

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

Vol. 12, No. 41

December 8th, 1951

Threepence

After Winning the Elections to "Set the People Free" the Policy now is

More Power to the State

THOSE who believed in the Tory slogan "Set the People Free!" and who looked with suspicion on the increased power the State took to itself during the six years of Labour government, no doubt breathed a sigh of relief on October 26th, and felt in their imaginations, the shackles falling from them.

But for their illusions! There have been something almost unbelievable in the pathetic innocence of their hopeful immaturity, if it had not been so tragic to see them the victims of a cynical political hoax.

And yet—what could they expect? By and large, the voter who swung to the "Right" this year and the Conservatives back are those who swung to the "Left" in 1945. They put the Conservatives out of patience in following the Tory line, "Try, try again," may seem to have become a virtue, but to the Anarchist it looks like a stubborn refusal to look facts in the face.

Before the election, we were almost alone in pointing out the superficialities of the issues on which the parties built up their election fight. We showed the Tories on the issues that really mattered, Labour and Conservative were united. But even we were almost surprised at the promptness with which the Tories forgot their election arguments.

For six years the liberty-loving Tories had denounced rationing, bulk-buying and the whole system of economic controls by which Labour had manipulated internal and foreign trade, as "doctrinaire socialism". Within six weeks of attaining office, they have restricted imports to government licence-holders, confirmed bulk-buying, brought in economic measures that have the approval of the

"doctrinaire" opposition, raised the price of food, reduced certain rations, refused a food bonus for Christmas, and squirmed out of all questions on their housing promises.

But more important still, to our minds, are the two measures announced last week to strengthen the power of the State over the individual. The Tory supporters, in the main the middle-class, may not, of course, see much to be afraid of in the Home Guard Bill and the proposed re-introduction of direction of labour. They will not be affected adversely in fact, and have never been concerned, even in principle, for the welfare of the workers.

But the workers may well sound the alarm at these two proposals by the Government, who, for all their professed dislike of State interference when they are out of office, have not hesitated to grab added powers as soon as they have the chance.

The Home Guard is to be a voluntary body of part-time soldiers, specially trained to guard "vulnerable" points—including armament factories—frustrate saboteurs and help Civil Defence in case of air attack.

Its formation is an indication of the Government's intention to push forward with its war preparation, and also it underlines the fact that this country is obviously going to be in the front line in the next war. Mr. Churchill himself has already pointed out that our leasing of air-fields in East Anglia to American bomber squadrons makes England a legitimate target for attack as soon as the war starts, but although the Home Guard is being formed now as a defence preparation, how much of its real function is going to be control of the British population itself?

In the debate on the Bill in the House of Commons, the Opposition pressed for an amendment that the Home Guard would not be used as a strike-breaking force either in peace-time or war-time.

Mr. Head, Minister of War, however, introduced another amendment, which was accepted, ensuring that the Home Guard could not be used in an industrial dispute before it was mustered. But Mr. Head said he could not extend this to cover war-time.

It is proposed that the Home Guard would only be mustered in war-time—and Mr. Head pointed out that in war-time it might be difficult to define the dividing line between an industrial dispute and a civil disturbance.

So all the Government has to do is to decide an Emergency, muster the Home Guard, and there they have an armed force with strike-breaking and coercive powers. Of course, Mr. Head said there was no intention to use the Home Guard for strike-breaking, but it was difficult to make a legal definition.

Under just such vague words do governments gain powers of life and death over the people.

The other Government measure, with nothing voluntary about it, is the proposal to re-introduce job-control to build up man-power for the defence programme. The final decisions on the form it is to take have not yet been made; Sir Walter Monckton, Minister of Labour, will shortly call together his "Inner Man-power Cabinet"—the Joint Consultative Committee of the National Joint Advisory Council, to work that out.

The line Monckton will probably take is to compel jobless workers to find work through the Labour Exchanges—where they will be "steered" into the priority industries.

The sinister nature of these two measures should not be under-estimated. They are both deliberate efforts to control labour in the interests of military preparedness. We have often shown how, in order to make war on a totalitarian enemy, Britain must become totalitarian herself. The Conservative government is wasting no time in accelerating the trend the Labour Party began.

There is, however, an answer to the impudence of the State. But it is the Anarchist answer. To look towards the Government which is taking away your freedom and hope to get it back from that direction is clearly nonsensical. We must look to ourselves, and realise that governments can only operate as they do on the acquiescence of their peoples. Our experiences during the war taught us many ways of combatting the direction of labour—and while the Home Guard remains a voluntary organisation the answer there is a simple one; stay out of it!

What was it Churchill used to say? "Set the People Free?" That still remains the task of the people themselves.

FOREIGN COMMENTARY

There's Money in Oil

THE Anglo-Iranian Oil Company last week published its balance sheet and report for 1950, and in spite of the present difficulties, they had cause for considerable satisfaction with last year's activities which resulted in the Company making a record gross profit of £115,495,994 (compared with £63,020,405 for 1949) and after payment of £16,031,735 in royalty to the Iranian Government (£13,489,271 in 1949).

The £115 million-odd was disposed of in the following manner: £34 million for depreciation on fixed assets, oil exploration interests and survey repairs; £16 million to a "Special Contingencies Account"; £32 million to the British Exchequer in Taxes and the balance of £33 million is available for reserves and dividends. The shareholders received a 30% dividend, which absorbed £7 million of the Balance, leaving £25 million to be placed to the general reserve which now stands at the very substantial and—for the shareholders thinking of their future—gratifying total of £60 millions and £1 million to the Preference Stock reserve which now stands at £8 million. So secure is the financial position of the Company that the chairman was able to assure stockholders that, "after reviewing all the circumstances, I feel I can say that unless there is some wholly unforeseen happening in the remaining few weeks of this year the company will be in a position to pay the same rate of dividend on the ordinary stock for 1951 as has been paid for some years past."

The chairman's report which was published as a paid advertisement in a number of daily newspapers and occupied nearly two pages, deals in considerable detail with the events leading up to the deadlock in negotiations between the Company and the Iranian Government. Of course, the lily-white purity of the Company in all its dealings runs right through the report. The fact that in

March the Company offered to advance £5 million to the Iranian Government and a further £2 million a month for the remainder of 1951 and that when it was clear the Iranian Government was not going to be fobbed off with that, increased their offer in June to £10 million down and £3 million a month from July onwards until agreement was reached, is given as an example of their eagerness to assist the Iranian Government "in its financial difficulties"! We are expected to be struck dumb by the vast expenditure, totalling £39 million during the past three years, on "housing, health, educational, social and recreational facilities for its employees" and the various incentives offered to both Iranian and British employees. We are told that staff pay was the same for Iranians and Britishers in the same posts but we are not told the rates paid to unskilled labourers. It may be true, as the Financial Editor of the *Manchester Guardian* writes of the Report that the Company's "conduct and its social services have been exemplary". But how easy it is to appear generous when you have made a cool £110 millions in profit in a year!

Continued on p. 3

"A most extraordinary procedure," said Lieut.-Col. W. E. Batt, the magistrate, at Thames court yesterday when an attendant, Mr. B. Benjamin, told him that people using free conveniences in Stepney to wash their hands were not allowed to comb their hair.

—*News Chronicle*, 29/11/51.

"A fifth of the houses in Leicester, some 13,000, are unfit to live in," says the city's Medical Officer of Health, Dr. E. K. Macdonald, in his annual report.

—*News Chronicle*, 28/11/51.

TEETOTAL ANARCHISM

THE other day, Lady Astor, letting herself go on the subject of "Shaw's ridiculous will", came out with the bland statement that her old friend, Shaw, was "a sound Conservative".

Ian MacKay, of the *News Chronicle*, took her pompously to task (27/11/51). There was "nothing like it since Hamlet called Polonius a fishmonger" (and the rest, as MacKay readers can well add for themselves). Before long, Lord Salisbury would be proving Marx was really Disraeli in a different set of whisks, etc., etc.

