

In this Issue :
Emotional Development in Children - p. 2
We need an Anarchist International - p. 3
Malthus and Natural Selection - p. 4

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"Don't ask for rights. Take them. And don't let anyone give them to you. A right that is handed to you for nothing has something the matter with it. It's more than likely that it's only a wrong turned inside out."
 —FINLEY PETER DUNNE
 (trans.)

Vol. 18, No. 9

March 2nd, 1957

Threepence

Why are we always on the Defensive?

THE EMPLOYERS ATTACK

SHORT of pursuing a policy which would alienate large numbers of its bank-benchers and thus losing a vote of confidence—and that is most unlikely—the present Conservative Government looks as though it is going to stay in office for the rest of its term. Or at least until some distant moment when their chances in an election may be more favourable.

This gives them three years at the most—three years in which to do their worst to the people of this country and the Commonwealth and then, in the last few months, throw a few bones to 'make things better' as an election bait.

The immediate prospect before us then is not a very bright one. The pattern of Conservative policy becomes clearer every day and it never has meant good for the ordinary people of the country—the people who have 'nothing to sell but their labour power', who live in other people's houses, work in other people's factories and shops—exist, in a word, on other people's terms.

All-Out Attack

The Government, hand in hand with the employers and the landlords, is going all out in an attack upon our standards of living in a desperate attempt to stabilize the 'national economy', by ending the inflationary movement which is continually unbalancing Britain's trading position with the rest of the world.

But in point of fact it is difficult to see just how a policy could be operated which would more certainly accelerate inflation than the one being pursued by the Tories—without the kind of iron control over the population which the totalitarian states have and which the Tories are supposed to oppose.

The Tories' present policy of cutting subsidies is throwing the cost of living right on to the housewife's purse—where it is most noticeable.

Over the past few months the

price of most basic foods has gone up. The latest cut in subsidies has attacked the cheap milk and cheap school meals which mean so much to working-class parents. The mid-day meal provided at most State schools (which, by relieving mother of the necessity of being home at lunch-time enables her to go out to work to supplement the family income) has been raised from 10d. to 1s. The cheap daily pint of milk for children under five has gone up from 1½d. to 4d.—a whacking proportional increase which will lead to real deprivation in many working-class homes.

Background Fears

Over all is the shadow of the Rent Bill and in the back of many workers' minds the fear of a coming slump to drive them back to the dole queues.

This fear the employers are quick to exploit. Very noticeable is the hardening of the attitude of the managements of big concerns in industries already affected by redundancy. The motor-car industry is the outstanding example. The struggle at the British Motor Corporation's Birmingham works last year over redundancy—which ended with a pathetic compromise by the unions—and currently the struggle going on in the Ford empire, are indications of what to expect if similar conditions reach other industries.

The message for employers to-day is clearly—"get tough with the workers". As markets slacken, as surplus jobs increase, the bosses see their opportunity to make a comeback on the workers for the advances they have been able to achieve for themselves since 1939. And not only on the material level, but also in the organisational field.

Ford Management Attacks

This is the issue at Ford's. Over the years the workers have been able to build up an organisation within the workshops, knit together by the

shop stewards, which has given them sufficient strength to challenge and defeat the management time and again. It is small wonder that, as soon as the opportunity presents itself, the management hits out.

As we go to press we do not know whether the threatened strike at Dagenham will take place. When, ten days ago, the strike ballot was affirmative but the Amalgamated Engineering Union's officers gave ten days' notice to Ford's, we thought that the breathing space was enough to give time for tempers to cool and a compromise to be found. But there has been heavy breathing from both sides right up to the last minute, with the AEU sinking so low as to find new words to express what they wanted ('Re-engagement' of McLoughlin instead of 're-instatement!') and begging the management to save face all round by using them.

Then at the last moment came the dramatic intervention by Frank Cousins, head of the Transport & General Workers', and the man built up as a bogey-man by the Tory press after last year's TUC. He came forward with a proposal for a compromise: that Ford's reconsider the sacking of McLoughlin and the AEU call off their strike threat, in return for which both sides agree to a court of inquiry, a suggestion which has hitherto been accepted by Ford's, rejected by the union. Object of the court would be to inquire into the state of labour relations in the Ford factories and try to uncover why they are so bad—why there have been 229 stoppages in Briggs, for example, since Ford's took over in 1953.

Continued on p. 4

KOINONIA FARMS

A Crippling Boycott

IN our January 5th issue we published a condensed version of an article which appeared in the *American Journal of Liberation* on the Koinonia Farms, an interesting and stimulating experiment in Community.

The persecution of this community by the white *herrenvolk* has in the meantime, if anything, increased. An *Associated Press* report (Feb. 16) makes it clear that the economic boycott which followed the unsuccessful attempts to destroy the community by "bombs, bullets and fire" are proving more successful, an indication surely that the appeal made by Koinonia to radicals throughout the United States to defeat the local boycott by purchasing its produce has not met with adequate response.

The situation so far as the future of the Koinonia community is concerned is grave. According to the *A.P.*:

Koinonia Farms, a bi-racial agricultural community, is facing a desperate fight for its life after fourteen years of peaceful existence.

Its defenders regard it as an experiment dedicated to the ideals of brotherhood. Its opponents, growing sharply in numbers of late, tend to view the community as a "cancer" that should be cut out of this agriculture and livestock centre in southwest Georgia.

In the last six months this communal farm and some sixty whites and Negroes has survived bombs, bullets and fires. Now an economic boycott threatens to close it...

At near-by Americus the anger of some of the townspeople has reached an inflammatory peak over what is viewed as the "haunting" of integration practices by the farm.

"The people have had it up here," said Sheriff Fred Chappell of Sumter County, which has a population of about 25,000, half Negro. "We get reports of whites and Negroes strolling down the streets together in Americus. One report said a white girl and two Negro boys walked down the street all eating popcorn out of the same bag."

It has been fired on sporadically with rifles and pistols. Its roadside retail market stand several miles from the main farm has been destroyed by two dynamite attacks.

A cross was burned a week ago before

the home of a negro tenant worker. A vacant house was destroyed by fire.

The sheriff said he had investigated the incidents, but, "I don't find any clues and I don't get any co-operation from those folks."

"A lot of people ask me why I don't go out there and clean out that place," he said. "But they aren't breaking any laws and until they do there isn't much I can do."

The violence and the boycotts started after an attempt last summer to establish an integrated youth camp on the farm. Another injunction by the county on the ground of health and sanitation delayed the opening of the camp. The injunction was dissolved in September when the question became a "moot" point at summer's end.

[According to the Rev. Clarence Jordan, co-founder of the Koinonia Farms] the boycotts and economic sanctions are complete and effective.

"We are in serious financial trouble," he said. "We lost over \$14,000 in property in recent months to say nothing of the lost income. Our poultry flock of 4,000 hens has been reduced to 1,000 since the refusal to buy our eggs. And still we can't sell all of them."

"Our roadside market provided about half our income... We lost our deep freeze equipment."

"But we haven't yet exhausted all our resources," he added.

He said townspeople would not buy from the farm and would not sell to them.

"They refused us services, they won't repair our vehicles, they refuse to do business with us in any way... Our insurance policies have been cancelled."

"We have had a perfect record for fourteen years but now the bank has refused us," the minister said.

