

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

In this Issue :

Mutual Aid and
Social Evolution - p. 2
The Budget - - - p. 3
Anarchism and
Syndicalism - p. 4

Governments dig themselves
in: their true aim should be
to become unnecessary.

W. R. LETHABY.

Vol. 14, No. 17

April 25th, 1953

Threepence

MALAN RETURNS TO POWER

DR. MALAN'S victory in the South African elections can only mean that the political struggle between the White and the Coloured population will continue to be intense. In voting for the continuance of a small White minority's domination over the enormously larger African population, the electorate exposes its complete lack of democratic foundation, for such a result could only occur where the franchise, for practical purposes, extends only to the whites.

It also shows clearly that the United Party's "opposition" does not extend to the "apartheid" policy of Dr. Malan. The speeches of Mr. J. G. N. Strauss, the United Party's leader, made it quite clear that non-whites could expect nothing from his party even if it was voted in. This political attitude shows more clearly than anything the general outlook of the white voter. If there had been substantial opposition to Malan's racial policy the opposition would have waned. If the United Party had any principles about racialism they could hardly do this, and they deserve to lose the election. Critics of Malan in this country should learn at least this lesson, that on this crucial issue there is no official Opposition.

The Opposition having shown itself so weak on this point, it is not surprising that Dr. Malan now seeks to crush it altogether by securing the two-thirds majority he needs for unlimited control. His call to members of the Opposition to cross the floor and join with his party may well be successful since politicians are not unconcerned about jumping the bandwagon.

Repercussions in Other Parts of Africa

Malan's success will almost certainly encourage him to try and incorporate other South African terri-

AFRICAN SCENE DARKENS

tories into the Union. He will appeal to all those Europeans whose fear of the coloured population has the same pathological character as the South African Nationalists'. In such circumstances the resistance of the Africans can only be sharpened, and feeling between the European minority and the African majority will increase in temperature.

The British government, by their conduct of the Seretse Khama case, and in Central African Federation, have shown that, if they are aware of the dangers, they are not willing or able to do anything practical about it. Some ghastly outbreak of hostility seems therefore inevitable in the long run, and it does not seem likely that it will be so long.

Kenya

British handling of the Kenya

situation points in the same direction. The appointment of General Hinde, with open instructions to follow General Templer's Malayan footsteps in Kenya, has been applauded, even demanded, not only by the reactionary press but also by those very liberal papers which professed hesitancy at General Templer's Malayan methods. However, in politics, nothing allays scruples so effectively as success, and General Templer's apparent success has turned his critics into admirers.

The total effect of military measures against Kenya's nationalism, of Central African Federation whether the Africans like it or not, and of Malan's victory at the polls, is to darken the African future considerably.

The Pope and Politics

THE Pope gave an audience a few days ago to 500 Catholic Action Activists specially picked and brought from the Private College of Professor Gedda at Casale where they have been undergoing "intense political propaganda courses" in preparation for the forthcoming Italian elections. The *Manchester Guardian* reports that they go into the country as paid professional propagandists.

The interest that the Catholic Church displays in politics from time to time was given some prominence last year during the elections in Central & Southern Italy. An article in *FREEDOM* at that time, quotes from a collective episcopal letter circulated among Catholics . . . "that anyone who fails to vote is committing a mortal sin and is a deserter, for the vote is the most effective means of defending rights . . . especially of the Church most gravely menaced by the foes of Christianity". The faithful were then instructed for whom they must vote with a warning that a vote for any party with a materialistic-atheistic programme would constitute another mortal sin. (Note the use of the word materialist

with atheistic so that any party concerned with even the mildest of economic reforms can be interpreted as atheistic).

The Catholic Church has always displayed a very 'materialistic' interest in politics, but its enthusiasm and support has varied according to the degree of co-operation the different political parties have been prepared to extend to the Church. Only a few years ago in Italy the same people who, to-day, are being forced to vote through spiritual coercion, were being forbidden to take any part in politics whatsoever. *Catholic Action*, for example, at its inception was strictly forbidden to participate in any political activity and was ostensibly formed "for the diffusion and exercise of Catholic principles outside any political party". Thus in Mussolini's Italy it was allowed to flourish unmolested.

Ban on Catholics to Vote

Up until after the first World War Catholics were forbidden to vote under penalty of ex-communication. The reason for this was not that their souls would be sullied, but that the Vatican could not come to terms with the Italian

Continued on p. 2

FOREIGN COMMENTARY

McCarthy's Bloodhounds at Large in Europe

THE vocal hostility in this country to Senator McCarthy's two Investigator's during their lightning tour of Europe seems to have been based on false rumours: that included in their "probe" was the British Broadcasting Corporation. The Inquisitors have found it quite easy to demonstrate that this was not their intention, pointing out that their "mission" is to investigate American personnel in Europe. And with this reassurance, the man-in-the-street will turn his attention to some other rumour until that too is exploded. It is sad to observe the way much of what is called public indignation is the result of the spreading of rumours by word of mouth, while the real facts, over which there is

every cause to feel indignation, are allowed to pass unnoticed. This seems to us to be the case in the present investigation being conducted by Messrs. Cohn and Schine, McCarthy's bloodhounds in Europe. Now that we are assured that they have no intention of interfering in British affairs, there is no cause to be alarmed at their mission since they are only concerned with their fellow-nationals. This all too common attitude to-day is to our minds a wrong and harmful one. Where civil liberties and the freedom of the individual are concerned there are no frontiers, for apart from the fact that man's struggle for freedom has never been confined by national frontiers, witch-hunts and book-burnings, like contagious diseases, are not respecters of frontiers. And to allow what is at present happening in America, and among American personnel in Europe and Asia to pass without protest, is a virtual invitation to the McCarthys in our midst (and they lurk in all countries waiting for the opportune moment to strike) to apply similar methods in the name of democracy.

One of the most sinister jobs entrusted to the two young Inquisitors was the inspection of the huge American libraries in Berlin, Frankfurt and elsewhere and the weeding out of volumes "written by Communists". This is a matter on which Senator McCarthy has strong feelings. Earlier this month, the Senator called on Secretary of State John Foster Dulles to find the State Department officials responsible for putting Communist-written books in United States libraries overseas.

He also asked that Mr. Dulles should assign someone to "run down" the purchase orders for Communist books or, if they were accepted as gifts, "the names of the individuals who accepted them". In an earlier letter to Mr. Dulles, which McCarthy made public, he alleges that books of "some 75 different Communist authors like William Z. Foster, Earl Browder, Agnes Smedley, etc., were purchased by the Acheson administration and stocked in our libraries throughout the world". Once such a policy is put into effect (and we do not doubt that in many libraries in America this has already been done without wait-

ing for official orders) it means the end of free, independent thinking, and there will be very little to choose between the new situation in America and the book-burning rituals under Hitler.

Already these attacks on the mind which are the result of the anti-communist nationalistic policies developed in American life since the end of the war are producing these results. According to Devere Allen, editor of *Worldover Press* (the American News Agency): "New surveys reveal a frightening lack of thought on anything, among high school seniors, along with an absence of any efforts in school curricula to stimulate thinking. Whether we have reached rock-bottom or not, no one can say".

