

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

All of us have occasionally met people who seem to have made and kept their own laws. They are the creative ones. Their personalities are in some way illuminated from within. Everybody should make an effort to discover the good and true by himself, and then set standards based upon his own findings.

—Sir Gladwin Jebb!

THE COLD WAR IN ARGUMENTS

PERFIDIOUS PRAVDA

WITH the Russian reply to Eisenhower's speech, the cold war is settling down in a new key. FREEDOM has pointed out that important as Stalin's death is as a factor in history, the accession of his quarrelling colleagues will not much alter Russian policy. The internal situation in the Soviet Union may be eased by the amnesty, the new price lowering, the legal set-up after the release of the "doctor-assassins". But such relaxations are intended only to enable the new régime to consolidate itself. The Communist Party will still continue to try and maintain and extend its power and the dictatorial State will certainly not wither away.

Similarly, Stalin's death in no way alters the economic needs and clashes of the major States, in no way reprieves rearmament and war of their function in a dwindling market economy.

All the headline shouting about a "genuine change of heart", a "new outlook for the future" and so on has receded as so much empty foam and the basic situation remains the same.

A Change of Method

The political commentators accordingly speak of a change in Soviet *method* rather than in *policy*. Despite this anti-climax conclusion they remain enthusiastic about the change. Eisenhower's speech was reported in full in *Pravda* which then devoted six columns to answering it. This reply is often sarcastic and challenges American policy at every point, but it is couched in reasonable language. Of course it serves many points in exposing differences between what the U.S. government proclaims and what it does just as Eisenhower did in his speech. And the *Times* has no difficulty in pulling the *Pravda* article to pieces. What has happened seems to be that the Russian government has abandoned mere abuse — imperialist hyenas, lackeys and jackals and so on — in favour of reasoned argument. Reasoned — but is it any more sincere than that of the West whose reasoned method easily takes

Flexibility of Justice

WE have often questioned the logic, if not the sanity, of the mind which confuses the administration of justice with the administration of the law. The following news-item which appeared recently in an evening newspaper under the title of 'Almost on Both Sides' makes us wonder whether we have not underestimated the doublethink which can be caused by the operation of the legal system. It reads:

"When Charles George Masters, 45, Hatton Garden jeweller . . . appeared for the tenth time (!) at Clerkenwell court to-day accused of receiving stolen jewellery, Mr. Frank Powell (magistrate) was told that Mr. R. E. Seaton (prosecuting counsel) was engaged at the Old Bailey.

"He asked Mr. Richard du Cann, for Masters, if he would conduct the prosecution.

"Mr. du Cann said 'Yes', but later said there was a difficulty about the evidence of a police witness.

"Mr. Powell put back the case till Mr. Seaton arrived."

No doubt many interesting variations can be thought of if this practice became common. With difficulty we refrain from elaborating a few, merely contenting ourselves with the suggestion that if such a case happens again the prosecuting-cum-defence counsel shall also be the magistrate in order that he can give an impartial decision on the two opposing cases he has advocated!

S.E.P.

in the somersault of attitude towards the Communist Tito or the Fascist Franco?

Nor are the Russians unskilled in the "reasonable" method for they have long used it in their theoretical journals and to convince intellectual party members and fellow-travellers. One may perhaps wonder whether the change represents the access to power of younger but better educated men in Russia — better educated, that is than the coarse and brutal and suspicious Stalin.

Example of the West

More likely however the change reflects a willingness to use the methods of the West and so make use of the comparative freedom of discussion there — for printing Eisenhower in full does not make Russian

internal control of propaganda any less monolithic. It was done before to a lesser degree during the Litvinoff, League of Nations period. One may be sure that the Russian points will be given "serious and sincere consideration" by such periodicals as the *New Statesman* which always contrived to be reasonable about Soviet policy even at its most intransigent. Nor will many members of the Labour Party, some of them high up in the hierarchy, easily resist the temptation to use "reasonable" Russian arguments to beat the Conservative holders of office with.

Reasonableness has served British foreign policy well over the years, even if it has earned the appellation "perfidious Albion", and there is no reason why it should not serve equally well the perfidiousness of any other government, including the Russians!

Nevertheless the facts remain. The Anglo-American bloc still faces the Soviet Empire, war is still an economic necessity, political persecution still a growing, spreading disease. Reasonableness may reassure the softies, but it doesn't alter the basic patterns.

Austins: What Use is the Enquiry?