But how does Mr. MacKay describe Nancy Astor? "Despite her lack of bombs or poniards" it appears that "a lovelier or livelier anarchist never existed even in the pages of William Le Queux or Phillips Oppenheim". She sat in Parliament to the delight of all "opposite that other anarchistic aristocrat, Davy Kirkwood", now certainly an aristocrat since the Dissolution Honours List just after Mr. MacKay's outburst.

Strange company we seem to have been keeping in the anarchist movement. Any haddocks, Polonius?

Czecho-Slovakia: Stansky's Downfall

IN an article in *FREEDOM* of June 16th this year, it was suggested that Rudolf Stansky, the Secretary-General of the Communist Party in Czechoslovakia was liable to be axed. His arrest is now reported.

He is described in the party newspaper *Rude Pravo* as an "imperialist agent", and is compared with Trotsky, Bukharin, Zinoviev and Gomulka, the former Secretary-General of the Polish Communist Party who is now awaiting trial. It is typical of the Communist conception of law that men yet to be tried are denounced in the same breath as those already convicted.

Significantly, the paper relates Stansky's arrest with the agricultural question: "The activities of our enemies are directed against our socialist industrialisation and co-operation in agriculture, just as they were in the case of the Soviet Union. It is our task to be more watchful and suspicious towards anyone who might try to undermine our friendship with the Soviet Union and the great Stalin."

Thus it repeats the pattern whereby purges are used in the struggle to subdue the peasants in predominantly agricultural countries, and also in the consolidating of the colonial power of the Soviet Union over its satellites.

There is another aspect of interest. Stansky was himself concerned with preparing the propaganda trials of Dr. Clementis, the former Czech Foreign Minister, and his alleged associates. Presumably these arrests were intended to play their part in allaying the grievances of the Czech workers and peasants. An editorial writer in the *Manchester Guardian* suggests that "the delay is unusual and seems to show that something has gone wrong with that particular purge and that it has not had the desired effect."

Much criticism has recently been levelled at the mines and other industries, and the Central Committee of the Czech Communist Party recently declared that "the many cases of unjustified absenteeism, the disregard of working hours, and the non-fulfilment of the orders of senior staff must not be tolerated." Many workers have been deprived of their Christmas bonus, and the government has hinted that "those who shun or shirk work" may be deprived of their clothes ration cards. As the *Manchester Guardian* observes: "It looks as though someone's head had to roll for all this and Stansky's had been chosen."

This is, doubtless, only a partial explanation. Czechoslovakia is a satellite with most connections in the past with

the West, with the highest educational standards, and with a former standard of living with most to lose from Soviet imperialism. Obviously a target for Western diplomacy and potential "Titoism".

In Poland Also

The new purges in Poland are said to involve General Rola-Zmierski, formerly Commander-in-Chief, and Edward Osobka-Morawski, Socialist Prime Minister in the first post-war coalition government. They are said to be nationalist deviationists.

And In The West

It is also reported that an entire German family, with the exception of one child had been imprisoned by a U.S. district court for "spying for Czechoslovakia". The family consisted of a wife, and her mother, brother and husband. The wife, who is 27, was sentenced to one year's imprisonment. The sentences of the others are not known to us.

In Vienna, a British corporal was recently sentenced to eight years by a British military court for espionage on behalf of Czechoslovakia. A girl he was said to be associating with was sentenced by the same Klagenfurt court to seven years, and an Austrian described as her lover, to 15 years. The girl is 23, the Austrian, 25.

FIGHT AGAINST OVERTIME IN THE PORT OF LONDON

WHAT started as a normal wage dispute in the Port of London has now developed into a large-scale struggle to establish the Port-workers' right to refuse overtime.

This is an official union-supported dispute, and it flared up when, in pursuance of their wage claim, the lightermen's union called a ban on overtime, which was countered by the employers with suspensions of over 800 workers who refused to do more than the eight-hour day.

Under the National Dock Labour Scheme—for so long held up as of such benefit for the port-workers—lightermen, dockers and stevedores are supposed to work for "reasonable" periods. These periods more or less have to be flexible in order to fit in with the tides. Ships have to be brought up the river, turned round and taken down according to the tides, which do not conform to an 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. day.

Port-workers, of course, realise this, and are prepared to work accordingly. What they are not prepared for, however, is that overtime, as dictated by the Dock Labour Board or the Port of London Authority, should be compulsory.

That is how the D.L.B. and the P.L.A. translate the word "reasonable" in the decrees of the Dock Labour Scheme, but the men and their unions—for now the lightermen have been joined by the stevedores in the overtime ban—see in this a threat to "everything the old-timers fought for".

It means that port-workers can be compelled to work an eighty-hour week, if the authorities deem that is "reasonable". It means slavery.

And not only that. It means very dangerous slavery, too. The lightermen are licensed craftsmen who serve long and hard apprenticeships before they get their "tickets". Loaded barges can weigh 200 tons or more and carry cargo worth several thousand pounds. They have to be taken up or down the river, often with the power of the tide as the

only motive power. Getting their craft through the many narrow spans of London's bridges means a very high degree of skill, physical strength, an intimate knowledge of the tides, eddies and currents, and constant vigilance.

After working long hours, during day or night, fatigue can lead to mistakes; mistakes can lead to loss of licence, and loss of licence means loss of livelihood. And this does not take into account the possibility of loss of life itself.

Both the lightermen and the stevedores (the "blue-card" holders, who number about 7,000 in London) are now working strictly from eight till five. It means the tugs and barges are not being prepared or moved into position until after 8 a.m. and are being secured in time for the men to leave at 5 p.m. This considerably shortens the stevedores' effective working time.

All this is holding up much perishable food and fruits coming in for Christmas. Bill Lindley, Lightermen's leader, has told his members, "This may be a black Christmas instead of a white one... That may sound callous, but we do not pick the time for these things to happen."

One of the two wage claims involved in the start of this dispute has been outstanding since 1947! A suggested compromise arrangement by the union has been turned down flat by the employers.

The latest position at the time of writing is that altogether 11,000 port-workers are operating the ban. As usual, Deakin's union, the Transport and General Workers', to which the remaining 17,000 dockers belong, is showing no solidarity in the struggle and its members, by continuing overtime wherever their work-gangs do not include blue-card men (a gang will not work under-strength) is weakening the position of the militants.

By the time these words appear in print, however, the tides will be high outside the men's working hours. This means that the lighters will not be able to be used at all. The pressure of accumulating work will probably soon force the employers to give way.

American Minorities—Conclusions Roots of Prejudice: Roots of Joy

"But love, they say, is a tender thing, that will smooth frowns and make calm an angry face: will soften a rugged temper, and make ill-humoured people good..."
—Silvia, Act III, Scene 10, *The Old Batchelor*. (William Congreve.)

1

OUR survey of American minorities makes no pretence at either completeness or inclusiveness. We have discussed only the five major minorities: the Negro, the Jew, the Mexican, the Japanese and the American Indian. (FREEDOM (4/3/48) carried an article on the "newest" American minority: the Puerto Rican.)

Nor have we touched at all those great semi-minorities, the proletarianised Italians (6,000,000 souls), the silent Poles (4,000,000 souls). (The Italians are discriminated against in medical schools, the Poles "even" within the hierarchy of the Catholic Church); the other Slavic nationalities: Czechs and Slovaks, Ukrainians, Great Russians, the South Slavs; the "foreign born", the "foreign encysted" Americans of the first and second generations, numbering in 1940 perhaps 25 millions or one-fifth of our population.

