

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"Those who get power hate to lose it and use every means to condition the people to obedience. The two most powerful buttresses of power are state religion and education."
 —LORD BOYD ORR.

Vol. 12, No. 27

September 1st, 1951

Threepence

KOREA--DEADLOCK; PERSIA--DEADLOCK; EGYPT--DEADLOCK

DIPLOMACY? HUMBUG!

THE Korean truce talks could be turned into a perfect Gilbert and Sullivan comic opera, were it not for the fact that as each week passes hundreds of men, women and children are being killed and maimed or driven to join hundreds of thousands of already homeless and starving Koreans.

First it was General Ridgeway who ended the talks because a hundred Chinese troops had been spotted in the neutral zone. Now it is the turn of the Communists to suspend the talks because of the alleged bombing of the neutral zone, the intention apparently being to kill off the N. Korean-Chinese delegation. The truth of all these allegations can only be known by the leaders on both sides, and until we have their reports, in about ten years time, we shall have to read all the sensational and biased tripe that the gutter press pours out day by day in order to fill its columns. For the pro-United Nations side the latest incident is a "put-up job" by the Communists who want to break off the talks. For the Communist side *Worker* it is "a premeditated attempt to wreck the cease-fire talks"—the United Nations, of course!

Through all the roar of this melodrama, perhaps the tiny voice of the public might be heard asking, "What has all this to do with 'peace talks'?" If indeed the respective leaders really meant business, all the incidents which are made to believe are "wrecking" the talks could easily have been avoided, and the public—that is the victims on

both sides—getting a little tired of diplomacy, national pride, symbolic gestures, etc. . . . you know the kind of thing I mean. The armistice in the First war was signed in a railway coach. So the Germans, when they signed the armistice with France in the Second War, dragged the coach out of a museum and rigged it up at the same spot before they signed. The talks over Korea presented a greater problem in the choice of location than the talks themselves. So that both sides should feel no humiliation or loss of prestige, etc. . . . the place chosen Kaesong, is a shambles somewhere in no-man's land, always at the mercy of some straying bombers, or troops who have lost their bearings. (It might be argued that if the delegations tasted some of the medicine they were handing out to the Korean people, it might encourage them to arrive at some satisfactory terms for bringing the war to an end.) Would it not have been more simple to have held the talks outside Korea altogether. Then there would have been no excuse to overshadow the main purpose of the talks—an armistice—with sensational incidents in which the delegates from each side accuses those of the other side of wanting to murder them?

The "peace talks" are nothing more than a tragic farce, yet no voices are raised, even in the responsible press to expose them and to call a halt. Indeed, that such a farce, and it is only one of many, can be carried on, and seriously

reported in the headlines of the press, is an indication of the contempt in which the people in all countries are held by their governments. In our day to day transactions, such behaviour would be repaid by "firing" those concerned. Instead it is used on both sides to build up hatred and fear, and to justify the mad rearmament race and the division of the world into two mighty power blocs.

PERSIA

THE oil talks in Tehran between Persia and Britain have ended in a deadlock. If ever there was a farce this is it; and unlike the Korean tragedy, we can watch this performance with amusement and interest, for human lives are not directly involved (part of the joke is that the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company, for obvious reasons, is paying wages to all its staff including its 26,000 Persian employees, though wells and refinery are at a standstill) but instead, only political and economic interests (with the stress on economic so far as the British are concerned).

We need not go into all the preliminary details. The Persian Government taking a leaf out of the book of the Mexican and Argentine Governments who (some few years ago) just seized the British-owned oil wells and railways respectively, without a by-your-leave, decided to do likewise with their oil wells. To add a piquant note to their action they nationalised the oil industry assuming (!) that since this was what the British Labour Government had advocated for all the major industries in their own country and had actually put it into effect when they came to power, despite the objections of the directors and shareholders of the industries concerned, surely they could not but approve of such a socialistic measure by the Persians. (After all, didn't the Labour Party always conclude their rallies with that lusty tune which goes "the international unites the human race"?) The British Government were, however, very shocked and hurt by such disloyalty. The yellow press on both sides of the Atlantic dragged out the Communist bogeyman to chill our spines, and the Churchills, still living in those romantic days of Palmerston and Don Pacifico's

TO PAGE THREE

Political Stalking-Horses

From our Australian Correspondent

AN election is to take place in New Zealand shortly. If the results are similar to those in Australia, the Conservatives will be returned once more. Our elections resulted much as had been expected, the Communist issue being the determining factor. But since then the inflation issue has come to the fore. The real trouble is, of course, the shortage of civilian goods accentuated by the last war, and aggravated by preparations for the next one. Armaments and civilian goods cannot both be produced in sufficient quantities and the former are receiving preference. We are soon to have an "austerity" budget, and are solemnly warned that it will make us "shiver".

