

WAR

For Anarchism

COMMENTARY

Vol. 2 No. 11

SEPTEMBER, 1941

Twopence

ANARCHIST RECORD

THOUSANDS of arrests have been made in occupied and unoccupied France, and Petain has recently issued ferocious decrees creating special military courts to deal with sabotage, and Communist or Anarchist activities. This confirms the reports we have received that our comrades in France are carrying on the struggle against Fascism for the emancipation of the workers.

It will be remembered that anarchists were gaoled or sent to the "disciplinary battalions" on the front line by Daladier and his friends. They were denounced as fifth columnists by the French Democratic Government. Trade Union leaders had our comrades watched by spies in the factories and sent them to prison when they dared to express their ideas. But who are the Fascists now? Who sit with Petain, Laval and their fascist friends if not the leaders of the French Trade Unions—the Belins and Dumoulins, who, like De Mans in Belgium, received the Germans with open arms?

These facts should open the eyes of those people who lightly accuse everyone who opposes this imperialist war of being fascists. Every day in the capitalist Press it is hinted that those who oppose the war can only be friends of Hitler. We are hardly surprised at that; the yellow journalists who called

the Spanish anti-fascists Reds, Murderers, Bandits, Atheists, and so on, will scarcely lose the opportunity to slander us now. But we are more surprised when people like George Orwell in the "Partisan Review" or C. A. Smith in "Left" also state that those who are not in favour of the war now are fifth columnists.

No one dares to call the reactionaries now in the Government fascists—not even those who, right up to the last moment, were the friends and ardent admirers of Mussolini, Hitler and the Franco fascists. Nobody dares to call the Beaverbrooks and Rothermeres fascists though they lavished insults and lies on anarchists and socialists fighting Fascism with bare hands in Spain. Nobody reminds the leaders of the Labour Party and of the Trade Unions of their attitude of compromise at the time of the Abyssinian and Spanish wars. These after-the-war anti-fascists are hailed as heroes; they have apparently the right to teach us lessons—with imprisonment included!

These people are prepared to call the anarchists fifth columnists, but we can show them a record of anti-fascist struggle longer and a hundred times more glorious. Anarchists fought with all their strength against Fascism in Italy. When they were beaten, many of them left their country and con-

tinued the struggle abroad. Only "illegal" action was left to them; unable to organize the Italian people to fight against the regime, they tried to strike at the head of it. And Schirru and others gave their lives to kill Mussolini—at the time regarded as a "respectable gentleman," although now he has become a "stab-in-the-back monster," "Hitler's jackal," and so on!

In Germany the anarchist movement was weak and could achieve little. But in Spain it fought Fascism by revolution with all its energy and power. And it goes on fighting Franco now at this moment. Every day the Press announces that "anarchist plots" have been discovered, that anarchists have been imprisoned or shot.

Is it necessary to add to this record the struggles of the anarcho-syndicalist movements in the Scandinavian countries, in South America, in Mexico, in Japan?

With such a record we do not accept to be taught by politicians who are only anti-fascists because it is the safe side to be on nowadays. We know that if Fascism comes they will strive to retain their cushy jobs while we shall be imprisoned, thrust into concentration camps, or shot. We claim to know how to fight Fascism better than all the Churchills, Bevins and Attlees in the world. We know that we have to destroy the causes of Fascism, that we must get rid of capitalism and ruling classes. We must destroy Fascism root and branch; that we must throw down the present regime with the aim of building a new society based not on authority, but on the free initiative of individuals, on their free associations between themselves, and on the federations of their organisations.

BEVIN ON RUSSIA

"Russia is no longer a Socialist State. Let us be honest. She is an imperialism, just like ours.

"I called attention to the fact that Russia had started along that road as far back as the Trades Union Conference of 1931. I have never had any illusions about it." (Ernest Bevin, reported in "Daily Herald," 27th March, 1940.)

Reconstruction Fund

THE response to our appeal for the Freedom Press Reconstruction Fund has been rather disappointing this month. Large numbers of our comrades and sympathisers have not sent in their contributions yet, and this, of course, renders our propaganda work doubly difficult. It is essential that our propaganda should not be limited in scope now by lack of funds, as the attitude of our audiences at the open-air and indoor meetings, together with ever-increasing literature sales show that sympathy with the cause of Anarchism is growing by leaps and bounds. We appeal to all our old comrades to come forward and give their support to the Fund NOW.

AUGUST

London: K. H.	4/0	London: A. M.	2/6
Southall: D. L. C.	£1/0/0	London: Park	1/3
London: T. B.	10/-	Bristol: H. F. B.	£1/0/0
Ealing: A. E. B.	10/-	Harrow: "Group of Harrow Sympathisers"	
London: Park Collection	2/6		10/-
Maidstone: E. T. J.	1/9	Greenock: S. M.	3/0
E. Boston: "Circolo Aurora" part pro- ceeds Social, 15th June, 15 dol.	£3/13/0	London: Anon. (I.L.P. Meeting)	1/3
Cheshire: W. J. H.	1/-	London: H. H. B.	5/0
Belfast: S. W.	4/-	London: L. H.	£1/3/6
London: Anon.	7d.	Dublin: S. K.	7/6
New York: Z. 2 dol., H. S. 2 dol., J. D. 1 dol., L. K. 1 dol.	£1/9/8	Yorkshire: J. H. B.	2/-
		Bristol: K.	3/-
		Harrogate: J. H.	1/2
		Carnforth: J. B. B.	2/6
		London: V. R.	£5/0/0
		London: J. H.	£1/0/0
August Total	£18 3 2		
June and July Totals (see War Commentary, Vol. 2, No. 9 and 10)	£91 18 4		

Total to date £110 1 6

We have had several letters lost in the post, so any contributor not receiving acknowledgment in the Press Fund Lists should write to us immediately.

FOOD FOR THOUGHT

Behind the gun the Stock Exchange
Takes a generation's range.

The oil that bubbles out of mud
Is dearer made by human blood.

The orator that makes you join,
Unlike Judas, keeps his coin.

The general and the diplomat
Have never fed a Flanders rat.

W. A. RATHKEY.

RUSSIA—THE COLLAPSE OF THE MYTHS

By Tom Brown

MARS is history's judge. Before his awful judgement place are brought governments, churches, parties, nations and beliefs. Beneath his scorching gaze the old bluffs wither, the old impostors stagger and fall. Few survive his testing; his executions are swift. Just as the last war saw the end of such great empires as the German, Turkish, Czarist, and Austrian, so this war will end most of the governments which entered it. As the last world conflict shattered well established social institutions and ideas, so this one will shatter most of the political combinations and myths built up during the last two decades. In time of peace it is easy to carry out a long term bluff, to cover the ghastly contradictions of authority and exploitation with a dense screen of propaganda; but war's steel and high explosive soon shatter the illusions of years.

The Stalin régime and its expensive propaganda machine cannot be exempt from this test. One after another the myths it built up are falling in the dust of the eastern battle-front. For more than twenty years, in every country in the world, the Bolshevik machine poured its money into propaganda, bringing into its employ not only professional Communist Party speakers, but also hordes of journalists, authors, and lecturers, ready to prove correct any new 'party line' at a moment's notice. Now these bewildered people are racing against time to erect new myths.

THE INVINCIBLE RED ARMY MYTH

The Russian Press, the C.P., the petty-bourgeois left and the "Russia Today" set-up have spent a considerable amount of their time assuring us of the absolute invincibility of the Russian Army, Air Force, and with slightly less confidence, Navy. Photographs of masses of the most powerful tanks, guns, and aeroplanes, of the "mightiest army of the world" were showered on us. The myth was well expressed by George Bernard Shaw on the day of the German invasion of Russia: "Today we have nothing to do but sit and smile while Stalin smashes Hitler."—News Chronicle, 23rd June, 1941.