In town, James R. Blair, publisher of *The American Times-Recorder*, summarized the feelings of many opponents of the farm.

"It's like a cancer on the community and we ought to get rid of it," he said. "We don't agree with what they are doing but we deplore the violence."

Eugene Horne, head of the Sumter County chapter of the States Rights Council of Georgia, said the sentiment was "universally hostile"...

"When Jordan came here, he was well accepted... before people learned of his sentiments."

REFLECTIONS ON

Progress and Human Behaviour

THE habit of comparing the present with the past in order to justify some particularly unpleasant political measure, or to score a debating point, or to show how much better or worse off we are to-day than we were fifty years ago, is a widespread one, and on the whole, an unrewarding and even dangerous practise. By all means let us learn the lessons of the experiences of the past where they have some bearing on the present or future, but where standards and values are concerned it is to the future that we must look if the present is not to be moulded by the dead hand of the past.

It is significant that on questions concerned with Man's destruction, scientific imagination has no *Angst*, and that even before we have become accustomed to the idea of the H-bomb, research in America is being directed to finding out the possibilities of "negatons" which used in inter-continental missiles would, so we are officially told, "make the hydrogen bomb look like a fire cracker". On social questions, however, we are still talking of "human nature being what it is", and justifying thereby the retention of social and economic patterns which, however much they may be juggled with, fundamentally remain what they were centuries ago. (Even the new nations born of persecution,

such as Israel, or through struggle for liberation, such as India, face a new life with hardened arteries: they have learned nothing from the past; they think and act along the lines of their persecutors and oppressors).

The social sciences have opened up a new world of knowledge which prove that so much that our forefathers accepted as absolute truths were simply old-wives tales; they have also shown (by implication only, since so few social scientists are socially free enough to draw the conclusions from their findings), that the social set-up far from encouraging harmony and co-operation and bringing out the best in Man's very flexible "nature", ensures that just the opposite reactions and tendencies will be brought to the surface at the expense of those which are most conducive to human happiness.

★

IT is generally recognised that the Victorian attitude to Sex is contrary to "the facts of life", yet the Law in these matters continues to be applied as if it were not; parents are still embarrassed about talking to their children about Sex; and research on a simple and effective birth control method is still virtually neglected. In spite of the fact that it is now accepted that love-making

is one of the human activities which give pleasure and happiness and which from the physiological and psychological point of view is to be recommended. Yet, while no efforts are spared to develop weapons of destruction, to which end every test explosion is a biological threat to mankind, including that of sterility, no serious attempt is made by science to ensure that procreation and love-making shall be two distinct, conscious, human activities. The explanation is a simple one: that the forces which effectively control our lives are less concerned with human happiness and freedom than with maintaining and perpetuating that state of affairs, that *status quo* which ensures that, superficially, society ticks over smoothly, unquestioningly and differentially! Our rulers, political, spiritual and moral, firmly face towards the past, their backs to reality and the future.

It is equally unrealistic and Victorian to imagine that one section of society will willingly be economically exploited by another, a minority section at that. Such a state of affairs may be prolonged by wrapping it up in the slogans that initiative and ability must be given additional rewards if they are to be encouraged. Assuming that everybody gave of their best, are we to

Continued on p. 3

Anti-Semitism in Poland?

Of Poland's pre-war Jewish population of 3,250,000 about three in a hundred survived the Nazi massacres. Despite the fact that the present Jewish community (an estimated 45,000) is only an infinitesimal part (less than 2%) of the population of Communist Poland, a wave of anti-Semitism is sweeping the country. Since the break with Russia last October and the relaxation of border

regulations, more than 25,000 Jews have applied for passports to Israel. An exodus, including intellectuals, manual labourers and Communists, is in progress, reported New York *Times* correspondent Sydney Gruson.

Wladyslaw Gomułka's Communist régime blames Polish Stalinists for the migration. Deprived of office, the Stalinists, they say, spread the lie that the "Jewish administration had pauperized Poland" after World War II. When the Russians set up the Polish Communist régime in 1944, they placed Jews in key positions in the bureaucracy. An obvious reason for this was that the Jews were beyond question reliable "anti-Fascists." A more sinister accusation is that in Poland as in Hungary, Stalin deliberately placed Jews in high positions in order to have convenient scapegoats at a later date for the vast deprivations he planned in Poland.

A sense of Communist guilt was expressed last week by Juliusz Burgin, a leading Polish Communist, in *Przeglad Kulturalny*. Wrote Burgin: "The exodus is in fact containing a frightful charge against our people's authority, our party and all of us. The preponderant part of the Jews who remained after the Hitlerite slaughters have reached the conclusion that in the conditions that prevail after twelve years of the people's authority, they are unable to work, breathe and live."

Time, 25/2/57.

It is a Surplus!

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT!
 WEEK 8

Deficit on Freedom £160
 Contributions received £163
 SURPLUS £3

February 15 to February 21

Nairn: W.M.R. 6/-; London: D.M. 1/6;
 London: J.S.* 3/-; Manchester: M.G. 11/-;
 Luton: J.L. 5/-; Melbourne Comrades: per
 B.F. £27/17/9; London: H.M.* 2/-; Cleve-
 land: T.H. 6/-; London Colney: E.H. 6/-;
 Welwyn: Mog 10/-; London: Anon. 1/-;
 Chicago: T.B. 7/-; Farnham: D.M.B. 10/6;
 Minneapolis: McC. £6/7/0; London: W.F.
 2/6; London: G.E.W. 11/-.

Total ... 38 7 3
 Previously acknowledged ... 124 16 4

1957 TOTAL TO DATE ... £163 3 7

GIFTS OF BOOKS: London: S.B.; Stroud: L.G.W.

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP OPEN DAILY

New Books . . .

(Open 10 a.m.-6.30 p.m.; 5 p.m. Sats.)

The Mandarins
Simone de Beauvoir 18/-
Pity the Innocent Ethel Mannin 15/-
The Delinquent Child and the
Community Donald Ford 24/-

Reprints &

Cheap Editions . . .

Story of My Experiments with
Truth Gandhi 7/6
The Universe and Doctor
Einstein L. Barnett 2/6
Guide to the Moon Patrick Moore 2/6

Albert Schweitzer: an
Introduction J. Feschotte 2/6

Freedom Press Publications

Again Available . . .

Anarchy Enrico Malatesta 6d.
Barbarism & Sexual Freedom
Alex. Comfort (paper covers) 3/6
Philosophy of Anarchism
Herbert Read (paper covers) 1/-

Second-Hand . . .

Selections from
Remy de Gourmont 2/6
The Mind in the Making
James Harvey Robinson 2/6
Juno and the Paycock and
The Plough and the Stars
Sean O'Casey 3/-
Elmer Gantry Sinclair Lewis 2/6
The Plague Albert Camus 3/-
The Dance of Life Havelock Ellis 3/6
The Euffe Inheritance
Gabriel Chevallier 3/-
The Fancy-Dress Party
Alberto Moravia 3/-
See You in the Morning
Kenneth Patchen 3/6
Impressions and Comments
Havelock Ellis 4/-
Insurrection Liam O'Flaherty 3/6
Whisky Galore
Compton Mackenzie 2/6
Commonsense and the Child
Ethel Mannin 5/-
The Positive Outcome of
Philosophy Joseph Dietzgen 6/-

During the next month we are selling off hundreds of second-hand fiction and popular trifles at one shilling each, or three for half-a-crown. This is our first sale, so come and see us if you can.