But apparently there are signs of reaction to this situation. According to the same source:

"The FORD FOUNDATION has set up the Fund for the Republic with a grant of \$15,000,000 to inquire into assaults on academic freedom, censorship, the use of guilt by association. It has organized a competent committee to guide the work. It will move slowly, as so large a body must. But when it gets going, it should be heard from. And if it fails to cut the McCarthys down to their right size, it will be recreant to its trust. It is high time. For McCarthy and his crowd are not out merely to save the world, or to ride the tiger of their own intolerance and ignorance; they are out to dominate the foreign policy of the free world. Until they are halted, there can be no free world to save."

We do not doubt that with its \$15 million backing the Foundation will discover quite a lot about assaults on academic freedom. But we already know quite enough! As to how "McCarthy and his crowd" can be halted is not a matter for research and legislation. We do not believe that it is possible to halt a process such as this until there is a fundamental change in attitude to the whole problem of investigation of "loyalties". Such progressively minded people as the editor of *Worldover Press* are themselves partly responsible for "McCarthy and his crowd" because they do in fact believe in some kind of loyalty tests. Let us quote further from Devere Allen's dispatch where he writes: "As promised under the McCarthy dispensation, college teachers are being investigated. With that, in a

different mood, there could be no real quarrel. But if professors are to be probed because they are felt to be possibly 'unreliable', how about professors known to be so? How about that ex-Communist Professor Louis Budenz, whose word is now gospel to the McCarthy committee, but who says to-day that Owen Lattimore is a Communist, though he testified in 1947 and 1949 to the contrary? In the sight of the present writer, it is difficult to trust a professional anti-Communist who makes \$70,000 out of his conversion."

"In a different mood, there could be no quarrel". That sums up the attitude of American liberal opinion to the Inquisition. Yet is it not obvious to these people that once fetters are placed on thought no matter how judiciously and in whatever "mood" it is the beginning of a process which will eventually develop into a thoroughgoing Inquisition? It is an admission that one believes there are standards of what is right thinking and wrong thinking and that some machinery can be created, some standard can be established, just like that for weights and measures, against which one's thinking shall be tested. Who will establish what is the standard of right thinking? Our American liberals strongly resent that in Russia such standards have been established by the ruling class (the Communist hierarchy) because to their minds it is wrong thinking. But why assume that the standards that will be established by ruling classes—even in America or Britain—will necessarily be right thinking? Right thinking can only emerge from freedom of thought, and, however old-fashioned such an idea may appear in this streamlined world of ours, it is the only bulwark against wrong thinking.

Such ideas have not completely disappeared, even in America. For instance, the National Council of Jewish Women awarded first prize in a college senior contest to Stanley Wolpert, who in the course of his essay declared:

"Unless the teacher is free to question and dissent, the student's mind will emerge from school, not strong with wisdom, but at best heavy with information."

LIBERTARIAN.

More People Eat Less

DEFERENCE to the "Vatican bloc" of member states makes it unusual for United Nations' experts to do more than hint at the danger of population pressure. When courageous Dr. Karl Evang, Norwegian delegate to the Fifth World Health Organization Assembly, did propose one obvious remedy, government promotion of contraception, the issue was tabled "in the interests of harmony." Such enforced "harmony" within the U.N. contributes nothing to the "harmony" of hungry peoples. U.N. reticence on realities partly conceals, but does not obliterate the fact that we increase by about 30,000,000 stomachs each year.

This rate soon will be exceeded and with the greatest increase in the areas of most desperate hunger. In the Far East, where approximately half the world lives, "seven spoonfuls of food out of every ten contain rice. But rice production in the Far East is two and one-half per cent. below pre-war levels." Yet the post-war population has so increased "that to-day eleven people take their places at the table for every ten before the war." Thus warns the front page of the *United Nations Reporter*, N.Y., Feb., 1953. The second "World Food Survey" of the U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization paints a picture of increasing hunger, indeed sombre.

"The proportion of the world's population with inadequate food supplies has grown appreciably larger. World food production has indeed expanded since the end of the war, when it fell to a low point, but much of this achievement represents merely a recovery from wartime devastation and dislocation." Furthermore, where this expansion is achieved

without the use of adequate fertilizer, we are borrowing from a hungrier tomorrow. Even though for many areas nutritive value has been lowered by diverting feed-grains for livestock to the kitchen, eating products (such as oil seeds) normally used for industry, mixing coarse grains with wheat for bread, and substituting cereals and starch for animal protein, the Survey cautions that the quantity consumed is still less year by year for many members of the human family. "It is important to note that for some of the worst fed areas . . . the decline has been greater than for the world as a whole." To depend on surplus areas, which have shipped thousands of tons of food to hungrier regions, also would not meet the problem: "They, too, have rising populations."

Four millions in India face death by famine, "even though heavy imports from the U.S. in 1952 enabled her to start the year with 1,880,008 tons of food grains." (Reuters, New Delhi, Feb. 6). But 5,000,000 more mouths to be fed appear each year. Mr. B. G. Kher, High Commissioner for India, believes that the rate of population increase will require over six million tons of additional food supplies at the end of the five-year period, even to maintain the present standard of food allocation. Fortunately the Indian Government, unlike the timid United Nations, is facing squarely the over-population problem by adopting voluntary parenthood as one measure towards solution.

(This very moderate statement is taken from the April Bulletin of the International Planned Parenthood Committee, New York.—Eds.)

VIEWPOINT: Anarchism

AS I see it, anarchism is not a specifically proletarian doctrine. It transcends class concepts and its psychological context is classless. Anarchism is neither proletarian nor bourgeois, it is simply anarchism, however misunderstood and misinterpreted by those who consider it should fall into one or other of these two categories. Its basic concepts of no-government and a free society of autonomous individuals voluntarily co-operating to further their common interests, were formulated before the rise of the industrial factory workers who appear to be the main concern of marxists and of many syndicalists.

Anarchism stands for the liberation of all men from authority. It does not advocate the domination of one class over another. Anarchy will be achieved by individuals realising that they cannot be free until they have thrown off the shackles of authority and joined together with other individuals of like mind to destroy the ideas and institutions of oppression. Since anarchists are committed by their principles to struggle against human authority in all its forms—and all such authority is by definition domination of man over man—we are naturally opposed to the oppression and exploitation of the workers by the capitalist class and seek to aid by all the means in our power any attempt by workers to free themselves from the capitalist yoke.

