

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

Vol. 14, No. 16

April 18th, 1953.

Threepence

AFRICA & KENYATTA

THE enormously long-drawn-out trial of Jomo Kenyatta and other leaders of the Kenya African Union—it lasted 58 days—has come to an end with a verdict of guilty and the maximum sentence for all the accused. As an anti-climax the specially appointed magistrate has escaped—the press make it clear that the word is not misplaced—to England. Prison for Kenyatta, exile for Thacker.

African Comment

No attempt has been made to conceal the bitterness with which the verdict has been received among the African population of South Africa. "This effect is not improved" wrote the *Observer's* Johannesburg correspondent, "by obvious European elation." The secretary of the South African National Congress, Walter Sisulu went so far as to declare "Kenyatta is no racist. We Africans resent Britain's method of suppressing the people by force of arms instead of negotiating with their leaders. This method makes the entire African people bitter against the British government. We regard Mau Mau as a legitimate organization of the Kenya Africans."

The italicised comment above illustrates the situation as it appears to militant Africans. People in England may be horrified by Mau Mau outrages (FREEDOM has denounced their terroristic methods unequivocally) but for Africans it is war against the government of the settlers. (FREEDOM has unequivocally denounced governmental violence in Africa also). And, leaving anarchists and pacifists aside for the moment, the majority of people believe that war justifies all sorts of horrible methods. Clearly for many Africans Mau Mau violence is simply a reply to governmental violence, and they would say that the Europeans started the violence as well. From the point of view of African nationalism, moralising over Mau Mau is hardly more than hypocrisy, and Kenyatta is bound to be regarded as a martyr to Imperialism.

Indian opinion in South Africa obviously shares this point of view,

MORE LIGHT ON POLICE METHODS

THE following extract is taken from a review in the *British Medical Journal* of a recent book on the so-called "Lie Detector". No comment is required.

"This book, written by an American police detective, shows again how the spirit of man can be attacked by mechanistic approaches. The lie detector depends on the fact that alterations of blood pressure, respiration, and pulse rate are greater in most normal persons when questions involving personal guilt are put to them. Psychiatrists and psychologists know there are many exceptions to this generalization: one false positive response quoted in this book was due to a suspect under examination seeing a girl start to undress and sunbathe through the police station window. And the author realizes that such tests alone would hardly stand up to critical examination in a Court of law, although important information can be obtained.

"The purpose of these methods becomes clearer, however, when it is frankly admitted that their real value in the hands of the American police who use them is to enable more confessions to be extracted from frightened and guilty people. If a suspect can only be convinced of the supposed infallibility of the test he can be more easily broken down. In 80% of cases giving positive results confessions were, in fact, extracted afterwards, and a description is given of how these confessions are best obtained from the victims. Even if the test is negative, the police may sometimes pretend it is positive in order to get a confession."

for Yusuf Chachalia, the secretary of the South African Indian Congress wrote that "seemingly the judgment is political and comes from a despotic administration." Even Manilal Gandhi's paper, said to represent the right wing of non-white opinion, regards the outcome of the Kenyatta trial as a political issue of the first magnitude.

If nationalism triumphs in Kenya as in India and West Africa, the trial will have set Kenyatta securely on the road trodden by Nehru and Nkrumah—the road that ends in the premiership.

The Trial

Very little of the evidence of the trial has been published over here and so it is difficult to form a judgment on whether Kenyatta's connexion with Mau Mau was effectively proved. One is not however reassured by the magistrate's declaration that he "unhesitatingly believed" the evidence of a prosecution witness, "while he disbelieved the evidence of 10 defence witnesses which had been evasive and untruthful." Or later when he accepted one prosecution witness against eight for the defence. (It does not seem that the defence simple packed in witnesses for they called 35 in all to the prosecution's 44).

The magistrate also made great play of the fact that Kenyatta and the others "did not accept the invitation unequivocally to denounce Mau Mau." Such a denunciation would have been excellent propaganda for Imperialism which Kenya

nationalists could hardly consent to make. And if Mau Mau appears to South African National Congress leaders as "a legitimate organization of the Kenya Africans", Kenyatta, even if he absolutely disapproves of terrorism, is hardly likely to make an unequivocal denunciation of an organization pledged to remedy Kikuyu land hunger and racial inferiority.

No Jury

More fundamental criticisms can however be levelled at the trial. The magistrate was specially appointed by the Kenya administration to try the case, and there was no jury. Now Mr. Ransley Thacker may be an admirable man; he may even have been uninfluenced by the fact that he is white and the accused were black (though this seems inhumanly unlikely); but the fact remains that the jury system with all its faults is regarded in England as a better method of administering justice, and magistrates try only relatively trifling offences and have limited powers of sentence. Mr. Thacker imposed seven years hard labour (a term now for many years obsolete in British law) and recommended to the Governor that restriction orders be made against all the accused. He regretted that the penalty, though maximal, was "inadequate" and clearly would, if he had been able, have imposed still harsher punishment.

It could be objected that in the present state of racial tension, the jury system would have been impossible to operate. In that case—and who can doubt that it is the case—the whole question of impartial justice becomes impossible. Not even the most judicious and cautious spectator of politics could fail to feel disquiet about the whole mode of procedure.

Continued on p. 4

Peron Fumbling for an Exit

IT seems that Perón's movement is tottering at last. The weakness of movements built upon strong men—or rather, in this case, upon a "strong woman", for it was the late Señora Eva Perón whose personality dominated the administration—rests upon the inevitable human limitations which they possess. The oratorical genius herself has died, following a sustained dramatic performance which places her at the top of her true profession, that is to say, as an actress. Eva Duarte may have forsaken the stage for politics, but her success there places her amongst such figures as Rachel, or Sarah Bernhardt. But the curtain "rang down for the last time", in the hackneyed phrase. Eva came to the end of her rôle as the poor little girl who made good, but Juan still had another act to play. It could not help being an anti-climax. Without the heroine, the Argentine drama became revealed as a cheap farce in which corrupt politicians ran in and out of doors like indignant husbands in a bedroom comedy. Before the patrons began throwing eggs and fruit, the stage managers appear to be ready to ring down the curtain!

Perón has bitterly protested at the "ingratitude" (quite a Churchill touch) of those whom he has "tried to help" who "will not help themselves". Poor devil, he was always a bit of a ham. Evita could have managed that speech so dramatically! He is still desperately "playing to the gods" and trying to appease the wrath of the gallery now that he sees how cold the reaction is in the stalls.