Postage free on all items

Obtainable from

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

CALLING MONICA HALL

Will Miss Monica Hall please get in touch with "Freedom Press"?

The Life and Death of Gustav Landauer-2

(Continued from our last issue)

IN the German elections of 1912, the SPD became the largest single party in the Reichstag, and in the following year the Social Democrats without exception voted for the Rearmament Bill. On the eve of the First World War the Socialist International met in Brussels and Jean Jaures put his faith in the strength of the SPD. "Don't worry," he said to a friend, "four million German Socialists will rise like one man and execute the Kaiser if he wants to start a war".¹ But Landauer had no such optimistic hopes, writing in July 1914:

"Let us be under no illusions as to the situation in all countries to-day. When it comes to the point, the only thing that these revolutionary agitations have served is the nationalist-capitalist aggrandisement we call imperialism; even when originally tinged with socialism they were all too easily led by some Napoleon or Cavour or Bismarck into the mainstream of politics, because all these insurrections were in fact only a means of political revolution or nationalistic war but could never be a means of socialist transformation, for the sufficient reason that the socialists are romantics who always and inevitably make use of the means of their enemies . . ."²

On August 4th the Socialists unanimously voted the government's war credits. "The SPD, loyal to its reformist past, bound the destiny of German labour to that of the German Reich". Opposition to the war, led by Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg did not begin until 1916. In the following year, Ernst Toller, who had been profoundly influenced by Landauer's *Aufruf zum Sozialismus*, went secretly to see him at Krumbach.

"I couldn't understand why, at a time when everybody was waiting for the voice of truth, this ardent revolutionary kept silent. But when I put this question to him he said: 'All my life I have worked for the downfall of this social system, this society founded on lies and betrayals, on this beggaring and suppression of human beings; and I know now that this downfall is imminent—perhaps to-morrow, perhaps in a year's time. And I have the right to reserve my strength until that moment. When the hour strikes I shall be ready.'³

On November 9th, 1918, with defeat in the field, mutiny in the Navy, hunger at home, and Soldiers' and Workers' Councils being formed everywhere, the Chancellor, Prince Max von Baden, handed over his office to Karl Ebert, the leader of the Social-Democrats, who had told him two days earlier, "Unless the

Kaiser abdicates, social revolution is inevitable. But I will have none of it. I hate it like sin." And at a time when dynasties were falling, the High Command decamping, and the people rising, the socialist government of Ebert, Scheidemann and Noske, sought at all costs to preserve the militarism of the officer corps, the feudalism of the Junkers and the capitalism of the industrial magnates.

IN Munich on November 7th, soldiers and workers deposed the Government and proclaimed the Republic of Bavaria, and the Independent Socialist Kurt Eisner formed a cabinet. Of the rôle of Erich Muhsam, and of Landauer who had come to Munich at the beginning of the revolution, Willy Fritzenkotter writes:

"The first action of the two anarchists was to organise the 'Revolutionary Workers' Council'. This council then took the initiative and formed in every workshop the 'Revolutionary Workshop Organisation'. These councils were to be organised in every city, and form (in connection with the 'Sailors and Farmers' Council) the administration of every city and village. All these councils in the country were to elect representatives and send them to a 'Council Congress' in Munich. According to the plan of Muhsam and Landauer these councils and congress should work on a federative basis, and not be centralised. Against this revolutionary movement Eisner and Auer worked in conjunction with the reactionary forces. They were for a Parliamentary election. The Parliament they aimed at making the real law-maker in Bavaria, forcing the 'Workers' Councils' into insignificance.

"Eisner had Muhsam and eleven other revolutionaries arrested on January 10th, 1919 because he feared they would frustrate the election for parliament which should take place on the 12th January. Yet Muhsam and his comrades were on the next day liberated from prison by the 'Workers' Council' which forced Eisner to set them free."⁴

Eisner was assassinated in February by a Bavarian aristocrat, and his place was taken by Johann Hoffmann, a Social Democrat who began negotiations with Berlin. "But the workers of Munich were not amenable to this, and on the night of April 6-7 they proclaimed a Soviet Republic. It was acclaimed with cries of *Los vom Reich*."⁵ Hoffmann's government fled to Bamberg in North Bavaria. Ruth Fischer gives this account of the Council Republic:

"Erich Muhsam proposed to the Munich Workers' and Soldiers' Council

that they proclaim a socialist republic. This proposal was adopted by 234 votes to 70 with the Spartakists voting against it . . . The first Bavarian council government has always been depicted as a half-crazy adventure of literati and intellectuals . . . All of them later proved to be serious militants, who suffered loyally for the cause they had adopted.

"At the head of this group was Gustav Landauer, a cultured humanitarian anarchist. He visualised socialism as an anti-autocratic co-operative. Landauer was an outspoken individualist, a defender of socialist morality, an opponent of terror and violence against the class enemy. Erich Muhsam, the other anarchist writer in the cabinet, had a following among intellectuals and young workers. Ernst Toller, the third writer in the government, was in 1919 a young man uncertain of his politics. He also was what the Germans call an ethical socialist . . ."⁶

The Communists condemned what they called this 'pseudo-soviet' and demanded the resignation of the Central Council, and the Social Democrats, with the aid of the Monarchist garrison arrested several members of the Council on April 13th and took them to North Bavaria. Communist troops then defeated the garrison, and the Revolutionary Council formed a new Soviet cabinet. Then Noske's army of 100,000 men, commanded by Gen. von Oven moved on Bavaria.

"His army was not to crush a handful of men; it was to crush any idea that the substance of the German State could be changed in any way whatever . . . what was to be done to them was to serve as a warning to all the millions of Germans who wanted to eliminate militarism by different means.

"The revolutionary councils realised the hopelessness of fighting against Noske's army and declared their solidarity with the survivors of the first soviet government who were negotiating with Hoffmann in order to avert a catastrophe and forestall the Prussian invasion."⁷

ABOUT seven hundred people were butchered by Noske's army, among them Landauer. A workman who was arrested with him described his death:

"Amid shouts of 'Landauer! Landauer!' an escort of Bavarian and Wurttemberg infantry brought him out into the passage outside the door of the examination room. An officer stuck him in the face, the men shouted 'Dirty Bolshi! Let's finish him off!' and a rain of blows from rifle-butts drove him out into the yard. He said to the soldiers round him: 'I've not betrayed you. You don't know yourselves how terribly you've been betrayed'. Freiherr von Gager went up to him and beat him with a heavy truncheon until he sank in

Continued on p. 3

The Voice of Blimpism

"Lord Derwent asked the Government in the House of Lords yesterday what benefit the United Kingdom received from its membership of Unesco; whether such benefit was worth the £535,572 which membership cost in the two-year period 1955 and 1956; and whether the time had not now come to withdraw from membership so that the money could either be saved or spent to greater advantage.

Lord Hailsham (Minister of Education) replied: 'Membership of Unesco affords both to organisations and individuals the opportunity for international exchange in education, science, and the arts. It also offers scholarships, fellowships, and other forms of assistance which are of particular value to British non-self-governing territories. In the view of the Government these benefits do not constitute the sole justification for membership, which must be considered more broadly as the participation by the United Kingdom in a relatively new method of international co-operation.