The increased yield of taxation will, of course, be spent on war preparation, not on civilian needs. If it be asked, "Will the Australian people put up with this?" my reply is, "Yes, I think so." The barrage of press propaganda is very formidable, preparing the public mind for "sacrifices", and, as I have had occasion to remark before, the Australian people do not think deeply, nor reflect on big political issues. It may feel dimly that something is wrong; but to ask it to think out what the real trouble consists in, is to ask it to do something to which it is totally unaccustomed.

The referendum against the Communists which is to take place on 22nd September, will strengthen the present trend towards a war-economy, for every opportunity will be taken to emphasise the danger that the Communists present to Australia. Of course, their own behaviour will lend support to this view, the promotion of strikes for purely political purposes having been their chief activity. The events in Korea and Malaya have been a god-send to those who desire to use the Communists as a convenient stalking-horse for bringing in repressive legislation.

Wherefore I anticipate that the Referendum will be carried and the Communists suppressed. This need not in itself cause any supporter of the working class the slightest grief, as the Communists have been a pest and a parasite on the movement ever since they started here thirty years ago—but what does cause anxiety is the fact that the legislation forecast could be used to hamstring the whole Labour movement, both industrial and political. The word "communism" is not defined. It could mean anyone of the Leftist or even Labour views. For this reason the Labour Party is opposing the Referendum.

Mr. Chifley's sudden death has made Dr. Evatt leader of the Labour Party, and he is at the head of the campaign. Evatt, in my opinion, is a political careerist and adventurer. He has no working-class background, and I think his defence of Communist Trade Unionists in court cases (which earned him much criticism even in Labour circles) is due to a desire to stand well with the industrial wing. He has not gained the respect that Mr. Chifley had from all sections of the Labour movement; for no one believed that Chifley was self-seeking, or ambitious for a great career, consequently he was respected even by Leftists. Evatt is not trusted either by the Right or the Left. The former believed him to be a Socialist (everyone in Australia who believes in increased Governmental power is called a "Socialist", and the epithet has even been applied to Mr. Menzies!); but the Leftists consider that Evatt so far from being a Socialist is not even a Labourist, but only an Evattist.

K. J. KENAFICK.

Food & Population in India

WILL ANYTHING BE DONE?

IN our issue of July 14th, we commented upon the speech by Mr. Nehru, Prime Minister of India, in which he declared that the State must encourage birth control—the first time that any government has openly advocated it.

Under the title *Talking Is Not Enough*, the Delhi magazine *Virgil* discusses Nehru's "two excellent ideas of increasing food production and diminishing baby production", in the following terms:

"One wonders what prevents his Government from giving a practical shape to these propositions? So far as the first suggestion, namely, increased production is concerned, the Government has been fiddling with it for a long time. The expert as well as the general opinion about the "Grow More Food" drive is that it has been a costly failure. If the Government's own figures, which unfortunately keep on changing, are any indication, the costly grow-more-food campaign has resulted in all these years in a one per cent increase, while the deficit is estimated at 10 per cent. Food production has remained almost stationary, not because there was no plan, not because money was not spent, not because expert advice and service were not available, but because the administrative machinery was neither efficient nor conscientious nor honest. A former Food Minister at the Centre admitted in Parliament that the improved seed given to the zamindar and the cultivator often found its way into the black market. The same was the case with manure. The money given for well-digging was often not used for the purpose. Both the former and the present Food Minister have complained that the best thought-out plans of the Centre were defeated by the apathy, opposition and perversity of the State Governments. The latter, on the other hand, complain of the Centre's lack of knowledge of local conditions and its undue interference."

"The second thing necessary to solve the food problem, according to him, is the limiting of population. We don't think the Prime Minister when he talks of limiting population, is thinking in terms of Mahatma measures of moral self-control by individuals. Evidently, he is thinking in terms of scientific devices of birth control. If that is so, we hope he has communicated his ideas to the Health Minister. If he has done so, one would like to know the number of birth-control clinics established during the last four years in India. Or is it that the menace of increasing population

has only just occurred to the Prime Minister after the threatened famine in Bihar and the South? Whatever may be the case, the Food Ministers have always talked of the pressure of population as the chief cause of food deficit.

