

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

May 2nd, 1953

Threepence

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 travelling colleagues will not much alter Russian policy. The internal situation in the Soviet Union may be eased by the amnesty, the new peace lowering, the legal set-up after the release of the "doctor-assassins". But such relaxations are intended only to enable the new regime to consolidate itself. The Communist Party will still continue to try and maintain and extend its power and the dictatorial State will mainly not wither away.

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

All the headline shouting about a "change of heart", a "new look for the future" and so on has receded as so much empty foam on 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 of importance for German enterprise.

Although shorn 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

All of us have occasionally seen 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!

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 Bretschneider, 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. Bretschneider. "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

The Church & Women's Suffrage in Mexico

THE new president of Mexico Don Adolfo Ruiz Cortines submitted to the federal legislature the day after his inauguration last Dec. an amendment to the constitution to grant full citizenship and suffrage to women. The Mexico correspondent of *Manas* (Los Angeles) makes the following comment on the possibly paradoxical implications of the new legislation:

Jubilation marked the reception by articulate Mexican women of the suffrage amendment. After approval by the House of Deputies, the measure passed the Senate on Dec. 24 by a vote of 42 to 1. To become effective, the presidential initiative must be ratified by two thirds of 28 state legislatures embraced in the federal union.

The lone dissent came from Senator Aquiles Elorduy of Aguascalientes, who saw in the amendment a threat to statutory Church-State separation. *El Nacional*, official government organ, reported the dissenter as saying:

There are two classes of men: those who confess they are ruled by their women, and those who conceal it (laughter). Women have everything: they are in my heart; in the home they rule their husbands and their children. Then, what more do they want? 1

fear that they would neglect the home in order to attend political discussions and meetings.

Ninety per cent. of Mexican women are Catholic and hardly fifty per cent. of the men. I fear they would receive instructions from curates. Then we will see a future Congress of frenzied Catholics . . . who will demand the repeal of Article 3 [secular and free primary education], civil marriage and the separation of Church and State. We will then be in the same fix as Spain where the non-Catholic fares—badly.

For not throwing their handbags at him as on previous occasions, the Senator thanked the full gallery of ardent women present for the hearings. An affirmative spokesman arose, described the dissenting solon as a dignified representative of the eighteenth century; another protagonist declared that the separation of Church and State would remain inviolate. Women will not confuse the boundaries separating politics from the Church, but will reject any clerical suggestions, he affirmed. The doubting legislator was assured that Mexico, which had suffered so bitterly, would not return to the ways of the past.

Although traditionally opposed to education for women, the Roman Catholic Church, perennial partisan of reaction—against Benita Juárez, Francisco

Madero and the federal constitution; for Porfirio Diaz and Victoriano Huerta—through its sprouting political auxiliary, PAN (*Partido Acción Nacional*), conveniently supported the measure. The Mexican women, strongest bulwark of the Church, will undoubtedly exercise a potent influence in the expansion of PAN.

As an appropriate climax to his six-year term, retiring president Alemán rushed to dedicate unfinished public projects before the termination of his administration, among them a statue—of Miguel Alemán—which was unveiled on the campus of *Ciudad Universitaria*—of which, incidentally, the stunning architectural conception will doubtless make it one of the most imposing campuses in the world. By accident or design, Miguel Alemán in sculpture bore a striking resemblance to the late Joe Stalin.

Aware that the millionaire ex-Chief of State has taken measures to assure posterity of his pre-eminence, a skeptical native expressed his sardonic gratitude that the furniture in his home does not yet carry the mark *Alemán*, as do bridges, highways, dams, airports, hydro-electric projects, *et al, ad nauseam*.

