm to anyone.

There was a second system of control and authority in Syrian society, which, it still appeared, was the real one. It was real Government, which in the parlance of the People's Party protests that republican institutions are merely veiled.

GOD AND THE SWEDES

FOR a hundred and forty-two years, a law has been in force in Sweden ordering every Swedish citizen to belong from birth to the Evangelical Church recognised by the State. One can, to be sure, leave this State church, but only on the condition of adhering to another officially recognised religious community. There are naturally, in Sweden, people who do not wish to take part in any religious activity, but, as a matter of form, they are considered to be members either of the Evangelical Church, the Roman Catholic Church or the Jewish faith, and are obliged to pay to these churches the religious tax imposed by the State.

This old law also contains certain rigid requirements. The king, the members of the government and the teaching profession must belong to the State church and profess "the pure evangelical faith." When a foreigner has been called in to occupy a university post, he too, has had to declare himself to be an evangelical Lutheran.

The law resulted in considerable difficulties for Hjalmar Branting, the best-known figure in modern Swedish history, when for the first time, in 1917, he was led in to the government. The conservative opposition insisted that Branting, having left the State church in his youth, was not qualified to exercise the

functions of a minister. An exhaustive enquiry showed, however, that Branting having "omitted to join another church" and remained therefore an evangelical Lutheran, was thus permitted to take part in the government.

Sweden, "the most democratic country in Europe" has at last freed itself from this tom-foolery. According to a new law passed in May this year, each citizen when he becomes of age has now the right to opt for the religion of his choice, and even to declare himself without one. At the same time, the Catholics will have the right to found monasteries (which have been prohibited until now) and—unprecedented innovation!—even Moslems will be able to become university professors.

It is characteristic of Swedish democracy that at the time of the parliamentary debates on the new religious law, no deputy was tied in his vote to a party line. The Stockholm paper *Afton Tidningen* writes of this in its leading article, "In all the parties, there are Lutherans, Catholics, and atheists. But we do not mix with the political things belonging to Caesar, those things which belong to God."

There are even, in Sweden, some anarchists who manage to get along without God or Caesar . . . A.P.

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

- Race & Psychology Otto Klineberg 1/6
- The Roots of Prejudice Arnold Rose 1/6
- Two important pamphlets in the UNESCO series on "The Race Question in Modern Science".
- Let's Join the Human Race Stringfellow Barr 9d.
- The Bureau of Current Affairs has issued this reprint of a widely-discussed American pamphlet.
- Social Surveys & Social Action Mark Abrams 8/6
- What is the use of social surveys?
- Dictionary of Philosophy ed. D. D. Runes 35/-
- A comprehensive reference book.
- The Canterbury Tales Geoffrey Chaucer 3/6
- This translation into modern English by Nevill Goghill has been broadcast in part. Here it is as a Penguin Classic.

... Obtainable from 27 red lion st. london, W.C.1

Some Sailors Do Care

TO most of us landlubbers, sailors are a race apart. Quite a romantic race, too, since, for want of first-hand experience, we are forced to rely for our knowledge of the sailor's lot on the occasional Hollywood epic, wherein magnificent specimens of manhood knock hell out of each other on a yardarm in a struggle for bullion or a blonde.

It is a little disillusioning, therefore, to learn that real-life seamen, far from being careless of life and limb, make no attempt to match the angry ocean with their temperament, but are concerned with mundane things like working conditions!

Mind you, we had suspected that the fo'castle did not exactly coincide with our own ideas of the comfortable life, and had once or twice wondered whether the slogan "Sailors Don't Care" had been originated by capitalistic shipowners to excuse primitive conditions on board.

At least one sailor we knew, however, did care. And on one trip shipping cattle, he made it his job to tour the ship slinging out of portholes the Wild West and Crime novels that were the cowboys' main literary diet, replacing them with I.W.W. propaganda booklets. His story would always stop at that point, leaving us to guess the reaction of the yarn-hungry cowpunchers.

Not quite so direct in approach, but still disproving the sailors-don't-care story, is the statement recently made by Mr. Tom Yates, general-secretary of the National Union of Seamen, at the Union's annual meeting in London.