"It is not due to want of constructive suggestions and practical propositions that the country is suffering to-day. It is suffering because what plans there are, are constantly changing and when not changing are not faithfully carried out."

EFFECT OF SPEED-UP ON THE MINERS

THE DUST THAT KILLS

WHEN a mine disaster occurs the dramatic story of suffering and heroism brings back our minds with a jerk to the ever-present dangers that beset the men in the pits. But, because it is not so sudden, so dramatic or so publicised, we tend to overlook the creeping death that eats away their ranks.

A disaster is always followed by an enquiry. We want to know why it happened; who was responsible; was every safety device properly used; will it be prevented from ever happening again?

But the subtle dust works away unnoticed. Miners are not wiped out in a body, but drop out one by one, the spectacular figures noted only by the statisticians and the experts in industrial health.

We have often discussed in these columns the problems arising for workers from mechanisation, and how it so often entails a loss of livelihood. In few industries, however, does it entail a direct loss of life as it is now being shown to do in coal-mining.

At the recent British Association meeting at Edinburgh, several speakers in the Physiology Section warned about the effects of increased mechanisation in the mines. Dr. Meiklejohn, lecturer on Industrial Health at Glasgow University, said:

"The clamant demand is for more coal, and to this end there is more mechanisation. But pause to examine the situation. Are we quite certain that, in some mines, more coal cutters and conveyor belts are not diminishing output by the deleterious effect on the miners."

The fact is simply that the new machines of which the National Coal Board are so proud, are creating problems on a scale obviously unforeseen by the experts. Dust—coal dust and stone dust—has always been a major problem in coal-mining, but the high-speed machines which serve the frantic demand for more and still more coal, create such quantities of dust that the dread disease pneumoconiosis—caused by inhaling coal-dust—is increasing at an alarming rate.

Another speaker, Sir Andrew Bryan, a member of the National Coal Board, also said that in spite of great improvements in mining operations dust was still increasing. "This nuisance ought to be removed and every possible step must be taken towards that end," he said. "We are losing more manpower through pneumoconiosis than from any other cause. If we go on doing that, it will bring the industry to a standstill."

We hope that Sir Andrew is more concerned for the welfare of the men than for that of the industry, but from the above report his remark seems ambiguous, to say the least!

One sinister fact that emerged from the British Association's discussion of this matter was that, although the incidence of pneumoconiosis seemed to be higher in South Wales than elsewhere in the country, it was so only because there was more thorough examination there.

In other words, the disease exists just as much throughout the other coalfields of Britain, but is undetected. Where examination does take place, findings are alarming. For instance, between April and December 1950, 631 miners in Scotland were examined, and 44 per cent. of them showed disability of 20 per cent. or more.

Following nationalisation, the Government proposed schemes for the rehabilitation of miners forced to leave the pits, and the development of alternative employment in colliery areas. These schemes have just not matured, and diseased miners are now queuing to get back to the only work they know—the work that ruined their health and will eventually kill them.

Anarchists have always opposed speeding up of the workers for the profit motive. To-day, the miners are being pushed harder and harder for the sake of the new armament drive. The five-day week which followed nationalisation with such proud publicity has now been virtually abolished, since the unions are persuading the miners to work Saturday mornings. In spite of their efforts, however, all the signs are that there will be a very serious fuel shortage during the coming winter.

Miners are leaving the mines. To the frustration and the disillusionment of nationalisation is added the strain of increased pressure of work and the fear—and the reality—of mining's dread diseases. These are the rewards of capitalism in an age of technical resources that could provide us with abundance and leisure.

P.S.

PECKHAM OUTLOOK BRIGHTER

THE London County Council have announced new proposals for the future of the Pioneer Health Centre (see the article "The Experiment Ends," in *Freedom* for 11/8/51). The *Architect's Journal* reports that:

"Following the Health Committee's report to the L.C.C. in December, 1950, regarding the acquisition, conversion and partial equipment for health service purposes of the Pioneer Health Centre, Camberwell. The Committee has now revised its proposals in order to secure maximum use of the premises at the earliest possible date.

"The Education Committee concur in the proposal that the first and second storeys of the building should be used for a wide range of educational evening institute activities, together with a family club under the direction of the Council. Discussions have been held with representatives of the Peckham Health Centre Members' Association with a view to incorporating their activities in the educational and health activities proposed. The L.C.C. hope that the Association will participate by the majority of their members enrolling as members of the evening institute.

"Informal discussions are in progress with members of the former Scientific Advisory Committee set up by the Sir Halley Stewart Trust to determine what form of research could best be carried out in future under the schemes outlined by the Health Committee in their present report.

