

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"Tyranny is a habit: it may develop and it does develop at last into a disease."

—F. DOSTOEVSKY

SMOULDERING AFRICA

IN Kenya there appears to be no softening of the government's attitude. The curfew extends over the whole of the Kikuyu district. Police patrols are empowered to examine the credentials of any individual. Collective punishment or fines may be inflicted upon a district as a retaliation for individual crimes, and imprisonment pending investigations has already occurred on a large scale.

Now the government has taken yet further powers. The official *Gazette* states that where a district officer believes that the inhabitants of a particular district have failed to make reasonable efforts to prevent a crime or to prevent the escape of guilty persons, or are members of a banned society, he can confiscate their cattle and vehicles and close the shops and markets in the area for 14 days. He can in fact bring economic life to a standstill.

Furthermore, the government may order the confiscated goods to be sold. Power has also been given to remove resident labourers summarily from an area if they are guilty of any action in support of an unlawful society.

One may surmise that "guilty" in this and the preceding paragraph mean are considered guilty by the district officer, and not tried and found guilty by the courts. Such powers—sufficiently offensive in themselves—are clearly open to every kind of abuse.

Penalising the Kikuyu

In all this emergency legislation the government is acting principally against the Kikuyu tribe who number about one-quarter of the population. It is the Kikuyu who most feel the land-hunger which all informed observers declare to be at the root of the troubles in Kenya. The white administration have not only reserved the highlands to themselves, thereby cutting off a possible area for Kikuyu expansion; they have also broken down the old system of land-tenure and of tribal administration. The so-called "chiefs" are appointed by the government and have nothing to do with the original tribal organisation. They and the government are looked upon as breakers up of the old way of life.

The government has also refused all offers from moderate opinion among Africans to help to solve

Miners' Boycott

LIKE their fellow-workers in the Scottish pits, Welsh miners have begun a resistance against the National Coal Board's decision against their demand for an all-round increase of 30/- a week.

In Scotland there was a series of short strikes. In Wales the protests have taken the form of cutting out the Saturday morning shift. This is delaying the usual pre-Christmas increase in production. Of the 151 pits in South Wales, fifty did not work the voluntary overtime shift last Saturday. Among them were 24 where the miners have told the Divisional Coal Board they are boycotting the shift because of the recent rejection of the miners' demand for another 30s. a week.

Among the boycotting pits are nine in the Rhondda and five in the Dulais Valley. In addition to this boycotting of Saturday work some miners are going slow during the week. Normally at this time of the year the saleable production in South Wales is about 500,000 tons. This year it should be more because of increased employment, but last week it was only 450,000.

the present problems. They probably feel that such people will add their weight to the urgent demand for land reform. But the effect of such a refusal is to declare war on the Kikuyu and accept no peace except one based on abject obedience.

There can be no real doubt that the government in Kenya has settled on a policy of rule by force. It seems certain that they feel that white rule is threatened and the issue is therefore one of White versus Black.

South Africa

This issue is even more nakedly the central one in South Africa. The Conference of Municipal Associations has demanded that the government set up concentration camps and this demand has been widely publicised in the Nationalist Press. "All who are known by the authori-

ties to be leaders of the resistance campaign and all agitators who incite non-Europeans to violence," writes *Die Burger*, "should be committed to concentration camps—needless to say, without trial.

It is an irony that there is no lack of such camps in South Africa. They were used by the British in the Boer War and during the last war were used for the Nationalists themselves because of their pro-German sympathies. The Kenya situation shows that the British colonial administration have little to learn from Malan in the way of repression.

General Discontent

That the whole problem of white supremacy in Africa is the basis for widespread discontent is shown by a news report from the Belgian Congo. At Elizabethville, police are said to have arrested "a few score" members of the banned Kitawala sect which is said to spread anti-white feeling.

The most effective spreader of anti-white feeling, however, is white supremacy, white privilege, and brutal methods of white administration.

THE DOCKS HOPES AND FEARS

THE expected decision of the National Dock Labour Board, on what measures it is to take to cope with the present unemployment in the docks, has not yet been announced. The dockers are left "roasting", to use their own term, although "freezing" would probably be a more appropriate word this weather.

This is quite clearly a deliberate tactic on the part of the Board, who, in company with the employers, have not forgotten the massive strikes and the militancy of the Port workers in the immediately post-war years. To put it crudely, they are now "getting their own back" on the workers. Although this is probably very satisfying, however, for Master Stevedores, Dock Board and union officials alike, a far more practical purpose is being served in that the longer they hesitate to take any real measures, the more demoralised will the dockers become—and the more dockers will leave the industry to seek work elsewhere.

The demoralisation of the dockers is easily understood when we see how they have been left in the lurch by the people on whom they had come to rely. Now it would be easy to be clever at this point and say that if they relied on somebody else they deserved to be let down, but that is not very helpful for workers who are really up against it. We can only hope that they will draw the proper lessons from their experiences

and act upon them in the future. For the time being, however, they are bewildered and lost, and by continuing to keep them guessing, the Board hopes to soften them up so that they will accept whatever is decided for them.

Meanwhile, a report in the *South London Press*—a local London paper with a large circulation in dockland—claims that: "Every effort is being made by the National Dock Labour Board to avoid cutting the register of men in the industry and a statement on the plan approved by the Board in consultation with the Minister of Labour, Sir Walter Monckton, is expected in the House of Commons soon.

"Much depends on the employment position in the next few months, and the Board has been trying to obtain from the Government some reliable forecast of how the docks industry will be affected in the New Year.

"But there are now rising hopes of a satisfactory scheme which may for a few months, anyway, tide over the problems, though it is generally realised that if the dock labour scheme is to continue working fully satisfactorily, it will need more than palliatives."

Which sort of thing has been appearing for weeks, and is all annoyingly vague. It has been definitely promised however, that timber ships are due to arrive in January, and the promise of work after Christmas will, of course, cheer many a docker's family. But in case they get too cheerful about it, suitable warnings have been uttered.

Miss Irene Dowling, for example, whose connection with work in the docks is, we fancy, rather slender, recently told Young Conservatives at Deptford, where she is Tory candidate, that South London dockers will have to give up their restrictive practices when the timber arrives.

Miss Dowling has "been told that dockers work in gangs and will not start if one of their number is missing. This is all wrong." Miss Dowling has actually heard something about how those queer people—workers—do the business they

Continued on p. 3

WHAT DOES IT MEAN?

The Commonwealth Conference

ECONOMIC crisis—the words are so familiar to those who have grown up since 1929 that they have little force left. Indeed, they describe the normal, the everyday. The daily press used to couple Sir Stafford Cripps with the term austerity, but those who can remember any budget speech without dire warnings, increased taxes, regrets at cuts in proposed social services must be well advanced in middle age. We have grown up with the tale of woe about being in a serious economic crisis which will require all our self-discipline, self-sacrifice—and, no doubt, self-deception—to tide us over to that economic security, stability or whatnot which is just around the corner, within our grasp if only we will tighten our belts and work hard.

Now FREEDOM has pointed all this out often enough, and has also pointed out how often it has pointed it out. The economic crisis itself, in short, is less important than the fact that it has become the normal and accepted fact of life. Not only have we for nearly a quarter of a century lived under the tyranny of stringent economy; for many years this fact has been plain to many thinking people, including economic advisers and ministries. Yet they seem powerless to alter the general situation.

