

Kropotkin - - p. 2  
 Michael Scott - - p. 3  
 Military Training  
 in U.S. - p. 4

# Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"The real law lives in our hearts. If our hearts are empty, no law or political reform can fill them."  
 --LEO TOLSTOY

Vol. 13, No. 2 January 12th, 1952 Threepence

## New Life to Land?

Development in the question of loss of soil and of soil fertility recently opened. This is the question of a synthetic plastic "concrete" for exhausted soil which has attracted the most enthusiastic attention of many soil experts, agricultural chemists and meteorologists in England.

Soil is exhausted by repeated cropping and loses its power to hold to water. Hence in dry weather the top soil is blown off as "dust" while in wet weather floods wash it from loss of productivity. Floods have become recurrent disasters in the Missouri and valleys.

The development is a derivative of krypton, which is the starting point of many plastics, and is called "krilium". According to Alistair Cooke, *Manchester Guardian*, "it is not a gas, it does not feed in new foods of nitrogen or nitrates. Its action is to decompose manure or peat and reconstitutes the physical structure of the soil to allow its natural drainage through oxygen, water and nutrients. But krilium works anywhere from one hundred to one thousand times as quickly and powerfully as the natural processes."

The science correspondent of the *Times* who attended a demonstration at the American Association for the Advancement of Science given at the University of Chicago by Dr. C. A. Hochwalt, said that krilium "will mark the

beginning of a revolutionary era in agriculture, in which man-made deserts may be turned into blooming gardens and green acres."

Krilium does not, like compost, add nutrients to the soil; but it does affect the physical structure in a manner which counteracts the processes which lead to erosion. It thus creates the necessary physical conditions whereby the soil can receive nutrients and become fertile. And, presumably, it also prevents the soil from being blown away and lost altogether as dust.

Dr. Hochwalt, who introduced it to the American Association, is the chief of research of the Monsanto Chemical Company. The company say that krilium will be available commercially in 1953. Despite the small quantities required—concentrations of no more than 0.1 per cent. by weight of soil—the cost is likely to be from £100 to £120 per acre (2 dollars per pound of the krilium powder). No doubt costs will later come down. The Monsanto Company is constructing a 50 million dollar factory for the production of acrylonitrile.

On the face of it, krilium offers hope of advance in the struggle against soil erosion. But its expense will make it difficult to apply except by government schemes of the type of the Tennessee Valley Authority. Small farmers and market gardeners employ methods of culture which enrich the soil and conserve it. Such people could afford krilium but they are the least likely to need it. Erosion affects the land of the

large farming syndicates who acquired it at low cost and just exhausted it by repeated cropping. Are they likely, or able, to expend £100 per acre on reconditioning when their whole economy was rapid immediate returns? Erosion also afflicts the land of poor peasants in India and Africa who would employ a soil conserving method but for economic stringency. This same factor will prevent them from deriving help from krilium.

Nevertheless, the new development shows that even the most appalling man-made depredations are susceptible of repair when scientific research is available to be applied to it. It may be that a powerful new weapon against soil erosion is now available. It remains to be seen whether our economic system will strangle its capabilities.

## Union Leaders Cling to Nationalisation

THE leaders of two unions have just expressed their concern that the State control of their industries shall not be tampered with.

The executive committee of the National Union of Blast Furnacemen, in a resolution sent to Duncan Sandys, Minister of Supply, referred to "uncertainty and confusion . . . during this critical period" and stated: "That we, holding the profound belief that it is impossible to assure the necessary development and expansion of the industry, secure adequate production of iron and steel to fulfil the rearmament programme and maintain full employment unless the industry is planned and operated in the public interest, express our great concern at the decision of the Government to proceed with a Bill to annul the Iron and Steel Nationalisation Act."

The union, of course, need not worry unduly, since, as we have already dis-

cussed in these columns, it is unlikely that the Tories will interfere radically with the system of public control of the steel industry. All they are concerned about is the direction in which the profits flow, and that the products of the steel industry shall be at the service of the State for its rearmament programme.

If the profits go to the shareholders, but control remains in the hands of a public corporation, the Tories will be well satisfied—and for all we can see from the above resolution, so will the unions.

It is ironic to notice that, apart from a passing reference to full employment hardly to be feared in an industry so essential to war! the main concern of the Blast Furnacemen's leaders seems to be the rearmament programme, not the welfare of the workers.

The other union leader springing to defend the State, is our old friend Sir William Lawther, president of the National Union of Mineworkers, who, in a New Year's message told his members that private ownership was dead and that its return would be a disaster too terrible to contemplate.

Without wishing to debate that at this point, we must draw the conclusion that Sir William does not believe that a continuance of State control would be disastrous.

We do believe that the nationalisation of the mines has undoubtedly brought the miners certain small material benefits in the matter of welfare, but in return they have had to put themselves in the hands of their employers far more completely than ever they did under free enterprise.

And the material benefits they have gained are going to be nullified by the effects of re-armament—the increased pressure of work, the falling value of money.

Neither the steel workers nor the miners are going to find security or satisfaction in their position in their industries until they are themselves in control. The choice is not between nationalisation or a return to private ownership—except for those who have an interest in those alternatives. Capitalists want free enterprise; it's in their interests. Trade union leaders want nationalisation—that's in their interests. But the workers have no interest in either of these two systems of exploitation.

Their interest lies in working towards a system of no-exploitation. The system of workers' control.

## More Pay for Civil Servants

THE Treasury have decided that all Civil Servants earning up to £1,500 a year (£30 a week) are to have pay increases.

These have been arranged on a percentage basis on a sliding scale, decreasing as the salary increases: thus on the first £500 of salary, the increase is 10%, on any part of salary between £500 and £1,000, 5%; and between £1,000 and £1,500, 2%. The increases, which will benefit 600,000, will cost about £30 millions a year.

In all the various appeals we have had for restraint in pay demands, the official line has been that increases in reward must be earned by increases in production. But what do civil servants produce? Must they, in order to balance their bigger pay packet, produce more government forms? Must every document from now on be filled in in quintuplicate instead of merely in triplicate? Shall we all be bombarded with com-

munications from the various Ministries, churned out by conscientious clerks and typists at the instruction of executives and administrators, hastened on their way by those Post Office departments who stand to gain their 10 per cent.?

We hope not. But even if we are, since this is the first time that Civil Service pay has been officially tied up with the cost of living index, as that index rises and the pay increase is shown to be of temporary relief only, no doubt the Whitehall production drive will prove temporary, too. The paper flood will abate and the suffering Civil Servants will drown their grievances in still more frequent cups of tea.

But the productive workers will have to continue to carry them on their backs. The £30 millions will have to be paid for by people like the railwaymen, for example, who were recently granted a wage increase of only 8 per cent. on incomes averaging much less than £500 a year.

## Captain Carlsen and the Unknown Bulgarian

Nearly a week a ship's captain has "hit the headlines". In their sense of what the public is the newspaper editors have wanted all else to the inside pages. The odyssey of Captain Carlsen is a kind of story which is lapped in our escapist society. How many people reading the accounts of his seven day wait for the trawler to take his ship in tow, and the time he and the trawler's mate and crew have been promised when David and Goliath enter Falmouth, will not re-lived the experience with themselves in the place of the captain, just as at the cinema they identify themselves with the Hollywood hero. What an escape from the humdrum of everyday existence! That it was quite unnecessary for Captain Carlsen to remain on his ship is beside the point, any more than there is any rhyme or reason for undergraduates at Oxford to climb the highest spire to affix a chamber pot to the lightning conductor. In America every week someone thinks up a new endurance feat—from sitting on the top of a pole for a fortnight to dancing marathons in which the winner is the last to collapse in a heap on the dance floor. In Russia where they take their endurance feats more seriously, it takes the form of laying thousands of bricks or hewing hundreds of tons of coal in a day, and of being named a Stakhanovite or Hero of the Revolution or some such pompous title.