Yet in two months the "invincible" army has been driven from some of the most valuable of Russia's territory, equal in area to about twice the size of Greater Germany. We are waiting for another profound statement from G. B. Shaw. The "Daily Worker" in October, 1939, condemned Poland as

rotten because half of its territory was lost in Germany in a few weeks; but Russia lost its half of Poland in about half the time.

So the Stalinists and their allies must invent some rattling good excuses for these defeats. Their first attempt was the "strategic retreat." "The Red Army could advance into Germany any time Stalin said go, but it was very clever to choose retreat, and all would be well in the end." Had the Red Army advanced at the rate of the German actual advance, the whole of Germany would have been occupied about four weeks ago! Now, even the faithful must doubt the genius of surrendering rich corn lands, rivers, railways, cities, and so large a portion of vital industry to the enemy, so the faithful shriek about "German preparedness." Well! after all, the war has been on for two years; and the same people have been ramming Russian preparedness down our throats long before Hitler ever came to power; and the Bolsheviks have held their forces as if in a state of war during the whole of this twenty-four years of power. But a new hope appears! The winter will defeat Germany! Once it was the Red Army that would save the Bolshevik régime, now it is General Winter. The frosty old fellow is more reassuring than the much photographed conscripts of Bolshevism

THE GREAT RUSSIAN INDUSTRY MYTH

The latest apology for Bolshevism's military failures is the drawing of attention to Germany's industrial might, the attempt to explain the retreat by telling of Hitler's vast masses of tanks and guns. Now what has become of the propaganda telling of Russia's unsurpassed industrial power, surpassing any countries in Europe surpassing even the U.S.A.? Unfortunately war cannot be conducted by the editor of "Russia Today."

The invasion of Russia caught most left politicians standing on one leg. The C.P. began, as usual, by trying to reconcile two opposites; on this occasion, to support Stalin and oppose his ally Churchill. In a manifesto issued on June 22nd, the C.P. declared:

"We warn the people against the upper class reactionaries in Britain and the United States, who will seek by every means to reach an understanding with Hitler on the basis of the fight against the Soviet. Only the action of the people can prevent this. We can have no confidence in the present government dominated by Tory friends of Fascism and Coalition

Labour leaders, who have already shown their stand by their consistent anti-Soviet slander campaigns."—*"Manchester Guardian,"* June 23rd, 1941.

As we declared at our meetings, this line could not last long. No one was going to waste good cash on stuff like that. Somebody gave somebody an awfully wiggling, and the line was changed.

"Declaring that the Communist Party of Great Britain now stands for *full co-operation* with the government in the defeat of the common foe. Mr. William Gallacher, Britain's only Communist M.P. explained yesterday the new turn in his party's policy."—*"Daily Telegraph,"* June 27th, 1941.

Now the C.P. supports the Churchill government sends its speakers, such as Politt, to the factories to urge the workers to work harder and calls for an invasion of Europe. The "People's Peace" has gone with the other myths. But the leaders of British Stalinism showed themselves rather slow at changing the "line." Still, one must not condemn; a double back somersault is the most difficult of the acrobat's tasks.

HOW TO STAND IN MID-AIR

The position of independent friends of Russia, i.e., the Stalin régime is scarcely happier. They attempt the impossible by supporting Stalin but not Churchill! There are only two ways. One cannot support Russia by going there to fight, but only by supporting the Churchill Government. The issue is: for the ally of Stalin—the British Government—or against it. To be against it means to fight on the side of the workers in defence of wages, life and liberty; and that means being against Stalinism. The Communist Party have chosen the former, the Anarchists the latter. The I.L.P. tries to get in between, to stand in mid-air, or become a political mermaid—half-and-half.

It must not be supposed that we consider Hitler invincible. If Russia had been a Communist society in deed as well as name, she would have smashed Hitler Germany and overrun Europe in the present course of the Eastern war. *Germany is weak* and conquers only by understanding the deep contradictions in the ranks of its enemies. Germany has little more than a third of Russia's population and one fortieth of its territory. It had, at the beginning of the war, none of the essential raw materials of war, whereas Russia had most of them. Here are the materials of a new Revolution which will overthrow Stalinism and conquer Hitlerism. But the way of victory is not by following myths; many more of these well-established frauds will be shattered by the rude hand of time. Life is hard.

OUR ACTIVITIES

FOLLOWING Frederick Lohr's recent visit to Peckham a second public meeting was held at the Co-op. Hall, Rye-lane, on Monday, August 18, when Tom Brown spoke on Anarcho-Syndicalism. He dealt with the differences between syndicalism and trades-unionism, and explained how the exploiting class could be weakened by strike action until the workers were in the position to strike at private ownership of land, raw materials and means of production, obtaining control themselves and producing for the need of the community. After the lecture there was a lively discussion, and the questions showed that a large proportion of the audience were sympathetic to our attitude.

On Saturday, August 16, Laurie Hislam spoke on Kingston group's platform in Kingston Market Place. The open-air meetings have been a great success this summer in Kingston, and visiting speakers are always assured of a good hearing. Comrade Hislam spoke on the Anarchist attitude towards the present imperialist war, and showed how, through the medium of direct action the workers could bring an end to war and exploitation.

Following the clash between the Russian and German imperialisms, the members of the Communist Party are, of course, very disgruntled to find that the attitude of the Anarchist platforms is still uncompromisingly against the war, and that our platforms are getting an ever-increasing measure of support. Employing typical Comintern tactics, the members of the party attempt to break up our meetings by shouting "Fascist" and "Fifth Columnist" at our speakers. An instance of this occurred on Sunday, August 23, when small groups of Stalinists infiltrated a meeting of some 1,500 people which Frederick Lohr was addressing in Hyde Park, and tried to make it impossible for Comrade Lohr to be heard by obviously organised heckling. The attempt, however, was completely unsuccessful and the meeting was a great success. Weather permitting, we intend continuing our open-air propaganda work throughout the winter.

The lectures and discussions which are held at Freedom Press Rooms, 27, Belsize road, N.W.6, each Friday at 7 p.m., are drawing larger audiences each week. On August 15, Ken Hawkes dealt with "Distribution and Supply in an Anarchist Society." He briefly explained the complexity and the evils of distribution and supply under capitalism and state-socialism, and demonstrated how, in an anarchist society, where production was for need, the distribution would be carried out by the workers' organisations. The following Friday, Tom Brown spoke on "Co-ordination of Distribution and Supply." He dealt with the way in which the workers' organisations would be co-ordinated by means of freely-elected district and national syndical federations which would be linked together in a confederal economic council, and showed how the framework of an anarchist society could be constructed by the workers within the shell of the present capitalism, so that, after the revolution, the workers would immediately be able to assume control of production, distribution and supply.

F. A. Ridley

WHITHER THE LEFT ?

IN the year of Grace 1925, the late Leon Trotsky wrote a brilliant though rather superficial pamphlet, entitled "Where is England Going?" Today in this year of (dis)grace, 1941, it is necessary to ask the not less relevant question—Where is the Left going? In deference to the traditions of socialist analysis I shall try to answer the question seriously.

The picture of English left-wing politics drawn by the great Bolshevik pamphleteer was something like this:

England, objectively ready for the Social Revolution was held back by a reformist Labour Party, itself led—or rather misled—by incompetent and treacherous leaders,—MacDonald, Thomas, Snowden, et al—who held back the masses of the Labour Party from an otherwise inevitable radicalisation. In the background lurked the Communist Party (of Great Britain), of which Trotsky was then still a leading supporter—to be sure, he was still the leading revolutionary expert of the International. It was only a matter of time, thought the sanguine writer, that the mass Labour Party would throw overboard its pro-imperialist leaders, and, after perhaps a short period of indecisive pseudo-leftism under the Wheatleys and Lansburys, would line up alongside the Communist Party. And then, hey-presto for the Revolution along the Moscow Road; backed of course, by the full moral, military, and economic support of "the proletarian Fatherland," Soviet Russia herself.

