

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

Law was made for
Property alone.
T. B. MACAULAY

Vol. 13, No. 47

November 22nd, 1952

Threepence

Situation Critical in S. Africa

THE situation in South Africa since the recent riots is clearly very tense indeed. "Riots"—to use the question begging term employed by governments and newspapers—only occur at all when smouldering discontent breaks into flame here and there, and men and women ventilate their grievances on the streets. Their very occurrence is an indication of mounting tension and they are never without causes. The South African Government has handled these outbursts in the usual way—with police baton charges. Such methods can only increase the tension still further.

No one who has talked to middle class white South Africans can have failed to notice that on the colour question they are dominated by fear. Fear of the minority with privilege for the overwhelming majority without it. And this fear is added to by all the hysteria and the fanning of unconscious attitudes (found wherever the colour question exists and epitomized in the sex-fear of rape) which the newspapers have fostered for years. In such an atmosphere it is impossible to achieve objective discussion—and this applies to many South African progressives. It is the cause of the exasperated plea that people outside South Africa "cannot understand our problems". It is this fear that enables both mass political parties to secure support for racial policies which are absolutely repellent to liberal opinion.

This basic tension of race fear provides the background for the recent factors which have increased it still further; the non-cooperation campaign against Malan's laws; the struggle between government and judiciary over the validity of the changes in the electoral status of non-whites, both African and Cape coloured; and the discussion of racial problems in the case of South Africa by the United Nations. To all this must be added the effect of other African political changes—on the Gold Coast, the Seretse Khama affair, the acrimonious question of Central African Federation, and most important of all, probably, the recent events in Kenya.

The development of all these factors has caused observers of the South African scene to view the future with foreboding. There has been no contrary tendency working towards an easing of tension.

Police Violence

It is on this picture that the Government have now added some lurid strokes of their own, in the shape of exceptionally brutal police repression in the recent riots. The police have been criticized by a considerable number of white Europeans as well as being universally condemned by Africans.

The press has headlined the killing of Europeans in these riots, but Hugh Latimer, the *Observer's* special correspondent, writes: "One inescapable fact remains: in every case where Europeans were murdered, Africans had first been killed by the police."

At East London, the police fired on the crowds. The official account gives the dead as two Europeans and seven Africans, but other sources say that Africans suffered 80 killed and 100 injured, and add that the Africans are said to have buried their dead beneath the floors of their huts.

It is stated that the police baton charged crowds gathering for a meeting before it had begun. A gang of boys then stoned the police, who opened fire and continued firing on and off for eight hours.

Guns Instead of Tear Bombs

The Torch Commando condemned "the lack of discretion which appears to have been shown by their (the police) officers in

resorting to firearms" and the failure to use tear gas bombs first. The *Rand Daily Mail* has pointed out that the police bought a quantity of anti-riot equipment from the American Government but have never used it. Such equipment was designed to minimise casualties in repression of riots. Similar action occurred at Kimberley and at Johannesburg.

It is also being said—and the above accounts lend colour to it—that the police do not wish to minimise casualties. That they use brutal methods as a policy because they think the situation needs it. "No one," writes Hugh Latimer, "who talks to an ordinary policeman here can doubt his personal inclination to such a policy. Most of the police come from that class of Afrikanerdom which cannot see a black man without itching to kick him off the pavement."

But the police are also supported by the government. Mr. C. R. Swart, the Minister of Justice, has publicly stated that his "instructions to the police is that they should act and act drastically. As Minister of

Continued on p. 3

READY TO START

Willy Messerschmitt, builder of the famous Nazi fighter-plane, has plans completely ready for the rebuilding of his factory in Essen, on the site of one of the main Krupp cannon factories which was dismantled after the war.

Professor Ernst Heinkel, West Germany's expert in jet planes, has a completely equipped factory at Stuttgart with 350 machine tools waiting to go to work on new war planes.

H. M. Govt. Grudges Your Tuppence for UNESCO

Sir S. Radhakrishnan . . . Vice-President of India . . . said that recently he asked a candidate for a senior post in the Government of India what the initials Unesco stand for. The candidate replied: "United Nations Electricity Supply Company."—Evening Standard.

PERHAPS you heard the programme on the radio last week, "Mission to Mexico," in which

Leonard Cottrell gave his impressions of the Unesco Centre for Fundamental Education at Patzcuaro, Mexico. Mr. Cottrell introduced his programme by an article in the *Radio Times* on "Learning to Live." His final remarks were:

"I think after you have heard it that you will agree with me that the work now being carried on at Patzcuaro is one of the most interesting and constructive experiments in the field of human betterment. And if you are inclined to query the cost of this experiment, you may be surprised, as I was, to discover that the total budget of Unesco (covering all its activities, not only Fundamental Education) is less than the amount which a great city like New York spends each year on cleaning its streets; and that your individual contribution to Unesco, as a British taxpayer, is twopence a year!"

It must have been a surprise for the B.B.C.'s listeners to hear three days afterwards that at the seventh Unesco congress in Paris, the Minister of Education, Miss Florence Horsbrugh warned that Britain, which pays 11 per cent. of the organisation's funds, would look critically at its coming programmes and budgets. She said: "International budgets are not, any more than national, exempted from the laws of arithmetic. Of every project we must ask, 'Is this essential?' and if so, then 'Is this the most effective

THE DOCKS SIGNS OF CHANGE

THERE are signs that before very long there will be changes made in the National Dock Scheme to deal with the unemployment which is now officially admitted to be affecting 20 per cent. of the country's dockers.

The decasualisation scheme, which was introduced while the late Ernest Bevin was Minister of Labour during the war, has been consistently held up as a prize jealously to be guarded in the interests of the working docker. The number of unworking dockers at the moment, however, is showing up some of the weaknesses of the scheme—for at a time like the present, many dockers are worse off because of the conditions it lays down and—now that the situation it was supposed to alleviate is actually here, there are indications that the scheme will be radically altered.

This sort of scheme, based upon agreements for collaboration and co-operation between workers and employers, invariably operates in the interests of the latter. This is understandable, since the boss badly needs the collaboration of the workers who, after all, are the ones who do the work. It is like collaboration between the wolf and the three little pigs—highly desirable from the wolf's point of view, but disastrous for the little pigs!

Now that unemployment is so widespread in the docks, the scheme is actually costing the employers money. It was all right while there was plenty of work and the number of men to be paid £4 8s. a week for doing nothing was a negligible quantity. Then the 16 per cent. levy on all wages which the employers paid the National Dock Labour Board was a small amount, easily passed on to the consumer. For it should not be thought that the Stevedoring companies paid that levy themselves. This was simply calculated into the cost of shipping, carriage and warehousing, and the public here paid it in

all imported goods and abroad on all exported goods. For the Master Stevedores it was merely a series of entries in the ledgers.

Now, however, the falling off of imports and exports has so reduced traffic through the docks that the amounts to be paid by the Board to unemployed dockers cannot be met out of the 16 per cent. levy and the Board has recently increased this to 22½ per cent. This, has, of course, caused a howl to go up from the employers, who are now asking for the number of registered dockers to be reduced. For although the increase can simply be passed on to the importers and exporters, it adds to prices at a time when, to maintain our weakening grip on export markets, prices must be vigorously kept at a minimum.