Of course, we have all followed the salvage efforts with excitement. It represented a struggle against the elements, and the whole of mankind's history has been such a struggle, but there is surely a sense of proportion in all things. In the present case, the *Flying Enterprise* is an American ship and its rescuer, the *Turmoil*, a British trawler. To what extent does national pride play its parts in the excessive publicity? The fact, for instance, that recently somewhere off the coast of Spain, a ship was cut in two during a storm, with nine members of the crew stranded on the stern half and the

others adrift in boats, is surely drama of the highest order, especially in view of the eventual rescuing of the men and the towing to a Spanish port of the part of the ship containing the engine room and cargo. But nothing has been made of this in the Press.

AND what of that unfortunate Bulgarian, of whom we are only told that he is about 30 years old, who had travelled from Paris to London on the night ferry train by clinging all night to the rods underneath a sleeping compartment. The three-inch press report headed: "Paris to London Under Sleeping Car," tells us that the man was observed by the police as he dropped to the rails at Victoria Station, ran across the track, and walked off the platform. He was covered in grime.

The man was wearing two pairs of trousers and a thick woollen jacket. He pleaded that he was cold and hungry and near to exhaustion and immigration officers, before questioning him, gave him a hot meal.

Who was this nameless Bulgarian? He was a refugee from behind the Iron Curtain, hoping that the "democracies" would give him work and shelter. To have travelled the way he did he must have been a desperate and courageous man.

Surely if we recognise the courage in Captain Carlsen's quixotic gesture, we cannot withhold such recognition from this unnamed Bulgarian?

Yet how differently we treat these courageous men! When Captain Carlsen and first mate Dancy arrive in triumph at Falmouth, they know that a London hotel has offered them a "river suite" on the house. That obviously means the Savoy Hotel.

For the unnamed Bulgarian, an escort was provided to take him back to France!

## Electric Power from Atomic Energy

THE U.S. Atomic Energy Commission has announced from Chicago that American scientists have harnessed atomic power to generate electricity.

After concentrating for years upon the destructive potential of atomic fission, time has been taken off to see if its obviously tremendous constructive possibilities are realisable.

In a two-day experiment, enough power was produced to run some of the Atomic Station's own plant, as well as all the electrical equipment of three averaged-sized homes.

This tiny experiment was only de-

signed to gain technical information necessary for further research into the problem of generating electricity at a "competitive" cost.

We wonder if the term "competitive" takes into account the cost in miners' lives of the existing method of generation—from coal?

However, the fact that a start has been made, holds out hope for the future. But, of course, it needs much more than the technical knowledge, before society will benefit from atom-produced electricity. It needs the social attitude that constructive activity is better than des-

tructive, and it needs years of peace. Neither of these are compatible with the present power-political forces which are dividing the world, and which will still concentrate on atom-bombs rather than on producing electricity to light our homes.

## EGYPT AND MALAYA POTS AND KETTLES

EXAMPLES are never lacking as to the double-think which goes on among our politicians and in the Press. And by exposing this double-think we are not condoning the actions of one side or the other, but simply showing that before protesting about the barbarous behaviour of others we should first see whether our own conduct is such as to allow us to make such moral strictures on the actions of others.

What the *News Chronicle* calls "Cairo's extreme Left newspaper", *Al Gomhour al Misry*, last week printed a headline the translation of which reads: "£1,000 for him who kills Erskine. And £100 for everyone who kills a British officer."

British protests have been lodged against the incitement to murder by the paper which stated in justification that it appreciates the motive which led Egypt's 'heroic Commandos' to fight the red-faced thieves with the help of others. It had decided to participate financially in the liberation battle by offering rewards.

Now let us look at the other side of the medal. Last September, Ching Peng, a Hokkien Chinese, was named officially for the first time as Secretary-General of the Malayan Communist Party . . .

"The authorities [that is the British authorities—Ed.] have offered a reward of 80,000 Straits dollars (£9,400) to anyone who captures alive the Communist Party's secretary-general, and a reward of \$60,000 (£7,050) for anyone who delivers his dead body to the

authorities. In offering these rewards the authorities have never mentioned the secretary-general by name. As far as is known no member of the Malayan Communist hierarchy has ever been killed or captured.

"Ching Peng was described by Colonel Spencer Chapman in his book, *The Jungle is Neutral*, as a 'young and attractive Hokkien, who was later to become Britain's most trusted guerrilla representative'."

*Manchester Guardian*, 6/9/51.

## Freedom of the Press

IN a debate on the freedom of the Press, arranged by the Council for Education in World Citizenship, Mr. Frank Owen, former editor of the *Evening Standard* and of the *Daily Mail*, declared that the freedom of the press was "slender".

He recalled the closing down of the *Daily Worker* by Herbert Morrison under Defence Regulation 18n (wouldn't it be more correct to say under 20d) When Morrison called a meeting of editors and announced his intention, Frank Owen opposed it. At the time, *FREEDOM's* predecessor *War Commentary* was one of the very few papers to protest, and

almost the only paper to protest earlier at the powers conferred on the Home Secretary by the Defence Regulations.

Frank Owen declared that "it is a very serious thought that it could be done again to-morrow morning". He also pointed out that the restriction on newsprint caused a real censorship of opinion, but added that "there is always an unofficial censorship, as I know as an editor, when someone comes round to your office from the boss, or perhaps even from the boss's wife, and says, 'Do you think that that is in good taste?' and you will get it in the neck for putting it in the paper."



# KROPOTKIN by Malatesta

In this article, written at the very end of his life, Malatesta discusses the effect of Kropotkin's great eminence on the development of Anarchist thought. He knew and worked with Kropotkin for nearly half a century and his opposition is therefore of great interest from every point of view. Of particular interest, however, is Malatesta's ability to stand back and survey the effect of Kropotkin's influence, and his readiness to see that it was not always wholly beneficial. His article is fascinating not only for itself but for its method and for the revelation of the independence of anarchist thought at its best.

PETER KROPOTKIN is, beyond doubt, one of those who have contributed the most (perhaps even more than Bakunin and Elisee Reclus) to the elaboration and propagation of the anarchist idea. He is for that reason worthy of the gratitude which anarchists have for him. Still, in acknowledgement to the truth and in the supreme interest of the cause, it must be said that his work has not been totally and exclusively beneficial. It has not been his fault; on the contrary, it has been the very height of his merits which caused the ills I propose to point out.

Naturally, Kropotkin could not (no man could) avoid all errors and take in the whole truth. Consequently we should have profited by his valuable contribution and continued research to achieve further progress. But Kropotkin's literary talents, the value and extent of his production, the prestige given him by his renown as a learned man, the fact that he had sacrificed a position of high privilege to defend, at the price of dangers and suffering, the popular cause, and with that, his personal charm, which captivates all those who had the good fortune to approach him, all this gave him such notoriety and such an influence that to a great extent he appeared—and really was—the acknowledged master of the great majority of anarchists.

And as a result criticism was discouraged and development of the anarchist idea was halted. For many years, in spite of the iconoclastic and progressive spirit of anarchists, most of them, in regard to theory and propaganda, only studied and repeated Kropotkin. To speak contrary to his views was, for many comrades, nearly a heresy.