It is, of course, true that there has always been a large body of working-class support for the Peróns. This can be understood in terms of Argentine politics. Since the death of the dictator Uriburu in 1932, the

three succeeding Presidents did little to ward off the effects of depression and slump. Uriburu had crushed the working-class organizations with long and vicious attacks. The middle-class liberals did little to alleviate such persecution; their liberalism did not extend to their opponents in a clearly-divided class society. Nor did they make much attempt at social reform. For them it was sufficient to be "back to normal", but matters were far from normal, and finally in 1943 a military junta overthrew the Presidency. The generals came to power. They succeeded each other rapidly as they elbowed for personal dictatorship, and finally in March 1946 Juan Perón pushed out O'Farrell the apostle of war-time neutrality (which had consistently favoured the winning side, whichever it had happened to be at the time). Eva came to the throne.

The vendetta of "society" against Perón's wife had made her a popular figure. She was already well known as a radio actress, and the spectacle of a woman of humble origin challenging these snobbish matrons was good newspaper copy. Her political impressarios thought so too, and in linking her talent to Perón's social programme, a degree of public confidence was won. It is a little difficult to analyse what the "social programme" really contained, other than vaguely-expressed sentiments in favour of the oppressed and of national independence. The most lauded achievement was a programme of crude charity, the need for which should not exist in so developed and potential a country as the Argentine.

While the régime may not be finished, because of the scandals that are now breaking, and the obvious creaking of the party machine and inability for the dictator to manage any longer, it needs only the push of a hostile demonstration or the effect of any political intrigue or Army manoeuvre to send it back reeling. So much for the positive achievements of one more movement of "social realism" that has taken the place of mere "utopianism". Perhaps the Argentine workers—bearing in mind not only Perónism but the equivocal attitude of the Stalinists to it and the betrayal by socialist and trade union leaders—will return to the methods that once made it possible for them to withstand the bloodiest dictatorships then known. Many of them must undoubtedly feel some nostalgia for the days when Anarcho-Synicalism held the major influence amongst the Argentine workers, before the era of mass betrayals, and perhaps the time has come for a return from "realism".

INTERNATIONALIST.

OPERATION ESCAPE

THE London Anarchist Group are considering the organisation of a mass exodus from London on June 2nd, when, it is rumoured, a certain incident is to occur which will make the city distasteful for men and women of sanity and independence of thought.

The L.A.G. project will probably take the form of a whole day's outing, including a picnic, and the transport to be employed will depend upon numbers, as will the cost.

If any readers of FREEDOM are interested in joining, will they please write in the first instance to:—

"ESCAPE" COMMITTEE,
c/o 27 RED LION STREET, W.C.1

FOREIGN COMMENTARY

The Inquisitors at Work

WE do not think it is possible to give "too much space" or to draw attention too often to the witch-hunts being staged in America in the name of democracy. The thoroughness and ruthlessness with which the campaign is being conducted has even created a certain amount of consternation among those who were originally its supporters. Where it will end we do not know. At the time of writing McCarthy's sleuths are hunting out the Reds among American staffs in Germany. The *Manchester Guardian's* headline to its Bonn correspondent's report is an indication of that newspaper's views: "MORE HEADS ROLL IN THE BASKET". We shall deal in a future issue with the American inquisition and book-burnings in Germany. For the present we shall deal with the Senate Internal Security Sub-committee's investigations into the Red subversion of the American educational system. A correspondent has sent us a copy of the *Boston Daily Globe* for March 27 which reports the "Testimony of Four Educators" who were summoned by the Inquisitors. Since these hearings are not reported *in extenso* in the British Press, we are reproducing in full the examination of one of them: George R. Faxon, a Boston teacher, for our reader's delectation, and so that they may share their American cousins' pride in seeing real democracy in operation:

Q—How long have you been a teacher in the Boston School system?
A—Approximately 19 years.

Q—What schools have you taught in?
A—Roxbury Memorial High School for Boys, from 1934 until 1940 or 1941, I

believe. Then later I was shifted to Boston Trade School because of a drop in the enrolment. I taught there for two or 2 and one-half years, until 1942.

B—What did you teach there? A—In all my teaching in Boston it has been mathematics.

Q—What was your next school after Boston Trade School? A—There was an interval of three years when I was in the Army, from January, 1943, I believe, to January, 1946.

G—What kind of service did you do in Army? A—I was an officer in the information and education branch of the Army. I served at Fort Bliss, Tex., the Pentagon at Washington, Paris University at Paris, France, and the University of Biarritz, France.

Q—What did you do when you left the service? A—I returned to teaching in the Boston Public School system.

Q—What schools? A—I taught in Boston in the veterans' school.

Q—What did you teach? A—That school was started to help veterans, to give them refresher courses and to speed up and review what they had forgotten.

Q—How long were you at the veterans' school? A—Until it was closed, I believe in June, 1951.

Q—Where have you taught since? A—I was transferred to the Boston Latin School.

Q—How long were you there? A—I am still there.

Q—How many are there in your classes? A—Classes vary from 24 to 35 or 36. I have five classes.

Q—Where did you obtain your degree?

A—Harvard University, AB, 1928; University of New Hampshire, MS, 1932.

Q—Other degrees? A—No.

Q—Are you at this time a member of the Communist Party? A—Do I understand that at any time I wish to confer with my attorney I may do so without your permission?

Q—(Jenner) At any time, you may.

(Faxon confers with counsel, Atty. Oliver S. Allen).

A—I decline to answer that question on the grounds that my answer might tend to incriminate me.

(Allen said at this point that he wanted the record to show that Faxon was claiming the protection of the Fifth Amendment. Jenner replied that the record so indicated.)

Q—(By Morris) Do you know Herbert Philbrick? A—I decline.

Q—While you taught at the Boston Latin School, have you tried to recruit anybody into the Communist Party? A—I decline.

Q—While you were an officer in the Army did you make any effort to recruit into the Communist party? A—I decline.

Q—Did you at the Boston Trade School? A—I decline.

Q—At the Roxbury Memorial High School for Boys from 1934 to 1940? A—I decline.

Q—Have you ever tried to recruit a fellow teacher into the Communist party? A—I decline.

Continued on p. 3

BOOKS The Anatomy of Revolution

THE ANATOMY OF REVOLUTION, by Crane Brinton (Jonathan Cape, 35s.).

IN the clammy atmosphere of seventeenth century Spain hardly a book was written, even the obscenest novel, which did not contain some pious or hypocritical genuflection to the dogmas and teachings of the Church. In many books written in the twentieth century, very similar genuflections are found, but before the altar of Science. The pre-occupation of appearing dispassionate, objective and scientific seems just as obsessive as was once that of appearing a good catholic, and one suspects it springing from the same sources. How scientific is then in view of all his scruples and protestations the book by Crane Brinton on "The anatomy of revolution" we leave to the reader to decide. We need only point out that a revolution dissected and analysed is a revolution no more, and certainly the result if not the intention of all books that approach social and historical problems in a scientific way is bound to be anti-revolutionary. The *Unknown Revolution* by Voline may serve as a contrast, and then even with the best of intentions towards science and those who wish it applied to society, we can only conclude that their best findings are just as useful and convincing to those who suffer from social evils as is the exact description of all the causes, symptoms and consequences of hunger to a hungry man. I fail to understand the purpose of studying revolutions in a scientific way, without feeling the need for it or being personally, morbidly interested in preventing its occurrence. Revolutions, the same as all the facts that lead to them, cannot and must not be studied objectively, unless man is to be de-humanised and taught to consider himself as will-less, with no initiative or destiny. We lay at the door of a book like that of

Crane Brinton all the criticisms so well expressed by a Gabriel Marcel against objective and verifiable truth in the name of the truth that is personal and existential.