However, we do not see that there is any particular revolutionary virtue in

being a worker any more than being a capitalist (there is an ethical preference involved, but that is another question). Both classes are a product and necessity of each other. Only people who still believe the Marxian fallacy of some force operating in history external to the consciousness of men ("the dialectical process") can cling to the myth that, after the failure of a hundred years or more of propaganda to create a revolutionary class consciousness, the workers have an "historic mission" as a class to liberate mankind. A society in which the workers were the dominant class—and such would be the result if this fetishism of the proletariat succeeded—is just as repugnant to us as any other class society. If the revolutions of the past have anything to teach us it is that the struggle for human liberty presents a far deeper problem than the merely material objectives of what is conceived of as the industrial struggle. Material well-being is a basic prerequisite for the anarchist society; the struggle for wresting the control and ownership of industry from the boss class is an essential part of the anarchist revolution, but these objectives are not the only ones, they are just a part of the struggle of the individual to control himself: the achievement of individual sovereignty.

Let there be no mistake about what I am stating—I have no wish to underestimate the value of the class struggle. It is a vital necessity for the defence of living standards under capitalism and if it grew fierce enough would be an important means of bringing about the collapse of the *status quo*. The anarchist revolution, however, is primarily a process of individual liberation from authority and to look to any class in society today as a means of its realisation can only lead to fatal errors and eventual despair.

To sum up: We the enemies of capitalism and identify ourselves with the struggle for its destruction because it is the contemporary expression of authority in its property form. Its inevitable condition for existence is the economic subjugation of the mass of the people to a position of wage slavery, in which they have to sell their labour power at terms dictated by the capitalist class to whom

Continued from p. 1

Government over a very "materialistic" disagreement such as who owned which States, etc. However, after the war Catholics were leaving the Church *en masse*, and to counteract the influence of Anarchism and Socialism the Pope agreed to the formation of *The Catholic Popular Party* under the leadership of a Sicilian priest, Don Sturzo. *The Catholic Party* gained in strength particularly in rural areas and captured a few of the Socialist voters who in 1919 out of a total vote of 3,500,000 polled 1,840,593.*

At the same time the Fascist Party was beginning to gain support, and it has been suggested that a coalition of all Catholics and others, including the Socialist parties, at this time would have served as an effective combat to Mussolini. Whether or not this would have been the case is only speculative. Before the results of such a move could be ascertained the Vatican issued a circular letter forbidding the Italian Hierarchy to continue to identify themselves with the *Catholic Party*.

Co-operation With Mussolini

In 1923, the first of the secret interviews between Mussolini and the Vatican Secretary of State took place. As a result the Bank of Rome, to which the Vatican's High Prelates and the Holy See had entrusted their funds, was saved from bankruptcy by Mussolini to the tune of 1,500,000,000 Lire. In the same year the Head of the Sacred College of Cardinals, Cardinal Vanutelli, publicly declared that the "Duce had been chosen by God to save the Nation and to restore her fortune", later on, in 1929, the Lateran Agreement was concluded,

accrues the surplus value this system creates. In a free society equality of opportunity and freedom of access to the means of production will be the basic economic principles and the tyranny of capital over labour will be ended. His imagination is a poor one indeed, however, to whom this is the measure of anarchism, for without the spiritual and moral emancipation of man economic emancipation will remain an empty husk. Our task is to propagate our ideas to all men, presenting our case to them as human beings with everything to gain and nothing to lose from the achievement of liberty.

S. E. PARKER.

THE POPE AND POLITICS

under which the Vatican was recognised as an independent State and the "Fascist Government undertook to pay a vast sum of money as compensation". In addition a Concordat was signed by which the Catholic Church was restored to her former prominence and privileged position; "religious education was made compulsory in schools; teachers had to be approved by the Church; textbooks had to be approved by the ecclesiastical authorities; religious marriage was made obligatory; books, Press and films against Catholicism were made a penal offence, etc." Little wonder the Pope declared that the "atheistic" Mussolini "was the man sent by Providence". In return for such a claim Mussolini entered St. Peter's and was blessed with holy water.

In the early part of this year we mentioned in an article in FREEDOM how the Communists in the Italian Parliament were trying to push through an electoral bill which would guarantee them two-thirds of the total votes in the future elections. It was a similar bill for which in 1923 Mussolini tried to get approval and which was resisted by all the parties in parliament headed by the Catholic Popular Party (with its 107 Catholic Deputies). A few weeks later the Pope ordered the resignation of Don Sturzo (who was also a priest) from the leadership of the Catholic Party and the eventual disbandment of the Party. Thus a serious obstacle to Mussolini's bid for total power was weakened.

Manhattan writes:— "The following year [i.e. 1924] under the direct personal instructions of the Duce, the Socialist leader, Matteotti, who was the bitterest opponent to Mussolini's bid for absolutism, was murdered by the Fascists. The indignation of the country was so great that the régime had never been so near to falling . . . in protest the Popular Party and the Socialists, after having withdrawn from the Lower House asked the King for Mussolini's dismissal.

"But, once again the Vatican came to the rescue of the Fascist leader. At this juncture when Socialists and Catholics were negotiating to bring into being a solid coalition . . . Pope Pius came forward with a solemn warning to all Italian Catholics that any alliance with the Socialists, including the

moderate brand, were strictly forbidden by the moral law, according to which co-operation with evil is sin. The Pope said this, conveniently forgetting that such co-operation had taken and was taking place in Belgium and Germany."

This was followed by the Pope's order that all priests resign from the Catholic Party, which led to its disintegration and opened the way to complete power for the Fascists.

It is at this stage that *Catholic Action* was formed and placed under the direction of the bishops. The pope asked all Catholics to join the new organisation, which of course was allowed to flourish under the pretext that it was non-political.

Catholics Ordered to Vote

With the defeat of Mussolini the Pope ordered once again all Catholics to take part in the political life of the nation. Priests and bishops were told to tell the flock to vote for the *Christian Democratic Party*. In 1946 the Italian Consultative Assembly passed a decree forbidding priests to discuss political matters. This decree was in effect like one of the clauses in the 1929 Concordat concluded with Mussolini and, the Vatican forbidding the clergy to take part in political activity. The tactics however have changed, and the Pope has this to say: "To exercise the right to vote implies grave moral responsibility at least when it is a question of electing those who are called upon to give the country its constitution and laws . . . the clergy must guide laity on civic issues that involve faith or morals. It is an essential right and duty of the Church to teach the faithful everything pertaining to the faith and moral behaviour". Thus under the name of moral guidance the Church once again actively enters the political arena. What happened to the moral responsibility in Mussolini's day? Was he not responsible for framing the constitution and laws when he finally had complete power, and how vocal was the Church in its condemnation?

The Italian people are the best judges of who benefited by the support given to the "man chosen by God". R.M.

*See Avro Manhattan's *The Catholic Church Against the 20th Century*. Available from Freedom Bookshop, 2/6d.

ON THE VICTIM'S SIDE

WE also refuse to accept the statement that the trials which are now taking place in Europe should not concern us. It may be true that our protests will not change the course of events, but we must voice them nevertheless. Workers all over the world who rallied to the defence of Sacco and Vanzetti were not able to save them from the electric chair, yet who can say that their protests were useless?

We shall denounce political trials, whether they are held in Washington or a man in jail for his political opinions, in Warsaw. When a government puts we do not ask the nationality of that government. We are always on the side of the victim of State tyranny.