"Capitalist Wickedness"

Simple people among Socialists are apt to imagine that this situation suits the wicked capitalists who naturally don't care about the poor working man. Such a viewpoint has the advantage of providing a simple solution—get rid of the wicked capitalist and put economy in the hands of good socialists who have the welfare of the working-class at heart, and everything will be all right.

Before 1945, it was often said that the first two Labour Governments didn't have a chance, for the Tories sabotaged everything. When the Labour Government got a clear majority in the 1945 elections suggested that this excuse would no longer operate. But simple believers in socialism have since realised that the Labour leaders are sold secretly to the capitalists (deserters! renegades!); or they have become aghast, with Mr. Bevan, at the malign power of U.S. big business, for surely it is Wall Street which has sabotaged the socialist revolution of the post-war years. Or it

is the struggle against Communism which is more important than any other consideration.

The important thing about this sort of argumentation is that it makes it unnecessary to enquire further. "Our ideas would work—if it were not for Hitler, or war, or Stalin, or America, or Tory sabotage or Labour sell-outs. It really doesn't matter much which reason one chooses, the great thing is not to look too closely into the nature of the economic process itself.

Russia and other Socialisms

In passing, we may remark that neither Russia nor the satellites, nor the breakaway Tito, all of whom operate a rationalised economy claimed to follow the conception of Karl Marx, has succeeded in evading austerity and the same exhortations to hard work and rewards in the future with which we have become so familiar. Nor has economic prosperity been achieved in such dominions as New Zealand and Australia, where Labour has also wielded considerable power.

Markets and All That

Before the last war it used often to be said that Britain, for example, lived by exporting manufactured goods and

DREADFUL PROBLEMS

Speaking at Louth recently, Mr. Cyril Osborne, M.P., said that if Marshal Stalin were to accept an invitation to the Coronation, or if the Korean war were to end, there would be a dreadful fall in commodity prices. Unless we made plans in conjunction with America to deal with the problems that must arise when the fighting ended, there would be the greatest slump the capitalist system had ever known.

"What, for example, is to happen to the stockpiles of strategic raw materials?" asked Mr. Osborne. "Will they be marketed in an orderly way and on a long-term plan? What about the men who will be demobilised? Are plans being made to find them civilians jobs? How long will it take to convert the engineering industry from war to peace production? What is to happen when the rearmament orders fall off?"

—Observer, 26/10/52.

importing cheap agricultural produce. But it was also said that by exporting machinery to "under industrialised" States like those of South America, British capitalists were equipping them for competition in the world's markets for manufactured goods. During the war (as foreseen) this process of industrialisation in the "backward" countries was enormously accelerated, and led to inevitable consequences. Among these has been a fall in demand from such countries for manufactured goods, for the good and readily foreseeable reason that they now manufacture them for themselves with machinery imported from England in the thirties.

But the matter does not end there. Not being able to send manufactures to the now industrialised agricultural countries, Britain has to pay for agricultural imports with cash, and in addition, these agricultural products have themselves become scarcer and therefore more expensive to buy.

But it is not the intention of this article to go over the ground in detail. The facts given above are described with a view to bringing out certain particular aspects. First, the present situation was clearly foreseeable, and was indeed foreseen by many critics of capitalism many years ago. If mere journalists could accurately map out the future of certain economic trends, so presumably could governmental economic advisers the world over. Why, then, did they not take steps to alter the course of economic policy?

The Commonwealth Conference

It is another left-wing illusion to suppose that no effort is made by official economists to deal with these problems. The Commonwealth Conference which opened this week in London has to consider among other things the whole economic future of the sterling area.

Whereas it used to be thought that the British Empire was a sound economic concern, the fact now is that the accumulated debt of the Sterling Area (which is the same thing under a new name) over the past seven years is £2,381 millions. Only during one year (1950) has it ever shown a positive balance. Failure to earn dollars, moreover, is not confined to Britain itself: the dominions no longer sell enough raw materials to

America to earn a dollar surplus.

The Institute of Foreign Affairs attributes this insolvency to the very industrialisation of Colonial areas which we have already referred to. In the last fifteen years, Australia and New Zealand have both increased their industrial capacity by 70 per cent., while agricultural output has only increased by 10 and 25 per cent. respectively. South Africa shows the same figure for industrial increase, but no increase for gold and wool. India's agricultural output seems to have fallen, but her industrial production has increased by 30 per cent.

This process, the industrial revolution, occurred in Britain a century ago. It converted us from a nation living off home food production, to an exporting economy importing two-thirds of our food from abroad. The same thing is now happening to the Empire as a whole.

The effect is summed-up as follows. This process of industrialisation "has helped in three ways, to bring about dollar crises for the Sterling Area. First, it has sucked capital and resources away from the land and the mines—that is, from the chief potential dollar savers and earners. Secondly, it has not only stimulated very heavy buying of capital goods and services from the dollar area; it has also increased the demand of the Dominions for industrial raw materials. This inevitably means either that fewer home-produced raw materials are left over for export, or that more foreign raw materials (many of them costing dollars) have to be imported to feed the new industries."

In a succeeding article, we shall see that the same process afflicts not merely the Sterling Area but also the Russian bloc and, doubtless, the dollar area as well.

ANARCHISM & THE "OPEN SOCIETY"

THE first thing we should say about the objections to anarchism from the "reasonable" point of view which we raised in our last issue is that people are justified in raising them, as a glance at the world's anarchist press will show. But just as we would not seriously discuss Conservatism by examining the views of Sir Waldron Smithers or Socialism by a consideration of Mrs. Bessie Braddock, so we cannot defend anarchism when it is presented as a mere inversion of political dogmatism, or as a substitute for religious faith.

The most important of the criticisms of anarchism is the one about human nature. Anarchists, we are told, believe in "the natural goodness of man" in "perfectability" and so on. In the words of the Spanish novelist, R. J. Sender, they "go on dreaming of a strange state of society in which all men as well as interested as St. Francis of Assisi, bold as Spartacus, and able as Newton and Hegel."

Many anarchists like so many socialists, have based their approach upon this view, consciously or unconsciously—and how sour they are when they get disillusioned! Some, like Dr. Joad, shed their "progressive" ideology and rediscover the idea of Original Sin, and consequently, Christianity. Even Mr. R. H. S. Crossman has decided that:

"The materialist conception of progress was based on assumptions about human behaviour which psychological research has shown to have no basis in reality, and on a theory of democratic politics which has been confuted by the facts of the last thirty years. . . . Judging by the facts, there is far more to be said for the Christian doctrine of original sin than for Rousseau's fantasy of the noble savage, or Marx's vision of the classless society."*

DOES HUMAN NATURE EXIST?

What I think anarchism says is this: Human nature is neither good nor bad, it is capable of anything. Certain forms of social life and environment bring into play those attributes of "human nature" which make for peaceful co-operation and the development and fulfilment of individual personalities. Other environments and social forms bring out just the opposite characteristics and stunt and inhibit the individual. The second of these environments is that based on authority, and the first is that based on the absence of authority, that is to say, on anarchy.