The anarchist, however, who seriously considers revolution as part of his being, of his intellectual, ideological and psychological make-up, will do well to study this book to gain a more precise knowledge of the problems and difficulties that beset a revolution. He will learn above all how power, organisational power, is the factor that decides of its outcome, and that if ever there is to be an anarchist revolution a way must be found in the *dvoelastie* or double sovereignty period to prevent the exploiters of revolution from gaining the upper hand, becoming its grave-diggers and a set of new tyrants far more fearful and repressive than those the revolution has destroyed. He will also learn that it is not misery that causes revolutions, for if it were, as Trotsky pointed out, there would always be a revolution, and finally that revolutions are successful only when those in power are hesitant or incompetent in the use of their armed forces as it is proved conversely by all abortive revolutions, and in particular those of 1848 and 1871.

The main theme in Crane Brinton's study is that revolution is like a 'fever', with its prodromes, crises, relapses and convalescence. The four revolutions he studies (1648, 1776, 1789, and 1917), present certain uniformities which he lists as first signs, the rule of the moderates, accession of the extremists, reigns of terror and virtue, and Thermidor. One can accept them as conceptual schemes useful for the four revolutions mentioned, but only very cautiously as a guide in the interpretation of other revolutions 'in fieri' or to come, witness the Chinese revolution, in which no stretching or compressing of facts will show that there

was ever a rule of the moderates. As for Russia, Crane Brinton considers the reigns of Terror and Virtue definitely over while he is not so sure about the Thermidorean phase. If the figures about the inmates of labour camps in Russia are at all approximately correct it would be sheer stupidity or bad faith to say

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP OPEN DAILY

(OPEN 9-6.30; 5.30 SATURDAYS)

New Books . . .

- The Need for Roots Simone Weil 18/-
- Civilization, War & Death (selections from works) Sigmund Freud 8/6
- Journey Through Utopia M. L. Berneri 16/-
- The Great French Revolution (2 vols.) Peter Kropotkin 12/6
- Psychology for Everyman A. E. Mander 1/6
- U.N.E.S.C.O. Pamphlets:— Race and Culture; Race and Psychology; Race and Biology; Racial Myths; Roots of Prejudice; Race and History; The Significance of Racial Differences; Race and Society. each 1/6

Remainders . . .

- Shelley Edmund Blunden 7/6
- New Shelley Letters 3/6
- The Shelley Companion 3/6
- Shelley in Italy 4/6
- Shelley's Socialism Aveling 2/6
- Feb./Mar. Portworkers' Clarion now in 2d also The Syndicalist 2d. Postage extra in all cases.

HAVE YOU HAD OUR NEW BOOK LIST?

Obtainable from

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

that Terror there is over. As for Virtue, it is not over either as shown by an interesting article by Henry Brugmans which appeared in 1948 in the Belgian magazine *Syntheses*. If the signs are not misleading it appears instead that Thermidor is likely to begin now, the death of Stalin corresponding to that of Robespierre. Garcia Pradas has written a poem on the death of the former centred on the idea that all the tears shed on his coffin were tears of joy. The statement, though literally incorrect, is a good poetic interpretation of the truly Thermidorean sigh of relief that most Russians must have heaved seeing at long last the time for them had come to relax from anguish and strain, and prepare to live a life of normal human beings.

To return to the book under review, two quotations will show the author's point of view. Referring to the extrem-

ists turning very authoritarian when they reach power, he writes on page 181: "There is no need for us to sigh over this, or grow indignant, or talk of hypocrisy. We are attempting to discern uniformities in the behaviour of men during certain revolutions in specific social systems, and this seems to be one of the uniformities". That is what the scientific approach does to you. You will sigh no longer, never grow indignant or worry about hypocrisy. On page 185, thinking of Levellers and Anarchists, the author writes: "There are, then, if you like, those more extreme than the group we have called the extremists. But such men are of the lunatic fringe. They are the impractical people erroneously thought by some conservatives to be typical revolutionists. They definitely do not succeed in attaining power". No doubt a most consoling thought.

GIOVANNI BALDELLI.

Among the Ihalmiut Eskimos

THE Ihalmiut are only men, after all, and not infallible. Therefore, there are deviations from law, and there are crimes in the land; for no race of men can be free of these things. But there are also certain forces which the People control and which in turn direct the actions of men, and these forces keep the law-breaking within narrow bounds. To understand these forces is to realise why the Ihalmiut have no need of our laws to maintain the security of their way of life.

There is absolutely no internal organisation to hold authority over the People. No one man, or body of men, holds power in any other sense than the magical. There is no council of elders, no policemen. There are no assemblies of government and, in the strictest sense, the Ihalmiut may be said to live in an anarchistic state, for they do not even have an inflexible code of laws.

Yet the People exist in amity together,

and the secret of this is the secret of co-operative endeavour, limited only by the powers of human will and endurance. It is not blind obedience or obedience dictated by fear. Rather it is intelligent obedience to a simple code that makes sense to those who must live by its rules.

However, methods of punishment do exist. Should a man continuously disregard the Law of Life, then little by little he finds himself isolated and shut off from the community. There can be no more powerful punishment in the lonely wastes of the Barrens, and in fact it is a punishment which can easily be fatal in a world where man must work closely with man in order to live. A small dose of ostracism usually brings the culprit to an acute awareness of his defects and he ceases to transgress the law.

—FARLEY MOWAT:
People of the Deer.
(Michael Joseph, 15/-).

MUTUAL AID & SOCIAL EVOLUTION

WHEN Kropotkin returned to France after his first visit to England in 1883, he was immediately charged with belonging to the International Working Men's Association (the First International), and with being concerned in the revolutionary demonstrations at Lyons. While he was imprisoned at Clairvaux, a large number of the most eminent scientists and men of letters in England signed a memorandum to the French Government in an endeavour to secure for him better prison conditions and the right to see his wife. But by no means all Kropotkin's colleagues in the world of science exhibited this sympathy. The most eminent of Darwin's followers, Thomas Henry Huxley, for example, positively refused to sign this memorandum, and stated that in his opinion, Kropotkin was too well off as he was. It is an open question whether Kropotkin knew of Huxley's attitude to him in this personal matter; but in later years, when the two men crossed swords on the question of mutual aid, he never showed the slightest trace of bitterness. On the contrary, he always praised Huxley's scientific eminence, and especially as a defender of Darwinism against clerical attacks.* This differing attitude in the two men has a certain significance when considered in the light of their social conceptions, for Huxley's view of the mechanism of evolution as being continuous mutual strife, was quickly seized upon by the philosophers of capitalism.