WE have already dealt (April 4th) with the background of the strike of vehicle builders at Austin's motor works at Longbridge, Birmingham. That strike is still continuing, while the public enquiry called by the Ministry of Labour is in process, but it is clear that the men's determination has weakened and at the slightest excuse they will go back to work.

The Company has agreed to take back 1,200 of the strikers, in batches of 300 over 3 or 4 weeks, but this leaves over 350 workers (the total was 1,583 who got the sack) who will be left out in the cold. This number will include John McHugh, the senior shop steward over whose reinstatement, after redundancy, the whole thing started. No doubt it will also include any vehicle builders who have played an active part in the strike, on the committee or even picketing.

For the management at Austin's have clearly smelt blood. They are steadfastly refusing under any circumstances to take McHugh back, and they obviously feel that they are now in a strong enough position to begin to get heavy-handed with the unions. And as we pointed out before, at least nine unions are represented among the workers at Austin's, and for all the evidence to the contrary, they could all be attacked singly, under the old technique of divide and rule, without the rest doing anything about it. In such a situation militant workers are sitting pigeons, just waiting to be picked off.

The Inquiry

But what of the inquiry into the dispute, to which the union and the management both agreed? The official point of such an inquiry as this is a little difficult to see, for whatever recommendations the court make at the end of the protracted hearing carry no weight whatsoever.

Neither side in the dispute have undertaken to act upon the recommendations, and in fact Austin's management have already announced that even if the court recommends the re-instatement of McHugh, they will refuse to do so.

Both sides go into the inquiry, just as contending litigants go to law, determined to show that all the blame lies with the other side. And the legal atmosphere is engendered by each side engaging

Queen's Counsel, but unlike a Court of Law no decisions are taken which need affect either side.

One function of the inquiry, however, has emerged. It would appear to be incidental, but when one remembers the quality of the solidarity the ruling and employing class practices, one can see that it is definitely not accidental. This function is the publicity that has been given to the inquiry.

Were They Criminals?

Reports have appeared in the Press practically every day the inquiry was being held. But wasn't it strange how it was always the case for Austin's that got all the space? How the arguments of Sir Godfrey Russell Vick, Q.C., briefed for the company, got all the space; how the management's point of view was well aired, but of the union's side only defensive answers under cross-examination were published?

And the tone of the cross-examination

AFRICA & KENYATTA

In our front page article *Africa & Kenyatta* (FREEDOM 18/4/53) we quoted from the *Observer* a statement by Walter Sisulu, secretary of the South African National Congress in which he was alleged to have said "We regard *Mau Mau* as a legitimate organization of the Kenya Africans." The *Observer* has now issued a correction to this statement. In transmitting the message reference to K.A.U. (Kenya Africans Union) was wrongly taken down as MAU. Thus Mr. Sisulu's statement should have read "We regard K.A.U. as a legitimate organization of the Kenya Africans."

This correction makes the third paragraph of our article unnecessary, but we do not think it invalidates our arguments in trying to explain the attitude of many African militants, nor does it affect our own position to *Mau Mau* outrages which, as we pointed out in the article in question, FREEDOM had denounced "unequivocally".

The Struggle for Markets

FOR those of us who connect modern wars with capitalist economics rather than with ideological questions, the growing difficulties created by increasing competition as the number of countries seeking outlets for their manufactured goods increases and the markets for them shrink, can create a situation in which war clouds will be seen on the horizon.

Industrial production in W. Germany has been advancing very rapidly during the past two years, so much so that figures for 1952 show that that country's output is second only to Great Britain's. In the meantime German business men have been retrieving markets in S. America and in Europe, and FREEDOM has on many occasions referred to complaints by British industrialists of the filching of their markets by Germany.

There is now abundant evidence that German big business is directing its attention to African markets. According to a correspondent in the *New York Herald Tribune's Monthly Economic Review* (2/3/53):

West German business, having re-entered the Near Eastern, South American and Far Eastern markets in an impressive manner since the war, is also re-examining Africa as a field on importance for German enterprise.

Although scorn of colonial possessions in 1918, the Germans never lost interest in African economic development between World Wars I and II. Last week, they held a special "Africa Day" at the Frankfurt International Fair to stimulate German contact with such diverse areas as the Gold Coast, the Union of South Africa and Tanganyika.