What justification have we for saying this? Merely our own observation of society and that of the people from whom we have learned, and (if one regards social psychology and anthropology as scientific), the observations of social scientists. "The earliest theorists of anarchism, such as William Godwin and Kropotkin, strikingly anticipate the findings of sociology in their estimate of sociology in their estimate of human behaviour and the means of modifying conduct," says Alex Comfort in his book *Authority and Delinquency in the Modern State*, and there are innumerable

* *New Fabian Essays* (Turnstile Press, 15/-).

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

New Books

La Prensa Defence of Freedom 15/-
George Woodcock
Ravens & Prophets 15/-
Walter Greenwood
Love on the Dole 2/-
P. Henderson William Morris 2/-
N. Kreitman (Ed.)
The Dove in Flames 2/-
(An anthology of Anti-War Poetry)
Leonardo da Vinci
Selections from Notebooks 5/-

Reduced Books

David Mitrany
Marx Against the Peasant (25/-) 15/-
Lin Yutang
My Country and my People (10/6) 3/6
Henry Miller
Sundays after the War (10/6) 4/6

Second-hand Books

Upton Sinclair (Ed.)
The Cry for Justice 15/-
Ethel Mannin
Bread and Roses 5/-

Have you had our list of second-hand books? Obtainable from 27 Red Lion Street.

Obtainable from

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

able studies by social scientists which provide evidence which tends to support the anarchist rather than the authoritarian point of view.

When we look at the anarchist attitude to human nature in this light, we see that it is by no means the same thing as the Rousseau doctrine of natural goodness which Prof. Talmon, Dr. Popper and Mr. Berlin justifiably attack.

LIBERTY AND ORDER

We quoted in a previous article the reference in *The Times Literary Supplement* to the discovery that "the optimistic belief of late eighteenth-century philosophy, that liberty favours order, was untrue." This view that liberty favours order is certainly an anarchist view—"Liberty, the mother, not the daughter of order" (Proudhon), "Freedom is the highest form of order" (Reclus). We know of no evidence to show that this is untrue. Certainly when Mr. Churchill says, "Set the people free" he is thinking in terms of the classical economic doctrine known as *laissez faire* which means that the haves should be free to exploit the have-nots, and this is a freedom not leading to order since the have-nots have to create disorder so as to enjoy the freedom of not being exploited. But the enemy of order is the absence of freedom and as Kropotkin said, the cure for the abuse of freedom is more freedom.

MESSIANISM

The answer from our point of view to those objections to anarchism from the point of view of the "open society" which accuse anarchism of a hidden authoritarianism and of "revolutionary Messianism", is given in a recent editorial reply to a correspondent in this paper: "We will use the analogy of the gun in order to explain to him very simply what we mean by the anarchist social revolution. In present-day society, a minority by pointing a gun at the majority is in a position to coerce and exploit that majority for its own benefit. The aim of the anarchists is not to possess that gun but to destroy it. We do not hope to win the struggle in order to impose our desire for a new society on a minority who desire the old. All we want to do is to free ourselves from the physical and mental coercion and exploitation of others. It is true that as a result those who desire the existing society will be deprived of the human material on which their privilege and power was built. By refusing to continue to be exploited by them are we coercing them?"

COMPROMISE & EXCLUSIVENESS

Finally let us consider the objection based upon anarchist rejection of compromises, and the way in which "pre-conceived perfectionist theory blinds the anarchist to facts".

Let us look first at this political exclusiveness as applied to a different 'ism' socialism. George Barrett, a very penetrating anarchist propagandist wrote during the first World War of—

"... that great crowd who remain loyal to their party, and consequently regardless of the truth. If it is necessary to take an example we may always find one near at hand. The Socialist politicians are as good as any. For years their energies have been expended in advocating State control and guardianship in all things. To-day we have Old Age Pensions, Insurance Acts, and Mr. Lloyd George's plans for 'socialisation', as he terms it, i.e., Government control of the munition works, and some prospect of compulsory military service; but though these things work towards the universal State, the average party Socialist quarrels with them all—and why? They are not perfect from his point of view, it may be admitted; but who can deny that they are steps in the direction he has been advocating? Why then does he not hail them with delight? They have not been introduced by his party
Who has not met a variety of this

essentially political attitude among anarchists, who have been unwilling to give credit to reformers who do not share our point of view but who have accomplished steps in the direction we have been advocating? But the real question to ask about compromise is whether it is compromise in our direction. I have no doubt that Mr. Attlee's government was "better" than Mr. Churchill's, or that in the last war the Allies were "better" than the Axis, but this is hardly the point. Mr. Attlee and Mr. Churchill, the Allies and the Axis, or to-day the two dominant powers in the Cold War, have more in common with each other than they have with me. Let us by all means travel on the same road as other people, but not if they are travelling in the opposite direction.

THE MIDDLE WAY

When we put it like this we can see what is wrong with the view of the open society as presented by Mr. William Clark in his broadcast on *The Middle Way in Politics*. He draws all the right conclusions from the studies of Prof.

COMMENT

Speaking and Writing

IN FREEDOM (Nov. 8th, 1952) Philip Sansom discusses the reasons why it is difficult to persuade workers to write. I know full well how qualified he is to speak of the difficulties entailed and the recurrence of the under-inscribed initials in the columns of *The Syndicalist* is one more mute testimony to the powers of persuasion he brings to bear upon the subject.

However, I would suggest the reason "workers refuse to commit themselves on paper" is not so much because of the way such points are seized upon by the State in prosecutions. In any case, these attacks usually fall upon editors rather than contributors and it is most frequent that editors of revolutionary newspapers have faced prosecutions on charges relating to articles they had not even seen before their appearance in print, and occasionally even in relation to articles they did not print. The reason is rather more the difference between what is accepted heckling of a speaker and that attaching to a writer.

The speaker faced with a hostile or only indifferent audience can always answer his heckler, and feel the satisfaction entailed in finally silencing the objection. The advantage is entirely with him, because if the heckler wants to persist in his objections he is finally driven to making a speech himself (which is usually the last thing he intends to do). The old platform technique—"Come up here for five minutes"—is one way of doing the trick; but in any case the impossibility of keeping up a

sustained barrage of objection soon daunts the most persevering heckler, who is at least beyond the "So's your old man" stage. It is impossible for him, as a rule, to trip up the speaker on minor passing errors of argument, for to be able to do so he must think with the same rapidity—in short, be as capable a speaker himself.

How different with writing! The carping criticism one gets for articles from opponents or the lukewarm can never be silenced in so easy a fashion, and the article one dashed off on the typewriter to catch the paper going to press may soon be coldly dissected by many who have no necessity to think with the same rapidity or to measure their wits with yours. The stray expression used daily at work seems different in cold print. (Once having used the expression "Thank Christ", a letter asks pointedly if the writer does, therefore, accept the divinity of Christ after all—as if the upper classes accepted the divinity of Jove when they swear by him.) If you write regularly on one subject which you happen to know something about, you will find that an occasional hostile reader regards you as a fanatic on that subject; if you write regularly on a subject which you consider important, though not necessarily having a specialised knowledge, you will be denounced as a "self-styled expert"; if you write about different subjects, you will be a dilettante, and you can only really escape criticism by not writing at all!

Talmon and Dr. Popper, and rejects idealism and perfectionism, but what does he conclude? That we should attempt by constant change and experiment, a slow process of trial and error to make life happier and more worthwhile for the individual. But how? He says in effect that, having a two-party political system we should, presumably according to taste, vote for the Conservatives so long as they are not too conservative or for the Labour Party so long as they are not too socialist. This assumes, of course, that the way to make life "happier and more worthwhile" is through political action.