In order to get round this increase, traders will divert their goods from the piece-work ports of London and Merseyside to the day-work ports of Southampton and Hull. It may take a little longer that way, but it's cheaper. And therein lies the reason why the Thames and the Merseyside are the black spots for unemployment to-day.

There is no doubt that the National Dock Labour Board are seriously considering taking dockers off the register. The Board "cannot afford" to continue paying £4 8s. a week to idle dockers. Senior officials of the NDLB were called to a conference three weeks ago, and a statement is expected shortly.

What should not be lost on the workers, however, is the way in which the scheme is used by the Board and the employers when it goes in their favour, but has to be adjusted when it goes against them. For all the time there was plenty of work and the scheme was little more than a means of discipline over the dockers, then it was "a great step forward" but when the "advantages" for the dockers have to be found—then adjustments are demanded.

As I said at the beginning, however, many dockers are worse off because of the conditions the scheme lays down. For example, every docker has to report for work twice a day—at 8 a.m. and 1 p.m.—and once on Saturdays—eleven times a week. If there is not work in the morning he simply has to hang about in the docks area, sitting in cafes or pubs—spending money, until the second "call". He has to find these fares and expenses every day. And if he misses one call out of the eleven—even if there was no work for him anyway—he may lose his full pay for the week.

Further, while he is registered under the Dock Board, a docker cannot apply for unemployment pay through the Labour Exchange—although he pays contributions like every other employed worker. And a married man with several children would be paid more unemployment benefit than the £4 8s. he gets under the marvellous scheme!

Single workers and old men are better off on the scheme—but the old ones are likely to be the first to go, soon, and the dockers only hope they will get pensions. That is no part of the scheme.

The dockers seem to have been sleeping while this situation was developing. They now find themselves in a very sticky position. The "Dockers' Charter" about which we heard so much at the time of the Old Bailey trial last year seems to have dropped right out of mind. On Merseyside, the Portworkers' Committee has been kept alive and has successfully maintained a monthly paper, *Portworkers' Clarion*, which represents a left-wing Labour and militant trade-unionist point of view. But in London, the Stalinists got control of the unofficial Committee, at the time of the trial, and have more or less allowed it to die out until last week, when a meeting was called at which the demand was for an increase in basic pay of 30/- a week. (To which one docker remarked, "Some hopes!")

We will return to this subject next week with a further article on the situation in the docks. P.S.

WORLD FOOD SCARCITY

Europe's Dollar Imports

WHILE the world's total agricultural production this year is about 2 per cent. more than last year, the world's need for more food "has not yet begun to be met". A report published to-day by the Food and Agricultural Organisation which gives this warning explains that the 2 per cent. advance in output is mainly in rubber and fibres.

In the least developed and most heavily populated regions of the world, where the mass of the world's population lives, per capita food consumption levels are still substantially below the already inadequate pre-war averages. The situation is most acute in south-east Asia. It is estimated that total agricultural output in 1952-53 will equal, and perhaps exceed, that of 1951-52 and that the trend towards expanded agricultural production is likely to continue into 1953-54.

Food production in western Europe is expected to show an increase over last year's figures, though the dependence of this area on imports from the dollar area has increased, mainly because of the decline in exports from Latin America.

In reviewing the situation of various crops, the report emphasizes that world production of rice failed to expand in 1951-52, which created a serious situation in many areas and higher prices. There was, on the contrary, an increased supply of cotton, which, however, was accompanied by falling prices and a contracting demand.

In many countries, the report notes, the Governments are showing increased interest in promoting the production and efficient use of fertilizers. Total fertilizer production showed a 5 per cent. increase in 1951-1952; and for the first time synthetic nitrogen fertilizers are being manufactured in every continent, the largest production being in the Middle East.

—(Despatch from Rome, Times, 11/11/52.)

It is clear from the above that questions of profit and prices are still the dominant factors in world food production, even in the teeth of starvation. Prices are high with scarcity while abundance brings lower prices, lower profits.

ANARCHISM & THE "OPEN SOCIETY"

IN our last issue we mentioned several recent books on what may be called Messianism in politics, the most important of which are J. L. Talmon's *The Origins of Totalitarian Democracy* and K. R. Popper's *The Open Society and its Enemies*. A current series of broadcast lectures by Mr. Isaiah Berlin with the title *Freedom and its Betrayal* has a similar theme.*

These thinkers all illustrate a tendency in present-day political philosophy (though not in political activity) to reject perfectionism and idealism as inevitably leading to the "closed society" of the totalitarian state, in favour of a philosophy of moderation, of the middle way, of trial and error. In Mr. William Clark's words, "the ideal state is not only unattainable, but it is a will-o'-the-wisp which leads free men into the cage of the closed society. There is no such thing as the perfect state; the best is only the open society in which constant change and experiment attempt by a slow process of trial and error to make life happier and more worthwhile for the individual. . . . The open society is not a perfect society, it is not even in the last stages of becoming perfect. Utopia is not around the corner; but it does have the merit of being open, that is of being capable of change and adaptation, and so of progress. It cannot promise inevitable progress; there is no short cut to perfection. . . ."

This is a very reasonable point of view and in these days of forced labour camps, purges and witch-hunts reminiscent of the religious struggles of the 17th century, it is a point of view which is bound to appeal to sensible people who are sick and tired of the political curalls offered them from right and left.

When it is put in the terms quoted above, how can we fail to agree with it? But we are anarchists, and anarchy, which the dictionary tells us come from the Greek an archia: the state of being without government, is in most people's opinion most certainly an extreme view. Is anarchism compatible with the "open society"?

I think it quite possible that Prof. Talmon, Dr. Popper and Mr. Berlin would consider that anarchism is yet

another variation on the philosophies which they are attacking. Mr. Clark is explicit in his attitude; in the passage we quoted last week he says, "The primacy of the individual does not mean anarchy, it does not mean that the state disappears: it does mean that the state is regarded as the instrument by which the individual improves his lot." The "reasonable" arguments against anarchism as opposed to the simply reactionary arguments may perhaps be summarised as follows:

(1) Anarchism is an idealist and perfectionist philosophy of personal freedom stemming ultimately from Rousseau, and if ever it became a real social influence the effect would be much the same as that of the teachings of Rousseau. George Orwell wrote of "people who are convinced of the wickedness both of armies and of police forces, but who are nevertheless much more intolerant and inquisitorial in outlook than the normal person who believes that it is necessary to use violence in certain circumstances. They will not say to somebody else, 'Do this, that and the other or you will go to prison,' but they will if they can, get inside his brain and dictate his thoughts for him in the minutest particulars. Creeds like pacifism and anarchism, which seem on the surface to imply a complete renunciation of power, rather encourage this habit of mind. For if you have embraced a creed which appears to be free from the ordinary dirtiness of politics—a creed from which

you yourself cannot expect to draw any material advantage—surely that proves that you are in the right? And the more you are in the right, the more natural that everyone else should be bullied into thinking likewise."

