

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"No laws are binding on the human subject which assault the body or violate the conscience."

—BLACKSTONE.

EAST GERMAN WORKERS SHOW THEIR STRENGTH AN ANGRY PEOPLE

ANARCHISTS have always maintained that true working-class revolt is unpredictable and unplannable. When a people rises against its masters the conscious revolutionaries are usually as surprised as the government. Palace revolutions or *coups d'etat*—these can be plotted, but a social revolution is a spontaneous mass action that can be guided, captured, crushed or corrupted by revolutionary groups—but never started by them.

As far as one can see, from what evidence is available up to now, the workers' rising in East Berlin last week, which spread like wildfire throughout the Eastern Zone, follows closely this classical pattern, and the East German Government's stories, faithfully repeated by the Stalinist propagandists throughout the world, that the rising was the work of provocateurs from the West, is too one-sided to accept for one moment.

Not that there has been any lack of propaganda or incitement from the West. Ever since the cold war began the Western powers have spent colossal sums yearly on newspapers and radio stations to bombard the Eastern Zone with propaganda on behalf of the Western Way of Life. This has undoubtedly played a part in maintaining some independence of thought among the East German workers; they have heard two sides of the story and have been able to choose from the lies churned out by both sides and make up their minds for themselves.

Not Insulated

Couple that with the immediate contact with the Western sector of Berlin that thousands of East Berliners live in one zone and work in the other, passing through the "Iron Curtain" which divides the city, twice a day—and the fact that the Western Powers have made West Berlin a sort of shop-window for "freedom", and we can see that East Berlin and the Eastern Zone have not been

as insulated from outside as the other satellite areas.

However, we must not forget, against that, that all the other aspects of the totalitarian state have been securely and powerfully established there for years. Not only the rigidly controlled press and radio, but the whole system of secret police and informers, and, of course, the "People's Police"—that semi-military organisation 100,000 strong, armed to the level of automatic weapons and Bren-gun carriers which was very clearly established as a nucleus for a new German army (while the Stalinists were denouncing the re-arming of Western Germany!) and also to play the rôle fulfilled by the Civil Guard in Spain—to hold down the people.

In the event, however, the "People's Police" counted for nothing when the people went into action. When, on June 17, the workers of E. Berlin emptied the factories and filled the streets, the security forces were outnumbered, over-run, beaten up and rendered completely impotent.

The whole apparatus of government was helpless and it was only the appearance of Russian tanks and armoured cars which restored "order".

Minor Issue Started It

The riots and demonstrations started as a protest by building workers against the increase in their norms—increases which were imposed on them at the same time as the Government was announcing it was going to relax its demands. But what began as a simple walk-out protest turned into a full-scale revolt. The only thing the workers did not do was to arm themselves—which, in view of the presence in the country of armoured divisions of Russian troops, was eminently sensible.

The events show that, when a population is held down, bitterness and resentment will grow and fester beneath the surface and it needs only a touch, a relatively minor issue, to spark off an explosion.

The results? Within a day, the Government announced it had withdrawn its demands for increased norms—a sign of weakness on which the people pounced. Apart from that, perhaps nothing material. What the people of East Germany have discovered, however, is their own strength—and the knowledge that what they have done once they can do again. Their government is finished. Discredited and despised, it remains propped up by foreign troops.

Divide & Rule

Sir Godfrey Huggins, Prime Minister of Southern Rhodesia, announced on his return from London that the Federation party formed to fight the first general elections under the new Central African Federation would be open to Africans from the start. "Our object must be to get Africans into party politics and not into black versus white politics," he said.

If we understand Sir Godfrey aright what he is saying is that by getting the Africans to participate in the political game we could encourage them to fight among themselves instead of being (nationalistically) united against the white man. That used to be referred to as *divide and rule*.

No Leaders

There were no leaders of this uprising—workers were quoted as saying, "We don't want leaders, we've had enough of them", but scapegoats have to be found. The second day of the revolt, a West Berliner, an unemployed building worker named Willi Goettling, was picked up by the Soviet troops and shot. (He wasn't given two years of public trial and legal struggle like the Rosenbergs!) Reprisals and shootings follow, and clearly many citizens of Berlin will pay the price for their outburst. That is always to be expected when revolts fail—and it was quite impossible for this one to succeed even if the workers had had any conscious revolutionary aims—which they did not appear to have.

Nevertheless, these German workers have pointed the only way to deal with totalitarian governments. They have shown that when all other channels of organisation have been closed to them, the methods of direct action remain—and since the workers are essential, the essentially working class methods cannot be taken from them.

Hypocrisy abounds in approaches from all sides. The Stalinists denounce it as the work of Imperialist agents, the West pretend to be delighted—but no ruling class ever really welcomes revolution anywhere [Even when it takes place against their rivals—e.g. Italy in 1943].

Socialists—Please Note

We shall return to these events again for discussion as more reliable news becomes available. For the moment, we should like our Parliamentary Socialist opponents to ponder the following quotation. It is from an article by Sebastian Haffner in the *Observer* for June 21:

"What happened on that day—and we have hardly yet caught our breath and taken in its full significance—is this: A totalitarian Government, which for nearly four years had been in complete possession of all the paraphernalia of comprehensive modern dictatorial power in its territory, has within less than twelve hours been reduced to complete impo-

Reflections on

The Rosenbergs

ROME, June 20.—*Communist and anti-Communist workers decided to-day to unify their periods of mourning for the Rosenbergs and for the Berlin worker Willi Goettling executed by the Russians.*

The anti-Communist unions refused to take part in symbolic downing of tools throughout the nation to-day to "mourn for the assassination of the Rosenbergs." Instead, they invited their followers to stage brief walk-outs "as a sign of fraternity for the German workers and for the murdered Goettling." For "motives of order," they suggested that their members should down tools at the same time as the Communist unionists.

★

THE above is not an extract from that fantasy *The Little World of Don Camillo*, though it comes from the country in which this best seller originated. We have quoted from this Reuter report from Rome because in certain respects it sums up the mood in which the world

wide campaign for the reprieve of the Rosenbergs has been conducted. Between these extremes, there has been that large body of unpolitical men and women who were uninterested in the guilt or innocence of the Rosenbergs, but who had still sufficient human feelings and imagination, to put themselves in the skins of the condemned man and woman, to re-live with them those two agonising years, to feel with them the frustration of being separated only by walls and corridors, which nevertheless constituted an impenetrable no-man's land between them. Thanks to a curious twist of the American official mind (we do not know whether it is that they are so publicity conscious as to have no discrimination, or so cock-sure that they "couldn't care less") the world has even been allowed to witness their agony and the strength derived from the love Julius and Ethel Rosenberg felt for each other, by the publication of the little intimate notes they exchanged during their two years in the death house. Only hardened politicians and sadists could fail to be moved by the human tragedy that was being lived behind the grim walls of Sing Sing; only those so de-humanised by the ruthless struggle for power which neither gives nor accepts any quarter can stand by and watch the unequal and prolonged struggle between the conquerors and the vanquished without in the end feeling if not sympathy, at least pity and a sneaking regard for the vanquished, the more so when there is so little to distinguish the moral values of the judges from the judged. One has not to think back very far in contemporary history for such examples. The trial of Laval, though

Continued on p. 3

ence and has been forced to seek protection behind the tanks of a foreign Army. And it has been brought to this pass not by an internal split or an armed conspiracy in its midst, but by a spontaneous popular uprising in the classical revolutionary style of 1789 or 1848. This is exactly what we had all told ourselves could not happen in the conditions of modern totalitarian power. We had all convinced ourselves by the most rational arguments that a population deprived of all freedom of speech and association, atomised, controlled, systematically indoctrinated, shepherded, and regimented, supervised by a ubiquitous political police, and cowed by the terror of a ruthless concentration-camp régime, could never organise itself for successful revolution. We have been proved wrong."

