

In this Issue:  
**The Free Union** - p. 2  
**Libertarian Feeling**  
in India - p. 3  
**The Idea that**  
won't die - p. 4

# Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

Government has committed  
more crimes than it has  
prevented.

R. INGERSOLL.

Vol. 14, No. 13

March 28th, 1953

Threepence

## Korea: Ammunition Shortage?

RECENT revelations in America about the shortage of ammunition in Korea may give pause to those simple folk who think that governments enter war with the simple, untrammelled aim of winning them. Those cynical (utopian), realists, the anarchists, have sometimes suggested that other questions enter into it, for example, the need to keep the wheels of industry turning with consequent maintenance of stock exchange levels; the need to try out new military equipment, train soldiers and officers, and so on. Here is General Van Fleet:

"Washington, March 22.—General Van Fleet, former Eighth Army commander, has told Senators that he once had to issue 'no shoot' orders to his gunners in Korea because ammunition supplies were so low, it was disclosed here today. In May, 1951, the Army's artillery supply dumps in Korea were empty, he said. This was revealed by the publication of evidence which General Van Fleet and others gave in secret before the Senate armed services committee earlier this month.

"The General maintained that there was a critical scarcity of ammunition 'that exists today, and there is not an adequate amount to take care of a situation that might develop.' He understood the situation was better now than when he left Korea last month, but he made it clear that he disagreed with his superiors about how much ammunition the troops should expend and what the Army's mission in Korea should be." (Times, 23.3.53).

General Van Fleet obviously is a simple man, almost a man in the

street, one could say, and seems to think there should be enough bullets to poop off at the gooks. But another U.S. general, one obviously with a more practical mind, showed a greater grasp of the situation:

"General Collins, Army Chief of Staff, told the committee he considered that under present policy there was enough ammunition in Korea to cope with the forces' limited tasks. He said the Army's position was dictated by political or diplomatic policy, and not by the military." (Times, 32.3.53).

Perhaps it will not be long now

before a general will be realist enough publicly to acknowledge that the Army's position was directed by economic policy and not by the military. Even now, however, it is plain that simple honest-to-God soldiers like General Van Fleet are quite out of date. "Stormed at by shot and shell, bravely they fought and well" may be all right for such as he, but simplicity really is not enough. One has to realise that Army red tape is, in reality, the ticker-tape of the stock exchange.

## RICE & THE COLD WAR

RICE is the only staple food known to half the world's population, and, at that, they do not receive nearly enough of it. Very often, too, rice-eaters cannot obtain their favourite grain, except on the black market, and are compelled to subsist on millet, cassava, and other substitutes. This alone causes widespread dissatisfaction with any form of Government which allows such a state of affairs to continue. More serious still, more people die when rice crops fail than from earthquakes, floods or war. To quote the noted American economist, Dr. J. Norman Efferson:

"Because of its world-wide importance, rice is as important as the atom bomb in the present world conflict. The

powers that control the major surplus rice areas are the ones which will control at least one-half of the world's population." The Communists have realised this vital fact from the beginning, and have played upon the West's apparent indifference to the plight of eastern peoples with great skill. The march of Communism is no mere bogey in the countries of Asia. It is fact.

Previous to the war, there were five major rice-exporting countries: Burma, Indo-China, Thailand, Formosa and Korea. Is it coincidence that these five countries, now, are either in the toils, or so closely threatened that they live always in the shadow of fear? Burma, whose pre-war exports of rice totalled three million tons annually, last year exported one hundred thousand tons. The whole of the world's rice trade has decreased by from three to four million tons annually. Indo-China, especially the French part of it, is at war and exports very little rice although the French are still precariously clinging on to the rice-growing areas. Thailand is utterly dependent upon what happens to the French. If the Communists win, Thailand rice will go to feed Communist countries. Formosa, with Chaing Kai-Shek and his Nationalist Chinese in possession, is in no position to think of exports, and Korea is torn by war.

What is the position of those countries who relied upon imported rice prior to the war? India, Pakistan, Ceylon and Malaya are all members of the British Commonwealth of Nations, between them numbering over five hundred million people. Their position is dangerous, to say the least of it. India has twice been saved from savage death-rolls by the importation of thousands of tons of grains—not rice—which had to be rushed into the country in English and American ships. Pakistan is barely self-supporting. Between them they number over four hundred million people and, on balance, they cannot feed themselves. Moreover, their populations are going up rapidly, while their rice production is going down. During the last year of British occupation, India produced 37½ million tons of rice. In 1951, with some millions more people to feed, the crop realized 35 million tons. Ceylon, a small island of 26,000 square miles of territory, has approximately 20,000 square miles lost to the jungle. In the other tiny area she has a population of nearly 8 million Australia—and the proud distinction of possessing the highest birth-rate in the world. Yet she produces only 50% of her rice requirements, and is exporting rubber, a valuable war material, to Communist China, in exchange for rice, so desperate is her position.

—HARRY WILLIAMS in  
*Rural Economy*, March 1953.

### FOREIGN COMMENTARY

## When the Truth is as Immoral as a Lie

THE particular concept of the truth expounded by Hitler in *Mein Kampf*, and the double-think of the Communists and their followers have helped to create the myth that in the democracies, at least, we are told the truth; that we enjoy the confidence of our politicians, and because we have only one ambition: peace, we have nothing to hide from the world. This concept that some politicians are truthful and the remainder liars and rogues is itself the biggest lie of all. We do not mean that politicians are rogues and liars all the time, but that when they are truthful and virtuous it is for the same reasons as when they are liars and rogues; that is to say, when it serves their political ends, and advantage. Clearly the creation of the myth that the statesmen and politicians of one's country are honest men makes the acceptance of a lie as being the truth a relatively simple matter. And in the democracies the ever growing anti-communist propaganda machine is being geared to this very end. By building up the conviction in the minds of the public that every utterance by a politician East of the Iron Curtain is a lie, one is at the same time creating a psychology of acceptance to all that is said by those politicians of the West as being the truth. Let us hasten to add that behind the Iron Curtain the same process operates, with the same results!

A former member of the Comintern has explained how in Russia a lie can be transformed into the truth, by quoting a cynic who pointed out that a lie when uttered by one man, simply remains a lie; that when repeated by thousands becomes a doubtful truth; but that once repeated by millions acquires the stamp of an established truth. The Communists are, as he points out, adepts at this technique, but are the democracies, with their millionaire Press any more innocent in this respect? Perhaps there is one virtue distinguishing the West from the East; that in the West the truth will eventually out. But that generally happens so long after the perpetration of the lie that it is of interest mainly to historians and members of the older generation who can still dimly recall the event. And all they can do in the event is sadly shake their heads at the thought that what they were convinced was the truth was just another lie after all!

LET us now illustrate the foregoing thoughts with a concrete example contained in a recent release by *Worldover Press* (an independent

American news agency). We quote the item in full:

"On Feb. 13, 1945, American and British planes bombed Dresden, considered previously a non-military target, killing some 100,000 many of them women and children sent there by Germans for safety. Last Feb. 11, the U.S. State Department released, in Germany, records 'revealing' that Russia had specifically requested the bombing, to prevent German reinforcements from possibly reaching anti-Soviet troops. Reason for the release: Russia was organising a hate-America campaign for Dresden's eighth anniversary ceremonial, blaming the U.S. for the raid.