STATE & SOCIETY

He is making the mistake which Martin Buber points out is common to most political thinkers from Plato to Bertrand Russell.* This is the confusion between society and the State, "the confusion between the social principle and the political principle even in our time, one hundred years after the rise of scientific sociology. It has long been recognised that all social structures have

* Martin Buber: *Society and the State* (World Review, May, 1951).

Continued on p. 4

I have read in some other journals, articles denouncing the anarchists because "they" preferred this novelist to that—basing it on a book review by a competent enough writer in *FREEDOM*, who might well be right, but I had just not read either of the two novelists in question. Once, on the other hand, an indignant letter in another paper complained bitterly that in an article in *FREEDOM* I had only "spoken for myself", as if there was anything else I could do.

No, so far as the militant worker is concerned, I do not think it is the natural reluctance to writing that is altogether responsible. The reluctance to self-expression based on compulsory sausage-machine education inhibits many from writing or from speaking, but there is another reason for the particular reluctance to writing too, namely that we never know how to squash the heckler, unless he is so rash as to commit himself to a letter to the editor of the same paper as that for which one has written.

However, I do not want to discourage any anarchists who are determined to spread their views by the written word, but then, nothing could. I can only suggest they take heart at the undaunted example of "Internationalist", the brilliance of whose comments on foreign affairs might well silence the most glib critic who had not seen him gazing across from the end of Southend Pier under the impression that he was studying the coast of France.

A.M.

LESSONS OF THE SPANISH REVOLUTION—20

During the last fifteen months of the struggle in Spain the revolutionary and anti-fascist movements were living a lie. With the control of economic life and of the military struggle in the hands of Stalin's agents supported by all the political enemies of the revolution, and with the willing or unwilling connivance of many who called themselves revolutionaries, there could be no other outcome than a victory for Franco and his allies. The military offensives launched by the Negrin government were either ghastly failures or costly adventures in which the advances were quickly turned into retreats. Political and not military considerations dominated all these offensives, so that even the advocates of a single command, military organisation and an iron discipline similar to that of the enemy, were to be bitterly disappointed with the results.

Months before the date, Franco felt confident enough to announce the coming attack on Catalonia. According to Santillan, the F.A.I. had submitted to the government a plan for the defence of Barcelona, which consisted in the building of strong points within a radius of fifty kilometres from Barcelona and to be manned by volunteers. "All we asked for was the necessary authorisation and the material for building the fortifications. All the rest would be carried out on a voluntary basis."* The plan was not acceptable to Negrin. The government had its own plans. The months passed. Franco launched his attack at the end of December, 1938. It met with hardly any resistance, and in a matter of a month Catalonia was in his hands. Barcelona was entered without a shot being fired. Only by recalling July 19, 1936, when the ill-armed workers of Barcelona put down in a matter of hours a carefully prepared military putsch; and May, 1937, when the government attack on the Telephone Building was answered by the immediate "mobilisation" of the Defence Committees of the C.N.T.-F.A.I.—only by recalling those inspired actions can one measure the extent of the demoralisation that existed among the Catalan workers when in January, 1939, Franco's troops marched into Barcelona unopposed. The victory of the forces of counter-revolution was complete. Its architects were already safely over the frontier; the men who had made all the sacrifices were either left behind to await the firing squads and Franco's jails, or were at the beginning of their long odyssey, through inhospitable French concentration camps, where so many died, later in

German slave labour camps. And, with the victory of "democracy" they became spectators at the final humiliation: the recognition of Franco's régime by the Governments of the "free world" connived at by the apathy of the workers of the world, whose cause was so heroically defended by the Spanish workers for nearly three years.

CONCLUSIONS

WE embarked on this brief study of the Spanish Revolution with a feeling of humility, and now in attempting to draw our conclusions we do not propose to assume the rôle of the politico-military strategist whose blue print would have ensured victory. We leave this task to those who have such presumptions. That we have expressed our indignation of those men who in Spain usurped their functions as representatives in order to become the directors of the destinies of their fellow-beings is, we trust, sufficient proof that in our criticisms we do not intend to put ourselves in a position similar to theirs! But what happened in Spain—and in particular the rôle played by those who declared that they were acting in the name of anarchism, libertarian communism and the social revolution, is of profound importance internationally to all who call themselves anarchists and revolutionaries.

But we should first express our point of view that the lessons of the Spanish experience have no bearing on the validity of anarchism as a philosophy of life. Because we live in a world in which everything is measured by the yardstick of its practical possibilities, the tendency is to equate a philosophy of life with, say, a motor car. The argument is roughly along these lines: A motor car will function because mechanically and scientifically we can prove that it will. If we cannot scientifically prove that anarchism will function then it must be discarded in favour of a system that works! Anarchists and libertarians are seeking a form of society in which all men and women will be free; free to live the kind of life in which they will find fulfilment and a sense of purpose. It does not imply either uniformity and conformity or the guarantee of eternal happiness. It is based not on a scientific formula but on our emotions, our feelings for the kind of life that we should like to lead. All that science does for us is to confirm that fundamentally the great majority of

our fellow beings desire and need similar surroundings of freedom in which to develop. If science, on the other hand, indicated the contrary view, it would not destroy the validity of our aspirations. All it would indicate is that the difficulties in the way of attaining the anarchist society would be even greater than they are at present. And this is not an insurmountable obstacle, unless one believes in some kind of slavery to the mind to scientific infallibility. After all, even in the case of the motor car, thought preceded action and science!

The importance, therefore, that a critical study of the Spanish Revolution has for anarchists, is not on the objectives of anarchism but on the means by which it is hoped to achieve them. It raises also the ever-recurring problem of the rôle of anarchists in situations, albeit revolutionary, in which it is clear that the solution cannot be an anarchist one. Since the former, *the means*, is influenced by one's concept of the latter, we propose to examine this problem with special reference to the Spanish situation.

It is generally agreed among the Spanish anarchists (F.A.I.) and Syndicalists (C.N.T.) that the situation created by the militarists' uprising and the workers' reaction to it in the first days could not be successfully resolved by the C.N.T.-F.A.I. and their sympathisers without the collaboration of other elements. (For the sake of interpreting as accurately as possible their point of view, we must add that many militants declare that they had underestimated the extent of the uprising, and because of this, much valuable time was lost. Had the initial successes been followed up, they argue, by organising armed columns immediately, Franco would not have had time to reorganise his forces, and the uprising would have been destroyed before the bulk of Franco's war potential in Morocco could have been put into the field.) It is also the general opinion that had agreement with the U.G.T. (the socialist controlled Trade Union) been reached from the beginning it would have been unnecessary to make any compromises to the politicians. Actually as we have seen there were many difficulties, of a political nature, on both sides which prevented this union of the two organisations and in the circumstances for the leadership of the C.N.T. the problem became one of choosing between the lesser and greater evils: either the victory over Franco through a moderate, popular front government or a victory for Franco with all that this might entail. There can be

Continued on p. 3

* Santillan: *Por que perdimos la Guerra*.