The S. Korean P.o.W. Break Out

JUNE 17th is a date that brought many surprises to Europeans, for while Germans in the Eastern zone were demonstrating against the Russian imperialists, Syngman Rhee was releasing 26,000 prisoners of war from camps in South Korea.

This mass escape may have been a surprise to people in Europe but not the least curious aspect of this affair was that it cannot have been wholly unexpected in South Korea itself. The Korean correspondent of the *Observer* had already three days before remarked that among the possible mischievous actions of the South Korean government was that "they may even release those non-Communist prisoners who are in charge of Korean guards" (13/6/53). American and British newspapers have not been slow to point out that if the United Nations authorities in South Korea were taken by surprise, it was a fantastic lapse on the part of their intelligence services. The excuse of the United Nations Commander, General Clark, that he had to weigh the possibility of this action on the part of the South Korean guards at the prisoner-of-war camps against the risk of further embittering President Syngman Rhee, is not only feeble but contains the implied admission that he did in fact know of the proposed plot.

What is the Explanation?

The immediate result of Syngman Rhee's action has been to hold up the Armistice negotiations and has given an apparently embarrassing hold to the North Korean negotiators. It is not immediately clear what the explanation of this action is. The European newspapers all state that Rhee's aim is to sabotage the armistice negotiations so that the

war will continue till Rhee's aim of a united Korea (under his presidency) is achieved. But it seems unbelievable that he actually calculates that this will happen.

What of the Americans? In searching for motives in international affairs one has to disregard what is said and look instead for the effect of particular actions. Who does it benefit?

In theory the possibilities are that the Americans (1) Didn't know beforehand. As we have suggested this seems unlikely in the extreme. (2) Did know, and are actually (as they vociferate) greatly shocked. (3) Did know, and don't mind because of some advantages accruing to them which counter-balance the loss of argument at the bargaining table.

(2) Seems very unlikely, since it would not really have presented a serious problem to replace the South Korean guards at the P.o.W. camps by United States personnel. There remains (3) and this seems to represent the problem which we have to try and understand.

Many Prisoners Still in Camps

It is as well to remember that altogether the "escape" must be the largest mass escape ever achieved, involving at the time of going to press nearly 27,000 men. The total number of prisoners of war in the United Nations' hands is nearly five times this figure:

"The 25,000 prisoners released to-day (the true figure may turn out to be greater) formed part of the total of 32,200 anti-Communist North Koreans held by the United Nations command. In addition there are 14,200 Chinese prisoners who do not want to go home, but these, about whose fate Peking is most adamant, are fortunately in camps

on Cheju island, off the South Korean coast, and are not involved.

"Another 70,300 North Korean prisoners are Communists who want to go home, and these are still in custody, while the political affiliations of another 3,000 who are in hospital are undetermined. The anti-Communist North Koreans were in seven camps, mostly along the south coast. The four camps involved in last night's breakout—Camp 5 at Sang Mudai, Camp 6 at Monsan, Camp 7 at Masan, and Camp 9 at Pusan—contained 10,600, 11,000, 3,800, and 3,900 prisoners, making a total of 29,300.

"The other three camps were apparently not affected. The United Nations command described the break-out earlier to-day as 'partially successful', but it is clear from later reports that the great majority of prisoners escaped, leaving at most 3,000 or 4,000 in American custody."

—Times, 19/6/53.

This means that the men who have been allowed to escape are the very ones about whom the armistice commission were in deadlock for nearly two years. It has been suggested that the virtual connivance of the Americans in the escape is due to the wish of the American government to prolong the war and defeat the armistice negotiations. FREEDOM has often stressed the economic advantages which Western capitalism has achieved through the Korean war, but nevertheless it seems a very tortuous way to prolong the war to use Syngman Rhee's aspirations in this way. The course of events will shed more light on this, but for the moment it seems best to discount this explanation.

What then will result from this action? It seems certain that it will prove im-

Continued on p. 3

Comment

CORONATION TO CRIME THRILLS

THE *News Chronicle* (22/6/53) reports that an all night queue formed outside the Old Bailey of those people hoping to gain admittance to the public gallery where the trial of John Christie charged with four murders opened on Monday.

The trial judge, according to one paper arranged for No. 1 Court to be made ready for the occasion, and we learn that hundreds of applications for seats in the Court have been received. Something like the ballot for seats in the Abbey for the Coronation was made necessary and as in the case of the Abbey ceremony only a small proportion of applicants were among the lucky ones.

We write these lines on the opening day but can imagine that the Press which for the past three weeks has been feasting its readers on fairy princess stories, will for the next few days switch over to all the sordid details of this murder trial, about which enough has already been written to have witted the appetites of all lovers of the macabre. And if we are to believe the newspapers when they say they give the public what they want, one is forced to the conclusion that the very same people who drooled over the pages of pictures and sentimental rubbish written about the Coronation are the same people who are now lapping up column after column of sordid details—and supplementing the reports by reading between the lines—in the Notting Hill murder case.

Talk about split-personalities! Or is it perhaps a measure of people's boredom, that they need thrills whether by fairy princesses or monsters?

R.

THE SOVIET IMPACT ON SOCIETY, by Dagobert D. Runes (New York: Philosophical Library, \$3.75).

THE spate of books on Russia continues to pour from the presses of the United States. Some of these are reasonably good studies, based on a careful examination of evidence that has come out of Russia in recent years and presenting original and valid conclusions. Others are merely attempts to cash in on the rise of McCarthy and the perpetuation of the cold war without and the Communist scare within. *The Soviet Impact on Society* falls into neither of these categories. To the credit of Mr. Runes, it must be said that he is not one of those recent converts from Communism beating their breasts in an orgy of public penitence who have become so disgustingly familiar a phenomenon in contemporary American society. He was an anti-Communist and saw through the pretences and hypocrisies of the Russian ruling class and its international lackeys during the 1930's, when such an attitude was much less popular than it is to-day. But that, alas, is about all we can say in praise of his present book.

I am not arguing that all Mr. Runes has to say is wrong or beside the point. He tells us about the errors in Marx's economic and social prophecies, he exposes in some detail the tyranny of the Russian social machine, he discusses the way in which the Third International was used as a tool of Russian foreign policy and military aggression. But he presents no new facts; every fact he brings forward in his 200 pages will already be familiar to those who have studied the Russian question at all thoroughly in the past two decades, and this presentation of unoriginal material is not justified by any new interpretation or original synthesis.