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP OPEN DAILY

(OPEN 9—6.30; 5.30 SATURDAYS)

Reprints . . .
News from Nowhere William Morris 4/-

Reminders . . .
Well of Loneliness Radclyffe Hall 10/-
Commonsense and the Adolescent Ethel Mannin 3/-

Second-hand . . .
PENGUIN
The Romantic Exiles (about Herzen, Bakunin and Nechaev) E. H. Carr 1/6

GUILD BOOKS
The Village Labourer (2 vols.) 2/6
The Town Labourer 2/6
J. L. & Barbara Hammond.
The Federal Bureau of Investigation M. Lowenthal 5/-
London's Underworld (Edited by Quennell) Henry Mayhew 6/-
Thorstein Veblen and his America Joseph Dorfman 6/-

Periodicals . . .
Poetry and Poverty No. 4 2/-
The Libertarian No. 4 3d.
The Syndicalist 2d.

Obtainable from
**27, RED LION STREET,
LONDON, W.C.1**

Getting Rid of the Eskimos

But there are other more refined and subtle ways of bringing about the disappearance of a race whose presence is an embarrassment. The best of these is simply to let events follow their natural course—to leave it to the germs of disease to carry out the work of destruction, without raising a hand for the Eskimos or against them, just remaining strictly neutral so far as they are concerned.

Apparently, this is the method that was chosen by the Canadian Government a few years ago. As short a time ago as 1931, the Annual Report of the Department of Indian Affairs said, regarding the Eskimos, "It is more than possible that many of the northern districts are now over-populated."

There is, in fact, not one Eskimo to the square mile!

Doubtless to remedy this sad state of affairs, Parliament simply lowered the appropriations for medical care. Thus:

Cost "per capita" per annum, 1931-32, \$10
Cost "per capita" per annum, 1932-33, \$7.60
Cost "per capita" per annum, 1933-34, \$7.20

Meanwhile the cost of medical service to the Canadian population at large was \$30 per annum. (p. 324.)

In 1937 the Government advised their Indian Agents:

"Kindly instruct all personnel concerned with the care of sick Indians that their duty in the immediate future is to keep the cost of medical services at the lowest point consistent with reasonable attention to acute cases of illness and accident. Their services must be restricted to those required for the safety of life, limb or essential function.

"There will be no funds for tuberculosis surveys, treatment in hospitals of chronic tuberculosis, or other chronic conditions, tonsils and dental clinics, artificial teeth and limbs, spectacles, except for those for the prevention of blindness, dental work, except for the relief of pain or serious infection, nor, in fact, any treatment except for acute illness." (p. 325.)

... The essence of the Government's love for natives, both Eskimo and Indian, was demonstrated in a circular dated at Ottawa, January 20, 1939, and

addressed by the Superintendent of Medical Services to the various Indian agents.

"If I recall the facts correctly, within the years 1932—1933, a reduction made in medical costs of somewhat about \$250,000. I doubt if so large a saving could be made now, but I try to point out some ways in which economies could, and, in fact, be made:

"1. A reduction of one day in average length of stay of sick Indian hospital would save about \$15,000.

"2. It should not be difficult to \$10,000 in drug costs by limiting amount of cough mixtures, liniment tablets, etc., given to the Indians.

"3. A few hundreds, or perhaps thousands, of dollars could well be saved by requiring bands of Indians to organize themselves to convey their sick members to hospitals (When they might hundreds of miles from the nearest hospital? R.B.) and to help one another in other directions, such as assisting child-birth and minor nursing. The principle to be followed is that the Department ought not to, and will not pay for services which Indians can render to one another." (pp. 325—326.)

[The above quotations are taken from *Inuk* by Fr. Roger Buliard, just published by MacMillan at 21/-.]

Ballet

The Green Table

Another short season of the Ballet Jooss has opened at Sadlers Wells. An interesting and well-produced repertoire, "The Green Table" is a dance sequence of especial interest to the politically (or anti-politically) minded. The scene is a 'peace' conference and the Green Table, from which the ballet derives its title is a table around which the politicians of the world haggle and gesticulate. The war, the refugees, the figure of death waving the standard which led the troops to war and the aftermath are portrayed and in the final scene the same politicians resume their bickering around the same Green Table whilst the figure of Death stands by for the next performance.

"The Green Table" was first performed in 1932 and is as topical now as it was then. C.Q.