KOREA

THE situation in Kenya and the American Presidential elections have dominated the news for several months to the exclusion—in this country—of the Korean war. In America, of course, the situation in Korea, or, rather the hopes of American people about finishing the war, were prominent in the campaign speeches of both candidates. In England, however, interest in the war has waned, only to be revived by the current discussion at the United Nations of the Indian resolution as a basis of further armistice discussions.

The main assumption of the Indian resolution is that the deadlock over the repatriation of prisoners of war is a real one which must be cleared away before peace proposals can begin. It is wise to be sceptical about this assumption. History does not support the idea that policy is dictated by moral principles, and FREEDOM has already several times before pointed out certain important functions which the Korean war fulfils for both sides.

Nevertheless, diplomacy acts on such assumptions, and even if the prisoner-of-war question does not in fact occupy the position of first importance accorded to it in propaganda, discussion still has to be proceeded with.

The Americans screened the North Korean and Chinese prisoners early this year with a view to determining whether they wanted to return to their country when a high proportion expressed unwillingness to do so and said they feared reprisals or death, the question of whether they could justifiably be repatriated by force arose. The United Nations has taken the view that forced repatriation would be morally indefensible. Such a standpoint utilises to the full the propaganda value of prisoners' unwillingness to return home, and it is of course very damaging to the Communist governments.

When, however, the Chinese and North Koreans took a stand on this point—as from a face-saving point of view, they were bound to do—there were many realists who saw the disadvantages of such a stand. Discussion of this moral issue was reported in FREEDOM last summer.

The Communists, of course, also claim that the American screening of prisoners was biased and its results untrustworthy. The new Indian proposals concentrate on this point and provide for a re-screening by delegates from two Communist and two non-Communist States and a neutral umpire.

Such a "fair" proposal has been seized on by western propagandists as "a test of the Communists' sincerity" in their professed desire for peace. It is almost certain that many prisoners are unwilling to return to Communist régimes—the Soviet bloc has always had to guard its exit doors. Hence, the Communists will always denounce any attempt to "co-operate". Furthermore, such a commission would depend for its "neutrality" on the umpire, and tremendous political juggling would ensue over this appointment. The practical nature of the Indian proposals may therefore be doubted. As propaganda they clearly serve the west.

The split between America and Britain is almost certainly also a mere propaganda move. The British want to appear practical, the Americans as defenders of principle.

Let us reiterate our own attitude.

Every man, whether a prisoner or not, should have the right to go where he likes and live where he likes. (Neither the American nor the British immigration authorities accept this principle, be it remarked, in passing.) There is no doubt of the essential morality of the stand the United Nations have taken on repatriation—though, we repeat, there must be considerable reserve in accepting their motives at their face value.

As to ending the war, resolutions will not do this. If the war is useful to both sides they will continue if necessary finding new difficulties when old ones are solved. This seems to be the fate of the present Indian resolution since Vyshinsky, on behalf of Russia, has rejected it outright.

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 SANSOM :
Syndicalism—The Workers' Next Step 1s.

ERRICO MALATESTA :
Anarchy. 6d.
Vote—What For? 1d.

M. BAKUNIN :
Marxism, Freedom and the State. paper 2s. 6d., cloth 5s.

HERBERT READ :
Art and the Evolution of Man. 4s.
Existentialism, Marxism and Anarchism. 3s. 6d.
Poetry and Anarchism. cloth 5s., paper 2s. 6d.

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

RUDOLF ROCKER :
Nationalism and Culture. cloth 21s.

ALEX COMFORT :
Delinquency 6d.
Barbarism & Sexual Freedom. 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.

Co-operators Bring "Reynolds" Back In Line

FOR a long time now, *Reynold's News*, the Sunday paper of the Co-operative movement, has been pursuing a policy of "popularisation". This has meant in effect a continuous series of serials of the "Forever Amber" type, and regular articles on "Famous Crimes" or the memoirs of some retired police chief. All of which has about as much connection with the Co-operative movement and the brand of "socialism" which it professes as Churchill has with the "freedom" he professes.

But in its fight for circulation, *Reynold's News* thought that its best chance lay in competing with the Tory popular press on its own terms. With the result that you could hardly tell *Reynold's* from the *Sunday Dispatch*.

How many serious readers of what claims to be the only Socialist Sunday newspaper were lost by this policy, it is difficult to say, but a resolution at the conference of the London Co-operative Party last Sunday, attacking the paper's present policy, was carried by a large majority.

The resolution expressed concern at the amount of space devoted by *Reynold's* to reports and articles on crime

and vice, and urged that "more space be devoted to Co-operative, political and trade union issues, and that a vigorous Socialist and Co-operative policy be pursued along the lines advocated in the editorial columns".

In opposition to the motion, it was claimed that if *Reynold's* were to print only items of Co-operative and Labour interests, its circulation would soon be only 70,000—the circulation of the *Co-operative News*.

But what, one may ask, is the purpose of forcing up your circulation if you do it at the expense of the ideas you want to get across? No one reading *Reynold's News* last week could have had a clear idea of what it really stood for. That, of course, applies equally to the whole of the Co-operative and Labour movements, who, in fighting for members, have forgotten what they wanted the membership for in the first place. Now, the Labour Party has to have its members and *Reynold's News* has to have its circulation merely in order to keep going. Like capitalism itself they have to continue to expand, for to stand still or, worse still, to decrease in numbers means a diminution of power and even-

tual extinction. So it must be numbers, numbers, numbers at no matter what cost.

Perhaps *Reynold's* has pushed up its circulation, but who is reading its sensational and near-pornographic tripe? Is it better to have a readership of a million frustrated neurotics, seeking second-hand thrills from the adventures of a Southern Belle of 1880, or 70,000 responsible individuals seriously concerned with the real problems of the day? Of which sex is certainly one, but which is not used in a serious manner in this "Socialist" Sunday paper.

We are reminded of when the *Daily Worker* began its circulation drive—with racing tips! And how many of its readers to this day buy the paper of the Communist Party only because its tipster can spot an occasional winner?

We congratulate the London Co-operative Party on having passed its resolution. We commiserate with those of its present readers who will miss their ration of sensationalism, and look forward with more than a little interest to the emergence of a "vigorous Socialist and Co-operative policy"—whatever that may be.

HOPES & FEARS

Continued from p. 1

are best fitted for—work. And because for respectable people the word "gang" has unpleasant, if not criminal, connections, it is obviously all wrong for workers to operate in this way. The fact that working in gangs is the only possible functional way of doing the work of loading and unloading ships—and that it is dangerous to work under-manned at this kind of work, does not seem to occur to the good lady.

Did I say dangerous? Well, on Merseyside alone 2,000 workers are given first aid attention every week, and that does not include hospital cases and fatal accidents. In London the figure is proportionately higher. Now timber can be very tricky stuff to handle. A stand of timber has to be roped just right, or when the crane lifts it, to swing it out of the hold on to the wharf, it may tilt and come sliding out of the sling—and woe betide any dockers underneath. Perhaps Miss Dowling's imagination cannot stretch so far as to imagine what it is like to have half a ton of timber clattering about her ears. But dockers don't need imagination—it can be a reality, with disastrous results.

The situation being what it is in the docks, we can expect a lot of good advice from all sorts of likely and unlikely quarters. The real tragedy, in our opinion, however, is that the dockers are completely unprepared to put up any sort of fight at all.