It is true that the book was written and failed to attain publication fifteen years ago, when American publishers were a good deal less inclined to bring out anti-Communist material than they are to-day. But, though the facts which

Soviet Impact on Society

Mr. Runes presents might have had more freshness in 1938, even this fleeting timelessness would not have made *The Soviet Impact on Society* a good book. It is excessively badly written, in a pedantic jargon reminiscent of the stodgier German newspaper styles, irritatingly garnished with witless wisecracks. It is filled with prejudice, not merely against Communism, but also against any revolutionary or truly radical attitude—Proudhon, Bakunin, Muehsam and Landauer, though in fact they were some of the most potent critics of Marxism, are dismissed as "fantasists". Worse than this, the arrant class prejudice of Mr. Runes perpetually crops to the surface when he refers to the sections of the working class whose misery led them to be taken in by the Marxists in Russia and elsewhere as "rabble" and "riff-raff". For instance, in discussing the liquidation of the kulaks, he spoils the perfectly sound condemnation which can be brought against the Communists in this case by painting the Kulaks as 100 per cent. angels (and nobody with any sense, however much he may condemn their massacre, would pretend that there were not some avaricious money-grabbers among them) and the landless peasants as "the riff-raff returned from the front, loafing seasonal labourers and good-for-nothings", as "the negligent farmer, the incompetent, the unreliable, the loafer", as "the most incompetent dirt-farmers . . . the seasonal labourers and riff-raff", and so forth, for page after page. This is not the language of dispassionate examination; it is the language of conservative prejudice. And conservative prejudice appears again in the way in which Runes exposes the villainies of the Bolsheviks and ignores those of their right-wing opponents. We are told of the Communist Terror in Hungary under Bela Kun in 1919; but Mr. Runes says nothing of the equally vicious counter-terror which followed the suppression of the Communists by the Rumanian army and Horthy's reaction-

aries. And, while we are told of Communist villainies in China during the 1920's, Chiang-kai-shek is represented as a man of virtue with no innocent blood upon his conscience. It is not surprising that the book should end with a plea for the legal suppression of Communist organisations and propaganda in the United States. Mr. Runes, in the last resort, seeks to turn the methods of the Communists against themselves, to cast out Stalinist devils by means of the conservative Beelzebub. This final conclusion is only the appropriate ending to a book which has little balance, much partisanship in the bad sense, and which shows a total failure to apply to the authoritarian opponents of Stalinism the same criteria as the author rightly applies to the Stalinists themselves.

GEORGE WOODCOCK.

JUSTICE

(from the Latin *justitia*)
JUSTICE consists in having all the rights of every human being respected in all circumstances. It protects the good and punishes the wicked.

Justice is dispersed by judges in a hall called a court. It never errs.

There has never been an instance in fact, since the world began, where it has been guilty of the least judicial error. Of course it sometimes condemns innocent persons, but in that case it always perceives this in the end. It has happened, of course, that persons quite unconcerned in a crime they have been accused of have been inadvertently executed, but sooner or later it is arranged to rehabilitate them, and they no longer have the least reason to complain.

There was a time when a king of France, named St. Louis, dispensed justice with great pains under an oak. In our days Themis* has been modernized, thank heaven. Now she pronounces her sentences on a conveyor-belt.

Example:

"Accused, stand up! What have you to say in your defence?"

"I"

"Six months' imprisonment! Next case."

Justice is symbolized by scales. Is not the best way of respecting the rights of others to swing them as much as possible?

From *Le Canard Enchaîné* (Paris)

*Goddess of justice, represented with scales.

The Junk Box

A LOT of rubbish goes to the junk-box, but what was thought to be rubbish by one person often becomes a precious possession for another or for the same person at a different time. From a few letters which recently appeared in FREEDOM I gather there are readers who think that the series of articles started by my "Anarchism and mysticism" should have gone not to the junk-box but to the editors' waste-paper basket. The editors, however, did not think that it was all rubbish that my articles contained, and judging by a few important points Edwin Peeke has left unanswered, maybe he shares the editors' opinion.

Perhaps the following will bring the controversy to a conclusion or, at least, to an end, since there seems to be no hope of cross-fertilisation between Edwin Peeke's ideas and mine.

He emphasizes that those who people the universe with spurious entities can do so only in their imaginations. The point did not elude me in the first in-

stance. Let us call these entities 'imaginings'. As inhabitants of imagination they are real, so much so that Edwin Peeke can talk about them and know what he is talking about, whatever his means of gaining access into other people's imagination. Imaginings act in people's imaginations and people act according to their promptings. In this sense they are forces, and there is no harm in calling them spiritual to distinguish them from physical forces.

As for referents to imaginings in the empirical world a connection is admitted by Edwin Peeke himself when he speaks of "the primitive confusion of a word with what it stands for, which leads some persons to suppose that if they are comforted with a word then there 'must be' something named by that word". Obviously for persons to confuse a word for what it stands for, the word must stand for something. The comforting or haunting quality of a word, on the other hand, is not irrelevant or to be scorned at. To it we owe not only the best of poetry, but the best of civilizations. Humanity would not have gone very far without the comfort of words. Without the comfort of words, emotionally chosen to be emotionally neutral, Edwin Peeke would not feel so cock-surely right in his statements. If I make so bold to speak of his feelings it is that I know about them in the same way as he knows about my imagination.

The "luminiferous ether" is a good example of the reality of imaginings and their important rôle in scientific developments. Given the wave-theory as framed at the time, the ether had to be imagined to make the theory meaningful, complete and self-consistent. Michelson and Morley carried out their famous experiment in the hope of proving the ether's physical existence. The unexpected result did not affect only the ether but the whole wave-theory. With the discovery of 'quanta' of light, it looks to-day as also "waves" are mere imaginings, though no physicist is yet prepared to throw them into the junk-box. "These waves", in fact, to follow Edwin Peeke's example of quoting from a dictionary, "are not conceived as having any real physical existence, the term 'wave' being really used only by analogy as a description of the mathematical relations employed, since in all but the simplest cases the waves would have to be imagined in a 'hyperspace' of very many dimensions". In the present state of physics it is indeed very difficult to say what has any real physical existence. It is easier to say what has metaphysical existence, and it is interesting to note that scientists like Einstein who have sent the ether to the junk-box, have not done the same with "God" and other metaphysical rubbish that lesser men have discarded.

No student of mysticism will agree that it is not hard to be a mystic, nor must a student of mysticism like myself be confused with a mystic. When you have rationalized "your introspective fancies in terms of some handy system of theology or metaphysics" not only are you not a mystic but you are as far from mysticism as you can possibly be. The last thing remarkable about mystics is that they have remarkable experiences, and others have shown already more ably than I could do how unjustified it is to put mystics in the same bag with opium-eaters, madmen and victims of delirium tremens. At any rate, knowing what a precarious and ambiguous thing is my being usually classified among normal people, I have the greatest respect for those usually classified as abnormal. Their personal experiences may be just odd to the impersonal observer, but to them and to those who love them they are of paramount importance. Their imaginings are real, existentially real, no less and perhaps more than the personal experiences (observations, read-

ings, and reflections) from which Edwin Peeke derives his ideas. If nobody has put forward schizophrenia or manic-depression as a philosophy of life, many lives and thoughts on life have been deeply affected by them. As a matter of fact Geoffrey Gorer has written a book on "The people of Great Russia" in which he takes great pains to show that their philosophy of life is manic-depression.

I fear no argument or explanation will clean me of the sin of entertaining metaphysical entities. My only consolation is to see that many others are guilty of the same sin, and among these others I am glad to number Edwin Peeke. For what is his junk-box where "God", "the soul", "the Absolute" and all the other metaphysical rubbish have gone if not an imagining, a metaphysical entity in his sense of the expression, and with no discoverable referent?