(2) Anarchism in its rejection of compromises and lesser evils is like the varieties of religious fanaticism that Monsignor Knox writes about in his book on *Enthusiasm*, whose special contempt is reserved for those weaker vessels who do not completely share their apocalyptic vision. As examples of the way in which preconceived perfectionist theory blinds the anarchist to facts there might be quoted the way in which anarchist opposition to war leads to (again in Orwell's words), "the sterile and dishonest line of pretending that in every war both sides are exactly the same and it makes no difference who wins." Or the way in which the anarchist opposition to government leads to expression of the view in anti-election propaganda that all parties are the same and equally bad, when obviously they are not.

(3) Anarchism often talks in a Messianic way of a revolution which is to inaugurate a golden age in much the same way as religious fanatics used to talk of the Judgment Day, etc. All previous revolutions have failed to inaugurate utopias, have been "betrayed" in just the same way as all previous Judgment Days have been false

prophecies, but always the next one will be "the real thing".

(4) Anarchism makes the same false assumptions about human nature as those 18th century French philosophers who sought in Prof. Talmon's words, "to bring into harmony the personal with the general good, and resolve the tension between duty and freedom. The question arises: If such an order was natural, why had it never become a historic reality? The answer is: Because vested interests were at work to prevent it. Then, it may be asked, what is the warrant of its imminent realisation? The answer was that the eighteenth-century philosophy had for the first time in history fathomed the 'source and origin of all evils and crime—the belief in the badness of man—and made the momentous discovery that man was nothing but the creature of education and laws."

And anarchism also shares "the optimistic belief of the late eighteenth century philosophy, that liberty favours order". As H. W. Nevins said, anarchy would only be possible if mankind really were a little below the angels. "Anarchism, though it shows some of the actionistic fantasy that is common in the radical thought of the nineteenth century, is based not so much on a utopian future as on a return to a primitive naturalism which shall free men from the political state and economic exploitation. In this sense anarchism has much in common with the mythology of the return to an Arcadian past."†

Are these criticisms of anarchism justified? Is anarchism yet another enemy of the open society? Or is the open society in fact incompatible with "the state as the instrument by which the individual improves his lot"? We will attempt to answer these questions in a forthcoming article. C.W.

† Kimball Young: *Handbook of Social Psychology* (Routledge & Kegan Paul).

Group Marriage and Anthropology

I WOULD like to question Mr. Bob Green's examples of group marriage which appeared in an article in *FREEDOM* on September 27th.

Melville Jacobs, a professor of anthropology at the University of Washington, writes in his *Outline of Anthropology*, "A functioning and stable marital union of a group of males with a group of females has never been found."

Mr. Green intimates group marriage among the Masai. It is true that Masai warriors live in bachelors' quarters with the girls of the settlement. Such a situation is common among other peoples. But this state is carefully distinguished from any marriage relationship. In due course, every warrior will leave the bachelor's "shack" and settle with a wife. There is no group marriage here, since the functioning and recognised institution of procreation and child-rearing is the family involving a man and wife.

Both the Dieri of Australia and the Chuckchi of north-eastern Siberia possess a kind of periodic sexual communism. With the Australian group a girl becomes the promised wife of one man who may if he wishes share her with others of proper kinship status. On certain occasions there is a limited "open season" when any man may abduct a female. The Dieri also have a system of concubinage yet, according to Radcliffe-Brown, these concubines are by no means even the equivalent to wives. Malinowski has pointed out that the family and marriage are as firmly rooted in Australian culture as in any other.

The Chuckchi often unite for the purpose of sharing their wives. The

members of this union do not live together, however, but belong to different camps. No one forgets whose wife is whose. The system actually functions as a means to providing bed-fellows for travellers and has nothing to do with marriage. (The above is taken from R. H. Lowie, *Social Organisation*, p. 123-124.)

Even the famous Trobrianders have stated periods of sexual licence yet this cannot be construed as group marriage. Marriage, especially among pre-literate people, is an economic relationship as well as a sexual one. Indeed, the former is frequently the more significant. All of these systems of alleged group marriage exist alongside of the institution of the family and marriage as such.

They may serve numerous functions but they are not significant institutions for procreation and rearing of children, the determination of descent and, hence, inheritance or any of the other aspects of what we may call the real institution of marriage and the family in a society. As Robert Lowie points out, "Temporary looseness no matter on what scale is not to be confused with group marriage, a purely hypothetical condition."

The hypothesis of group marriage is chiefly a residue of the now antiquated school of evolutionary anthropology to which, I believe, Sumner and Keller belonged. Modern anthropology, by applying the so-called functionalist method, has aptly shown that what purports to be a group marriage is not one at all since it involves and fulfils none of the significant functions of marriage and the family.

HAROLD B. BARCLAY.

Heroic Deeds Not Required

HEROIC deeds are not required to effect great and momentous changes in human life. It is not necessary to have millions of armed men, or new railroads or new machinery, or new expositions, trade unions, revolutions, barricades, dynamite outrages, or airships, and the like; nothing is required for the purpose but a transformation of public opinion. In order to bring about this transformation, no new efforts of thought are required, it is not necessary to overthrow the existing order and to invent something new and extraordinary. All we have to do is to resolve not to submit to the false, to the dead public opinion of the past, which is artificially kept alive by the governments. It is only required that every man should say what he really thinks and feels, or else abstain from saying what he does not really believe in.

If only a small group of men were to act in this manner, then the old public opinion would disappear and we should have the new, the living, and real public opinion in its stead. With the

change in public opinion would follow easily the transformation in the inner life of men. It is shameful to think how really little is required for men's deliverance from oppressing evils; they must only not lie. Let men not submit to the lies that are suggested to them, let them say only what they think and feel, and then there will come such a change in our life as revolutionists would not be able to bring about in the course of centuries, even if they had the power.

A free man may utter truthfully what he thinks and what he feels in the midst of thousands of men who by their actions and doings show something quite the opposite. It would seem that the truthful man must stand alone, yet it happens that the majority also think and feel the same, only that they do not express it. What was yesterday a new opinion of one man, to-day is the joint opinion of the majority. As soon as that opinion establishes itself, men's actions commence to change slowly, and by degrees.

—LEO TOLSTOY.

Lessons of the Spanish Revolution—19

THE U.G.T. -- C.N.T. UNITY AND ACTION PACT

ONE has long ago come to the conclusion that Treaties and Pacts are not worth the paper they are written on. One has only to recall the broken Treaties of the last thirty years to realise that their purpose is to lull the general public into a feeling of false security, and to justify the existence of an army of professional diplomats and politicians, the culmination of whose "efforts" these agreements and treaties represent.

In Spain there was a shortage of everything other than Pacts of Alliance, or of Unity, between the Parties and Organisations. None of them had more than a temporary effect on morale; for facts speak louder than Pacts! The most important attempt at Unity was not between the Parties, but that which aimed at drawing the two workers' syndicates together in a common effort in the armed struggle and the reconstruction of the country. That no such pact was agreed to until March, 1938, can be explained by the fact that it was made at the highest level, that is among the leaders of the C.N.T. and U.G.T., at which level all kinds of considerations of a political nature were involved. Whereas, from the very beginning, some kind of practical unity had been achieved in the factories and in the agricultural collectives by the workers themselves who, faced with the very real problem of earning their livings and of producing the food and the articles needed by the community, had quickly solved the political differences that existed between the two organisations, and were running their collectives jointly. Instead, the pact of Unity between the C.N.T. and U.G.T. was only in part an attempt to give official expression to what already existed in fact. It was also an attempt to find common ground in the event that at some future date the leaders might be jointly in control of Spain's destinies.