MARIE LOUISE BERNERI

—NEITHER EAST NOR WEST

This article and that printed last week are part of a series of three on social aspects of Kropotkin's conception of mutual aid as a factor of evolution. They were issued some years ago as a pamphlet but have been out of print for a considerable time. After the third and last article, FREEDOM will print a new study by Richard De Haan on Kropotkin, Marx and Dewey. Since Kropotkin's book *Mutual Aid* has long been out of print, the present articles are re-printed to serve as an introduction to De Haan's analysis. The conception of mutual aid within human society is gradually coming to be taken account of by sociologists of to-day.

*

"THE WAR OF EACH AGAINST ALL"

THE question must now be considered in more detail. Thomas Henry Huxley had represented Darwinism as an unbridled competition of each against all which tended to weed out all individuals save those "best fitted to survive".

" . . . from the point of view of the moralist, the animal world is on about the same level as a gladiator's show. The creatures are fairly well treated, and set to fight; whereby the strongest, the swiftest, and the cunningest live to fight again another day. The spectator has no need to turn his thumb down, as no quarter is given . . ." And further on in the same paper he declares that what obtains among animals, is also true of primitive men. Significantly enough, in this connexion, he refers to the English philosopher Hobbes, whose book *Leviathan*, in defence of the highly centralised state, was written in the middle of the seventeenth century, in the years during which the English capitalist class fought for the political supremacy which they wrested from the landowning aristocracy and the monarchy in the Revolution of 1642.

" . . . The weakest and stupidest went to the wall, while the toughest and shrewdest, those who were best fitted to cope with their circumstances, but not the best in another way, survived. Life was a continuous free fight, and beyond the limited and temporary relations of the family, the Hobbesian war of each against all was the normal state of existence."

It was to show that this conception was very far from corresponding with the facts of nature, in what we know of both animal and human life, that Kropotkin wrote the articles for *The Nineteenth Century* which he later collected together into his book *Mutual Aid*.

The Huxleyan views which the capitalists took to themselves were obviously at variance with the teachings of Anarchism; yet Kropotkin did not write *Mutual Aid* simply in order to vindicate Anarchist ideas in a merely controversial way. He never allowed his Anarchism to lead him into making a partial selection from the facts for the sake of making out a "case". In his introduction to *Mutual Aid*, he describes the observations which he made during his explorations in Siberia with Poliakov:

MUTUAL AID AND SOCIAL

"We were both under the fresh impression of the *Origin of Species*, but we vainly looked for the keen competition between animals of the same species which the reading of Darwin's works had led us to expect, even after taking into account the remarks of the third chapter."

Kropotkin pointed out that it is by no means always the longest teeth and the sharpest claws that ensure survival of a species among animals. On the contrary, the most successful are those in which the individuals, so far from competing with each other, eliminate this competition altogether, and instead combine among themselves for the purpose of securing food, for defence against their enemies, or for safeguarding the young during the breeding season. He showed that many species even of predatory animals, such as certain eagles, combined for the purpose of hunting for food. Other animals, on the other hand, whose members are individually poorly equipped for attack or defence, defeat their more powerful enemies by combining together in groups. This tendency to form groups for social purposes he called *Mutual Aid*, and he demonstrated that the operation of this principle was a much more potent influence in securing survival than mutual struggle. Kropotkin's book is really a development and amplification of the view put forward by the Russian biologist, Kessler, whom he quotes in his first section:

"I obviously do not deny the struggle for existence, but I maintain that the progressive development of the animal kingdom, and especially of mankind, is favoured much more by mutual support than by mutual struggle . . . All organic beings have two essential needs: that of nutrition, and that of propagating the species. The former brings them to a struggle and to mutual extermination, while the needs of maintaining the species bring them to approach one another and to support one another. But I am inclined to think that in the evolution of the organic world—in the progressive modification of organic beings—mutual support among individuals plays a much more important part than their mutual struggle."

A recent writer has pointed out the same principle in regard to the actual history of human society:

"The early members of the human family . . . the fossil hominids that are often termed palaeo-anthropics, were not our direct evolutionary ancestors; in the pedigree of *Homo Sapiens* they represent the side branches of the main stem. And yet their bodies were better equipped than ours for certain physical functions such as fighting. The canine teeth of Eoanthropus, or Piltown Man, for instance, were formidable weapons."

* V. Gordon Childe: *Man Makes Himself*. 1936.

How, then, did *Homo Sapiens* manage to survive whilst the cave bear and the sabre-toothed tiger disappeared? These animals were well enough equipped for the "war of each against all"; but they had only themselves to rely on. Men lived in societies and practiced mutual support. They used mutual defence, and learned to implement their individual physical equipment by means of tools. As Professor Gordon Childe says, "In a sense the possibility of making artificial substitutes for bodily defences is a consequence of their absence".

MUTUAL AID IMPLIES SOCIAL LIVING

It is clear that the idea that mutual aid is a powerful factor in securing evolutionary survival must imply that men have always lived in societies, for if they had been solitary they could never have lived on in conditions which rendered better equipped animals extinct. To have survived at all they must always have been social creatures. Kropotkin devoted a considerable amount of his book to showing that living in societies is widespread among animals and is by no means a purely human acquirement. The work of Lewis Morgan (best known nowadays through Frederick Engels' book *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*, which is based on Morgan's book *Ancient Society*) had already shown that social groupings in *tribes* can be traced as preceding societies in which families are the predominant grouping. Among others whose researches established this precedence of tribes over families was Elie Reclus†, the brother of the geographer Elisée Reclus. It was his scientific researches in anthropology which led him to his Anarchist convictions.

This question of the tribe and the family is important because it is commonly believed that in primitive times men roamed about in small mutually hostile groups held together by no more than "family ties". Children are still taught by ignorant teachers that men have "progressed" from a condition of primitive savagery in which internecine strife was the rule to a condition of nation societies in which "peace" (1) is the blessed condition of the human race. It is needless to point out how convenient such a conception is to the philosophy of capitalism and also of gradualist reformers. Although such a teaching is not at all in conformance with the facts of observation and research, and would have rendered the survival of man impossible if it had been the actual conditions of primitive men, it none the less holds the field to-day. In order to accept capitalist society it is necessary to regard nature as Huxley did, with the "Hobbesian war of each against all" as the "normal conditions of existence".

† See Elie Reclus: *Primitive Folk*.

THE BUDGET

OF recent years successive British governments have tended to make the Chancellor of the Exchequer and his Budget, with its slightly musical comedy Gladstone bag, into a kind of publicity stunt. Budgets themselves are treated to more preliminary speculation and more headlines than ever before. As with other stunts, the shouting quickly dies down and the budget in a week or so is forgotten. Indeed in writing about it in a weekly paper nearly ten days after the Chancellor made his announcements one is conscious that it is no longer news.

All this underlines a contention that anarchists have made over many years: that the Budget is not in fact of any great interest to the vast majority of the population. The hard economic facts of our social organization are still that a man sells his labour for what he can get for it, and that does not leave much margin for any real changes in his way of life. Budgets and Chancellors may come and go but the divisions between rulers and ruled, between those who earn wages and those who pay them remain. No budget whether Conservative or Labour (or, in dim history, Liberal either) alters that.