The tone of speeches at the "Africa

Day" affair clearly took into account the ground swell of social change that is under way in Europe's African possessions. One of the dominant themes was that, at this stage of history, it is better for Germany to be free to deal with Africa on a purely economic basis without having on its hands the political burdens of colonial rule.

Rolf Brettschneider, head of the Hamburg-Bremen Africa Society, stressed that European merchants must increasingly get the "colonial complex" out of their mind. The time is past, he said, when the African can be regarded any longer as the servant of the European, and old-fashioned methods of exploitation are through.

West Germany's trade with African states and colonies last year (excluding Egypt) ran at a level of \$300,000,000 worth of German imports in raw materials and food, but only about \$150,000,000 worth of German exports in finished products and equipment.

Recently, German financial newspapers reported that the prospects for improving this unbalanced situation in the immediate future are slim. Accordingly, the real hopes of German experts lie less in the direction of annual trade contracts in the next few years than of getting in on a large scale on the immense programme of African capital development that lies ahead.

"Africa's harbours, waterways and railway nets still lie in a sad state," said Mr. Brettschneider. "It is this field that German industry might enter. It is possible, for example, that Germany will receive a fair portion of the investment contracts in British West Africa."

Dr. Heinz Beutler, another speaker for the Hamburg-Bremen group at Frankfurt said that it was one of the agreed policies of the Schuman plan for the six member states (France, Germany, Italy, Belgium, Holland and Luxembourg) to co-operate in the development of backward areas, and especially of Africa. But the revised dynamism of the German economy makes it quite certain, at all events, that representatives of German industry will be seen in growing numbers on the African continent, whether in co-operation with other Europeans or on their own.

a strike involving more than 200 anywhere in the country has to be obtained from two-thirds of the members attending meetings throughout the country.

This is a ridiculous rule, whose only function could have been to protect the union's fund from frivolous strikers, but since few workers go on strike without good reason, it seems rather pointless. What it does point to is the lack of local initiative that is encouraged in the trade unions. However, Harry Helliwell, Gen. Sec. of the N.U.V.B. had to admit it was an impossible rule to work, and that the union were not attempting to use it.

We wrote four weeks ago that no credit was due to anybody for the way this strike has been handled. Nor, as far as can be seen, was there any good reason for the union agreeing to this inquiry. It has so far served only the interests of the Austin management. The men's position has not improved and they have practically accepted to have a ballot on a return to work, when it is certain the majority will favour going back.

What emerges from the struggle at Austin's is simply that the trade unions to-day are in no position to wage class-war at all, and that nothing short of a new alignment of forces with a new inspiration, could do so with any hope of success. But the very mention of the class struggle is enough to give the average union leader of to-day blood pressure.

For him, the path of class-collaboration, negotiation and "inquiry" seems the only way. But is it any good for the workers? P.S.

Have you introduced a new reader to FREEDOM this year?

A Stupid Rule

Another thing which has emerged from the inquiry is the existence of a particularly silly rule of the National Union of Vehicle Builders. It is that consent for

SHOULD AKIHITO SEE THE CORONATION?

SHOULD the Japanese be allowed to send a representative to the Coronation? Ought nineteen year old Crown Prince Akihito be given an official welcome by our municipalities? Much heat has been generated on this question for many ex-prisoners of war from the Far East, and their organisations, take such ceremonial invitations as an insult, a too-ready forgetting of the sufferings and brutalities of the Japanese prisoner-of-war camps during the last war. The singling out of Akihito for this kind of demonstrated opposition sheds much light on popular feeling and the factors that move it.

In the first place, Japan is the only defeated enemy with whom a peace treaty has been concluded. This political fact has obviously no weight at all with those who object—and why, indeed, should it have any weight? Akihito, himself, is now nineteen. He was eleven when the war ended, five when it began. Personally, therefore he can have little responsibility for any Japanese act during the war. Yet this fact, too, has no weight in the outcry.

Such a situation contrasts markedly with the visit of Marshal Tito. Tito's partisans and, later, his government, also have much blood on their hands; have engaged in mass slaughters, torturings, organised injustice. And Tito is the responsible, absolutely, dictatorial leader of this movement. His visit was unenthusiastically received, but there were no serious hostile demonstrations.

It is not difficult to see where the difference lies, however. The survivors of the Japanese prison camps, saw and felt the brutalities on their own bodies and on those of their friends. They saw their companions die often without medical aid, often killed off because they were wounded. They know that in some camps the mortality was appalling. The horrors and brutalities of war had a direct impact on their experience.