All this was solemnly written down by a man of unusually penetrating intelligence, in the month of April 1925: "quantula sapientia orbs gubernavit"—("how small the wisdom that governs the world")—How much water has flowed under London Bridge in the interim? "Where are the snows of yesteryear?" Where indeed?

LABOUR PARTY TO-DAY

Today, in 1941, the picture that we see is somewhat changed. Instead of combining to take the Moscow Road, the Labour and "Communist" Parties have parted company, it would seem. The Labour Party has taken the Western Road to Washington: in the person of its Fuehrer, Sir Walter Citrine—that is, it has enthusiastically endorsed and underwritten a blank cheque putting the British Nation and Empire in permanent pawn to the Wall Street Plutocracy of the U.S.A. in return for its now indispensable aid in preserving "Labour"—and, very particularly, the Labour leaders—from the Nazi concentration camps and the firing squads of the Gestapo.

As for MacDonald, Thomas, etc. who, according to Trotsky, alone held back the Labour Party from the road of revolutionary socialism,—imagine Thomas holding back a revolution; a compliment from a strange source!—most of them went out with the bandwagon in 1931, without waiting to be thrown out, but, so far from becoming revolutionary, the Labour Party of 1925 was a veritable party of Jacobin-

Bolsheviks compared with the Labour Party of 1941. In truth, looking at the concrete results of their predictions, it seems that the Trotskyist theory of the "Bad Man Interpretation of History"—now transferred en bloc to Stalin—is no more satisfactory as an historical divining rod than its now universally discredited predecessor, Carlyle's "Great Man Theory of History!"

Space unhappily forbids us to follow the tortuous zig-zags which the Third International has pursued between 1925 and the present day. We recall their advocacy of a holy war for "Democracy against Fascism," and then the equally holy war for "Fascism against Democracy."

Who really knows his Stalin? Certainly not Harry Pollitt, the hero of the Great Recantation: when is an imperialist war not an imperialist war?

Let us proceed to do, so to speak, a little historical stocktaking and look at our "movement," as close on two years of the Second World War have left it.

It can never be repeated too often that the fundamental fact about the social history of Great Britain throughout the last three-quarters of a century is represented by a process that, for very good reasons, is never mentioned in the university text-books on British history. Undoubtedly, the central fact about modern British history, is the silent incorporation of the organised British workers into the capitalist state; nor by means of Fascist castor oil, but by the vastly more appetizing plunder of the British World Empire. "The Empire," as Cecil Rhodes pointed out long ago, "is a question of Bread." And it also cannot be repeated too often,—it is, indeed, the central fact of British history, as it confronts us today, that the sole effective role of the British Labour Party is to act as the instrument of British Imperialism in this incorporation of the masses, via the agency of successive reforms, and of an unceasing barrage of imperialist ideology, into the normal framework of British (bourgeois) society. *And it has no other effective function in the real world apart from this. It is the junior partner of British Imperialism.* We say *junior* advisedly since this fundamental historic role alone explains what is otherwise inexplicable, the fact, in itself so puzzling to the uninitiated, that "Labour" in the present crisis is "more Royalist than the King," more imperialist than the imperialists. *For the very existence of the Labour Party is at stake in this war.* For the Tory Party might become a gauleiter of Nazi Germany through "appeasement," even if the war went badly. But Nazism and Reformism are absolutely irreconcilable terms. For Bevin, Attlee, Citrine, and Co.—not forgetting the staff of the "Tribune"!—a Nazi victory means political extinction.

Again, let us repeat that capital can migrate, even in the event of military disaster, but Labour must stagnate, must stay put, in the event of a Nazi victory.

The above is a bald statement of fact; but from it there flows a political deduction of the very first importance: *the ruling class can absolutely rely on the Labour Party.* However much it may grumble about details, it dare not lose the war; indeed, in view of its desperately close character, it dare not even seriously embarrass its conduct. Hence the "Tribune" can foam at the mouth, and the "Specialist Clarity Group" get even more obscure than they are today: the fact remains that they simply daren't do anything likely to "embarrass the war-effort"—and the Tory Party is sublimely indifferent to words. Professor Laski can write a book about it for all they care; in any case, "the gentlemen of England" would be far too stupid to understand it. Churchill, Margesson, Beaverbrook and Co. have got the whip hand, and well they know it! One crack of the whip and the whole Labour circus will come to heel!

The scientific student of contemporary English History is, indeed, faced with an intriguing, and, withal, highly instructive spectacle. The process of "Colonial Fascism," by virtue of which the British masses have been brought into a moral and mental unity with the British Imperialist state, has been achieved with a success that must make the Fascist dictators green with envy. To my knowledge, there has never been anything like it in all recorded history. The process that began with Disraeli's brilliant discovery of "Tory democracy" ended last year in (appropriately enough) the courtyard of Buckingham Palace, when the President of the T.U.C. presented H.M. George the Sixth in person with a gold medal and an invitation to attend the Trade Union Congress. The shade of the cynical Beaconsfield (Disraeli) must be chuckling in the Elysian Fields!

THE CENTRAL PILLAR OF THE CAPITALIST STATE

I conclude, then, that the Labour Party—the mass Labour Movement—has been transformed from the originally revolutionary critics of capitalism that its founders, Keir Hardie, Hyndman, etc., originally intended it to be, into the central pillar of the capitalist state. As such, its value to the capitalists is beyond all price: the Labour Leaders are worth their weight in gold to the ruling class; the more so, as, at any rate just at present it would be virtually impossible to start an ostensibly Fascist Party, for obvious reasons. *It is in fact, literally true to say that the Labour Party is the last hope of British Imperialism.* The process of buying the workers with (ultimately) colonial loot culminated in 1936 when Baldwin voted an official salary for the (Labour) Leader of the Opposition. At that historic moment the Hegelian dialectic—"the Identity of Opposites"—was incorporated in the British Constitution!

We recall how the old Roman, Cato, ended his every speech with the historic adjuration—"Delenda est Carthago"—"Carthage must be destroyed." Similarly, a modern revolutionary could advantageously end his every speech, "the Labour Party must be destroyed." For Toryism—viz., the World-power of British Imperialism—can and will be dealt with by history. But only the workers who originally created it can destroy the imperialist wolf in (socialist) sheep's clothing in their midst.

The Communist Party need not detain us: we know

already its present role as an exclusively Russian "Fifth Column." Nor do the smaller ultra-left groups call for any detailed comment—from "Trotskyism"—(literally knocked on the head by the instrument with which the Kremlin finally settled accounts with its most famous critic)—to the S.P.G.B. still standing in immovable constancy, like Lot's wife, incrustated in salt, amid the wreckage of a civilization.

Does it require any specially keen insight to see that the Labour circus is "through"? Socialism has become a source of surplus-value, has become a racket. The (self-styled) General Strike would seem to have been the end of it. Nothing left now but blue-prints for green people! "Where are the snows of yester-year?" Where "that Great Rosy Dawn?" the promise of which made the fortune of innumerable spell-binders, who saved the working-class one by one, beginning with themselves—and usually ending there! In Disraeli's once famous metaphor, they stand like a row of exhausted volcanoes, whose fires are smouldering down into eternal silence. They are simply has-beens, and we recall the apt Jewish proverb: "For what has been a Jew gives nothing."

The World Revolution, which evolution has peremptorily placed on the order of the day, will be achieved by other hands, from fresh beginnings. It is reserved for our generation to achieve this supreme task and, therewith, to forge new instruments capable of achieving it.