The patient and sympathetic reader will disagree with my rhetorical question, and point to Edwin Peeke's skull as the discoverable referent; the patient and unsympathetic readers will point to mine; and the impatient reader both to Edwin Peeke's and mine. After which, if he is of a reflective type, he will perplexedly touch his own head.

GIOVANNI BALDELLI.

Southampton, June 13.

[The present correspondence is now closed. At a later date however, we propose to print a long article which we have just received from a Manchester reader on The Nature and Validity of Mystical Experience which we think will be of more interest to the general reader than perhaps has been the case with the present series—EDITORS.]

Back to Normal in Fairyland

TO make a fit setting for the Fairy Queen, crowned with all the magic rites that wizardry demands, surrounding our Snow-white with many more than seven dwarfs, London has been turned into a Fairyland of pageantry and gay elfin colour.

Which is all very well, but in capitalist Fairylands there are always a few snags, and the biggest one in London is that all the good fairies who are flying into the very centre of Fairyland to gape at the pretty decorations are getting in the way of all the other good fairies who live in the place and have to earn a living there.

Thousands of fairies from the bottom of the garden (i.e. the Provinces) are flying about in Fairyland in magic coaches and holding up the traffic so much that no amount of magic can get you through the centre of London in less than three times longer than usual—and usual is long enough, as Tinkerbell was saying to the Wizard of Oz only the other night.

In fact, there are so many fairies buzzing about in Fairyland just now that they are beginning to get in each other's hair. So much so that even the Chief Magician on the most influential evening paper in Fairyland, the Deadly Nightshade, has been moved to complain about the interference with normal business and to suggest that the visiting fairies leave their coaches outside the very centre of Fairyland and flit around by the normal methods. (This, incidentally, was how things were arranged two years ago, for the magic Festival, but since that was arranged by bad fairies, not too much should be said about it).

Not only that, but a lot of little elves in places like Littlehampton and Ramsgate are complaining that Fairyland has received much publicity and has been made so attractive that hardly any fairies are going for their holidays in their old haunts—and the little elves are losing money.

That's the worst of having a Fairyland—it costs money.

Men Against the State

("Men Against The State". The Exponents of Individualist Anarchism in America, 1827-1908. By James J. Martin. Foreword by Harry Elmer Barnes. The Adrian Allen Associates, De Kalb, Illinois, 1953. \$6.50).

MR. MARTIN's monograph on the growth and decline of individualist anarchism in the United States is a welcome addition to the somewhat scanty historical material on anarchism that exists in English. He gives a detailed and documented account of the American individualist anarchist movement between the years 1827 and 1908. The ideas of such people as Josiah Warren, Stephen Pearl Andrews, William B. Greene, Lysander Spooner, Ezra Heywood and Benjamin Tucker are rescued by him from the undeserved neglect into which they have been allowed to fall in what must be one of the most objective books on anarchists ever written by a non-anarchist. Although most anarchists to-day do not advocate the mutualism of these pioneers as a solution to the economic

evils of capitalism their writings on individual sovereignty and the tyranny of the State are still as valid as ever.

As in this country, anarchists in the U.S.A. have often been accused of seeking to introduce ideas which are 'alien' to 'our way of life'. "Men Against The State" is a crushing rejoinder to such an unfounded assertion. The author shows how Josiah Warren was expounding the anarchist ideal of 'individual sovereignty' before either Proudhon or Stirner had written their pioneer works in Europe. He describes also the three 'colonies' of Josiah Warren which gave successful examples of men and women living together without authority or law. 'Modern Times', the last and most long-lived of these communities, attracted a good deal of interest at the time and was visited by many people, among whom was Moncure D. Conway, the then famed biographer of Thomas Paine. Mr. Martin appears to be rather non-committal as to the value of this community, but he does quote the following testimony to its success by a veteran resident, G. Codman:

"As an Equity Village, 'twas a success as far as it went, and in its practical working no flaws were found in the principles as formulated by Mr. Warren. Nor were the principles ever successfully challenged. . . . None of us had the desire for riches. Equity was the ruling motive. That was what we were here to establish. Our aim was to show, by example, that better conditions for living were possible—that Equity could be made actual, and that living conditions could be made worthwhile. We may have been speculators in morality, but not in the land or its products. From the standpoint of worldly ambition, we failed yet—we had—the cheering hope that our lives had not been entirely for self—that our social experiment might be 'a factor in the moralization of humanity, and that we had assisted in keeping alive the aspirations of social progress."

The apathy and exhaustion that followed the Civil War of 1861-1865 brought to an end—for the time being—experiments in anarchist communities, but the efforts of Josiah Warren had pioneered the way for the development of libertarian propaganda.

In general, Mr. Martin's work is a worthwhile addition to the reading list of all serious students of anarchism and, so far as the present writer can judge, has an accuracy which makes a refreshing change from the distortion and vituperation heaped on our movement and

ideal by so many would-be 'historians'. Nevertheless, there are a few points (more of interpretation than fact) on which this reviewer is in disagreement with both the author and the writer of the foreword.

Mr. Barnes, in his foreword, writes deprecatingly of 'the violence of foreign intruders, and occasional quasi-criminals, exemplified by the Haymarket Affair in Chicago in 1886, Alexander Berkman's attempt on the life of Henry C. Frick and the assassination of President McKinley by Leon Czolgosz. Whatever opinions one may hold regarding the use of violence or the value of political assassination, it comes to something near an insult to imply that the acts of Berkman and Czolgosz were 'quasi-criminal', and no-one has yet discovered just who was the perpetrator of the Haymarket explosion. Berkman went to the U.S.A. under the impression that it was a land of freedom and equality—he soon found out the truth. It is easy to raise one's hands in academic horror at his act or that of Czolgosz, yet when one considers the violence and brutality enacted at the orders of the American ruling class at that period such acts of resistance on the part of the oppressed were only to be expected, and we whose world is symbolized by Belsen and the atomic bomb should be the last to cast stones at a Berkman or even a Czolgosz.

With regard to Mr. Martin, I am not sure that he is correct to refer to E. C. Walker as being "related through marriage" to Moses Harman. Walker was the father of Lilian Harman's child, but the present writer was always under the impression that their relationship was in the nature of a free union rather than a legal marriage. Also a reading of *The Alarm*, when it was under the editorship of Dyer D. Lum, does not appear to support the statement that Lum "expressed the conviction that force was not necessary to effect a revolution, nor was there any proof that its use was even generally successful". In *The Alarm*, Vol. 1, No. 31, Lum expresses his agreement with an article by W. G. Markland appearing in that issue which advocates the use of defensive force and also contains the statement that "To feign death when in the embrace of a tiger is good policy, but, limbs free, to reach for a 'Winchester' is right principle". It would appear from this that Lum did not adhere to a policy of anarchist 'quakerism'.

These are minor defects, however, in an otherwise interesting and valuable book. It should be bought by all who can afford it and borrowed by those who cannot.

S. E. PARKER.

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

OPEN DAILY

OPEN 10 a.m. to 6.30; 5.0 SATURDAYS

New Reprints . . .

Journey to the End of Night
L. F. Collins 2/-
On the Night of the Fire
F. L. Green 2/-

Second-Hand . . .