Therefore, it will be well to submit Kropotkin's teachings to a severe critique, without reserves in order to distinguish between what is always true and living from what later thought and experience may have demonstrated to be wrong. This, after all, would not con-

cern Kropotkin alone, since the mistakes we can blame him for were made by anarchists before Kropotkin had acquired an eminent position in the movement. Kropotkin confirmed these mistakes and made them last in giving them the support of his talent and prestige, but we, old militants, have all of us—or nearly all—our share of responsibility.

In writing to-day about Kropotkin, I do not intend to thoroughly analyse all his doctrines. I only want to record a few impressions and remembrances which will serve, I think, to throw a light on Kropotkin's moral and intellectual character and help to bring about a better understanding of his merits and faults.

However, first of all, I shall say a few words from the depths of my heart, for I cannot think about Kropotkin without being stirred by the remembrance of his goodness. I remember what he did in Geneva during the winter of 1879 to help a group of Italian refugees in real distress—of whom I was one; I remember the attention, which I would call maternal, which he gave me in London one night when I had been the victim of an accident and had knocked at his door; I remember his thousand acts of kindness towards everybody; I remember the atmosphere of cordiality which surrounded him. For he was really good, that nearly unconscious goodness which feels the need to help all who are in suffering and to spread around oneself smiles and joy. Indeed, one could say that he was good without knowing it; anyway, he did not like it to be said of him and he even felt hurt when in an article on the occasion of his 70th birthday I had said that goodness was the first of his qualities. He preferred to show his energy and pride, perhaps, because these last qualities had developed in the struggle and for the struggle, while his kindness was the spontaneous expression of his intimate nature.

I had the honour and good fortune to be linked to Kropotkin for many years by the most fraternal friendship. We loved one another because we were filled with the same passion and hope... and also by the same illusions.

Both of us having optimistic temperaments (though I think that Kropotkin's optimism was much deeper than mine and had a different source) we saw things, alas! in a much too rosy light. We hoped, already more than fifty years ago, that a revolution in the near future would realise our ideal. During this long period there were many spells of doubt and discouragement. I remember, for instance, Kropotkin once saying to me: "My dear Errico, I fear that only you and I believe in a near revolution." But they were only passing spells; soon confidence returned to us, we explained to each other present difficulties and the comrades' scepticism, and we continued to work and to hope.

Nevertheless, one must not think that we were of the same opinion on all matters. On the contrary, on many fundamental ideas we were far from agreement, and seldom did we meet without some sharp discussions on our different views bursting out between us. Still, as Kropotkin always felt sure of being right, and could not calmly tolerate being contradicted, and I, on the other hand, having great respect for his knowledge and much care for his failing health, tried in the end by changing the argument to ensure that we should not needlessly excite each other to excess.

However, this did not hurt the intimacy of our relations because we were collaborating more for sentimental reasons than for intellectual ones. Whatever the differences between our ways of explaining facts and in the arguments that we used to justify our conduct, in practice, we wanted the same things and were motivated by the same desire for freedom, justice, and well-being for all. We could thus go on together in harmony.

And, indeed, there was never any serious misunderstanding between us until the day when, in 1914, a question of practical conduct and of capital importance for both of us presented itself: that of the attitude anarchists had to take in regard to the Great War. On this wretched occasion his old and exasperating preference for all that is Russian and French stirred within him and he declared himself passionately in favour of the Allies. He seemed to have forgotten that he was an internationalist, a socialist and an anarchist. He forgot what he himself had said a short time before—about the war for which the capitalists were making preparations, and began admiring the worst Allied states-

# Travellers' Tales about Russia

(from our Bombay correspondent)

The Indian publicists and even scientists who visited Russia at the invitation of the Soviet Government, have brought wonderful tales of what they had seen there.

We wish that what they said were true, for in that case there would be some prosperity at least in one vast country. But the question is whether even a part of what our visitors tell can be true. It is unnecessary to go so far as Russia to judge if what they and the Soviet Government publicise is true. It is enough if we know the economic set-up and economic technique under which these miracles are claimed as true to the letter. For what cannot be done by economies cannot be done at all. It is not simply a question of production but how the products are distributed that is important.

Our visitors seem to claim that the Soviet Government spend more money than they make out of production. That is not possible either for private capitalist Governments nor for the Soviet Government which is the sole owner and capitalist in Russia. It is finally the so-called Communist Party of Russia which commonly owns all things through the monopoly of the State. If it is claimed that State monopoly can manage to pay out more than it receives, then alone the stories brought by our Indian visitors can be true. But even the State must make more than it pays even under the ownership of all things by the "Communist" Party. For the State even in Russia is not a charity institution which can produce more money than it receives. Even if it is called Communist.

In Russia, the State is the sole monopolist employer. It pays all whom it employs, sells all things to those employed and maintains itself with the difference, which the Marxians call "surplus value", and which is an euphemism for profit. Otherwise the State cannot pay its expenses; it will have no offices to run. It is true that like any private capitalist the Communist Party, through the State, advances money

for production but like any private capitalist it must sell the products, which can only be consumer goods, to its employees, and recover what is advanced through sales, in addition to what it must have to run the Government.

## No Difference

Thus all these expenses have to be added to the actual cost of production as under any private capitalist State. That means that those in actual production must bear all these expenses when they go and buy what they made to produce, which means that living costs must be much higher than their income. If they and our travellers say that all arithmetic is set at naught by the magic words Communism, State-ownership, then argument is possible. Their argument seems to be that there is plenty of products in Russia. But production alone is not enough to distribute the products; the economic system obtaining in it, even if that is true also of the capitalist system. If anything, the capitalist system takes chances, the rigid Soviet economy cannot do so. Russian Communist system is based on selling for profits. In a sense, whether conducted by the State or the private capitalists, it is a production that counts but the investment and profits. In the course, the profits go only to the State and finally into Communist hands, for unless profits are made, whether private or State-owned, cannot be maintained. Has this been in Russia, because the Bolsheviks own the State?

In the Russia of the Bolsheviks are also two classes of workers, those who work in production, the productive workers, and those who produce things which are not for the people. The cost of maintenance of the latter class of workers is distributed through the products of production. For example, the cost of maintenance of offices, the defence armaments manufacture and police or security services. These services also pay the consumers' goods like all products. But that does not make the living for producing or producing workers less, so employees must be parting with a proportion to maintain the producing activity of the State. Increased production does not change thing, because in Russia, too, goods represent so much money which must be recovered from the total cost price, which means the prices of the goods must be far more than what the workers received.

The Russian State's apparatus is enormous and it can only be met by productive workers, out of their earnings. To deny that, is to deny the fact. It is unnecessary to know statistics, although we have some meagre statistics available. For figures and percentages may be, and usually are, cooked up in Russia. It was Stalin who once said the dictum that statistics can only be Marxian, not objective. In Russia statistics are State secrets. But it is enough if we know the relation between

Continued on page

## FILM REVIEW

### MOB VIOLENCE

**THE SOUND OF FURY**—General Release.

JUST going the rounds on a minor cinema circuit is one of those American films which manage to escape the twin damnations of mediocrity or ballyhoo. Like *Strange Incident* (and very similar in theme) *The Sounds of Fury* ends with a lynching. It is the story of a weak character, whom we discover unemployed, persuaded into crime by a slick hoodlum. From petty stick-ups of grocery

stores they progress to kidnapping and murder, and in the small town in which the action takes place, the local newspaper, with screaming headlines, stirs up the population to an hysteria of fear.

The editor of the paper frankly admits that his circulation needs the boost the sensation can give it. The reporter shows his "responsible" attitude to society by demanding a clean-up, strong action against the hoodlums and so on—in fact, behaving very irresponsibly.

