

The Second Evans Report Does Not Answer the Critics

A SUGGESTION!

THE Henderson Report on the Evans murder trial (examined in some detail in FREEDOM 25.7.53) which was hailed as a "vindication of British justice" by large sections of the Press, has proved, on the contrary, to be the cause for considerable disquiet among many lawyers and laymen, as well as for the Home Secretary. So much so that he resorted to the unprecedented procedure of asking Mr. Scott Henderson to reply to the criticisms made by members of Parliament. Unfortunately for the Home Secretary, the supplementary report has merely added fuel to the fire, and some sections of the Press have even gone so far as to eat their words about British justice being vindicated, and suggest as does the *News Chronicle* that "sufficient doubts have been cast upon the Evans verdict to justify some form of further inquiry to the public". The *Manchester Guardian* which had editorially joined the chorus of "sighs of relief" when the Report was first published has at the time of writing made no comment on the Supplementary Report, and one waits with interest to see whether this undisputed champion of justice for horses will have the good grace to admit that perhaps its original verdict of the Report was a mistaken one.

AN intelligent and useful summing up of the Evans Inquiry by a lawyer was published in last Sunday's *Observer*. The writer concludes that:

"(3) The report does not disclose any fundamental weakness in the judicial system. On the evidence produced at Evans's trial he was bound to be con-

victed. No system can be perfect. No system can be guaranteed to establish the truth when a man confesses to a crime which has been committed by another. "Can you suggest any reason why Christie should want to strangle your wife and child?" was prosecuting counsel's final question to Evans. To that question the jury waited in vain for an answer. We now know there was an answer but it was unknown to all save Christie himself.

(4) If the full facts about Christie had been known to the jury that tried Evans they would almost certainly have acquitted him. Thus a man has been convicted under our jury system only because the full facts were not known at his trial. Even if he were guilty, or even if he cannot be shown to have been innocent, there are many who would call this a 'miscarriage of justice'."

And he adds this important point: "Such a miscarriage can be set right in all crimes save that which carries as its penalty—Death".

The public inquiry which is being pressed for by a number of parliamentarians such as Messrs. Rogers, Bing and Paget if intended to establish the innocence of Evans will probably fail in its mission and at the same time will seriously weaken what we consider is the fundamental argument: namely, that at a murder trial it is not certain that the jury has access to all the evidence on which to arrive at a decision; that any new evidence which might establish the innocence of a man, or at least create strong doubts as to his guilt, are of no use to him if in the meantime society has judicially murdered him. The Evans-Christie trials therefore are the most

powerful argument for the abolition of the death penalty.

A PUBLIC enquiry which, on the other hand, aims at establishing how the police go about their (sordid) job of obtaining evidence in these cases; of the facilities which the prosecution gives to the defence to have access to all the information in their possession (not only incriminating and circumstantial evidence but also that information which may weaken the prosecution case), would be of considerable public interest. There is too much public complacency about how police investigations are conducted. Lulled by the foreign tourists summing up that "your policemen are wonderful" it is too often assumed that "our" policemen must be above suspicion. That is the attitude adopted by Mr. Henderson in his report, though this, clearly, as the following extract from his trial shows, was not the opinion Evans formed of the police:

Q. Did you make the statement which the Chief Inspector took down in his notebook?—A. Yes, Sir.

Q. Before we go to that, was there any reason why you said Yes, as well as the fact you gave up everything when you heard that your daughter was dead?—A. Well, Sir, I was frightened at the time.

Q. Why were you frightened, or what were you frightened of?—A. Well, I thought if I did not make a statement the police would take me downstairs and start knocking me about.

Q. You really believed that did you?—A. Yes, Sir.

Continued on p. 3

Race Relations in S. Africa

Following Dr. Malan's refusal to admit to S. Africa the committee appointed by the United Nations to study race relations there, the committee heard evidence in Geneva. A correspondent sends us the following account of the evidence he gave before the committee.

THE Palais des Nations is too big, there are too many people looking too professional, staffers chosen for their shorthand speeds or their knowledge of Chilean banking systems, not because they're wild about world brotherhood. So be it. The atmosphere at the U.N. Commission on the racial situation in South Africa was much the same.

I went before the Commission with two sections of evidence to submit. The first was an elaboration of a written statement sent to the Commission beforehand. It dealt exclusively with conditions within South Africa. My attempt here was merely to establish that discrimination on grounds of race did exist in the Union and to give some detail of the effects of that discrimination in human terms.

The second section I considered the more important. It dealt with the reasons for the existence and deepening of that discrimination as I saw them. It was intended to throw some light on the minority fanaticism which sways South Africa and to afford recommendations as to what might constructively be done about it.

Now my arguments as to the circumstances which enabled Malan to pursue his drastic course might not, indeed have not, been favourably received in all quarters. They are simply that for a

variety of reasons, colonial, economic, defence, diplomatic, major powers in the U.N., particularly Britain, the U.S. and powers with colonies in Africa are not inclined to back the U.N. resolutions calling South Africa to account for her internal policies. More than this, I hold that there is sufficient evidence to suggest that active assistance in the matter of broad racial policy, defence, communications and strategic political arrangements is being offered to South Africa by these leading Western powers. I believe that this grand design for Africa is being assiduously developed and that it has the support, in varying degrees, of all the white communities in Africa.

This means in effect that because of the demands of the cold war and the desperation of imperialist economies becoming increasingly shorn of the colonies on which they feed, Britain, for example, has in practice abandoned her declared policy of partnership and progress towards self-government in her colonial territories. More obviously she has departed from the principle of recognising the paramountcy of interest of the indigenous peoples in those territories.

Without the support which has shown itself in such actions as the banishment of Chief Seretse Khama, the silence over the annexation of South-West Africa, Great Britain and the U.S. would not perhaps be in their present position of receiving, exclusively, all the production of uranium from South African mines. South Africa is calculated to be among the world's largest producers of this metal within a few years. Neither would the Union be so eager to participate in the defence arrangements for Africa and the Middle East; it is certain that she would not have strained her coffers to the extent of spending two million a year to keep a South African air force unit in Korea, had not diplomatic "understanding" with the Western powers been of the best.

Even with the most effective totalitarian systems it is difficult to maintain control unless there is wide support, or at least acquiescence. In South Africa three-quarters of the population can be reckoned as positively opposed to the present régime. For the Government to have risked what it has risked and to plan what it is planning makes it clear that it is confident of external backing should the worst come.

I was allowed to deal with the first part of my evidence all right. When it came to the testimony I have reviewed above, I was stopped. The chairman announced that it was not the Commission's business to deal with "aspects of international politics".

When I got back a waggish friend cracked that he could see me in the rôle of the first world political prisoner, victim of a sophisticated cosmopolitan bureaucracy. I didn't think it was funny. T.W.