FREEDOM PRESS PUBLICATIONS can be obtained at the following BOOKSHOPS

London

LAHR'S BOOKSHOP

12 Little Newport St., W.C.1

COLLETT'S BOOKSHOP

Charing Cross Rd., W.C.1

SOCIALIST BOOKSHOP

Raquet Court, Fleet St., W.C.1

THE NEW BOOKSHOP

Coptic St. (Shaftesbury Ave.), W.C.1

BETTER BOOKS Charing Cross Rd., W.C.1

LIBRAIRIE POPULAIRE

Shaftesbury Ave., W.C.1

FREEDOM PRESS OFFICE

ETC. 27 Belsize Rd., Swiss Cottage, N.W.6

Glasgow

THE ANARCHIST BOOKSHOP

127 George St. C.1

UNITY PRESS ROOMS

65 Burnside St.

Bristol

FLYNN'S BOOKSHOP

19 Horsefair

Ask your Newsagent to stock
Freedom Press Publications

War Aims at Last!

LESS than two years after 'Cameronian' fired the first shot in 'Reynolds News' of September 10th, 1939, the campaign for a statement of war aims has been won." In this jubilant fashion "Reynolds News" of August 24th acclaims the joint declaration of Churchill and Roosevelt which Attlee broadcast to the world on August 14th. Drawing attention to the similar declaration of President Wilson's Fourteen Points in the last war, "Reynolds" goes on to point the similarity of the Eight Points to Attlee's Six Points of November, 1939. But "Cameronian" himself, in the same issue, quotes with approval the remark of a War Minister that "we have still to learn many of the lessons of the last war." "Reynolds" premature jubilation makes it clear that the lesson of the origin and fate of the Fourteen Points has been wholly lost on them. On the other hand, the Eight Points make it equally clear that Churchill and Roosevelt, representing the ruling class, have learnt it only too well!

The recent declaration indeed bears a striking resemblance to Wilson's ill-fated Points. (1 Merely repeats Balfour's declaration to the effect that we did not wish to add one square inch to our colonial burden!) 2 and 3 repeat Points 6 to 13 in Wilson's list; 4, 5, and 6 cover his third; 7 is Wilson's second; 8 is a modification of his fourth and fourteenth. Two of the Fourteen Points are omitted altogether; there is no reference to secret treaties being abandoned in favour of "open diplomacy" (hardly surprising in view of the embarrassment which this question has raised in the past—in regard to the mutually contradictory Palestine pledges given to Jews and Arabs, and the National Government's several "gentlemen's agreements" with Mussolini, for the partition of Abyssinia, and the assistance of Franco, for example!) More significant is the other omission—the absence of any reference to the colonies—an omission which has doubtless been the subject of considerable colonial discussion. But the colonies, especially India, are too voluble about their 'rights' themselves, for Churchill and Roosevelt to reopen this delicate subject!

PEACE AIMS AND THE TRADE UNIONS IN THE LAST WAR

But we are less concerned with the content of the Eight Points than with their possible effect in clearing away working-class doubts about the purity of the Tories' war motives. When Wilson advanced his Fourteen Points, he was conscious of a "vital need . . . for a 'revision' of what some termed the Imperialist aspirations of the Entente . . . The Allies must make it plain that they were waging their battle in behalf of permanent peace and not for the sake of territorial annexations. *Only thus could the enthusiasm of liberal and labour elements be maintained.*" ("Intimate Papers of Colonel House," Vol. III, pp. 172-3; 176-7). He believed that "it was important also to pledge, if possible, the Allied Governments to the principles of a settlement which would justify

the sacrifices of the war and maintain the enthusiasm of the liberal and labour circles in Great Britain and France." (Idem., p. 326.) Wilson was evidently fully aware of the propaganda value of his peace programme

Lloyd George was no less alive to the need for clearing away doubts on the home front. "There was . . . an advantage," he writes in his War Memoirs, "in having a Government at the head of affairs which had the support of Labour. This secured the adhesion of the great Labour organizations whose action and sympathetic aid was essential to its vigorous prosecution. Had Labour been hostile the war could not have been carried on effectively. Had Labour been lukewarm victory would have been secured with increased and increasing difficulty. The most prominent and influential leaders of trade unionism worked for victory throughout the war. Without their help it could not have been achieved" (page 220). (One may be pardoned for asking for whose victory the prominent and influential leaders of trade unionism worked? Certainly not the victory of the British workers!)

Yet just as in this war, the declaration of war aims was deferred as long as possible. Wilson had to resort to threats of a public exposure to the American Congress before his special emissary, Colonel House, received any sympathetic hearing at all from the Allies. By the end of 1917 however, Lloyd George reports that "amongst the workmen there was an unrest that was disturbing and might at any time become dangerous. The efforts we were making to comb out more men for the army were meeting with resistance amongst the Trade Unions whose loyalty and patriotism had been above reproach" (p. 486). Conscription and the dilution of skilled labour had created "difficulties with our man-power" which "had almost produced a deadlock with the Trade Unions. Without their goodwill and co-operation we could not have secured further recruits from among the exempted—certainly without a resistance which might have alienated organized labour throughout the land. . . . *It therefore became necessary to open negotiations with them.*" As a result of all this Lloyd George summoned the Trades Union leaders to a meeting in the Caxton Hall on January 5th, 1918, and there declared that the Government's peace proposals were essentially the same as those put forward by the Labour Party in December, 1917. "I made it clear that our one object in the war was to defend the violated public law of Europe, to defend Treaty obligations and to secure the restoration of Belgium" (p. 2486). The Labour Party replied with a manifesto on the "War Aims of the British People," adding a special "Note on the Prime Minister's Statement" declaring that "The great speech made by Mr. Lloyd George to a Congress of Trade Union delegates on January 5th, 1918, is by far the most important which any statesman has made during the war." (Similar claims have been made for the Churchill-Roosevelt declaration!) "It makes plain the essential unity of purpose that now ani-

mates the British people. It reveals a Government and a people seeking no predatory aims of any kind, pursuing with one unchanging mind, one unchanging purpose: to obtain justice for others so that we thereby secure for ourselves a lasting peace. We desire neither to destroy Germany nor diminish her boundaries; we seek neither to exalt ourselves nor to enlarge our Empire." If the Labour leaders of that time were sincere (and from the conduct of their successors in this war, one may doubt it), one hopes that they received a jolt at finding the Empire which they so curiously describe as "theirs" increased by one million four hundred thousand square miles, Germany's boundaries heavily curtailed, and lasting peace a mirage. But the point to grasp is that Lloyd George succeeded, with the help of the Fourteen Points, in fooling the Trades Unions into acting once more as recruiting sergeants for the bosses. (The whole story is told in some detail by "Vigilantes"—from whom most of the above quotations are taken—in his Penguin Special "Between Two Wars?", published in the spring of 1939.)

THE REAL FUNCTION OF "PEACE AIMS"

When, in the last war, H. G. Wells' great slogan—"The War To End War"—had worn a bit thin in the face of the unequal sacrifices of the workers and the soaring profits of the employers, Wilson's Fourteen Points came as a godsend to the Coalition Government. We have tried briefly to indicate the actual role they played and to recall their fate in the waste paper baskets of Versailles. Now, as then, the course of the war is marked by increasing pressure on the workers of the belligerent (and, indirectly, of the "neutral" nations). Now, as then, the denial of precise statements of what they are fighting and sacrificing for has produced apathy and unrest among the workers. Lloyd George's remarks, quoted above, apply with equal, if not greater, force to the present war. As before, the same method of injecting further doses of ideological "democratic" content into the war has been applied. This is the real content of the Eight Point declaration; *and it has no other purpose*.

It only remains to see if a further study of the propaganda history of the last war can help us further to analyse the moves of politicians desperately seeking for means of maintaining the support of the workers' organizations. The trade union leaders are easy enough to fool, from the point-view of their parliamentary colleagues; but there is beneath them the discontent of the workers. The Eight Points are really directed at them. The final shot, in the last war, which shored up at the last minute the tottering morale of the Allies, was the League of Nations. There are still those who would try to breathe a semblance of life into that smug old corpse, the "thieves' kitchen," as Lenin called it. But they will be only voices crying unregarded in the wilderness of Geneva. Yet it is not to be supposed that a substitute is lacking.