When the two kidnappers are caught—following the crack-up of the unwilling partner—fury is let loose in the town. The social basis for their action—and the responsibility society should take for it—is sympathetically expressed, but by now it is too late for reason to prevail. (And, indeed anarchists may smile at what "reason" here implies—"fair" trial with just retribution at the end!) But the people of the town decide to take the law into their own hands. The mob scenes are terrifying and convincing, and the whole film is a salutary lesson on the powers that lie in the hands of the press to sway public opinion to the point of madness.

One is left wondering how much lynch law is peculiar to America. The mass hysteria whipped up by the Nazis and other totalitarians always seemed to be artificially stimulated and temporary. The fury of the mob never seems far below the surface of American life. Is it because America is a young country, not many generations away from the time when the six-shooter was the only arbiter? Or is it a reflection of the tensions of a neurotic society, speed-mad, sensational and empty?

This is not a great film, but it is at least a good one. It does at least make us think.

P.

## BOOK REVIEW

# Yet another Book on Oscar Wilde

**OSCAR WILDE: A Present Time Appraisal.** By St. John Ervine. (George Allen & Unwin. 18s. net.)

IN this otherwise unhelpful book, St. John Ervine, in a laboured attempt to debunk Oscar Wilde, succeeds only in debunking himself. In his insensitive criticism of Wilde's poetry, the niggling evaluation of the prose, and the meticulous picking of pieces of the plays, the small portions of praise given grudgingly with the left hand are immediately snatched away with the heavy right, and, so to speak, chucked into the garbage bin. This kind of put-and-take criticism, cluttered up and clogged with Ervine sermons on sodomy, sex, bastardy, etc., and his high-horsecorn moralisings like those of Anthony Comstock, does not contribute anything new or much that can be taken seriously in regard to Wilde's work. But it does tell us very clearly how far hate can blind a critic and, incidentally, underlines the living power in Wilde's work to serve as an antiseptic to Comstockery and as a stiff tonic for arrested development. So that, apart from providing between the covers of one book, a conspectus of costive sex-obsessions, and a skilfully compiled combination of anti-Wilde dicta and obiter dicta, Ervine's ill-tempered and ill-mannered "Appraisal" may be a useful document for study by the analysts of morbid psychology. That is, if they can ever sort it out.

There is great malice in the book. Ervine says of Wilde: "He was deliberately sodomistic. He not only practised the vice, but he believed that it should be practised. He denied that it was a vice. These are facts to which his

friends testify." It is true that Wilde talked a lot of poppycock about pederasty, but, curiously enough—not that it matters much, except for the use made of it by those who need a weapon to help their calumnies—nobody has yet been able to produce one iota of convincing proof that he practised it. The evidence, and it is all hearsay, comes from the most doubtful sources. The really appalling feature of this book—and it is the one part on which Ervine's integrity as a writer can reasonably be challenged, for his general sincerity need not be questioned—is that, from it, the average reader must think that, in the famous prosecution, Wilde was tried for sodomy and found guilty. This is so widely accepted that even the publishers of the *Wilde Trials* said in their 'blurb': "Literary geniuses have appeared in the dock on more than one occasion, but seldom on so serious a charge as sodomy!" The simple truth, known to Mr. Ervine and to everybody who has read *The Trials* (published by Hodge & Company, 1948), is that Wilde was never even charged with sodomy! He was charged with the legal misdemeanour of "indecent exposure in private". Of this "crime", proof of which was provided by the lowest and least desirable types of witnesses—persons who to-day would be thrown out of court—the unfortunate man was found guilty and given the maximum sentence, a most savage one, of two years. To the pure all things may or may not be pure—but to the impure all things are certainly impure. And so we get a reiterated repetition of this colossal calumny, based on a complete distortion of a "Trial" which itself was little more than a frame-up. Lawyers, including the Editor of *The Trials* and their Introducer, The Rt. Hon. Travers Humphreys, do not hesitate to

say that Wilde was "guilty". But they are not so foolish or such liars as to go further than say that he was guilty of the actual offence with which he was charged. That, at least, can be said for the lawyers. Not so of the anti-Wildes. Instead of clarifying the position, and thus indicating the objective approach, Ervine—to take the latest—once more gives us the old distortions. The smear is heavily reapplied in new fresh paint of Ervine invention. The smear, as a technique of amoral journalism, is making progress these days, helped by the brush of moral indignation.

In the case of Wilde, the fact that his name was associated with homosexuality has been consistently used to smear his reputation and works, but one had hoped that writers of our own time had grown out of this sort of thing. His works, in spite of the calumnies, have their place in literature. Incidentally, Wilde's works are the liveliest of all anti-Blimp literature, the horror of the politically and morally static and of the reactionary. That is one good reason why we may always expect the Blimp camp to find its champions against them. But, as the works hold their own, and are more popular than ever, it is far easier to attack the dead man, to apply personal abuse, to re-hash all the dirty tittle-tattle one can rake up. This—incidentally (sic)—caters for the market of garbage-eaters, which is considerable. And it helps to explain why these infatigable books appear from time to time. It is with relief that one turns from the muck-raking to the sympathetic appraisal such as Hesketh Pearson; or to the sanity and reasoned objectivity of George Woodcock's *Paradox of Oscar Wilde*.

CHARLES DUFF

## FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

- Talks to Parents & Teachers 6/-  
Homer Lane  
A reprint of a modern educational class.
- Workers' Councils 5/-  
Anton Pannekoek  
"The author, who for many years attentively observed, and sometimes actively took part in the Dutch workers' movement, gives here a summary of what from these experiences and study may be derived as to methods and aims of the workers' fight for freedom."
- Child of Light 12/6  
Biography of Mary Shelley, the daughter of William Godwin and Mary Wollstonecraft.
- Rece & Biology 1/6  
L. C. Dunn  
The latest pamphlet in the Unesco series *The Race Question in Modern Science*.
- Wagon-Wheels 12/6  
Jim Phelan  
"The vigorous oral tradition of an unlettered people, with its ritual past of narrative, is admirably commemorated, so too are the sturdy adaptability of the gypsies to the claims of the gorgio community and their power of remaining apart from the nation-State round which their wagons pass."—*Times Literary Supplement*.
- Journal of Sex Education 2/6  
Vol. 4, No. 2, Dec. Jan.  
A popular-scientific journal for the sexual enlightenment of adults.

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



## MICHAEL SCOTT

IN this totalitarian age it is a salutary corrective to see how one man can sometimes stand up to all the power of government and the politics of expediency. Ever since the ending of the war, the rights of the colonial Africans—and their wrongs—have been set out in high relief by the pertinacity and courage of one man, the Rev. Michael Scott.

During the last few months, Scott has been appearing before the United Nations as representative of the African race, the Hereros. Without him, their voice would not have been heard, and the ambitions of the Nationalist South African Government, Dr. Malan, would have been virtually unopposed. For he has shown the British Government that they treat their subjects with Malan as so much property, and their absolute expediency in the Tcheledi case showed.

In this case, too, Michael Scott acted as a friend and counsellor to the Tcheledi Khama. FREEDOM, years ago, drew attention to his participation in some of the non-violent demonstrations of the Africans against racial discrimination and other humiliations.

Michael Scott is clearly no anarchist, nor has he any well-defined ideological convictions. Although he stands for, he is nevertheless still a minister of religion. His revolutionary history may make him uncomfortable about clergymen as such. Even Gandhi, though not in the strictest sense, showed that religious views can sometimes soften the edge of a struggle at times when it should be keenest. Michael Scott, however, hardly ever brings religious parallels into his arguments. He has always stood for simple issues of right, announcing the wrongs of colonial rule with its weapon of white racial superiority, on grounds which appeal to everyone who has any feeling for moral issues.