The "dagos", "bohunks", "square-heads", "micks", one sloppy step above the "niggers", "Kikes", "Japs", "spics" and "savages"; who live out their impoverished existences as "ordinary proletarians" ("citizens") with no (special drawbacks of the "minority question" minorities (and even here a great supposition!), live out their lives as nothing but poor miners, factory workers, semi-neurotic clerks, spiritually empty servants of the Great American Empire, good shoemakers and poor fish-pedlars, "denizens" (a legal immigration term) of Fischer's bloody Chicago, the dreary Cleveland of Leon Czolgosz, Joe Hillstrom's sadist city of the Salt Lake. Those uncouth, unremembered inhabitants of those busy cities, those most men leading lives of quiet desperation, whose tragedy approaches that piercing anxious sadness of the wild beasts (or caged animals) who live out a tragedy greater and sadder perhaps for all its unconsciousness.

Book Review

LITERATURE OF THE SPANISH PEOPLE

THE LITERATURE OF THE SPANISH PEOPLE. From Roman Times to the Present Day. By Gerald Brenan. (Cambridge University Press, 40/-.)

GERALD BRENNAN'S *Spanish Labyrinth and The Face of Spain* will be known to many readers of FREEDOM as books in a class by themselves, if only for the very simple reason that they are good books on a subject which tempts many writers but for which few have the necessary equipment. It is, perhaps, not surprising that there are so few really worth-while books in English about Spain, Spaniards and Spanish Literature. For a century or more French has been the first on the list of modern languages studied in school and university in Britain. French governments, irrespective of the political party in power, have long been subsidising their official "cultural propaganda" with the object of impressing on foreigners that a knowledge

We have not considered the regional minorities: the South-East, for example, the burnt-out sections of New England.

We have not considered the other Asiatic minorities: the Chinese minority, doomed by lack of immigration (107,000 in 1890, 77,000 in 1940) to extinction. Shut by the great wall of America in their coolie laundries and their hot-house restaurants; the Filipino minority, field slaves and houseboys (50,000 in Hawaii, 50,000 on the mainland); the East Indians and the Near Eastern minorities: Greek, Syrian, Armenian, Turkish, etc., etc.

The authoritarian family minorities: the women and children. The minorities within the minorities: the Syrian and Yemenite Jew among the *Ashkenazim*, the Negro within the Puerto Rican group, the Okinawan among the Japanese. Negro anti-Semitism, Jewish anti-Negroism. Jewish, Negro, Japanese self-hate.

Indeed, the list is endless because America makes everyone a minority.

Every group a minority against the rulers of America.

Every individual a minority against the ideas and society of America.

2

The Problem of the Minority

What is this problem of "minority"? What does it mean to be a minority? *The minority problem is essentially a problem of authority. That group under the down direction of authority is a minority.*

Therefore questions of number have no relevance here. A group may be a numerical majority (as the Negro in great sections of the South, or the Mexican in large areas of the South-West) but it will still be a minority because it has a minority of the power.

And in society of devil cat devil, we are all a minority. Someone always has the power, direct or implied over us. Before that monster called the State, each citizen appears as a minority of one. The bureaucrat always belongs to the majority nationality. It is interesting that the Federal Government in the U.S. to-day is the great (theoretically, anyway) defender of the minority. Before the State all are equal; that is equally powerless. Therefore the President of

U.S. will demand that a dead servant (or soldier) of this State who happened to be an American Indian, be given non-discriminatory burial. (As to his living co-Nationals, a slightly different matter, of course.) Yet this is the tendency to-day. The hate has been directed outward to the extra-national community: the Soviet Union and the Communists. (Thus wars, seen in this light, are to-day simply struggles between two almost equally balanced groups, arranged in mammoth institutions of nation-states, over authority: i.e., whose authority is to be imposed on whom; which group is to become the minority and which the majority. Indeed, many present-day minorities originated in just such a way, i.e., the Sudeten Germans, the Indians and Mexicans of the U.S.) But the distribution of the energy of hate will be discussed later on.

Authority is a problem of scarcity. This scarcity may be economic or emotional or both. When there is the need for authority a down group will be found. This will operate on a societal level and on a personal level. There are group scapegoats and personal scapegoats. Our terrorised lives demand their terroristic expression.

3

The Authoritarian Personality

What is the bigot like? What sort of a person is he? Basically, he is an unhappy person. He does not love, he hates. He is frustrated and seeks the source and cure of his frustration neither in himself nor in the structure of society, nor in any combination of the two. Nor does he accept the great defeats of his life as acts of fate or God and attempt to make the most of it. No,

he is the fascist rebel against... against any weaker group or individual. How the great well of this energy of dissatisfaction is channelised we will discuss later. Here we will focus on the personality of the bigot himself.

"The lack of an internationalised and individualised approach to the child on the part of the parent, as well as a tendency to transmit mainly a set of conventional rules and customs may be considered as interfering with the development of a clear cut personal identity in the growing child. Instead, we find surface conformity without integration, expressing itself in a stereotyped approach devoid of genuine affection in almost all areas of life. The general persuasive character of the tendency on the part of the prejudiced individual toward a conventional externalised shallow type of relation..."

"Even in the purely cognitive domain ready-made clichés tend to take the place of spontaneous reactions. Whatever the topic may be, statements made by prejudiced as contrasted with the unprejudiced are apt to stand out by their comparative lack of imagination, of spontaneity and of originality and by a certain constrictive character." (p. 385.)

"The unprejudiced is aware, the prejudiced repressed. He externalises, the unprejudiced internalises. The prejudiced person is conventional, the unprejudiced person tends to be genuine. The prejudiced person is orientated toward power. The unprejudiced person is orientated towards love. The prejudiced person is rigid. The unprejudiced person is flexible.

"Forced into a surface submission to powerful authority, the child develops hostility and aggression which are poorly channelised. This displacement of a re-

pressed antagonism toward authority may be one of the sources and perhaps the principle source of his antagonism toward outgroups." (p. 473.)

(These quotations are from: *The Authoritarian Personality*, by Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswick, Levinson, Sanford, and others. Part of the *Studies in Prejudice Series*, published by Harpers in 1950. This study was the most extensive of its kind ever made and its data are based on thousands of samples. A variety of techniques such as questionnaire, intensive interview, psychoanalytic and projective techniques were used. The American Jewish Committee sponsored the research.)

The inability of the individual to adjust himself to a huge new world where the horizon of personality must expand; the collapse of the personality in the collapsed family; the mass-atom society; the consequent inability of the individual to think or feel in any but mass, contentless stereotyped ways, or as the only seemingly dignified alternative in provincially selfish ego-centric way; these are related to the psychological question of "the minority problem."

But if the Negro problem in America has been justly described by Richard Wright as the White problem, then it follows that the minority problem is a minority problem, but a majority problem. Nor is it basically a question of "the reason" (at least as classically understood) nor of toadying to the majority.

Not all the wooden medals of Kaiser's Reich saved a single German Jew from the gas chamber.

JACK GALLEGOS

(To be concluded)

Social Responsibility in Science & Art-

by ALEX COMFORT

IT happens that the branch of science in which I was trained, medicine, is the only branch which not only has such a unified ethic, but has had it for almost six thousand years. The idea of the human responsibility of the doctor has been present since medicine was in distinguishable from magic. For some it has been a supernatural duty based on religion or philosophy, but I doubt if that was the true origin of the Hippocratic tradition. It seems more likely that it arose because men recognised that since knowledge of poisons and more or less dangerous and powerful remedies was useful for the struggle with disease, some safeguard was necessary to place the possessors of this hazardous proficiency in a special category, a category which made them responsible to humanity in general. When we destroyed the data obtained by human experiments in the Nazi concentration camps, we were reasserting that tradition. Our own age is the first since early European history in which that tradition has been seriously challenged, and even to-day a government is going to think twice before it calls a medical psychologist to assist in spreading disease. It knows it runs the risk of meeting a refusal which would have the support of very nearly the whole of world medical opinion. Non-medical science has grown up without that tradition.