Another fact of governmental economy is that ultimately the vast bulk of the money dealt with in the budget must come from the workers, because numerically, they are in an enormous majority. Of course, in a more fundamental sense all government wealth, whether obtained by taxing the rich or the poor comes ultimately from the workers. Since real wealth is only created by applying labour power to natural resources. Hence, in taxing the rich the government are only "robbing the robbers", and not helping the workers. One should beware of re-

garding this economic approach as entirely fundamental however. For if carried to an extreme of political publicity, a government may strip the rich of practically everything in order to pose as protectors of the workers. Where this has happened as part of Communist technique, the workers, far from being helped, have been ground down still further and government has been even more despotic.

"Taking from the rich to help the poor", or "equalizing sacrifice" or "redressing economic injustice" or whatever fancy name is used for budgetary propaganda gestures, when it is not more or less meaningless superficial vote catching, as usually with the Labour Party, may be regarded as an aspect of the "war" between private and State capitalism, the gradual absorption of private undertakings into nationalized organizations. Budgets may reflect this procedure but they do not alter the general situation of the workers.

It is not surprising therefore to read in a more or less independent Sunday paper's editorial that "it seems unfortunate that so very little has been done to help the poorest of all. Old age pensioners and many other people struggling to live on small fixed incomes have been severely hit by rising prices, and they will obtain very little relief from Mr. Butler's proposals."

Finally, it is as well to keep a sense of proportion. The budget to-day is one means of adjusting a national economy to the changing face of world economy. Mr. Butler's budget foresees a trade recession (as slumps are now called) and seeks to combat it by increasing purchasing power a little. But the increases in purchasing power are a small matter compared with the total figures of the budget. Basically, therefore, we are faced with the same conception in the end: that the budget is determined by the economic needs of British capitalism, and this goes for whichever government is in power. In the nature of things it cannot "help the worker" very much.

COMMENT:

SIR DAVID MAXWELL FYFE was sorry but "an honest mistake by witnesses does not warrant compensation." This is what Edward Penfold of Southwark was told after spending three weeks in jail for an offence which he did not commit.

After protesting his innocence Mr. Penfold agreed to take part in an identification parade and was picked out by witnesses as one of the men who participated in a raid on a Wapping public-house.

Later another man described as "not unlike Mr. Penfold in general appearance" made a written confession that he had been concerned in the robbery and the witnesses agreed that they had made a mistake when a second identification parade was held.

"If there had been any fault or negli-

Sir David is Sorry But ...

gence on the part of the police in bringing this charge against Mr. Penfold I should certainly have been ready to consider the question of making some *ex gratia* payment to him," said Sir David.

"But I can find no reason for thinking the police to blame."

There is no reason whatsoever to doubt the integrity of the witnesses in this case but even the most conservative-minded will find cause for misgivings about a legal system which enables such outrages to be committed.

Amongst the cases tried at Great Marlborough Street Court recently was that of a middle-aged woman accused of stealing a £1 note from the till at a multiple store in which she was employed. She was divorced and living in a single room and it is not difficult to imagine the reason which caused her to transfer the £1 note from the till to her handbag. But the law is by nature unfeeling and unimaginative, she is now spending one month in Holloway.

The magistrate, Paul Bennett, V.C., told her: "I have a duty to perform to the public and to employers. They are at the mercy of their employees."

Mr. Bennett was also the magistrate before whom our comrade, Philip Sansom appeared last October (see *FREEDOM* 1/11/52) following his arrest on a charge of obstruction at an Anarchist meeting in Manette Street. In order to satisfy the curiosity of Mr. Bennett our comrade explained that it was not law and order that Anarchists objected to—only law! Mr. Bennett should ponder on this distinction.

To send this unfortunate woman to jail may as Mr. Bennett states, serve to protect the employing class but quite where the duty to the public comes into this case it is hard to imagine.

Whilst on the subject of the protection of the public it is pertinent to examine the wide-spread idea that the murderer is a public enemy. In some ways the murderer may be said to be a public benefactor.

When a murder is committed it is undeniably a great misfortune for the victim and for his relatives and friends. But the victims and those near to them form a very small part of the public; what of the remainder?

The morbid enjoyment shown by so

many people in the details of the crime, the revelations and technicalities of the trial and execution have often enough been commented upon in these columns. Even a National Lottery would not suffice to compensate for the excitement of the murder trial. The people might become very discontented if the circuses provided by the Old Bailey and the other Assize Courts should be taken from them.

Week after week the Sunday newspapers re-hash their stories of rape, murder, the 'criminal offence' of homosexuality and so on. Almost invariably they are the same old tales, told in the same suggestive (not so clearly defined as to offend the more 'sensitive' palates and not quite vague enough to fail to stimulate the less imaginative) quasi-legal jargon familiar to the regular reader. Only the dates, the names of those involved and the scene of the crime seem to vary in these accounts of human misery but, despite the intrinsic monotony of his writings the popular crime reporter is sure of a larger readership than any more intelligent writer on another matter of public importance.

'Crime does not pay' is a platitude which may apply to the convicted criminal. But to the proprietors of the national press, the middle-men of crime, it never fails to bring big dividends.

The one-minute appearance of Christie, alleged to have been involved in the Notting Hill Gate murders which have recently been in the headlines was merely a legal formality and yet it sufficed to fill the major part of the front page in all three popular London evening papers on that day.

If, whether by Act of Parliament or by Act of God, crime became a feature of an era now past the number of unemployed in this country would show a considerable increase—unless, that is, the resultant 'surplus labour' could be utilised in armament production! C.Q.

Now Ready:

FREEDOM PRESS

Publications List

April 1953

Copies will be sent free of charge on request

EVOLUTION - 2

The dissemination of this entirely false and politically biased view is due in no small measure to certain popular scientific writers, who have taken upon themselves the task of providing capitalist philosophy with a certain "scientific" sanction. Thus H. G. Wells in his popular and very widely read *Short History of the World*† makes the statement that "True" (Cro-Magnon) men "ousted the Neanderthal man by competing successfully for the same food; they probably made war upon their grisly predecessors and killed them off." (p.31).

In this short passage, Wells implies three propositions for which there is no evidence at all. (1) That true men ousted Neanderthal men by successful competition for the same food supply. The assumption therefore is that the food supply was limited and could not sustain the existing population. This is Malthus' idea once more. (2) That true men made war on Neanderthal men. (3) That Neanderthal men were "grisly", that is, presumably, savage and addicted to horrible practices. Now there is no evidence whatever to support any of these loose assumptions. In all of them lies implicit the idea of internal strife, for which observation provides no vestige of proof. Indeed, it is evident, that the assumption that men did fight among themselves is the basis for Wells' picture of prehistoric human life. This conception appears again later on when he declares:

"Probably the earliest human societies, in the opening stages of the true human story, were small family groups. Just as flocks and herds of the earlier mammals arose out of families which had remained together and multiplied, so did the earliest tribes. But before this could happen a certain restraint upon the primitive egotisms of the individual had to be established."