By keeping the struggle on this level he has forced his reactionary opponents in South Africa, and their expedient associates in Whitehall, to stand nakedly on the ground of mere political manoeuvres where they have not openly avowed racial beliefs worthy of Hitler.

Now Dr. Malan has intimated to Michael Scott, by letter, that he will not be allowed to return to the Union of South Africa. This is an altogether extraordinary step. Its legality is open to question, and it is clearly counter to all the Human Rights clauses of the United Nations. Even in this, Scott has managed to crystallise the moral issues, and has shown up State morality in the hardest and most unfavourable light. FREEDOM protested vigorously when the U.S. Government refused a passport, among others, to Paul Robeson, making it impossible for him to leave America. Even more arbitrary is this decision of the South African Government not to permit Michael Scott to return. Could one have a clearer example of the black-mailing methods of government. "You are a free agent, but if you do things we don't like, we'll see to it that you are made to suffer for it." Always the State wants to set up an opposition between the individual's feeling for what is morally right and his material interests. Such a threat is hardly likely to succeed with Michael Scott. And the depriving of the African majority of their friend, adviser and mouth-piece is hardly likely to promote

## LETTER FROM GERMANY

(Continued from our last issue)

OUT of the little principality of Moscow, with an area of a few thousand square miles, there developed in five centuries the gigantic Russian empire. Continuous conquests of the adjacent countries, combined with a steady growing power of the arbitrary rulers, and an ever-worse enslavement of the people were the characteristics of this period.

The ruler, Ivan the Terrible, in the 16th century was in many respects a forerunner of Lenin, Stalin and the Bolsheviks. He made serfs out of the previously relatively free peasants, introduced a secret state police with unquestionable power over life and death, had his former companions killed by sham jurisdiction, behaved in the conquered countries like a real savage, etc., etc. It is perhaps worth mentioning that there already existed in former times in Russia, a certain state-capitalism; the rulers also directed the economic life of the country. So the Bolsheviks had only to copy the methods of their predecessors, to study other systems or ideologies was for them superfluous.

Killings and fighting between the factions who wanted to rule the country were also the order of the day. As a French philosopher put it: "The despotism in Russia is mitigated by assassinations." The rulers of Moscow were often foreigners and not Russians at all, they took as their standard the methods of the neighbouring Mongolian princes and the rulers of Byzantium, and later the arbitrary German princes. But all these despotic rulers never managed to spoil the extraordinarily good and human character of the Russian people, and the older generation have it yet, but the younger generation, raised under Bolshevik rule is, alas, partly influenced by their moral standards.

In the course of the 19th century, there began a slight relaxation of the arbitrary rule, the peasants were released from their serfdom, and with the beginning of the 20th century the people obtained franchise. But the conquest of other countries continued unabated. Russia has inside its borders to-day several dozen nationalities; about 40% of the Russian population are real Russians. Even the White Russians and Ukrainians who are near-related to them in language, consider themselves as peoples apart; they, too, were conquered in former times. In order to keep all these conquered peoples in submission the rulers of Moscow employed military

and police organisations whose names changed but whose purpose remained the same: Opritshniki, Strelitzen, Ochrana, Cossacks, and to-day it is the N.K.V.D. with its 14 divisions of heavily-armed soldiers.

Stalin's wars against Finland, Poland and the Baltic states, and the occupation of the satellite countries, prove that he is a first-rate imperialist and militarist. To expect that he has changed his mind and is now peaceful would be fallacious. With his powerful armies he could over-run Central Europe at any time in a few weeks, but no such event has happened till now, despite the fact that he knows that the forces of his adversaries grow more formidable every day. In possession of Central Europe, Stalin could defy America. He would have thousands more modern, highly-industrialised workshops for production, and millions of first-rate trained workers to keep production running, and would also have harbours on the Atlantic seaboard, which have been coveted by imperialist Russia for several centuries.

We do not know the plans of the Kremlin, nor what happens behind the Iron Curtain. We can only guess according to what we know of the dictatorship in Russia in general, and of the Russian people in particular. An attack against the West would bring the war all over Russia from all sides; the Russian cities, towns and villages would be bombed into ruins, and how would the people of Russia react to that? When it was known that Stalin had started the war, he could not as in the last war, proclaim that Russia had been attacked by a foreign enemy. The Russian people are war-weary like any other people, and Hitler caused terrible damage in Russia. They are one of the most peaceable peoples in the world and have always been forced into wars of conquest by their rulers. So it was during the First World War and in the war of 1904-6 against Japan when Russian soldiers in Siberia told us, "Why war? Russia wants to conquer Manchuria. That is crazy. Russia has land enough for its people." Nobody knows when a war is once started what its consequences may be. Suppose the

West managed to occupy a part of Russia and treated the Russians as human beings in a friendly manner, it would not be surprising if some of the people lined up with the West. And that could be the start of an uprising of the down-trodden in general and the beginning of the fight for independence of the many nationalities in Russia in particular. Even the Nazis, in spite of the savage behaviour of the S.S. troops, had an army of 200,000 Russians who fought on their side against Stalin.

There is resistance in Russia, and in more than one place. Although we hear only sporadically of it, it exists. With the experience of more than 30 years of dictatorship, the Russian people have become dictator-wise. By terrible experience it has learned that to abolish the dictatorship takes the force of all the people. Attempts on a small scale are doomed to sure defeat, and turn out to be useless sacrifices. But a rising of all the people is only possible when the state for some reason is tottering and staggering, and a war can cause that. It is, therefore, not surprising that the Russian people have never made an attempt to throw off the yoke of the Bolsheviks. They never had a chance, and if they had tried in the last war, they would only have jumped from the frying-pan into the fire. Hitler would have enslaved or even partly exterminated them for the benefit of the "master-race". And the small attempts which were made, were promptly silenced in the cellars of the N.K.V.D. and the outside world heard nothing. Stalin has to be very careful if he starts a war of aggression, nobody can with probability say what the Russian people is liable to do in that case, not even the N.K.V.D. How can they expect to know the minds of the people when their own terror forces the people to tell them lies and falsehoods for their own self-preservation?

But suppose that Stalin avoids a hot war and wages only a cold war for several years to come, and keeps his adversaries guessing his real intentions? The U.S.A. and the Western powers will in all probability keep to the armaments race and militarism for the next few years to come, and the armaments debts will grow, causing heavy taxation, high prices, inflation, etc., which will bring about the pauperisation of masses of people and the attrition of the economies of the Western countries in consequence. The Western world would have to decide one day either to quit the armaments race or under one pretext or another, start a war against Russia in order to justify the ruinous armaments to their own peoples, or else they must face a capitalist crisis.

A war started by the West against Russia would be a great moral victory for Stalin, and in this case could perhaps rally the people for a second time in the defence of Russia as he did in Hitler's war. But if the West should not start a war, and "peace should break out" with an economic crisis for consequence. Then Stalin could send his emissaries to the hungry masses in the Western countries, to recommend Bolshevism as their saviour from capitalism and all its evils. And in the countries where the Communist parties have influence he could also employ his fifth column, assisting them if necessary with a few divisions of the N.K.V.D., as he did in the satellite states, and add in this manner a few more countries to the Russian empire, without danger to the Bolshevik regime.

We turn away with horror from these plans and machinations for wars, genocide and destruction. The politicians and militarists prove with their plans not only that they are devoid of any human feeling but also that they do not use any common sense. They can only think in terms of power politics. Why endanger the future of the world with wars of extermination, why not try for once a solution with the remedies of peace? We know that in the society of to-day a real peace cannot exist, but the fear of the future could be mitigated to a great extent if a real goodwill for peace was shown at least from one side, either East or West. It would be much cheaper for all powers concerned to make friends of their adversaries than to fight them. If the U.S.A. would use half the money which it spends to-day on armaments, and produce goods which the people of Korea, China, Russia, etc., need so badly, and which the majority of them have never possessed, and give these goods free of charge to these peoples. That would be a solution of great benefit to the U.S.A. and to the peace of the world.