At the outset, Darwin's work dealt such a deadly blow to the theological view of creation, and elicited such bitter hostility in Church circles, that its more fundamental social implications were overshadowed. For the controversy which raged during the latter half of the nineteenth century between the theory of evolution and the Church ended many years ago in such a decisive victory for the scientists that the "Darwinian question" is often regarded as entirely settled. Yet the conflict over the exact manner in which Darwin's theory of Natural Selection is to be interpreted is still fought over, though with rather less heat, despite its ultimately more fundamental character. Darwin's theory of the mechanism of evolution has an important bearing on sociological questions, and its social implications were immediately recognised at the time.

Karl Marx, for example, when he published his *Critique of Political Economy* in 1859, considered it an extremely lucky chance that *The Origin of Species* should have appeared in the same year. "This wonderful work", he wrote, "makes my own absolutely impregnable. Darwin may not know it, but he belongs to the Social Revolution." At the same time, however, the liberal capitalists and their political philosophers, the Manchester school of *laissez-faire* economists, acclaimed it in support of their theories also. According to them, unlimited free competition of each against all was the best method of securing economic progress and prosperity, and it was this apparently ceaseless competition which they stressed in Darwin's work. As Kropotkin pointed out later, Darwin himself took no such narrow view of the "struggle for existence", although it became the basis of his follower Huxley's interpretation of natural selection.

The struggle of Religion versus Science threw the con-

trovery regarding the social implications of Darwin's work into the background. But it also seems to have cast the mantle of ecclesiastical obscurantism over the discussion, for we usually find that investigation of the facts of the matter is neglected in favour of dogmatic assertion and blind assumption. Capital and governmental prejudice have usurped the place of clerical mythology in obscuring the problem. Kropotkin's great work *Mutual Aid* goes far towards settling the question once and for all, and more recent investigations have only confirmed the position he put forward. But before considering it, it will be of interest to consider the historical background to the question at issue. We shall then see that it is one that has been debated by sociologists since the time of the French Revolution.

MALTHUS AND CAPITALIST IDEOLOGY

By a remarkable coincidence, both Darwin and Alfred Russell Wallace, who reached the idea of evolution taking place through natural selection almost simultaneously, started on this train of thought from the same initial stimulus. In his *Naturalist's Voyage Round the World*, Darwin relates how the ideas of Malthus set him on the track of Natural Selection.

"... In October 1838, that is, fifteen months after I had begun my systematic enquiry, I happened to read for amusement "Malthus on Population", and being well prepared to appreciate the struggle for existence which everywhere goes on, from long continued observation of the habits of plants and animals, it at once struck me that under these circumstances favourable variations would tend to be preserved, and unfavourable ones destroyed. The result of this would be the formation of new species."

Similarly, Wallace describes how, when he was lying ill with fever in February 1858, twenty years later than Darwin, he was thinking about the "positive checks"—war, famine and disease—described by Malthus in his *Essay on Population*. Wallace felt that these "positive checks" must act even more powerfully on animals than upon men because of their greater rate of multiplication. Thus both men began to speculate about natural selection after reading Malthus' book.

The *Essay on Population* became almost a textbook of capitalist ideology. It was very convenient to think that poverty was due to an "inevitable" tendency for the population always to be greater than the available food supply, so that the poor were merely those on whom the "positive checks" were acting. Such a belief happily relieved the economic and social system of any blame for the prevalent human misery. But even in the latter half of the nineteenth century it was becoming apparent that the possibilities of production far outstripped the actual consumption of the working class who formed the vast majority of the human population. It was not the limits of world resources that made poverty inevitable, but the limitation of purchasing power which the wages system imposed on the mass of mankind. The history of the last twenty years has even more decisively cast Malthus' ideas on the scrap heap, for we have been compelled to witness the spectacle of the vast majority of human beings eking out a life of miserable poverty in the midst of a world of plenty. For years, while there has been widespread starvation, huge masses of foodstuffs have been dumped in the sea, burned in locomotives, and spread as manure on the fields. Food which is sorely needed to relieve famine

has been fed instead to animals because it has been cheaper, more "economical" to do so. Such a spectacle makes nonsense of Malthus' idea that the world is always slightly overpopulated, with a resulting scarcity which makes poverty and starvation inevitable, and at the same time limits the growth of population. Yet apologists for the present system of society still put forward his exploded views.

Now Malthus himself wrote his book in an attempt to refute the ideas put forward by the Anarchist, William Godwin, in 1793 in his great book *An Enquiry into the Nature of Political Justice*. Thus the whole controversy may be said to have originated in the work of the "father of Anarchism".

DARWINISM AND CAPITALIST IDEOLOGY

Huxley developed Darwin's views to the extreme point of representing "the war of each against all" as a natural law, and thus carried Malthus' views to a logical conclusion. It was this conception which Kropotkin attacked in *Mutual Aid*. He entered the lists as a powerful supporter of the ideas advanced by Godwin almost a century before, and the evidence he adduced is so convincing in its cumulative effect that, for those who have read *Mutual Aid* and grasped its social implications, the controversy will appear settled.

We saw that Darwin's theory was acclaimed by the political economists of the Manchester School, and that these bourgeois economists had advanced Malthus' ideas in support of their theories. The characteristic feature of capitalist economy—mass poverty in the midst of potential, and even actual, plenty—has destroyed Malthus' case. In addition, work in anthropology has confirmed Kropotkin's refutation of Huxley's conceptions, and shown that the idea of individual competition as a "law of nature" is unsupported by facts. Yet in spite of all this, Kropotkin's ideas do not by any means hold the field to-day, although the bankruptcy of the ideology which he demolished is becoming ever more apparent.

The reason is not far to seek. Although competition between individual members of society is not a "law of nature", it is certainly a law of capitalism, and indeed of any class-divided society. However much they are at variance with the facts of nature, Huxley's and Malthus' views are very well suited to the cut-throat society which exists in all developed countries to-day. Under apparently inevitable conditions of adversity it is natural to make a virtue of necessity, and the oppressed worker, no less than his capitalist exploiter, tends to console himself with the reflection that the evils of society are part of the natural order of things. "There always has been poverty and oppression, and there always will be. It is the law of human nature." How often has one heard it said! The great value of Kropotkin's work for the present age lies in his demonstration that such a philosophy is very far from being a true reflection of the actual phenomena as observed in nature, and finds no confirmation in the facts. The "law" of each against all, so far from being the rule, is very much the exception in the long history of human society. On the contrary, it is the special characteristic of class-divided societies—that form of social organisation in which the many are ruled by the few. Poverty and struggle, wars and scarcity are universally found in governmental society; they are conspicuously absent from those societies which observe freedom and equality. In such societies, as in evolution generally, the law of Mutual Aid inherent in all social groups is allowed free development, and is the prerequisite of progress.