"But why the long delay by Washington? The policy seems to have been, 'The less said about Dresden, the better.' *Worldover Press* broke the whole story of Russia's chief responsibility as far back as March 3, 1950, and told of posters periodically used by the Russians to put all blame on the U.S. The story's official release, so late, not only negated its value as counter-propaganda, but has made few friends among the Germans. British officials, who gave the facts to W.P. at Berlin in 1948, then pointed out that many Germans knew them, and were bitter because of Allied acquiescence in Russia's request, also finding it hard to understand why the city was virtually destroyed by obliteration bombing for a very limited military objective."

Throughout the war we were told in this country that unlike the Nazis, we only bombed military targets, and convincing air photos were published in the Press to prove this contention. This we know was a lie.

And in this instance the Germans were telling the truth! Now that the enemy is Russia, the Americans are trying to counteract that lie, which the Russians have turned to their advantage, by revealing the true motives for the bombing of Dresden, because they hope to gain a political advantage at the expense of the Russians, by so doing. But in this case the truth is double edged. It places the main responsibility for the initiative of killing 100,000 Germans with the Russians, but an equal responsibility rests with the British and Americans who agreed to this plan and executed it. And, understandably, the relatives of those killed and the surviving victims make little distinction between the criminals behind the bombing. And what of the airmen who carried out the bombing? What reasons were they given when they were being briefed and saw the plans of Dresden which indicated that there were no military targets to destroy? Were they so involved in living a lie that they could be convinced that rows of houses were in fact armament factories and ammunition dumps?

We agree with those cartoonists who portray the Stalins and Hitlers, the Titos and Francos, the Himmlers and Goerings with their hands stained by the blood of their victims. Perhaps the day will come when they will have the courage to portray the politicians of the democracies without gloves. LIBERTARIAN.

## 2,800 Detained in Kenya Raid

In large-scale security operations in the Pumwani native location at Nairobi during the week-end, 2,847 people have been detained. More than 1,600 of them are persons wanted by the police, mainly in the Nyeri and Fort Hall districts. Combined forces of troops and police carried out raids and detained Africans who did not have the

special passes, issued less than a week ago, authorising Kikuyu and Embu tribesmen to remain at Nairobi if employed in the city.

Durling operations in the Fort Hall district yesterday six Mau Mau men were killed, six were wounded, and 14 captured when security forces came into conflict with a number of small gangs.

The Governor, Sir Evelyn Baring, with his chief military staff officer, Major-General Hinde, and the member for agriculture, has carried out an all-day aerial reconnaissance over the forests of the Aberdare Mountains and Mount Kenya, to see what control measures had been carried out regarding concentration of forestry and sawmill labourers by moving them into villages instead of leaving them scattered throughout the forests. (Times, 23.3.53.)

Without comment.

Are we still  
waiting for you  
to renew your  
subscription to  
**F R E E D O M ?**

## Overcrowded Schools

OVERCROWDING in primary schools has become so serious, according to the T.U.C., that buildings condemned long since have been reopened, classes expanded, and the average age of entry raised by two months. A survey conducted by about one hundred trades councils was submitted to the T.U.C. General Council, and the council declared its concern "at the amount of overcrowding in primary schools and at the lower standards of education which are resulting from makeshift measures to find school places."

From this survey "the main features that emerge are the widespread makeshift arrangements that are bringing in their train bigger classes, worsened teaching conditions in unsuitable premises, and a heavier strain on teachers."

What the T.U.C. calls "the most desperate measures of all" have been the reopening of condemned schools. Two trades councils mention the continued use of condemned buildings, two others the reopening of primary schools previously closed and condemned, and another two the use of huts dating from the First World War.

In Birmingham, the survey says, the average class in a primary school consists of 47 pupils and there are 4,800 temporary classrooms.

## Hitch-hikers Please Note

LUXURY rides for lorry and van drivers, with heaters and radio, are provided by a range of new Bedford commercial vehicles announced at the Vauxhall works, Luton, yesterday.

Designed for payloads from 20cwt. to five tons, the vehicles have three-seat cabs insulated against noise. A special three-point rubber mounting cushions the unit against any bumps or side movement.

A test showed that the 20-25-cwt. truck, which has adjustable seat, "no-draught" windows and four-speed synchromesh gearbox, is as cosy and comfortable as any modern cars.

News Chronicle, 19/3/53.

## MANPOWER DISTRIBUTION

INFORMATION analysed in the *Economist* recently showed that in October, 1952, Britain had 22,146,000 persons in civil employment; 4,111,000 were in "basic industries," 8,630,000 in manufacturing. The "basic industries" were taken to include transport and other services; the primary occupations of mining, quarrying, agriculture and fishing accounted for only 1,995,000—barely 9% of total manpower. This compared with 7,969,000 in "white-collar" jobs—distributive trades and professional, financial and administrative services—nearly 36% of the total.

## LONDON MEETINGS

Due to a misunderstanding, last Tuesday's IAG meeting at the Garibaldi Restaurant could not be held.

The lecture announced for March 31st will be the last at these premises.

See back page for meetings from April 7th.

MUCH as I agree with "Andreas concerning individual freedom, especially for recognising it in terms of power over self, I feel constrained to defend myself (non-violently) on one or two other points.

"A" indicates that the evolutionary and revolutionary anarchists form two distinct types, and that the difference between them may well become important as the movement grows. Being on the opposite side of the crack to "A," he taxes me with what amounts to lack of realism.

Let us examine the facts. Can "A" point to a violent revolution that has, on balance, brought humanitarian, non-authoritarian principles any nearer in practice? The so very successful Bolshevik one? "A" must shudder to think of the fruits nurtured by that eminent horticulturist, J. V. Djughashvili, recently departed to other regions, reputed to be much in need of reform. The French one? Remember the Reign of Terror and the emergence of Napoleon? The American one? Perhaps The Merry Macs, McCarthy, McArthur, McCormick and McCarran, tend to undermine what otherwise might have been a firm conviction that for once all's well that ends well. Earlier doubts might have been raised by the Civil War and the Prohibition era.

If "A" could convince me that the sum total of human happiness (a woolly concept, I admit—but offer me another) would be increased by a blood-bath, then

I might be a willing accoucheur to such a drastic surgical operation. But as Bertrand Russell has so succinctly pointed out, the perpetration of a very certain evil to attain a very hypothetical ultimate good is a dubious transaction, justified if the only available alternative is an equal or greater immediate evil. This, of course, is the case of the lunatic kicking a child to death—an instance in which I should most certainly interfere, violently if necessary. Political situations are rarely so clear-cut.

The eventual outcomes of the Yugoslav and Chinese revolutions I await with interest. It must be a hard-boiled revolutionary indeed who has not already had misgivings about the public "trials and confessions" and executions in the Land of Mao.

On the other hand, the civil disobedience campaign launched by Gandhi seemed to achieve a remarkable success—somewhat vitiated more recently by the emergence of an India government that indulges in power politics when its interests are at stake in much the manner of the British Raj. Yet if Indian peoples have changed only their bosses, at least they saved themselves the discomforts of a violent revolution. More is the pity that religious quarrels helped to fill the bill in this direction. South Africa is a superb test-case; if one can maintain that air of objective detachment when faced with oppression and misery on a mass

scale, as those who have drunk deep of the heady wine of dialectical materialism do so stoically on behalf of their victims.