Leonardo might suppress his submarine, but most scientific workers, even the most far-sighted, have felt no uniform, corporate pressure from their tradition to act in this way—if they did, the decision was an individual one. Many felt that by stepping outside the normal processes of politics and citizenship and withholding their support from a particular course of action they were taking the law into their own hands. To-day, we have only just ceased executing Germans for failing, in such a situation, to take the law into their own hands. It may perhaps be our recent experience of totalitarianism which will be the decisive factor in making the acceptance of personal responsibility general in science. Another and a more important force is the growth of a science of human behaviour. It is becoming clearer and clearer, through the work of social psychologists and psychopathologists that if I make an atom bomb and entrust it to a political authority, its use or non-use will not depend in any real sense upon threats from without, upon the moral will of the people, or upon any coherent argument or object, but upon quite irrelevant factors in the culture which possesses it and in the childhood upbringing and resultant personality of those who happen to hold office.

I don't think I need stress the unique position of the scientist in facing these problems. If he is prepared to formulate a humanistic ethic and stick to it, he can neither be replaced nor in the last resort coerced—it is possible for a state to command a certain amount of purely technical acquiescence, but fundamental research and original investigation, on which the whole technology now depends, can only be produced by willing and enthusiastic workers, not by conscript labour in a science-factory.

is prepared to take a really strong line about co-operation with anti-human and destructive policies it can be both effective and decisive. It can, moreover, rally very wide popular support, as the doctor relies on the sanction of world opinion when he asserts his professional neutrality in the care of the wounded. It is possible that in movements such as the American Society for Social Responsibility in Science, to which Professor Einstein has recently given his support, and in debates such as those conducted through the Atomic Scientists' Association, we may be seeing the emergence of such a unified ethical attitude.

In the situation in which our own country finds itself, it will certainly be argued that unless the scientist is willing to co-operate with what is termed defence, even if that means the preparation of highly destructive weapons, he must take the responsibility for the destruction of all scientific liberty by one or another totalitarianism. The same argument would apply to medicine, and I doubt if most doctors would be prepared to abandon their tradition because of that risk. In fact, the effect of atomic and other preparations on the growth of science and the liberty of information, as well as the psychological effects of the weapons on their users, are proving not much less serious than those of the forces they are supposed to counter. Even if that were not so, I would remind you that I'm talking about a policy for scientific ethics, not scientific expediency. There are some policies, such as Hitler's gas chambers, or war based on genocide, to which I believe we can only reply "Here stand I, I can do no other." It is the point at which this stand must be made which is the constant anxiety of a great many scientific workers to-day.

Compared with the immediate practical responsibility of the scientist, the responsibility of the artist must seem puny. The decision which faces him out of world history isn't, I think, one of practical action: of course he will try to throw his weight into the scale, and that weight, if he is a writer or even a painter of genius may have its effect. For the novelist, in our society the only artist who has a mass audience and at the same time effective economic control of the means of addressing it, for the novelist the hope of some decisive influence is a reasonable one. The dichotomy which people have tried to establish between artistic proficiency and artistic content is becoming unbearable to almost all sensitive minds. I doubt if it has ever been real—we might have admired Shelley as much if he had been indifferent to such things as war and tyranny, though I doubt it; certainly had he been indifferent we should never have been led by him. For the novelist, who takes of all artists what is probably the largest portion of his culture as material, there is no more escape from the necessity for treating the content of his work seriously, than there is for the social psychologist he is coming so closely to resemble.

There is no Hippocratic oath in literature, and I am not attempting to-night to draw one up. As far as I'm concerned, the artist is a human being writ

large, and his ethics are the ethics of any human being. Perhaps I can illustrate what seems to me the consciousness of those duties of assertion and refusal from one writer, and I don't think it is without significance that this writer projects the whole situation of choice into a scientific parable, the parable of a pestilence; a pestilence, many beings are called to fight against, called not by any supernatural obligation but by the simple fact that the fight against a plague is something like a biological human obligation. Albert Camus seems to me to be the first modern writer, though I'm certain he won't be the last, to put the problem of responsibility in specific terms: "I only know," he wrote, "that in this world there are pestilences and there are victims, and it is up to us not to ally ourselves with the pestilences." For the medical scientist, who knows that he may quite well be called upon to-day to use literal pestilences, of mind and of body, in psychological and bacteriological warfare, that statement has a meaning clearer, I think, and more imperative than its author intended. But for the scientist as general enemy of pestilences, and the artist as general representative of humanity, the basic pestilence which, by its epidemic spread in our time challenges his allegiance, is the same—it is the pestilence which, through the spread of irrational fears and irrational hatreds, through the acceptance of coercion, through the neglect of what one can only call social and personal sanitation in our attitudes to society, leads us to forget who we are and who our fellow men are; the pestilence which exterminates gooks or dissidents, which apologises for torture and massacre in any shape or form, whether it be called for the moment revolution or collective security, the pestilence of atom bombs and concentration camps. In the last resort, there is only one ethically satisfactory reply to that pestilence: an unqualified and unargued No. This No does not spring, I think, from any idealistic or metaphysical imperative, but simply from the fact that by saying anything else we should cease to be human beings and become something different.

I know that this view will seem oversimple to some. Very often it will be denounced as neutrality, a neutrality which is morally unworthy because of the Communist atrocities here, or the Capitalist atrocities somewhere else, which we ought to oppose.

To that, I would reply myself that so strongly do I oppose not only atrocities of all kinds, but the pestilence itself, from which I believe they spring, that a bald reassertion of what I have called "humanity", so far from being neutral, is a declaration of partisanship, of being more specifically, on the side of man. And it is because both art and science are almost by definition "on the side of man" that the issue of choice which confronts them to-day seems to me more than a matter of personal ethics—it is rather the reflection in the individual of something in the social nature of the human species. By the practice of their professions, the artist and the scientist have already assumed responsibility for the preservation of that something.

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

Some books to send to your friends this Christmas...

- To Live in Mankind
Reginald Reynolds 15/-
Traces Gandhi's influence on Indian affairs and includes a full account of "basic education" in practice.
- Pioneers of Russian Social Thought
Richard Hare 15/-
A study of 19th century Russian thinkers.
- Tressell of Mugsborough
F. C. Bell 12/6
Biography of the author of *The Ragged Trousered Philanthropist*.
- The Anarchist Prince
Woodcock & Avakumovic 21/-
The biography of Kropotkin. "Admirable and carefully documented work."—*New Statesman*. "His life is related in great detail in this volume."—*John O'London's*.
- The Canterbury Tales
Geoffrey Chaucer 3/6
Translated by Nevill Coghill. "This translation will remain a beloved classic until the language changes again sufficiently to call for another renaissance."—*Punch*.
- Byron for To-day
Ed. Roy Fuller 1/-
An attractive little book reduced from 5/- which gives a selection of Byron's wit and brilliant satire.

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

THE POPE: SCIENTIST

Solidarity in Disaster

LAST month brought the most appalling flood disasters to Italy—first in Calabria and Sicily, and then on a far larger scale in the Po Valley in the north. Not only was the volume of water in the Po such as to cause breaches in its banks 300 metres wide, but the Adriatic had flood tides so high that all the coastal towns from Trieste and Venice to Ancona were under water. These exceptionally high tides obstructed the outflow of the flood waters.

Over thirty towns—three of them large ones—have been submerged. The loss of human life has yet to be assessed. Enormous numbers of livestock have been drowned. The disaster is the worst since the area was drained eighty years ago.

Life to-day constantly defeats the natural social solidarity of men. National divisions are deep, but the divisions within national societies are just as far-reaching. Superficial sociologists often assume that men and women are not social because their societies show so little cohesion. But when disaster occurs, the basic solidarity immediately comes to the surface. And this happens not occasionally, as a favoured exception, but whenever disaster occurs in the world and whatever its magnitude.

