

WAR *For Anarchism* COMMENTARY

Vol. 3 No. 11

MAY, 1942

Twopence

End Class Collaboration!



May Day March 1942

MAY DAY 1942 finds the workers all over the world apparently going hand-in-hand with their worst enemies—capitalist exploiters and ruthless dictators. But before they become entirely friendly with their class enemy, before they become willing slaves, it will be necessary for them to forget the meaning of liberty entirely.

In fascist, democratic and communist countries alike, politicians will use May Day as another pretext for trying to dope the people, and make them believe that they cannot manage their own affairs without their help, that they look after the workers' interests much better than the workers could themselves.

They will explain May Day as a day of solidarity not between the workers of all lands, but between "all sections of the community"—that is to say, between bosses and men. They will demand that the workers win the war for them more quickly by ceasing to carry on their own class struggle, and by massacring wholesale other workers who are gagged and exploited just the same as themselves.

We anarchists take the opportunity to declare our fundamental opposition to all governments and all parties whose only concern is to keep the people down.

RALLY TO MAY DAY DEMONSTRATION
Conway Hall Sunday, 6.30 p.m.

We declare our determination always to fight against the boss class, and those who rule over the working-class. The employers' men, Labour Party officials, communist politicians, Trade Union bureaucrats are all the enemies of the workers, just as much as Roosevelt and Ford, Churchill and Nuffield. They are all "swarms of cringers, dogfaces, lice of politics."

We must realize their real role and regard them as dangerous enemies who must be exposed. We can then build up an industrial organization which cannot become merely the instrument of the Bevins and Citrines, but will represent the will of the workers themselves. Syndicates built up to embrace all the workers in one industry in the same organization will be able to destroy the old system and create the new society.

We must throw overboard the political "weapons" which the ruling class has granted to its subjects. The right to vote or to sit on production committees only deceive the people and prevent them from using their real power against their exploiters.

We must use the arms which have never failed whenever there were men courageous enough to use them. Far more lasting victories have been won for the workers by strikes, boycotts, mass action, reliance on our own strength, than by parliamentary methods. If the victories gained by direct action have been lost again, it is because the working-class have returned to political methods.

We are not taken in by the false calls to solidarity issued by the Labour leaders and communist acrobats. The workers are not contented with half measures, with merely a five-shilling increase in wages. Wages and money are all sources of inequality whereby

rulers try to divide the ranks of the workers; they must be abolished.

May Day can teach two grim lessons to the workers. The judicial murder of the anarchist militants by the State in Chicago in 1887 showed clearly that the ruling class does not stop short at killing those who fight against its cruelty and oppression. But the more recent assassination of our anarchist comrades by communists and socialists in the Barcelona May Day of 1937—only five years ago—shows that it is not only the capitalist ruling class who have a monopoly of crimes of violence against the militant workers. All those in power, or who aspire to power, are alike ruthless in their attempts to exterminate the revolutionists who fearlessly expose them. These are the lessons of May Day that the workers must never forget, these are the crimes against their comrades which they must avenge.

But every year swells the bloodstrewn record of the sacrifice of these heroic workers fighting for liberty. The bloodshed will only be ended by the workers acting in solidarity with one another in all lands to overthrow their class oppressors everywhere. To prevent more sacrifices we must make the social revolution and end class divisions now, before starvation and disillusionment and useless slaughter bring forth a sterile revolt of despair.

An Appeal—

for War Commentary

We know that we are doing a useful job of work in running Freedom Press. Our knowledge of the growing rapidity of the sales of our books and pamphlets, and of this paper, proves it. It is no easy task to maintain the present steady flow of literature from our offices: we must have the cash to do the job. We have no salaries to pay, but the cost of paper, printing, etc., means that the need for more money is urgent.

No paper is printed at a profit. The profit comes from advertising revenue. We have none. The only way we can maintain our paper as an independent organ is by donations to our Press Fund by our friends. You have helped us to keep the flag flying in the past. Let us keep on with the job.

WAR COMMENTARY

incorporating
Spain and the World and Revolt!