In the proposals put forward by the two organisations one is immediately struck by the fact that the U.G.T. made no concessions to the revolutionary objectives of the C.N.T. with the exception of paying lip-service to the importance of workers' control, which it considers "one of the greatest and most valuable of the workers' conquests" and demanding that the government should legalise workers' control "which defends the rights and duties of the workers as regards production and distribution". The C.N.T., on the other hand, in what appears a desperate attempt to find common ground with the reformist U.G.T. outlines the function of a National Joint Committee as that of "ensuring the

effective participation of the proletariat in the Spanish State, and of undertaking to defend "now and always, a really democratic régime, opposing all totalitarian ideas and ambitions". On the question of "National Defence" the C.N.T. proposed among other things that the C.N.T. and U.G.T. should "assist in every way in the creation of an efficient Regular Army to win this war, and to guard our liberties in the future". The C.N.T. advocated workers' control but also the formation of a National Economic Council, composed of representatives of the syndicates and the Government whose function will be to "direct production, distribution, credit, trade and matters of compensation, acting through national councils of industry—which shall be constituted in the same way as the Economic Council."

The Spanish Anarchist Federation, commenting on these documents,* refers to the U.G.T. proposals as being "from the beginning to the end a recapitulation of the Government's point of view" and that the U.G.T. leaders were not interested in effective unity and "are only playing to the gallery". Of the C.N.T. proposals the F.A.I. comments:

"... [they are] a product of the double necessity, that of demonstrating our will to co-operation, and that of maintaining our principles. In it we have made every concession consistent with the latter and with the defence of our revolutionary conquests."

"The C.N.T. has again demanded co-operation and representation in the anti-fascist Government, particularly in the departments of War and Economics. . . . On the other hand, the C.N.T. have accepted the nationalisation of the war industries, railways, banks, telegraphs, etc., and have made many concessions, only reserving the principle of syndical representation on the governing councils of these organisations."

The Programme of Unity of Action between the U.G.T. and the C.N.T.† which was the outcome of the proposals put forward earlier by the two organisations is a document which clearly recognises the ultimate power and authority of the government and the State, and seeks to insinuate the workers' organisations wherever possible in the institutions and machinery of government and State. Even on the question of the collectives the government has the last word:

* The text of these proposals and the comments by the F.A.I. were published in *Spain and the World* (London, March 4, 1938, Vol. 2, No. 31).

† *Spain and the World* (April, 8, 1938, Vol. 2, No. 33).

"1. The U.G.T. and the C.N.T. recognise that lawful form should be given to collectives and therefore think that legislation on the question is necessary to settle which of them are to be continued, the conditions of their constitution and working, and to what point the State should have a say in them.

"2. Such collectives as are amenable to the legislation in question and are of recognised economic usefulness, will be helped by the State.

"3. Legislation regarding collectives should be planned and put before the Government by the National Council of Economy."

Who, one is tempted to ask, will decide which collectives are of "economic usefulness" and to whom? And by giving the legislators the powers to determine which collectives shall continue, they remove the very basis of the collectives: that they are the spontaneous creation of the people who work in them.

In the C.N.T.-U.G.T. programme it will be left to the Government "to control production and regulate internal consumption, which are the basis of our exportation policy". As to wages:

"The U.G.T. and C.N.T. advocate the establishment of a minimum, salary based on the cost of living, and taking into account both professional standing and individual production. In this connection they will uphold the principle of "to him that produces better and more, more shall be given, without distinction of age or sex, so long as the circumstances arising from the needs of national reconstruction last".³⁸ Such methods of increasing production, make necessary a new bureaucracy of production experts, rate-fixers, time-keepers, and other parasites, quite apart from the fact that in the process

Continued on p. 3

³⁸ This very un-anarchistic sentiment cannot be wholly attributed to the influence of the U.G.T. in drafting the document. It reflects a growing mentality of the Union boss who echoes the complaints of the middle-classes about "slackers" among the workers and the need to penalise them. Much more shocking than the sentence quoted from the U.G.T.-C.N.T. document is the campaign conducted by the C.N.T., organ of the C.N.T. in Madrid, in favour of issuing producers' cards with the purpose of eliminating "work slackers". These cards, according to the *Spanish Labour Bulletin* (New York, June 7, 1938), "showing that the bearer has done his or her share of work to help win the war, would entitle them to their ration card without which no food can be procured". The popular slogan, declared the organ of the C.N.T., should be "He who doesn't work shall not eat."

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

Unesco Publications on Race . . .

- Race and Psychology Otto Klineberg 1/6
- Racial Myths Juan Comas 1/6
- Race and Culture Michael Leavis 1/6
- The Roots of Prejudice Arnold Rose 1/6
- Race and Biology L. C. Dunn 1/6
- Race and History C. Levi-Strauss 1/6
- The Significance of Racial Differences G. Morant 1/6

These pamphlets comprises the series by acknowledged experts on "The Race Question in Modern Science."

What is Race? 5/-

Evidence by scientists
The object of this booklet is to present, in a popular way, certain essential information about the biological aspects of race. Of recent years, discoveries in the field of human genetics and anthropology have thrown new light on the old problems of how races are formed and the nature of the differences between them. It was felt that certain provisional conclusions reached by scientists who work on such problems could be put into non-technical language and illustrated—often in a necessarily over-simplified form—so as to make them more easily intelligible to the layman. An acquaintance with the more important of these conclusions is necessary for the proper understanding of the race question as it now exists.

Obtainable from

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

FEAR OF SINCERITY

IN the Russian-dominated territories, as in Nazi Germany, as every newspaper reader knows, failure to conform to the official political line means concentration camps or loss of the ability to earn or some other suicidal way of life. Nor is this mere newspaper exaggeration, for it seems likely that the reality of political pressure is far more sinister and life destroying than those who do not directly experience it ever imagine. The exposure of these methods of thought control has occupied anarchist periodicals for more than three decades and has been independent of pro-Fascist, pro-Soviet, anti-Nazi, or anti-Communist swings in western political orientation.

Communist totalitarian methods are denounced in every reactionary newspaper nowadays because the needs of the cold war demand it. But it is always a matter of contrasting "their way" and "ours" on the assumption that there is a difference in kind. Actually the difference is one of degree, though we are fortunate—in England—that that degree is very considerable indeed.

Nevertheless, an objective study of trends in international events and political development makes it quite clear that the trend towards totalitarianism is present not only in Fascist and Communist countries but also in democratic régimes as well. This fact alone should make one pause before accepting the war slogans of the future—even if the war slogans of the past were not, in perspective, so hollow and hypocritical.

Recently, in New York, a high official of the United Nations' secretariat committed suicide by jumping out of the window of his twelfth floor apartment. There seems no doubt at all that the precipitating factor in Mr. Feller's suicide was the investigation of members of the U.N. staff by the McCarron Committee, and the dramatic intensity of this tragedy has focused imagination on the workings of the American purge system in a most startling manner.

FREEDOM has for long inveighed against this enquiry into men's lives and opinions, past as well as present, on information received by hearsay from informers who are not required to give evidence on oath. The power and destructiveness of such committees as the House Un-American Activities Committee, of the slanders of Senator McCarthy, and the enquiries of the McCarron Committee have been thrown into lurid light by this suicide.