FOOD AND PRODUCTION

DR. C. S. URWIN discussing Prof. L. Dudley Stamp's new book *Our Undeveloped World* (Faber 18s.) writes: "It will come as a surprise to many to learn from Dr. Stamp that owing to its much higher survival rate, the population of the United States, for example, is growing at a faster rate than India's 'teeming millions.'" More astonishing still is the demonstration that the rate of increase in the English-speaking white race is four times as rapid as that of the population of the world as a whole. Thus he refutes entirely the popular belief that the white races are being swamped by the coloured races.

"What population, asks Dr. Stamp, can the world support? On the

basis which he uses, the area of the world at present under cultivation, if fully farmed, could support at least three thousand million people, the estimated world population at mid-1950 being taken at two thousand four hundred millions. By bringing into the calculation lands at present unused or inadequately used, the potential population which could be fed adequately rises to more than ten thousand millions. Science, adding constantly to the sum of human knowledge, leads us to expect further advances which will simplify the nutritional problems of the human race 'if only man can overcome the barriers he himself has erected between the nations'."

THE SOCIAL SIGNIFICANCE OF MUTUAL AID

IT remains to discuss the bearing of the mutual aid controversy on the theoretical basis of Anarchist sociology on the one hand, and authoritarian ideas advanced by both capitalists, fascists and socialists on the other.

Kropotkin sums up the evidence regarding mutual aid in animal life in these words:

"Happily enough, competition is not the rule either in the animal world or in mankind. It is limited among animals to exceptional periods, and natural selection finds better fields for its activity. Better conditions are created by the elimination of competition by means of mutual aid and mutual support. In the great struggle for life—for the greatest possible fulness and intensity of life with the least waste of energy—natural selection continually seeks out the ways precisely for avoiding competition as much as possible. The ants combine in nests and nations; they pile up their stores, they rear their cattle—and thus avoid competition, and natural selection picks out of the ants' family the species which know best how to avoid competition, with its unavoidably deleterious consequences. Most of our birds slowly move southwards as winter comes, or gather in numberless societies and undertake long journeys—and thus avoid competition. Many rodents fall asleep when the times comes that competition should set in; while other rodents store food for the winter, and gather in large villages for obtaining the necessary protection when at work. The reindeer, when the lichens are dry in the interior of the continent, migrate towards the sea. Buffaloes cross an immense continent in order to find plenty of food. And the beavers, when they grow numerous on a river, divide into two parties, and go, the old ones down the river, and the young ones up the river—and avoid competition. And when animals can neither fall asleep, nor migrate, nor lay in stores, nor themselves grow their food like the ants, they do what the titmouse does, and what Wallace (*Darwinism*, Chapter 5) has so charmingly described: they resort to new kinds of food—and thus, again, avoid competition."†

In regard to mutual aid among men, Kropotkin cites an exceedingly interesting passage from Darwin. "Darwin was quite right," he says, "when he saw in man's social qualities the chief factor for his evolution, and Darwin's vulgarisers are entirely wrong when they maintain the contrary."

"The small strength and speed of man, (he wrote), his want of natural weapons, etc., are more than counter-balanced, firstly, by his intellectual faculties (which, he remarked on another page, have been chiefly or even exclusively gained

MUTUAL AID AND SOCIAL

for the benefit of the community); and secondly, by his social qualities, which led him to give and receive aid from his fellow men. (*Descent of Man*, 2nd Ed., pp. 63, 64)"

Modern observations have only confirmed the formidable mass of evidence which Kropotkin brought together in *Mutual Aid*. Sociability has a pre-human origin, and mutual aid lies at the root of all social institutions.

"Sociability and need for mutual aid and support are such inherent parts of human nature that at no time of history can we discover men living in small isolated families, fighting each other for the means of subsistence. On the contrary, modern research . . . proves that since the very beginning of their pre-historic life men used to agglomerate into *gentes*, clans, or tribes, maintained by the ideas of common descent and by worship of common ancestors. For thousands of years this organisation has kept men together, even though there was no authority to impose it."‡

Yet this evidence for the universality of the mutual aid tendency is tacitly ignored by all opponents of Anarchism, whether capitalist, fascist or socialist. Let us again quote Kropotkin himself:

" . . . though a good deal of warfare goes on between different classes of animals, or different species, or even different tribes of the same species, peace and mutual support are the rule within the same species; and those species which best know how to combine, and to avoid competition, have the best chance of survival and of further progressive development. They prosper, while the unsociable species decay.