They cannot forget that experience, and feel it would be a betrayal to do so.

Tito's crimes for most British people are hearsay only. It is known that he killed thousands of Chetniks, recalcitrant peasants, political opponents. But we did not see him do it, and his victims were not our personal friends whose characters we had come to know through all kinds of shared experiences. Tito's brutalities cast no emotional shadows for everyday folk in Britain.

When the Japanese were invading Manchuria and China twenty years ago they no doubt acted similarly to ten years ago. But the victims were not our friends and relatives or ourselves, they were just Chinese. People like Sir John Simon and L. S. Amery could defend their actions without arousing more than theoretical indignation. It is the same with Nagasaki and Hiroshima. When the Americans—with British observers also present—dropped the two atomic bombs the men and women and children were civilians of an alien culture. Newspapers could publish pictures of their burnt and twisted bodies but—well, they were not our friends, they do not come alive for us. Indignation is really felt only by the few.

Now the prisoners of war are coming back from Korea, and the tales of tommy-gunning the wounded, forced marches, deprivation of food and medical aid, enormous camp mortalities, begin once again to unfold in all their dreadful monotony, inevitably arouse the same bitterness, the same inability to forget.

Asiatics are used to suffering. They are more indifferent to it than we. And they have not the same regard to war traditions behind them as Europeans have. Even now, in Europe, the slaughter of prisoners or of wounded is unthinkable; the terms of the Geneva Convention are naturally counted out. Such an attitude has come down to us, has 'survived' from the eighteenth century men of war. The wounded and the prisoners are carried to the touch-line to watch the second half of the game.

But no such traditions mitigate the Asiatic outlook on war. In Korea at the beginning there were

many occasions when the American army was guilty of brutality towards the "gooks" (such a term ensures that the Koreans make no emotional impact upon our compassion), and the Syngman Rhee administration was shown to be guilty of many atrocities. All that is true, but it will not efface the emotion from those whose friends have died and suffered as prisoners in Korea.

Anarchists also have their memories. The brutalities of many a reactionary régime—that of Franco in Spain, for example—are not forgotten for many of our friends have fallen in the struggle against them. The treacheries and assassinations of anarchists and other revolutionists by the Communists are not forgotten, and it is difficult to see how they ever can be during the lifetimes of those with memories of such crimes committed on their friends.

If we are unforgiving, how can we criticise the Associations of ex-Japanese prisoners-of-war? Of course the answer must be that it is not a question of forgiveness. If one is very understanding indeed one may forgive injuries to oneself: it is not so easy, nor very pleasant, to forgive injuries to one's friends, especially if those friends have died under them. Christian forgiveness, pacifist exhortations to be friends, seem very like insensitivity, and moral obliquity here.

Yet it is also true that when a man is consumed with revenge, one instinctively shrinks from him. The nursing of injuries, of hatred, is a most unattractive, indeed a repulsive thing. When the hatred is universalized, when the hatred for brutal prison guards is extended to cover every member of a nation or race: when one hears bitter hostility expressed towards "the Germans", "the Russians", "the Japanese", Koreans, Chinese, dirty Reds, Kikuyu, or any group of people: then something really evil has happened. How often in the past few days have ex-prisoners of war from the Far East, with the "railway of death" in mind remarked (in print sometimes) that they'd like to see Akihito do a bit of plate laying. "I'd like to give them some of their own medicine". The evil has sowed itself and borne crops in a big way when this happens.

For some it is possible to seek the causes of brutality in mass or industrial psychology, and such study is rich in rewards of understanding. But it is only possible to the very few. For the rest the best response to dreadful events is the determination to work to see that they do not happen again. It is not difficult to realize that wars inflict such appalling injuries on civilians and combatants alike, that horrors and atrocities are bound to arise. Yet war is a method of national policy only too readily resorted to. Its causes and uses to our civilization are not too difficult to analyse.

But wars appear utterly dreadful only to those who see in every man a fellow being, instead of a member of a hostile group. The sense of human kinship is taught by almost all religions and philosophers: it is

defeated by almost every group loyalty.

The brutalities one cannot forgive are committed by individuals in the service of some authority. There are the Japanese prison guards serving a military machine which not only made war but also inaugurated a rigid class system in Japan. There are the guards, but there are also the Japanese peasants maintaining their own mutual aid institutions to keep their lives together. Peasants in no way different from the vast millions of suffering peasants throughout the East—India, China, Japan, the Pacific populations. The mass of mankind is mostly suffering, and it is larger than the groups of sadists whose cruelties inflame hatreds and foment divisions. Despite the brutes and the governments, mankind is one.