He demanded that the shipping companies embark upon a programme of modernisation and building of new ships, but his approach seemed to be based as much on concern for the economic running of merchant fleets as for the working conditions of the sailors themselves.

Mr. Yates welcomed the formation of the Ship Mortgage Finance Company and said that shipowners should be helped with regard to replacement and modernisation in the form of tax relief and subsidy.

This concern for the interests of the owners is by no means new on the part of union officials. But it is still a little puzzling to see just why taxpayers should help private shipowners replace obsolete

tonnage from which, we may be sure, they have already wrung every possible ounce of profit.

But the National Seamen's Union boasts of the fact that it has a record of industrial relations without equal. The Shipping Federation (employers) and the National Maritime Board (the State) find in the N.S.U. a body only too eager to collaborate—which, we suspect, has a lot to do with the unsatisfactory conditions on board so many ships.

The Shipowners have been agitating for two years for a revision of taxation in their direction. Pleading that in our island home shipping is a special case, they show figures of the value in export trade of our ship-building industry as well as the "invisible" exports represented by the work of our merchant fleet.

In the last Budget, last April, a 40 per cent. depreciation allowance was discontinued, and this, say the owners, together with the rising costs, makes the ordinary wear and tear allowance completely inadequate for replacing obsolete tonnage.

But all this is only one side of the picture. Although undoubtedly costs have

risen considerably, so have charges. Capitalists in all industries are always—according to their own arguments—living on their losses, and it is astonishing to see how profitable these difficult times can be.

For it is not as though the shipping lines are hard-up. Far from it. From the *Portworkers' Clarion* for July we learn that shipping companies are declaring bigger and better dividends than ever before. For example: The Coast Lines group profits are up by £34,000 to £1,109,000; Clan Line are able to pay a total dividend of 30 per cent. for 1950; the Ropner group's profits doubled from £150,000 to £326,000—and so on.

The means to improve conditions in the docks and on the ships are there, all right. But when the shipowners decide to do something about it, it will not be for philanthropic motives but because it is "uneconomic" to continue working with obsolete equipment.

We suggest that the dockers and the seamen co-operate to find ways and means of accelerating the process. It shouldn't be difficult.

P.S.

ON THE RIVER

THE Festival of Britain and the special arrangements deemed necessary to cope with increased traffic on the River Thames have upset many usual practices, and give us examples of the way centralised planning over-rides the rights of individuals.

The recent strike of watermen was due to such planning. The London County Council passed a bye-law this year specially covering passenger-carrying craft on the Thames, and a pool was created to organise all the available craft to deal with visitors to the South Bank, Battersea, and sight-seeing up and down the river.

To the planners in County Hall, a boat is a boat, and if it carries a certain number of passengers, it can be used for any trip. Unfortunately, this ignores the fact that boats are built for specific purposes, and are not necessarily suitable for any other job.

The strike arose because boats which had been built and used for short river trips—say from Tower Bridge to Westminster or Chelsea—were put on much longer runs—as from Greenwich to Hammersmith—and were not equipped

with the lavatory accommodation necessary for long trips. A simple fact, but one of considerable importance to both the crew and passengers, although easily overlooked by officials who do not work on the boats themselves.

However, thanks to the crews' strike, the boats are now put back on to the short trips for which they were originally built and used.

The L.C.C. bye-law also attempted to freeze out small craft from the public piers. The special pool arrangements for Festival year aimed at preventing any craft carrying less than 70 passengers from picking up or setting down at piers and landing stages. But the Freemen of the river—the craftsmen watermen—are entitled by ancient right to use any public landing place, and three of them are challenging the bye-law by insisting on their right to ply for hire on publicly-owned piers and forcing the authorities to summons them and make a test case.

So many of our freedoms were whittled away from us by obscure bye-laws and regulations that it is heartening to hear of resistance being made in this case.

SUNDAY IN BERLIN

FROM PAGE ONE

the important questions of government.

I met a group of these young people in the house of a friend where they had come to talk of the problems with which they were preoccupied; "Must Communism wear this mask of oppression and servility? Is there no place for a more noble communism?" They had noticed that the old militants, animated by faith in an ideal, were, without exception, the most disillusioned and also the most threatened. "What must we do to avoid, in our turn, the power of lies, the propaganda which among the youngest has more success than one would like to believe?" "Shall we ever once again know a free world, without terror, without shame, without concentration camps?"