'The desirability of membership of Unesco is, I should have thought, a some-

what wider question than could be usefully dealt with in question and answer, and, in any event, raises far wider issues than those implied in the third part of the question. But it is sufficient to state that, for the above reasons, the Government has no present intention of withdrawal.'

Without wishing to defend Unesco it is a fact that perhaps alone among the offshoots of UNO it has done some useful work in the international field; has published interesting publications and generally, has followed a course uninfluenced by the game of power politics. It would explain why it is subjected to the noble Lord's criticism. American Blimps have also at various times, objected to the United States making a contribution to its funds since many of its scientific publications were, to their minds, subversive and anti-American! How many democrats believe in freedom of investigation, of thought and of the press so long as no one takes it literally!

Some Factors Affecting Emotional Development in Children-3

(Continued from last week)

One of the most difficult tasks facing those concerned with sex education is to convince the sex-armoured adult that masturbation is both universal¹³ and physically harmless (psychological dangers arise from environmental attitudes—these are discussed below) and that their condemnatory attitude is based neither on reason nor observable facts but is an emotional outlook engendered by the pronounced anti-sexual Judeo-Christian cultural tradition. The Jewish insistence upon the sexual drive being directed towards procreation alone, which arose from the early Jewish social environment and the consequent deep feeling for the need to ensure racial-religious survival, led to the Biblical condemnation of non-productive behaviour—an attitude passed on to the Christian religion as it evolved from its Judeo-Egyptian predecessors.

The phallic content of early Christianity¹⁴, which can be observed by the student of religious history, probably indicates a primitive preoccupation with procreation rather than any pronounced emphasis on sexual activities generally. The more insidious anti-sexuality of contemporary Christianity was a later development, reaching a peak in some of the more bizarre sects such as the Skopts with their ritual castration and being seen in one of its most cruel forms in the custom of castrating boys for the soprano section of the Papal choirs, a practice which persisted until as late as 1880. During the 18th century over 2000 boys each year suffered from this practice¹⁵.

The widespread emotional aversion to any sexual activity not primarily aimed at procreation, arising from centuries of cultural conditioning, can be seen, not only in the attitude towards masturbation, but also in the popular attitude towards such behaviour as homosexuality and the condemnation, by members of some section of the Christian Church, of contraception.

The present irrational legal attitude towards male homosexuality in this country and the USA is well known. Possibly many will be surprised to learn that in one State in the USA the use of any contraceptive is an offence punishable by fine and imprisonment. Even more fantastically, some court decisions in the USA limit the individual's right to solitary masturbation¹⁶.

The censure of masturbatory activities seems further to have been strengthened by a misinterpretation of the Old Testament legend of Onan whose "sin" had been read as masturbation whereas it was, in fact, *coitus interruptus*. This error

continues to be perpetuated by the still prevalent use of the term *onanism* as a synonym for masturbation, even by writers who should know better.

Masturbatory genital manipulation appears with greatest frequency during two phases in the development of the normal individual, the significance of the activity depending upon the stage of growth being considered.

The genital play of the very young infant cannot be considered to be masturbation but is merely part of the child's exploration of his or her own body—the beginning of the youngster's discovery of the world around. Some writers refer to this activity as *pseudomasturbation* but there seems little need for this piece of terminology. The baby will play with his or her genitals as happily as with, say, the toes, if permitted—and with no particular preference for either.

The apparent emphasis on genital play, which seems to disturb some parents, arises from our cultural tradition wherein the young child is considered more socially acceptable if the natural lack of control of bodily functions is hidden by diapers. The only opportunities which the infant usually has for genital exploration are during such periods as bathing when the freedom from clothing allows access to these parts and when, of course, the child is most likely to be under observation by the parent.

The infant does obtain some pleasure from genital play but, probably, no more than from any other tactile experience. Cultural variations in attitude can be observed in the different practices adopted for comforting infants. In some parts of Egypt, for example, an adult will greet a baby boy by tickling his genitals, a custom which would be regarded, probably, with dismay by most Europeans. Similarly, among the Kazaks an adult playing with children, particularly boys, will frequently stimulate their genitals¹⁷.

Infantile masturbation proper occurs in all normal children as they enter the genital stage of development (2-2½ years, approximately). It is as normal a phenomenon as thumb sucking at the earlier oral stage and should be no more regarded as something to be suppressed.

It should be remembered that, as was stated above, the transition from the oral, through anal, to genital stage is gradual and that traces of the earlier stages remain throughout life—though any undue fixation on any one particular stage (the result of wrong parental handling) results in incomplete orientation.

During the genital stage of development the child is for the first time becoming aware of him- or herself as an indivi-

dual. Masturbatory activities are part of the essential self-exploration and assist the ultimate correct localization of the erogenous zones. Such activities do not necessarily take the form of actual manual manipulation of the genitals (as is usually the case with adolescent masturbation) and may not be recognized for what they are by unsophisticated parents ignorant of childhood sexuality. Little girls, for instance, may masturbate by thigh movement alone. Often children's games may be disguised forms of masturbation.

Parents who deny the appearance of sexual behaviour in their young children are either those who are singularly unobservant or, as mentioned above, are ignorant of the various methods which may be employed by children. There may be some whose anti-sexual conditioning causes them to subconsciously reject the observed phenomena. Others may be lying because they feel that the admission of such behaviour will incur some social stigma.

Possibly some adults with pronounced guilt complexes and the conditioned attitude that sexual activity is "impure" are reluctant to accept the idea of childhood sexuality since they are only capable of a subjective view of the practice and attach the same significance to the activity as to adult sexuality, attributing to the child the same feelings towards the subject as they themselves harbour. The significance of the activity to the child is, of course, completely different from its significance to the adult. The masturbating child does not indulge in the fantasies which normally accompany the activity in an adult. To the child the practice merely produces a pleasurable sensation.

A.C.F.C.

(To be continued)

¹³ Statistics of incidence are given in Kinsey's two surveys.

¹⁴ For details see: Scott: "Phallic Worship"; Knight: "Two essays on the Worship of Priapus"; Cutner: "Short History of Sex Worship".

¹⁵ This figure is given by Oliven: "Sexual Hygiene and Pathology". A useful study of ritual castration is that by W. A. Brend: "Sacrifice to Atis". (A situation, similar to that of the provision of castrati mentioned here, existed in ancient China where parents would castrate their boys to render them fit for service as eunuchs in the Imperial Court. See, for instance: V. Cronin: "The Wise Man From the West". Much useful information on genital mutilation generally can be found in Briffault's classic work: "The Mothers".)

¹⁶ See: Karpman: "The Sexual Offender and his Offences"; Kinsey et al.: "Sexual Behaviour in the Human Male".

¹⁷ See: Ammar: "Growing Up In An Egyptian Village"; also Margaret Mead's books and Ford & Beach: "Patterns of Sexual Behaviour".