In London, as we stated last week, the unofficial Portworkers' Committee, which grew up during the strikes of 1947-8-9,

has fallen into the hands of the Stalinists. Its paper, *The Portworkers' News*, is a sort of junior *Daily Worker*, efficiently produced and very obviously financed by the Party.

For some time, the Secretary of the PWC has been a member of the ILP, although the best known and most influential members of the Committee have been CP members, who co-opted themselves on to the Committee at the time of the Old Bailey trial last year. The Secretary, several times over the past year has attempted to call a committee meeting, but has been unable to get a quorum. A fortnight ago, the Stalinist members of the Committee called a *mass public meeting* at Canning Town Public Hall—without consulting the Secretary who only heard about it through the general word-of-mouth advertising by which activities get known in dockland! He was in the body of the Hall, and heard the Committee of which he was supposed to be Secretary putting forward a policy which had never been discussed!

The speakers were, of course, the Communist members of the Committee.—(Although one well-known member was absent. He is at present serving a four-year prison sentence for biting off the ear of a fellow-worker with whom he was having an argument on a bus!)

The Communists are—now—coming out with attacks on permanency. They have for long kept silent on this issue for the simple reason that, whenever possible, their own members were taking

permanent jobs themselves. It was the only way they could make sure of keeping their members at work in the docks. Now, however, that feeling is rising among the pool-men, so long unemployed, against the "perms", the CP are seeing that it would be a more popular line to attack permanency.

Here, then is the dockers' weakness. Their official leadership has long since ceased to represent them. Their unofficial Portworkers' Committee has now passed into the hands of another bunch of renegades. Their economic position, with so little work to do, is very weak and they have no organisation through which to strengthen it.

A bitter situation. And not one, to be honest, for which there is any easy solution. A long and patient struggle to build up again an organisation through which they can fight, lies ahead of the port-workers. If they learn from their experiences with politically-minded leadership, they will turn to a form of organisation which resolutely sets itself against both politics and leadership.

The corruption of craft unionism and the intrigues of the Communists leave the dockers—as all workers—with only one alternative—Syndicalism. Only with an organisation based at the point of production and owing allegiance to nothing outside of the workers themselves will really operate in their interests and bring in the final solution which will lift them out of the power of bosses and politicians alike—the solution of Workers' Control.

P.S.

Lessons of the Spanish Revolution—20

Continued from p. 2

no doubt that their minds had been made up in the first days of the struggle when the revolutionary action of the workers, such as the expropriation and reorganisation of the essential public services under workers' control was in its early stages. As a result, far from ensuring that the Revolution should be as far-reaching as the workers were able to lead it, their decision to recognise the State and the authority of democratic government created confusion in the workers' ranks, and instead of destroying every bourgeois institution through the creation of revolutionary organisms, they found themselves occupying posts in those very institutions which all their experience had taught them should be destroyed as the first step in any thorough-going revolution! As one observer rightly pointed out in the early months of the struggle, "An old rule about revolutions was once more confirmed; a revolution must either be carried through to the end, or had better not start at all" (Borkenau: *The Spanish Cockpit*).

Having decided against an attempt to destroy the bourgeois State, single-handed if necessary, the C.N.T.-F.A.I. accepted the lesser evil; that anything was preferable to Franco, that every compromise should be made in the name of unity and for victory over Franco, justifying this position on the grounds that defeat by Franco meant also the defeat of the revolutionary gains made by the workers.

⁴⁰ A phrase used by Durruti, the anarchist guerilla leader who was killed in Madrid in November, 1936: *Renunciamos a todo menos a la victoria* (Let us give up everything except victory) was extensively and, in our opinion dishonestly, used by the collaborationists in the C.N.T.-F.A.I. as an indication that even the great Durruti was in favour of abandoning the revolutionary objectives of the anarchists in favour of a victory at all costs over Franco. We have nowhere seen in Spanish sources the text of an interview Durruti gave to a journalist, Pierre Van Paasen, and published in the *Toronto Star* in September, 1936. In it Durruti clearly and uncompromisingly indicates what the rôle of the anarchists should be, refusing to be diverted from his principles by considerations of expediency.

On the other hand, the Governments of Barcelona and Madrid (the latter it should be remembered, only after attempts at a compromise with Franco had failed) also realised that they could not win the war against Franco without the support of the C.N.T.-F.A.I. and in

"For it is a question of crushing fascism once and for all. Yes, and in spite of government."

"No government in the world fights fascism to the death. When the bourgeoisie sees power slipping from its grasp, it has recourse to fascism to maintain itself. The liberal government of Spain could have rendered the fascist elements powerless long ago. Instead it temporised and compromised and dallied. Even now at this moment, there are men in this government who want to go easy with the rebels. You can never tell, you know—he laughed—the present government might yet need these rebellious forces to crush the workers' movement."

"We know what we want. To us it means nothing that there is a Soviet Union somewhere in the world, for the sake of whose peace and tranquillity the workers of Germany and China were sacrificed to fascist barbarism by Stalin. We want the revolution here in Spain, right now, not maybe after the next European war. We are giving Hitler and Mussolini far more worry to-day with our revolution than the whole Red Army of Russia. We are setting an example to the German and Italian working-class how to deal with fascism."

"I do not expect any help for a libertarian revolution from any government in the world. Maybe the conflicting interests in the various imperialisms might have some influence in our struggle. That is quite possible. Franco is doing his best to drag Europe into the conflict. He will not hesitate to pitch Germany against us. But we expect no help, not even from our government in the last analysis."

"You will be sitting on top of a pile of ruins if you are victorious," said Van Paasen.

Durruti answered: "We have always lived in slums and holes in the wall. We will know how to accommodate ourselves for a time. For you must not forget, we can also build. It is we who built these palaces and cities here in Spain and in America and everywhere. We, the workers can build others to take their place. And better ones. We are not in the least afraid of place. We are going to inherit the earth. There is not the slightest doubt about that. The bourgeoisie might blast and ruin its own world before it leaves the stage of history. We carry a new world, here in our hearts. That world is growing this minute." (As quoted in *Revolution and Counter Revolution in Spain* by Felix Morrow, New York, 1938.)

a desperate effort to stave off defeat were prepared to make considerable concessions to the revolutionary workers, which they would obviously withdraw once they felt that the immediate danger of Franco had passed and the shattered apparatus of government was again strong enough to impose obedience.

The questions that a revolutionary organisation in such a situation must ask itself are: (1) how best can the common cause (i.e., the struggle against Franco) be prosecuted; (2) what measures must be taken to extend and consolidate the social revolution; and (3) to prevent the government from building up its power which it would eventually use to further the counter-revolution.

The C.N.T.-F.A.I. sought to answer these questions by participation in the governments and in all the governmental institutions. Their arguments can, we believe, be summarised as follows: (1) that the central government would be the rallying point for all the "anti-fascist" sectors; that it could organise a popular army with a unified command; that it controlled the finances and was therefore in a position to buy arms and raw materials needed for waging the struggle; (2) that by having representatives of the C.N.T. in the government it would be possible to legalise the revolutionary gains and influence the other ministers in the direction of further "revolutionary" legislation; (3) that only by being in the government could the interests of the workers be safeguarded, and any attempts to undermine the revolution prevented by the intervention of the C.N.T. ministers in that government.