Report on the Russians
W. L. White 2/6
Free Expression in Industry
James J. Gillespie 3/-
Walden
H. D. Thoreau 3/6
Bread & Roses
Ethel Mannin 4/-
Boys in Brown
Reginald Beckwith 2/-
Kaiser Wakes the Doctors
Paul DeKruif 2/6
The Anarchist Peril (1895)
Felix Dubois 15/-
A Survey of Socialism
F. J. C. Hearshaw 7/6
Are Workers Human?
Gordon Roxbury Taylor 5/-
Seven Women Against the
World
Margaret Goldsmith 3/6
The Science of Society
Stephen Pearl Andrews 7/6
Fascism and Big Business
Daniel Guerin 6/-

Obtainable from

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

THE ROSENBERGS

Continued from p. 1

it ended with his execution by a firing squad, gained more sympathy for the accused than for his persecutors. And the quite sadistic treatment in Spandau gaol of the leading German War criminals who escaped the rope (recently described in two articles published in the *London Evening Standard*) has, judging by the correspondence it evoked, awakened a feeling of pity for these men, whatever may have been their crimes when they were all-powerful. These may not be rational feelings, but they are very human ones, and it will be a sad day for civilisation once such feelings are replaced by the ruthless philosophy of "an eye for an eye".

In America the mark, the informer, has been given a new status, whilst throughout the civilised world he has always been shunned or treated with the contempt he deserves. The guilt of the Rosenbergs rested on the evidence given by Mrs. Rosenberg's own sister and her husband David Greenglass. For her services in sending her sister and brother-in-law to the electric chair Mrs. Greenglass is a free woman, in spite of the part she played in the alleged conspiracy. And the Rosenbergs themselves were offered their lives by the Attorney General if they were prepared to disclose all they knew about the Russian espionage organisation. On the lips of those who can bargain with the lives of others in this way, who penalise group loyalty and reward the petty informer, the word "justice" (and how often they have used it in the Rosenberg case) takes on a sinister and cynical meaning.

WHEN President Eisenhower rejected the Rosenbergs last appeal for clemency he gave as a reason, that he was convinced they had received "the benefit of every safeguard which American justice can provide". But he was using this term in its limited, legalistic sense. And even in this context, how can justice be impartial in a conflict between the State and the individual when it is the State, through its Executive, which makes the laws—and breaks them when it sees fit to do so in the "national interest"? "Treason"—wrote Talleyrand—"is a matter of dates". So too is President Eisenhower's "American justice". What is "justice" to-day may be a "gross injustice" to-morrow.

THE failure of the Clemency campaign to save the Rosenbergs must in part be attributed to the fact that it was organised by the Communists and to their insistence on the Rosenbergs' innocence. These two factors could have no other effect than of making the influential reactionary elements in America even more hostile. It is significant that the appeals from non-Communist sources ignored the question of guilt and attempted instead to win support on humanitarian grounds.

The question one is forced into asking is: to what extent are government leaders influenced by questions of humanity and the opinions and criticisms of large bodies of people as well as of eminent world figures? We think the answer to this question is that governments are only sensitive to criticism when it is accompanied by action. To protest is not enough, and it is surely this conclusion which prompted Einstein to urge intellectuals to refuse to testify before the Investigation Committees. Five Brooklyn teachers, besides the one to whom Einstein addressed his call to resist

TRAMPLED GRASS IN KENYA

When elephants fight it is the grass that gets trampled. A. Kikuyu proverb.

THE British press now openly refers to Jomo Kenyatta as a "Mau Mau leader" and "terrorist". Nehru, who has been so lavishly honoured during his stay in England, and who is no fool, must be smiling to himself somewhat cynically as the calumnies that were once heaped upon his head are transferred to Mr. Kenyatta. The lion-lamb Coronation picture of the Commonwealth Prime Ministers, in which Winston and Jawaharlal rubbed shoulders, while Dr. Malan and Mr. Senanayake stood beside one another without a fraction of apartheid between them, need not convince us that imperialism is dead. It may well be that one day a similar picture may include Jomo Kenyatta hand-in-hand with Sir Hartley Shawcross (save the day!) for all that the latter gentleman-socialist has made it abundantly clear to those ignorant of legal ethics that no such consideration would have deterred him from acting for the Crown by using his forensic talent in making sure that Jomo did his seven years hard first.

In the meantime, however, the Kikuyu people are pushed around, one week evacuated, and the next week told to stay. The independent schools have been closed—which is the greatest scandal of imperialism and Christianity in Africa since they began their activities—and only the inadequate and imperial-minded mission schools may remain open. The sending to Kenya of a force almost comparable with those in Indo-China or Malaya (where they face armed Communist-led forces backed by China) has hardly abated the hysteria of the European settlers in calling for more and more drastic action. The conservative *Times of India*, writing of the "Kenya nightmare" remarked in January:—

"If the authorities in Kenya had embarked upon a systematic policy of decimation of the Kikuyus they need do no more than what they are already doing."

It added to this, (April 6): "New iniquities have been heaped upon the hapless Kikuyu people. Mass evictions, mass searches and screenings, mass arrests and mass terrorisation continue unabated. It is true that the Kikuyus have also retaliated against this terror... Tens of thousands of Africans have been driven from their homes, deprived of their land and their cattle and their jobs and their education. Even the Governor of Kenya was forced to admit not long ago that 'hordes of hungry men, women

"DOCTORS' CONSPIRACY" AND THE WEST

NOW as before everything in U.S.S.R. that is bad comes from the West. Even the recent anti-Semitic drive was a Western diversion and *Pravda* said so plainly: "The capitalist encirclement tries to use all means to undermine the power of our Socialist régime, tries to smuggle amongst us spies and diversionists, make use of ideologically unstable people infected with nationalist prejudices, bearers of bourgeois views and bourgeois morals, careerists and turncoats." The same paper also said concerning Riumin, the high M.G.B. official supposed to have been responsible for staging the "doctors' conspiracy" this January, that he was a despicable adventurer and agent who tried "to foment feelings of national hostility deeply alien to the Socialist ideology."

—P.I. Agency, 30/5/53.

tance (see *FREEDOM* 20/6/53) have been dismissed from their posts for refusing to testify and five others have been suspended. When five thousand and five follow their courageous example perhaps the Government will begin to take notice.

WE think the judgment of history in the Rosenberg case will be in their favour, even though their judges may be proved legally fair and the Rosenbergs' actions considered misguided. And the reason will be that opposed by the whole might of the State these two people were yet able to grow in stature by their dignified bearing during the long years spent in the death house, culminating in their refusal to "co-operate with the government" in return for their lives. For this too their judges will be remembered... but with horror and disgust.

and children are wandering around the country."

A significant fact was noted by the *Times of India*. It will be recalled that whereas Africans in South Africa united with Asiatics against the apartheid measures, Africans in Kenya tended to regard Asiatics as their enemies. This has changed. The "hungry and harassed Kikuyus" says the *Times of India* no longer cause any anxiety to Indians in Kenya.

"In great contrast to the position of the Europeans and Africans at the moment in Kenya is the position of

those Indians who live in isolated homesteads and shops in the hearts of the troubled areas. Their businesses and households are as full as usual of Kikuyu assistants and domestic servants, yet they feel no sense of undue insecurity and are able to carry on their work without interruption. Settlers are struck forcibly by this contrast and the more hysterical among them have even inferred that, in some way or other, these Indians must be aiding the Mau Mau. Fortunately, however, no responsible person either believes this seriously or is willing to be persuaded about it."