In Italy, the whole country seems to have geared itself to meet the needs of the flood situation. Refugees poured into the surrounding towns where beds and accommodation were found for them. All over Italy funds have been raised for relief. Even areas like Calabria and Sicily, themselves newly stricken by floods, have raised money for the north.

Fisherman and their boats were brought from the west coast of Italy by lorry, and coaches arrived from all parts loaded with food, clothing and medical supplies or other relief requirements.

Nor has the disaster failed to arouse solidarity across the national frontiers. Over a hundred British and American Army engineers were sent from Trieste. From Germany arrived over 50 new large-scale pumping installations. In general, however, reports seem to indicate, as is only natural, that the most immediate solidarity comes from the poorer people all over the country.

By contrast with this natural and active sympathy with the victims of disaster, the politicians have been unable to desist from trying to make capital out of it. The Communists have tried to open a separate relief fund to be administered by themselves. Their members have sought to enter relief organisations as party members. Their paper has used the flood disaster to attack the government.

De Gasperi, the Prime Minister, and the public figures like Nenni have been more restrained and have appealed for non-party co-operation in the emergency. Yet, even then, some capital was made on the side—for instance, by De Gasperi in praising an old man who said: "I am a man of order, President," as he voluntarily accepted army discipline.

Even Eisenhower had to bring in the relief work done by soldiers as evidence of the peaceful intentions of the Western Defence system. The simplicity of a natural response to other people's troubles, is hard for politicians to understand, and they have to try and seek advantage from all situations. As always, however, the general response of solidarity in disaster shows that there is hope for the future if only social feelings were allowed free expression instead of discouragement.

WE hope it will not be thought that this column is putting itself out to persecute the Pope but God's official representative has been hitting the headlines for many weeks and threatens to rival Stalin in the number of authoritative pronouncements he has made on a variety of subjects. It all started when he called in the mid-wives and gave his directives on childbirth and birth control. This was followed by some worldly advice to delegates to an international Congress of bankers. And shortly afterwards he laid down the law on when a mammal is a fish when he denied reports that the Archbishop of Vienna had ruled that the flesh of that mammal, the whale, constituted "meat" as understood in the Roman Church's rules of abstinence. He made it clear that the flesh of any animal living predominantly in the water was permitted to Roman Catholics on abstinence days, but this did not apply to aquatic fowl.

And the following day he called on Sports reporters to write with "sober discretion which is a thousand times more eloquent and more powerful than lyrical dithyrambs" and then he proceeded to be lyrical himself when telling them how they should be conscious of the influence they wielded in forming public opinion which could be done by "a simple word which seizes in its flight a fleeting incident, a gesture, an attitude." The Pope also used the occasion to issue a *ukase* on sport: The Roman Catholic Church "does not forbid Sunday sport, and indeed regards it with benevolence on condition that Sunday remains the Lord's Day and the day of corporal and spiritual relaxation."

BUT on November 22nd, His Holiness really dropped a bombshell among the faithful who had hitherto been taught that while all things were created by God alone, nothing was defined as to the order or period of creation. On November 22nd he declared at a gathering of scientists that he accepted their estimates of the age of the world, and in discussing scientific estimates of the age of meteorites—stellar masses of five or ten billion years ago—he found no conflict with the Old Testament. "Although these figures may seem astounding," he declared, "nevertheless, even to the simplest of the faithful, they bring no new or different concept from the one they learned in the opening words of Genesis: 'In the beginning . . .', that is to say, at the beginning of things in time. The figures we have quoted clothe these words in a concrete and almost mathematical expression, while from them there springs forth a new source of consolation for those who share the esteem of the Apostle for that divinely inspired Scripture, which is always useful 'for teaching, for reproving, for correcting, for instructing.'"

We do not profess to understand the meaning of these divinely inspired words nor those that followed. We need hardly say that the findings of science according to the Pope confirm the existence of God. His concluding words were that the scientist knew that in a universe where all things were subject to change

DISINTERESTED AID

THE following report from the Washington correspondent of the *Daily Telegraph* (23/11/51) is an enlightening illustration of the way in which economic dictatorship can be dressed up as economic co-operation. (No, the correspondent's tongue was not in his cheek.)

"Britain has agreed to divert about 9,850 tons of aluminium to American purchasers during the next five months to meet a critical American shortage. In return, Britain will buy a similar amount intended originally for the United States, starting with the last quarter of 1952.

"By that time America's expansion of her aluminium facilities will be completed. The British have been released from contracts with Canadian firms. As part of the same pattern of mutual help, the United States will provide some relief for the British steel shortage by three measures:

"(1) An allocation of 25,000 tons of fabricated American steel, mainly for military equipment, during the first quarter of 1952;

"(2) Authorising Britain during the same quarter to purchase about 45,000 tons of steel consisting of ingots of a type which are not in great demand in America because of their high price.

"(3) The diversion of about 28,500 tons of iron and steel scrap from Germany to Britain over a five-month period.

"Negotiations are continuing on a plan under which Britain would make structural products out of American steel ingots and sell them to the United States. This would ease the British difficulty in finding dollars to pay for steel ingots, and also the American shortage of structural steel."

there must be an "immutable being." "The scientist of to-day," he declared, "directing his gaze more deeply into the heart of nature than his predecessor of a hundred years ago, knows well that inorganic matter is, so to speak, in its innermost being, counter-signed with the stamp of mutability, and that consequently, its existence and its substance demand a reality entirely different and one which is by its very nature invariable."

Is there a scientist in the House?

LESS than a week after these directives in the realm of science, His Holiness felt that he should return to the subjects of Childbirth and Birth Control, and cross his t's and dot the i's in order to counteract the adverse publicity given to his pronouncement in the Protestant Countries, not to mention the many urgent requests he must have received from Catholic doctors concerned about the future of their practices.

On the question of the Mother and Child he has wriggled out of his original pronouncement by complaining that it had been mistranslated and adding that in his ruling he purposely used the expression "direct attempt on the life of an innocent person" or "direct killing". The reason, he said, was "because if for example, the saving of the life of the future mother, independently of her pregnant state, should urgently require a surgical act or any other therapeutic treatment which would have as an accessory consequence, in no way desired or intended but inevitable, the death of the foetus such an act could no longer be called a direct attempt on an innocent life."

On the question of birth control, he does not explain the contradiction in his ruling (see FREEDOM, 10/11/51), but says that: "In our last allocution on conjugal morality, we affirmed the legitimacy and at the same time the limits—in truth very wide—of a regulation of offspring which, unlike so-called birth control, is compatible with the law of God. One

may even hope (but in this matter the Church naturally leaves the judgment to medical science) that science will succeed in providing this licit method with a sufficiently secure basis, and the most recent information seems to confirm such a hope."

Now the "licit method" refers to the observation of the "safe periods". Therefore assuming the "safe periods" are safe, then to regulate her offspring a woman must limit her sexual relations to these periods or abstain altogether. But the Pope in his first allocution was condemning "the cult of pleasure" in sexual relations, and particularly in the case of those people "who allow the conjugal act to take place exclusively in those days [safe period], then the conduct of the spouses must be more carefully examined." On the other hand, he did not condemn those who had intercourse during both the "safe" and "unsafe" periods which, of course, makes complete nonsense of his latest remarks.

Perhaps now that the Pope has accepted the idea that the world is not 6,000 years old as Catholic and Protestant theologians had led the faithful to believe through their studies of the Old Testament, and has made such learned

disquisitions on scientific matters, he may have decided that this is the right moment to be a little more up-to-date on the question of birth control—since so many of his followers ignore his rulings on the subject in any case. Has he in fact retreated to some extent from his first ruling? That reference, for instance, to leaving "the judgment to medical science" and the "hope . . . that science will succeed, etc. . . ." is so unlike past pronouncements.