Have you renewed your
Subscription to
FREEDOM?

Behind Peace in Korea

ON the face of it the proposals for a peace conference on Korea which have been placed before the United Nations seem simple enough. But some insight into the workings of power politics can nevertheless quite easily be derived from them. For example, there is the Chinese proposal, backed by the Russian delegation, that the Korean peace conference be widened to include India, Burma, Indonesia and Pakistan.

Behind all this there is the propaganda war going on mainly concerning the apparent desire of the Chinese government that the conclusion of hostilities on a major scale in Korea shall not result in a switch of American forces to Indo-China. By contrast, the French and American governments are anxious to do just this.

One might think that the evident desire of the Chinese Communists to conclude their military commitments in Indo-China as well as in Korea was a gratifying indication that they had "had enough" and would be glad to make terms. But there is much more to it than that, for the Russian and Chinese Communists know quite well that American economy, severely hit by the ending of the Korean war, needs not an ending to the war in Indo-China, but its extension. In making their proposal the Communists are able to pose as the "peace lovers" while the embarrassment of the American government makes them seem the "warmongers" they are so regularly described as in the Soviet-inspired

press. It is perhaps needless to point out that the Chinese intervention in Korea with Russian arms and technical advisers revealed that the capitalist countries were not the only ones to draw benefit from wars.

Economic Slump

But, it may be objected, is it true indeed that the American government would be embarrassed by a cessation of hostilities in Indo-China as well? It is a question which deserves closer study. According to the *Times* New York correspondent writing on the financial page

on 21/9/53, most American business men "expect, though not immediately, some sort of a decline in business activity while differing widely about what is likely to be the extent of it. Mostly where a difference of opinion has arisen it is over what measures the Government and Federal Reserve system will probably take to moderate the effect of a decline expected to follow on a big reduction of Government defence spending and of business spending for plant and equipment with a consequent shrinkage of employment and payrolls.

Continued on p. 4

THE "trial of strength" between electricians and their employers which we expected a fortnight ago to see develop, has not transpired. The strikers have gone back with nothing gained and the dispute has been the subject of a court of enquiry, whose decision has not yet been announced.

So far we can only chalk up a defeat for the electricians. True, at Earl's Court and one or two other sites, small numbers gained increases from employers outside the National Federation of Electrical Associations, but that organisation is standing firm and so far has not yielded an inch.

It is difficult to see exactly what the E.T.U. leadership has hoped to gain by recommending a return to work when it did, that could not have been gained by going to arbitration in the first place. All along, Walter Stevens (E.T.U. Secretary), resisted arbitration, but has called off the strike—and announced it to the Press before consulting his rank

ELECTRICIANS GIVE WAY

and file—order to attend a court of inquiry which turned into a sort of McCarthy committee of investigation.

For Mr. H. J. Phillimore, Q.C., representing the employers, seemed blissfully unconcerned about the issues of the strike, but was more interested in Mr. Stevens' political affiliations. Trying to prove that the strike was nothing more than a Communist attempt to sabotage the defences of this country, Phillimore showed all the tactics of the Un-American Activities Committee.

C.P. Benefit

On the issue of Stevens' membership of the Communist Party, Stevens did not deny it, but went on to say: "I do not think it has anything to do with the business before this court, any more than if I impertinently asked you if you are a member of the Tory Party."

The collapse of the strike, how-

ever, has meant that nothing of any value has been won by the workers. The only organisation that has won anything through this action is the Communist Party.

The Party has been able to point to the militant leadership shown by the Stalinist officials of the E.T.U., and to the stubborn refusal by the bosses to grant the wage increase. The Stalinists have therefore done all that was possible for their members, but the capitalists have been able to hold out.

The fact is, of course, that the leadership, which started off well, began to waver and show weakness, and did not use the full strength of the union at all.

The answer to bosses' intransigence is not to give way and accept legal quibbles—it is to extend the strike to its fullest extent. This Stevens was afraid to do, and the rank and file will now pay for it.

The New Herrenvolk

AN American Congressional Committee has been investigating a \$17 million (£6 million) housing project in Bonn which was built in 1951 for American government officials and employees when the capital was moved there from Frankfurt. The Committee criticises the expenditure as "too lavish and luxurious"—sheer understatement as the following details reveal only too clearly.

The report states that five officials' homes were built at a cost of \$115,000 (£38,500) to \$227,000 (£76,000) each. In addition 458 one- to four-room-and-bedroom apartments, complete with furnishings, were built at a cost of \$26,000 per unit, the report said.

The furnishings reportedly included everything from ham-slicers to champagne glasses. Mr. Brownson's subcommittee conceded that the project was necessary to avoid further requisitioning of German homes for Americans, but said construction should have been on a more modest scale.

The Committee did not however criticize the expenditure of a mere \$240,000 (£81,000) for the purchase and equipping of a residence for the high commissioner, who was then Mr. John J. McCloy. It said: "The official and social responsibilities of the High Commissioner's office demand a high degree of latitude in this respect."

But the committee said these considerations do not apply in the same degree to the top-ranking officials for whom five new homes were built.

And the committee disagreed also with Hicog's contention that even the lowest-paid clerk needs suitable quarters in which to entertain as unofficial representative of the United States.

The Council Republic of Munich

MUNICH, November 7th, 1918—Revolution! The king, whose ancestors had ruled Bavaria for the last 600 years, was forced by the people to abdicate. The people were bewildered by their own success, wanting socialism, but not knowing how to reach this aim. Eisner and Auer were two leaders of the Social-Democrats, busy sabotaging the aim of the people, and seeking co-operation with reaction. Gustav Landauer and Erich Mühsam were two Anarchists busy bringing about a social revolution.

The revolution in Germany, 1918, broke out first in Munich, the other cities in the North, Kiel, Berlin, followed a few days later.* That the revolution should break out first in Munich was contrary to all bourgeois and marxist expectations, for the following reasons:— (1) The ruling house had managed to remain fairly well liked in Bavaria and even in Germany, and during the war had been suggesting that, if Germany was victorious, the kings of Bavaria should occupy the throne of England, since they had a better claim to it than the house of Hanover, because they were more closely related to the Stuarts. (2) Bavaria is principally an agricultural country, and its industry was not yet sufficiently developed, so that the people were not, according to marxist conceptions, "ripe" for a revolution.

Eisner had become prime minister of the new government, and he meant to keep his place, and not have it spoiled by a social-revolution. His aim was to have a parliamentary government with the monarchy left in power. But the movement of the people and the rebelling soldiers in the barracks spoiled his plan. Auer was leader of the social-democratic party. Other workers were members of the independent socialist party. This party was supposed to be "radical" and stand "left" of the official

*See the Freedom Press pamphlet: "The Wilhelmshaven Revolt."—Icarus.

social-democratic party, from which it had split in the last years of the war; Eisner was a member of it. The biggest part of the workers were organized in trade unions, but the league of Spartacus had no adherents in Munich, nor did the communist party exist in Germany when the revolution broke out.