As I confess to being emotionally involved at times on these and other issues, perhaps we can profitably discuss another aspect of "A's" attack.

Yes, I believe in progress—inevitably. For if I did not I should either contract out of this sorry society altogether by becoming a hermit, or I should shoot myself in sheer desperation. Before the hounds of reason move in to tear me apart let me forestall them. What I am saying is that faith in progress is, like all faith, essentially non-rational. I have this particular emotional attitude because I am constitutionally incapable of believing otherwise. This statement of my personal emotional economy may or may not have public interest, but one thing I am sure of is that "A's" emotional need for violence must have public repercussions if he indulges it, and certainly has no more logical justification than my belief in progress.

Let us be quite clear on this point. We turn to violence or other aggressive forms of behaviour when we are denied some material or emotional need and are frustrated in our attempts to satisfy it by less primitive measures. The use of violence is a confession that we do not know of a rational means of achieving our end, and are reduced to relieving the emotional tension of anger that is aroused by this failure, as a substitute for relieving the original need itself. This mechanism is at the bottom of all aggressive behaviour. For some of its less "honourable" and palatable forms compare the article on "The English Vice." (FREEDOM, 10.1.53.)

No doubt "A" feels very frustrated by the shortcomings of our present societies. So do I. But the civilised and self-aware individual will try to avoid harming

others because of his own emotional conflict, and if he attempts to be rational and is genuinely humane he will try instead to ensure that those who are still in the process of being corrupted by our society will suffer a little less from this disease than he does himself.

To this end it is not essential to thrust the portfolio of the Minister of Education into the hands of A. S. Neill. Even if this could be done without the use of violence, as a complete solution it is inadequate—the anarchist variation of that venerable game of passing the buck. What is essential, and what can be done by each one of us, non-violently, is to refuse to allow our children to be thrashed in the service of a Headmaster's neurotic craving. (This is already a "legal" right—we don't have to fight for it.) To work inside Parent-Teacher Associations and press for the abolition of corporal punishment in the school as a whole. In fact, to do everything in our power to dispel the shadow of ignorance in our immediate vicinity. It may be the gift of a unique individual to produce echoes from a wider audience, but all of us can at least try to influence our friends and neighbours, and, most important of all, to act as if we believed in our ideals. That is, for instance, to eschew violence in our own dealings with children.

Similarly, there are literally dozens of organisations in the world in which a sincere anarchist could do invaluable work. The Youth Hostels Association is a promising example of what free association between independent individuals working for their own and the common good can accomplish. Gentle pressure from friends within the organisation might well lead to a modification of its somewhat monastic attitude toward segregation of the sexes, after the lines

It is all very well to protest that we reject the values and machinery of our society, but we have the choice of departing for our desert isle or accepting the task of working within the present framework to improve matters so that the next generation may have a less painful prospect.

It is the personal contact and individual effort that counts ultimately. Power may change hands overnight, but the non-authoritarian attitude that anarchism professes is a delicate blossom that has to be cultivated under less cataclysmic conditions.

This policy is rather different to the one imputed to me by "A" of "wishing very hard." Wishing is useless unless it leads to action. It does not follow that the action has to be that of firing a rifle or working the guillotine like a yo-yo.

If anarchists were prepared to give the movement form and direction by working and organising to realise their ideal with half the energy they devote to gnawing their finger nails, "A" and the comrades on his side of the crack might feel a little less frustrated and a little less eager to rush to the barricades.

Indiana, Mar. 19. BOB GREEN.

## The Free Union

\*A speech made by Elisee Reclus on the occasion of the free union of his daughters Magali and Jeanie with the young men Regnier and Cusinier in 1882.

THE most dear children who have called us together as witnesses to their union, joined together in the fulness of their liberty, do not ask through our words the confirmation of that which they have already spoken in the depths of their hearts. Their deep desires are enough; but it may please them to hear the voice of their father on entering into the new life which awaits them.

It is not in the name of parental authority that I will speak to you, my daughters, and to you young men, who must now permit me to call you my sons.

Our title of parents does not make us your superiors and we have in regard to you no more than a deep love. Furthermore on this great occasion of our life, we ask that you be our judges.

To you, my dear children, it remains to say if we have ever abused our power in order to keep you in submission; used our will in order to enslave yours; used our natural influence to impose our morality on you. Can you say to those that love you that their love has been in no way tyrannical?

In the group of parents that surround us, there are those who would have preferred that your marriage be accompanied by legal ceremonies; perhaps a certain oppression of the heart will have been mixed in some with the joy which your union has occasioned. But all have respected you, no one has wished to impose his own ideas. Over and above the divergencies of opinion the integrity of your free choice has been preserved. This has served as a sign to bring us closer to one another, to show us how we mutually cherish one another. The mothers and fathers have felt their tenderness redoubled, the sons and daughters have felt their respect and their love grow. Having been given your freedom you have returned to us as loving beings.

Moreover on this day you are your own masters. You are responsible for your own acts. There is no doubt that we shall follow you with all the solicitude which pours forth from our love, but you shall not be humiliated by it. When the little bird tries its own wings for the first time before attempting its flight in the blue sky can we reproach the mother that contemplates it anxiously from the edge of the nest? But she will return soon reassured. Your wings are strong

and they shall carry you through wide spaces.

We shall ask of you nothing, my children; but you shall give us much. The years begin to weigh on our heads; you must return to us our youth and strength. It is true that in the great human family we see all renewing itself ceaselessly: springs replace springs and ideas replace ideas. But we shall experience a most intimate sweetness, observing the renewal of life which shall come again to us there in the discrete circle of the family. It is in you, youth, in whom it gives us such pleasure to see ourselves live again, beginning again the struggle of life and continuing with new strength the work already begun. We are weary, but you will continue our work, others will follow after us. And thus we see the future extending itself, our hard and good work enduring still. You will give us the feeling of duration; in you my daughters and my sons we feel ourselves immortal. But you have more than immortality; you have the intensity of living now. How will you use it? Only in loving one another, in breathing joy, in profaning destiny in order to convert it to your accomplice, to make it give you a winning number in the lottery of existence? No. You have more exalted ambitions I am sure. No it will not be enough for you to be happy; your union will not become a family selfishness, but the multiplication of your virtues of work and of goodness. Be loving! But even yet be sincere in the practise of justice, be strong in the vindication of the right.

Remember that not all are happy, that all do not have the happiness of having loving parents, comrades who encourage them, wives and husbands who are devoted, who will make sacrifices for them.

Remember that in this very moment there are those who are dying without friends, and others that walk with despair in their hearts, watching from the heights of bridges the moving black waters of the Seine. You are of the fortunate. Seek absolution working for those that are not. Promise yourselves to dedicate your life to diminish the sum of undeserved sufferings which weigh down the world. For the highest good you are stronger than you think; even alone one may work, and you are together!

Translated by J.G. from MATRIMONIO Y AMOR (Barcelona).

## Review Soviet Minorities

RUSSIA & HER COLONIES, by Walter Kolarz (Geo. Philip and Sons, 25s.)