Such a position is not one peculiar to Spanish syndicalism or Spanish anarchism, nor is it even the result of the exceptional circumstances of the Spanish situation in 1936. We can therefore examine this problem as a general one facing all revolutionaries, and not specifically the Spanish movement.

(To be continued)

V.R.

ROUND THE MEETINGS

THE leading article in last week's FREEDOM referring to the tension in South Africa, rightly points out that a "race war can have little content of social improvement" and the writer goes on to say that if it comes to a showdown in South Africa the white population would be severely outnumbered but that their physical and political extinction would not (necessarily) constitute a revolution. But rightly or wrongly our sympathies are with the Africans whose demonstrations against years of suppression by the white population epitomises the growing resistance of coloured people in other countries.

PASSIVE RESISTANCE CAMPAIGN IN SOUTH AFRICA

ON the subject of *Passive Resistance in South Africa*, the London Anarchist Group had a speaker from *Contemporary Issues* at one of our Tuesday night meetings. He was of the opinion firstly, that since evidence received from South Africa pointed to the fact that the movement was organised from above, led by the Communists and had no real backing from the "masses", it should therefore not be supported. Secondly, that there were much more important economic issues to be faced than mere violation of the many discriminatory laws, which is the basis of the passive resistance movement. On being questioned whether there was another leadership in South Africa supporting the Africans in their economic struggles (which takes the form of protesting against cattle culling), the speaker had to admit that the Unity Party in South Africa which he supports was in the forefront, the difference being that this particular struggle was an expression of the rank and file. Which left some of

us wondering, perhaps unkindly, but justifiably considering the speaker's arguments, whether it was not just a case of "sour grapes".

THE PROBLEMS IN KENYA

A SIMILAR situation exists in Kenya, but as in South Africa the immediate problem facing the Africans is not of social revolution (although this would undoubtedly be the answer) but how to alleviate hunger, ill-health and lack of housing now. Until these problems have been dealt with we must expect hungry and frustrated people to react violently against those who are largely responsible.

Fenner Brockway, in a brief summary of his ten-day visit to Kenya told an audience at the All Nations Social Club that the so-called Mau Mau was an "organisation of despair turned to violence because of intolerable conditions".

The first grievance that needs examination is land hunger. Thousands of Africans are forced to leave the Kikuyu reserve because the land has long since been unable to support an increasing population. There is no unoccupied land in the native reserve, but in the white highlands large areas of land remained uncultivated while the Africans are prevented from getting access to them.

Those Africans who cannot get a living from the soil are to be found in the streets of Nairobi, over 10,000 of them completely homeless. And those who have been fortunate enough to get some sort of home are living five, seven and ten people in one room.

Wages are totally inadequate, and the report quoted by Brockway comes from

the Labour Department of the Kenya Government. 17,000 Africans in public service are living on less than £24 per year, and over 28,000 in private industry are receiving much less than that. Weigh against this the fact that the medical department has issued a report stating that to enable a single man to live at a reasonable level he needs 60/- per month, and one can only wonder why Africans have tolerated these conditions so long.

On the question of violence which has given the Government the excuse that it needed to cover up the real issues, it is revealing to learn that the first acts of violence committed against Europeans took place after the emergency laws were

introduced, and until then the natives who were attacked were those who were known to be "paid servants" of the Kenya Government.

We have no quarrel with the course of action outlined by Brockway as a means of beginning to create better conditions for the Africans. These are, the elimination of the colour bar, minimum wages raised, the price of posho reduced (by subsidy if necessary) and education extended. But we have real doubts as to whether any Government Department is capable, or even desirous of grappling with these problems. In the long run they must be the work of the Africans themselves.

We can at the same time understand the fear of one Kikuyu who is worried because a demand for the very means of life should be turned into a party political issue. We rather think that if the needs of the Africans are left to politicians, the political interest will be served first. This is not intended to be a reflection on Fenner Brockway who as an individual has in the past shown his sincerity when it comes to supporting the suppressed peoples. But can he do anything about the political machine?

BEVAN HOLDS THE STAGE

WE are unconvinced but certainly not bored by the oratory from the platform of the Prince's Theatre (temporarily vacated by Maurice Chevalier) when the Editorial Board of *Tribune* appealed to a packed and enthusiastic audience for increased support for their paper. After we got over the first embarrassment at being addressed as "Comrades", we settled down for an hour's entertainment.

Special Appeal

November 1st to 21st:

London: M.S. 1/-; Glasgow: A.McD.* 4/-; London: F.E.D.* 5/-; Anon* 2/6; London: L.G.W.* 5/-; Mitcham: F.H. 6/6; Denver: R.B.* 14/-; Luton: J.A.L. 3/-; London: Anon* 5/6; Glasgow: T.O.M.* 10/-; Manchester: T.D. 2/-; Cambridge: R.H.S. 4/6; London: W.E.C. 2/6; London: F.B.H. 3/-; London: D.M. 10/-; London: Anon* 4/-; Richmond: E. C.J. 3/-; Anon* 2/6; London: S.E. 1/6; Los Angeles: part proceeds ramble Oct. 19, per Noi, £12/5/0.

Total	16	14	6
Previously acknowledged	468	1	1
1952 TOTAL TO DATE	£484	15	7

GIFTS OF BOOKS: Stroud: M.K.: London: C.W.

* Readers who have undertaken to send regular monthly contributions.

Birth Control In China and Russia

The following reports are taken from the current bulletin of the *International Planned Parenthood Committee* (New York and London). The accounts from China and Russia confirm previous reports in FREEDOM regarding the hostility of Communist governments to birth control. They also confirm the similarity in outlook between Communist and Catholic on this point.

At the same time, the British questioner of Dr. Chochol partook in some degree of the same hostility by implying that overcrowding "as well as medical reasons" justified birth control. It cannot be too often urged that birth control is necessary as a means of freeing women from the fear of pregnancy, permitting them to choose, and so allow of the development of sexual happiness and fulfilment. Communists, Catholics, and western moralists, are all alike appalled at this.

CHINA

"MOST Chinese are not willing to co-operate in methods of family spacing. The women often use a simple, home-made method of birth control, but this frequently fails." So reports Dr. Norah Tregear, a British doctor, who has worked from 1946 to 1951 in Wuchang, Hupeh, Central China, giving family planning advice to patients needing it. According to her, western appliances are obtainable in the large towns in China, but most of the people do not know the efficient use of them. Illegal abortion was rife in China and was the alternative to the bearing of children which the family could not afford to feed. "In such cases many starving and even moribund children were left at the doors of Roman Catholic institutions, which never refused to receive such children, and would feed and clothe them. Many of these babies were beyond medical aid and account for the terrible child mortality in Roman Catholic institutions in China, which have led to charges of child murder by the Communists." The Communist Government was making a strong drive to end illegal abortion as a commercial racket, and Dr. Tregear entirely supported them in this.

Family Break-up

"In the projects to industrialise China, women are being recruited as industrial workers, and maternal welfare schemes, including antenatal care, children's creches and homes, have been drawn up. Women's Army Corps, attached to the men's Army Corps, have been created. Women are well-treated, being given adequate holiday before and after child-

birth. There seems to be very little promiscuity in the Army Corps, even though many families have been broken up in the successive wars, and it is common for a woman to be unable to trace the whereabouts of her children." Dr. Tregear thinks the attitude of the Communist authorities was unfavourable to birth control. This may have been due to a desire to increase the population to meet the demands of industrialisation and the army, and may not be permanent. Dr. Tregear left China in the spring of 1951.