"The scheme of works now proposed for the premises, together with those previously authorised, will enable the whole of the main building to be used for day nursery, ante-natal, educational and recreational purposes."

POLITICS AND RESPONSIBILITY

AMONG the criticisms levelled at the anarchist are the charges that he is impractical, unrealistic, irresponsible and unconstructive. He is unconstructive, it is said, because he ridicules the political parties and their aims but has no plan of his own to put in their place; he is irresponsible because for all his sniping at those who accept the responsibilities of government, he says that he would not accept authority even if he had the power; he is unrealistic because he does not recognise that mankind is imperfectible and that authority is necessary for the protection of the weak; he is impractical because he does not recognise the value of the work done by reformist bodies in improving social conditions; and

the anarchist will show that the very words are descriptive of the political attitudes of the critics of anarchism. It is they who are impractical for they do not see that the reformist remedies for social ills, their practical legislative measures, merely set up new problems in solving the old, nor that the "lightened" policies of governmental systems are more than cancelled out by the governments' predatory activities. It is they who are unrealistic about the nature of man, because they will not recognise the truth of William Morris's saying, "No man is good enough to be another man's master," because they will not accept the evidence of history that the best-intentioned system of authority contains elements of tyranny.

It is they who are irresponsible, because they foster the notion that the citizen can meet his responsibilities to himself and others by making on a ballot paper his delegation of those responsibilities to others. It is they who are unconstructive, because by urging people to give their support to political movements and "properly constituted authorities", they are destroying people's capacity to support themselves and to solve their own problems.

When people with political concepts of life accuse anarchism of being an irresponsible attitude, the question to be asked is, irresponsible to whom? The responsibility of the politician is not, as he claims, to the electors, but to the political system within whose framework he acts. He is convinced that he is acting responsibly in all the expediencies, deceptions, changing alliances and policies, in which he indulges. And so he is, within the limits of the political game, the "give and take of the political arena" as it is called. But it is not a game for the people whose abnegated power provides the motive force of the politicians, and whose delegated responsibility becomes their authority.

It was held at the Nuremberg trials that the German people were responsible for the crimes of their rulers, that the German soldiers could not disclaim responsibility for atrocities committed under military orders. So it can also be held that the British and American peoples are responsible for the atomic bomb though they were ignorant of its existence until it was used, and that the British people were responsible for the late Mr. Bevan's policy in Palestine, or present British policy in Malaya, or in our participation in the Korean war. And so long as

FROM PAGE ONE

ear advocated sending the fleet to Persian waters to let the "natives" look down the barrels of our heavy guns. But the Government's advisers obviously knew which way the wind was blowing.

Compromise and bluff must be their tactic, they were advised, and a business man, Mr. Stokes, was chosen for the job. The compromise was not accepted and his bluff was called. We have not yet seen, however, the end of the oil incident. Mr. Stokes may yet call the Persian Government's bluff. One thing is certain: the Persians have the upper hand since in the long run they have little to lose and much to gain, whereas the British have nothing to gain and much to lose. Already under the British proposals the revenue derived by Persia from oil would be three times the amount received under the original contract (which the Persians could well point to as a very good justification for all the fuss and bother caused by their nationalisation programme. Without such direct action—if one may be permitted to apply such a term to governments—the British Labour Government would certainly not have been so generous!) And there is no guessing what the British will next offer if the National Iranian Oil Company's spokesman, Mr. Mazda, proves that he was not bluffing when he said that four foreign-trained engineers were ready to take over in the large oilfield at Masjid-I-Sulaiman, from which 130 British are now being evacuated. He added:

"It is not a matter that can be settled in a few hours, but we are getting more Persian engineers from Tehran. Everything should be in order in a few days in the oilfields. There are enough Persian engineers for us to run the oilfields."

The British have, of course, a few more tricks up their sleeves. They uncovered one last week when they pointed out that by 1953 Europe would have sufficient refineries to deal with nine-tenths of her total requirements. That will give those Persians something to think about before they reject our generous offer to take all her oil production!

But when you have much to lose and

A READER'S IMPRESSION OF GERMANY TODAY

I HAVE just returned from a holiday in Germany. This, I agree, is a poor qualification for writing about German life and thought; after, say, a year of working in Germany my impressions would undoubtedly have been more accurate, and probably very different. However, I think I can claim to have learned more in my few weeks of travelling than anyone who travelled for a similar time by rail or by air, or even in a comfortable Chevrolet. Hitchhiking is slow, uncomfortable and hard on the nerves, but the hitch-hiker is constantly meeting new people of all kinds, who are willing to describe what they really think, because they know a wanderer will never be able to tell their friends or mention them in an official report.