We have seen that this runs counter to the facts regarding the social development of tribes and families. Wells' last sentence is significant because this argument has been made the justification of governmentalism and coercive authority. Kropotkin demolished this viewpoint in his book and his arguments will be cited later.

Wells goes on to speak of the fear and jealousy and respect inspired by the "old Man" who ruled over the family according to these unfounded assumptions. A similar view of early society was taken by Sigmund Freud in his book *Totem and Taboo*, in which he also speaks of the "primal horde" dominated by an "old Man" as though there were solid evidence for such a conception.‡ This book, one of the most widely read of his works, has been vigorously attacked by anthropologists.

† Circulated in large cheap editions both by the Rationalist and Socialist publishing organisations, and also as a Penguin.

‡ Freud took his ideas about the "primal horde" from a highly speculative book *Primal Law* by J. J. Atkinson, published in 1903.

Morgan, among many others, had already shown at the time when Kropotkin wrote that the monogamous family grew up only gradually out of group marriage in which sexual affairs were wholly communistic and promiscuous; family organisation was thus a later rather than an earlier development of man's social life.

EVIDENCE FROM PRIMITIVE GROUPS TO-DAY

Since Kropotkin wrote *Mutual Aid*, many primitive tribes in all parts of the world have been studied, and a great deal of information bearing on the subject of social organisation has been derived from them. It is necessary, however, in order to avoid confusion, to make a distinction between truly primitive societies which have never known agriculture, and those 'savage' cultures which prove to be degenerated remnants of more advanced cultures of the past. The former are the modern representatives of the 'ancient hunters' of the stone age, before the discovery of agriculture. It is these latter who are misrepresented by the Huxleys, and H. G. Wells's and other unconscious ideologists of capitalism as savage hordes addicted to grisly practices.

Primitive food-gatherers have been observed in widely differing parts of the world, by various observers ranging from travellers and missionaries to anthropologists and ethnologists. In spite of this, the accounts of these primitive societies are surprisingly uniform. Everywhere they are found to be characterised by sociability, mutual trust, and absence of violence and strife within the group. Thus the African pygmies never steal or kill, no such act having occurred within the memory of their oldest member (Van den Bergh). Another writer speaks of the Mambuti Pygmies of the Congo in similar terms. They never kill or steal among themselves, are very gentle and hospitable, show great courage in hunting, and have no social aspirations. The Kalahari Bushmen were exterminated by the Dutch; yet they are described as being entirely free from cruelty and vindictiveness, upright and faithful in their dealings, kindly and lighthearted and careless of the morrow. They were as innocent of tribal organisation, chieftainship or central authority as of criminality in their deeds (Dornan).

The Veddahs of Ceylon are "as peaceable as it is possible to be. They are proverbially truthful and honest" (Bailey). The Semang of Malaya have no form of government. "Freedom, but not licence, is the principle of the Semang group, and the characteristic of each individual." They eat in common and share all their food; drunkenness and theft are absolutely unknown (Schebesta). The Negritos of the Philippine Islands are wholly pacific, any member of any other tribe being welcomed in each others' homes. To the question of a missionary (Vanoverbergh) as to whether they would allow Negritos from further off to hunt in their forests, the answer was, "Yes, we cannot forbid them. If they like to come here and hunt in our forests, they are allowed to do so—why not?" Similarly, Eskimos cannot understand the profession of

soldiering, and have no words for murder or theft. Their practices, however, become more like "civilised" man's in the districts where their territories come in contact with the white man, and where they have learned to trade with them. It was the same with the North American Indian. Verrill declares that the usually accepted ideas about their cruelty are quite erroneous, and where degradation has occurred he attributes it to the influence of white men. Not even primitive men were prepared to be massacred by the extermination policy of early colonisers without putting up some resistance! Verrill notes, "I have seen Indians change the site selected for their camp in order not to disturb a nesting bird." And H. J. Massingham comments: "We might almost call such delicacy an act of imaginative piety and it is a singular comment upon civilised attitudes of mind that such an act would be regarded as purely childish." It is worth remembering that it was the character of the Red Indian which so profoundly influenced the French humanitarian thinkers of the eighteenth century and their conception of the 'noble savage', so often ridiculed to-day by the ignorant.

As a final example in this necessarily brief selection, I will quote what two observers say of the Punan of Borneo, a people who have no social classes and no private property, everything being communal. The Punan himself "is a likeable person, rich in good qualities and innocent of vices. He never slays or attacks men of other tribes wantonly. But he will defend himself and his family pluckily if he is attacked and has no choice of flight. Fighting between Punan whether of the same or different communities is very rare . . .

"Public opinion and tradition seem to be the sole and sufficient sanctions of conduct among these Arcadian bands of wanderers . . . Harmony and mutual help are the rule within the family circle, as well as throughout the larger community . . . each shares with all members of the group whatever food, whether vegetable or animal, he may procure by skill or good fortune."

They are described as being "rich in imagination" and possessing "a fine sense of pictorial art and craftsmanship". Elliot Smith speaks of them as "exempt from the exasperations and the greed which civilisation creates" and "the very antithesis of what is usually understood by the term savage".*

It becomes apparent therefore that natural man, unhampered by social institutions and inequality, is neither savage nor quarrelsome, but lives in harmony and freedom with his fellows. These modern observations, derived from many sources and widely separated parts of the world, provide no confirmation whatever for the capitalistic conception of "the Hobbesian war of each against all." On the contrary they strengthen at every point the arguments put forward by Kropotkin with so much charm and skill in his great book.

* For a fuller account of primitive food-gathering communities, see Elliot Smith, *Human History* 1930.

(To be continued)

Anarchism and Syndicalism - 3

ANARCHISM is frequently sneered at by Marxists as being "alright for peasant countries, but no good for modern industrial societies." In saying this they are following faithfully in the footsteps of their master on the theoretical plane, but unfortunately Marx's prophecies regarding the rôle to be played by the industrial proletariat have not been borne out by historical fact.

It is very comforting, no doubt, when living in an industrialised society, to believe that you are automatically, by that very fact, in the vanguard of the world revolutionary forces. The history of this century however, shows us that it is only in the industrially backward, peasant countries that social revolutions have been made, while in the highly industrialised countries capitalism has consolidated its grip through the bourgeois State, in a way which apparently Marx never foresaw, although the "impossible" Anarchist Bakunin could see it coming very clearly. The strongest revolutionary movements have sprung up, and the only revolutions of note since Marx's time have occurred, in Mexico, Russia, China and Spain—all peasant countries in which (with the exception of China) Anarchism or libertarian communism have been the strongest influences among the workers and peasants.

We need not go here into the reasons for the failures of these revolutions, but it is worth noting that it was in Marx's own country, Germany, a highly industrialised State with a dispossessed proletariat and an uncertain bourgeoisie, that the blackest, most reactionary and anti-working class régime was established, which has only been equalled by the tyranny of the State where Marxism is being worked out in practice.