"FEDERAL UNION" RAISES ITS UGLY HEAD

The League of Nations was conceived—I believe, by H. N. Brailsford—quite early on in the first Imperialist War. It sank into obscurity until Finance capital needed it for its own purpose—to revive the

again-flagging war-enthusiasm of the workers in the Allied countries. Federal Union was conceived by the ingenious Clarence Streit even before the present war had broken out. Yet in spite of its wealthy and philanthropic backers, and the enthusiasm of intellectuals of the Left like G. D. H. Cole, it too was laid by in the bottom drawer, ready to be brought out again when it could usefully serve the turn of British ruling class interests. It has been stirring recently, and one may safely bet that F.U. will figure in the next propaganda push thrust by the Ministry of Information on the war-weary British workers. It is a fossil well suited to the musty propaganda department of Whitehall! Nevertheless the Eight Point declaration of those two stalwarts of Democracy, Sidney-Street-Churchill and strike-breaker-Roosevelt, must not be underestimated. The jubilation of "Reynolds" indicates how easily the Labour leaders, with their vast organs of propaganda, are fooled even in the teeth of the most glaring lessons of history.

J. H.

Anarchism

have you read?

Anarchy by E. Malatesta. 3d.
postage 1d

Modern Science and Anarchism
by P. Kropotkin. 6d.
postage 2d

Anarchism by E. Goldman. 2d.
postage 1d

Objections to Anarchism
by G. Barrett. 4d.
postage 1d

The Anarchist Revolution
by G. Barrett. 2d.
postage 1d

The Wage System
by P. Kropotkin. 2d.
postage 1d

The Philosophy of Anarchism
by Herbert Read. 2/6
postage 3d

Due to the destruction of Freedom Bookshop we have only a very limited number of the Freedom Press pamphlets on this list.

Cash with orders should be sent to
FREEDOM PRESS
27 Belsize Road, London, N.W.6

Anarchism

NATIONALISM *versus* CULTURE

WAR has an unhappy effect upon cultural relationships. In times of peace the idea that culture is international, or rather supra-national, is unquestioned. During war, however, strange distortions of accepted theory take shape in the propaganda of belligerent Powers. The extraordinary notion of an affinity between Nationalism and Culture, hitherto the concept of a few fanatical minds only, is a topical case in point.

To-day, Nationalism is being misrepresented as springing from a cultural background, and patriotism the evidence of the defence of a common cultural heritage. Certain pseudo-scientific theories couple nationalism and racialism and seek to show that culture has its roots in the biological constitution of race; nationalism being the evolutionary expression of racial identity. Such ideas are quite false. Nationalism is not an expression of culture, but an attribute of politics, part and parcel of the science of government. It was spawned in Statecraft, in the instinct to Power. It does not seek to enlighten or improve, but to embrace and confine. Its path is not upward, but outward; aggrandisement its function and militarism its only accomplishment. It cannot be said even that nationalism is representative of those regional customs and traditions which are sometimes rather euphemistically described as national culture. Nationalism has nothing whatever to do with culture; its very nature is the antithesis of all we understand by that word.

Nationalism is in reality nothing more than a political resultant of the necessity within a monopolistic economy for centralised control over the affairs of men. Generally speaking, the more insistent the demand for centralisation, the stronger will develop national consciousness, and the more politically unified the national State will become. But this unity is achieved only by a sacrifice of provincial autonomy, and since regional independence is vital to the growth of culture, a strong unified political administration must tend to weaken the cultural development of the whole area. For, to a great extent,

cultural expression is dependent upon the degree of differentiation existing between individuals and regions, and nationalism could never tolerate a wide freedom of creative initiative. To preserve centralised political authority the State must endeavour to direct

By

Fredrick Lohr

social activity within certain narrowly defined limits. Its standards must necessarily be low, for its social values must be general. To fulfil its function the State must proclaim itself the arbiter of cultural values, values, which is proceeding to the ridiculous, for outside of the individual no new creative expression is possible. Thus, far from nationalism being the promoter of culture, we see that the virility of the authoritarian national state is dependent upon the death of culture.

Races are ethnologically very ancient, and the history of culture is a very long and painfully slow process, but nationalism is a comparatively recent idea, and its growth of mushroom-like rapidity. It can claim, in fact, no longer ancestry than that of modern industrial capitalism, hardly a couple of hundred years.

In its conflict with ecclesiastic conservatism and feudal prerogative, capitalist enterprise required a dynamic ideology to spur on its commercial challenge. Science became its ally to undermine the superstitious authority of the Church, and humanism gnawed away at the vitals of aristocratic privilege. Militant capitalism advanced its cause under the banners of Liberty, Equality and Fraternity, and from progressive liberalism the nationalism of the modern totalitarian State was born.

As capitalist expansion proceeded apace, and railways and postal communications linked up great territories under centralised government, the idea took shape that a Nation was a spiritual entity, and that this entity manifested the cultural ethos of a common stock. It became fashionable to talk of the national soul, the national destiny and the rational duty in terms of racial divisions and sub-divisions. Thus are concocted the nonsensical doctrines of National-Socialism which portray the political unity of peoples as a manifestation of Race-Culture. German Weltanschauung, Anglo-Saxon Imperialism, Sino-Japanese Asiaticism, etc., but if Nations evolve

through cultural processes, how is it that so much vicious exploitation and oppressive legislation is required to weld a nation into being, and why the parade of armed terror to bind together people already in harmonious cultural relationship?

Nationality and Nationalism have nothing in common with popular interests. Nothing to do with a love of contributions to art, science and philosophy. Nor are nationality and nationalism rooted in the soil and scenery of any country. A homogenous people are not necessarily a nation, and a heterogeneous people very often are. Nationality is imposed upon them by political machinery. What is termed a patriotic love of country is usually an allegiance to a political concept. The love of country which is genuine emanates from the identification of oneself with a particular region through social contact and pleasant experience. Goethe may be said to be a German patriot, but one could hardly describe him as a German Nationalist.

NATIONALISM A CURSE

Nationalism is a curse, and immeasurably more harmful than is generally believed. It weaves an emotional spell over people, and generates a dynamic power all the more dangerous because it has no logical justification. It energises itself into a kind of quasi-religious faith which accomplishes nothing, because having no meaning it spends itself in futility. In its unconscious fanaticism it mirrors the frustration of the system whose tool it is. How can it have any cultural ambition, for it grows in strength and ferocity in ratio to the decline in human values, which are the only true standards of culture?

The nation is the product of the mob. Without a mob there can be no nationalism. Though fervent nationalism may come into being under strong individual leadership, nevertheless it is an expression of mob-rule. The leader is the embodiment and reservoir of crowd psychology. The political demagogue can manufacture a national consciousness from the material of the crowd, but he cannot produce the mob itself. The economic system creates the mob, and political propaganda harnesses mob frustration to serve the ends of Power politics. The mob is deliberately infused with a sense of messianic importance, the very lowest method of cultural debasement. Modern nations have been made from modern mobs, and just as the mob is necessary to the politician, so is the demagogue necessary to the modern mass man.

The politician moulds the mob, and from it he hammers out the nation, but, as I say, he cannot produce the mob itself. That is the exquisite product of capitalist civilisation, the feminine Eve to War's masculine Adam, the necessary consort to capitalism's supreme achievement—Total War. Future generations will measure our civilisation in terms of Wars and Mobs.

Modern industrial technique needed slaves; it produced them in masses. They were docile and amenable when the system had need of them, but they tended to become intractable when superfluous. They were mass-men, but, alas, also they were human. They must be disciplined to be docile and

obey at all times, and they are disciplined by national consciousness.

Now, how can anyone postulate this hideous growth of mass-man uniformity and regimentation as a sign of cultural progress? Many years ago Hölderlin prophesied that modern States would be "People made barbarous by industry and science," and the prediction has come true. The age denies the individual—it outlaws the human personality—it prefers the mob. It is an age of national culture—an age of barbarism.