"It is evident that it would be quite contrary to all we know of nature if men were an exception to so general a rule: if a creature so defenceless as man was at his beginnings should have found his protection and his way to progress, not in mutual support, like other animals, but in reckless competition for personal advantages, with no regard for the interests of the species. To a mind accustomed to the idea of unity in nature, such a proposition appears utterly indefensible. And yet, improbable and unphilosophical as it is, it has never found a lack of supporters. There always were writers who took a pessimistic view of mankind. They knew it, more or less superficially, through their own limited experience; they knew of history what the annalists, always watchful of wars, cruelty, and oppression, told of it and little more besides: and they concluded that mankind is nothing but a loose aggregation of beings, always ready to fight with

each other, and only prevented from doing so by the intervention of some authority."§

That such views should be held by capitalists and supporters of capitalist society is not surprising. In order to justify support for a social and economic order based on competition, strife and tyranny, it is necessary to elevate competition, as the Manchester School of *laissez faire* did, into a positive virtue making for "progress". Acceptance of the principle of mutual aid demands the rejection of capitalist society and *vice versa*.

But the implications of mutual aid are also ignored by socialists. Wells, for example, already implies the justification of government and the State by his remark—already quoted—that before social forms could develop "a certain restraint upon the primitive egotisms of the individual had to be established". Wells may not be very acceptable as a socialist apologist, but his views in this particular do not differ from those of other socialists, especially the followers of Marx. In defending their conceptions of the State against the critical attacks of the Anarchists, these people declare that authority and power to enforce it are necessary to protect society from the anti-social inclinations of the individual. And they add that "you must have authority where a division of labour exists, otherwise everyone would do as they liked". The assumption behind all these arguments is that "doing what one likes" is of necessity anti-social, and that social behaviour must be imposed on men by an authority outside of themselves, to wit, the State. Such a premise makes the erection of a central coercive authority a logical necessity.

But to assume that "doing what one likes" is necessarily to engage in anti-social behaviour is to ignore the whole evidence on which the conception of mutual aid is based, and to deny its universality in human society and throughout the societies of animals. In effect, such an assumption destroys the whole basis of socialism itself. If authority and restraint are necessary, how are we to explain that in the primitive societies which exist to-day without recourse to authority or government, "freedom but not licence is the principle of the group and the characteristic of the individual"? How explain that "public opinion and tradition are the sole and sufficient sanctions of conduct" in these societies? The history of governmental and class society is at most only 7,000 years old, whereas the primitive communist society has existed since

† Kropotkin; *Mutual Aid*, pp. 72-73.

‡ *Ibid*, p. 129.

§ *Ibid*, pp. 74-75.

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 sixteen. 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

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!

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.

The N.W. Pacific Co-Operatives

I FIND George Woodcock's article on "The Co-Operative Plywood Factories of N.W. Pacific" (FREEDOM 21/3/53) very interesting, because it is additional proof that, "Where men can identify their own good with the general good, they will work without the threat of physical or economic sanctions".

However, there are dangers in this form of propaganda, unless it is sufficiently emphasised that the only reason for pointing to such instances is to show that, in fact, men can co-operate when conditions allow them to, and are not inherently prevented from doing so; and not, as some people might quite easily think, because it is true that human problems can easily be solved by such methods which try to work within the capitalist system.