Landauer and Mühsam organized Soviets amongst the people. Not the perverted Soviets later made by the Bolsheviks, but revolutionary councils of workers, farmers, and all people with an useful occupation.

They were for the management of people's own affairs and had nothing to

do with a "Dictatorship of the Proletariat". Similar Soviets were organized in the year 1905 by Voline, the author of the book: *La Révolution Incomplee*.

Besides Mühsam and Landauer, there were several Anarchist workers in Munich. These few comrades stood alone; the rest were marxists, or people of other opinions. These anarchists had to remain either passive, away from the struggle of the people, or work together with it and with the marxists. They decided to be active, and do their best to bring the revolution to a good end. During the six months which the council-republic lasted, many obstacles were put

in their way by the marxists, and they had to make many concessions to them. Anarchists in Germany have later reproached Mühsam for the concessions he made to the marxists in those days. Mühsam sympathized with the communists, and had hoped to drive the revolution ahead with their help, and Landauer thought likewise. This was not surprising in those days, because people expected something better of the Russian revolution than later turned out. These half dozen anarchists had to struggle against both reaction and the treason of the social-democratic leaders, which explains much. Nevertheless here arises

the question: which is better, criticize, split hairs, and be passive, or be active and make faults? Landauer could not be touched by a critic after the revolution, he was killed by the white guards, with all their accustomed bestiality.

The revolution in Munich broke out against the wishes of the socialist leader Eisner. Only a mass demonstration of the workers for a democratic constitution with a few social-democrats for ministers and retention of the monarchy was planned. But this demonstration got out of the hands of the future minister, and became a revolution when the demonstrators united themselves with the soldiers in the barracks. On the same day Mühsam proclaimed the republic. The social-democrat Auer attempted in the following night to collect 500 "loyal"

Continued on p. 3

IT is quite possible for a person born in a "civilized" country to go through life without coming across a single case of oppression. He may have been so privileged in his circumstances as to have never come into direct contact with what we may call the subsoil of civilization where oppression is the norm; or his attentive faculty may have been so conditioned and dulled by education as to doze under the assumption that normality can never be oppressive; or, finally, he may be so confused with undigested ideas, so habituated to a limited set of inferences, and so deadily fighting shy of any mental process leading to self-commitment that when oppression stares him in the face he finds other names to describe it or leaves it unnamed.

A civilization, in fact, would create disaffection, and work for its own destruction if its structure did not correspond to its ideology of right and wrong, and if it did not supply within itself the mechanism for dealing with all wrongs as well as with ideologies that challenge its own. Democratic liberties are no ex-

ception to this rule, but part of the very mechanism to which I have just referred. Whenever they are used in such a way and find such a response as to threaten any vital part of the system they are said to be abused, and in the name of their preservation punitive action is taken against their users.

Oppression, therefore, which is acceptedly wrong, is bound to be invisible or hardly visible. When clearly detected and described, it is explained and justified in terms of transcendence or impersonal, ineluctable forces. The main point at stake is that any one living within or profiting by the system should not be held responsible. If there is guilt it must be distributed to the point of dispersion; crime must be denied by concentrating on errors, the fundamental must be forgotten in details, and optimism must prevail by the daily instilled conviction that if our country is not the best of all existing countries, everything in it will be put

Oppression and Culture

right in time with a bit of patience and good will.

The existence of classes is minimized by calling attention to vertical divisions, by contrasting income and social status, by appealing to equality of legal and political rights, by stressing social mobility and instances of interpenetration, co-operation and collaboration, and by developing a legislation ostentatiously inspired by the principle of equality of opportunities. Failing all this, its economic basis will be glossed over or natural inequalities will be given the last word. Talent, initiative, and all kinds of virtues will be shown to reap ineluctably their just reward, with no tort or injury inflicted upon those who lack them.

THUS, in the end, there is only fate to blame, and there is nothing to do but leave things as they are. But it so happens that part of the fate of man is to question his fate, and to discover that much that passes as fate is man-made and can therefore be unmade. It is by this discovery that oppression is made visible. Oppression lies first and foremost in such pseudo-fatal circumstances by which a man is born of poor parents, grows up in a crowded house with a tired mother and an ill-tempered father, receives a summary education, and then is left with no choice but to spend the best part of his remaining days doing what he is told, and working for purposes alien to his wishes, and often beyond his ken.

Oppression is in being a worker, and only secondarily in the conditions under which one works. A peasant who owns his land or an artisan who owns his tools can and does find fulfilment in his fate; what they produce is theirs; there is pride and a feeling of social importance in their productive activity. But the worker has no sense of belonging to the society for which he works. He is an economic and not a social unit; he can be replaced at any time; the less personality he has the more efficient and appreciated his work will be. He can be replaced by another worker or, better, and more economically, by a new piece of machinery. He is himself a piece of machinery, and in most cases he does not control a machine but is controlled by it. That a civilization should turn a vast number of men into slaves to machines, make them lower even than animals, make them tools, automata and things, is, from an ethical point of view, its worst indictment.

It is true that a man is always free to refuse to become the slave of a machine, but to reach such a decision and to have the courage to carry it out requires an ability to think about one's fate and a strength of will which is greatly discouraged by the type of education the worker receives and by the type of interests and activities ready made for him in his leisure hours. Besides, a decision to rebel against his fate either leads him to sacrifice his leisure time to study or more work with chances of success greatly limited by the competition of others born in more favourable circumstances, or makes him resort to acts of violence or expropriation which the beneficiaries of the system have taken good care to define as criminal and to punish accordingly. Even when taking background and circumstances into account, modern psychology and criminology fail to admit that for a vast number of people, and especially for the youth, crime is the only alternative to a life-time of slavery and a sub-human condition.

Those most directly responsible for the existence of the sub-human worker, and those concerned with labour problems, have no qualms of conscience, no feelings of involvement in what amounts to an institution of forced degradation. Whether liberals or socialists, they are

not interested in men but in production or, rather, the more and more quickly men produce, the prouder they feel of their species and of their civilization. But the humanist, whatever his creed and affiliation, is positively repelled by the existence of fellow-men who are practically insensitive to all the values that make his own life worth living. He is aware of their increasing number, his repulsion becomes despair. His idea of a better and fuller humanity cannot be realized out of millions brutalized and stultified by the discipline of the factory and the machine. The proletarian, as he used to be called, is the internal barbarian of our civilization, ignorant and contemptuous of the culture that is the humanist's most precious possession.