Korea P.O.W. Breakout

Continued from p. 1

possible to recapture these men. Their escape will therefore render unnecessary the cumbersome machinery of neutral commissions to supervise repatriation and screening and the difficulties of Communist agents to persuade the unwilling of the advantages of returning to North Korea. It has already been pointed out in the press that the Communists really lose nothing from Rhee's action as the prisoners involved were those who were unwilling to return anyway. Can it be that not merely the Americans but the Chinese and North Koreans also connived at the escape and had agreed to it beforehand? If this is so, and it is far from fantastic, what will be the fate of the 14,200 Chinese who do not want to return either? Will they too be released, or will they be handed back as "atone-ment" for the present escape?

What of the Prisoners Themselves?

Whatever the upshot, the effect of this escape is largely to dispose of the problem of the repatriation of the unwilling. Government statements and press dis-

cussion have concerned themselves entirely with the diplomatic repercussions of the affair, and with denouncing Syngman Rhee. Nothing at all has been said about the men themselves. It is reported that the South Korean population are rejoicing at Rhee's action and that the 27,000 have simply been received into the general population. The South Koreans can scarcely wish for a prolongation of the war and are probably indifferent to the kind of argument Rhee puts up to the Americans. It seems reasonable to think that they are simply rejoicing at the release of long-imprisoned fellow countrymen.

And from this point of view so should every humane person. Long ago we suggested that instead of screening prisoners and letting agents loose on them, they should simply be set at liberty and provided with aid to do what they liked about repatriation or otherwise. This seems now to have happened—with this proviso—that it may be true that Syngman Rhee's price for their freedom may be enrolment in the South Korean army. There may well be substance in the North Korean negotiators' declaration that these prisoners are being press-ganged into the South Korean Army.

Even so, the escape seems a better solution than a further prolongation of captivity for 5 months after peace, harried by the cumbersome committees of the accepted neutral powers. Anarchists have no illusions that captivity is "better" than release, and the reaction of the prisoners themselves and the population of South Korea seems natural and healthy in the circumstances. Against it, the manoeuvrings and prevarications of the politicians and the great Powers seem tortuous indeed. It will be very interesting to learn what in fact the inner history of this episode will turn out to be.

The mystery is easily solved. The Indian community in Kenya many bourgeois elements which form an exploiting caste just as do the Europeans. They have liberal tendencies, however—"they were also in bondage after all"—and have endeavoured to render voluntary relief aid to Africans returning to their reserves. Their relief efforts have often been thwarted by the Government, but it can be seen that the Kikuyus are far from being the savage, insensate gangsters that they are represented as being in the popular press with its fanciful reports of Mau Mau activities and lack of reference to what has caused the situation. They feel that the Indian community has tried to alleviate their desperate situation and (as the Asiatics lack, too, the imperial "garrison mentality"—a legacy from Anglo-Irish and Anglo-Indian days) the Indians can come and go freely, without fear of the local population, traders and exploiters as well as others.

Eventually Kenya will become an African country, as is clearly seen from the innumerable examples of Ireland, India, Pakistan, Ceylon, Burma, Egypt, Palestine, Persia, Indo-China, the Gold Coast... The occasional petulance of a Foreign Secretary (a narrow-minded man like Bevin, who having let India go, insisted on having his way about Palestine, which he lost in the finish; or an Eden, obsessed with Europe, who clings to Kenya because he thinks of it as the prerogative of the Colonial Office rather than his department) does not alter that fact. It is now that countless lives are lost; families uprooted; the bitterness that will endure a century is laid; and the work of generations is destroyed.

It is well to remember these facts. In the meantime responsible Africans would score a tremendous point if they made it patently clear to the Church authorities that unless the independent schools are restored now, under Imperial rule, no Church missions will ever be tolerated in an independent Africa. The episcopal business-men would soon see the point. And the support of commercial interests for the imperial policy might well be weakened if they feared that it would lead to a complete boycott throughout Africa, and confiscation of their interests immediately independence came. The most starchy-eyed Imperial thinker might well recognise such an ultimatum as having the ring of destiny about it.

In the future, which one hopes is not too distant, a revolutionary Africa will, in fact, drive out oppression whether spiritual, temporal or economic. It may be that some African leaders fear to play with the slogans of revolution lest the demand for freedom pushed them aside too. But this is a demand which can never ultimately be denied. A.M.

PAKISTAN POLITICS - 2

IN April events in the stagnant waters of Pakistan politics moved fast. The Nazimuddin ministry fell, and Mohammed Ali became premier. The food and economic situation was completely beyond Nazimuddin, an indifferent politician without any of the demagogic appeal of Jinnah, suffering from Jinnah's legacy. The Muslim League had cut the country in two in order to create Pakistan. It was economically impossible. Jinnah having "gone to glory"—it is left for his successors to find a way out.

Mohammed Ali has chosen the easy road of an appeal to the U.S.A. which is this week being asked for a wheat loan to relieve famine. That political conditions will go with the wheat is a certainty. U.S. observers already "hope"—in somewhat authoritative terms—that such famine relief will prevent Pakistan blaming everything on India. In other words, that they will get together as allies. If they could "get together" there would be no need for U.S. wheat relief, of course, but world affairs are not conducted on such simple lines.

In the meantime Pakistan is suffering from another Jinnah legacy. It came into existence by the pressing of Muslim claims and could hardly fail to be theocratic in character. One finds such irritating, stupid, narrow religious prejudices and laws as belong to theocratic states—from Lahore comes the news that one state is fining those who do not fast during Ramadan, and from Karachi came the news that there were demonstrations by excited mobs against the inclusion of one politician in the Mohammed Ali cabinet because he belonged to a heretic sect. Pakistan is—alas—not alone in these troubles. Israel introduces absurd restrictions on the sale of pork, Papist-dominated countries ban the sale of contraceptives, England still bans Sunday theatres (while allowing radio, film and television performances, since

these presumably were invented after the laws of God)...

Such sectarianism has certainly a purpose. It serves in Pakistan, for instance, to provide a *raison d'être* for the Muslim League and is an effective preventive against movements for working-class and peasant emancipation, which inevitably arise out of secularism. The development of India towards a secular country (owing to the fortunate stupidity of the theocratic Hindus, who have formed themselves into a minority party—at loggerheads with Congress) will, let us hope, be followed by secularism in Pakistan. It can hardly be believed that Pakistan youth, no longer (at least) in defence of their minority status forced to assert their Mohammedanism, will forever feel itself bound by the laws of the Koran like any desert sheikh in Saudi Arabia. They will tend towards the freer thought (in religious matters) of Turkey, or at least of the younger generation in Egypt.

It is only then that one can hope for the resurgence of even liberal-minded movements, but in view of the utter shamelessness of political action that can be seen to-day, this may turn to the economic field.

The patent military meaning of the "communist" party in relation to Russia has tempted to discredit any revolutionary movement whatsoever among the industrial workers, but nevertheless there is an intense interest in industrial organization, although strong attempts are being made (under financial assistance from Western unions) to force this on social-democratic lines.

The economic situation certainly demands much more vigorous action than labourism could provide, and despite the American bribes, some movement to challenge the Muslim League must certainly arise. It is perhaps too much to hope just yet that this movement will be revolutionary and libertarian.

INTERNATIONALIST.