How much would I have wished that some of the eminent writers, thinkers and pedagogues from the West who have urged youth to take part in this festival could themselves have watched the procession in honour of the great Stalin, and then the talks at which I was present and which must have been repeated many thousands of times amongst others. For my part, I have drawn the lesson from it that the eighteen-year-olds who have known nothing but two dictatorial régimes can be animated by a sense of the truth and of liberty unknown to the great intellectual guides of the west. In the Thomas Manns and Hermann Hesses, for instance (to quote only those from German literature), this sense is lacking to such an extent that we have recently seen these writers send cordial greetings to the jailers of German youth, consolidating the prestige of a régime in which they themselves could neither create nor breathe. The spirit breathes where it will . . .

But it did not breathe upon this Festival, the parade of cardboard ikon bearers and sloganising loudspeakers. I was, moreover, surprised by this. The German Communist Youth parade last Whitsun had been incomparably more enthusiastic. Instead of keeping them away from the Western sectors, their leaders had on the contrary proudly marched them there. Why did a meeting of young people of all races, from all the continents, under the banners of friendship, of sport and of peace—the three officially-announced aims—even while basing itself upon misconceptions, fail to create a similar exaltation? This semi-fiasco cannot be placed to the credit of the West, for the vexations, confiscation of passports, closing of the frontier—and other police measures were both

anti-liberal and ineffective. Our young people should on the contrary have been encouraged as much as possible to go to the Festival of Berlin and mix with the youth of the other half of the world, who themselves had an exceptional opportunity of making contact with their brothers from the West. They should not have allowed this contact to be limited to discussions between delegations selected by the Communist Party. That the organisers of the Festival, for their part, took care to isolate as far as possible the delegations of the People's Democracies, from those of the West; that they should have discouraged all free contact between young people of different nationalities; that they should have made even more difficult than usual, access to West Berlin—all this was "normal", and came within the logic of a system which fears like the plague, all that is unforeseeable and not capable of organisation; but that to their Iron Curtain they should have opposed, not liberty, principle force of the West, but police cordons—that is humiliating.*

At least the City of Berlin is to be congratulated on not falling into the aberrations of the Bonn government which could only think of excluding the young Communists and Blue-shirts by decree, for otherwise, instead of welcoming these young people in a fraternal manner, West Berlin would have had them arrested by its *Schupos*. It is for this reason that the semi-failure which, according to all objective witnesses, the festival to the glory of Stalin proved to be, cannot be held without reserve to be a moral victory of the free world. One of the young Communists with whom I spoke in Berlin, asked me: "Do you not feel that a United Europe, outside the old chauvinisms and absurd boundaries dividing free men among themselves, would be your salvation—and ours?" Before a youth in which the best elements put seriously such considered questions, our answers must be on the same level.

FRANCOIS BONDY.

*Our view on what could be expected from the governments of the West was given in our last issue; from a reading of which it will be clear that we do not share our correspondent's surprise at their bungling of what he thought was an ideal opportunity for showing that the West stands for liberty. No government believes in liberty for the governed. The sooner this is realised by such obviously sincere people as our correspondent, the less will they be surprised and disappointed by the anti-democratic behaviour of the "democracies".—Eos.

Is Capitalism Inhuman?

MR. TEMPLE, in his letter ("What is Capitalism," *Freedom*, 18/8/51), attributes to me the view that "the evils of capitalism come from the fact that capitalist economy is operated by bad men." By Mr. Temple's curious logic, this has arisen because I explained that my reference to an "inhuman system" was "a reflection on the people who operated it." I should have thought that Mr. Temple, who is well acquainted with anarchist ideas would have taken it for granted without my having to state it, that Capitalism is an evil system by definition. But since Mr. Temple is obviously so concerned with making a distinction between capitalism and capitalists, I am not surprised that he misinterprets my remarks. Mr. Temple writes: "The Capitalist class has not produced capitalism. You could not talk of the capitalist class at all except where there is capitalism." Are we to understand that Capitalism is a kind of natural law? Or is Capitalism a man-made system for the evils of which man must accept his responsibility? One might add to Mr. Temple's statement—"If there were no capitalists, capitalism would be relegated to the text books on economics!"