Comment

ELEPHANTS v. MACHINES

THE idea that all that is needed in the undeveloped areas of the world is the wholesale concentration of the West's mechanised might to turn vast forests into fertile fields, or poor land into rich productive estates, has suffered a number of setbacks in the past few years, chief among them, perhaps the disastrous failure of the schemes started in Africa, in which it was proposed to clear vast areas of jungle and plant them with peanuts. One recalls that after the failure, some experts ruefully suggested that perhaps the way the Africans cultivated the land, (by clearing strips of jungle which they then abandoned after a certain number of crops had been grown and proceeded to clear new strips) was perhaps the only successful method under such conditions as exist in that part of Africa.

Similarly one comes across examples in which the experts are having serious doubts as to the wisdom of mechanization in certain cases. But this is such a vast subject, and we have only raised it as an introduction to an interesting dispatch from *Worldover Press* correspondent in S. India where this very question of the old methods versus mechanization is being hotly debated, both on the grounds of efficiency and productivity as well as from the point of view of economics. And it is not often that we in Europe—or America—have the opportunity of comparing elephant power against tractor efficiency!

Here is Mark Sunder-Rao's dispatch from Trivandrum (S. India): The relative superiority of the Indian elephant

in agriculture, as against the Western-revered tractor, is being hotly debated in Uttar Pradesh State. Key experiments in the village of Lalkua indicate that the animal may win out. A widely experienced officer declares: "Even on the present showing, the elephant for log hauling has not been superseded by modern methods."

In assessing the cost of ploughing per acre, the authorities who recommended foreign tractors have apparently failed to take into their reckoning the factor of depreciation. In the case of a tractor costing around \$5,250, this works out to something like \$1,260 a year, for, say the elephant's proponents, tractors can last only four years here. To this cost, that of fuel must be added, and \$840 per year for spare parts and replacements. As against this, the elephant's friends assert that the cost of the animal is only \$840, and he has a working life of 50 years even though he starts work only at age 25. His upkeep is a mere \$3.15 per day, or less than \$1,150 annually.

The tests in Uttar Pradesh are being watched with keen interest, for officialdom is in a dilemma over the use of tractors, which have been breaking down sadly, and which, as often used, are said to exhaust the soil too fast. However, the argument ends, it is bound to affect the question of technical assistance and is causing those who advocated Western mechanization to look at the problem afresh. It is a vital question, for India needs nothing more than a speedy increase in the output of foodstuffs.

EVOLUTION - 3

modern man himself appeared on the earth—at the very lowest estimate, for 70,000 years. The social principle of mutual aid has existed in animal societies for a far longer period still. As Kropotkin, and more recent investigators have shown, men with their weak physical equipment, would never have survived at all in the struggle for existence but for the practice of that mutual aid and mutual support. Yet this social principle which is inherent in man, and has been the main factor in his evolution and survival is calmly ignored, and even denied, by socialist theory.

Like the capitalists with their economic theories of the necessity for competition, the socialists ignore the lessons of *Mutual Aid* because it destroys the premises on which their theories of the necessity for authority and government are based. These people are content to construct their social and political theories—especially political—in the intellectual cosiness of the study or in the Reading Room of the British Museum. Kropotkin, by contrast, was before everything else an observer of what actually happens in life, a realist who never permitted his theories to lose touch with the facts of human life. His study of animal life demonstrated quite clearly that the social instinct has a pre-human origin. So far from requiring a coercive authority to compel them to act for the common good, men behave in a social way because it is their nature to do so, because sociableness is an instinct which they have inherited from their remotest evolutionary ancestors. It is necessary to stress once again that without their inherent tendency to mutual aid they could never have survived at all in the evolutionary struggle for existence, much less developed the social arts and institutions which distinguish them from other animals.

In the middle chapters of *Mutual Aid*, Kropotkin shows how mutual support was not only the dominating feature of animal societies and primitive human communities, but also of the highly developed city communes of the Middle Ages. The central authority embodied in the National State is a development only of the last three or four hundred years

of our epoch (though similar institutions have existed before in other eras also). Even so, the principle of mutual aid still survives as the motive force in all the vital institutions of society, despite all the State's attacks on local initiative. However ruthlessly governments attempt to eradicate mutual combination and support among workers, they can never succeed in uprooting it altogether, for it provides the cement which binds society together and gives it whatever degree of cohesion it may possess.