The Germans, I found, were almost all against the idea of a new war, yet they had gathered from somewhere (perhaps the occupying powers) that the British want a war. "You English and Americans," said one, "do not understand the meaning of war. We Germans have learned it twice already this century." They have, too. They are no longer dying from explosions, or even from starvation, but they still live in the macabre remains of bombed cities.

Many people, discovering I was English, showed a complete lack of good manners in their haste to point out every heap of rubble that our gallant allied Air Forces had made of a bit of building. One rather unpleasant fellow (he was not in the habit of giving lifts, he said, though his car was always empty) kept repeating in English, "Here the bombs fell, and they burned in the cellars."

I don't think I felt shame or guilt (after all, I never approved of the carpet raids, and before the end I was actually agitating against them), but for some reason I always tried to point out that earlier in the war, quite a few ruins had

been made in Britain. But to tell the truth, the German bombers early in the war were not nearly so efficient as those who bombed Germany at the end. In Hamburg over eighty thousand were killed in one night, and two hundred and six thousand in three days, yet it did not strike me as a ruined city. Perhaps it was the ornamental gardens and the many new blocks of flats, like those in London, that disguised the ruins of Hamburg. In and around the Ruhr area where they are not rebuilding so much (especially not dwelling places) and where the land is not so flat and the buildings not so wide apart as in Hamburg, was where the ruins impressed me most. They are positively sickening to remember. The enormous death-rolls become remarkable in their smallness; how can so many survive? Cologne, seen from the Cathedral Tower, is a monotonous desert of rubble, crisscrossed by aimless streets.

In justice to the German Air Force, I must point out that the efficiency of the striking power of "our own boys" was vastly increased by the fact that the anti-aircraft artillery was removed from Germany at the invasion of France by the allies. This meant that bombing strafing (machine-gunning, mostly of trams, pedestrians, etc.) were able to proceed without hindrance. It isn't really surprising that the Germans want peace.

TRAGIC ACTORS

INDIA and Pakistan again stand near the edge of the precipice from which Mr. Nehru and Mr. Liaquat Ali Khan have already once before pulled them back just in time. The reason is that each, while not desiring war, has spoken the language of war. The responsibility sits on the political leaders: except at moments of tension, no great excitement over Kashmir has possessed the greater part of the voters in India; the impediments to a settlement do not come from them. The quarrel has the true ingredients of tragedy in which passion plucks down disaster on the most honourable men and destroys their life's work. The fact that their intentions are honest is no safeguard against catastrophe. Did not Frederick the Great begin by being a disciple of the pacifist Voltaire and writing the *Anti-Machiavel*? If Mr. Gandhi were alive to-day he would probably be fasting. Now he is dead what is left to appeal to the reason of these tragic actors?

—Manchester Guardian, 15/8/51.

FOREIGN COMMENTARY

PERSIAN OIL "DIPLOMACY"

nothing to gain, you never close the door with a bang. In fact you don't close it but leave your visiting card with a fragrant bouquet.

"The Lord Privy Seal paid a farewell round of visits to the Shah, the Premier, Dr. Musaddiq, the Foreign Minister, Mr. Kazemi, and the staff of the British Embassy. He thanked the Government and the people of Persia for the 'generous hospitality' shown during his visit and added: 'To my mind, the welcome that we have received augurs well for the future friendship and co-operation between our nations.'" (Reuter)

Significant, in connection with the oil dispute, has been the three weeks visit to this country, at the invitation of the British Government, of the Emir Feisal, Foreign Minister of Saudi Arabia, complete with colourful robes. At a Press conference, he stated that the purpose of his visit was "to strengthen the already existing friendship between the two countries and to discuss some points of mutual interest." Have we heard something like that before?

What has been discussed is given in a Foreign Office statement which says that discussion during the talks had turned mainly "on the delimitation of frontier areas between Saudi Arabia and some of the British-protected shajhdoms on the Trucial Coast and on the determination of sovereignty over certain islands, shoals, and sea bed areas in the Persian Gulf."

And the concluding remarks are that "considerable progress was made" and the "talks were most frank and friendly and have contributed to strengthening still further the close relations already existing between the two countries."

In case the reader confuses what he understands by "close relations" with what Government Ministries mean, let me hasten to explain why the British are so interested by quoting further from Prince Feisal's Press Conference.