May I make it quite clear that I do not hold the capitalist class entirely responsible for all the evils of the world. Capitalism, to work, requires also a proletariat to exploit. And one must admit, with regret, that the proletariat does very little about getting rid of its exploiters. To expect the latter to get off the workers' backs of their own accord is asking too much.

The purpose of Capitalism is to serve the interests of a minority, irrespective of the needs of the majority. Does one really need to pour out thousands of words to prove that this is an inhuman system? Let us content ourselves with one obvious by-product of capitalism: the destruction of food, to maintain prices at an "economic" level, while millions of people live on starvation diets. The responsibility lies with the system, yes, but it is human beings (capitalists) who must give the orders to other human beings (workers) to have the food destroyed. We are therefore all responsible in varying degrees. I am only interested in pointing to the inhumanity of capitalism and of capitalists in so far as I am able to bring to the "victims" of capitalism an awareness of these evils. But the solution of the problem rests with the "victims".

Thus when Mr. Temple writes: "And I do not believe that the anarchist case can depend on whether as a matter of fact politicians are rascals or whether they are not", I must answer that Anarchism does not depend on this, but it seems obvious that before people can think and act for themselves they must be convinced in their own minds that they can hope for no good coming from politicians, from those in authority or from benevolent, capitalists. Their interests are different. But as a result of conditioning—the Press, the schools, the experts, the Church, etc.—the "victims" spend their lives accepting that there must be the rulers and the ruled—"where would the wages come from if there were no employers?"—And Mr. Temple bangs another nail in their coffin by telling them that even the capitalists are the victims of the system, that immutable system! To my mind, comrade editor, that system has feet of clay!

Fraternally,
LIBERTARIAN.

VIOLENCE

AS a recent subscriber to *Freedom*, let me give you my enthusiastic approval for the work you are doing. In general your periodical presents its material with a clarity and keenness worthy of the best traditions of journalism. Off-hand I can only think of two criticisms regarding the substance of some of your articles. In the first place, I disagree with the critical or even patronising, and I might add, superficial attitude shown towards pacifism by some of your contributors. It seems to me that in this you are slighting one of anarchism's most powerful weapons. I would reply with two general objections to Philip Sansom's "Defence of the Revolution" 7/7/51: (1) Workers' militias would not stand a chance against the organised might the State has at its disposal. The only results of violence on the part of the workers would be death or imprisonment for the workers involved, increased repressive measures by the State against the rest, and an alienation from the anarchist cause of many who would be potentially sympathetic (pacifists, intellectuals, portions of the middle class, etc.) had they not been repelled by the workers' violence. (2) Once we admit that the end justifies the means in some instances (as Mr. Sansom appears to do despite his protestations) we have sold out anarchism. I believe that Emma Goldman expressed a view similar to this in her later years. It is obvious that any number of abominations could easily flow from one such submission to so-called "necessity". I would ask just

where does the defence of the libertarian revolution begin and where does it leave off? Would it involve assassinations and bombings—and other sorts of terrorism, or would it be strictly "defensive" (ignoring the fact that a good offence is the best defence)? Would the militia of one syndicate have to fight to help another—even though the first syndicate were secure and not under any attack whatever? What about use of the atomic bomb and other such weapons? Would that ever be justified? And so on. My second criticism is of an occasional expression of a violently anti-religious attitude. Personally, I am a positivist concerning religion; however, I much value good humour and tolerance. If one respects objectivity one will realise that much social good—as well as evil—has come from religion. Your attack on the Catholic Worker movement a while back appeared to me to be unfair. We must not be dogmatic concerning who are our friends and associates. "He who is not against us is for us."

Fraternally yours,
Minneapolis.

LIFE BEGINS TO-MORROW

FREEDOM was one of the few films which referred to the importance of the film *Life Begins Tomorrow*, when it was first shown at the beginning of the year.

Having only just seen this film showing in London at La Contine Cinema, Tottenham Court Road, I know now why most of the critics attacked some even saying that they could make out what it was all about.