The U.S.A. would get rid of its unsaleable goods without running into debts which the country could not carry, but what is more important: it would make friends in these countries by the millions, with whom the government of these countries would have to reckon if they intended to make war. It is much more human and cheaper to give a suit of clothes or a watch to a Russian, or Chinese than to fight them, and in the fights Americans are liable to be killed. Shiploads of American gifts brought to Russia, Korea and China would cause more damage to Bolshevism, than shiploads of fighting soldiers to their own peoples, or else they must face a capitalist crisis.

WILLY FRITZENKÖTTER.

## ANOTHER BIRTH CONTROL TRIAL IN ITALY

WE hear from Italy that a new trial against birth control is in progress. During this month, Dr. Dino Origlia will be tried under Article 553 of the Fascist Penal Code (which is still in force) for his book on *Voluntary Procreation*. Dr. Origlia calls attention to the fact that the law not only forbids writing on this subject but even talking about it.

This is the third anti-birth-control trial in Italy in recent years. Our comrades of *Volonia*, Giovanna Berneri and Cesare Zaccaria, were prosecuted in Naples for their pamphlet on birth control. Although they withdrew nothing the jury acquitted them. In the second trial, Dr. Lenard was tried at Milan for publishing a book on contraception. The prosecution stopped the case after several days. Now comes Dr. Origlia's case—obviously a follow-up of the Pope's recent pronouncements.

Progressive opinion in this country should be up in arms about these trials. No one can force birth control on anyone else, and it is simply fantastic that the dissemination of knowledge about it should be illegal. It is to be hoped that observers will be sent to this trial and that liberal opinion will make itself felt on leaders of opinion in Italy.

calm and "good counsels" in the Union. Malan's action simply throws into still further relief the difference between governmental trickery and deception and baseness on the one hand, and the moral force of Scott's position on the other.

In retaining the moral question as the central one, Scott has performed a revolutionary service. It is the moral issue and the simple and straightforward recognition of what is right by masses of people that have proved to be the motives in all the great steps of progress in history. And it is a tremendous encouragement to see how one man can stand against all the forces of expediency and put them to shame.

## 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 2s.
- 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.
- P. A. RIDLEY : *The Roman Catholic Church and the Modern Age.* 2d.
- ★
- Mario Louise Berneri Memorial Committee publications : *Mario 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.

## Travellers' Tales about Russia

Continued from p. 2

the productive and non-productive activities. That is why the extreme and orthodox Marxians denounce it as State-capitalism which is against Socialism and Communism.

### Ideal Set-up

Our travellers praised the State and rigid capitalism as wonderful because they have seen children brought up in creches and kindergartens; education up to the secondary stage is free; house rent of two to five per cent. of the wages; workers having annual holidays which they spend in beautiful health resorts; "Every strata of society" (under Soviet Socialism!) has cultural activity and medical aid is free. We need not deny that most of this is true. But these guests have not mentioned what the working population of Russia is, and what are the unemployment figures (if any), and what provision there is against unemployment and whether there are any concentrations camps, how many inmates there are and what is their condition. All these were not told nor shown to our 'honoured guests' in Russia. And they did not see anything except what was shown or "explained".

Recently a French labour paper quoted a Soviet report saying that so many rubles have been paid as wages and salaries to all the employed in Russia and by mistake I suppose, it was mentioned in the report that 40 million persons were the recipients. That shows that only 40 million persons were employed in all in Russia. Let us remember that a part—a large part—of these are non-producing workers who are maintained at the expense of producing workers, although both of them maintain the Soviet State out of what they pay as profits from their earnings.

It is enough if we know the system to deduce this, whatever figures and percentages may say. Do the Soviet Government print special money to give the amenities for which our travellers admire it? Surely these amenities are provided out of the earners' pockets, while much of the contribution is consumed by a huge bureaucracy appointed to administer them. The cost of some of these amenities is deducted from the pay envelope. For example, the cost of running clubs, where in the name of culture, Government propaganda is thrust and dinned into them whether they want it or not. They would rather have that money to buy more things

than they do. But subscription for clubs is compulsory.

### Tall Chim

According to statistics, there are only 40 million persons employed in all Russia, out of the 200 million people. Our friends of the Soviet Union claim that there is no unemployment in Russia. What are others, who are not infants and invalids doing for their living? Yet they claim there are no beggars in Russia. Are the unemployed getting any doles? Our friends do not say so and do not know. The fact is there is no unemployment insurance or doles in Russia. That is described as there being no unemployment in Russia—"unemployment is abolished!" Our Government also can claim there is no unemployment in India because there are no unemployment insurance or doles here.

Besides 40 million paid workers, there are about 15 to 29 million unpaid labourers working in concentration camps. That is because the Soviet economy cannot afford to pay for labour, since its apparatus is so huge and wasteful and parasitic and no Government can invest money in employing all able-bodied men and women without the prospect of making them repay the investment with profits. Hence 20 million people have to be put into concentration camps in order to make them work free for the sole employer, the State. According to the Soviet statistics mentioned above, the average wage works out at about 400 rubles a month. It does not matter how many hundreds or thousands of rubles are earned, but what counts is its purchasing power. It has been proved that the cost of the huge State and non-productive apparatus is maintained out of the purchasing power of the producing workers who are far fewer than the 40 million employed. In Russia even Stalin and the Ministers are just employed, deciding their own employment. It cannot be otherwise under the economic technique of the Soviet system which is considered new, Marxian and Communist. Only believers in miracles can assert that miracles have happened and that they have seen them. Arithmetic cannot create miracles, even under the wand of Stalin or Marx. Since average earning is 400 rubles and there are many who are earning far more under the miracle system, it is natural, the vast majority will be earning less than the average.

M. P. T. ACHARY



# Military Training in the United States

MILITARY training has two main purposes. The first of these is preparation for war, and the second is the annihilation of the individual's will by instilling in each soldier the habit of automatic obedience to authority. These two purposes are, of course, meshed together. As Willard Waller put it in his *Veteran Comes Back*:

"The aim of an army is to impose its will upon the enemy. Before an army can succeed in this purpose its leaders must first impose their will upon the men in their organisation. They must mould the common soldiers and the officers into perfect instruments for expressing the will of the leader."

The marines are quite proud of their training system and have co-operated with various writers who in a number of periodicals have described it for the public. A former marine, writing for the January 16th, 1949, *New York Times* magazine, says: "The theory is that you can't change a civilian into a marine without first driving a hard wedge between his past and his future."

This "wedge" is started the moment the marine enters "boot" camp. The drill instructors "are deliberately rough and abusive. They heap maddening indignation on the 'boots' (recruits), demanding almost impossible physical exertions and keep up a ruthless pressure 17 hours a day, seven days a week." (*Life*, October 8th, 1951.)

The indignities, many of which have been photographed by a *Life* photographer, begin with shearing of every marine's hair until he is completely bald. The theory is that this is "essential for humility". (*Ibid.*) A marine who had neglected to shave all the fuzz off his chin had to scrape it off with a dry razor while a bucket covered his head and rested on his shoulders. Another who "forgot his belt had to carry it around in his mouth." (*Ibid.*) A careless recruit who throws a candy wrapper on the floor is punished by being forced to "hold it for three hours until the hand goes slightly numb." (*New York Times*, January 16th, 1949.)