"The importance of boundaries in Eastern Arabia and of the ownership of islands and seabed areas lies in the oil deposits, and Prince Feisal agreed that certain American, British, and Australian oil companies had been seeking new concessions in his country, though 'nothing serious has developed yet'" (23/8/51).

Is this another trick up the British Government's sleeve?

EGYPT

"Il faut qu'une porte soit ouverte ou fermée," wrote Musset, but the diplomatic rumpus between Egypt and Britain is over the fact that the Egyptians say that Foreign Secretary Morrison's speech in the House of Commons on July 30th had "slammed the door on further negotiations," whereas Mr. Morrison assures his Egyptian counterpart that there was nothing in his speech which justified a closed door interpretation. So one sees that in diplomatic language as to whether a door is closed or open depends on your point of view.

THE FRUITS OF MILITARY TRAINING

The prosecutor at a Canadian court-martial alleged to-day that when a number of British and Canadian soldiers were prevented from assaulting two Korean women, one of them lobbed a hand-grenade into a room full of people.

—Evening Standard, 25/8/51.

A SEX-AFFIRMATIVE SOCIETY

(Continued from page 2) Sexual Life of Children

This freedom extends also to sexual matters. "To begin with, children hear of and witness much in the sexual life of their elders. Within the house . . . a child has opportunities of acquiring practical information concerning the sexual act. I was told that no special precautions are taken to prevent children from witnessing their parents' sexual enjoyment."

The older children also allow the younger ones to witness their own sexual acts. "There are plenty of opportunities for both boys and girls to receive instruction in erotic matters from their companions. The children initiate each other into the mysteries of sexual life in a directly practical manner at a very early age. A premature amorous existence begins among them long before they are able really to carry out the act of sex. They indulge in plays and pastimes in which they satisfy their curiosity concerning the appearance and function of the organs of generation, and incidentally receive, it would seem, a certain amount of positive pleasure. Genital manipulation and such minor perversions as oral stimulation of the organs are typical forms of this amusement."

In quoting Malinowski, the same western attitude as appeared in his remarks about punishment emerges in the use of words which cast moralistic shadows like "perversion", and the implied surprise at the achievement of positive pleasure. Of course, babies and children do experience orgasm, unless the moralistic taboos succeed in obliterating the capacity for it.

There is, unfortunately, no space to indicate further the charm and liveliness of these children, which Malinowski brings out in abundance. Even so, the contrast between the life described in these bare quotations and the solitary and anxious and furtive and inhibited sexual explorations of civilised children—when they have not been wholly suppressed by their elders—is only too plain.

"Small girls," writes Malinowski, "follow their fathers on fishing expeditions, during which the men remove their public leaf. Nakedness under these conditions is regarded as natural, since it is necessary. There is no lubricity or ribaldry associated with it." Again, the contrast with the salacious modesty of our own society is marked.

Malinowski, despite his cautious language makes it quite clear that these sexual activities of the children are not merely tolerated by the adults, they are regarded as natural and proper behaviour. Following his description of their erotic pastimes quoted above, he makes this plain:

"As they are untrammelled by the authority of their elders and unrestrained by any moral code, except that of specific tribal taboo, there is nothing but their degree of curiosity, of ripeness, and of 'temperament' or sensuality, to determine how much or how little they shall indulge in sexual pastimes." In brief, their sexual development is allowed to follow a perfectly natural course.

"The attitude of the grown-ups and even of the parents towards such infantile indulgence is either that of com-

plete indifference or complacency—they find it natural, and do not see why they should scold or interfere. Usually they show a kind of tolerant and amused interest, and discuss the love affairs of their children with easy jocularity. I often heard some such benevolent gossip as this: 'So-and-so (a little girl) has already had intercourse with so-and-so (a little boy).' And if such were the case, it would be added that it was her first experience. An exchange of lovers, or some small love drama in the little world would be half-seriously, half-jokingly discussed. The infantile sexual act, or its substitute, is regarded as an innocent amusement. It is their play to *kayla* (to have intercourse). They give each other a coconut, a small piece of betel-nut, a few beads or some fruits from the bush, and they they go and hide and *kayla*."

Even in our society, children sometimes have love affairs whose depth and seriousness is entirely overlooked by adults. Almost always, however, and inevitably, they end in misery and disappointment and so add their quota not to joy but to the mechanisms of repression. Is it necessary to point out, furthermore, that overt sexual activity in civilised children means often enough the juvenile courts and approved schools, or even the misery of Borstal training till the age of 18.