In case you do not accept the point of view that those co-operatives are not of any great value, even to the workers who run them, as far as actually solving their material problems is concerned, I refer you to your own article where you show that even if certain of those workers have larger incomes than the majority of workers in the same industry; which, incidentally, is not saying a lot when one considers that the wages of the majority of workers in any country in the world are but kept at subsistence level; just like all other workers employed by single capitalists or the state, they are subject to the disastrous effects of the laws of capitalism as a whole, i.e., the effects of wars, slumps and depressions. You write, "in hard times the members of co-operatives are willing to accept relatively small pay in order to keep their own factory in operation." You seem to see a wonderful advantage in this; but it reminds me of the argument used by the Stalinists, and formerly by the Nazi, when they condemn what they consider to be the 'capitalist' or external world. They gleefully point at the unemployment figures and the evil effects, and say, workers as a result of the uncontrollable laws of capitalism are impoverished through unemployment, whilst in Russia (or the Germany that was) all workers are fully employed. This particular argument can be demolished by simply showing that there is no virtue in being employed if the employed people are so controlled that they cannot even demand the market price of their labour-power. So also with your

co-operative workers, there is not much glory for them in dying for starvation even though they might have their arms linked in co-operative brotherhood.

I would like some elucidation of the following points. (a) When dealing with the mill at Tacoma you say, "the members of the executive do a six-day week in overalls, carry on what managerial work is necessary in their spare time." If 'managing' in this instance is not managing in the usual sense of the term (coercion of workers), as you seem to imply, surely whatever administrative work the managers have to do is—as important as any other kind of work because it is just as necessary to the running of the concern and should not be just a spare-time job, but just another one of the jobs of the co-operative. The very fact that the executive is made to do his administering in his spare time and that particular kind of work is not considered as legitimate as, say, chopping up logs, makes me very sceptical, even of the limited claims which you make of the success of those co-operatives. (b) Quoting the *Saturday Evening Post* you write, "Nobody was loafing, not even in the dim recesses of the plant where an office man would be unlikely to catch once a day." Implicit in this statement is the realisation that there was an 'office man', evidently one with authority, one to kick the recalcitrant, even if he might appear but once in the day. How can an Anarchist accept even the mild trace of authoritarianism for inclusion in a propaganda article?

London, April 9. FRANK DUNNE.

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

OPEN AIR MEETINGS

Weather Permitting
HYDE PARK
Sundays at 3.30 p.m.

INDOOR MEETINGS

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

MAY 5—Albert Grace on
THE TRADE UNION.

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

NORTH-EAST LONDON

DISCUSSION MEETINGS
IN EAST HAM

MAY 6—Ron Wheeler.
"THE COMMUNITIES IN
PALESTINE".
Alternate Wednesdays
at 7.30 p.m.

LIVERPOOL

DISCUSSION MEETINGS at

101 Upper Parliament Street,
Liverpool, 8.
Every Sunday at 8 p.m.

GLASGOW

OUTDOOR MEETINGS

from now until further notice

at
MAXWELL STREET.
Sundays at 7 p.m.

With John Gaffney, Frank Carlin
Jane Strachan, Eddie Shaw,

MANCHESTER

LIBERTARIAN GROUP

Meetings at

LAND O' CAKES HOTEL
Gt. Ancoats Street, (by *Daily Express*)

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

MAY DAY MEETING

Platts Field
Sunday, May 3rd at 3.30 p.m.

Enquiries to:

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

FREEDOM

The Anarchist Weekly

Postal Subscription Rates:
12 months 17/- (U.S.A. \$3.00)
6 months 8/6 (U.S.A. \$1.50)
3 months 4/6 (U.S.A. \$0.75)

Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies
12 months 27/- (U.S.A. \$4.50)
6 months 13/6 (U.S.A. \$2.25)

Cheques, P.O.'s and Money Orders should
be made out to FREEDOM PRESS, crossed
a/c Payee, and addressed to the publishers:

FREEDOM PRESS
27 Red Lion Street
London, W.C.1 England
Tel.: Chancery 8364

What Federation Means to the African in Nyasaland

ADVOCATES of Central African Federation have repeatedly claimed that the native population would benefit economically from the increased flow of private capital into the federated territory, and that the proposed constitution, which may be changed after ten years, safeguards their social interests. At the same time, they play upon emotional feeling with the phrase "racial partnership". After spending a few months in Nyasaland two years ago, before the present passions were aroused, I feel that a few comments on the life and peoples of the protectorate may interest some readers.