"In short, neither the crushing powers of the centralised State, nor the teachings of mutual hatred and pitiless struggle which came, adorned with the attributes of science, from obliging philosophers and sociologists, could weed out the feelings of human solidarity, deeply lodged in men's understanding and heart, because it has been nurtured by all our preceding evolution."**

The socialists therefore who wish to set up an authority to compel men to be social are ignoring the historical fact that men cannot help being social, and that the authority they wish to set up in the shape of the socialist state can only act as a disruptive and anti-social force. Government by authority can only function on the eternal state principle of "Divide and Rule"; it can ever act as a cohesive force. Nor is the imposition of such a force from outside necessary to compel men to act according to their nature—that is, in a social manner. Authority simply hinders men from giving free expression to their inherent social tendencies.

THE STRUGGLE TO ACHIEVE FREEDOM

The social revolution which will bring a harmonious and developed social life to men is seen therefore to imply a struggle to destroy all forms of coercive authority, and so to set men free to develop their innate social tendencies. In every revolution of the past, the workers and peasants have thrown off their class oppressors, and have then immediately set about the task of organising their lives on a basis of free agreement among themselves. The necessity for an authority to "restrain the primitive egotisms of the individual" is simply illusory, and a product of capitalist ideology.

The institutions set up by the Spanish workers and peasants in 1936 were free collectives imposed by no authority, but built by the free co-operation of the workers themselves after they had overthrown the coercive power of the State. But when the counter-revolution ushered in by the Socialists and "Communists" established the State power once more, it immediately set about destroying these free institutions of the workers, and in consequence destroyed the backbone of the struggle against Fascist tyranny.

** *Mutual Aid*, p. 229.

Thus the study of primitive societies in which no government exists, and of the short-lived revolutionary societies of our own day, both confirm Kropotkin's teachings as profoundly realistic, and at the same time condemn all ideas of authority as having no basis in nature, and being absolutely reactionary in effect. The struggle for freedom is the struggle against government for the purpose of allowing free development to man's nature. Anarchists are ready to do without all forms of authority because the study of men and of life shows that men do not need such restraints. As Kropotkin said: "We are not afraid to say 'Do what you will; act as you will;' because we are persuaded that the great majority of mankind, in proportion to their degree of enlightenment, and the completeness with which they free themselves from existing fetters, will behave and act always in a direction useful to society; just as we are persuaded beforehand that a child will one day walk on its two feet, and not on all fours, simply because it is born of parents belonging to the genus *homo*."††

The principle of mutual aid which is seen throughout nature and in all human societies is ignored by all authoritarian theorists, whether capitalist, fascist, or socialist; but it is fundamental to Anarchism. The great value of Kropotkin's book was his demonstration that freedom of scope for his principle was the essential prerequisite for human happiness and progress. He showed that Anarchism is the most realistic and practical method of all, because it is in line with the tendencies which have operated throughout the whole length of human history, and have their roots in nature itself. It is the schemes to bring about the social revolution by means of coercive authority which are illusory and Utopian, and ultimately prove reactionary in effect.

This concludes the reprint of John Hewetson's articles on "Mutual Aid and Social Evolution". In the succeeding three issues *FREEDOM* will be printing Richard De Haan's discussion on Kropotkin, Marx and Dewey. These new articles will start next week. Kropotkin's book, "Mutual Aid", in which he expounds the ideas discussed in these two series is now out of print. The Penguin edition is still occasionally available, however, and almost all public libraries possess a copy. Besides presenting Kropotkin's challenging ideas on this subject which are only now beginning to exert their effect on sociology, "Mutual Aid" is a most delightful and readable book. It well reflects the personality of its author and readily explains the love and esteem which he inspired among all who came in contact with him.

†† Kropotkin: *Anarchist Morality*, p. 24.

One sometimes hears the "transitional state" (after the overthrow of capitalism) defended by socialists on the grounds that "years and even centuries of capitalist conditioning will have to be guarded against". But this represents a whole-hearted acceptance of Lamarck's theory that acquired characteristics are inherited—a view that in its general form, was completely discredited by Darwin's work. As in the case of Malthus, a theory discarded by science is here kept alive to save political ideologies; this time, however, by the Socialists!