A dreadful feature of political persecution in Communist countries is unconcern for the truth. But also the question of whether a man is sincere in his beliefs becomes quite irrelevant when political conformity is required. This latter feature is also present in America. Very many, especially in the thirties must have sincerely sympathised with what they conceived to be Communist aims. Sincere or not, and no matter how many years afterwards, they are now made to go in fear of what a chance informer may "reveal". The atmosphere of fear and suspicion which these enquiries produce goes far beyond the actual hearings. And what is most serious of all, men come to fear to express sincere opinions at all. If one is "wise" one only says what is acceptable, the most jingoist-patriotic attitudes.

Feller's suicide has perhaps made this aspect of American trends

clearer than before. It cannot be hoped that it will alter the methods of the Administration: let us hope it will evoke a revulsion of feeling in the American people as a whole.

Nor should we forget that, in lesser degree again, the same trend is observable here. The purging of the Civil Service, the enquiry, more or less unadmitted, into a man's views before he is appointed to certain jobs, can only create the same fear of sincere expression of opinion here also. That the official methods are themselves called forth by the Communist tactics of infiltration and espionage is true: but the effect is not altered—that the trends observable in frank totalitarian régimes are present in every governmental society.

FREEDOM PRESS

- MARIE-LOUISE BERNERI :**
Neither East nor West cloth 10s. 6d., paper 7s. 6d.
Workers in Stalin's Russia. 1s
- SELECTIONS FROM FREEDOM**
Vol. 1, 1951, Mankind is One paper 7s. 6d.
- TONY GIBSON :**
Youth for Freedom paper 2s.
- PHILIP SANSON :**
Syndicalism—The Workers' Next Step 1s.
- ERRICO MALATESTA :**
Anarchy. 6d.
Vote—What For? 1d.
- M. BAKUNIN :**
Marxism, Freedom and the State. paper 2s. 6d., cloth 5s.
- HERBERT READ :**
Art and the Evolution of Man. 4s.
Existentialism, Marxism and Anarchism. 3s. 6d.
Poetry and Anarchism. cloth 5s., paper 2s. 6d.
The Philosophy of Anarchism. boards 2s. 6d., paper 1s.
The Education of Free Men. 1s.
- RUDOLF ROCKER :**
Nationalism and Culture. cloth 21s.
- ALEX COMFORT :**
Delinquency 6d.
Barbarism & Sexual Freedom. paper 2s. 6d., stiff boards 3s. 6d.
- 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.
- 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.
- 27, Red Lion Street,
London, W.C.1.**

Chaim Weizmann and Israel

THE death of Chaim Weizmann, President of Israel, has called forth many eulogies from the Press. This was to be expected since like many other politicians who live to a ripe old age, the sentimentality that attaches to the veteran tends to overlook any serious criticism even while they are alive.

It has long been forgotten by the Zionists themselves how the obstinacy of Weizmann drove their leader and pioneer, Theodore Herzl, to his grave—broken in spirit over the stubborn insistence of those who insisted on Palestine as the only possible "homeland". Herzl originally contemplated a Jewish State, but the religious element led by Weizmann cast aside all offers of land anywhere but Palestine, insisting on "the Promise" and other such myths. It is true that Herzl probably did not foresee that the Jewish State would eventually triumph in Palestine, but it would have been difficult to foresee in the early days of this century how religious orthodoxy could combine with an artificially-stimulated nationalism and even a secular socialism that nevertheless held fast to a mythical "Promise", in the settlement in Palestine.

A modern myth which may well yet rank with the "Promise" made by "God" is that which was fostered by Lloyd George and others, namely, that they made the "National Home" promise to the Jewish faction led by Weizmann because of the latter's "assistance to the Allies" in certain chemical inventions. Weizmann himself discounted this legend though there is an apocryphal story that during a luncheon to aid Israel in the early days of its establishment, a Zionist leader remarked bitterly to Einstein, "If the Weizmann story's true, Albert, you certainly sold yourself cheap." In actual fact, of course, the politicians give nothing away so easily. The whole point was that in re-drawing the boundaries of Turkish possessions, they wanted an "Ulster" in Palestine and the "Jewish Nation" within a mandated territory suited them very well. It also diverted the Arabs from anti-imperialism. But what was not foreseen at Versailles was the resurgence of barbarism in Europe—as a result of their other deliberations—and the anti-semitic drive that began in Poland and spread a thousand times worse in Germany, which forced Jews to leave Europe and who, finding no other sanctuary but Palestine, became Zionists by force rather than by argument.

Thus the minor settlement gradually increased in importance, and under various influences—though, despite what the religion taught, they were not a nation before, but a religion—a nation was in fact created. Weizmann took the course of trying to reconcile Zionist aspirations with British foreign policy. It is probably true that this was due to his consciousness that the victors agreed to settlement provided that such an Ulster was created. His opponents in the Zionist movement, however, cared nothing for the arrangements he had made. They could not agree that the mandatory power had any real right there anyway, and with the growing national consciousness, it was inevitable that a showdown should come—which

really left Weizmann high and dry from Zionist opinion, an apostle of appeasement, but by virtue of his years he remained the titular head and later became President of the State when it was formed by force of arms.

To do him credit, Weizmann never joined those humbugs who for so long declared, "The Jewish people is not interested in building a State. It only wants a National Home, &c., &c."—the people who more or less denied that the Arabs were to be excluded in any way whatsoever, until finally they were altogether liquidated. On the other hand, he did help to obscure the final aims of Zionist nationalism in his policy of appeasement with the British which involved such soft-soaping of the Arabs prior to the final trial of strength.

Leaving aside the legends about Weizmann, it can still be said he made an enormous difference in Europe. It was due to him that so much energy and intelligence and application was diverted from Europe to the building of the State of Israel. All the enthusiasm that has been given to erecting that State has created one more State like any other, with its own police like any other, its own Army like any other, its own class divisions. It is impossible to say what would have happened had all that remained in Europe. If the private armies formed in

Palestine to fight immigration restrictions and military rule had been recruited in Eastern Europe to fight anti-semitism on the spot for instance, it might well have made the one great check to Hitler's mass murders, as could be seen in the final decision of the Warsaw Ghetto to rise, when it was too late. Moreover, a great difference might have been made in the transformation of Europe had Jewish proletarians not been diverted into Palestine. These considerations, however, are now too late. The terrorism that might have brought Hitler and Stalin to their knees and assisted a libertarian transformation instead has been used in a military victory that has created the State of Israel. Its future lies largely in its military power, and it is not the liberal and pacific Weizmanns who will have any influence on it in the foreseeable future. For the moment the Social Democrats form the Government—due solely to a coalition with the Orthodox Religious bloc in order to form a Parliamentary majority. But the nationalism which has been created will not rest until the Old City of Jerusalem, Arab-occupied Palestine and Transjordan, too, are included in the borders of Israel. This will mean increasing restrictions, austerity, military rule and autocracy, and the days of idyllic "Plant a tree in the Holy Land" Zionism are over. INTERNATIONALIST.