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

Vol. 18, No. 9. March 2, 1957

Progress and Human Behaviour

Continued from p. 1

assume that we should automatically achieve the equalitarian society? Of course not! The unequal society exists not because some people are superior to others, that some work harder or are more intelligent than others but because those who are in power (or aspire to power), do not believe in the equality of man. Obviously we are not directing our attack against Conservatives but against all men who aspire to rule over, or exploit the labour of, their fellow men. In both cases they consider themselves superior to their fellow men, either in ability or in their rights to better conditions which the possession of wealth, through the exploitation of another man's labour can provide. The root of all (social) evil is not in fact only money. Money may be, and in the industrial field generally is, the "Open Sesame" to power, but it would be an over-simplification to say that money and power are synonymous. Hitler was a penniless house-painter with a lust for power; John Minton was a sensitive young painter who was bequeathed a very large sum of money. They both committed suicide for reasons as different as were their lives: the house-painter to avoid humiliation at the hands of his fellow power-maniacs; the creative painter because his monetary wealth was no compensation for a feeling of humility towards his fellow beings, a fear, real or imagined, that he had nothing more to say through his art.

★

THIS brings us to the point which we wished to make. The ugliness of the world in which we live, and which adds point to the anarchists' determination to refuse to give up the struggle, is not symbolised by the sordid political machinations within the United Nations, or outside, in Cyprus, Algiers, Kashmir, the Middle East or the Far East. At government level we expect nothing that is not opportunistic or hypocritical.

The ugliness against which we raise our voice is at the human level, between man and man. It is the attitude of mind which prevents the "whites" in S. Africa, in Kenya and Algeria from recognising that the "natives" who, in each case, are an overwhelming majority, have at least equal rights; of the skilled workers in all countries who believe themselves superior beings deserving of privileges to distinguish them from their so-called "unskilled" fellows; that no doctor in this country or in France (where the issue of a "free" medical service for all is now being hotly resisted by the medical profession), has raised his voice on behalf of his patients or against the financial demands of his Association the only aim of which is to increase the financial (and therefore, social) differential between the medical profession and the general public.

The ugliness of our world is the mentality which impels people to report to the police a "sex assault"—often against the wishes of the parties concerned—but allows them to remain passive spectators whilst a fellow being is being savaged by a mad Alsatian! It is the mentality which burns with impotent indignation over the crushing of popular revolt in Hungary by Russian tanks, but is impassive when British troops ruthlessly crush popular movements in Cyprus, and French divisions defend white supremacy in Algeria. It is the mentality which raises mil-

WE NEED AN ANARCHIST INTERNATIONAL

ANARCHISM is the one social philosophy based on the conviction that the individual is naturally and spontaneously co-operative, and that co-operation in society can be achieved without authority or coercion. Anarchists reject the age-old concept of society vs. the individual because they do not believe that society must always be opposed to the interests of the individual. Rather they conceive of a time when society will exist for the benefit of the individual and of a time when the individual will freely and without compulsion exist for the benefit of society.

While we do not believe that the individual and society must always be opposed, we also view most societies of to-day, steeped as they are in their authoritarian traditions, as opposed to the thinking intelligent creative individuals in the world. To-day's world, governed by militaristic and greedy states and institutions, is so organized as to foster a continued, unending trend toward conformity, toward the mass stereotyping of human beings. Increasingly, the creative person, the artist, the worker, the intellectual, the student, etc. is being moulded into a pattern that destroys the uniqueness of the individual that makes the world a delightful place in which to live.

By governmental order, by absurd laws, by legal privilege, by statist decree . . . the creativity of the individual is being suppressed and in many cases completely destroyed. The philosophical truth that the state is the enemy of society, that the authoritarian institutions are the enemies of the people is more evident in 1957 than ever before.

But what can the individual do to retain his integrity, his sanity? Is it better to go off and be completely "individualistic", to turn one's back upon a world guilty of the crime of slaughtering millions of human being for economic and political wars, a world far more concerned with H-Bombs than it is with the simple lives of men, women and children?

To my mind, such an individualistic course is fatal! To close one's eyes to the problems of modern society, to the rising possibly to total annihilation, and to escape into an "ivory tower" now is to draw tighter the shackles of authoritarianism, even upon one's own head. It is to blind oneself to the fact that our individual freedom is all bound up with the freedom and integrity of our fellow men. One can never be really free if the society in which he lives is still in chains.

To criticize those who feel that they must "go it alone", who feel that to work with a Libertarian movement is to lose one's individuality, does not mean that one necessarily refuses to accept such individuals as anarchists. In their own way and in their own fields, if they are fighting authoritarianism and spreading the idea that society could be arranged in a much more natural fashion . . . then such persons should have the blessings of all who are themselves working toward a free society, whether they are co-operating on the same project or in the same movement or not. It is not the

lions of dollars for Hungarian refugees but which leaves the Koinonia Farms to the mercy of Klu Klux Klan gangsters.*

★

IF we must look back to the past to take our bearings, then materially, as we have so often pointed out, no one can deny that man today is better off than were his forebears. But in our social relations even if we are no worse-off it is difficult to state categorically that we are better-off. Perhaps among the grossly "under-privileged" members of human society mutual aid is still the determining factor of human survival. But in the "civilised" nations the happiness that material security might have provided has been offset by a "tooth and claw" struggle not only between, but within, nations and if our understanding of human history is valid, this can only lead to untold misery and unhappiness. We may not be in a position to change governments. But human behaviour, the way we behave towards one another, that is something directly under our control if we so wish!

*See elsewhere in this issue on the fate of this agricultural community.

honesty, the sincerity, the integrity, or the morality that is here being challenged; rather it is the wisdom of those who still believe that an organized movement of libertarians throughout the world is contrary to the individual liberty of the person.

★

THE whole question of movement, the whole question of a world federation of anarchists has recently been raised by a group of exiled Bulgarian anarchists, who have appealed for an international congress to be held in Paris this July. The appeal begins by calling attention to the present state of the anarchist movement throughout the world.

In Russia, the anarchists lie in concentration camps, that is, those who have not yet been slaughtered by the "dictatorship of the proletariat" or sent into exile as have our Bulgarian comrades. In Spain, most of our comrades languish in Franco's dungeons, while the so-called "free" ones operate an underground propaganda organization against Franco and his allies. In South America, anarchists know constantly the terror of the police state, the raids, and the bans upon their papers. In England, a small faithful group still publish FREEDOM, and keep the idea alive and before the English-speaking world. In America, the voice of anarchy is all but silenced, except for the new and growing Libertarian League, and a few papers with small circulations and in some cases, periodic publication dates. In small intellectual circles, anarchist voices will be heard, but truthfully, it is usually drowned in the sea of authoritarianism.

On the other hand, look at the enemy of the anarchist movement. Millions upon millions of people are its slaves. Every year, millions upon millions of work hours are spent building up the political state, paying taxes for our further enslavement. Millions of young men throughout the world spend the best years of their lives in the fiendish militaristic institutions which further the tyranny of the state over man. Our educational institutions, our press, our labour organizations, etc. . . . everything which the state controls is organized against the individual and I see no hope of ending the present political tyranny, unless individuals all over the world join hands freely with their fellow man and refuse to continue bending their knee before the state. This is why I am en-

thusiastic about the appeal which the Bulgarian comrades have issued. I do not believe that they desire to become a central committee issuing orders from above, nor do they intend to encroach upon the autonomous nature of present groups or any forthcoming groups; rather they hope to co-ordinate the activities of all consenting groups by making possible closer contact and thus making the fight against war, colonialism and totalitarianism more effective.