(to be continued)

* In *Modern Science and Anarchism*, for instance, Kropotkin speaks of his opponent as "Darwin's courageous, learned and intelligent apostle, Huxley"; in *Mutual Aid* he refers to him as being "certainly considered as one of the ablest exponents of the theory of evolution". Nowhere does he speak of him with rancour.

IS WAR LESS INEVITABLE?

IN recent issues of FREEDOM the change in Russian tactics has been discussed mainly with the aim of discovering its causes in the internal Russian scene. Now that the immediately reaction of surprise is over it is well to consider further the effects of the change in Soviet foreign policy, and especially as this affects the question of war.

Looking at it from a general standpoint there is much less change than consideration of immediate policies seems to suggest. The nature of the Soviet Union and its satellite empire has not changed, nor has its basic economic pattern of State capitalism with its consequent economic needs. Nor has the capitalist world changed overnight. Hence the main factors in the world situation remain the same.

FREEDOM has always stressed the fact that war serves certain very definite functions from an economic point of view. In a world where markets are continually contracting and competition is permanently sharp, wars do provide a method of economy which increases production and so maintains profits. Without profits capitalist economy is meaningless. That this is so has been demonstrated during the Korean War when the first armistice talks were started over a year ago, and the New York stock exchange prices fell sharply at the prospect of peace. Similarly, at the present time, the Russian "peace offensive" has had once again a depressing effect on Wall Street and the Stock Exchange.

But FREEDOM has from time to time pointed out also that it is the fact of being on a war economy that is stimulating to a flagging economy, and the question of whom one is at war with becomes to that extent a secondary one. In the world markets it seems certain that America is a much more serious rival to Britain's economy than Russia is, and the possibility should be borne in mind that the final struggle in the permanent world war may well be between the Anglo-Saxon powers and not, as generally assumed, against Russia necessarily. Speculations of this kind should not be wholly dismissed.

Looked at from this distance it will be seen that the Russian moves and not, as generally assumed, economic pattern which needs war and which makes war ultimately inevitable.

What it has done is to create confusion in stock markets and to make it necessary to consider replanning the allocation of war materials and war production. If the proposition is accepted that American economy needs the Korean War (or, at least, some war) for the sake of industry, then Eisenhower's warning that the end of hostilities in Korea does not mean a free hand for Chinese troops in Indo-China may perhaps be read as an indication that American war production will switch to the Indo-Chinese War.

The new line in Russian foreign policy, so acceptable to the masses of the world with their nerves frayed and on edge by the war anxiety sedulously maintained by the governments and press of all countries may thus create more difficulties for the Western Powers than Stalin's foreign policy did. And it cannot be ruled out that such an effect is calculated.

There remains the question of what will take the place of war scares (or war if Korean hostilities do actually cease) for the Russian government's policy internally? The answer may be no more than that war anxiety has been induced to the point of satiety and that some respite is needed before it will again

be effective. It must also be remembered that war anxiety is much more effective as propaganda to urban populations than to peasants who always have hated war and regarded war preparations and conscription as the "blood tax". The Russian government may therefore gain a little popularity with the peasant population by its peace moves.

All in all, however, the new situation does not alter the basic position adopted by anarchists. War is no less inevitable for its causes are untouched. Dictatorship is still dictatorship even though it chooses to mitigate some of its brutalities probably under pressure from below. The possibility of the dictatorship in Russia crumbling must always be borne in mind however. If that happened and initiative once again lay with the Russian people, a rift in the war clouds really would have appeared, for then the basic social and economic patterns which underlie modern war would have begun to change at last.

BEFORE THE INQUISITORS A Plea for Freedom of Thought and Human Dignity

Maurice Halperin, Boston University professor, who testified in the Senate subcommittee probe in Boston, issued the following statement upon concluding his testimony:

"What issues confront a teacher summoned to testify before a Congressional committee investigating Communism in the schools?"

"He is expected first to state his political beliefs and affiliations; second, to state those of others with whom he has been associated; third, to expose himself to accusations against which adequate defense is possible only through normal court procedure; fourth, to refrain from invoking the Constitution of the United States to protect himself from

these abuses. If he passes all these tests to the satisfaction of the committee, then he is fit to return to the classroom.

"What kind of teacher is this? He has given up his freedom of thought and conscience; he has conceded that the state has the power to investigate his mind and, by inescapable inference, to control it. He has also become a stool-pigeon, a menace to his students and colleagues and the most reprehensible of creatures.

"All our democratic institutions are anchored in the concept of the inviolability of the individual conscience, stated in the First Amendment of the Constitution of the United States. Directly associated

with this concept is that of academic freedom which, among other things, means freedom of teachers and schools from dictation, intimidation or any other form of coercion by the state in matters pertaining to political, philosophical and religious ideas.

"It is incumbent upon those teachers who would defend academic freedom to refuse to acquiesce, wherever possible, to an invasion by the state of one's private beliefs and convictions.

"Another pillar in the structure of our democratic system is the Fifth Amendment of the Constitution. It provides that a person cannot be forced to bear witness against himself. This embodies an epoch-making and far-reaching principle regarding the sanctity of the individual. It was born in the struggle of religious dissenters resisting tyrannical attempts by the state to punish non-conformism in the realm of speech, belief and faith. Since its inception, it has been considered a 'safeguard against heedless, unfounded or tyrannical prosecutions.' (Twining vs. New Jersey, 211 U.S. 78, 91.) 'No presumption of guilt, either from the legal or moral point of view, is properly derived from the use of this Amendment'.

"Thus far our Congressional investigators have been restrained from some gross abuses of their power by the Fifth Amendment. With it, a teacher may still protect his physical freedom and moral integrity. But those in academic life and outside who deprive a teacher of his livelihood for invoking the Fifth Amendment, however much they proclaim their aversion to the purposes and methods of the current inquisition, are effectively collaborating with the inquisition."

Inquisitors at Work

Continued from p. 1

Q—Have you attended any secret meetings of the Communist party in Massachusetts? A—I decline.

Q—Outside the state? A—I decline.

Q—When did you last see Herbert Philbrick? A—I decline.

The right of the citizen to refuse to answer certain questions was referred to in greater detail by an earlier witness Professor Maurice Halperin when he was asked whether he was a member of the C.P. "Well that is a question I would like to answer with some preface. I believe that an improper question, sir, and I would like to explain why. This is a probing into my mind, my political affiliations and political beliefs. I believe the Constitution, specifically the first and fifth amendments, protects me and all American citizens from such arbitrary authority. Also, as a teacher, I have an obligation . . . therefore I refuse to answer this question. I am not required to testify against myself."