SINCE this book is exclusively based on Soviet documents and publications, it is all the more significant that it should contain such a vast amount of evidence of persecution of all national minorities in the Soviet Union. In this, as in many other fields Stalin's policy appears as a continuation of that of the Czars, and a complete denial of the principles of autonomy and voluntary federation which first inspired the revolution. The culminating and most horrible phase of this policy is represented by the liquidation, mass-dispersal or mass-transportation of whole peoples like the Volga Germans, the Kalmucks, the Crimean Tartars, the Ingush and the Chechens. A chapter devoted to the Soviet Jews is of particular interest because of the light it throws on the recent

Moscow-inspired Czech trials, and clearly shows that Communist anti-Semitism is not altogether of recent date. But the whole book is interesting, although it tells the same story in chapter after chapter for each Soviet nationality, of the boosting up of national pride, followed by its ruthless checking and humiliation. Chapter after chapter tells of men executed or led to suicide because they loved their country and their people, often also of their accusers soon meeting the same fate and allegedly for the same reasons.

Ample illustration is thus given of one of the "inner contradictions" of the Stalinist regime, namely its need to foster the national pride of all the people it chained by treachery to the Kremlin's cart once it deprived them of the revolutionary and internationalist ideals that first won their loyalty, and its necessity to suppress the same national pride as soon as it is taken seriously and threatens thereby the hegemony of the Great Russians whose

overweening glorification has become the sole purpose and inspiration of all Communist policy and education.

The ludicrous aspects of the constant re-writing of history in the Soviet Union are now universally known but the story of terror and suffering accompanying it has yet to be written. Walter Kolarz supplies important information and gives a well-founded hope of seeing one of the world's worst tyrannies sedulously preparing the rope with which to hang itself.

It is the fact that nationalist aspirations and the writing of history are bound to come into the open before they are detected and condemned, that has made it possible for Kolarz to write his book. But what about the other contradictions of the Stalinist regime, those that arise on the social and economic plane? Data for these are not available, but are we to suppose that if people in Russia still have the courage to rebel and risk their life for pride of race and tradition, there are not people equally brave to fight for that minimum of freedom and dignity that makes life worth living? GIOVANNI BALDELLI.

## FREEDOM BOOKSHOP OPEN DAILY

(OPEN 9—6.30; 5.30 SATURDAYS)

- New Books . . .**  
 Avro Manhattan Terror over Yugoslavia (the threat of the Catholic Church to Europe) 10/6  
 Franz Borkenau European Communism 42/-  
 Rudolph Rocker Nationalism & Culture 21/-  
**PENGUINS**  
 T. S. Eliot Selected Prose 2/-  
 Pamela Hansford Johnson An Avenue of Stone 2/-  
 F. Powdermaker & L. Grimes The Intelligent Parents' Manual 2/6  
**PENGUIN RE-ISSUES**  
 H. G. Wells Short History of the World 2/6; Forster Howard's End 2/-;  
 Uvarov Dictionary of Science 2/-;  
 Guide to Lake District 2/-.  
**EVERYMAN. New Price and Format.**  
 Cheucer Troilus and Criseyde 6/- & 7/-  
 Boccaccio The Decameron (2 vols.) 6/- each  
 Johnson, Ben, Plays (2 vols.) 7/- each  
 Several titles in stock at 5/- each  
 e.g. Turgenev Fathers and Sons; Smoke; Rousseau Emile; Whitman Leaves of Grass; Zola Germinal; Macchiavelli The Prince.  
 Individual Action No. 8 3d.  
 and March Syndicalist now out 2d.  
 (Run of back numbers of Syndicalist now available).

Obtainable from  
**27, RED LION STREET, LONDON, W.C.1**

## Exhibition

### MEXICAN ART

I AM not a very frequent visitor to art exhibitions but the present exhibition at the Tate is calculated to make an enthusiast of any visitor. The civilisation of Ancient Mexico is bright and alive and its strong appeal to aspirations lying buried in the minds of man gives a colour and warmth that has moved Stockholm and is now moving London.

The effects of European art can be seen in the stereotyped offerings of the Colonial period, when Spanish art simply imposed itself with its crucifixes and Madonnas, but the veneer wore thin, and modern Mexico provides a sustained culture which has its basis in the pre-Columbian era.

The Mexican Revolution has been celebrated in the country's art. The events leading to the Revolution and the figures of the revolution, as much of Indian as of Spanish origin, have been recognised in folk-art and modern graphic art. In the Exhibition one can see the depicting of "Skill against Brute Force," "Death of a Revolutionary," "Execution," "The Rebel," "It is dangerous to talk too much," "A peasant hanged" and other vivid depictions of life in pre-Revolutionary Mexico under the dictatorship of Porfirio Diaz. The engravings of José Guadalupe Posada are most gripping in this respect. Then the period of struggle: Guadalupe Posada gives us "The Execution of Two Maderist Revolutionaries," the "Anti-Religion Manifestations" (which call to mind the movement against the continual re-election of dictator Diaz, finally result-

ing in the Presidency of Madero), and the many representations of the great libertarian revolutionary Emiliano Zapata.

The most moving of such pictures is by José Clemente Orozco ("El Caudillo Zapata") and it is interesting to compare this picture with one in the same room of another Mexican-Indian, the Liberal Juárez. One can soon tell which it was that refused the Presidency and which it was that had taken it!

Alberto Beltrán portrays "The Efforts of Victoriano Huerto to liquidate Zapatism," and how the new dictator, who killed Madero, tried to prevent the growth of the movement for Land and Liberty.

It is truer than ever—as Ricardo Flores Magon predicted—that "the timorous and conservative" who yesterday crucified Christ, today adore him, and that those who persecuted and destroyed the rebels, now venerate the martyrs. The representations of both the Revolution and the Zapata movement by an exhibition organised by the Mexican Government is a symbol. Magon declared that to the conservatives of the day the Land and Liberty movement appeared as revolutionists, but "to the revolutionists of tomorrow our acts will have been those of conservatives." That, of course, has hardly been borne out but it is ironical to note how to Mexican conservatives of today the acts of the revolutionists of yesterday appear as patriots. The artists, however, have captured more than the current "line."

## FOR POPULAR CONSUMPTION

**MARSHAL TITO'S** visit has had an almost ludicrous side which has scarcely been concealed from the public. Yet at the same time the official accounts have been just as serious and grave in their pompous phraseology as if they were really to be taken seriously.

The police precautions—"fabulous" as one respected newspaper called them—themselves set a high comic level. "Hours before the Marshal was due to leave," wrote the *Observer* on its front page, "there were policemen above and below ground in all possible approaches to Westminster. The total mounted steadily, as more and more blue columns poured out of the conveniently adjacent gates of Scotland Yard. In the end, policemen outnumbered the crowd on the Embankment by about three to one, their cordons making a desert of Westminster Bridge and of wide stretches of riverside roadway." It is small wonder that a radio comedian got his best laugh of the evening with the crack: "Join the Police Force and see Marshal Tito!"

Despite all this the Marshal himself, speaking on Westminster Pier, and addressing, presumably, the assembled coppers, said: "I wish to express once more . . . my thanks for the hearty welcome extended to us and I send my warm greetings to the courageous people of Britain." To round off this idiotically meaningless piece of pageantry here is the sober *Observer* again:

"The people, including small children on their fathers' shoulders, waved. Tito, in the splendid uniform of a Marshal of the Yugoslav Army, waved back, with a smile broad enough to penetrate the river mist. Nobody broke through the restraint of the last few days sufficiently to raise a cheer, but the parting was unmistakably amiable."