There are innumerable indignities of a sadistic nature such as every recruit being forced to stand in a tear-gas chamber and sing the Marine Hymn without gas masks. A recruit who "committed the crime of calling his rifle a gun, had to hold the 10-pound rifle at arm's length for five minutes." Another who scratched a bug bite during formation had to wear his cap pulled down over his eyes. *Life* shows him stumbling along to the chow line in this blind fashion.

**THE PERFECT NERVOUS SYSTEM**  
Every move of the marine recruits, unless otherwise specified by drill instructors, is made on the run. (*Life*.) They must address everyone as "sir" from PFC on up and must lurch to attention when spoken to, "must request permission" to speak, get a drink of water or go to the toilet. (*Life*.)

"The objective," writes an ex-marine, "is a nervous system conditioned to respond without the slightest hesitation." The marine recruit is given no opportunity to make choices. "Every act is a command" and "the smallest detail of training becomes a matter of supreme urgency."

This is marine training—as brutal and

sadistic as any storm-trooper training in Hitler's Germany. The result is acceptance of authoritarianism and dependence upon it. There is a vast difference between this ordered existence and the opportunity parents, teachers, and other civilians give boys to learn to make decisions for themselves so they are not forever dependent on a "leader".

Air Force training at Randolph Field was described in the July 24th, 1949, *New York Times* magazine. From the moment the boy gets his uniform "he is not permitted to walk across the campus. If he is alone, he must run. If he is with another cadet, he must march in step. He goes from class to class in stiff formation. Outside his room he may not speak unless he is spoken to except under certain rigidly defined situations. He must keep his eyes cast down to the ground except when saluting."

Meal-time for the cadet is an astonishing ordeal. He files into the huge hall without a word because he is not allowed to talk. His eyes are on the floor. He walks stiffly, his shoulders thrown back in the almost painful posture of "bracing". He then sits in his chair, but his is a special one. Its front legs have been sawed off several inches, so the cadet is hunched forward. He sits only on the forward inch of the chair, eyes still cast down and not speaking.

## THEORY OF SUPERIORITY

"I don't need to explain anything to my men," a post commander said recently. "The good soldier is the one who obeys without question everything that he is told." (*New York Times*, May 19th, 1951.) This idea is not simply the expression of one officer's convictions. It is the rule of the army. One of the "Armed Forces Talks" issued for the use of commanders in informing their personnel of army procedures and ideas points out that "training in the service is designed to instil in us the direct and almost automatic obedience to orders that is necessary in peace-time and indispensable in war. The habit of discipline must become almost second nature to us and it can be acquired only by actual performance." (*Armed Forces Talk No. 281.*)

The army teaches every man that this automatic obedience to authority is a virtue surpassing the undisciplined civilian life. The same *Armed Forces Talk* says to the soldier: "In the armed forces... you are faced with standards that are higher than and different from those you knew in civilian life." This emphasis on a soldier's being superior to a civilian is part of the programme, which the marines call driving a wedge between a man's past and his future.

As Willard Waller points out, there is a direct relationship between a man

and his environment. Most men have whatever habits their society permits and encourages them to have. Few court social disapproval in a conforming society. "Change the society," says Waller, "and you change the man. The civilian turned soldier derives his distinguishing characteristics from the social environment of the army."

## ROLE OF THE NUMBER

Two social scientists, Howard Brotz and Everett Wilson who served in the armed forces, discussed the characteristics of military society in the March, 1946, *American Journal of Sociology*. After discussing the authoritarian caste system, they described the disintegrating results of military life:

"... The impersonality of the military method of handling great numbers also makes for anonymity. This impersonality, as evidenced in serial numbers, squad and platoon numbers, queuing up by alphabet, numbers designating main civilian occupation and main occupational speciality, tent numbers, and laundry numbers, is soon accepted by the GI. He learns, somehow, that his new rôle will be easier if the anonymity of numbers is preserved—if, to be specific, his officers and the orderly room never identify his name or number with face and personality."

—U.S. NATIONAL COUNCIL AGAINST CONSCRIPTION.

## FEWER SCHOOLS

WE have several times recently quoted press reports of protests by local education authorities on the drastic cuts in their school building programmes made by the Ministry of Education.

It was a little surprising to hear Sir John Maud, the Permanent Secretary to the Ministry declare in Birmingham this month that one hundred thousand new school places are needed before 1953 to provide adequate accommodation, and that over the next eight years we should have to start £6,000,000 worth of building for secondary schools alone.

If he is alive to these urgent needs he had better tell his masters about it, not the general public, who if they are parents, are aware of the needs, and of the continued over-crowding in schools.

Answering questions in the House of Commons on November 30th, Miss Florence Horsburgh revealed that there are 628 schools which were on the 1951 black list as being unfit for use, still in use.

## STIFF-NECKED PROFESSOR

As most of us know, "the Portuguese can't bend their knees, half so as a Russian." Not that Professor Vladimir Kamenov performed Cossack dances on the platform of the Institute of Contemporary Art last week; but he was mentally agile... Up rose the lean figure of Mr. Spender, the Apostate, to ask point blank what the Professor thought of the Picasso hanging on the wall behind him. This time the evasion unblinking. He could give no answer, since the painting was behind him he could not see it.

—*Architects' Journal*, 6/1

## INTOLERANCE & AUTHORITY WANTED

What this country needs is "a bit of healthy intolerance" and a greater willingness to exercise authority. That was the substance of what Mr. J. F. Wolfe, Vice-Chancellor of Reading University, told some 700 councillors, directors of education, university representatives, parents, businessmen, and teachers in his presidential address to the North England Education Conference.

—*Manchester Guardian*, 3/1

## LETTERS TO THE EDITORS

### Last Words on Purpose of Marriage Controversy

TO prevent any further misunderstanding, it would be better if I pointed out certain beliefs on which I agree with Mr. Green. I agree entirely that women are in no way inferior to men or have any different rights, or that there is any need for conventional or legal laws in "marriage". His answer to my second misconception, in which he had a small part, I agree with entirely.

Where my beliefs are the direct opposite is in the meaning of love. Whereas Mr. Green's conception of love seems to be based on a dictionary definition of the word, which seems to fit his theory perfectly, I believe that love between two persons of opposite sex is of much deeper significance than that which an individual can have for the whole of humanity. This may be an emotional belief and not a rational one, but Mr. Green cannot dispense this belief from Society by rational argument, nor prevent couples from falling in love with each other who will break all conventional and legal codes so that they can live happily together. A writer in *FREEDOM* only a few weeks ago, supported this view. Writing of people in our midst not in some remote society, he said of the gypsy that, without any form of marriage or interference from others, men and women choose of their own free will to live together. The writer, a gypsy, has not known of any couple having a "divorce". Given absolute freedom, isn't it conceivable that men and women would still choose to live together until such time when they were no longer in love.

Mr. Green seems a little scared of the word or his emotions, does he really believe that he rejects emotion when he explains his theory? He does couple it with the intellect once as a mutual development but avoids it after that until he accuses me of emotional thinking, implying that such beliefs, which cannot be proved by some theory, are untrue. If this were so, then we would have to reject practically all that the poets, artists and some philosophy have been able to offer us. He was very careful in not coupling the word love with that of sexual satisfaction, though I do not share his interpretation of my letter in which he states I made this error. I apologise if I did. Dr. Julian Huxley was also very careful not to couple these two ideas in a recent broadcast; he said, "If sexual impulse is at the base of love, then love is to be regarded as nothing

but sex." This, he warns us, is a dangerous fallacy. Then, later, "Man was impelled forward by mental and spiritual forces. Doesn't it appear that both Mr. Green and Dr. Huxley by rational thinking have come to the same conclusion that love is beyond rational thought, but Mr. Green has tried to fit this "new" discovery into his theory?"