How many well-fed cardinals there must be who on reading these phrases sadly shook their heads and cursed the day when the Pope got mixed up with those scientists! And yet they can put their minds at rest; the Pope has had a good training in politics, and what he gives with one hand he will take somewhere else with the other. By this we would suggest that to gain more support, more converts among the professionals and intellectuals, particularly in America, is it perhaps possible that the Pope is discarding some of the old dogmas which are of no use anyway, and which put off many would-be converts? After all, at one time it must have seemed that the end of the world would come if the Church admitted that the earth moved around the sun. Yet that crisis was overcome and the Church survived. So why not accept science and get away with it on the "mutable" and "immutable" stunt, especially if it serves to increase the Church's effective political power?

LIBERTARIAN.

Israel: after the Liberation

IN a report to *Labor Action* (New York, 12/11/51), Moshe Silber writes from Tel Aviv:

"As a result of sheer hunger and belief that a war is near, the spirit of some three years ago has disappeared utterly. It is indeed difficult to find anyone who looks forward to a change for the better. The interests of the people are the immediate ones: food for the next two or three meals, how to get a shirt on the black market, how to improve working conditions. In all their dreariness the situation is that of a land on the eve of disastrous inflation.

"In the 'transfer camps' for new immigrants—where tens of thousands wait, some of them having been there for more than two years—the coming of the first rains has unnerved even the Oriental Jews, who are the only ones who do not find the food and clothing situation desperate, since many of them had no better conditions in Yemen and Iraq and were

moreover in constant danger there. "The tents, often sheltering families of twelve or more, fall under the onslaught of the water; thick black mud, oozing everywhere; the corruption and indifference of the party-designated government employees, who are selected for the different camps in accordance with an unofficial quota for each party and paid by the government—all this has brought about a state of near-desperation in many camps.

"But bureaucratism reigns supreme: some 30 Iraqi immigrants' families, who settled four months ago near Tel Aviv on abandoned ground and built themselves wooden huts preparatory to working in the city, were expelled with brutal violence, including the indiscriminate use of clubs on men and women, because their dwellings were "not planned". The huts were destroyed. Since they had nowhere to go, they were distributed back to the various transfer camps."

Tito's 'Peace Congress'

(from a Balkan correspondent)

TITO may have freed himself from Stalin but he cannot shake off stalinism for the simple reason that his entire system of government is based on it. Therefore, even Tito's propaganda cannot do anything else but take over stalinist slogans and tricks. Just as in the past two years the "struggle for peace" became one of the stalinist specialities so the Titoists decided to proclaim themselves "peace champions" and aping the Cominform peace congresses at Paris, Stockholm and Warsaw organised one, too, at Zagreb in October.

For months Tito's press in Yugoslavia and pro-Tito newspapers abroad wrote about the preparations for the Zagreb meeting. At last, when it opened it was possible to see at once that very few personalities took part at this international gathering. Of the various famous French left-wing writers who were expected to contribute the largest contingent from Western Europe, not one turned up. Many of the writers who had been announced did not even bother to send telegrams of greeting to the congress while those who appeared were either obscure or represented nobody but themselves. Moreover the organ of the International Movement for the Freedom of Culture which contains the best-known Western authors (among whom are many former stalinists) and whose visit to Zagreb the Titoists expected, published in its October number an intelligent and unfavourable article on Tito's Yugoslavia by an American writer and former participant in the Spanish Civil War.

Another Titoist reverse occurred on the very eve of the Zagreb congress, when the two American trade union organisations announced that they would not send their representatives "for conscience would force their delegates to declare on their return from Yugoslavia that the Yugoslav trade unions are under the control of the State". The same thing had happened before—with Stalin during the Second World War—in that both Communist leaders were to be supported not by U.S.A. trade unions but by American bankers and generals. Tito claims he is a marxist-leninist; those who give him verbal support are mostly neutralists (Bourdieu in France, Bevan in England); and those who really maintain him in power are American capitalists. When these three groups

meet in one place as was the case of Zagreb, each says only what is convenient for its own interests.

Tito is interested only in his own skin and his henchmen as soon as they opened their mouths at Zagreb talked about the Cominform danger and sang hymns of self-praise. As they began, so they continued throughout the congress. Their only aim is to be left alone by the Cominform and to be supported by the capitalist West. Needless to say, if this basis is sufficient for Tito, who after all has no other alternative, it is far from attractive to intellectuals of the West.

The loudest group present seems to have been the one composed of the so-called neutralists and supporters of the idea of a third force in world politics. An Indian delegate for example advocated "a third force, but not a third bloc", while an Englishman asked for just the opposite "a neutral bloc". A former member of the French C.P. expressed the view that "we need a free communism whose model has been given to us by the country in which we meet. . . ."

The American delegates, all obscure names, did not describe Titoland as a model State, ignored neutralism and refrained from attacking the American army and policy. One of them said: "One must commend the United Nations, the South Korean army and the troops of the 16 nations who are fighting to-day in Korea for the defense of collective security."

Tito has had enough time and sufficient opportunities to discover that the spread of Titoism has no chance of success as witnessed by the complete failure of the attempts to form "national communist" parties in Germany, France and Italy. He therefore switched to organising intellectuals in the "struggle for peace". This was the purpose of the Zagreb congress, but it failed, for Tito is unable to give a new message to the Western world. A moral condemnation of stalinism sounds hollow when coming from the mouth of one of its imitators and branches, just as he cannot impress anybody when he speaks about the guarantees of freedom in Yugoslavia, to whom the destruction of that very freedom is both his own occupation and also the only condition for his remaining in power.

B.L.

FREEDOM PRESS

- TONY GIBSON : *Youth for Freedom* paper 2s.
 - PHILIP SANSON : *Syndicalism—The Workers' Next Step* 1s.
 - ERRICO MALATESTA : *Anarchy. Vote—What For?* 6d. 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.
 - ALEX COMFORT : *Delinquency* 6d. *Barbarism & Sexual Freedom.* paper 2s. 6d., stiff boards 3s. 6d.
 - 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 : *Sexual Freedom for the Young* 6d. *Ill-Health, Poverty and the State.* cloth 2s. 6d., paper 1s.
 - M. L. BERNERI : *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.
- ★
- Mae Louise Berneri Memorial Committee publications : *Mae 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.

HOUSING & THE TORIES: A Cynical Crusade

"Though more than one-third of all houses in England and Wales were built since 1918, more than three-quarters of all houses of low value in 1938 had been erected before 1914, and they provided homes of perhaps eight in every ten working-class families."

—THE TIMES, 3/2/1945.

"In such a society the housing shortage is no accident; it is a necessary institution and it can be abolished together with all its effects on health, etc., only if the whole social order from which it springs is fundamentally refashioned."

—FREDERICK ENGELS.

WE have commented before upon the curious superstition that politicians can build houses. "Since the war we have built . . ." say the Labour Party leaders. "Between the wars we built . . ." say the Tories, who pledged themselves to build 300,000 houses a year in their pre-election propaganda (even though, like their opponents, they were also committed to the export drive and armaments programme which will prevent sufficient labour and materials being available to fulfill their promise). The people who were credulous enough to vote for the Tories on the strength of the 300,000, got their first shock when Mr. Harold Macmillan, Minister of Housing and Local Government announced on Nov. 14th that it would not be possible to reach the target "until after 1953".

The new policy announced on Nov. 27th, which has been given such a rapturous welcome in the press, will not add a single house to the present rate of 190,000 a year. (This rate not only means that the number of houses required is increasing more rapidly than it is being satisfied—it actually means, according to a statement by the Sanitary Inspectors' Association, that "houses are going out of commission faster than new houses are being built.")