FREEDOM PRESS

- 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 SANSOM :
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.
The Education of Free Men 1s.
RUDOLF ROCKER :
Nationalism and Culture cloth 21s.
ALEX COMFORT :
Delinquency 6d.
Barbarism & Sexual Freedom boards 3s. 6d.
PETER KROPOTKIN :
The State: Its Historic Role 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 or Hovels? 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.

T.V. D.T's.

THE Englishman's home, it seems, has been reduced from a castle to a dungeon, not (as you might think) by the paring away of his civil liberties but by his addiction to television. Such, at any rate, appears to be the opinion of the *Observer*, which has recently fired its first salvoes in an engagement with the advocates of sponsored television. The British Government's intention to license stations for commercial television has led the *Observer* to inquire into the ethics of advertising, and one of its objections to the use of television for this purpose is that such advertising would be directed at a "captive audience".

The concept of the captive audience first achieved notoriety when the *New Yorker* was carrying on its campaign to end advertising over the public-address system at New York Central Station. There is no need to cross the Atlantic, however, to find instances of advertisements inflicted on persons "captured" in some other activity. Those of us who have gone in search of entertainment to palatial suburban cinemas know all about the sufferings of a captive audience. Much of our time there seems to be spent sitting in a twilight auditorium while the management projects reel after reel of advertisements. It is too dark to read, and the changing patterns on the screen draw our eyes back irresistibly from their wandering survey of the walls and ceiling. But no *New Yorker* or *Observer* has yet (alas!) delivered us from our captivity. It is doubtful whether it ever could. Cinema advertising is now too well entrenched to be easily got rid of, and most movie-goers are too inured to it to protest.

The whole weakness of the *Observer's* case lies in its attempt to set bounds to advertising when those bounds have long since been exceeded. It is a little late to say that there are some places where the public "can and should demand freedom from commercial advertising" when our towns and fields are already disfigured by enormous boardings and electric signs. Even the proposal shortly after the end of World War II, to erect a neon-light Coca-Cola sign on the roof of Milan Cathedral was seriously considered by the church authorities. The *Observer* does not, it need hardly be said, object to advertisements in newspapers, and the imputation will inevitably be made that its attempt to erect ethical barriers to advertising in other spheres is prompted more by self-interest than by zeal for the common good.

Another argument it puts forward is that sponsored television would be advertising by a trick in that viewers would be offered advertisements disguised as entertainment. Most advertisements are tricks in any case. Those who design them are not so naive as to try to sell

THE AMERICAN INDEX

MR. DULLES, U.S. Secretary of State said last week that "only" 11 out of 2,000,000 books in 285 American overseas libraries had been burned following the investigation by the McCarthy witch-hunters.

He said he used "burned" in the literal sense. He did not know how many books had been removed.

★

FROM Bombay the United States Information Service (U.S.I.S.) confirmed that it had withdrawn the book "Mission to Moscow" by the former United States Ambassador, Mr. Joseph Davies, from its library there. Clarence Streit's work on Federal Union, "Union Now," and "Washington Witch-hunt," by Bert Andrews, had also been withdrawn pending instructions from Washington. But a spokesman denied there was any banning or burning of books.

Referring to American reports of books removed, the U.S.I.S. spokesman said Mr. Alan Barth's "Loyalty of Free Men" was still in circulation. "Rising Wind," another book said to have been banned, was, he said, "never received by our library."

Mr. Bert Andrews, a 52-year-old newspaperman, received a Pulitzer Prize in 1947 for his Washington correspondence. "Mission to Moscow" was published in 1941, three years after Mr. Joseph Davies had left Moscow, where he served two years as United States Ambassador. He was President Roosevelt's special envoy, with the rank of Ambassador, to Mr. Stalin in the early summer of 1943.

Clarence Streit's book, "Union Now," was published in 1939, and was followed two years later by "Union Now With Britain."

soap: instead they try to induce us to buy schoolgirl complexions, country freshness, or freedom from body-odour (which still remains a good selling line in spite of J. B. S. Haldane's protest that he would rather smell like a human being than like a chemical factory). A good deal of advertising is intended to suggest that the products they are designed to see will make their buyers more attractive to the other sex, socially sought after, and successful in earning a living. Commercial television would be only an intensified form of advertising as already practised, and the fact that advertisers would sell entertainment of a sort as well as the imaginary attributes of their products is not likely to outrage anyone.

The entertainment provided by commercial television, however, differs significantly from that supplied by the B.B.C., which is paid by its consumers in much the same way that theatrical producers are paid by their customers. This is made abundantly clear by Christopher Mayhew, M.P., whose pamphlet "Dear Viewer" the *Observer* quotes extensively. All commercial broadcasting is based on the formula of "cost per thousand", i.e. the cost of the programme per thousand viewers per minute. Obviously the sponsor wants the largest possible audience for the least cost. It might be supposed that the largest audience would be secured by the programme that gave most enjoyment; but when it comes to enjoyment the rule is that one man's flowers are another man's weeds, and a programme that gives great enjoyment to one viewer very often disgusts another. Consequently a programme that is to appeal to everybody must be so engineered as to eliminate anything that depends on a particular taste for its appeal. Thus it is precisely those features of a programme that make it so enjoyable for some that are sacrificed. The aim is at the lowest common denominator.

Now the lowest common denominator is very low indeed. Somerset Maugham, a successful playwright, once said that if a theatre audience were arrayed in order of intelligence and you were to represent the dramatic critic of the *Times* by A and a shopgirl by Z the average intelligence of that audience would be found on this scale to be somewhere near the letter O. Commercial broadcasting cannot afford to aim as high as O: there are too many below this level to risk losing them by putting a strain on their grey matter; and to be successful a commercial broadcast must not de-

mand any more intelligence from viewers than that possessed by the most stupid of them.

The important thing for the sponsor is to make sure that nobody should want to switch off even if nobody is really enjoying himself very much. Indeed, the chief characteristic of commercial broadcasting is its insipidity, and it is this that has led in the United States for some demand for "subscription radio" on the lines of the B.B.C.

The opponents of sponsored television are also concerned about its effects on the minds of children. The *Observer* fears that television in the hands of commercial interests will become "a monstrous power of de-education". Perhaps it would be more accurate to say that it will replace one form of education by another; but not even the most nagging critic of compulsory state education is likely to regard the change with approval. Some San Francisco mothers who made a survey of children's television shows saw (according to *Time*): "Thirteen murders and assorted killings, four sluggings, six kidnappings, five hold-ups, three instances of blackmail and extortion, three thefts, two armed robberies, two cases of arson, one torture scene, and one miscarriage". Comment on this seems unnecessary.

At present the demand for sponsoring comes only from the big advertising agencies and manufacturers who will be the only ones to benefit from it. The public have not so far taken sides in this controversial issue, and it seems likely that their apathy will give the commercializers an easy victory. But if the public can be induced to make a stand against this further extension of commercialism there may be some slight hope that they will begin to question their present acquiescence in the commercialization of so much that is valuable because it is useful or pleasant in itself. If commercial television comes it will not surprise anarchists, who see in it merely the development of the attitude to life that regards every human need and desire as just another opportunity to make money. This attitude, which is fundamental to the capitalist economy, seems to have been less common in the remote past. Aeschylus did not write the *Agamemnon* to make money (and he was no fool, Dr. Johnson notwithstanding); nor did those who produced his play do so in the hope that it would enable them to sell something to the audience: they did it because they enjoyed doing it and they thought it worth doing for its own sake. To that extent they shared the anarchist's attitude to life. EDWIN PEEKE.