Coming out Twice a Month

SUBSCRIPTION RATES:

6 Months 2/6 (post free)

12 Months 5/0 (post free)

All subscriptions and enquiries
should be sent to

FREEDOM PRESS,
27, Belsize Road London N.W.6.
Phone: PRImrose 0625

The Strange new Friends of INDUSTRIAL UNIONISM

INDUSTRIAL Unionism is becoming quite fashionable among certain politicians of the Left. The I.L.P. some time ago began to talk of industrial unionism, ceasing its previous cries for trades unionism. Now the "Tribune" a paper associated with Cripps, Aneurin Bevan and Strauss, all left M.P.s, is advocating the reorganization of the existing craft and general unions in industrial organizations.

This may seem, at first glance, a step forward, for the industrial unionist movement had never previously received support from such quarters. The modern method of union organization was, in the English-speaking countries, pioneered by the Industrial Workers of the World, and by them introduced to the British working class shortly after the Chicago Conference of 1905. For 35 years the movement received no support from the I.L.P. or any other section of Left politicians, for they preferred to pay tribute to the much more "successful" trade unions.

Strange, is it not, that the socialist politicians should to-day have discovered virtue in the form of organization proclaimed by the Wobblies at the beginning of the twentieth century? Yet not so strange to those who know the present mood of the British workers. The workers are fast losing faith in politics, a speech by a politician provokes little else but cynical smiles or open jeers, except from the well-trained clique of Stalinists. If the workers' attention is to be held, the socialist politicians must seek inspiration from beyond the political field. Of little use to revive the old cry of "100 per cent trade unionism," for the trade unions are suffering from the same blight as the parties of the left. The workers see the trade unions used as the stooges of capitalism. Where must the Left look to find a programme capable of winning working class respect? Why not borrow the banner of industrial Unionism, a banner free of the stains of political intrigue?

But the Industrial Unionism of the I.L.P. and the "Tribune" has little in common with the revolutionary industrial unionism of the I.W.W. or the Syndicalist International.

WHAT IS INDUSTRIAL UNIONISM?

The chief slogan of trades unionism has always been Unity; the existence of trade unions has been the greatest cause of disunity. There are several hundred unions affiliated to the T.U.C. and many outside of it. In the engineering industry alone there are over forty unions. One may enter a factory and see several thousand workers united by capitalism under one roof and making one commodity, yet disorganized into a score or more of unions. Each craft has its own union, sometimes two or three; women are barred from most craft unions and other engineering workers are catered for by the unions of the bus-drivers or municipal workers. This is true of most other industries.

Instead of the hundreds of warring unions the Wobblies and Syndicalists present the twenty-five or so industrial unions. One industry—one union, with all the industrial sections federated into one organization—the Industrial Workers.

Instead of the factory workers being divided by internecine warfare,

they become organized around the commodity they produce. No craft or degree of skill, neither sex nor age, neither "black-coat" nor "manual" is allowed to divide the ranks of labour. So far, so good. The new friends of Industrial Unionism seem to be willing to travel with us, but organization by industry is not enough.

Industrial organization is but the beginning of revolutionary unionism. Industrial Unionism is not just a cheaper, more efficient form of reformist organization, as the "Tribune" implies. Between trade unionism and revolutionary unionism there is a great gulf fixed. Space is too short here to outline all the differences between the two; the novel strike tactics

By

Tom Brown

of the revolutionaries and their long history of working class fidelity; or their higher social consciousness. But three issues we must outline.

TWO WAYS

First; the reformist unions are controlled from above—power is in the hands of the leaders. In the I.W.W. and the Syndicates, control is from below, and the higher up a man is the less power he has. The principle of delegateship is upheld. Instead of representatives who do what they "think is right," delegates are elected and *instructed*, and every delegate is subject to 24 hours notice if his conduct is unsatisfactory. So power is distributed among the members.

Now existing industrial unions of the kind advocated by the socialists (the "Tribune" mentions the Miners' Federation and the National Union of Railwaymen) are just as bureaucratic and autocratic as the general or craft unions. Instead it was the newer, bigger unions and not the old craft unions which created the present trade union bureaucracy.

Secondly; money. When the apostle Timothy said the love of money was the root of all evil he must have had a vision of trade unionism. Trade unions collect heavy dues and have amassed a capital of many tens of millions of pounds. This capital is invested in house property, capitalist undertakings and war loan. From its interest are paid sick and funeral benefits and the officials' salaries. So, the trade unions become capitalist concerns with financial interest in the welfare of capitalism. Please do not tell us that strike benefit is paid from these investments. All strikes are unofficial now, so no benefit is paid out; and this has been general since 1926, while some unions have not paid strike benefit since 1922.