Mr. Macmillan's statement was:—"Local authorities are being given discretion to issue licences for the building of houses by private enterprise up to a maximum of one-half, instead of one-fifth, of their 1952 allocation. These houses will be for sale or letting to families on their waiting-lists or to other applicants in equally urgent need of a home. The houses to be built under licence will be controlled as to maximum size and sale or resale price and rent.

The sale of municipal houses is being permitted, subject to suitable safeguards. "For their own 1952 programmes, local authorities are being encouraged to follow specimen designs prepared in the Ministry of houses to existing Dudley standards of room sizes and living space but of smaller superficial areas."

The implications of this are perfectly clear. It will merely lessen the chances of those whose need is most desperate. If the local councils follow the government's recommendations there will be fewer houses for the homeless poor and more for the homeless who can afford to buy a house or whose jobs and income are sufficiently secure for them to borrow the purchase money from a "Building Society". If it is argued that the middle-class homeless are in just as serious a plight as the homeless members of the "lower-income groups", we need only ask who are the people living in sheds and shacks, slums, squatters' camps and emergency hostels, and condemned dwellings. If it is argued that in this welfare state nobody is really poor, we can only pity the person (who must evidently live in the South of England) who makes such a statement, and point out that it is not infrequent for people who are offered a council house after being for years on a waiting list to have to refuse it because they cannot afford the rent, even though it is subsidised,* just as a butcher or a grocer will tell you that there are people who simply cannot afford to buy all their hardly generous meat or butter rations, even though the prices are subsidised).

LOWERING STANDARDS

The cutting-down of house sizes was discussed in our article "Should Housing

Standards Be Cut?" (FREEDOM, 7/7/51). Since then, during the last months of the Labour Government, Mr. Dalton, who succeeded Mr. Bevan as the Minister responsible for housing authorised certain reductions from the 1949 standards while maintaining the minimum sizes recommended by the Dudley Committee. In the October issue of *World Review*, the Tories' housing "expert", Mr. Ernest Marples, M.P., suggested further reductions "which incorporate all the major Dudley Committee recommendations". Now his party is in office it evidently does not feel secure enough to openly ignore the Dudley standards, and the "space-saving" designs which the Ministry has issued to local authorities are merely a niggardly economy whose inconvenience to the tenant is out of any proportion to the alleged saving in costs. As an editorial in the *Manchester Guardian* says, "if you have to keep the perambulator in the sitting-room because the out-house which used to hold it has been abolished the sitting-room may be as effectively curtailed as if a fraction was knocked off its length . . . If the new 'People's Houses', as the Minister has christened them, turn out to be inconveniently cramped, someone will have to put up with them for the next forty or fifty years."

On the subject of housing standards we have little to add to our article of 7/7/51, but it is useful to draw attention to a study of post-war dwellings in 14 European countries prepared for the Housing Sub-committee of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe, published in October. It is very often assumed, by both politicians and architects that standards are highest in this country. But the *Manchester Guardian's* Local Government correspondent concludes his discussion of the report with these words:

"For England, and still more for other parts of the British Isles, one conclusion stands out clearly. Far from being extravagant in our space standards, we are, compared with the rest of Western and Northern Europe, distinctly frugal. With the exception of the storage space attached to the English

* See P.E.P. Report, "Economics of the Council House," (Planning: Vol. XVI, No. 308).

three-bedroom house, the accommodation we offer is in every important respect either below or barely equal to the average standard."

The Dudley Report standards work out at a three-bedroomed house area of about 920 sq. ft., which was increased in 1949 to 1,050 sq. ft.—described by Mr. Marples as "mischievous and extravagant", and was reduced this year by Mr. Dalton. A pre-war council-house size was about 800 sq. ft. The maximum size which the new government is allowing to private builders is 1,500 sq. ft., while its circular issued on Nov. 27th recommends an area of less than 900 sq. ft. for a three-bedroomed house for five people.

THE BANK RATE AND HOUSING SUBSIDIES

The change in the interest rate this month in the Public Works Loans Bill—which as Gordon Schaffer shows in Sunday's *Reynolds News* represents 3s. 6d. a week on the average council house, which will have to be borne either by the tenants or the ratepayers, and make nonsense of Mr. Macmillan's "liberation" of council house tenants by giving them opportunities to buy their houses. As Mr. Schaffer says: "Would you like to own your own house rather than pay rent all your life? Of course you would. But would you be willing to find an extra 30s. a week out of the housekeeping money in order to save the Government the cost of a housing subsidy and to pay higher interest rates to the people who profit from the money market?"

"That is the real issue behind the new policy. You do not need to be a financier to realise that if the subsidy averaging £22 a year is abolished and if you repay the cost of a house not in 60 years as in municipal loans, but in 20 years (after all, no-one is interested in buying a house which will not be paid for until the year 2011), it must mean a sharp increase in weekly payments."

When, at the National Housing and Planning Conference on Nov. 22nd, the Ministry's Under-Secretary fore-shadowed the announcement, the Town Clerk of Watford, said he wondered whether the sale of municipal houses was likely to be profitable for the tenants in view of the new rates of interest for local authorities. He maintained that the

Government had "made a fatal blunder" in changing the rate of interest. They were ruining the method of the poor man being able to purchase his own house and were killing the local authority scheme.

Lord Simon of Wythenshawe, who, with Prof. Cole, is this country's fore-housing, wrote during the war: "There can be no doubt whatever that the present authority on the finances of vention of any increase in the rate of interest, and if possible a progressive reduction, is the most important single service the government can render towards ensuring the success of the housing programme."

A POLITICAL STUNT

Mr. Macmillan's statement of his policy bears all the distinguishing marks of a political stunt. He talks of a "People's House". It is not surprising that this makes us think of the German People's Car of 1937, which never materialised until after the war, so far as German civilians were concerned, since the money had been spent on armaments. At his press conference on November 29th, he declared that, "Our object is to set in motion a housing crusade." The last government you remember promised to "treat housing as a military operation." The crusade, like the military operation, is to be a strategic withdrawal. Finally, he called on a miracle man to advise the government on house production. The man is Sir Percy Mills who is managing director of Messrs. W. & T. Avery Ltd. the scale-makers.

Certainly this policy, when weighed the balance, will be found wanting by any standards except those which condemn the penalisation of that part of the community whose need for homes is greatest.

* E. D. Simon: *Rebuilding Britain—A Twenty Year Plan* (1945).

C.W.

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

OPEN AIR MEETINGS

(Weather Permitting) at
HYDE PARK
Every Sunday at 3.30 p.m.
TOWER HILL
Every Friday at 12.45 p.m.
MANETTE STREET
(by Foyle's, Charing Cross Road)
Every Saturday at 4.30 p.m.

INDOOR MEETINGS

at the
PORCUPINE, Charing Cross Rd.
(next Leicester Sq. Underground Station)
Every Sunday at 7.30 p.m.
DEC. 9—John Hewetson on CHILDREN, THE FAMILY AND THE COMMUNITY
DEC. 16—BRAINS TRUST on OBJECTIONS TO ANARCHISM
DISCUSSION & SOCIAL MEETINGS
Every Wednesday at 7.30 at the BIRD IN HAND
Long Acre, W.C.
Everybody welcome

NORTH-EAST LONDON

DISCUSSION MEETINGS IN EAST HAM
at 7.30
DEC. 12—Bob Lindon on DIANETICS
Enquiries c/o Freedom Press

LIVERPOOL

DISCUSSION MEETINGS at 101 Upper Parliament Street, Liverpool, 8
Every Sunday at 8 p.m.
DEC. 9—General Discussion on ANARCHISM AND SYNDICALISM
DEC. 16—By P.R. REICH—
UNLIMITED INTERPRETATIONS
DEC. 23—XMAS SOCIAL

GLASGOW

INDOOR MEETINGS at Central Halls, Bath 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 Payne, and addressed to the publisher.