CULTURE itself is in a process of crisis and disintegration. Some even go as far as to foresee in the not distant future the end of religion, philosophy, poetry and art. Diagnoses vary, but very seldom have they gone near the core of the problem than when lamenting that these values have been commercialized. The agony of culture in our civilization is closely linked to the existence of internal barbarians, to the sub-human condition of the vast majority of people, to the subordination of man to production.

It is not only that cultural values have been incorporated into profit-making concerns, that in order to reach as wide a public as possible they must be adapted to the low intelligence and rudimentary sensibility of the greatest number. Culture is a living process, a communing in awareness, a common interpretation and sharing of man's fate on earth. It is thinking, asking questions, and readiness to venture upon new paths or to choose among old ones, it is freedom to sow and freedom to reap in the context of both one's life-history and one's social surroundings. But cultural activities have now sunk to the rôle of providing entertainment. Cultural problems are matters of technique and no longer of content. Creativeness, though not artificiality and extravagance, is comparatively rare. Cultures of all countries and ages are plundered, mixed, hashed and dressed up in an infinity of meaningless combinations. The dead products of culture are given to the masses to make them laugh, gape in uncomprehending admiration, move them inconclusively, and store their brains with a dazzling heap of day-dreaming material. Culture of this kind, if it may be called culture, serves thus an anti-cultural purpose, and continues the work of stultification and degradation begun in the factory. Culture is given to workers as a product like all products of industry, something they can buy and consume, but to the making of which they do not partake. The humanities are a closed book to them; they are the business of some specialists, like anything else, and the humanist, both as an ideal and a real person is even more inconceivable to them than the inhabitants of Mars.

Obviously, then, the so-called civilization and cultural values for which in the event of war both the few remaining humanists and the great mass of workers are called to fight and die are not even a superstructure in the Marxian sense, the result of the blood and sweat of the many for the glory of the few, but an integral part of the mechanism of oppression, a means to ensure the degradation of the many with nothing of a spiritual quality even for the few.

But if humanists and workers could come to mutual understanding, then the sub-human could become human, real culture would throb with new life, and all the hard-won values of the past would be preserved and added to, yield meaning, courage and joy. It might be the end of oppression.

GIOVANNI PALLIOLA

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF THE WITCH-HUNTS

WE are wondering, in these days of impassioned defence of civil liberties and humanist writers, when the convictions of the libertarians and the insights of the psychiatrists will finally meet, to produce a new political intelligence and a psychotherapy which has not only sick people for its patients, but the world.

For one thing we may be thankful: that the raids on freedom of speech and freedom of thought in the United States have provoked an increasingly vigorous response from certain leading citizens—men like Stringfellow Barr, Justice William O. Douglas, Robert M. Hutchins, and some others. Further, what seems the rapid knuckling under of the silent majority to rabble-rousers of suspicion is beginning to produce relative analysis of popular action, including attempts to understand the psychology of people who are willing to follow the lead of persons like Sen. McCarthy and to echo the attitudes of those who claim to be guarding the United States against subversion from within. "Why They Voted for McCarthy" (*Nation*, Sept. 20, 1952) by H. H. Wilson, was a notable step in this direction. Now, in the *Humanist* for May-June, 1953, George Simpson, a sociologist of Brooklyn College, writes on "The Conspiracy Against Reason" in a way that exposes further the anatomy of the witch-hunting trend.

Mr. Simpson shows that the groups and individuals who menace democratic institutions in this way may be divided

into several classifications, of which he indicates five: (1) power-seeking ideological-religious groups; (2) politically ambitious persons who would ride to high office on waves of fear and anxiety; (3) vested economic interests which oppose any change in property relationships and fear curtailment of profits; (4) the multitude of sufferers from neurosis or mild psychopathic disorder "who cannot bear to live in a world of free inquiry and scientific truth"; and, finally, (5) the intimidated and the frightened, who are easily made responsive to demagogic appeals.

Simpson discusses each of these groups in turn. It is the fourth group, we think, which merits the closest attention for this classification is probably growing rapidly, and its weaknesses are found in lesser degree among many other human beings. Mr. Simpson's account of this group begins:

"The fourth group who use 'communism' as a way to advance what they think are their interests, comprises the lunatic fringe. It consists of emotionally unstable people, terrorized by the atomic age or their own life histories, who latch onto this movement of unreason as a way of salving their own anxieties, relieving their tensions and covering their own shortcomings. Not understanding the complexities of modern industrial society, relatively illiterate in social science, weighed down by the heavy demands made on intelligence by modern scientific and secular ideals, they seek what they suppose is the good life, not through goodness, but through flagellating some scapegoat of evil. Haunted by guilt and fearful of death (as are all of us humans), these people have found an enemy on whom to relieve their guilt and expend energy so recklessly that though they may not dream of immortality any longer, they can at least forget mortality. All those who do not agree with them are Communists. Their lives are devoted to exorcising from the external world evils which exist only within them, and so they join the conspiracy of irrationality and downright stupidity which uses opprobrium as a substitute for the understanding of problems."

The hope that libertarians and the new psychotherapy may ultimately arrive at synthesis of outlook is largely pertinent to the problems of this group. We all know about these "unstable" people—we meet them, hear them complain, orate, whine, and threaten nearly every day of our lives. The question is, what to do about them? Or, more important, what are the contributing causes of their unhappy conditions? Mr. Simpson speaks of those who "cannot bear to live in a world of free inquiry and scientific truth," yet we should like to submit that

practically nobody is born to this state of mind, or mindlessness.

The fact that must be faced, we think, is that the causes which make this group so large, and therefore so threatening to democratic institutions, are causes inherent in the social and cultural environment of Western civilization. And libertarians, we further suggest, must do more than mark these tendencies for identification: they must study them, try to understand them, and work out at least tentative programmes for reducing their prevalence.

For years and years, for generations and even centuries, the liberal and revolutionary minorities, through their publications—pamphlets, periodicals, books, and tracts—have been identifying the forces of evil in the world. The "enemy" in each historical period is described, his crimes listed with enthusiasm, his elimination promised by the forces of righteousness. But after each "purge", even though conducted by political or "rational" means instead of totalitarian liquidation, the enemies reappear in new guises, often more numerous than before.

Now, however, with the sort of analysis and identification Mr. Simpson and some others are providing, there is at least the hope of a new kind of "attack" on the problem. Now we can say to ourselves, "These people are sick, and we, as representatives of the society we have helped to shape, have a measure of responsibility for their condition." We do not here propose a sentimental *mea culpa* attitude, but the realism which recognizes that people who attempt leadership thereby assume a kind of responsibility for both past and present, as well as for the future.