★

A WRITER in the French journal *Pages Libres* criticises the appeal because it does not represent the views of the majority of the exiled Bulgarians. This seems to be a poor excuse for opposing the idea, from a writer who is presumably an anarchist. I accept the anarchist opinion of majority rule, that is, I don't believe in it. Does this man think that the entire anarchist movement throughout the world should wait until our Bulgarian friends have reached a "majority opinion" in favour of an international league, when just the slightest glance at to-day's world tells that we direly need such a thing?

Another critic, who signs himself "G.B." writes in FREEDOM that those who see the value of such a thing should go ahead and get together, but in condescending tones, assures us, that "they could strain and starve, even supposing that they could harmoniously work together for a while." He then assures us paternalistically that "They would not harmoniously work together for long is to be surmised from human nature and past experience."

Does G.B. really believe that it is contrary to human nature to work together? Does he really believe that Peter Kropotkin who founded FREEDOM, and who wrote *Mutual Aid* for the express purpose of showing that it is man's nature to work together; does he really believe that Peter Kropotkin was a hopeless optimist, an idealist who lost sight of the realistic nature of human beings? And does he really believe that the present state of the anarchist movement is due to "human nature"?

I blame the obscurity of the anarchist movement, not on the inherent nature of man, but on the abstract, impersonal institutions which distort "human nature". I blame it on the false and erroneous philosophies of authoritarianism

which to-day hold the majority of the human race in ignorance of their grand and limitless potentialities.

If I thought men were instinctively unco-operative, that men are by nature opposed to working with their fellow men, I would not be willing to devote my time toward the building of a freer society, for I would then be convinced of its futility.

If "G.B." really does not believe in the goodness of human nature, then upon what basis does he think a free society could be built?

★

ANOTHER criticism of the appeal is that it will build up an organization, destroy individualism, and become an institution with no other aim, save self-perpetuation. But listen to this sentence of "G.B."—"The authors of the appeal themselves would not be so keen on their idea, if they knew beforehand that following its acceptance by large sections of the movement, they would themselves be excluded from any central position in the council or the bureau."

Does this not intimate that the writer is willing to place himself before the necessity of an anarchist international? Does his language not imply that he might be rejecting the whole idea simply because he was not the inventor of the idea, nor because he personally sees no advantage to be gained from the idea? Is it possible that he has placed his devotion to the London Anarchist Group above the necessity of an unsectarian world-wide fight against authoritarianism?

In conclusion, G.B. suggests that we wait until there are many more anarchists than there are at present before we act. But it is precisely to remedy the present shortage of anarchists that the International has been proposed. He goes on to say that we should know one another's minds and what we really want before such a move would be advisable. But if we are going to close ourselves off and refuse to meet and discuss our attitudes and views, how will we ever know each other's minds? It is precisely because we do want to know each other and to work in closer co-operation with our comrades all over the world that the congress has been proposed.

This is why I give my unqualified support to the Bulgarian comrades in their attempt to build a world-wide move toward freedom.

San Francisco ROY S. FARMER.

Gustav Landauer - 2

Continued from p. 2

a heap on the ground. He struggled up again and tried to speak, but one of the men shot him through the head. He was still breathing and the fellow said: "That blasted carrion has nine lives; he can't even die like a gentleman."

"Then a sergeant in the Life Guards shouted out: 'Pull off his coat!' They pulled it off, and laid him on his stomach. 'Stand back there, and we'll finish him off properly!' one of them cried, and shot him in the back. Landauer still moved convulsively, so they trampled on him till he was dead; then stripped the body and threw it into the wash-house."

Toller and Muhsam were each imprisoned in a fortress for five years. In 1934 Muhsam was killed by the Nazis in Orienberg concentration camp. His last work was *The Liberation of Society from the State* an exposition of Landauer's teaching.

In 1933 the Nazis dug up Landauer's remains and sent them to the Jewish community in Munich. Some years ago Mrs. Adama van Scheltem of Amsterdam told me how in 1939 she visited Landauer's daughter and son-in-law, living in fear in a Rhineland town, to get his papers and manuscripts which she smuggled across the frontier for the International Institute for Social History.

★

GUSTAV LANDAUER failed, said the philosopher Fritz Mauthner, "because he was no politician, and yet was driven by his passionate compassion for the people, to be active politically; too proud to join a Party, not narrow enough to form a Party round his own name". Landauer failed, but was not the failure of the political socialists more ignominious? In the struggle for the soul of the socialist movement in the 1890's, like that between Marx and Bakunin in the First International in the seventies, his forebodings on the nature of German Social Democracy were ignored, but were shown to be correct in every detail by the events of 1914, by the crushing of the revolutionary hopes of 1918 and by the final collapse before the Nazis. Is

his vision of "a society of equalitarian exchange based on regional communities, rural communities which combine agriculture with industry" any more ridiculous than the vision of a society of machine-minders and bureaucrats which is all the 'realistic' socialists can offer?

But what are we to say of the Munich Council Republic? Was it in fact "the embodiment of impractical romantic anarchism" that James Joll calls it? From the fragmentary and contradictory accounts that are all one can find, it is hard to come to any firm conclusions, but a number of points are worth making. It is variously referred to as the Bavarian Soviet Republic and the Bavarian Council Republic (Bayrische Räterepublik). This in itself has no significance. Soviet is the Russian word for Council, and the slogan "All Power to the Soviets", usurped by the Bolsheviks to gain support for an exactly opposite policy, had a wide currency in the years immediately after the Russian Revolution. The Communists were opposed to the Räterepublik. Why then did they form a 'second soviet cabinet' to succeed it? "Very simply, the Communists could not resist the drive of the Munich workers, who, irritated after the garrison coup, wanted to defend Munich", explains Ruth Fischer.

Was the Landauer cabinet a government? This is a matter of nomenclature. It was the 'soviet' installed by the Bavarian Central Council of Workers' and Soldiers' Councils. Fritzenkotter regards the Council Republic as lasting for six months, i.e. the whole period from the abdication to the suppression by the German army and the *Freikorps*. For him the term is synonymous with the period of the effective existence of the Workers' Councils. Landauer regarded the task of revolution as "the setting up of society 'outside' and 'alongside' the State".

Was there any chance of success? Mrs. Fischer, as an ex-Communist, deprecates the Communist attitude that it was simply an 'adventurist folly'. She

points out that it took place in the context of general unrest in Germany, especially in neighbouring Saxony, and of the setting up of Bela Kun's Hungarian Soviet Republic. Moreover Bavaria had only been incorporated in the German Empire in 1871, and had a strong separatist tradition. It was widely thought that "Berlin would not dare invade Bavaria." In Bavaria, unlike most of Germany, Peasants' Councils had been formed at the end of the war.

"The majority of them were non-revolutionary. Nevertheless they supported the revolution because they feared Bavaria would become a battleground after the defection of Austria, and because they regarded the war as a private business between monarchs . . . After the war was over, the Bavarian peasants' councils remained important; they wanted to have a say in the administration of their country . . . However, although one of their leaders was in the soviet government they blockaded the capital; no victuals were delivered to Munich".⁹

The Council Republic failed because not enough people supported it, because it failed to win over the peasantry, and to win over the returning soldiers from the reactionary *Freikorps*, because it failed to alienate people from their allegiance to political parties and political violence, and because German Social Democracy itself was so deeply wedded to German reaction. "Socialism", Landauer had written years before,

"is possible and impossible at all times; it is possible when the right people are there to will and do it; it is impossible when people either don't will it or only supposedly will it, but are not capable of doing it".