The Press, Radio and politicians are working overtime exposing the horrors of Russian expansionism. They are calling on the peoples of the satellite countries to resist, to fight to get rid of the Russian invader who is stripping them of their industries, and looting their production. "We will help you to get them off your backs."

But is it not obvious to any person other than a politician, or business man, that to a Persian, Egyptian, Malayan or African, it matters little whether the man on your back is a "democrat" or a "Stalinist". Yet the "democratic" line is that these people are ungrateful. After all, a democrat on your back is as a feather compared with the leaden weight of a Stalinist. To which the answer is: "which weighs more, a pound of feathers or a pound of lead?"

LIBERTARIAN.

The Rôle of the Father

Limitation of space precludes further illustration of the sexual life of the Trobriand children. But it will be in place to draw attention to an accompanying aspect of family life which is also in contrast, though less blaringly, with civilised life. This is the rôle of the father. We will use Malinowski's description. (*Op cit.*, p. 17.)

"The husband fully shares in the care of the children. He will fondle and carry a baby, clean and wash it, and give it the mashed vegetable food which it receives in addition to the mother's milk almost from birth. In fact, nursing the baby in the arms or holding it on the knees . . . is the special rôle and duty of the father. . . . Again, if anyone enquires why children should have duties towards their father . . . the answer is invariably: 'because of the nursing', 'because his hands have been soiled with the child's excrement and urine.'"

"The father performs his duties with genuine natural fondness; he will carry an infant about for hours, looking at it with eyes full of such love and pride as are seldom seen in those of a European father. Any praise of the baby goes directly to his heart, and he will never tire of talking about and exhibiting the virtues and achievements of his wife's offspring. Indeed, watching a native family at home or meeting them on the road, one receives a strong impression of close union and intimacy between its members. Nor . . . does this mutual affection abate in later years."

Such a situation can only come about where affections in childhood have not been brutally frustrated, so that the father treats the children with the same love which he himself received.

In the next article we shall describe the sexual life of adolescents, and the social institutions which underwrite it.

J.H.

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS

Anarchism and Pacifism

Is Capitalism Inhuman?

I WAS faintly surprised that my article on "The Defence of the Revolution" (Freedom, 7/7/51) had not drawn comment from pacifists nearer home...

(3) Violence would mean... an alienation from the anarchist cause of many who would be potentially sympathetic (pacifists, intellectuals, portions of the middle-class, etc.) had they not been repelled by the workers' violence.

If these potential sympathisers turn from anarchism, but still retain reformist ideas (they obviously will not have revolutionary ideas), to whom will they give their support? Since Anarchism is the only anti-government philosophy...

And, in fact, it is very noticeable how many pacifists, very horrified at the thought of workers' violence, condone its use by the State ("police forces are necessary," etc.)

They can, of course, turn their backs on all further social agitation or activity, and retire to their ivory towers, as do all those offended by the fact that their ideas do not coincide with reality.

The reality in this case is that a social revolution entails struggle. If M.A. and his fellow pacifists will carry on the struggle for an anarchist society by non-violent means, he will have my whole-hearted encouragement...

For all M.A.'s subsidiary questions ("Where does defence begin and end?") etc.) revolve around the question of the motive for the fighting. It is to seize State power, or maintain it, then violence

must become institutionalised and will never end. If it is to abolish it, then as soon as the institutions of power are destroyed, the violence will end.

This will probably shock M.A., but it would be just as easy to ask him questions like: "If the assassination of one tyrant would prevent the massacre of five thousand peacefully demonstrating pacifists, would you allow it?"

Of course, the use of the atom bomb is never to be justified. Nor is it a revolutionary weapon, or even a weapon that is likely to be used against a revolution except perhaps by an interventionist power.

Pacifism, it seems to me, is a great theory for the maintenance of the moral innocence of the individual. I admit that passive resistance has never yet been tried on a scale likely to show its social value...

London. PHILIP SANSON.

IT would be nonsense to talk of a capitalist class where there was no capitalism. That does not mean that there always has been capitalism or that there always will be.

If you say that capitalism is "man made", this can mean no more than that it has grown up in human society and is a form of human society...

develop into something different from what anyone at first intended. Certain people are well off in this form of society, and others are not.

When people behave as they do, this is not generally because they have decided to behave in that way, or even because they "want to" behave in that way.

Even in details, most of what we do is not decided on. I do not decide to take a bus to work in the morning, just hope I won't miss it.

I do not know whether capitalism is an evil system. And I can make no definition of the statement that it is evil. There are evils that come within capitalism, and some of these are not accidental.

Swansea, Aug. 25. TOM TEMPLE.