We need to ask ourselves, then, not only for a picture of the sort of society which will "produce" individuals with healthy minds and emotions—a society in which people will be eager for the responsibilities of freedom and creative endeavour—but, also, to ask ourselves what sort of currents of action may help to produce such individuals, now, within the matrix of a culture which seems increasingly to discourage appreciation of the values of freedom and to discount the vital importance of independent thinking.

The imperatives of such programming seem not to have occurred to most of those who write about the enclosing forces of emotional reaction which have made so many regions of life in the United States sanctuaries of complete mediocrity and conformity. Yet, as we see it, there is really nothing else of importance before us to do.

—MANUS (Los Angeles).

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP OPEN DAILY

OPEN 10 a.m. to 6:30: 5.0 SATURDAYS

Ready October:

KINSEY REPORT on—
SEXUAL BEHAVIOUR IN THE
HUMAN FEMALE

800 pages 60/-

★ ★ ★

SEXUAL BEHAVIOUR IN THE
HUMAN MALE 47/6

We are NOW taking orders for
the above books

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

A SUGGESTION!

Continued from p. 1

On this subject it is of some interest to refer to the evidence in the current trial of Alfred Charles Whiteway charged with the "Towpath Murders". In cross-examining the police witness, Detective-Superintendent Herbert Hannam of New Scotland Yard, the defence questioned him as to what was said after Whiteway had made his statement:

I put it to you that this is what you said. "Look, we can prove you did it, and you will go harder for you and we will give you another chance, so come on and we will help you?"

Detective-Superintendent Hannam: That is quite correct.

Whiteway: You deny you said that?—I did not say anything like that.

I am instructed to put it to you that Whiteway then said "Help me? You couldn't help yourself?"—Nothing of the kind was ever said.

And that that remark enraged you and you jumped up saying, "Right, you have got all the chances you are going to get. You will prove it. You wait and see. You will hang for it."—It is absolutely correct.

Mr. Prothero reserved further cross-examination.

Allegations such as those made at the Eveans and Whiteway trials, have occasionally been made at other trials during the past few years. But for the fact that lawyers know that to expose police methods in court is frowned upon by magistrates and judges, and can often prejudice rather than assist the prisoner's chances of a light sentence if found guilty, we are sure that much more of the third degree methods (with or without violence) used by the police, would come into the open. It is significant that in two murder cases police methods should be attacked. In these cases the defence is not concerned with humoring the judge or magistrate, since if found guilty there is only one punishment that can be imposed: Death.

★

THE campaign to oblige the government to hold a third inquiry may resolve itself into a party battle, in which one can only expect the House to divide along party lines—which presumably will result in the government having a majority of votes in favour of not holding an inquiry. And where does one go from there? On the other hand, if there are enough citizens sufficiently interested in going to the bottom of this Evans business—and we think there are, why don't we do something about it ourselves and hold our own public inquiry just for a change? We know who are the people we want to question, and we will invite them to appear. We know the documentation we want to see and we shall ask the government departments and the police to provide these documents. If the witnesses refuse to attend or the documents are not forthcoming we shall have no power to demand them but we shall be justified in informing public opinion that either the authorities have something to hide or/and that when it comes to the point of exercising our democratic rights, about which the politicians talk so much, the government is the first to obstruct them!

This may be a very unorthodox suggestion in a country choked by red tape and rules of procedure, but it is to be hoped that it might appeal to those men and women who have championed this very important case with no other motive than to see that right prevails and that the scourge of judicial murder should be wiped out once for all.

A PLEA FOR THE INDIVIDUAL

WITH the exception of a handful of octogenarian liberals, the anarchists seem to be alone among the politically conscious in defending the rights of the individual as an individual and in refusing to consider him as a cog in the vast machine of State. This is not surprising since the individual as such can no longer be catered for in a world divided into great blocs; in nations whose survival depends on the magic word "production"; in industries so vast and mechanised that the craftsman is an anachronism; in workers'

organisations in which the raising of one man's hand at a conference may represent his view of the views of a million workers!

This contempt for human personality and diversity is not only reflected in mass pleasures, mass tastes, mass prejudices, and herd behaviour in general, but is accentuated by the many injustices perpetrated towards those "misfits" of society who just don't seem to fit in the pigeon-hole reserved for their number and classification!

O'BRIEN'S ODYSSEY

THERE is the case of Patrick Michael O'Brien for instance. He has rightly been described as the "perpetual passenger". He was once a barman in Shanghai. One day he decided to pack up and go to Portuguese Macao and accordingly boarded a ship in Hongkong sailing to those parts. When he arrived there he was not allowed to land. He returned to Hongkong but met with the same refusal. So for ten months he sailed back and forth between the two ports! Finally he was given a visa for Brazil where his wife lives, but on arrival at Rio de Janeiro immigration officials refused to allow him to land. Being only the slave of the ship and not its master, he had to go where it took him, and the next port at which he attempted to land was Marseilles. But once again there was no room for Patrick O'Brien in France, and the last news we have of him is that he is on his way to Genoa. Will he be once more refused a haven?

[NOTE: If Patrick O'Brien had all the money that it would cost in fares to transport him backwards and forwards across the world for more than a year, he could set up as a business man. Then he would find all doors open to him. It's much more difficult to enter a country if you actually want to work with your hands].

★

CABINET MAKER NO COUNTRY WANTS

THEN there is the case of Ignatz Mezei, for twenty-five years a resident in the United States. A Hungarian, born in Gibraltar, he entered the United States illegally in 1923. (How many now "respectable" American citizens entered the States illegally in those days!) It has now become a crime in Ignatz Mezei's case because the organisation he joined in 1924, The Workers' Sick Benefit and Educational Society (a Hungarian organisation), and of which he was the President of the Buffalo branch between 1939-45, was taken over in 1930 by the International Workers' Order which is now one of the hundreds of "proscribed organisations" in the United States. Ignatz Mezei's mistake was that in 1948 he returned to Europe to visit his mother who was dying in Roumania (actually he only got as far as Hungary). After his

*That thankless parent, Mother Church,
Has ever left me in the lurch;
And while so many fools are seen
To strut a Rector or a Dean,
Who live at ease and find good cheer
On ev'ry day of ev'ry year,
So small her share of true discerning,
She turn'd her back on all my learning,
I've in my vineyard labour'd hard,
And what has been my lean reward?
I've dug the ground, while some rich
Vicar*

*Press'd the ripe grape, and drank the
liquor:*

*I've fed the flock, while others eat
The mutton's nice delicious meat;
I've kept the hive, and made the honey,
While the drones pocketed the money.*

WILLIAM COMBE. The Tour of Dr. Syntax in Search of the Picturesque (1809, 1812).

mother's death he sought to return to the States but could not get an entry permit. Finally his wife, a naturalised American citizen, succeeded in obtaining a visa and a preferred number on the English quota. He returned in January 1950, but on admitting to immigration officials that he was a member of the International Workers' Order, he was told to wait and then sent to Ellis Island and questioned several times more about his membership of the I.W.O. Two months later he was told that he had been excluded from entry to the U.S. as a "bad security risk". On May 10th, 1952, he was released from Ellis Island on \$3,000 bail, after Federal Judge Irving Kaufman had ruled on a fifth habeas corpus proceeding that his detention had been unduly prolonged! A matter of nearly two-and-a-half years on Ellis Island!