May I suggest that readers in London should see this film? It has a tremendous message for our time, and think of particular importance is Sanson's contribution in which he makes it clear beyond any doubt that we are all possible for war, poverty, delinquency and all such other horrors as the concentration camp and atom bomb. It may shock some readers into serious thinking just as it did the young man in the film, who had originally come to Paris to visit the monuments, museums—the past.

London, Aug. 17. N. RADFORD

Special Appeal

August 1st to August 17th:

London: A.M. 1/3; Petersfield: F.P. 10/-; London: Anon* 2/6; Los Angeles: R.S. £4/14/0; London: F.E.D.* 5/-; Olympia, Wash.: E.W. 7/-; Denver, Col.: R.B. £2/12/6; Sydney: R.A. 3/-; London: S.S. 2/-; Bolton: W.H.B. 5/-; London: S.S. (per J.H.) £3/0/0; Mulheim: W.H. 8/-; Hyde Park Sympathiser 5/-; Bradford: A.B.H. 3/-.

Total	12	18	3
Previously acknowledged	297	18	3
1951 TOTAL TO DATE	£310	16	6

GIFTS OF BOOKS:

Bombay: R.B.; Stroud: M.K.

FREEDOM PRESS

M. BAKUNIN: *Marxism, Freedom and the State*—paper 2/6, cloth 5/-

HERBERT READ: *Art and the Evolution of Man—4/-*; *Existentialism, Marxism and Anarchism—3/6*; *Poetry and Anarchism, cloth 5/-, paper 2/6*; *The Philosophy of Anarchism—boards 2/6, paper 1/-*; *The Education of Free Men—1/-*

GEORGE WOODCOCK: *Anarchy or Chaos—2/6, cloth 4/6*; *New Life to the Land—6d.*; *Railways and Society—3d.*; *Homes orhovels?—6d.*; *What is Anarchism?—1d.*; *The Basis of Communal Living—1/-*

ALEXANDER BERKMAN: *A.B.C. of Anarchism—1/-*

JOHN HEWETSON: *Ill-health, Poverty and the State—cloth 2/6, paper 1/-*

PETER KROPOTKIN: *The State: Its Historic Role—1/-*; *The Wage System—3d.*; *Revolutionary Government—3d.*; *Organised Vengeance Called Justice—2d.*

M. L. BERNERI: *Workers in Stalin's Russia—1/-*

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

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

★

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

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

OPEN-AIR MEETINGS at HYDE PARK
Every Sunday at 3.30 p.m.

INDOOR MEETINGS
Every Sunday at 7.30 p.m.
at the PORCUPINE (corner Charing Cross Road at Gt. Newport Street, next Leicester Sq. Underground Stn.)

These meetings are suspended for the Summer months. They will re-commence in SEPTEMBER.

Watch this column for future Announcements.

NORTH-EAST LONDON DISCUSSION MEETINGS IN EAST HAM

at 7.30
SEPT. 4—(at Woodford)
SOCIAL EVENING—Eric Lewis: "A TRIBUTE TO SPAIN"

Enquiries c/o Freedom Press

SOUTH LONDON

Meetings suspended for the time being. Readers interested in possible future activities, please contact S. E. Parker, c/o Freedom Press.

GLASGOW

OUTDOOR MEETINGS at MAXWELL STREET
Every Sunday at 7 p.m.
With John Gaffney, Frank Leech, Jimmy Raeside, Eddie Shaw

KINGSTON
Any Comrades interested in forming a Group in the KINGSTON area, are invited to write to Freedom Press.

FREEDOM

The Anarchist Weekly

Postal Subscription Rates
12 months 17/- (U.S.A. \$3.00)
6 months 8/6 (U.S.A. \$1.50)
3 months 4/6 (U.S.A. \$0.75)

Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies
12 months 27/- (U.S.A. \$4.50)
6 months 13/6 (U.S.A. \$2.25)

Cheques, P.O.'s and Money Orders should be made out to FREEDOM PRESS, crossed a/c Payee, and addressed to the publishers.

FREEDOM PRESS
27 Red Lion Street
London, W.C.1 England

Tel.: Chancery 8364