South Africa

Continued from p. 1

Justice I will support them. Those who create disturbances must expect to be severely treated by the police." There have been demands from Europeans for a judicial enquiry into the riots, including one from the Mayor of Kimberley. They have been refused.

Critical Situation

It seems certain therefore that the Malan Government is treating this demonstration of unrest as the occasion for a show-down, and are prepared to go to the limit of repression. Significantly, Dr. Malan praises the British Government's handling of the Kenya troubles. But the results of such a policy are likely to be dangerous in the extreme. It may well produce a conflagration all over South Africa, and thence spread to the whole Continent.

Such a result would, in our opinion, be productive only of tragedy. The tension in South Africa (and also, we may add, in Kenya) is between races, between Africans and Europeans. It is not surprising in view of white political predominance and privilege, but a race war can have little content of social improvement. In view of the numerical disparity between race contestants there can be little doubt that in a real conflagration

the situation of the white population would be critical indeed. The attitude of the European to the African in general merits only contempt and horror: but that does not mean that their political (and unhappily also, perhaps, their physical) extinction would have any compensating good to balance it.

Not a Revolutionary Situation

Such a situation—if it develops—would not constitute a revolutionary one. The social revolution demands aspirations of an idealist character which are not fostered by racial hatred, and which can only be endangered by anger and by blood shed in hatred. Nor does it appear that the actual aspirations of Africans go beyond nationalism of a kind which, in history, has been absolutely unproductive of any revolutionary results or social justice.

It is therefore to be hoped that the present situation will settle down. It will have demonstrated the unfitness of Malan's doctrines to produce any decent outcome. It may have stirred the conscience of Europeans, and so pave the way for the development of just those conceptions of social justice and human dignity, and radical economic change which will make the social revolution possible.

Lessons of the Spanish Revolution - 19

Continued from p. 2

The workers are divided and disunited by jealousies. Piece-work is the very antithesis of mutual aid, on which the collectivisations of the Spanish Revolution were based and which, for instance, distinguish them from the Russian collectives. We have yet another example of this attempt to destroy the spirit of mutual aid in the proposals regarding agricultural collectives.

The U.G.T.-C.N.T. proposals were that the land should be nationalised, "the benefits of which should preferably be made over to the rural collectivities and co-operatives, especially those set up by the C.N.T. and U.G.T. . . . The State should adopt a policy of helping existing collectives, particularly those of the U.G.T. and C.N.T. and the legally constituted voluntary syndicate country workers". The Government will have the task of assisting the peasants in the acquisition of machinery, seeds, etc., and grant credits through the National Bank of Agricultural Credit. Thus control will at all times be in the hands of the central authority, and this can only be achieved perforce at the expense of local initiative.

In passing, it should be noted that the proposals concerning agriculture are in direct contradiction with the spirit of the decisions taken by the peasants' syndicates at their Plenum in Valencia in June, 1937 in which it was agreed to co-ordinate their activities on a National scale not through the intervention of the State but by the workers' own organisms. And that spirit of mutual aid was clearly indicated in Art. 26(e) of their constitution, which reads:

"Though initially Collective and individual enterprises will consider themselves at liberty to deduct their needs from what they produce, it is nevertheless understood that both enterprises declare as their objective an equitable distribution of the produce of the agricultural industry in such a way as to ensure an equal right to all consumers throughout the country, in the widest sense of the word."

The references to workers' control in the C.N.T.-

U.G.T. past are in fact no more than a declaration that the workers' organisations will participate in joint consultation boards in Industry, but that the allocation of raw materials and production and distribution will be under the direction of the government. And it is too obvious to deserve elaboration that without economic control there can be no such thing as workers' control.

Of the C.N.T.-U.G.T. pact, the eminent Socialist leader, Luis Araquistain, said at the time: "Bakunin and Marx would embrace over that document of the C.N.T." to which the Barcelona anarchist weekly, *Tierra y Libertad*, made the following spirited reply, without nevertheless making any specific reference to the pact itself, though one could read into their critical remarks disapproval of the whole document:

"A love for phrases frequently leads to building on the quicksands of grave historical errors. The phrase, 'embrace between Marx and Bakunin', symbolizes a unity of divergent ideas such as neither the present reality nor the expectations of the future can guarantee. It is a phrase, therefore, which, when unqualified, may cause much confusion.

"The 'embrace' in striving for social reconstruction among all of us? Yes. The 'embrace' for those who want a revolution which will emancipate the proletariat? Yes, also. The 'embrace' of fighters against a common enemy, now and later? Yes. Those who follow the ideals of Bakunin and those who follow Marx are united to-day, and should be united to-morrow, to save the Spanish people and their revolution.

"But, those who continue as Anarchists and Marxists, have not obliterated—nor can they—with an 'embrace' the fundamental differences that separate them. Even though the Revolutionary tactic, the direct action of the proletariat itself, unites us, the fundamental dividing line remains. For as long as we, as Anarchists, think that the State cannot be the organ of the revolution, that it should not be tolerated as a political entity which assumes responsibility for emancipating the people; so long as the Marxists, on the other hand, continue to

think that the State has to be made the instrument, either transitory or otherwise, for constructing a free society—complete union will be impossible.

"Marxists and Anarchists may reach an agreement and fulfil it so long as in so doing they do not violate any essential principles. But between dictatorship and freedom; between State centralisation and direct association of the people, there is a great distance that cannot be spanned unless it is recognised by all that freedom is the only basis for real Socialism.

"For the revolutionists whose convictions derive from the lessons of history, there is no sentiment of race or patriotism which can obliterate the fundamental contradictions between the two theories; nor is there possible a synthesis between two historical currents that clash and repel each other. There is unity for specific struggles. There is an 'embrace' for a common revolutionary upheaval. But authority and freedom, the State and Anarchism, dictatorship and the free federation of the peoples, remain irreconcilably antagonistic until such a time as we all will understand that no real union is possible except by the free choice of the people.

"In short, the 'embrace of Bakunin and Marx' would be real only if the Socialists, who according to Marx want eventually to achieve Anarchism, will give up the classical paradox of resorting to a dictatorship of the State for suppressing the State."

The terms of the U.G.T.-C.N.T. pact were never implemented, even though both organisations were offered, and accepted, seats in a reshuffled Negrin government following the dismissal of the Minister of National Defence, Indalecio Prieto, and according to the arguments put forward by the pro-governmentalist syndicalists, should have been in a position to make demands on the government. But these were mere illusions which some them to this day seem unable to shake off.

(To be continued)

V.R.

39 Prieto, who was the enemy of his fellow socialist Caballero, as well as of the anarchists, was dismissed by his erstwhile friend, Negrin, on the ground of his "pessimism" as to the outcome of the war. Prieto, in a speech delivered to the Party some months later (*Coma y porqué salí del Ministerio de Defensa Nacional*, Paris, 1939), declares that it was caused by his refusal to be dictated to by the Communists.

AMERICAN LETTER

EISENHOWER--The Sorcerer's Apprentice

SECOND thoughts on the spastic electoral *entremes* leave one with as much a sense of moral and intellectual destitution as did the first. Perhaps I ought not be ungrateful for little blessings, for if it accomplished nothing else, Bloody Tuesday did terminate the sickening spot radio and television commercials indulged in *ad nauseam* by Eisenhower, Stevenson, lesser party lights and the chimney sweep next door lauding the planetesimal merits of whichever candidature the faceless cabal footing the enormous bills happening to be indorsing at that particular time. The insipid Eisenhower exhortations and *réchauffé* Stevenson pontifications have achieved their well-earned oblivion, leaving air and screen once more to the blandishments of beer baronets and petrol plutocrats.