This is the sense in which the Council Republic was doomed to failure.

C.W.

1. JAMES JOLL: *The Second International* (1955).
2. Quoted by MARTIN BUIER: *Paths to Utopia* (1949).
3. ERNST TOLLER: *I Was a German* (1934).
4. WILLY FRITZENKOTTER: *The Council Republic of Munich* (Freedom 26/9/53).
5. W. KNIGHT-PATTERSON: *Germany from Defeat to Conquest* (1945).
6. RUTH FISCHER: *Stalin and German Communism* (1948).
7 & 9. RUDOLF COSER: *Failure of a Revolution* (1955).
8. Quoted in TOLLER: *I Was a German*.

Malthus and Natural Selection

IN 1798 Malthus published his "Essay on the Principle of Population"; its implications have troubled the minds of thinking men ever since. According to Malthus a population multiplies rapidly if food is plentiful until its numbers outstrip food production and famine and war result. Others have taken a less pessimistic view and considered that improvements in food production could keep pace and even overtake the increase in numbers. This has happened, so far; food production has kept pace but nationalism and greed have prevented a satisfactory distribution. But, can this increase be maintained? Populations are still increasing at an alarming rate in some parts of the world and it seems unlikely, if the present rate persists, that there will be sufficient food in the future. Birth control in its present form is not a practical proposition for much of the world.

Was Malthus correct? His mathematics appear to be so but his biological basis has been questioned. Dr. C. B. Goodhart suggested in a recent broadcast* that he was wrong to assume that the human reproductive rate is constant, unless interfered with by man himself. He argues that natural selection can and does vary the rate.

Compared with most animal species the human reproductive rate is low. Normally only one child being born at a time and at least a year separates each birth. Also, almost complete sterility is quite common in both sexes. These checks must be evolved naturally. There is no reason why twins are not more common and since the tendency to have them seems to be inherited, it could have been altered by natural selection.

Evolution does not necessarily take hundreds of thousands of generations before its effects become noticeable. If a population is genetically heterogeneous, for genes giving contrasting effects of a particular character, the equilibrium between these genes is unstable and it is susceptible to selective pressures. If one of these gene types is selected, because of its advantage to the species, evolution can commence at once. In this country the population is polymorphic, as it is called, for hair types; straight, curly, light and dark being common. If, as Goodhart puts it, gentlemen really did prefer blondes we could expect an increase in blondes quite quickly. Fertility too, the evidence suggests, is

genetically controlled. Twins run in families; a selective pressure for types of high or low fertility would change the average fertility of the population.

In a dense unhygienic population, widespread disease and a high infant mortality would favour the larger families. As only a few of the children born could hope to survive, the small families would tend to be eliminated. Selection would favour high fertility irrespective of other characteristics, except resistance to disease. Conditions such as these must have operated early in the industrial revolution.

The opposite effect can be seen in primitive nomadic tribes where disease is generally of little importance because of isolation. Members with large families will have difficulty in feeding their young when food is scarce; selection favours small families and hence lower fertility. Such tribes often have difficulty in building up their numbers, should disease from outside deplete them.

Densely populated areas have only occurred during the past few thousand years; man living for the greater part of his existence in relative isolation. To assume, as Malthus did, that the present high reproductive rate is constant, is unjustified. Along with the teeming millions of Asia we find the declining numbers of the Eskimos, Australian Aborigines and African Bushmen. These cannot be ignored.

Declining numbers are not confined to primitive peoples affected by disease. Most successful nations and classes have nearly always died out in the end. Indeed, it is often stated that a high living standard is incompatible with fertility. Goodhart suggests that qualities which enable people to succeed in life may have become genetically correlated with a rather low average fertility, otherwise their line would soon become extinct.

Unless an inherited characteristic is constantly being selected it tends to deteriorate. This appears to be happening in modern society where many women have difficulty in feeding their babies. This does not happen in primitive communities providing their diet is adequate. Artificial feeding is now satisfactory and can replace breast milk so that selection for high milk yield is not taking place.

It follows that a relaxing of the highest level of fecundity would produce a progressive fall in the average fertility of a population. This is what we do find in an advanced civilization with low mortality. The equilibrium between high and low fertility will be easily affected by changes in the mortality rate. If early mortality is reduced there will be a corresponding reduction in the relative advantage of high fertility; members likely to succeed not being indiscriminately killed off. There will be an initial increase in numbers, the proportion of small families will increase and the average fertility of the family will tail off.

Goodhart cites the Irish as a recent example of natural selection operating on a population. Before 1750 the Irish were poverty-stricken and must have had a high infant mortality. The introduction of the potato raised the living standard considerably and their number increased rapidly, from 2 millions to 8 millions in 100 years. In the 1840's the Blight destroyed the potato crop and famine resulted followed by emigration. It was to be expected that the highly fertile Irish would have bred more quickly than ever to make up for this

loss. But this did not happen; they have continued to decline and the population is now half what it was in 1840. Goodhart doubts if emigration can wholly account for this.

The probable explanation, he thinks, is that there has been a strong genetical selection against fecundity, since the famine. At first large families were harder hit and emigration was probably selective. An only son would probably stay behind to inherit the family farm whereas the members of large families would have no such reason for staying and emigrated. As girls depended on a dowry for marriage, a single daughter stood a much better chance than the less fortunate girl in a large family. In a peasant economy marriage would tend to be deferred because of the necessity of helping on the family farm and so marriage and children were postponed. The more virile very likely, will not have tolerated such restrictions and emigrated also. The continued decline cannot have been the result of a poor economy only, for such conditions have not deterred other groups from marrying and bearing children. As the Irish, before the famine, when conditions were hard, were renowned for their high marriage rate and fertility, it suggests that some real biological change must have taken place; it could only have happened in a population polymorphic for genes affecting fertility.

The populations of Western Europe have grown rapidly since the industrial revolution but now seem to have stopped; there is evidence that they are beginning to decline. Goodhart suggests this is because the decrease in mortality has increased the number of people who cannot or will not have children. There are many people who do not have as many as they would wish; estimates suggest that approx. 10% of couples in this country are involuntarily childless. These facts are difficult to explain, unless something similar to what Goodhart suggests has happened, as it is usually assumed that any sign of infertility is eliminated by natural selection.

His conclusions are that the world population will increase in the immediate future, but, on biological grounds he doubts if the present rate of increase can be maintained for very much longer. The more conditions are improved in the overpopulated areas the faster it will fall; but so long as poor conditions exist so will selection favour high fecundity, as the factors which tend to limit the rate of increase cannot operate unless the majority of infants survive to maturity.

If his thesis is correct natural selection will defeat the mathematical law of geometrical increase of populations and the ghost of Malthus will cease to haunt us.

JOHN NOBLE.

*C. B. Goodhart (B.B.C. Third Prog. talk—printed in *Listener* 7/2/57).

EFFICIENCY IS UNPROFITABLE

AN unexpected laying spree by Britain's hens has driven winter egg prices down to the lowest level since the war.