The federationists do not deny that the constitution is only guaranteed to remain unchanged for ten years, and that the white settlers with 28 representatives in the Government to the natives' 6 would have almost uncontrolled power to alter it thereafter, but they try to create the impression that the settlers support the concept of racial partnership. They contend that the settlers are so concerned for the advancement of the native that it is inconceivable that they would misuse their power. My own contacts with the local settlers have left me with exactly opposite impressions.

At once, I must clearly differentiate between the attitude of the settlers and that of Government. The leniency of Government towards native criminals shows unusual enlightenment. They have initiated a survey for a flood control, irrigation and hydro-electric scheme on the Shire River, and if this scheme is constructed, they will have greatly advanced the economy to the native benefit.

The attitude towards the native of the majority of the European settlers, who are predominantly of lower middle class origin, can be fairly judged from a con-

versation I had with a trader on the subject of the laws against striking natives. Those laws impose heavy fines for the first and second offences, and deportation for the third. This trader lamented the fact that he could no longer openly demonstrate his "authority", but explained how he now "put them in their place" by knocking them about when he was sure he was unobserved, so that no witness could be brought against him. Several settlers condemned the District Magistrate's leniency toward native thieves in forms which brought to mind the old English penalties for sheep-stealing. A hotel keeper complained that he was not allowed to prevent natives entering his hotel. This freedom of the native had not, in fact, been exercised, as hotel charges are usually about those of English hotels, and native wages are never much more than ten shillings per week.

Again, I must pause, to say that the planters in the country districts had generally a greater sense of responsibility towards the natives, although their views could scarcely be called enlightened. Naturally, honourable exceptions exist in every field; but in the process of counting noses, their votes would be outnumbered by the town-dwellers.

The natives of Nyasaland, a very undeveloped country in comparison with Kenya or Southern Rhodesia, are unbelievably carefree, happy, contented and quite free from rancour. Their way of

life has not yet been upset by the entry of the European, probably because they outnumber the Europeans by about two million to three thousand. The laws strictly limit European acquisition of land—another sore point with the settlers—and the staple industries of growing tobacco and tea are attuned to the native way of life.

It is easy to visualise the results of federation, and the inflow of European private capital. With the capital would come more settlers, and with them, pressure for the relaxation of the land laws, probably in the name of "increased efficiency", and with the excuse that some of the native land had not been taken up. The parallel with Kikuyu grievances in Kenya scarcely needs pointing out. At the moment, virtually every native supports his own family on his own plot of land, and does not suffer if he is not employed by Europeans. This security undoubtedly lies at the bottom of their happy outlook. Deprived of their land, however, the natives would be reduced to wage slavery, at the mercy of their employer's whim, especially since the available native labour in Nyasaland so far outstrips demand, and suffering without relief from the periodic trade recessions of international capitalism. A glance at the Union of South Africa will illustrate these, and other forebodings.

With these thoughts in mind, what a sham, hollow, hypocritical phrase is "racial partnership". M.S.F.

Away With These Snoopers!

HOW many times were Conservative hands raised in horror at the action of Government snoopers while the Labour Party was in power?

But it seems that it makes a difference whether the snoopers are directly employed by a government department, or whether they are part of an industrial organisation—even if it is a "public-controlled" (sic) corporation.

We noted a fortnight ago a dockers' strike against the action of a dock policeman who, in performing the usual "frisking" of men leaving work, actually put his hand *inside* a man's pocket. That, thought the dockers, was going too far, and we certainly agree.

Now comes another case, where London Transport ticket collectors are the victims of London Transport police, for like the Port of London Authority, British Railways and British Road Transport, our wonderful passenger transport system in London does not only have its uniformed "jumpers" to catch passengers without tickets, it also has squads of plain-clothes "testers" (as they are politely called) checking up on London Transport workers.

In this case two ticket collectors were charged at Thames Magistrates' Court with embezzling sums totalling 3/- and 6/10d. Seven women went into the witness box and gave evidence that on three days they travelled to a certain station and paid excess fares to the two collectors. These women were introduced to the court as a "team of special testers".

The payments they made to the two defendants did not always appear on the excess fares sheet, on which every collector is supposed to record every payment made to him.