For every question it deposited, however, Election Day proposed a dozen dozen riddles. The morning after had barely dawned when *post-mortems* and cathedraic explanations began to broadcast from every journal, loudspeaker and manhole; it was a barrage, a cacophony of gloat, charge and re-cremation—anything, anything at all to drown the stubborn pipsqueak trilling from the also-ran Conscience. "And what now?"

By way of explanation the professors for once advanced, the unsophisticated one that the "people wanted a change"—and for once the professors were right. The fact is, though, that behind

the unsophistication of this deduction is the induction, as sophisticated as the deduction is not, that the whole electoral apparatus stands condemned by the events of Tuesday last. One would be hard pressed to recall a successful presidential candidate who committed himself to as little during the campaign ordeal as did Eisenhower (this is admitted by his come-lately idolaters no less than by his early champions), and yet some 33 millions troubled themselves to troop to the polls and sanctify him. If studied nebulosity can geysir such Pactolian springs, where exists there the aspirant so unpragmatic as hereafter to dare broast the gentlest drift?

This is the rotten fruit of one of the rottenest hustings in American history. It was a campaign which betrayed a plethora of venom, a paucity of ideas; the enthronement of mediocrity, the strangulation of talent; the triumph of crocodile heroics, the defeat of reason; and words, words, words sluiced with lies and passions to make a shambles of the high hopes before which some star-gazers fell prostrate last July. This is the backlash of the Eisenhower victory—a victory which Pyrrhus himself might well have disdained.

Change for the sake of change—no discussion, no discrimination, no *alternative*—is this not the portentous overture to the epicedium of every democracy in history? That is the kind of sequacity which bedevils the "ins", fortifies the "outs", and bloats the pocket-books of the autodiagnosticians; but when sequacity countervails the rational, it is time to ask what stripe of faith can such political determinism inspire, and further, why must we continue to perform its rites, all the more since politics admittedly is but a pendulum swaying between two points equally prescribed and limited, and becoming more so? The rationalisations of this dilemma I shall leave to the credal double-tonguers newly ensconced in their Washington see. Four years should be time enough for them to shore up the hustings for another round of sport. It usually is. As for the Democrats, if their counterparts could sweat out two decades of

half rations, surely they will prove themselves no less hardy a caste if circumstances so dictate.

And what now—with Eisenhower, the sorcerers' apprentice, and Republicanism, sequela to slothful, power-ridden Democratism?

The General, a gapingstock even before the conventions, is already paying dear for his whistle, for he had no sooner settled down to a post-election vacation in Georgia than second-rank party vultures were coming home to roost: Republicans, most of them unregenerate Taftites who would relish nothing better than to peck away at the last few shreds of meat left their flensed nominal chieftain, are descending upon the novice to redeem the promises extorted of a bewildered nominee in payment for their vouchsafing him election support. And what a flock of vultures! Even Eisenhower must wince at the sight of it. Patronage-hungry hacks, vengeful knackers, adumbral and reincarnated princelings, ancillary crusaders and Templars that have known better days and knights, hybrid gladiators of budgeted mentality and vision—a camarilla to test the mettle of the canniest of careerists. There will be days galore when Eisenhower, looking less like a general and more like a Republican every week, will hark back upon his relatively halcyon NATO interregnum and with all the nostalgia of the Old Grad returned for Homecoming Day long for its recovery.

Meanwhile, nesting ominously in his Ohio aerie, is Mr. Vulture himself, the wizardly Herr Teufelsdrückh—nesting ominously through the preliminary dissection. With his notoriously cunning timing, he will decide the hour to swoop to pick the bones clean. This Eisenhower must know, but he can only stand and wait—his flanks exposed, his communications cut, his bridges burned behind him. He might will to heed Hesiod's monition to "invite the man that loves thee to a feast, but let alone thine enemy," but unfortunately for

him, if his volitive capacity has been malingering alarmingly since last July, his aetional capacity has long since deserted. Nothing else explains, and certainly nothing else justifies, his cloyingly dogged *naiveté* in presuming to be able to run in double harness with Taft—and in different directions at the same time to boot! Eisenhower must have learned by now that while Taft can be vulture one moment and charger the next, he never can be dove. With the bit locked between his teeth, the senator will continue to gallop *ventre à terre* toward reaction, and if Eisenhower should once make the mistake of giving Taft his head, they will run in double harness all right, but the senator and not the president will be cracking the whip. The galling irony, for some, is that Taft's July defeat has suddenly sprung up a November triumph, and they know that Eisenhower the novice will be unable to cope with many such Phoenixes. Right now Taft has a firmer grip on the executive reins than he could ever have managed as presidential candidate, even a successful one. Until last Tuesday he and the whole Republican stable had to ride Eisenhower's coat-tails; now he will let the General wear the entry's colours while he and his same old stable-boys move in as stewards of the track. Even Eisenhower's campaign manager, taking the hint, has proclaimed the election results a party and not a personal victory. This is false, to be sure, for the party ran well behind Eisenhower nationally (*viz.*, its bare working majority in the congress. Nor, indeed, was there any such thing as a "mandate" for either Eisenhower or the Republicans. Almost 27 million people voted for Stevenson, and approximately 40 million eligibles didn't bother to vote at all. The myth of a "mandate" is deceptive quackery.

The first ordure of business of the new congress will be to throw the old rascals out and entrench the new ones. Save for insignificant personal discommodities, this transmission will be easily effected—one governmental functionary, after all, is not so different from the next as to require anything more than a good dusting of his predecessor's headquarters to make him feel right at home. For Eisenhower, though, there remains some unfinished business before his January investiture—some unfinished business, but not much. Had Stevenson been free to conduct the type of campaign he seemed on occasion to be wistfully wishing he could, Eisenhower might have been compelled to take some controversial positions, but his opponent, a millstoned Discobolus periodically poised to discharge the discus but shackled by his own equally beholden managers, was scarcely threat enough to force the general's hand, let alone that of his ghost-writers.

Nevertheless, Eisenhower did wave a

OH GAWD

In General Eisenhower's view on religion, as given in the press, he says, "What is our battle against Communism if it is not a fight between anti-god and believers in the Almighty? Communists know this. They have to eliminate God from their system. When God comes in, Communism must go."

—*Secular Subjects* (U.S.A.) Nov. '52

"TECHNICALLY SOLDIERS"

ARMY regulations dealing with conscientious objectors are to be questioned by M.P.s following the arrest of a 23-year-old man.

The man is to face an Army court-martial on a charge of being absent without leave. He is said to have been a National Service man from 1949 to 1951.

He was ordered to report for a fortnight's reserve training in June, but is alleged to have failed to attend. He was arrested in London on October 22nd and has since been under close arrest.

A friend, who is a Free Church minister, said that the man has developed a conscientious objection.

"It seems that as a National Service man reservist he is not allowed to register as an objector, or appear before a tribunal, until he has served three months' imprisonment for refusing to report for duty. If he had been a Z reservist he could have appeared before a tribunal."