On March 16 this year the Supreme Court ruled by a five to four majority that an alien barred from the country could be held indefinitely on Ellis Island, or at least until the Government could find a country that would admit him. Further, in its ruling the Supreme Court also sustained the right of the Attorney General to deport Mr. Mezei without a hearing or without disclosing the reasons for the deportation order.

So on April 23rd, with a bag of apples in one hand, and the tools of his trade in the other, Ignatz Mezei surrendered to the Machine, and back he went to Ellis Island. For all we know the 56 year old cabinet-maker is still there, for seventeen countries (including Bri-

tain) have already refused to have this "bad security risk" in their midst.

Ignatz Mezei's parting remarks as he was taken on board the ferry expose the criminal stupidity of those who make and who administer the laws:

"If I were a security risk I had a whole year to go around blowing up factories and bridges in between my weekly visits to the Immigration office. I would like to find out for myself what they have against me. If I were a Communist I would stay in Hungary—plenty jobs in Hungary for Communists."

Can nothing be done for Gibraltar born Ignatz Mezei? As a first step enquiries should be made with the competent authorities in this country, who refused him an entry permit, to know why he has been excluded. And then perhaps one of our octogenarians who still look on Man as a creature with feelings and rights will be moved by this human tragedy to take action in the right quarters. Above all, the Ignatz Mezei's of our times must not be allowed to become "forgotten men".

★

CONSCIENCE MONEY IS NOT ENOUGH

WHAT is a man's freedom worth? Or the question might, in the case we have in mind, be better put: what compensation is due to a man who has been wrongfully deprived of his freedom (assuming for one moment that the State has in certain cases the right to do so)?

Next to politicians . . . are some of our priests (who make religion policy), if not far beyond them, for they domineer over statesmen and princes themselves . . . What have they not made the common people believe? Impossibilities in nature, incredible things; what devices, traditions, ceremonies have they not invented in all ages, to keep men in obedience, to enrich themselves? . . . the common people will sooner obey priests than captains, and nothing so forcible as superstition, or better than blind zeal to rule a multitude; have so terrified and gullied them, that it is incredible to relate.

BURTON. The Anatomy of Melancholy. (1621).

LIBERTARIAN.

THE COUNCIL REPUBLIC OF MUNICH

Continued from p. 2

Continued from p. 2

soldiers in Munich to have the animators of the revolution arrested, and the former state of affairs re-established. But he could not find these 500 "loyal" soldiers in Munich, so his plan did not come off. During the same night Mühsam spoke on the streets. He was more an agitator for practical development towards socialism, while Landauer was more a theorist and literary man. Mühsam had been active in Munich before the revolution and published a paper *Kain*. Landauer came to Munich at the start of the revolution. Before the war he published in Berlin the paper *Der Sozialist*, several books on Socialism, and a book on Shakespeare.

The first action of the two Anarchists was to organize the "Revolutionary Workers' Council". This council then took the initiative and formed in every workshop the "Revolutionary Workshop Organization". These councils were to be organized in every city and village and form (in connection with the "Soldiers and Farmers Council") the administration of every city and village. All these councils in the country were to elect representatives and send them to a "Council Congress" in Munich, where these representatives were to deliberate for the ways and means to develop the revolution into real socialism, and defend it against reactionary forces.

According to the plan of Mühsam and Landauer these councils and congress should work on a federative basis, and not be centralized. Against this revolutionary movement Eisner and Auer worked in conjunction with the reactionary forces. They were for a Parliamentary

election. This Parliament they aimed at making the real law-maker in Bavaria, forcing the "Workers Councils" to insignificance. Auer developed into a treacherous second Noske. Behind the back of the revolutionary movement he organized the White Guards, together with the reactionary movement. The social-democrats had, since the first day of their existence, concentrated on parliamentarism. Since so many workers had found out in the course of time that elections had not helped them, they turned towards the workers councils. The reactionary army officers and high officials of the government and the bourgeoisie on the whole had no reason at all to complain against Eisner and Auer. "Their property was safe!" Eisner proclaimed, and soon he put the reactionary officers and officials back into their former occupations, from which they had been chased away by the revolution.

The reactionary forces used the social-democratic leaders to do their work for them, and therefore they assisted them to occupy high positions in the government—to be ministers, presidents of the police, etc. The reaction dared not yet show its own face openly. The social-democrats were the Praetorian Guards of the reaction. Auer was president of the Munich police force and in this position he was able to hinder the propaganda of the workers councils.

Eisner had Mühsam and eleven other revolutionaries arrested on January 10th, 1919, because he feared that they would frustrate the election for parliament which should take place on the 12th January. Yet Mühsam and his comrades

*The Social-Democratic police minister of Prussia, who crushed the Spartacists.

Hans Klose, a German citizen, was arrested by the British Security Police as a war crimes suspect and handed over to the Communists who kept him in a concentration camp for five years without trial. He has since been released. Not unnaturally Mr. Klose is resentful about the whole business and lodged a complaint against the British authorities for false arrest and extradition. A British Court has rejected his claim, but his lawyer said last week that the British High Commission had told him that Klose would get a £1,912 *ex gratia* payment. The High Commission stressed that it did not mean recognition of the German's claim.

The claims court which rejected Klose's suit said that full responsibility for his internment lay with the Communists because the error would have been cleared up in a trial. Klose's extradition was "in adherence to international agreements" in force at that time, the court said, but recommended an out-of-court payment for sufferings and deterioration of his health during the confinement.

It is easy enough to blame the Communists, but if before handing Klose over to them the British authorities had examined the evidence against him they might have found out then what they now know, and Klose would have been spared five years internment in a concentration camp. And it is no moral justification to say that their actions were governed by "international agreements in force at that time". The fact of there being "international agreements" did not therefore stamp them with the seal of justice, any more than four murderers conspiring to eliminate an enemy would make their action less reprehensible than of only one had done it. The arrest of suspects in one zone and handing them over to third parties, which has been all too common in "liberated" Europe, renders the former as responsible as the latter. The decision of the English Court in respect of the five year detention is both irresponsible and immoral, and we feel that the case of Hans Klose should be given wide publicity in this country and much more substantial moral and economic amends should be made to this man than the miserable *ex-gratia* conscience-money that has now been grudgingly offered him.

were on the next day liberated from prison by the "Workers Council" which forced Eisner to set them free. The bourgeoisie had in the meantime received reinforcements of several regiments of soldiers from the front in France, not yet imbued with revolutionary thinking.