We have italicised the last sentence which shows that the British talent for understatement is sometimes very much needed!

The official handouts meanwhile speak of "full agreement on all outstanding issues." Tito was "deeply impressed," etc., and sent a telegram to Churchill about the "great success of our talks," and one of formal courtesy to the Queen. Much has been made of renewing friendships made as comrades-in-arms in the last war. In 1946 a bare six years ago "Mr. Churchill has a heart of stone . . . he is only interested in his imperialist aims . . . Churchill hates our country . . . has shown himself the standard bearer of the warmongers . . ." (See *FREEDOM*, 21.3.53) and so on, and so on. Now it is "existing ties of friendship and alliance" which are "lasting," and "we stand shoulder to shoulder in the defence of peace."

George Orwell, in a conversation with some of the editors of *FREEDOM* just before his death, discussed his ideas for a study of the use of political clichés already sketched by him in an essay on "Political English," and in the sections in "Newspeak" in "1984." His thesis was that political language was now constructed with small and meaningless emotional images so as to inhibit thought and meaning instead of serving as a vehicle for them. Tito's visit would have provided him with much material—some of it culled, no doubt, from the *Tribune*.

It is necessary to debunk this ridiculous palaver, with its wide understanding, deep friendship and *vice versa*, which no one believes, and no doubt prepared long in advance since whatever is the actual nature of the discussions (supposing they had any) between Tito and Churchill, the official facade has to be one of agreement—shoulder to

## LIBERTARIAN FEELING IN INDIA

IT was one of the favourite objections to Indian independence that "the Indians couldn't govern themselves." Some British critics (as tactfully as international diplomacy allowed them) have pointed to one or another aspect of Nehru's government in support of their past objections to the inevitable. It is, however, quite certain that such faults as belong to the Congress Government are largely those it inherited from the Empire. The centralisation of power into the ruling few is one that runs quite contrary to what the Indians really want, for there is a substantial objection to being governed at all.

This has been recognised by many sources. In his famous walking tour of India, Acharya Vinoba Bhave ("Gandhi's successor") has appealed for land reform by consent rather than by legislation. It is remarkable how this movement has spread, and in State after State land has been given up by landowners for the campaign "Land for the Landless." According to the *Times of India* (15.1.53), Mr. Shanker Rao Deo (walking through Rajasthan on behalf of Vinoba Bhave's movement) has found a vast spontaneous response "from big jagirdars to peasants with holdings of not more than half-a-bigha." At a large meeting, Mr. Deo declared, "The first and primary task of any Government is to provide food to its people, imparting of compulsory primary education comes next." It is clear that the movement is not libertarian, that it clings to the Statist illusion, but at the same time it is providing what the State has failed to provide; namely, land being equitably distributed so that food may be available. Vast masses of rural India cannot eke out a living on the land it tills; the Congress Government still vainly seeks a means of providing them with sufficient land out of the vast amount of untitled land ready for cultivation. The Bhoodan Yagna ("Land for the Landless") movement has at least broken the deadlock in providing the basis of land reform.

So far 40,000 people have received land which has been donated. Fifteen thousand acres were given up during the tour of Rajasthan (which lasted only a month). Many landlords are moved by the appeal made on Gandhian lines, such as helped to fight Untouchability and Imperialism. This is particularly true of the small peasant landholders who have given their mite. It is also true that many big landowners have been moved by fears of "communism"—the fact that they will give fuel to C.P. propaganda if such a state of affairs continues. Many others, too, are afraid that they may have to give up land forcibly to a squatters' movement to expropriate the land—better to give a few acres to reformist non-violence than lose the lot to revolutionary confiscation. However such views are also reflected on and within Congress—but still the Government has not acted, and this voluntary movement has.

## Communities of Work

NO one after a brief acquaintance with the "Communities of Work" (see the descriptive articles in *FREEDOM* for 19/1/52 and 26/1/52) would conclude that France is a decadent country. Yet their movement is such a tiny part of French society, and such a recent development, that it is impossible to forecast how effective an influence it can be. The annual conference, at Lyons in October, brought together about 400 persons, representing perhaps 50 communities of work, or "precommunities" or groups interested in learning about the movement. I got an impression of vigour, devotion, pride in the discovery of social devices that bring results in organisation, management education.

This is an important achievement—the perfecting of a democratic economic structure which gives support to altruistic motives, and greater opportunity for their expression. In the industrial communities especially there is a feeling of

relief at having left behind the deep-rooted injustices of the employer-worker relationship in France. They feel free to grow into a unity that still keeps a proper place for individuality.

There was also, throughout the discussions at Lyons and in the communities visited, the only partly understood pleasure in the rediscovery of community, overcoming of traditional French individualism, experiencing the growing power of a group that has achieved a character and integrity of its own. The determination to hold the ground gained, both in the area of community and in the economic field, was the more significant in view of the serious differences of outlook that became clearer as individual communities were visited.

For the variety of forms and philosophies and purposes existing among the communities of work is so great as to raise the question whether they can collectively be called a "movement" at all. So long as these often startlingly diverse "communities" can hold to a clear concept of the few guiding principles on which they are agreed, their movement will continue vigorous. If any one social or religious philosophy should seek to become accepted by all, disintegration will begin.

The existence of a movement exemplifying mutual respect and freedom among varying ideologies becomes the more important as civil liberties continue to suffer attack in France. In the struggle for freedom the communities of work proportion to their numerical insignificance.

At the time of the Indian elections, we drew attention in these columns to the Naga Hills where nobody voted. This tribal area of Assam has made the formation of a district council impossible. Its autonomy would have been questionable, being subject to the approval of the Governor of Assam (an old move that is a legacy from Britain!). While other parts co-operated in the establishment of councils and participated in the elections, the Naga tribesmen still refused to do so. Now we learn that the Naga National Council has demanded an independent Nagaland (covering 10,000 square miles and a million people), including not only the Naga tribal area but all the Naga areas in other districts and states. "If Pakistan could have self-determination, why not us?" In an article in the *Indian People* (27.12.52) Ram Gopal says significantly, "The Nagas are agitated and raise political agitation on smallest provocation. They would have you believe that there is something like *Nagaism* which is neither socialism nor communism, but a philosophy of life all its own."

This *Nagaism* is a libertarian philosophy as the unanimous boycott of the elections showed. They have rejected, not only parliamentary representation, but also municipal government, and are the first people in the world to have carried through such a successful boycott. In their further elaboration of "*Nagaism*" we trust that they will maintain this stand, even in an independent Nagaland.

### Self-Help

The Community Project scheme in India is a constructive side of this spirit of independence from government that cannot be eradicated from India. We quote from a report:—

"The Dhuri Community Project scheme in Pepsu has got off to a flying

start after overcoming initial difficulties.

"A mere hundred days after its inauguration, villagers in the area have derived inspiration from it. The spirit of self-help has come to stay. Dotted the landscape are numerous signs of the popular will to build a new village.

There are now 26 co-educational schools with more than 13,000 pupils, 50 new wells, 500 acres of reclaimed waste land, 60 small but significant approach roads newly built and the foundations for a fine new hospital where only a mosquito-infested cesspool was to be seen a few days ago.

"Two notable events of the last month in the Project area were the clean-up of Uppla-kheri village and the filling up of a dirty village pond near Amargarh village. The pond was levelled up to provide a site for a new maternity hospital.