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS Write for all Men!

Atrincham, 12/6/53.

THANK you for printing my letter deploring recent examples of obscurity of language and thought in articles in *FREEDOM*, and for your comments on it. I feel, however, that an important point is at issue here, and should be grateful if you will allow me space to develop it further.

You observe, quite rightly, that the articles particularly in question, by Richard de Haan, were "the result of considerable research and thought". I am far from querying that, but in my opinion the author himself helps to negative the value of his own research through the intricate and unwieldy language in which he cloaks his argument and conclusions.

The written word acts as the medium of communication between the writer and the reader, by using words and phrases not immediately intelligible to the reader, the writer is in effect raising a barrier in the latter's mind which hinders his understanding. It should be the writer's job to see that this "word barrier" is as little in evidence as possible.

One has only to compare any article of Kropotkin's—surely one of the most learned and profound thinkers in the anarchist movement at any time—to realise the truth of this. Kropotkin does not isolate himself from his readers, his construction is concise, clear and economical in language, in consequence there are no barriers to the understanding of his theme.

Kropotkin was writing at a time when the anarchist movement had a far more extensive popular base than it has at present—in this country at any rate. I have not the space to go into reasons for the decline in the influence of anarchist thought amongst our people, but we must accept the position as a fact.

The problem now is to do our best to recover the ground that has been lost, however great the difficulties and however long the way may seem. *FREEDOM*, as "the anarchist weekly", has an important part to play here, both as a vehicle for the expression of current anarchist thought and the provision of a libertarian interpretation of events and circumstances, and as an instrument with which to attract sympathisers to the movement.

These functions can only be fulfilled efficiently if contributors write clearly and coherently, and with a minimum of jargon—that is, if they follow the example of Kropotkin and Reclus, and write for all men, and not for a privileged intellectual minority. The average man who has newly discovered *FREEDOM*, and is feeling his way towards an anarchist philosophy, is unlikely to give more than what you call "a cursory reading" to articles such as de Haan's. Unless he is possessed of a scientific training, the danger is that he will regard *FREEDOM* as too "advanced" or "intellectual" for him, and will lose interest. This is not a mere academic point—it has actually happened to my knowledge.

I have continued my criticism at some length because I look forward to the day when *FREEDOM* will appeal to a much larger audience than is the case at present. To do so, however, it must be equally intelligible to the scientist and the artisan. The majority of articles, of course, meet this requirement now; it is the exceptions which may deprive you of potential readers.

Finally, let me add that I would welcome further articles from the talented pen of Richard de Haan—provided they are translated into the English that I and my friends speak and read.

Atrincham, Fraternally,
June 12. A. J. BROWN.

DO WE NEED FOREMEN?

In a recent issue of *Tribune*, Ian Mikardo, M.P., puts in a plea for the foreman.

He seems to be astonished—or at least to regard it as astonishing—that skilled workers at the bench can, through piece work, overtime or output bonuses, earn more than a foreman, although the latter's basic day rate may be higher.

Mikardo points out that practically every report from the productivity councils who have gone to America from this country to see how things are done there have come back saying what an important part is played in American industry by the foreman—in contrast with the minor rôle he plays here.

Boss's Representative

Now it would be difficult to find many British workers with a good thing to say about their foreman. He is in the lowest level of the boss's hierarchy—the one with authority who is nearest to the worker—and he has been appointed in most cases, from the ranks of the workers.

The foreman is a worker who has gone over to the boss. One week he has been "one of the boys" and the next

—he's on their side. And it is not long before his change of position reflects itself in a change of attitude to his erstwhile mates, proving once again that "power corrupts".

Ian Mikardo is, of course, a Member of Parliament who believes in authority (what M.P. doesn't?) and the only thing that worries him is that the "best" available men are not getting into the foremen's positions.

It is difficult to see how this can be otherwise, for the best and most responsible worker will find pleasure in his work and will not be tempted away from it for the sake of the little "brief authority" which is the main bait for the foreman's job. And when, as now, the change may mean an actual drop in income, there is not the slightest incentive for a good workman to become a boss's man.

Nor is it good for the productivity of industry that the best workers should step up into foremen's jobs, for then they cease to be productive and the industry loses the benefit of their work.

Do We Need Them?

The real question however is: do we need this hybrid grade at all? From the boss's point of view the answer must be a definite "yes", for the foreman is the bridge between management and labour, the mouthpiece for the management who actually tells the workers what they must do.

But from the workers' point of view the foreman is as unnecessary as the higher grades of authority who are less irritating only because they are more remote. And in circumstances of workers' control the petty authority of the foreman could be swept away as the division between management and labour is abolished when labour begins to manage itself.

NOW READY
"Postscript to Posterity"
(Selections from *FREEDOM*)
Volume 2, 1952
240 pages (paper) 7/6*
Cloth 10/6
(*Paper edition available to readers of *FREEDOM* at 5/6 post free)

ANARCHISM AND INDUSTRY

P.S. in his articles on *Anarchism and Industry* appears to have confused a rejection of mass-production methods with a rejection of "mechanized modes of production". The two methods are not necessarily synonymous.

It is possible to utilize the machine product in limited quantities. The capitalist mass-production method envisages an ever expanding consumption of goods using many devices to ensure that this continues. Demand is created by advertising; goods, if not "ilth" (to use Ruskin's word) e.g. armaments and dopes are shoddy and short-lived tending to accelerate consumption (e.g. clothing); goods are adulterated necessarily because of centralized production (e.g. food); goods are stressed as 'fashionable', 'the latest', regardless of technical efficiency (e.g. motor-cars, chlorophyll); and mass-production is capable of disregarding peoples' 'needs' while creating a steady stream of "wants" (e.g. television installed in "pre-fabs").

Secondly if production was only of quality goods, the demand would be stable. One's shoes, clothing, houses and cars (if one had one!) would last considerably longer and once initial demands were met mass-production would be unnecessary. It is possible to envisage the factory worker producing for three months and turning to agriculture for the rest of his working time.

In any case much of the quality production of goods is a product of individual workmanship. The engineer and machine fitter do not work on a conveyor belt.

Castleton, Rochdale. J.R.

SCIENTISTS

THEY are very happy when they have invented a new, infallible method of blowing up the earth.

After which, to appease their consciences, they go and sign the Stockholm appeal.

The biologist who has found a new process capable of prolonging human life and the chemist who has discovered another capable of destroying millions of lives belong to the same academy and say to each other: "My dear colleague," This is known as division of labour.

From *Le Canard Enchaîné* (Paris)
Translated by E.P.

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
At 9, Fitzroy Square, Warren Street, London, W.1.

JUNE 30—Reshad Gool on
LIBERALISM & CHRISTIANITY
IN AFRICA

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.

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 Gaffney, & others

MANCHESTER LIBERTARIAN GROUP

Meetings at
LAND O' CAKES HOTEL
Gt. Ancoats Street, (by Daily Express)
at 7 p.m. on 2nd & 4th Sundays in
every month. June 14, 28, etc.
Enquiries to:
J. Pinkerton, 12 Alt Road,
Ashton-Under-Lyne, Lancs.

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 8164