There are no reliable statistics about China, but it is calculated that the population of China proper is between 350 and 400 million, or more than one-sixth of the human race, with a birthrate of over 40 per thousand and a deathrate between 30 and 40 per thousand.

Changes for Women

It is generally agreed that one factor for high fertility in civilisations such as the Chinese is the lack of any value or significance attached to women except as bearers of sons. The present Chinese Government's probable opposition to birth control is unlikely to have much influence on the rate of population growth as there is no evidence that effective birth control has ever been practised to any purpose among China's millions. But their programme of industrialisation and their efforts to integrate their women citizens into all forms of social organisation, even including the Army, may work a little against the rise in the net reproduction rate which they seem to desire. Hitherto, the average age of marriage in China was probably eighteen, unmarried women were almost unknown, the family unit was the one stable reality in Chinese life, outside it there was very little point in a woman's existence. High fertility was tragically counterbalanced by a high deathrate.

In thinking of China it should be remembered that if the birthrate of a population between 350 and 400 millions remains stable, fractional variations in the deathrate can have enormous consequences. A rate of population growth as slow as one-half of one per cent. would result in 20 million more people in ten years, 65 million more in 30 years.

NO BIRTH CONTROL CLINICS IN U.S.S.R

Soviet population: 207,000,000.

FOUR Soviet doctors visited London last April. Professor Chochol, professor of pediatrics at Kiev, said that there were no birth control clinics in the U.S.S.R. Only when pregnancy was contra-indicated for medical reasons was contraceptive advice given; it being the policy to increase the population. When asked whether non-medical con-

ditions, such as over-crowding, might not be sufficient reason for contraceptive advice, she said that in Russia they preferred to tackle the problem from the other end—by providing the houses.

Mr. Georgi Arkadyev, a Russian delegate, speaking of the Secretary-General's report to the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, said, "The Report clearly depicts the misery and lack of social progress in certain regions and the total inability of underdeveloped countries to ensure their people's adequate primary education or the most elementary medical care. But it wrongly adduces over-population as the reason for the critical situation, following a tendency which reflects the neo-Malthusian theories in favour in the United States and Western Europe. The only purpose of such theories is to divert attention from the real cause of the deplorable social situation in the capitalist world. It is by such theories that American, English and French monopolists seek to justify the catastrophic

The "Open Society" Continued from p. 2

a certain measure of power, authority and dominion, without which they could not exist; in none of the non-political structures, however, is this the essential element. But it is inherent in all social structures that men either find themselves already linked with one another in an association based on a common need or a common interest, or that they band themselves together for such a purpose, whether in an existing or a newly-formed society. The primary element must not be superseded by the secondary element—association by subordination, fellowship by dominion or, schematically speaking, the horizontal structure by the vertical. The American scientist, Maciver, has rightly said that "to identify the social with the political is to be guilty of the grossest of all confusions, which completely bars any understanding of either society or the state".

ANARCHISM

The anarchist view is that society and the state are, in essence, mutually hostile; that the state is a means of dominance over society. The "good" state, i.e., the "welfare state" is the usurpation by the state (whose function is authority) of the function of society (welfare). Thus, in our view, the "open society" is not any form of state but a society without a state. This is how the open society is defined by Kropotkin:

"... Society conceived without government—harmony in such a society being obtained, not by submission to law, or by obedience to any authority, but by

situation in Asia, Africa and the Middle and Far East."

Despite lack of official vital statistics demographers believe that the rate of growth of the Soviet population has in recent years declined sharply.

VATICAN VIEWPOINT

THE possible over-crowding of the world received serious attention in a report prepared by the Reverend A. Perego of *Civiltà Cattolica*, a Jesuit journal published in Rome. The staff of *Civiltà Cattolica* often makes detailed studies of subjects of current interest and serves as a research body for the Pope. Father Perego agreed that such alarmed students of the population situation as William Vogt and Frederick Osborn had much telling material on their side but turns to more hopeful signs such as the growth in Japan of as many as forty-five tons of tomatoes on a single acre. He concludes finally, that with science's aid enough food can be found for the admitted flood tide of new people until that time when "reason and revelation both tell us human history will reach its last day."

free agreement concluded between the various groups; territorial and professional, freely constituted for the sake of production and consumption, as also for the satisfaction of the infinite variety of needs and aspirations of a civilised being.

"In a society developed on these lines, the voluntary associations which already now begin to cover all the fields of human activity would take a still greater extension... They would represent an interwoven network, composed of an infinite variety of groups and federations of all sizes and degrees, local, regional, national and international—temporary or more or less permanent—for all possible purposes: production, consumption and exchange, communications, sanitary arrangements, education, mutual protection, defence of the territory, and so on; and on the other side, for the satisfaction of and ever-increasing number of scientific, artistic, literary and social needs.

"Moreover, such a society would represent nothing immutable. On the contrary—as is seen in organic life at large—harmony would (it is contended) result from an ever-changing adjustment and readjustment of equilibrium between the multitudes of forces and influences, and this adjustment would be the easier to obtain as none of the forces would enjoy a special protection from the State."

The conclusion to be drawn from the inquiries of the political thinkers into what went wrong with the philosophies which have landed us in a state of permanent war and decreasing freedom, lead I think along these lines rather than in the direction of "the middle way in politics". C.W.

We passed from the gentle socialist Mallalieu to Michael Foot, who left politics alone and delighted us with an attack on the press, and a rousing speech in defence of freedom of the press. From Jenny Lee we passed to the great man himself. He promised us public ownership (nationalisation), but hinted that a lot of unpleasant things would have to be said and strong things have to be done, which sounded very familiar to us, as did the promise of sacrifices and hard work à la comrade Churchill. The anarchists present rocked when in real political lingo Nye unblushingly told us that, unlike McMillan who had only built 230,000 houses, he (Bevan) had built 274,000. Is it necessary to add that neither of them have ever laid a brick in their lives?

SOCIALISM or CAPITALISM (or both)?

THE crowning event of the week was a debate between the Socialist Party of Great Britain and George Schwartz, economic correspondent of the *Sunday Times*, on "Socialism or Capitalism". We arrived a few minutes late by which time the capitalist had commenced his babblings* which were so incoherent that it took some time before we realised to which group he belonged. The other speaker devoted all his time to attacking capitalism, a feat that any child could have accomplished, considering the mental equipment of his opponent. In spite of petulant demands from Schwartz to hear something about "their system", socialism, the socialist seemed reluctant to discuss it, but referred him to a copy of the aims and principles of the S.P.G.B. lying on the table before him.

They were agreed on one thing in the end, however, that capitalism had done some good, and for those of you who think this is an odd statement for a socialist to make, you are referred to the "Communist Manifesto." R.M.

*Example: "There must be something fine about a country that can produce such a fine system as Public Assistance."

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.

DEC. 2—Norman Ingles on
THE NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE

NORTH-EAST LONDON DISCUSSION MEETINGS IN EAST HAM

Alternate Wednesdays
at 7.30 p.m.

DEC. 10—E. Murray Edghill on
ANARCHISM—THE YEAR'S WORK

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

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