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

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS

THE PURPOSE OF MARRIAGE

MR. CASEY'S criticism of my article on marriage appears to be based on two misconceptions:

(1) He equates "love" with "sexual satisfaction"—an error which I was careful to avoid.

(2) He seems to think that I advocate an extension of the "wives-as-chattels" principle, whereas I repudiate it entirely.

With regard to the first point: "To love", as I would use the verb, means "to identify oneself with the interests of others". I do not believe that this process necessarily involves sexual demands of the loved party. This emotional bond naturally expresses itself by a sharing of interests, pleasures, fortunes, and activities, among the parties (two or more) concerned. If two individuals sharing this bond happen to be of opposite sexes, then one of the activities that they may share is sexual intercourse. To my mind, if two people choose permanently to restrict this particular activity to themselves, then they have relinquished just one means of expressing love to the rest of mankind. They have allowed the prevailing social code to trick them into denying part of their natural heritage. In making the sexual relation unique each has restricted his or her capacity to develop both emotionally and intellectually. It is not

for nothing that "to be intimate" has such an ambiguous connotation in our language.

To make my position perfectly clear: The only connection between "love" and "sexual intercourse" is that the latter provides one possible way of expressing the former; just as making sacrifices expresses far greater love.

As to the second point: My fundamental position is, that apart from the obvious anatomical differences, there is no basis for discrimination between the sexes in contemporary societies. More specifically, I do not believe that women are in any way innately inferior to men, or have different "natural rights". If Mr. Casey contests this axiom, then I suggest he reads Margaret Mead's *Sex and Temperament in Three Primitive Societies*.

Accordingly, then, I reject the premise that a man has any moral right to demand the services of a particular woman, or vice versa. In our "civilised" culture, of course, he has a legal right. No society can be free so long as it adheres to an authoritarian code in any sphere of human activity. For sexual relations to require the sanction of parents, Church, State, or any externally imposed authority, is to deny the dignity of the individual and the essentially personal nature of human relations. The ideal

of a free society includes the ideal of free love.

Mr. Casey may prefer an emotional to a rational approach to the question of human relations, but I hold it as an article of faith that ultimately love and reason converge on common ground and are mutually justified.

Hull, Dec. 1. BOB GREEN.

WHAT of the woman's point of view?

It is only a wife who could be "delegated to society as part of its chattels". If there were no legal marriage and we could also eliminate social and religious conventions, women would be free.

Statistics as to "faithfulness" in marriage are difficult to obtain, but the opinion of many doctors and of people who have done some research into the question would appear to indicate that at least 30%, and possibly up to 90% of men have intercourse with women other than their wives after marriage. I know doctors who consider that for men this is necessary to fulfil a definite physiological need, but that women are com-

ANARCHISM AND PACIFISM

IN the letter from W. Knapp, which appeared in the last issue of FREEDOM, he writes: "I think these theories in support of pacifism or its counter, violence, are merely the rationalisations of intellectuals isolated from the dynamic reality of human affairs," and previous to this statement remarks that this type of rationalising intellectuals "produce fantastic theories such as whether pacifism or violence are absolute values, whereas each plays its part when circumstances demand." (My italics.—S.E.P.)

Now, there is no denying that isolated from any real, concrete struggle against our oppressors as we are at the moment (apart from the struggle of individual comrades against military service), we anarchists tend to become "theory-rotted", and Knapp makes what is, to me, a valid point when he contends that both violence and non-violence play their part according to circumstances. Yet in spite of his own criticism of taking an absolutist stand on one or another of these attitudes, he nevertheless dogmatically and arbitrarily affirms in the last paragraph of his letter that: "Let us accept with courage that we must and can only eliminate our masters by violence, that there is no choice in the matter." Surely this is a contradiction of his own thesis as put forward in the previous part of his letter? The logic of events in a revolutionary situation may be such as to demand the use of violence in defence of whatever gains of a social-revolutionary character those in revolt may have made, but to make the unqualified statement that our masters "must and

pletely fulfilled when they have children. Yet I know women who feel frustrated both sexually and socially. In many cases they have been encouraged by their families to marry young and they have entered into marriage with little realisation of what it entails. Their lives have become a monotonous round of the nursery, the gas-stove and the kitchen sink. In early middle life they find themselves with their children no longer needing their care and their husbands with diminished interest in themselves or in their homes. In this position it is difficult for them to obtain a job to fulfil their creative need or a lover to fulfil their sexual need. The bonds of marriage close more tightly on a woman than on a man. A wife may indeed be a chattel or a prisoner in an authoritarian society.

A society which recognises the polygamous and polyandrous needs of men and women, and which also recognises the fact that a woman may wish to fulfil her sexual needs without necessarily being tied to one home and one job with one employer (her husband) all her life, will permit absolute sexual freedom. It need not close the door to those who have monogamous tendencies and wish to abide by them.

Reading, Dec. 1. D.I.D.

can only" be got rid of by violence and thus by implication declare that all struggles connected with the achievement of an anarchist society must be of a violent nature, is an unjustifiable assumption.

In the light of this, however, to contend as some pacifists do, that only non-violence is efficient to achieve worthwhile ends is another arbitrary statement. To take two examples:

(1) The Danes during the German occupation declared a general strike on one occasion against the abuses of the S.S. It was of a spontaneous and non-violent character. The S.S. were helpless and their abuses were thereby stopped.

(2) During a strike—before the first world war—in the U.S.A., the hired gunmen of the employers were threatened by an "unknown committee" formed by refugees from the 1905 Russian Revolution and active in the I.W.W., that, if they persisted in the killing of strikers, the life of one gunman for each of the strikers killed would be taken. Four strikers were killed. The "unknown committee" responded by killing three gunmen. That was enough. The killings stopped.

We see that in the case of the first example non-violent resistance succeeded in attaining the object desired; in the case of the second, violent resistance succeeded. Let us therefore be a little more thoughtful and, a little less bigotted when discussing these questions!

London, Nov. 23. S. E. PARKER.

VICTIMISATION OF FIREMEN

WE often hear about irresponsible workers, hot-heads and agitators, who deliberately stir up class-hatred and industrial unrest.

Little is said in the national press, however, when provocative action is taken by employers.

Victimisation, described by the union as "savage", has been made against 62 firemen of the Nottingham Fire Brigade, following the nation-wide and official boycott of last week, when firemen refused all routine and drill duties in support of their claim for pay equal to the police.

The punishments were meted out by the Nottingham Fire Brigade Committee at a meeting attended by the Chief Fire Officer and the Town Clerk, but in the absence of the men charged, who had refused an order to attend, sending two delegates to state their case if asked.

Two sub-officers are to be reduced to leading firemen, three leading firemen to the rank of firemen. Two firemen would have £13 and £10 deducted from their wages at £1 per week and 55 firemen would have £6 10s. deducted at 10s. a week.

In Worcester, a disciplinary committee has fined three leading firemen to pay stoppages of £1 each and 31 firemen to

15s. each, "for a clear and deliberate act of disobedience".

We reported last week how the high-handed actions of some Fire Brigade Chiefs, in suspending firemen, had resulted in under-manning at some fire stations, with consequent danger to the public—just what the firemen had tried to avoid. (Remember that their boycott was against routine and training duties only; they remained available for fire and emergency calls.)

Now it seems that, in order to save their faces, a few authorities must "show the men who's boss". This attitude, incidentally cuts across the advice of the Home Secretary, Sir David Maxwell Fyfe, who suggested that local authorities took no action to increase bitterness and tension, or to aggravate the dispute. But, of course, Sir David was well away from the scenes of action. Many Fire Chiefs had their orders flouted under their very noses, and are obviously still smarting from the blow to their dignity and authority.

The victimisation is particularly ill-timed, too, since following the boycott both sides have agreed to submit the dispute to arbitration. The union are pointing out that men's action was taken in the course of a normal trade dispute and that charges of disobedience or insubordination did not apply.