"Uppla-kheri was cleaned entirely by the students, staff and the Principal of the Malerkotla College and the villagers. On the day of this clean-up campaign was born the idea that earth from a nearby mound could be used to fill up the cesspool near Amargarh.

"This idea was brought before a joint meeting of the neighbouring villagers' development committees. Details were worked out and workers from every village in the neighbourhood took turns to remove the festering eyesore from their midst. Today, the mound that was a landmark for decades is a thing of the past. Instead, the hospital in prospect will bring new health to those who had the vision to work for it.

"The Project is expected to make good headway in the forthcoming months as the villagers seem to be eager to work it out. Youth welfare associations have been formed in 30 villages. Their first big social event will be a youth rally on Republic Day. Ten co-operative societies

have been constituted in different villages. Consolidation of fragmentary land holdings in 51 villages is yet another achievement made since the inauguration of the Project.

"The Community Project covers an area of 340,253 acres of land of which 274,391 acres are cultivated, 4,007 acres are now fallow, 37,675 acres are cultivable waste, 24,126 acres are not arable and 56 acres are forest land.

"The total population of the Project area covering 307 villages of Malerkotla, Dhuri and Payal tehsils is 2,52,611 and the cost of the Project is estimated to be about Rs. 65 Lakhs.

"The work done during the last three months consisted of digging 490 compost manure pits, opening of model farms to show the actual working of the latest agricultural techniques, formation of development committees to associate villagers with the various schemes and reclamation of more than 500 acres of waste land. Two hundred acres of land have been treated with rat's-bane in a campaign to grow more food per acre and save more grain from the depredations of rats.

"Village level workers of the Project have demonstrated to the peasants how to sow vegetables in ridges for abundant produce, how to have green fodder available all the year round and how to break up crusty top-soil with the bar harrow. Demonstrations have been arranged for reclamation of alkaline soil. To extend this kind of work, a batch of 30 village level workers is under training at Nabha and another batch will be sent up in February.

"The Project authorities seem to be determined to make the Project a success by rendering concrete service to the farmer at his door-step. This is having the desired psychological effect. Wherever a farmer showed unusual enthusiasm or initiative, his holding was converted into a model farm."

INTERNATIONALIST.

## History of Krupps Continued from last week

ONCE again Krupp is undergoing a lean time. He has only 24,000 employees working for him. At the beginning of the century he had 50,000 and during the war several hundreds of thousands, besides innumerable slave labourers. Of the latter many died of starvation and from bombs, there being no air-raid shelters provided for them. The only help the East European workers got was from German workers, quite a few of whom used to divide their small bread ration with them. Even to do this was dangerous, because if the Gestapo heard of it the perpetrators were liable to be arrested and thrown into a concentration camp. Mutual aid being punished with the concentration camp is one of the most inhuman things I have ever witnessed (not only being a witness but a defendant as well). It is something

which would no doubt have been incredible to Kropotkin.

It has always been the policy of the Krupps to impress upon the workers the idea that the Krupps would take care of them in their sorrow and trouble. The real aim of this policy is to have steady and submissive workers who never go on strike or make trouble. Steady workers were able to execute high grade precision work were an absolute necessity to Krupp, for without them he could not keep up the quality of his armaments. It took a good artisan a long time to reach the required standard of efficiency, therefore, when a trained worker quit, it was always a loss to Krupp. He never tried to keep his workers with the bait of high wages, something he could have done without difficulty on account of the high prices he obtained for his armaments. Krupps' workers were paid the average wage—sometimes even less—workers in other industries often getting higher wages. For instance: the workers in the cutlery industry received wages which were about 25% more, in spite of working at the most only four days in the week. They earned sufficient to live and for the rest stayed at home saying, to hell with the boss! The cutlery workers were the most independent and best paid workers at that time in Germany. They proved to Krupp that high wages did not induce steadiness and submissiveness, but on the contrary made workers more independent and recalcitrant.

Out of these observations the Krupp pension scheme was born, which turned out later to be a mere pie-in-the-sky system. This scheme was based on the well known fact that when workers are old and unable to work many of them are forced to live on charity. Since 1890 there had existed in Germany a pension scheme for workers after they had reached the age of 70. It was a scheme whereby the state paid pensions out of the contributions paid by workers during their employment and exists to this day. But no one was or is able to live on this pension, a single man or woman perhaps being able to exist on dry bread and potatoes, but not a man and wife. The Krupp scheme provided an addition to the state pension. It enabled old workers to exist even if they were married and sometimes provided them with enough to put a little butter on their bread. Krupp also secured his employees submission by sending their undernourished children into the country during the summer at his expense. But the children often complained to their parents and asked them to take them home again.

During Krupp's heyday, at the end of the last and the beginning of this century, he paid this additional pension to his workers. But all this changed during the 1914-18 war. During peace time Krupp had to court the good will of the workers to make them submissive. In war time the reverse happened. Force of circumstances made him the arbiter of their fate. Any worker who was recalcitrant or dared to take a day off found himself on the battlefield a week later. One of the thousands of foremen and engineers had only to report such a recalcitrant to the management and the worst happened. The government considered that work in the Krupp armament factories was as important as fighting at the front, so Krupp's workers were tolerably safe from such a fate providing they were sufficiently hard working and submissive. During the war Krupp had as much power over his workers as any general on the field of battle had over his soldiers.

The defeat of Germany brought about a fundamental change in the relations between Krupp and his workers. The imperial army was abolished and the new republican army was only a fraction of its predecessor. Only a greatly reduced amount of armaments were required and Krupp needed but a small section of his previous employees. Therefore the Krupp pension scheme was abandoned, though it had proved a good investment during the time Krupp had needed workers. The workers for the most part were angry and depressed by this action, not expecting such trickery. With the abolition of the pension scheme the attitude of Krupp became like any other big lord of industry. So strikes occurred, one of which, in 1928, lasted several months.

Then came Hitler. He gave absolute power to the industrialists over the workers as well as a royal present in the shape of a 25% cut in wages. Krupp's fortunes flourished with the rearmament drive and this time he did not need to court the good will of the workers. But the scene has changed again and Krupp needs their good will in order to fulfil the expected big orders for armaments from the German and foreign governments—and at present there is no dictator in Germany to compel the workers into submission. Therefore Krupp has partly re-introduced his pension scheme in order to attract them. Most German industrialists give their workers an addition to the state pension after they have worked for them 30 to 40 years. Krupp, however, pays more than the others, which on the average amounts to about a 25% increase.

WILLY FULANO.

**WORKERS' CONTROL**

TO say that the idea of Workers' Control of industry dies hard is to give a wrong impression of the strength of the grip it has on working class imagination. The fact is that it is not dying at all.

Although "working-class" political parties like to shove the idea of workers' control into the background, bringing it forward for an airing just now and then, but for the most part thinking more in terms of political or State control, among conscious workers it remains a driving force that will not be suppressed.

True, it has been dormant. Like the class struggle itself, the conception of workers in industry running the productive and distributive processes themselves has suffered from the rot of political thought. Parliamentarianism and class collaboration have seemed the easier way. Workers have been prepared to believe that their interests could safely be placed in the hands of political leaders and that all they had to do was to vote at election time and emancipation would be dropped into their laps.