The election took place. Gradually after the election the "Workers Councils" and the reaction clashed. This was not surprising because the bourgeoisie was helped by the social-democrats, who utilised all means of frustrating the revolution. Not only the leaders, but also a large part of the party members supported the reaction.

Social-democratic ministers organized "Republican Defence Troops" to maintain "law and order". In their treacherous attitude towards the revolution, however, they were worse than the real reactionaries, because they proclaimed themselves its friends, when they had already planned to destroy it.

The "Republican Defence Troops" arrested Mühsam April 13th, during the night, with a number of other revolutionaries. Landauer was not arrested because he was away from home. The troops brought them to the railway station, and put them on a train, under strong military guard, to North-Bavaria. This, incidentally, saved Mühsam's life, because if he had remained in Munich a month longer he would have been killed like Landauer. In North Bavaria Mühsam was kept under arrest by the government which had been established there for the purpose of fighting the Munich Council-Republic. Mühsam remained in prison for a number of years.

(To be concluded)

IS THE N.H.S. REACTIONARY?

P.S. in the fifth of his series of articles on *Reform and Revolution* makes the following statement:

"Those reforms which should be fought for as an educational practice should be those which carry immediate benefits for workers. Nationalisation does not fall into this category—the Health Service does. State control has simply meant a change of masters. The Health Service has meant access to benefits which has improved the well-being and every-day life of millions.

"And it is precisely the worthwhile reforms which will be attacked first, and which therefore will have to be defended."

Nationalisation as I understand it is the taking over by the State of industries, trades, services, etc. The various health services which were previously run by voluntary organisations are now owned by the State. Why P.S. draws a distinction between nationalisation and the Health Service I cannot understand.

Apart from his question of terminology, however, the attitude expressed by P.S. towards such reformist measures as the N.H.S. is a rather peculiar one for an anarchist. The nationalisation and centralisation of what were in many cases non-governmental and voluntary bodies has had the effect of further increasing the evils of statism. It is a grave blow to individual initiative and personal responsibility. Many of the so-called benefits of the N.H.S. could be obtained from previous contributory

schemes such as the Hospital Saturday Fund before it was inaugurated. Workers used to form amongst themselves various sick clubs and mutual aid societies. P.S. has often praised self-help schemes on the part of the people, yet here he is suggesting that we should advocate the defence of something whose very nature involves the substitution of State paternalism for self-help! Not to mention the vast bureaucracy all State control creates and fosters!

What P.S. seems to ignore is the fact that the N.H.S. is a coercive scheme. Whatever faults the previous voluntary schemes may have had at least they did not compel us to belong to them. To cease contributing to them simply meant one no longer received any benefit, but if one just falls behind in one's contributions to the State scheme—let alone cease to contribute—not only does one not receive any benefit, but one is liable to prosecution as well! Since we have anarchists taken to defending *compulsive* schemes? The N.H.S. is a regressive measure and a perversion of natural mutual aid which anarchists should encourage. We can no more justify a health service which receives its sanction from the organized vengeance of law than we can any other government decreed measure.

London, Sept. 18. S. E. PARKER

A Gentleman is every man who, with a tolerable suit of clothes, a sword by his side, and a watch and snuff-box in his pockets, asserts himself to be a Gentleman, swears with energy that he will be treated as such, and that he will cut the throat of any man who presumes to say the contrary.

CHESTERFIELD, A Man of Honour (1752)

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

OPEN AIR MEETINGS

Weather Permitting
HYDE PARK
Sundays at 3.30 p.m.
TOWER HILL
Tuesdays at 12.30 p.m.

INDOOR MEETINGS *Watch this column for announcement of new meetings in September.*

NORTH-EAST LONDON

DISCUSSION MEETINGS

IN EAST HAM
Alternate Wednesdays
at 7.30 p.m.
OCT. 7.—S. E. PARKER
ANARCHISM, WORK AND INDUSTRY.

W. LONDON

ANYONE INTERESTED IN FORMING A DISCUSSION GROUP IN THE WEST LONDON AREA, PLEASE CONTACT:

S. E. PARKER,
79 WARWICK AVENUE,
LONDON, W.9.

BRADFORD

OPEN-AIR MEETINGS
Broadway Car Park,
Sundays, 8.30 p.m.

GLASGOW

OUTDOOR MEETINGS
from now until further notice
at
MAXWELL STREET,
Sundays at 7 p.m.
With John Galtney, & others

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 &c Payee, and addressed to the publishers:

FREEDOM PRESS
27 Red Lion Street
London, W.C.1 England
Tel.: Chancery 8364

A PHRASE which carries much truth behind it, but is very easily misunderstood, is: "Might is Right".

By this I do not mean that the strong have any moral justification for battering the weak, but simply that we have the rights which we have the might to win.

The civil liberties which we enjoy in this country have not been given to us by benevolent governments because they have wanted us to have them. They have to be fought for—often literally—and have been won because for various reasons the ruling class saw its weakness and thought it better to yield.

Free speech in London streets was fought for in Trafalgar Square on Bloody Sunday. Votes for women were won by the Suffragettes' militant struggle. The right to organise in trade unions was the result of a century of industrial strife. Concession after concession has been wrung out of the boss class by the organised might of the working class. Every right that we have won has been the direct result of the might at our disposal, and we shall retain these rights as long as we maintain our might.

Dissipation

But to-day the fight is going out of the working class movement. The trade union leaders of to-day bear no more resemblance to the pioneers who laid the basis for their present power than do latter-day Labour lawyers to Keir Hardie. They have the might behind them, but now are no longer interested in using it. They have the might but no longer care about rights.

Over recent years that strength has expressed itself in political forms—with the results we have seen and already discussed. The diversion from industrial and direct struggle to the political field has led to a dissipation of working class strength at the same time as building up the political strength of the Labour Party—and as we can see, these have little in common.

What is clear is that the Labour Party cannot place the interests of the people of this country above those of capitalism. The whole effect of their present policies—and this goes for the unions, too—is to keep Britain going as a capitalist power. Anarchists maintain that the interests of the people demand the abolition of capitalism and that attempts to patch it up are futile.

Must Things Get Worse?

Do we, then, want to see things get worse for the workers in order to drive them in a revolutionary direction? This attitude, born of basic Marxist contentions, is acceptable, I think, only if we look at human society like Marxists and think in terms of classes and masses instead of as human beings.

Taking the broad view; being impersonal and "scientific", we can look at humanity and, holding our noses, say that we don't really care if they are so oppressed that they are forced into revolution. But looking at our fellow-workers—and even looking at ourselves—as individual human beings, we very soon

see that oppression is degrading, degradation is demoralising, the demoralisation is the very opposite of revolutionary consciousness.