A War Office spokesman agreed. He said National Service reservists are still technically soldiers, but Z reservists are civilians.

THE VILLAGE THAT WON'T PAY

The three hundred villagers of Edingale, Staffs, refuse to pay a bill of £27 for their parish council election.

In the past they elected councillors by a show of hands at a public meeting. This year they were ordered by Lichfield rural council to hold a ballot.

To meet the bill, which amounts to an eightpenny rate, a parish meeting was called. The hall was filled, but nobody would propose, second or support the resolution.

—*News Chronicle*, 11/11/52.

COMMENT

A German Venture in Mutual Aid

THE call to mutual aid and co-operation manifests itself in strange and unexpected ways: particularly in the times of crisis and social chaos occasioned by the havoc of the war. It seems that the stress of human circumstance evokes all that is best in man—the simple acts of charity and sympathetic understanding which lie dormant, though ever watchful, in the primitive conscience of mankind.

I have said these manifestations are strange and unexpected, I should have added to all excepting those of the anarchist school of thought. Anarchists are ever-conscious of the instinctive capabilities of man, and it is the indomitable faith we have in these latent human qualities that sustains us in our struggle.

If evidence of our contentions should be demanded of us, we need never be at a disadvantage to satisfy our critics. The findings of anthropologists and sociologists alike are decidedly in our favour, and the following recent example of mutual aid lends further support to our claim.

In south-west Germany, the little town of Alfdorf had its own ideas of coping with the problems created by the late war. Hardly had the guns ceased to thunder than its people awoke one morning to find their streets thronged with refugees—dejected, penniless and weary. The little town of 1,300 souls had doubled its population overnight.

Alfdorf had plenty of problems of its own. How, then, could it be expected to cope with this sudden and unwelcomed invasion? The International Red Cross could have been appealed to; Marshall Aid might have lent a hand. But the situation was urgent, and there was no time to indulge in the niceties and formalities of enlisting such help. The problem was not made any easier by the fact that the people of Alfdorf were strictly Lutheran, while the refugees were practically all Catholics from Poland, Hungary, Bessarabia, etc., and had brought their own priest with them.

That the inhabitants were not anarchists hardly needs saying, but it is evident how—as in this case—human instinct reacts in a typically anarchistic way. Even the old *Bürgermeister*, Baron Hans von Holtz, climbed down from his social pedestal and set the first example.

"We will," he said, "share our homes and our larders with these people, and help them in every possible way." He, himself, accommodated six families in his own home; and the people of Alfdorf followed suit, making every possible room for the refugees.

The next problem was how best to absorb these people in useful employment in order that they could maintain themselves. The answer was provided by a young German ex-soldier, Wilhelm Schober, who had spent some time in a Russian prison camp.

He did not appeal to governmental authorities for help, but organised a builders' co-operative, in which the inhabitants of Alfdorf put money, materials and labour. Soon 95 new houses were built and the accommodation problem solved. He next set about to ascertain what particular trades or professions the refugees had been previously engaged in, personally interviewing each refugee. Having sifted and classified the information given him, he next set out to solve the problem of employment.

Soon a small factory was built and equipped for making women's clothing, employing some 40 refugees. In addition an old barn was converted into a factory employing 35 people in making artificial jewellery. Others set four potteries into production making vases, flowerpots and ewers from the local clay. These commodities have earned a reputation in Western Germany for fine craftsmanship. From once being a quiet farming community, to-day Alfdorf buzzes with the machines of industry.

Religious differences were quickly overcome. The Lutherans lent their church to the Catholics for their services, holding their own later in the day; and eventually with the help of Protestant labourers voluntarily working at half-rates, and by charities organised by the people of Alfdorf, the Catholics were able to build their own church.

To-day, Alfdorf is a happy community in which national and religious differences have yielded to the spirit of charity and humane understanding and as Wilhelm Schober and the people of Alfdorf can proudly boast, all this has been accomplished "without a penny of Marshall Aid".

GEORGE NICHOLSON.

coûte-que-coûte campaign. As his own irascibility and ill-concealed incompetence (one was a function of the other) continued to drain off more and more of the vast reservoir of goodwill he had accumulated during the war, Eisenhower was driven by vanity and apprehension to substitute adrenals for the bromides upon which he had first confidently depended to give his party's weary plati-tudinous *chevaux de bataille* the show of life to see him through, until in the frenetic homestretch, and upon the advice of some unsung Republican tout, he pulled the niftiest one of all: he vowed that, if elected, he would go to Korea. With such hocus-pocus, and internal legerdemain, are races won—and lost.

And now, of course, Eisenhower will have to doff his victory cummerbund and fly to that Serbonian bog engulfing whole armies, peoples and dreams. What matters it now that this could be naught but a selfish gesture, a fraud, a half-whew measure? The promise might well have gulled a decisive number of voters—no one will ever know how many mothers, for instance, in prayerful communion with their fears behind the purdah of the voting booth, at the crucial moment yielded to a one-in-a-hundred chance impulse and cast their lot with the hope of their heart instead of with the hope of their mind. What matters it now that already the grim quip is making the rounds that yes, Eisenhower will go to Korea, all right, but he'll probably take the boys with him.

And, according to the grubby rapacious ethics which govern this sort of licensed lust, what matters it now to the politicians that once again the people have been short-changed at the electoral bourse?

SEYMOUR GREENBERG.

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

OPEN AIR MEETINGS

Weather Permitting
HYDE PARK
Every Sunday at 4.30 p.m.
MANETTE STREET
(by Foyle's, Charing Cross Road)
Every Saturday at 6.0 p.m.

INDOOR MEETINGS

The present series of indoor discussion-lectures will continue at the premises of the British Drama League, 9 Fitzroy Square, London, W.1 (off Warren Street, Tottenham Court Road).

The meetings will be held on TUESDAYS at 7.30 p.m.

NOV. 25—Jack Rice on
THE RAILWAYMEN'S MUTUAL AID SOCIETY
DEC. 2—Norman Ingles on
THE NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE

NORTH-EAST LONDON

DISCUSSION MEETINGS
IN EAST HAM
Alternate Wednesdays
at 7.30 p.m.

NOV.—26—Edgar Priddy on
REBELS & REVOLUTIONARIES

LIVERPOOL

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

GLASGOW

INDOOR MEETINGS
at
CENTRAL HALLS, 25 Bath Street
Every Sunday at 7 p.m.
With John Gaffney, Frank Leech,
Jane Strachan, Eddie Shaw,
Frank Carlin
NOV. 16—Geoffrey Ostergaard on
SYNDICALISM

Special Offer to "Freedom" Readers

- ★ NEITHER EAST NOR WEST - 7s. 6d.
- ★ MANKIND IS ONE - 7s. 6d.
- ★ YOUTH FOR FREEDOM - 2s. 0d.
- ★ ANARCHY OR CHAOS - 2s. 6d.

£1 worth of books for 10/- post free
(U.S.A. 2 dols. post free)

These books will be valuable addition to your bookshelves or suitable gifts for your friends.

This special offer is limited to 200 sets, and will in any case not be available after the end of this year.

All orders must be sent direct to:—

FREEDOM PRESS, 27 Red Lion St., London, W.C.1

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