The cult of nationalism grows in ratio to the development of industrial production and takes on the shape of the mentality produced by such activity. We observe its workings in the new secular-religious outlook of the Communist Party member. Throughout the Comintern the recent years have witnessed the weakness of its international culture, and the growing arrogance of national consciousness within its ranks. Their firm belief in the necessity of centralised control makes nonsense of the internationalism of their pseudo-scientific gospel. Political expediency runs counter to theoretical principle, and so they are on the one hand denied the emotional outlet of their compatriots, and on the other unable to translate internationalism into political policy. Thus the longing for social identification compels them to embrace a foreign nationalism with the passionate nostalgia of exiles. Russia becomes their homeland and the defence of their "socialist Fatherland" renders them in their patriotic zeal blind to all the opportunist roguery of their political leaders. The fervour and sincerity of pro-war advocacy, from people who a few weeks ago were as fervent and sincere on an anti-war stand, gives one to wonder whether reason and sanity will ever stem the tide of nationalist emotion. Clearly such a phenomenon is not difficult to diagnose, nor too obscure in origin for all to intellectually understand. But to eradicate it, that is another matter.

NATIONALISM AND CAPITALISM MUST BE DESTROYED

We must recognise that what seems to some of us most irrational and shallow behaviour is really serious and significant in its potentialities. We are today confronted with a distortion of the deep reaches of human nature, an eruption of the hideous frustration of human energies which capitalism and its doctrine of acquisitive materialism has brought about. No matter how apathetic to his conditions the mass-man may appear to be, instinctively he revolts against a life of futile activity, without aim or meaning to him as a person within a society. By way of mechanistic industrial processes, man has been cut off from any creative expression; Society has been divorced from social significance. Frustration piles up in ever concentrated form, until the conditions produce a prophet and a new religion through whom and by which mass-man can find release, and temporary meaning in his drab and colourless life.

The times are tragic; otherwise it would be laughable to mention Nationalism and Culture in the same breath. Whatever culture remains in the twentieth century, exists in spite of nationalism and capitalism. The future of culture as we understand it depends on the destruction of both.

Behind the Slogans

THE campaign for V for Victory is in full swing. The idea originally behind the campaign was from the point of view of military strategy not a bad one. The Government hoped by a declaration in favour of the Allied cause, by the peoples of Europe themselves, to arouse opposition to German rule.

At first the campaign was a great success, because the peoples of Europe are so war-weary and disillusioned that they are prepared to support, in the main, any campaign directed against the Nazi masters of Europe. This has been manifested by a series of pin-pricking attacks on Naziism—such as V signs everywhere, chalked inscriptions on the walls (at which propaganda, one may mention, the capitalist Press here has sneered for years), and finally that campaign of tapping, coughing, whistling, laughing, etc. the V rhythm in morse code.

What the Government did not take into account, apparently, was that their scheme for a V campaign would founder not in Europe, but in Britain and America. Precisely where it has failed dismally to arouse a victory psychosis is in the very countries whose victory it is supposed to herald, and not because of its neglect, but because of its being taken up. The "V" campaign which might have been a symbol of resistance on the continent, is just another rage of sophisticated London and New York. Milliners' shops, cough-lozenge advertisements, slapsticks comedians, schoolboys scribbling the morse code rhythm on the wall in a sense of derring-do, the smart ladies who paint their finger-nails with a V for Victory, the novelist who follows his "W Plan" of the last war with a "V" Plan of this war—the V's, in short, that one sees everywhere—obviously these are not symbols of victory, but symbols of self-advertisement. V is just a rage of the hour, like mah-jongg once was, and yo-yo once was

So far as Britain and America are concerned, V is quite clearly a symbol of capitalism. It illustrates, as the current rage of the hour, both the immense need for distraction from the real problems of the day, and the immense need for advertisement in a

competitive system, wherein not the most meritable, but the most advertised, is the most popular. No doubt from a serious point of view it is not at all inappropriate that the sign of Victory should be a symbol of capitalism, but our propaganda leaders did not intend this. Unfortunately there was no avoiding it.

On the Continent, it has perhaps had more success, so far as propaganda is concerned.

"V" FOR VICTORY

So much indeed did the Nazi hierarchy dread the effectiveness of the V campaign that they simply adopted it for themselves, on an old-established Hitler plan of trying to steal his opponents' thunder. V stood for Viktoria, they declared. Everywhere Europe was celebrating the victory of Germany that was to come. The correct German for victory is, of course, Sieg. This did not deter the Nazis, of course, in their claims, and they have simply hoisted their own V signs when they couldn't obliterate the V signs that others had set up. And what is important to a study of propaganda as a use of warfare is that the Nazis have got away with it. Obviously it is no use chalking V's on the trees in Paris if there is an enormous one stuck up at the Eiffel Tower. Moreover, if V does not stand for Sieg in German it does stand for Victoire in French, and a Frenchman celebrating Victory might just as well be a Darlaniste celebrating a Hitler Victory as a De Gaulliste celebrating a British Victory.

It is just there that the British propaganda comes unstuck. Since, as responsible statesmen have echoed since the beginning of the war, "We have one aim—Victory," "Our war aim is to win the war," etc., we are bound to fall into this morass of misunderstanding. We believe in one thing—victory; obviously, so do the Germans.

And in the last analysis, even if people realise whose victory the victory campaign stands for, what then? For a German or a Bulgarian or a Norwegian to read that Britain wants Victory is nothing sensational. (The only people who might consider it sensational would be people seeing

The Attitude of the I.W.W. in the United States

In one of the last issues of the "Industrial Worker" there appears articles in which this organization states its position in some of the actual social problems of the country. Thus for instance we read about the attacks on the forty-hour-week:

"In the days just preceding the elections,

the procrastinations of our bureaucratic officials at first hand.)

And even if Britain's victory were to become to the oppressed peoples of Europe a symbol of liberation, which it is far from being, there is still no indication of how to achieve it. The German wishy-washy reformist anti-Nazi paper "Die Zeitung," published in London, did, indeed, suggest following the V campaign with an S campaign—S for sabotage. The government has studiously refrained from encouraging large acts of sabotage in Europe. Such a policy, carried much beyond the limits suggested by "Die Zeitung," would be best calculated to bring Hitler to his knees. It would involve radio and plane-leaflet instructions on the methods of sabotage and silent striking; on the means of ca'canny strikes and obstructive tactics. Finally, it would work up to explaining how revolutionary tactics could be employed to oust the ruling classes of Europe from their positions.

Obviously this cannot be done by the Government. Nor is it likely that the masses abroad would respond to such an appeal from a ruling class obviously resorting to such measures merely to save its own skin, and not from any belief in them itself.

Only a revolutionary Britain could offer such assistance to working-class Europe. Which country it will be that makes its revolution first and offers such assistance to the world revolution remains to be seen. One thing is certain, the defeat of Hitler by revolutionary means could not be done by capitalist Britain.

A. M.

attacks on labour were soft-peddled a bit in the interest of candidates for office who felt they needed the labour vote. But there was in spite of this concession, considerable sniping against more or less established restrictions on the length of the working week. Now we may reasonably expect a barrage and major assault from all employing class forces in a drive for a working day and week with practically no limits, and without a boost in the wage scale for the overtime hours. A regional conference of the United States Chamber of Commerce which met recently in Philadelphia came out boldly for the repeal of the wage hour law and of the Walsh-Healy act. . . Another move talked about in political and employer circles would provide a short cut to what employers consider most satisfactory labour relations. According to this plan the National Defence Advisory Commission would be given authority to "deal with all obstructive labour disputes." This latter scheme—a fine setup for a dictatorship—would doubtless suit the big, inner circle employers first rate."