It may be that the Constitution does protect American citizens so far as legal proceedings are concerned. But clearly, so far as the Inquisitors are concerned, the fact of invoking these rights in refusing to answer questions such as "Are you a member of the C.P.?" "Do you know so-and-so (a notorious Communist)" implies that the witness has some-

thing to hide. (It might be added that similar conclusions are drawn in British criminal courts where no prisoner is obliged to enter the witness box and submit himself to cross-examination by the prosecution. But the fact of not doing so undoubtedly creates an unfavourable impression).

In the case of Mr. Faxon the hearing produced the desired results. Within hours after he had stepped down from the witness stand he was summoned by the Head of his school and an hour later "following interrogation"—by the Head this time, he was suspended.

It appears that to be a teacher in Boston one has to swear an oath of allegiance—in fact two if one has joined after October, 1949. The first was introduced as long ago as 1935—long before the "Communist menace" and reads:

"I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and that I will faithfully discharge the duties of the position of . . . (title or position) . . . in . . . (designation of institution) . . . according to the best of my ability."

The second, the Communist Exclusion oath, reads:

"I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States of America and the

Constitution of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and that I will oppose the overthrow of the government of the United States of America or of this Commonwealth by force, violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional method."

Mr. Faxon joined the teaching system in 1934 and was therefore not required to sign the 1949 oath. But the impression one gets is that when he was interrogated by the Head he was asked to sign and refused, for afterwards a Mrs. Lyons, chairman of the School Committee said that the Board was in agreement with the Head's decision, adding, "I can't see why anyone should object to signing a non-Communist oath".

(In case the reader has forgotten, Mr. Faxon taught Mathematics).

All this forcibly reminds one of Mussolini's Italy, where one of the first things the Italian dictator did when he came to power was to oblige teachers to sign loyalty oaths. Next they were obliged to join the *Fascisti*, and finally they were obliged to attend school wearing their black-shirts, and whether they were teachers of mathematics or history their main subject was to teach the children how to be good *ballillas*.

Shall we yet see the day when American teachers will conduct their classes against a background of the star-spangled banner and a portrait bust of the greatest of all Americans: Senator Joe McCarthy? LIBERTARIAN.

Comment

Questions of Value

NELLIE is caretaker of the Westgate Alms Rooms in Peterborough. One assumes that she is not infrequently faced with human problems among the old folk with whom she is in constant contact. But she still has time to think of other problems. And recently an alarming thought entered her simple head and, in her own words: "I was worried about what the little princess would wear on Coronation Day". Without losing a moment's thought as to what some of the old folk would wear on Coronation or any other Day she set to work with a will making a new rosebud organdie dress smocked in seven different shades and with puffy sleeves. The Queen in a letter to Nellie makes an exception to her rule of "not accepting gifts except from those with whom she is personally acquainted" and accepted "with gratitude" the dress for Princess Anne.

This was a Coronation story for the Press. Interviews with Nellie. Questions such as "how much did it cost" and replies: "it's my secret. After all you don't skimp the coppers on a dress for the Queen's little girl, and I've got my savings to fall back on."

Poor, Nellie! In that last sentence one feels that she has never grown up; that she still believes in fairy princesses, and one feels loath to spoil her dream. And yet . . . the headlines last only a day; the princess' dress will lie in a cupboard with hundreds of others and Nellie will again be the caretaker at Westgate Alms Rooms. Has Nellie, we wonder, ever thought how much more real pleasure and warmth she would have given and received, had she spent her time and money making two or three simple garments for the needy members of the West Ward Old Folks Club?

MISADVENTURE was the verdict brought by a Manchester jury last week on a man who was chased through

the streets by an angry crowd, was charged at a city police station with indecent exposure, and died the same night from injuries which included a four-inch fracture of the skull and cerebral haemorrhage.

With the blood-chilling headline of "When a Mother Turns into a Tigress" the Sunday Pictorial gives us the sordid story straight from the lips of the "heroine of Morton Street", Mrs. Flo' Byrne, forty-one year old mother of the child who witnessed the indecent exposure. Mrs. Flo' is a "sturdy, straightforward woman who believes in good old fashioned respectability". "I have two daughters," she said. "They go to a Catholic school. I want them to grow up pure."

"Mrs. Byrne had her slacks on and her hair in curlers and was upstairs cleaning the bedroom, when she heard the front door bang.

Christine ran upstairs, hurled herself sobbing at her mother and said: 'Mummy, a man in the entry frightened me.'

Mrs. Byrne dashed downstairs. 'I only did what every other mother would,' she said. 'My little girl was terrified.'

In the entry at the back of her house the man stood. 'Get on with you,' she shouted. The man mounted his bicycle and sped away.

'Stop that man,' shouted Mrs. Byrne to window-cleaner Thomas Fitzgerald. 'He's frightened my little girl.'

Fitzgerald put down his leather and raced after the man. Parents came to the doors of the narrow streets.

The cry went up 'Stop that man—he's frightening the children.'

The two chasers became a crowd and the crowd swelled. When Fraser was caught he tried to get away. The window-cleaner landed him one on the jaw. Fraser fell from his bicycle on the kerb. The crowd hustled him to the police station.

Said Police Constable Greenhough: 'The crowd was hostile. The man had

cuts. I locked him in a police cell for his own safety while I tried to disperse the crowd!'"

★

LATER that night Fraser died of his injuries. The Sunday Pictorial points out that: "The wiry little Manchester housewife who first chased the man is the heroine of her street". But does Mrs. Byrnes feel the same about it? She started what was almost a lynching mob on the heels of this unfortunate, mentally sick man, to the cry of 'Stop that man, he's frightening my little girl'. One does not wish to suggest that her little girl was not frightened by her experience. But Mrs. Byrnes' reactions to the situation do not strike us as being quite as simple as the Sunday Pictorial would have us believe: "a normal housewife [transformed] to a mother fiercely defending her children—as a tigress might her young". We wonder how many of the Mrs. Byrnes of this world raise a similar hue and cry against the war-mongers who have been responsible for millions of children bearing for life the scars of fear endured during two world wars, and who are now preparing for a third? It's all a question of values. Mrs. Byrnes' main preoccupation in life is that her daughters shall "grow up pure". We know what she means by that, and we are quite sure that Mrs. Byrnes thinks that the fear instilled in the minds of the young by Catholic teachings (to which she proudly subjects her daughters) contributes to their purity. Perhaps if the Mrs. Byrnes of this world brought up their children without the mumbo-jumbo of God, King and Country they would be able to cope with situations such as the one which "terrified" the child and ended in the tragic death of a human being. Indeed with more freedom and less fear of sex (which is what is meant by "growing up pure") there would be fewer tormented George Frasers and "terrified" Christines and housewives transformed into tigresses at the thought that their daughters had seen a man's sexual organs. R.