To answer his points: (1) Workers' militias would not stand a chance against the organised might which the State has at its disposal.

History shows this to be simply not true. In the fighting that followed the Russian Revolution it was the peasant armies of the anarchist Mahkno that had the greatest success against both the Whites and the armies of intervention.

In the last war, the guerilla armies of the Resistance against the Nazis showed that even—on a limited scale—decentralised mobile forces can play havoc with centralised armies.

Let us not be hypnotised by the strength of the State. It all depends upon the workers. One soldier in the field needs ten workers to keep him supplied.

(2) The only results of violence... would be death or imprisonment... increased repressive measures by the State.

Only if the State won! I don't think it should be allowed to win. (Incidentally, one good step to take to prevent the imprisonment of anybody after the revolution would be to destroy the prisons immediately the prisoners have been released—which should be one of the first tasks of the revolutionaries.)

Germany Today

(Continued from page 3)

it there and why. (The explanation appeared a fortnight later: "Your hope, your dream, your film! To Live in Peace!")

The only two Germans I met who wanted a war (they were quite enthusiastic, too) were a team of drivers on a long-distance non-stop lorry.

I met one young man, by the way, who returned from a Russian prisoner-of-war camp in May of this year—five and a half years after the end of the war.

Those are the facts he told me. About his own feelings I gathered only that he found life in a slave camp very unpleasant and intended to enjoy his freedom while it lasted.

The Germans were very interested in nine young men in grey-green uniforms driving new four-seater Volkswagens in single file almost like a drill formation.

These nine, six officers and three constables, were the total force of the Grenzpolizei when I met them (31/7/51), but they had, besides the nine new four-seaters, two personnel wagons and two machine-gun cars, ready to accommodate a total of 100 men.

(To be continued)

ANARCHY AND PECKHAM

MAY I congratulate you on your "Peckham" number, occasioned by the final winding-up of the Pioneer Health Centre.

To return to your own brief anthology of Peckham writers and anarchist writers—what a grasp of the nature of a free society Kropotkin, Bakunin and Godwin had!

TO THE ANARCHIST GROUPS IN SAN FRANCISCO AND LOS ANGELES

We have received regular contributions to our funds from these Groups, and again this week they figure prominently in our Special Appeal with contributions of more than 50 dollars from each Group.

Their solidarity is a real source of encouragement to us in our task of issuing a journal every week in the face of ever-increasing economic difficulties caused by the rocketing prices of raw materials.

Special Appeal

August 18th to August 25th:

Glasgow: F.D. & H.D. 10/-; St. Austell: L.A. 4/-; Kingston: Comrade 1/-; Belmont: M.R. (par V.R.) £3/9/0; San Francisco: Group (\$51) £17/17/0; Los Angeles: Group part proceeds picnic Aug. 5 (\$52.75) £18/9/0; W. Somerville: D.C. 7/-; Colchester: W.M. 5/-; Edinburgh: T.O.M. 5/-; London: V.R. £1.

Table with 2 columns: Description and Amount. Total 42 7 0. Previously acknowledged 310 16 6. 1951 TOTAL TO DATE £353 3 6.

(per O.M. Newark).

BERLIN AND BRITISH YOUTH

(see eyewitness account in last week's Freedom)

AT the National Union of Students' Congress, the Russian delegates invited the Leeds University Theatre Group to perform at the Berlin Youth Festival.

The Foreign Office has admitted that it used every means in its power to dissuade British youths from going to Berlin without actually forbidding them (the Sheffield Peace Conference tactics, slightly adapted).

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

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

NORTH-EAST LONDON DISCUSSION MEETINGS IN EAST HAM

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

SOUTH LONDON

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

GLASGOW

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

FREEDOM

The Anarchist Weekly

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

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

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

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

FREEDOM PRESS

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.

ALEX COMFORT: The Philosophy of Anarchism. boards 2s. 6d., paper 1s. The Education of Free Men. 1s.

RUDOLF ROCKER: Nationalism and Culture. cloth 21s.

ALEXANDER BERKMAN: ABC of Anarchism. 1s.

PETER KROPOTKIN: The State: Its Historic Role. 1s. The Wage System. 3d. Revolutionary Government. 3d. Organised Vengeance Called Justice. 2d.

JOHN HEWETSON: Ill-Health, Poverty and the State. cloth 2s. 6d., paper 1s.

M. L. BERNERI: Italy After Mussolini. 6d. Workers in Stalin's Russia. 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.

WILLIAM GODWIN: Selections from Political Justice. 3d. On Law. 1d.

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.