The same paper then states that the employers are, unfortunately, not alone in attacking the law of the forty-hour-week and the actual social conditions in the States. It is a fact that also many workers—organized and un-organized, employed in industries which are occupied with the needs of national defence and in other industries—are willing to consent to an increased number of working hours, on the condition that they obtain compensation for the overtime work. They are even ready to accept further concessions: an extension of the working week, whereby the "extra-hours" will cease to be considered as extra and be comprised in the normal working day. All this happens in spite of the fact that there are numerous involuntarily unemployed in all industries who try in vain to get a job. The paper states that the solution of the problem of unemployment consists in reducing the hours of work instead of increasing them. In the case of overtime work, it says extra hours should be paid double

How Kenya is Governed

By Jomo Kenyatta

IN considering the question of civil liberties and the effect of European civilisation on African tribal communities, it is necessary to have some ideas of how the African people lived before the advent of the Europeans. Cut off as they were from the outside world, they lived in their isolation with natural contentment, each group acting independently and satisfying its immediate needs and desires with material near at hand. As to their mode of government, they managed their own affairs as best they could, through democratic tribal organisations formed according to the local customs and the stage of development which the particular tribe had reached. Tribal affairs were in the hands of several groups or councils which every tribesman had the right to join.

Thus they lived as the masters of their destiny, roaming freely within the boundaries of their own fertile territories, and enjoying the gifts which nature had bestowed upon them; fertile lands with favourable climatic conditions, and, in addition, with abundance of game of every kind.

Under the tribal system of land tenure, every tribesman had the right of access to as much land as he needed for the maintenance of himself and his dependents; this was possible because land-ownership was not based on profit-making—as it is in European countries—but on the principle of producing materials necessary for the progress and happiness of the whole community.

When the Europeans appeared on the scene, bringing with them stronger weapons than those possessed by any of the African tribes, things began to take a different course. British Government in Kenya took possession of all the land previously owned and occupied by the African tribes, thus with one stroke of the pen, depriving the African of his sole means of production. The African legal position with regard to land is defined by the following quotation from a judgment of the High Court of East Africa, in a civil case heard in Nairobi in 1921: "In my view the effect of the Crown Lands Ordinance, 1915, and the Kenya (Annexation) Order in Council, 1920, by which no

native rights were reserved, and the Kenya Colony Order in Council, 1921, as I have already stated, is clearly, inter alia, to vest land reserved for the use of a native tribe in the Crown. If that be so, then all native rights in such reserved land, whatever they were under the Gethaka system" (the term refers to the system of inalienable freeholds among the Kikuyu tribe) **"disappeared, and natives in occupation of such Crown Land became tenants at will of the Crown of the land actually occupied."**

From 1895 to 1920, this territory was known as British East Africa Protectorate, and subsequently as Kenya Colony. In 1923 the following declaration of Native policy was made: "Primarily Kenya is an African territory, and His Majesty's Government think it necessary definitely to record their considered opinion that the interests of the African Native must be paramount and that if and when these interests and the interests of the immigrant races should conflict, the former should prevail." (CMD. 1922).

In spite of this declaration the history of native policy in Kenya shows clearly that the African, the man of sorrows in the human family, is the one who is shouldering the burden: especially with regard to the land and labour questions, for around this issue revolves all the trials, burdens, hardships and sufferings of the subject races in the Colonial countries.

The present population of Kenya consists of about 19,000 Europeans, about 45,000 Indians and Goanese, 13,000 Arabs, and over 3,000,000 Africans. The Government is administered by a Governor, supported by an Executive Council made up of eight ex-officio members, and about four unofficial members. Besides this, there is a Legislative Council which passes laws, subject to the authority of the Colonial Office. It consists of forty members, including the Governor, who is the President, twenty official members, including one nominated Arab, 11 Europeans elected by the European non-official community to represent landed and commercial interests, five Indians elected by the Indian community, one elected Arab, and two Europeans nominated by the Governor to represent the interests of over three million Africans! *The Africans have no direct representative on the Council.*

The Governor is subjected to great political and social pressure by the white community of Kenya. For this reason, his position is one of exceeding difficulty. If he acts according to the settlers' demands he is hailed with satisfaction; but if he devotes his energies to encouraging the development of the unrepresented African population he runs the risk of being denounced as "pro-Native." As it is pointed out in the Ormsby-Gore Report of 1925, few, if any Governors have been able to withstand organised white pressure, and, therefore, African rights have

been violated and African interests neglected. The official members are under the order of the Governor who can not only order their votes, but can silence their criticism of legislative measures.

According to the Hilton Young Report, 1929, the eleven elected European members representing white constituencies, exercise large control over general legislation and Budget expenditure. Though in a permanent minority on the Council they are given far greater actual powers than their numbers would normally warrant. Their first duty is to their white constituents. They have little, if any, knowledge of the language, customs and home life of the Africans, and are chiefly interested in the African as a present or prospective wage-earner. It is obvious, therefore, that they cannot be regarded as representatives of the African interests.

The two Europeans who are nominated to represent (?) the Africans are usually missionaries. They have, therefore, a definitely specialised view of African interests. From the imperialist point of view they are a nuisance; from that of the Africans they are neither independent, disinterested nor equipped with sufficient knowledge of African needs, and as the Africans have no say in appointing them, they cannot bring pressure to bear on them to express their real desires.

Kenya administration as a whole is influenced in favour of European capitalists development in exactly the same way as the Governor and legislature. Heavy indirect pressure can be brought to bear on heads of Departments in the Legislative Council, by the Convention of Associations and the Press, to devote their main energies to furthering European development. In that direction lies their path of advancement, appreciation and popularity. Work done for the African carries but little outward reward.

From the above observations, I can say definitely that Kenya as at present constituted, is not "primarily an African territory" in any but a statistical sense.

The African Hand-book (1935) gives the total of Native Reserves, in 1933 as 48,345 square miles, or about 31,000,000 acres which include arid desert or semi-desert tracts, such as Taru-desert. Here are herded together the bulk of over 3,000,000 Africans having among them at the end of 1933, 4,965,963 head of cattle, 2,960,827 sheep, and 4,321,543 goats.

On the other hand, there were 4,700 Europeans, holding among them at the end of 1935, 5,206,264 acres of the most eligible land in the country, some of it originally granted to them free of all costs in 5,000 acre blocks, the bulk held in 999 years leases on merely nominal terms. Thirty years after the country was opened up for White settlement, and with total population at 17,620, less than 12% of this land was under cultivation. Europeans held at the end of 1933, 256,157 head of cattle, and 252,250 sheep. The Africans who were pushed out of a large part of this alienated land to accommodate the Europeans are to-day crowded in Reserves with a density of ranging from 165 to 1,100 to the square mile. A report on Kikuyu Land Tenure published in November, 1929 states:—

"... a very large number of native holdings were alienated to Europeans in the days before the

Reserve boundaries were fixed, and then a great many natives who had land rights on the holdings of their clans suddenly found themselves homeless and with no land on which they could cultivate in their own right."

The necessity to earn money is corollary of the whole land question, for, being landless, Africans are unable to maintain an independent economic existence. They are, therefore forced to go and work in the mines and on the farms owned by settlers or vested interests, in order to obtain money to pay their Hut, Head and other taxes, not only for themselves but also for their dependents. Even those Africans who can find a piece of land within the reserves, are not allowed to cultivate economic crops, such as coffee, which would enable them to find a ready market and thereby obtain their tax money. To-day every African male above the age of sixteen has to pay 12 shillings tax, and those who have more than one hut have to pay twelve shillings per hut. About 450,000 able-bodied African males pay £600,000 in hut and poll tax, or 27 shillings a head. In spite of the heavy taxation which the Africans pay, the education of their children is very poor. There is no official estimate of the number of African children of school age, but it can be safely said that there are between 500,000 and 600,000 children of school age. According to the Kenya Education Department Report, 1937, it is stated that there were 100,872 pupils in elementary schools in Kenya. Of these 3,175 were in Government schools, 36,477 in aided schools (mission or church) and 61,220 in unaided schools, built and financed by the Africans out of their own scanty earnings, not only with no help from the Government but often against considerable discouragement. The Government spends about 8 shillings a head for the education of African children, while it spends £49,255 for the education of less than 2,000 European children. It seems therefore that the poor are taxed to pay for the education of the well-to-do. Most Europeans in Kenya are free from Income Tax, for it is only those earning over £700 who pay Income Tax.