Peasants and Workers

When, therefore, Marxists maintain that Anarchism is alright only in peasant countries, we can point out that Marxism isn't alright anywhere, and that since two-thirds of the world are peasants anyway, Anarchism would seem to suit the majority. This, however, is the answer if we accept that the ideas of Anarchism cannot appeal to, or do not apply to the problems of, a working class in an industrialised society.

I do not accept that. The relationship

between an industrial worker and the industrial means of production is not fundamentally different from that of a landless peasant. To free themselves from economic bondage both peasants and workers have to enter into control of the means of life. The only difference is that it is more likely that a peasant can acquire a small piece of land of his own—although this gets increasingly difficult—than that a worker in industry can acquire any ownership there.

But as Anarchists we are not interested in "ownership". This is a legalistic conception which has meaning only in a legalistic society. What we are after is free access to the means of life for all, whether that means is land, to produce our food, industry to produce our goods or transport or social services.

Two Fields of Action

To achieve this we have to think along two lines—social and economic. On the social plane, Anarchist communism presents the only libertarian alternative to bourgeois authority. On the economic

level Anarcho-syndicalism offers the only libertarian alternative to capitalism.

And these two conceptions must go hand in hand. It is impossible to be emancipated socially without a revolutionary change in the economic structure of our society, and it is impossible to be economically free without social relationships changing.

Syndicalism is often thought of by Anarchists as a sort of junior partner, and to the extent that it is concerned with an aspect of social living, while Anarchism covers the whole of human life, that is true. But we must not forget that work is the basis of human life, both individually and socially, that it is the root of our culture, the source of our very existence, and that which is concerned with the organisation of work and through work the production of food, clothing and shelter—the necessities of life—has a particular importance in human society.

Not only that. Syndicalism has this to offer Anarchism: on the framework

of the Anarchist ethic, Anarcho-syndicalism has built a form of industrial organisation that conforms to the needs of industrial workers to-day. It offers a possibility of organisation that will give the worker weapons of struggle to guard and improve his conditions of living and working here and now such as he has never known before. It presents a basis and a means for performing that triple function necessary in a revolutionary industrial movement—defending our interests now, making the revolution when the time is ripe and looking after production and distribution in the free society.

The Small Unit

On the structural level Anarchism has one lesson to offer Syndicalism which I should like to stress. It is the use of the small group as a working unit. This does not mean that Anarchists want either the Anarchist or the Syndicalist movement to remain small, but simply that within that movement the units of organisation shall remain small enough

for the individual not to be submerged, for decisions to be arrived at, not by counting votes, but by the patient discussion of points of view and the maintaining of common interest and individual responsibility.

This means, as I see it, regarding each syndicate not as an industrial union, but as itself a federation of workshop committees, local industrial councils, or whatever co-ordinating units arise. This federation can cover the whole industry—must in fact do so to be effective—but can avoid the monolithic character of the industrial union in the same way that the Anarchist movement can avoid the regimentation of the mass movement, by retaining the responsibility at the smallest point of co-operation.

The consideration of Anarchism and Syndicalism does not resolve itself into an "either-or" conclusion. These two conceptions are not mutually exclusive, but, on the contrary, are complementary—each strengthens the other. By adding the federative principle and the concern for the individual in Anarchism to the militant methods of direct action in Syndicalism we arrive at a synthesis of aims and methods that can be applied wherever men or women work together, in mines or hospitals, schools, farms or factories, roads or railways or laboratories.

The dignity of man is continually affronted by the economic prostitution of capitalism and the irresponsibility of government. The achievement of a free society without either is not only desirable, it is a necessity if humanity is not to sink under fearful tyrannies to a level of barbarism intolerable in an age which should offer both leisure and abundance. And the most effective means to achieve that free society is presented in Anarcho-syndicalism. P.S.

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS GIVE TITO A HAND?

I FIND the negative attitude of FREEDOM towards the recent visit of Marshal Tito most disappointing and indeed perplexing. It would appear that so far as our purists are concerned Anti-Clericalism, and Anti-Muscovism, like Socialism or bourgeoisie "Patriotism"—is not enough. A very noble and commendable attitude indeed, but not one likely to win friends, gain allies, or advance the cause of Socialism.—Libertarian or otherwise. When "A plague on both houses" becomes extended to all houses without distinction between the occupants, then "All or Nothing" means mostly Nothing. Isn't it just about time we stopped "sending ourselves to Coventry" and extended a more cordial attitude without submerging our identity, on the common field of struggle to misguided and well-meaning Titoists, S.P.G.B's, and I.L.P'ers who still cling to the myth of the "necessary" "Workers State"?

What other possible stage of development could there be in Jugo-Slavia at this very moment? The people of that country have not shown themselves ready for anything else—and neither would Anglo-American aid be forthcoming if they were. Combined Anglo-American-Russian intervention to "save" the government of Belgrade would be more likely. The State must "wither away" in all countries at once—a most unlikely contingency—or first of all in those countries which are most heavily-armed and technically advanced. Anything else would be abortive, since Anarchism without control and eventual destruction of atomic weapons means ineffectual pacifism and martyrdom.

If your scathing attack upon Tito is merely an academic one, it was a bad choice to single out Tito's Government at

a time when all progressive-minded anti-clericals and 'Left-Oppositionists' are looking to the Marshal as their champion.

I seem to remember that the Anarchist Movement on the Continent has not always remained so exclusively hidden and imprisoned within its own ivory tower, as when our Spanish comrades voted in elections and sent their own members to the Cortés in Barcelona, or when the Italians even went so far as to form an alliance with the Catholic "Left" against Mussolini! I am not suggesting a repetition of this.

And who might one ask, are the "persecuted" in Jugo-Slavia and the closely-watched in Britain? Cardinal Stepinac the war-criminal, Russo-Balkan spies and saboteurs, royalist émigrés, or unreliable officers and public servants? For whom does the Bell Toll this time? Not for Us, I hope!

London, April 13. CAVAN McCARTHY.

A Reply:

IT is not often that letters such as the one from Mr. McCarthy escape the waste-paper basket. Not that we are afraid of criticism (most of the letters we publish are critical) but because we have all too little space as it is without wasting it on this adolescent populist-frontalist-reformism, which gets us nowhere. Either the anarchist philosophy is valid or it is not. We maintain it is because it corresponds to the kind of life that we would choose to lead, and we have confirmation that this view is shared by many other people as an "ideal", but like Mr. McCarthy they believe that it cannot be achieved in the near or even distant future. This may be quite true. Our reaction to such a proposition is to continue to put forward anarchist ideas in order to free people's minds from the fetters of governmentalism, leadership, etc. Mr. McCarthy instead spends his time putting the various leaders under a political microscope and trying to see whether one is not perhaps better than the other. And if he can discover any qualities in one which do not exist in the other he then advocates that we should give our support to the former!