There has been only a four per cent. increase this year in the number of hens in production, and the chief cause of the glut has been the mild weather, which has produced a freak spring flush several weeks earlier than usual. But increased efficiency has also played a part. More farmers are adopting intensive methods of production, and it is this aspect of the problem that is worrying poultry farmers. They fear that unless the Government is prepared to go on paying substantial subsidies their increased efficiency will result in prices being driven down to an uneconomic level.

(*Observer*, 24/2/57).

Why only Defensive?

Continued from p. 1

Apart from its immediate urgency for the Ford workers, however, this dispute there, however it goes, is important for the rest of us as a straw in the wind. It is an indication that the Government's attacks upon our standards of living are going to be followed up by the employers attacking our defensive organisations.

And there is the key word—*defensive*. The workers of this country have built up most powerful organisations for defence. But they have never been developed for attack because the working class movement (so-called) in this country has no ideas or where it wants to go. It doesn't know what it has to attack for.

It is considered very progressive, a 'great step forward', for employees' incomes to be pegged to the cost of living. But is it? Doesn't that simply mean fixing to-day's standards as the norm—as though they were sufficient and satisfactory in every way? If our incomes go up as costs go up, we stay in reality where we are. How do we progress? How do we make things better, our standards higher, if we think only in terms of not slipping back?

This is the curse of the reformist

FRIENDS,

Comrade R. J. Owen's letter in your issue Feb. 16th is one that should be ranked high as an example of "elite" thinking. Any exposition of anarchy which ignores the elite is either wrong expression or improper thinking. For surely anarchy is elite. Anarchy is the elite philosophy based on correct understanding of Man's social development. Anarchy, too, is the elite psychology correctly interpreting the origin of mankind's miseries in Man's so widely worshipped and so little understood human brain.

Man's brain, distorted, muddled and befogged by myths like "mind", "soul", "eternity" and "immortality", is the source of Man's every social sorrow. Begotten of Man's brain is that demonic word "incentive". To rise above the level of the merest worm, Man has to have the "incentive" of selfish, personal gain. To be good, he must have the hope of "heaven" and the fear of "hell". Anarchy is the elite surgeon who relieves human brains of the pressure of such degrading stupidities and abysmal ignorances. Anarchy, above all, is the elite morality. This is far too little realised and far too often forgotten. Every true anarchist should be ever and always above "taking advantage" in any shape

THIS ENGLAND

The Court of Common Council of the City of London decided yesterday to pay a firm £135 to keep the City's pigeon population under control. During the discussion Mr. F. W. Lean made an eloquent plea for the birds:

"There is a long history in the City attaching to pigeons. I cannot help feeling that justice is not being done to them. I must remind this honourable court that they had a terrible time during the blitz. Many of them were destroyed, and I am glad to say that many of them stayed here. They were faithful to us and we must be faithful to them."

After members had spoken of damage the birds could do, Mr. H. E. Lester, who said he had lived in St. Paul's Churchyard for 55 years, commented: "Providing you did not look towards heaven at the wrong time as you enter the cathedral, there is nothing which is not beneficial about pigeons."

(*Manchester Guardian*).

Have You remembered to renew your Subscription to FREEDOM?

or form. Anarchist sincerity and integrity ought not merely to forbid it but make it impossible.

And here it is that I wonder. In one particular respect more than any. Does the permanent existence of that deficit on FREEDOM represent elite sincerity and integrity? It is so relatively small that it could be wiped out and kept permanently away without inconvenience to any of us. If we all did our bit. Cannot we all do this? Primarily, cannot we all see that every single copy of FREEDOM we receive is properly paid for? That, when we do happen to forget to renew our subscription on the due date, subscriptions we do pay shall faithfully and fully cover all the weeks we have gone behind. You may call this anticlimax. I don't.

Yours fraternally,

DAVID MACCONNELL.

Derbyshire, Feb. 18.

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

LECTURE-DISCUSSIONS

Every Sunday at 7.30 at THE MALATESTA CLUB, 32 Percy Street, Tottenham Court Road, W.1.

MARCH 3—John Jones on SUGGESTION FOR GOVERNMENT

MARCH 10—Dwight MacDonald on EGYPT

Questions, Discussion and Admission all free.

OPEN AIR MEETINGS

Weather Permitting HYDE PARK Sundays at 3.30 p.m.

MANETTE STREET (Charing X Road) Saturdays at 5.30 p.m.

NEW YORK GROUP

(Libertarian League)

announce a new series of Classes on

THE DEVELOPMENT OF LIBERTARIAN THEORY

These classes will be held at 813 Broadway, New York on Monday nights, starting promptly at 7 p.m., and ending no later than 10 p.m.

- Mar. 4—Stirner.
- Mar. 11—Bakunin.
- Mar. 18—Kropotkin.
- Mar. 25—The Libertarian League.

★

LIBERTARIAN FORUM—

FRIDAY NIGHTS AT 8.30—

813 BROADWAY.

- Mar. 8—Pacifism and Social Change.
- Mar. 15—Paris 1871, Kronstadt 1921, Budapest 1956.
- Mar. 22—The People of the Paris Commune.
- Mar. 29—The World Government Movement.

★ Malatesta Club ★

SWARAJ HOUSE, 32 PERCY STREET, TOTTENHAM COURT ROAD, LONDON, W.1. (Tel.: MUSEUM 7277).

ACTIVITIES

Every Sunday at 7.30 p.m. London Anarchist Group Meetings (see Announcements Column)

Every Wednesday at 8 p.m. BONAR THOMPSON Speaks.

Every Friday and Saturday: SOCIAL EVENINGS

FREEDOM

The Anarchist Weekly

Postal Subscription Rates: 12 months 19/- (U.S.A. \$3.00) 6 months 9/6 (U.S.A. \$1.50) 3 months 5/- (U.S.A. \$0.75)

Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies 12 months 29/- (U.S.A. \$4.50) 6 months 14/6 (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

FREEDOM PRESS

VOLINE:

Nineteen-Seventeen (The Russian Revolution Betrayed) cloth 12s. 6d. The Unknown Revolution (Kronstadt 1921, Ukraine 1918-21) cloth 12s. 6d.

E. A. GUTKIND:

The Expanding Environment 8s. 6d.

V. RICHARDS:

Lessons of the Spanish Revolution 6s.

RUDOLF ROCKER:

Nationalism and Culture cloth 21s.

HERBERT READ:

Art and the Evolution of Man 4s.

Existentialism, Marxism and Anarchism 3s. 6d.

Poetry and Anarchism cloth 5s., paper 2s. 6d.

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

The Education of Free Men 1s.

FERRICO MALATESTA:

Anarchy 6d.

Vote—What For? 1d.

GEORGE WOODCOCK:

New Life to the Land 6d.

Homes orhovels? 6d.

Railways and Society 3d.

What is Anarchism? 1d.

The Basis of Communal Living 1s.

M. BAKUNIN:

Marxism, Freedom and the State. cloth 5s.

PHILIP SANSON:

Syndicalism—The Workers' Next Step 1s.

Marie-Louise Berneri Memorial Committee publications:

Marie-Louise Berneri, 1918-1949: A Tribute cloth 5s.

Journey Through Utopia cloth 16s. (U.S.A. \$2.50)

K. J. KENAFICK:

Michael Bakunin and Karl Marx paper 6s.

27, Red Lion Street,

London, W.C.1.