A depressed people provide first-class material for messiahs. Those who have lost confidence in themselves look for somebody to lead them, somebody in whose reflected glory they can shine, and I do not take the view myself that if conditions get worse and worse, the workers will turn revolutionary. There is much more to revolutionary ideas than that.

Improvement Now

Therefore I return to my argument—that we should not be afraid of supporting measures which make for improvements in our standards of living here and now. At the risk of making capitalism palatable we must do our best to make life more pleasant than it is. And if this is done by the means I have indicated I do not believe it will lead to complacency, but rather to an increased awareness of the possibilities of working class action.

The limits of parliamentary reformism have already been demonstrated. We have seen how effective they are in solving the problems of capitalism. The limits for anarcho-syndicalism are the limits of human emancipation, and to create organisations for the defence and improvements of our standards of living here and now in no way restricts those limits but instead puts in our hands the means of reaching them.

The economic power which the working class has provides the might by which

it will establish its rights in the economic field. On the social field our methods must be that of influencing public opinion.

Influence Public Opinion

On issues like that of the abolition of the death penalty, which can clearly only be brought about by State action, the rôle taken by Anarchists should be that of propaganda, agitation and demonstration, and doing everything possible to awaken public opinion to a barbaric and cruel practice.

This will not lead to the slightest necessity for Anarchists to go into Parliament to carry through the legislation themselves. There will always be plenty of reformists there who will take up such issues when they see the public demand for it.

And if Parliament goes down before totalitarianism, then there are no means for constitutional reformism to operate anyway. The function of Anarchists is to work among the people and stay among the people, to encourage them to raise themselves to the level of doing away with the State altogether.

But the whole thing depends upon the revolutionary clarity of thought of the Anarchists and Syndicalists themselves. The ability to press for immediate advancement without losing sight of the ultimate goal will not be easy if and when the Anarchist movement achieves influential proportions. But if we do not show that ability, either we shall not achieve any influence, or when we do it won't be worth having. P.S.

Behind Peace in Korea

Continued from p. 1

"It is expected that if there is a slump—and no situation develops in international affairs to reverse the trend of Government defence spending—federal, state, and local governments will much increase the size and number of public works they have begun or have in prospect; that, for the encouragement of new enterprise and for orderly liquidation of swollen inventories, the Federal Reserve system will ease credit terms; and that, as the Secretary of the Treasury has now promised, the tax reductions scheduled for next January—elimination of the excess profits tax and of the 10 per cent. emergency increase in income taxes—will be allowed to go into effect automatically. But whether such measures as these, and what others may be devised, will be enough to keep a general readjustment or recession from degenerating into a depression is a question to which no one can give any sure answer."

The passages italicized are fairly plain: "a big reduction of government defence spending" refers to the cessation of hostilities in Korea. The apparently innocent, but in reality ominous, remark "and (if) no situation develops in international affairs to reverse the trend of government defence spending" means "if no new war develops". And the meaning of this "if"? In plain terms: if there

is no new war, there will be a slump. Financial writers are often fairly blunt, and in papers with small mainly ruling class circulations seem to think they can afford to be so. But they are also adept in wrapping up these unpalatable truths about the financial boost which war gives to the economy of the great powers—they wrap them up in innocuous terminology.

In case it should be thought that our interpretation is far fetched, we quote a passage further on in the same article "Commodity price futures recently" (i.e. after the Korean armistice) "declined to their lowest level since just before the Korean war." It could hardly be phrased more plainly.

What of Russia?

Turning attention to the Russo-Chinese side of all this we begin to find the reasons for the desire to cease hostilities. Chinese and Russian industry have probably been somewhat strained by the demands of the Korean war—although the full employment and increase in output is also as much a source of revenue to them as it is in capitalist America.

The Soviet Union government have recently agreed to supply China with heavy industrial plant and goods and to send Russian technicians to China while training Chinese ones in Russia. The industrial expansion of China is to include the setting-up of 91 new enterprises, although there are no further details about these! What does emerge is that China wants to use its manpower in industrial development and does not wish further entanglements. The American government, which according to a speech of the Secretary for Air, Mr. Talbot, on 16th September has cancelled "production of several thousand jet and other engines, with a possible saving of \$400 million to \$500 million" is equally anxious to step up support for the French in Indo-China.

The *Times*' Paris Correspondent provides support for this view:

What would he [Democritus] have said, to see, hear and read so many bloody battels, so many thousands slain at once, such streams of blood able to turn mills . . . whilst statesmen themselves in the mean time are secure at home, pampered with all delights and pleasures, take their ease and follow their lust, not considering what intolerable misery poor souldiers endure? . . . So wars are begun, by the perswasion of debauched, hair-brained, poor, dissolute, hungry captains, parasitical fawners, unquiet hor-spurs, restless innovators, green heads, to satisfie one mans private spleen, lust, ambition, avarice.

BURTON. *The Anatomy of Melancholy.* (1621).

FREEDOM PRESS

- E. A. GUTKIND:**
The Expanding Environment 8s. 6d.
- V. RICHARDS:**
Lessons of the Spanish Revolution 6s.
- MARIE-LOUISE BERNERI:**
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.
Vol. 2, 1952, *Postscript to Posterity*
paper 7s. 6d.
- TONY GIBSON:**
Youth for Freedom paper 2s.
Food Production and Population 6d.
Who will do the Dirty Work? 2d.
- PHILIP SANSON:**
Syndicalism—The Workers' Next Step 1s.
- ERRICO MALATESTA:**
Anarchy 6d.
Vote—What For? 1d.
- M. BAKUNIN:**
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.
- RUDOLF ROCKER:**
Nationalism and Culture
cloth 21s.

- ALEX COMFORT:**
Delinquency 6d.
Barbarism & Sexual Freedom
boards 3s. 6d.
- PETER KROPOTKIN:**
The State: Its Historic Rôle 1s.
The Wage System 3d.
Revolutionary Government 3d.
Organised Vengeance Called Justice 2d.
- ALEXANDER BERKMAN:**
ABC of Anarchism 1s.
- JOHN HEWETSON:**
Sexual Freedom for the Young 6d.
Ill-Health, Poverty and the State
cloth 2s. 6d., paper 1s.
- GEORGE WOODCOCK:**
Anarchy or Chaos 2s. 6d.
New Life to the Land 6d.
Railways and Society 3d.
Homes orhovels? 6d.
What is Anarchism? 1d.
The Basis of Communal Living 1s.
- 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 5s.
Journey Through Utopia
cloth 16s. (U.S.A. \$2.50)
- ★
K. J. KENAFICK:
Michael Bakunin and Karl Marx
paper 6s.

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