What has he discovered in Tito? That he has suppressed the Church and has broken off diplomatic relations with Moscow. By approving the suppression of the Church in Yugoslavia Mr. McCarthy does not convince us that Tito is a lover of freedom—or Mr. McCarthy for that matter. And Tito's break with Moscow has been followed by his alliance with America and Britain. Has the cause of freedom in any way been advanced by this marriage of convenience? When Tito was being wine and dined in London we went to the trouble of reminding our readers of the kinds of things Tito had to say about Mr. Church.

chill and other as recently as 1946. Does Mr. McCarthy not take this into account in assessing Tito's probity. Far from sending ourselves "to Coventry" as our correspondent suggests, we would point out to him that we are very particular in the choice of our friends!

Anarchists have never taken the "All or nothing" attitude. They have always encouraged the working people to engage in struggle against employers and governments alike to improve their material conditions and to achieve greater freedom from governmental control. But that is quite another matter from thinking that the social revolution, which will free us from employers and governments, will come from above, by co-operation with "good" leaders and "good" governments. For this reason we are not interested in alliances with the advocates of the "Workers State" or of Parliaments that will vote themselves out of power.

We fail to understand why, if Mr. McCarthy does not advocate a repetition of the Spanish Anarchists and syndicalists governmentalism, (they did not enter the Cortes by the way) and the alliance of the Italian anarchists with the Catholic "Left" (the first we have heard of it) he should bother to raise the point... Indeed, if he doesn't advocate such action, then what is the point of his letter?

May we suggest he has rung the wrong bell?—EDITORS.

In Witchhunt Land

I SIT here in Boston watching with a somewhat fishy eye the antics of the "red probers" who just closed down hearings. Resentment is growing, witness the protests of the clergy and a much more objective treatment by the newspapers. The issues involved are so completely confused though, that those who would protest, in order to retain the good faith of the community, can only give one sentence of protestation and then have to give ten sentences of explanation of why, how and in what sense they are protesting; all of which is infinitely less sensational than the emotive accusation. And so much of what makes the headlines is that which happened ten, fifteen and twenty years ago. (This you don't discover until you're seven-eighths of the way through the newspaper article). The most amazing part of all is the completely extra-legal nature of the 'trials'... enough... it all goes to prove; where there's an emotion, there's a way... I enclose some clippings which will amuse you in a sordid sort of way*

* We quoted from these in last weeks' Foreign Commentary—Editors.

Special Appeal

March 12th—April 14th

Stockton-on-Tees: R.H.M. 4/-; Edinburgh: T.O.M* 5/-; Preston: W.A.L. 1/6; London: J.B. 10/-; Glasgow: S.M. 1/6; Glasgow: A.M.G.D.* 4/-; Philadelphia: R.N. £1/8/0; London: F.E.D.* 5/-; Australia: Anon 3/-; London: W.E.D.* 15/-; Edinburgh T.O.M* 5/-; London: Anon* 5/-; Mitchem: F.H. 6/6; London: W.S. 6/9.

Total ... £5 0 3
Previously acknowledged ... 104 12 6

1953 TOTAL TO DATE ... £109 12 9
GIFTS OF BOOKS: Rochdale: J.R.; C.C.; Purley: A.U.

* Readers who have undertaken to send regular monthly contributions.

Production and the Technical Revolution

THERE are fresh cries for more production. The T.U.C. tries to beat one of its members into submission. A Fabian professor—with the support of all right-minded Fabians—insists on the necessity for Labour taking, if it is to get in at the next election, a reasonable attitude to the need for more production, "even if it means less real wages and higher profits". Now the Central Statistical Office drops a little bomb by announcing a drop of two points in January industrial production compared to January 1952. The Manchester Guardian's editors shiver and rake over the debris, saying "... there is no point in arguments about cake-sharing until there is a cake to share... There seem to be two main necessities—first to persuade people generally that it is in everybody's interest that British industry should produce more goods, and secondly, to offer individual groups of workpeople convincing proof that prosperity will be shared."

Notice how the prospect of a disappearing cake turns liberals, socialists and Fabians into Tories...

The most noteworthy thing however, is the complete and blind acceptance by the contestants (a heavily weighted contest) granted of "more production" as a solution to the problem of us all being fed; they all agree with the need for more production and only disagree about the means.

More production, they say, is necessary to keep us fed at the present level—they are not prepared to think any further.

But perhaps some have thought a little further and the prospect has frightened them back into bland phrases and exhortations to the workers—much safer ground. For the very statement that more production is necessary to buy our food means only one thing—that in terms of food our products are less valuable as each day passes. What it amounts to is that British goods are being sold on the world market at a value less than the capitalist expected to receive—or not being sold at all. The market is, as it has been in the past, flooded with manufactured goods.

In a sense everyone must be in favour of higher production per man, for in theory it means less work and more enjoyment per man, but unfortunately the systems of exchange and increasingly savage competition destroy this simple picture; when we 'overproduce' we do not live in bliss—we go on the dole. The

very word 'overproduction' shows what a meaningless set of symbols capitalism relies on, for in a rational world exchange, such a word could not exist, it would be replaced by the word plenty.

Thus, it is clear that to increase production will only exacerbate this nation's malady and indeed the same will apply to every nation which relies on industrial produce for a living. Rearmament is of course being used to drain off some of the 'surplus', but the populations might just as well be put to breaking stones.

It is important to realise that this is not just another temporary setback for the industrial centres; a technological revolution is taking place. From coal, iron and steam, industry has shifted its centre of gravity to the exploitation of the universal elements, sea, air, and sand. Developments in science and technics enable the separation or synthesis of such production materials as Aluminium, Titanium, Nylon, 'rubber', and fertilizers, from materials readily available to any nation. Other materials that have come to the fore during the present century, such as cement and glass, can be made anywhere. Even timber requirements may be reduced to a level where countries will be largely independent of Canada and Scandinavia, owing to refinements in its use such as the use of synthetic resins in plywood and laminations—sheer bulk becomes less important and that was the main asset of the great Northern softwood forests. Even newsprint may be manufactured from grasses and other vegetable fibres by a nation determined to be self-supporting in this respect.

All the 'now' agricultural nations require is the electrical power and the 'know-how'. Kropotkin stated, several wars ago, in *Fields, Factories and Workshops* that such agricultural nations will be able to produce industrially more cheaply than those industrial nations forced to buy their food.

A very small gap now separates the industrial and 'self-sufficient' nations, and it is only a matter of time before the latter are truly self-sufficient except perhaps for some highly advanced articles which the countries fighting to sell their industrial products may keep as a lead.

But by that time all solely industrial nations will be in ruins—deserted heaps incapable of sustaining life.

S.L.C.

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 28—Bonar Thompson on OSCAR WILDE THE ROAD TO READING GOAL

MAY 5—Albert Grace on THE TRADE UNIONS.

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

NORTH-EAST LONDON

DISCUSSION MEETINGS IN EAST HAM

MAY 6—Ron Wheeler. "THE COMMUNITIES IN PALESTINE".

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

LAND O' CAKES HOTEL

Gt. Ancoats Street, (by Daily Express)

at 7 p.m. on 2nd & 4th Sundays in every month. April 26. May 10, 24 June 14, 28, etc.

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