This, briefly, is the kind of democracy which Mr. Churchill and his Labour Party colleagues ask us to defend.

REPRESSION OF C.O.'s

THE apparent leniency of the Government towards C.O.'s is fast disappearing. Practically every day the Press carries reports of men who refuse to register for military service or to undergo medical examination, receiving sentences of six and twelve months' imprisonment, and it appears likely that the sentences will become more and more savage as time goes on. Among those recently sentenced to six months was our printer, Hugh Brock. When he appeared at Willesden Police Court, he made it clear that he was making his stand as a matter of principle. Hence he could not plead guilty or not guilty, since his stand was against the conscription law itself. Needless to say, he was ordered to submit to medical examination, and on his refusal brought back to court and sentenced to 6 months' imprisonment. His case demonstrates clearly the naked force which is thinly cloaked with legal trappings.

Repercussions of the War in South America

(From our correspondent)

THE big South American dailies now regularly devote several pages to inter-American relations. The culture-tours between the North and South, exchange of visits between groups of students and commercial missions, are multiplying every day. An even more important, though less spectacular, enterprise is being pursued with the same enthusiasm—the efforts of the economic missions and of the military staffs.

The measures taken for the seizure of Axis merchant shipping, which have taken refuge in the waters of the American continent, and the unanimity with which the Spanish American nations have responded, demonstrates quite clearly that the influence of the United States has increased to such an extent as to allow them to direct joint manœuvres for the safety of the continent.

Certain aspects of the virtual conquest of South America by the U.S.A. are of interest. Thus Mexico announces that it will "reconsider" the rights of English enterprises which "suffered" at the time of the expropriation of the oil wells. The Mexican Eagle is one of the companies whose interests are tied to the democratic principles! The speed with which recent events have developed is such that many politicians, industrialists and militarists believe that the U.S.A.'s entry into the war is only a matter of time. The immediate problem is to know whether the continent as a whole has been sufficiently tamed to follow its new master or whether it still remains under the Nazi-Fascist influence on the one hand or of independent popular elements for the defence and maintenance of American neutrality on the other.

Already there is no country in the world which is not involved in the present conflict. Economic interdependence is such that there is no nation or portion of the globe which can declare and prove that it can isolate itself. It is not surprising, therefore, to see that the South American countries are suffering greatly as a result of the war.

Steel is becoming scarce in Chile, Argentine and in the Pacific countries. The reorganisation of the United States industry for war purposes prevents them from selling to

the Southern countries the engines for their new born industries. There is a lack of chemical and pharmaceutical products, as well as of enamel, cloth and many other articles. On the other hand, salts, iodine, corn, maize and meat cannot be exported any longer and are exchanged with difficulty by barter arrangements against necessary products or . . . military guarantees. Without actually being at war, America is completely disorganised as a result of the war.

The defence of Democracy, to which the United States have pledged themselves, and the diplomatic organs of the White House do not hide the fact that this formula in reality covers the defence of the old capitalist system against Hitler's new Autarchic system—does not necessitate their entry into the war. It is difficult to imagine where the United States would land troops except to defend the Dominions in case Great Britain was invaded. The entry into the war of the Southern States is even more remote. Important factors would intervene in case the problem had to be solved concretely. First of all the Italian and German minorities, which form well-organised racial groups, in particular the North of Argentine and South Chile for the Germans, and in the whole of Argentine for the Italians. There still are business men who had directed their commercial activity towards Europe. There are strong sympathies in military circles towards the Axis nations.

It is difficult to break away from the imperialist circles to seek a breath of fresh air among revolutionary elements. All the parties, Trade Union movements, groups and movements sympathetic to the workers, are directed towards either one or the other of the rival factions; the Stalinists confuse the issue wherever possible and make all efforts towards a clarification of the situation extremely difficult, thanks to the carefully concocted mixture of social demands and imperialist positions which they present every day.

In the United States the workers have organised strikes in order to improve their

FRIENDS OF FREEDOM PRESS

WITH this issue of WAR COMMENTARY we announce the formation of "THE FRIENDS OF FREEDOM PRESS," a voluntary association of men and women who consider that Freedom Press by continuing in its work of publishing literature on Anarchism and other subjects is performing a useful function.

But sympathy not accompanied by action will not further the cause of Freedom Press and the ideals which inspire its work. Consequently we suggest ways and means in which the Friends of Freedom Press can actively assist us.

Firstly, we should point out that we have formed the FRIENDS OF FREEDOM PRESS in response to numerous readers of WAR COMMENTARY and our other publications, who, while not yet convinced Anarchists, nevertheless found in our publications the expression of ideals worthy of their sympathy and support. The "FRIENDS OF FREEDOM PRESS" is, as its title implies an association of people in sympathy with our work and eager as friends to lend a helping hand.

An important function of the association will be the discussion, that is, the critical discussion and analysis

conditions; unfortunately the strikes have been called without any clear aims so that they have easily been misrepresented by government and fascist agents. There is, as in France, a lack of clear understanding of the imperialist game and of the possibility for the proletarian movements to play an independent role, and to win by carrying on a successful struggle against democratic exploitation and Nazi misery.

In South America the nationalist movements which played an important role by their political and social activity have rallied almost without exception to the democratic cause. One of the most important movements, that of the A.P.R. in Peru, is collaborating now with the Left and with the United States, while, of course, making several "reservations" for the future.

Only the Anarchist movements remain true to the internationalist and revolutionary ideals. Their strength is, however, limited, their methods out of date, and their activity rather slow. If they resume the struggle with new energy they may be able to create a movement which will take an active part in the social struggle and realise the tremendous task before them.

of the ideas expressed in WAR COMMENTARY and our pamphlets, and we believe that this can be best done by the coming together of members at regular intervals. Discussion groups should be formed wherever there are members, and as their ideas develop so can their activities expand. Meetings can be organized in their local halls, new contacts made and more members for the discussion group and other activities connected with the association.

A function of the FRIENDS OF FREEDOM PRESS whose importance cannot be underestimated is the distribution of our publications. Normally, publishers ensure the widest distribution of their books through the medium of advertising and through full-time travellers who tour all the bookshops in the country. FREEDOM PRESS has not the means to do this. Apart from a very limited amount of advertising, we rely entirely on our friends to do this essential work. And it must be the task of our members to organize this work in their respective localities so that wherever there are groups of individuals, there are FREEDOM PRESS agents to visit bookshops and newsagents and keep them supplied.

Finally, it must obviously be the aim of the FRIENDS OF FREEDOM PRESS to see that we have the means to continue, and even enlarge the scope of, our work. A tremendous amount of our energies have so far been expended in seeking ways and means to raise money to carry on the regular publication of WAR COMMENTARY, and of new pamphlets.

To launch the FRIENDS OF FREEDOM PRESS a Meeting Social will be held at Conway Hall on Sunday, September 28th, at which speakers will be heard and fuller details of THE FRIENDS OF FREEDOM PRESS given. This Social-Meeting will also be an opportunity for our readers in London and the vicinity to express their solidarity with the work of FREEDOM PRESS, and to affirm their hope in a practical way, that FREEDOM PRESS will continue to make its voice heard in spite of the ever-increasing difficulties put in the way of Freedom of Expression.

The meeting has been so arranged that the speeches will finish in time to allow for informal discussion, and refreshment some time before black-out. It will also be an opportunity for any details regarding the FRIENDS OF FREEDOM PRESS to be explained to individual enquirers.

WAR COMMENTARY AND SUPPLEMENT (post free)

6 months, 2/6; 1 year, 5/-.

Special terms for quantities

All subscriptions and inquiries should be sent to:
FREEDOM PRESS, 27, Belsize Road, London, N.W.6.