As for the widely divergent figures of D.I.D. (Reading), this seems another case of hypothetical rational thought. If the first figures of 30% were true, there would be a reason for believing that our neurosis was caused by sexual inhibition; if the second figure were true, which is 90%, and also the fact that sexual satisfaction was a cure for neurosis, it would be almost non-existent. I suggest that the lack of sexual satisfaction, although a great factor, is not the ultimate cause of our neurosis, but that it is more closely linked to our lack of belief in anything not material and a way of life that frustrates the soul and creative abilities of man.

Newport, Dec. 11. MILWARD CASEY.

★  
JOHN BERESFORD expresses a wish that "some competent person would undertake an analysis of the ideas of anarchists to-day". I cannot undertake so vast a work to oblige him, but I should like to comment on the particular nexus of anarchist ideas which is worrying him.

I, too, have followed with some interest the continued correspondence in *FREEDOM* under the heading of "the Purpose of Marriage", in which four men and one woman have been chiefly concerned with the pros and cons of monogamy. No one has ventured the opinion that Mr. Beresford, or any other man, should be denied the opinion of remaining monogamous as far as he himself is concerned should he "find continual delight with another person". If he has even a rudimentary appreciation of anarchist ideas he must acknowledge that his remarks about avoiding detection as a counter-revolutionary in free society by making forays into polygamy, are rather silly, and included in his letter to prevent a serious consideration of the matter under discussion. Or perhaps Mr. Beresford writes in good faith, and really lacks a rudimentary appreciation of anarchist ideas.

The main point at issue is that monogamy, in the accepted meaning of the term, is not a solitary condition that Mr. Beresford or any other individual can decide upon for himself. It requires two people to arrive at the same decision. If Miss A. happens to find continual and exclusive delight in Mr. B. who wants the same thing, it is a happy coincidence, and both are satisfied. I have never known of such a case, but I am willing to believe that it might exist. But dealing with people as they really are, we do know that if Mr. B. wants a monogamous relationship with Miss A. he is only satisfied if he can get her to put an end to her sexual relationships with Messrs C and D—and resist burning one with Mr. F. So monogamy is not, in practice, a matter of individual choice which affects no-one but oneself; it generally has quite wide social repercussions even when we pay lip-service to ideals of self-determination and to the emancipation of women. For, in practice, men do seek to dominate women and generally succeed. Like Robert Vine, I am somewhat pessimistic as to the chances of the sexual revolu-

tion succeeding while society is so man-dominated in structure for we men are, in general, doing our damndest to see that women do not escape from the social pattern so aptly described by your correspondent D.I.D.

And what of the reasons for this continued tendency to exclusiveness which impoverishes the lives of both sexes? Its main roots seem to me to lie in the remarkable lack of the capacity to love in an adult fashion. For most people (again, particularly men) their love is still that of an infant, helpless, jealous and demanding security, ready to wail in self-pity if some other head lies between those breasts. The infantile ideal of the perfect future is expressed in the old rhyme (if I may take a slight liberty with Shakespeare):

"Jack shall have Jill;  
Naught shall go ill;  
The man shall have his *niere* again,  
And all shall be well."

Again I would associate myself with Robert Vine in remarking that revolutions are necessary in several spheres of life before we can attain our full stature—revolutions in the fields, factories, workshops, bedrooms and nurseries. London, Jan. 5. TONY GIBSON.

[This correspondence is now closed.—Ed.]

## COMMUNITIES

I WAS very interested to read the concluding section of Mark Holloway's series of articles on "Communities in relation to Society". In his sketch of the right sort of community, I could not help being reminded of the Bröderhof (the Society of Brothers) in Shropshire, where I spent a memorable four days in the summer of 1945. This community, however, is definitely authoritarian, and I was not attracted to the life they led. I have wondered many times since my experience there whether, in fact, this strict discipline is not necessary for the organisation of all communal activities, both domestic and external; whether, in a word, it is lack of authority—and obedience to a leader—which is the main reason why so many communities have failed, apart from the obvious reasons that Mark Holloway advances.

This question is, of course, relevant to Anarchism. In an Anarchist society, who is going to work in the coal mines and on the land without some sort of compulsion?

Yours fraternally,  
Preston, Dec. 31. W. A. LEMIN.

## Special Appeal

December 14th—31st:

Lenally: L.W.\* 8/6; Anon\* 2/6; Dovercourt: L.C.W. £2; London: Anon\* 10/-; Alto: J.N. £1/5/6; London: Anon\* 10/-; London: S.P. £1/5/6; Blackpool: R.B.B. 2/6; Dublin: G.F. 7/6; Philadelphia: R.N. £1/15/0; Colchester: W.M. 2/6; Denver: R.B. £1/12/6; Burnley: J.R.S. £1; San Francisco: C.S. £1/7/0; Anon\* 2/6.

Total 11 11 6  
Previously acknowledged 498 13 8

1951 TOTAL £510 4 2

GIFT OF BOOKS—London: C.W. Stroud: M.K.  
\* Readers who have undertaken to send regular monthly contributions.

## WILL NEW TOWNS EVER GROW OLD?

IN his "Letter to Posterity", on the radio last week, Lord Beveridge, addressing the people of the year 2052, told them about Newton Aycliffe, one of the New Towns, where he is Chairman of the Development Corporation. "By the time you get this letter," he said, "Newton Aycliffe will be an old town."

## WORKING-CLASS HISTORY

Messrs Macmillan & Co. have just published *British Working Class Movements: Selected Documents 1789-1875*, edited by G. D. H. Cole and A. W. Filson. The volume is designed as a companion either to *A Short History of the British Working Class Movement* by G. D. H. Cole, or to *The Common People* by G. D. H. Cole and Ramond Postgate. Each group of documents printed in the volume (which is of 630 pages and costs 45/-) has an introduction and explanatory notes.

## THE ONE ABOVE SEES ALL

"It has been brought to our attention that pictures of Stalin have not been displayed in all hospital sickrooms," intoned the Communist Party Central Committee in Budapest last week. "Contact of the soul [with Stalin] is exceptionally important in hospitals. In the operating room, in particular, Stalin's portrait should be mounted in such a position that the patient on the operating table looks straight into Stalin's eyes. The patient should know that Stalin always guards over him."

TIME, 19/11/51.

## Firemen Still Angry

IN spite of the dropping of all charges against firemen (arising from the recent boycott) by fire authorities in London and elsewhere, some local authorities are pressing on with the imposition of penalties.

In Manchester, 165 firemen have been fined, and in Wakefield four sub-officers and four leading firemen have been punished, six by demotion and two by reprimand. A protest march to the County Hall at Wakefield is threatened, and throughout the fire service resentment is being fanned by this senseless and unfair victimisation.

The union, however, seems to be unable to move from their position of three weeks ago, seeking support from the T.U. movement, but apparently not knowing how to use it when they get it.

## MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

**LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP**  
**OPEN AIR MEETINGS**  
Weather Permitting  
**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.  
JAN. 13—DEBATE between  
Tony Gibson and Philip Sansom on  
**VIOLENCE & NON-VIOLENCE IN THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION**  
JAN. 20—Geoffrey Ostergaard on  
**SYNDICALISM IN ENGLAND**

**NORTH-EAST LONDON DISCUSSION MEETINGS**  
**IN EAST HAM**  
at 7.30  
JAN. 23—S. E. Parker on  
**VOLTAIRINE DE CLEYRE**  
Enquiries c/o Freedom Press

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

**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 Payee, and addressed to the publishers.  
**FREEDOM PRESS**  
27 Red Lion Street  
London, W.C.1 England  
Tel.: Chancery 8364