**"Common Interests"**

Both the practice and the belief in direct action by the workers themselves have taken a back seat, to be used only when the official unions were simply too slow to be tolerated. And through the class-collaboration methods of the Labour Party, the workers have in many cases come to think in terms of themselves and their employers having interests in common. While the nationalisation schemes have taken the place of socialisation—the two conflicting conceptions being deliberately confused by Labour leaders and Trade Union officials—so that the workers looked towards State ownership as a step towards workers' control.

This was, of course, completely false, but since workers are convinced more by experience than by argument, it has taken the reality of nationalisation to make them realise that to swap the old bosses for a new set is not really to affect their own position at all. Nationalisation has created a managerial caste, in place of the old owning caste, which will defend its position as fiercely as the owners—more fiercely, in fact, since the step from State control to workers' control will be a far more revolutionary one than that from private ownership to State control.

When the mines, for example, were nationalised, the owners were certainly not dismayed, for the compensation, which still claims £15 million per year from the ministry, is now guaranteed by the State and their incomes are not now subject to the fluctuations of the markets. But unless workers' control is simply to mean workers administering capitalism, its coming into being must mean shrugging these ex-owner parasites off their backs together with the new bureaucratic parasites—and this, we fancy, will lead to a certain amount of resentment. But it will have to be done and that is where

**That Idea That Won't Die**

the wide divergence of interest between the productive workers and the supervisors shows itself.

**The State Won't Let Go**

That is one reason why we cannot regard nationalisation as a step towards workers' control. Another reason is that State control of essential industries is too important for the State for it to be able to allow control to pass out of its hands, even if it wants to. It is often thought by workers that nationalisation has been introduced for their benefit, but nothing could be further from the truth. Nationalisation has been introduced for the benefit of British capitalism, and what benefits have been gained in the way of welfare schemes, canteens, pit-head baths, pensions or what-not are simply the crumbs thrown to the workers to keep them quiet—and are, anyway, gains that they could have won for themselves by their own direct action during the war and post-war full employment period.

Not only has the State come to the rescue of capitalism with its nationalisation schemes, but, since the primary function of the State becomes more and more organisation of society for war, it becomes more and more essential for it to

have complete and unhampered control of those industries which are most important in the waging of war. That is why it has been the sources of financial control (Bank of England), power (coal, gas, electricity), transport (road and rail) and iron and steel that have passed into the hands of the State. The Tories' denationalisation plans, be it noted, have aimed at diverting the profits of some of these industries back into private hands, but at leaving control to the State.

**Must Be Revolutionary**

This is why any advocates of workers' control must recognise that it is a revolutionary change in human and property relationships. Revolutionary feeling has been very successfully subdued in this country by all the "Socialist" parties, but still the hope for workers' control persists.

For example, an article in *Labour's Southern Voice* for March, 1953 is entitled "Next Step in Nationalisation—Workers' Control." It is by Price Jones, a shaftsman at Gin Pit Colliery, Lancashire, and after describing the growing feeling of frustration among the miners that nationalisation has not brought them any more say in the running of the mines, he goes on to say:

"We must find a method by which the worker will really be able to run his industry in the interests of himself and his fellow-workers. This is how I would do it.

"First of all there would only be one industrial union. All the workers in the industry would belong to that union—workers, officials and even the manager himself. There would be Regional, Area and Colliery Trade Union Committees.

"Each Colliery Committee would be responsible for the day-to-day running of that colliery, including the setting up of that colliery's target. The committee would meet regularly at the pithead and would deal with day-to-day problems. All officials would be elected at these meetings by show of hands.

"They would, of course, be required to possess the necessary technical qualifications and, after appointment, would have power to give instructions in accordance with agreed policy.

"From these meetings would be elected members to serve on the Area, Regional and National Committees, the colliery union branches retaining the power of recall.

"The idea is that the Mining Union should run the industry, with at national level a Minister responsible for a broad general policy.

**LETTERS TO THE EDITORS**

**WHAT IS A WORKER?**

I WILL leave to Comrade Andreas the task of deciding whether he or Comrade A.M. has the greatest misconception of anarchism. I would like, however, to comment upon some of the muddled statements which A.M. makes in his latest contribution to the controversy.

The term "worker" is one of the most loosely and confusedly used terms in disputes on the social question. In its economic sense (that is, in reference to the relationship of the worker to the economic system) a worker can be defined as one who can only exist by selling his power to labour to an employer. This definition obviously covers the great majority of people in contemporary society, including many, if not all, of the so-called professional class (another loose term which appears to be applied to everyone from a scientist to a prostitute). Most people use the term "worker," however, in a rather narrower sense, meaning by it a type of person who dresses, talks and behaves in a particular manner and earns below a certain income. It is in this latter sense that many propagandists, as well as would-be revolutionaries of the middle-class, refer to the "workers;" very often attributing to them an attitude different from their masters, but which few of them possess.

Comrade A.M. apparently thinks that term should be used in an even narrower sense, since for him the only worker that is in any position to take "immediate action" is the industrial, productive workers. Such people as dockers, railwaymen, warehouse and other distributive workers do not count. I am not quite sure what sort of "immediate action" is "contained in the idea of Anarcho-Syndicalism" that has not been advocated and practised by those who do not accept this title. As far as I can see, the only type of immediate action that anarcho-syndicalists can advocate and get support for is that of demanding higher wages and better working conditions. This type of action can be taken by productive and non-productive workers, solicitors clerks and sewer-cleaners, so there is no need for the "non-productive person" to be frustrated by A.M.'s exclusion of him from the "industrial struggle."

A.M.'s assertion that the "movement for occupation of places of work" is "in its successful conclusion... the Anarchist Revolution" can only lead one to wonder at the extent to which vulgar marxism has gripped the minds of certain anarcho-syndicalists. George Woodcock in the same issue of *FREEDOM* describes the timber workers' co-operative of the N.W. Pacific. Here is an example of workers successfully controlling their places of work, yet I am quite sure that the vast majority of them still pay their taxes, allow themselves to be conscripted and in general subordinate themselves to dictates of the state—not even thinking that is an evil or that men could exist without it. The same applies to the shoe-workers' co-operatives in Kettering. We are still as far away from completion of the anarchist revolution as before. I do not wish to derogate the value of such virtues, but we should always bear in mind that they are only limited experiments in a limited sphere, not permanently resulting in anything

that favours the realisation of our ideal. The state is prepared if necessary—and under certain conditions—to allow a partial autonomy in some sections of the social structure—always retaining ultimate control. The householder has considerable autonomy in the running of the house he rents or owns, but we do not usually use this as part of our case for freedom.

If it is argued that these are only isolated examples and that the anarchist revolution will only be accomplished when all places of work are controlled by the workers (The place at which I work is "occupied" by its workers. This does not stop us being exploited and dominated by the boss and the state) my answer is that I can quite envisage complete workers' control of industry, yet no anarchist society. For anarchism can only realise its aim in a complete liberative revolutionising of all aspects of man's relation to man. An economic revolu-

tion without a change in character of man as a lover, parent and friend as well as a worker, would merely result in the reinstatement of authority. Anarchism relates to all aspects of man's social and personal being.