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.
Food Production and Population 6d.
Who will do the Dirty Work? 2d.

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.

F. A. RIDLEY :
The Roman Catholic Church and the Modern Age. 2d.

27, Red Lion Street, London, W.C.1.

Anarchism and Syndicalism - 2

ANARCHISM is based upon respect for the individual. It is the only militant philosophy asserting the autonomy of the individual which is socialistic and not capitalistic, and because of this the socialist opponents of anarchism like to describe us as "petty-bourgeois, small-scale capitalists" while the capitalists themselves do their best in most countries to repress us, or at least, misrepresent us.

Anarchists, unlike socialists, see no contradiction between the ideas of individual freedom and co-operation. In fact we maintain that co-operation, mutual aid, far from curtailing the freedom of the individual, actually extends it. And this is increasingly true as production has become social rather than individual, for social production has rendered possible the elimination of much arduous toil and offers greater choice of occupation and opportunity for leisure.

Capitalist "Freedom"

Capitalism, of course, prevents these possibilities from becoming reality because the social production it has developed is not carried on for society but for those individuals who by luck or cunning have achieved dominant positions in that society. The freedom which individuals have within capitalist society to achieve these dominant positions, however, has nothing in common with the freedom of the individual which anarchists so ardently desire.

The capitalist's freedom is completely illusory. He has to play his ridiculous game strictly according to the rules, and if he does not play it efficiently, he goes under. All the time, however, his workers are already under, and the capitalist's measure of failure—i.e., loss of his dominant position—is having to join the ranks of the workers.

It goes without saying that the worker's freedom is completely illusory also. He is dominated by the man who holds economic power, and the only liberty the worker has is to change his job—or his place of work—which simply means passing under someone else's domination, or taking the chance of working on his own, which with no capital and no experience is a very risky business.

For capitalist and worker alike, therefore, capitalism does not offer freedom. For the capitalist, it does offer a greater choice among material things, than it offers the worker. The capitalist can be unfree in comfort—the worker is unfree in want.

The illusion of freedom under capitalism has been maintained on the possibility of everybody being able to climb the ladder of success from worker to boss. "If Lord Nuffield could do it, so can you", runs the argument. This completely overlooks the fact, however, that Lord Nuffield's success was due to the fact that thousands of workers remained

FRISKING—BUT NO DIPPING

THE recent lightning strike of 140 dockers at Chambers Wharf, Bermondsey, drew attention to the indignities suffered by workers in the docks.

In general it is a hard and fast rule that the police cannot search an individual or his property without a warrant unless he has been arrested and charged. But the "security guards" employed at all ports are allowed to run their hands over all portworkers as they leave work to see if they are carrying any goods out with them.

This has been tolerated for years by the dockers, but last week an ex-C.I.D. man, Jock Swanson, was not content merely to run his hands over the outside of the clothes of one of the dockers at Chambers Wharf, but put his hands into the pockets, in his zeal for his job.

His excuse was that rumours were circulating that silk stockings might be pilfered from the Dutch ship 'Timo' being unloaded at the wharf.

The dockers, however, were not interested in his excuses. They considered Swanson had gone too far, and the next day 140 of them refused to work.

This is obviously the action that will stop such impertinent liberties, but the question immediately arises—why allow themselves to be touched at all? If they strike against "dipping" why not against "frisking"?

After all, everybody knows that no docker would dream of taking any part of any of the cargoes handled by him—so why the search anyway?

on the lower rungs while he climbed on their shoulders to the top. It also doesn't face up to the fact that there simply is not room for everybody at the top, since if everybody were at the top there would be nobody at the bottom—and those at the top depend on the continued labour of those at the bottom to keep them at the top.

Natural Co-operation

If capitalism were genuinely competitive, and every individual were to set out to compete with everybody else in the way free enterprisers say they can, neither capitalism nor human society would last very long. Every form of human society, no matter how competitive, class divided, however vile it may be, can only exist through the co-operation of the human beings of which it consists.

This has always been clear to Anarchists. Kropotkin's *Mutual Aid* (referred to elsewhere in this issue) established in a scientific fashion what had been intuitively understood by Anarchists all along—that human beings are basically social and co-operative rather than competitive, as the capitalists would have us believe.

It is on this understanding that all socialist, communist and anarchist theory is based, and it is in the background of all working-class organisation. In the industrial organisations—the trades unions—there has been added to it the recognition that unity is strength. In order to fight the boss, who understood very well the old adage "Divide and Rule", the workers realised that they had to join together and pit their collective strength against his.

From their very first beginnings, the trades unions encountered the fiercest opposition from the ruling class. It took the unions one hundred years of struggle to compel the authorities to grant them legal recognition, and it is interesting to note that nothing like the same opposition was mounted against the formation of "working-class" political parties. True, these parties were not formed, in this country, until the industrial organisations were firmly established, and the ruling class knew and feared the industrial strength at the disposal of the workers, but it must have been with some relief that the rulers saw the workers turning from concentration on the industrial field to the diversion of political action. In other words, the rulers of Britain saw the workers dropping their strongest weapons and accepting ruling class ideas.

It is no coincidence that it was only a few years after the foundation of the Independent Labour Party that the trades unions were finally granted legal existence. With the creation of their politi-

cal wing the unions had given the capitalists the signal that they were not going to rely on their own strength, that the class struggle was to be abandoned, and class collaboration, through political activity, was to take its place.

Anarcho-Syndicalism

After that, within the trade union movement, it was only the Syndicalist minority who maintained that the industrial weapons were the strongest in the workers' armoury, and even they, as I showed last week, were not completely emancipated from the idea of political action. Only the Anarchists have steadfastly maintained their opposition and contempt for political activity and stressed that it is at the point of production that the workers' strength really lies. Only Anarcho-syndicalism has really resolved the problems involved in the struggle for the achievement of workers' control, and only in the insistence on individual autonomy, as applied by the Anarchists, lies the protection against leadership and subsequent corruption which is an ever-present danger in a mass movement.

Further, it is only the influence of Anarchism with its definite goal and consistent principles which can prevent syndicalism from becoming bogged down in the day-to-day struggle and becoming nothing more than an alternative, even if more militant alternative, unionism.

As I see it, it is quite useless for syndicalists to-day to think in terms of anything but *anarcho-syndicalism*. It is undoubtedly the harder path, and if anarchism is played down, support for syndicalism may well come from disgruntled Labourites, stranded Trotskyists, and even Fascists. And if all that mattered was to get as many membership cards filled up as possible, these could be as good members as any.