There was also a plain clothes copper keeping watch for two nights. With a small hand-operated machine (presumably in his pocket) he counted 482 passengers pass through the barrier and 20 of them paid excess fares which were not actually recorded.

One of the collectors told the court that in giving change to passengers he frequently used his own money, leaving in his pocket at the end of the day what was left above that shown in the records.

One man had 26 years service, the other 13 years. They have each lost

their job, and been fined £30 or three months in jail. For 3s. and 6s. 10d.!

Only Workers

When Ministry of Food snoopers wheedled round shopkeepers to sell them rationed goods off the ration, the Conservatives, in their Press and in Parliament, thundered against such methods. *But there hasn't been a squeak out of them in defence of these two ticket collectors.*

It seems that slimy methods are most un-English when used against small businessmen (after all, we are a nation of shop-keepers) but quite legitimate when it is a question of keeping the workers in order.

Well, how about the workers taking some action themselves? When British Road Services announced its intention of having plain clothes patrols on the road to catch any transport drivers contravening any of their hundreds of regulations, the transport men went on strike. London Transport ticket collectors could do the same.

Or if striking is not the best method, let them simply put into operation the rule about entering the payment of excess fares. Let them religiously enter on their sheet every penny and tuppence as it is paid. Let them do it conscientiously, neatly and above all *slowly*, especially in rush hours, holding back the following passengers while the precious money is properly recorded.

Alternatively, why not refuse to handle money altogether? At some Underground stations a special desk has been opened for the payment of excess fares. Let the ticket collectors compel London Transport to provide that at every station. It will provide a job for another worker, will cost L.T. much more than it loses in small change now, and will serve the Executive right for employing these slimy methods.

But whichever tactics they employ, London Transport workers should do something to get rid of these snoopers. They have the power to do so if they wish. And in whatever action they do take, let us, the travelling public, give them what support we are able. Snoopers, spies, narks and informers are supposed to be odious to the British public. Let us show it by encouraging the workers on public transport to do away with these snoopers.

FREEDOM PRESS

MARIE-LOUISE BERNERI :

Neither East nor West
cloth 10s. 6d., paper 7s. 6d.
Workers in Stalin's Russia. 1s.

SELECTIONS FROM FREEDOM

Vol. 1, 1951, *Mankind is One*
paper 7s. 6d.

TONY GIBSON :

Youth for Freedom paper 2s.
Food Production and Population 6d.
Who will do the Dirty Work? 2d.

PHILIP SANSOM :

Syndicalism—The Workers' Next Step 1s.

ERRICO MALATESTA :

Anarchy. 6d.
Vote—What For? 1d.

M. BAKUNIN :

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

HERBERT READ :

Art and the Evolution of Man. 4s.
Existentialism, Marxism and Anarchism. 3s. 6d.
Poetry and Anarchism.

cloth 5s., paper 2s. 6d.
The Philosophy of Anarchism.
boards 2s. 6d., paper 1s.

RUDOLF ROCKER :

Nationalism and Culture. cloth 21s.

ALEX COMFORT :

Delinquency 6d.
Barbarism & Sexual Freedom.
paper 2s. 6d., stiff boards 3s. 6d.

ALEXANDER BERKMAN :

ABC of Anarchism. 1s.

PETER KROPOTKIN :

The State: Its Historic Role. 1s.
The Wage System. 3d.
Revolutionary Government. 3d.
Organised Vengeance Called Justice. 2d.

JOHN HEWETSON :

Sexual Freedom for the Young 6d.
Ill-Health, Poverty and the State.
cloth 2s. 6d., paper 1s.

GEORGE WOODCOCK :

Anarchy or Chaos. 2s. 6d.
New Life to the Land. 6d.
Railways and Society. 3d.
Homes orhovels? 6d.
What is Anarchism? 1d.
The Basis of Communal Living. 1s.

F. A. RIDLEY :

The Roman Catholic Church and the Modern Age. 2d.

WILLIAM GODWIN :

Selections from Political Justice. 3d.
On Law. 1d.

★ 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.