As for the question of violence, A.M.'s scornful reference to "bourgeois near-anarchists" of "the last decade" discussing "secondary problems" such as violence in the revolution, merely displays his lack of proportion and historical knowledge. This question has been discussed since the inception of the anarchist movement and such "bourgeois near-anarchists" as Malatesta and Berkman thought it necessary to devote considerable space in their writings to it. Because Comrade A.M. has only discovered in the last ten years, it does not follow that it had no existence before then—unless he is a follower of Bishop Berkeley, of course.

Finally, to me there is no such thing as the "working-class angle" of anarchism, only the anarchist angle on the working class.

London, Mar. 20. S. E. PARKER.

**Education and the Child**

I AM unqualified to discuss the "old" philosophical problem of free will versus determinism, nor, I feel, would many people read on if I exceeded a few lines on the subject. My own point of view is that of Max Planch who described it as one of a group of "phantom problems," changing its meaning depending on where you are sitting. A phantom problem bedevils men who think into arguing, sometimes violently, with views which are contradictory and yet identical. They are all right. The only person who is wrong in this game is the one who compromises both points of view, as Voltaire did in pronouncing that while you can do what you will you cannot will what you will.

But "free will" was the last hare I wished to chase. I was trying to say something much simpler. What is risked and what gained by "sending" children to school? I agree with Mr. Peeke on the reasons that children are so sent and what is intended to happen to them there. (If you disagree you will be interested by the speech of the historian Macauley as an M.P. proposing the first

universal education bill in parliament.) But how great is this risk? Children will be adversely affected who, as a result of early development, are already open to inculcation, yet it is reassuring how early in his life a child may build on to a healthy dependence an equally healthy scepticism. A child who is down in the dumps will seize any comfort open to him, whether at school—in being top of the class, in gloating over red dye on a map, in recounting the seven times table till he drops off to sleep—or not. Such are the attitudes which, developed in later life, become subjects for editorials in *FREEDOM*, but such are not the attitudes we imagine, perhaps blindly, to be present in the children we ourselves may be caring for.

By the time a healthy child is old enough for school he is resistant or only superficially susceptible to dogmatic training. Is this belief borne out by the experience of teachers? And I cannot see that other children who need substitute "love objects" are going to be any better off finding them around the home than around the school. They will find them anyway.

I have misunderstood Mr. Peeke in thinking he was referring to the present day, rather than to a future day of anarchist societies. But neither then nor now would I have the temerity to appoint custodians to decide when a person was knowledgeable enough to be free, in the sense that he was free to choose. Making decisions isn't a right but a function. Decisions are being made continually. I was not concerned with determining why, simply with enlarging the scope—the narrower the scope the greater the restrictions the chooser is placing on his own freedom, the larger the scope the more freely made his choice will be. In this sense, not in any legal one, is a person free to choose. I believe that a school can enlarge scope and would therefore not refrain from using that subtle form of coercion, persuasion. At any rate, Tommy, give it a try. If you think you can do better somewhere else you can always chuck it up.

J.E.B.

**Special Appeal**

February 21st—March 11th:  
London: Anon\* 5/-; Anon\* 2/6; Alconbury: C.A.N. 3/-; Hosslo: G.T. 1/6; Danvor: R.B. 1/15/-; Sydney: M.G. 8/-; Glossop: H.S. 5/-; Ipswich: W.M.D. 1/6; London: A.U. 13/-; London V.T. per V.R. £2; Hope: A.F. 4/-; Glasgow: A. McD.\* 4/-; Cambridge: F.P. 3/-; London: P.H.S. 3/-; London: E.B. 1/-; London: F.E.D.\* 5/-; San Francisco: J.N. 16/3; Belfast: H.C. 13/-; Minneapolis: M.S. 1/4; New York: D.M.C.G. 1/1/3; London: J.P.B. 1/1; Per O.M.: Paterson: D.V. 14/-; W. Somerville: D.C. 7/-; Allenton: W.S. £5/5/-; S. Francisco: Incaricato £33; Los Angeles: (per "Noi") £17/10/-.

Total	67	2	4
Previously acknowledged	37	10	2
1953 TOTAL TO DATE	104	12	6

GIFTS OF BOOKS: Stroud: M.K.; Preston: W.A.L. London: V.R.

\* Readers who have undertaken to send regular monthly contributions.

What Price Jones writes shows how deep-rooted is the desire for workers' control and how, through all the disappointments with reformist and Parliamentary methods, workers will again and again return to it, each time, we hope, with an improved means of achieving it. And therein lies the eventual certainty of its success.

**MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP**

**OPEN AIR MEETINGS**  
Weather Permitting  
**HYDE PARK**  
Every Sunday at 4.30 p.m.

**INDOOR MEETINGS**  
**GARIBALDI RESTAURANT,**  
**10 LAYSTALL STREET, E.C.1**  
(3 mins. Holborn Hall)  
**MARCH 31—Rashed Gool on**  
**THE RISE OF THE BOLSHEVIK PARTY**

**APRIL 7—DEBATE**  
**"THAT THE TRADE UNIONS NO LONGER REPRESENT THE INTERESTS OF THE WORKERS"**

Proposers: Philip Sansom  
Albert Meltzer  
Opposers: E. J. Emden  
Sidney Wright  
At 9, Fitzroy Square, Warren Street,  
London, W.1.  
April 7th, at 7.30.

The meetings will be held on **TUESDAYS** at 7.30 p.m.

**NORTH-EAST LONDON**

**DISCUSSION MEETINGS**  
**IN EAST HAM**  
Alternate Wednesdays  
at 7.30 p.m.

**LIVERPOOL**

**DISCUSSION MEETINGS at**  
101 Upper Parliament Street,  
Liverpool, 8.  
Every Sunday at 8 p.m.

**GLASGOW**

**INDOOR MEETINGS**  
at  
**CENTRAL HALLS, 25 Bath Street**  
Every Sunday at 7 p.m.  
With John Gaffney, Frank Carlin  
Jane Strachan, Eddie Shaw,

**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

**FREEDOM PRESS**

- MARIE-LOUISE BERNEKI:**  
*Neither East nor West* cloth 10s. 6d., paper 7s. 6d.  
*Workers in Stalin's Russia.* 1s.
- SELECTIONS FROM FREEDOM**  
*Vol. 1, 1951, Mankind is One* paper 7s. 6d.
- TONY GIBSON:**  
*Youth for Freedom* paper 2s.  
*Food Production and Population* 6d.  
*Who will do the Dirty Work?* 2d.
- PHILIP SANSOM:**  
*Syndicalism—The Workers' Next Step* 1s.
- ERRICO MALATESTA:**  
*Anarchy* 6d.  
*Vote—What For?* 1d
- M. RAKUNIN:**  
*Marxism, Freedom and the State.* paper 2s. 6d., cloth 5s.
- HERBERT READ:**  
*Art and the Evolution of Man.* 4s.  
*Existentialism, Marxism and Anarchism.* 3s. 6d.  
*Poetry and Anarchism.* cloth 5s., paper 2s. 6d.  
*The Philosophy of Anarchism.* boards 2s. 6d., paper 1s.  
*The Education of Free Men.* 1s.
- RUDOLF ROCKER:**  
*Nationalism and Culture.* cloth 21s.
- ALEX COMFORT:**  
*Delinquency* 6d.  
*Barbarism & Sexual Freedom.* paper 2s. 6d., stiff boards 3s. 6d.
- ALEXANDER BERKMAN:**  
*ABC of Anarchism* 1s.

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