But if syndicalism is to be regarded as the means to the free society of anarchy—and that is the way I regard it—then it must have the inspiration behind it that will lead it in that direction and no other.

(To be concluded)

Correction

The article "The Asian Socialists" contained a printer's error which gave an erroneous impression. In the sentence, "German Social-Democrats might be prepared to help fight Hitler . . . where they followed the Kaiser blindly" the word "fight" was omitted.

The statement that Mr. Attlee "naturally represented" Britain also contained a printer's error. The word was "fraternally".

P.S.

AFRICA

Continued from p. 1

BRUTAL POLICE METHODS

Such disquiet finds support from criticisms of the conduct of the Kenya police voiced not by Africans but even by the European press in Nairobi. The British-owned and British-edited paper *Baraza*, and is said to reach 30,000 Africans and not merely circulated among the Europeans, has remarked that "The activities of the Kenya police reserve have gained many new recruits for Mau Mau". Describing some of them as "undisciplined sadists" it declares that reserve policemen were often to be heard boasting of the way in which they had beaten prisoners.

Liberal Party's Resolution

Finally it is necessary to point out that the kind of views which FREEDOM has expressed about Kenya are not so extreme as to be confined only to anarchists. At the Liberal Assembly at Ilfracombe on 11th April, a resolution was put "deploring the methods of mass punishment in Kenya and other practices contrary to the basic conceptions of British justice." The mover (Mr. J. M. Knowles, a Watford schoolmaster), pointed out that the resolution was not incompatible with condemnation of Mau Mau terrorism. "Crime and unrest in Kenya sprang from land hunger, from social frustration on account of White domination, from low wages and poverty, and from inadequate education." This has been the opinion of everyone accustomed to look facts in the

face in Kenya, and it places the government in an even more responsible position than Mau Mau itself for the present violence.

CENTRAL AFRICAN FEDERATION

Following on the Kenyatta result came the plebiscite on Central African Federation in Southern Rhodesia. As a result of an 82 per cent. poll Southern Rhodesia voted for federation with Nyasaland and Northern Rhodesia. The voting was 25,570 in favour of federation, 14,729 against. Including soiled papers the total votes cast numbered 40,614.

Yet the number of Africans involved in the scheme for Central African Federation is *six millions* and they have been consistently and virtually unanimously opposed to it right from the start. If the scheme comes into force 6 Africans—one per million—will represent African opinion. Such a proposition is scarcely democratic, and if proceeded with will constitute a formidable example of forcing through political changes in the teeth of African opposition.

African opposition is mainly on the grounds that it brings to an end the gradual progress towards self-government and places full power in the hands of the white settlers, wholly unhampered by any restraint from the Colonial Office in London.

Beware Democratic Illusions

It may be as well to remind ourselves at this point that we must

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS

Further Thoughts on the W.E.A.

MR. L. V. BEHARRELL makes a sound point when he asks what kind of subjects the W.E.A. should offer its students. In its present state, and I said that it has changed and does not consist of those who had little education or were perhaps ill-equipped mentally to profit from what they had, it is impossible to answer his question. W.E.A. "students", (or controversialists) to-day are a very mixed bag, and range from the genuine working-class student with a working-class educational background to the retired publisher, school-teacher, journalist, practising author, or middle-aged and elderly "library-bug", etc. I can only say what subjects should have been taught when the classes consisted of a majority of working-class members, and here I merely give you the opinion of the many sincere workers and tutors in the past who often came from the same professions or the same factories as the students.

Firstly comes Elementary Logic, for without this you cannot run your committees or conduct your discussions, and to a generation taught by rote and not encouraged to do their own thinking or to see themselves as individuals, this was essential. Susan Stebbing's excellent little book *Thinking to Some Purpose* is an example of this type of essential education. Working-class people wanting to achieve social emancipation should know this book by heart, and her analysis of politician's speeches and the press, should be read by all. Secondly comes the art of speaking or self-expression. I do not mean by this public speaking, which should follow later, but the art of lucid and simple expression and a knowledge of the exact meaning of words. I have attended classes held privately for genuine working-class students given by a sincere W.E.A. tutor. The ability to write would grow from a class of this kind and could be classed with it.

Thirdly comes Social History—but of a type. Even amongst men of the lowest intellectual class, social history has always been a chief item in their thoughts and discussion. Remembering what grandfather or even great-grandfather said is social history, or rather social experience, and serves as a guide to the future. It is also a great source of inspiration. But Social History as a subject for working-class students (or if one feels argumentative, students of a low educational background) should not go back too far. That is where the great unidentified "They" work their trick and "blow it out". "They" give the student too much to assimilate and take him back too far into the irrelevant past. The Enclosure Acts and the Industrial Revolution are far enough back for the working-class student for all practical

purposes, and the Hammonds' books *The Village Labourer* and *The Town Labourer* are excellent subjects for study.

This is all the groundwork the working-class student needs, as such, and in support of this, and on behalf of all those astute W.E.A. workers who have left the movement since 1925, I say that the first two subjects are the ones on which "They" have concentrated when they have taken in working-class men for their police. There is the pointer. But of course all this has been said as long ago as 1925.

If Mr. Beharrell pursues his policy of attending W.E.A. classes because he gets something out of the State from them, and because he, and all of us, have to pay for things we don't want, I ask—"How long will he continue to do this until he realises that he is unconsciously playing the State's game and directly propagating the will of the Unidentified Few?" The State can always say with mock innocence when the education of the men at the bottom is under discussion—"We provide classes but they won't come"—when it knows it has killed the W.E.A. by "blowing it out", and Mr. Beharrell is helping to do the "blowing" by his egotistical and directionless approach to the real function of a W.E.A. class; and I therefore say that he and others should pay for their classes and be denied all subsidies for they merely promote a cult and gratify the wishes of a few people who should pay their own way even as anarchists pay theirs and are all the better for it.

Watford, Herts,

6th April.

E. J. ROGERS.

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

OPEN AIR MEETINGS

Weather Permitting
HYDE PARK
Every Sunday at 4.30 p.m.

INDOOR MEETINGS

At 9, Fitzroy Square, Warren Street,
London, W.1.

APRIL 21—Arthur Ulloth on
LIBERTARIANS & LUNATICS

APRIL 28—Bonar Thompson on
OSCAR WILDE

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

NORTH-EAST LONDON

DISCUSSION MEETINGS
IN EAST HAM

Alternate Wednesdays
at 7.30 p.m.

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 Carlin
Jane Strachan, Eddie Shaw,

MANCHESTER

LIBERTARIAN GROUP

A Libertarian Group has been formed
in Manchester. All those interested
are invited to meetings at
CROWN HOTEL, Gt. Ancoats Street,

Enquiries to:

J. Pinkerton, 12 Alt Road,
Ashton-Under-Lyne, Lancs.

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