On the other hand, the salaries of the officials are usually heavy. W. J. Brown of the Civil Service Clerical Association gets £1,000 a year. Marchbank of the N.U.R. also gets £1,000. Ernest Bevin of the Transport Workers and Sir Walter Citrine, Secretary of the T.U.C., get £1,250 a year each. In the I.W.W.

and the Syndicates, most of the work (tougher work than that of the knighted labour leaders) is unpaid, but when delegates are paid, the wage is that of the industry. Nor do the revolutionary unions set out to be coffin clubs and amass great capital. As for fighting funds they have relied on the solidarity of labour rather than the power of the union's purse.

Thirdly; the reformist unions, trade or industrial, are tied to the chariot of party politics. The greatest factor causing the degeneration of the trade unions was their participation in politics. A trade union leader, Ernest Bevin, assisted by a horde of "national service officers," mostly trade union officials, conscript, threaten and imprison industrial workers. Trade Union M.P.s, sent to Parliament by trade union dues, pass laws against their own members to the applause of the Conservative politicians.

Because the I.W.W. refused to amend its "Preamble" to include parliamentary activity; because the C.N.T. in Spain, and the revolutionary syndicates in France, Latin America and Scandinavia refused to join the hustings, revolutionary unionism retains its integrity. Had they listened to the voices of the politicians there would, today, be no inspiration in the name of industrial unionism.

LUCY PARSONS

THE week of March 9, 1942 saw the gates of Heaven open wide. Tom Mooney, after a quarter of a century of incarceration in jails and hospitals had received his diploma and entered in with his scars and his medals reading "Well done, thou good and faithful servant; thou hast been faithful in the long days of ignominy and shame and travail; enter now into the joy of thy comrades; your companions J. B. MacNamara, who shared your stone wall and iron bars all the days you were in San Quentin, and his brother, J. J. MacNamara, who was with you for ten years in the walled city, are waiting to welcome you. David Kaplan, who died lonely and unknown in a London lodging house has a hand of welcome for you. Alexander Berkman, who worked so hard to organize the first Mooney Defence Committee, and Emma Goldman, the Beloved, all await you."

The same week Lucy Parsons, the stalwart, the faithful, entered the same Gates as Mooney, and was welcomed by her comrades and all the martyrs of Labour and the pioneers of a free and a better world. Just 40 years ago John Peter Altgeld* had entered the same Gates. November the 11th, 54 years ago, Albert Parsons, Lucy's husband, August Spies, Louis Lingg, Fisher and Engels had crossed the threshold by the way of the hangman's noose.

March 11th, 1942 was a cold, bleak day. In the shadow of the Chicago Anarchists' monument where are laid the bodies of the pioneers of the 8 hour labour movement, and the two greatest anarchist women, Emma Goldman and Voltairine de Cleyre

* Governor Altgeld who six years after the Chicago Martyrs were hanged, established their innocence, and exposed the packing of the jury, and the perjured evidence of the whole frame-up.

THE PARTY OR THE WORKING CLASS

Revolutionary Industrial Unions are not only weapons in the class struggle, they are the framework of the new society. When the working-class takes hold of the means of production, then the miners will control the mines, the seamen the ships, and the engineers the factories. But what place would industrial unions have in the state socialism of the "Tribune" or the I.L.P.? The trade unions would become (as the industrial unions of Russia) a minor appendage to the state. It would be impossible to have industry controlled by the workers through their unions and at the same time let it be controlled by the state. The political party, in order to keep power, must subjugate the unions. The unions, in order to live their own life, to reach their fullest development must repudiate the party.

True industrial unionism is a virile, constructive force which can yet carve a way for the workers through the entanglements and political intrigues of a corrupt and disillusioned labour movement. But the so-called industrial unionism of the politicians in search of a programme is but a pale sham of the real thing. "The emancipation of the workers must be the task of the workers themselves."

and where are scattered the ashes of William D. Haywood, we saw the gasping flames devour the bodies of Lucy Parsons and her comrade George Markstall, who lost his life trying to save Lucy from the flames. I took out my Rosary, C. E. S. Wood's 'Poet in the Desert':

I saw a strange, sad trinity: a tall
Gaunt man, another not so tall, between
Them a young Negro lad. Against the sky
a Gallows stood. The sad, bowed one spoke clear.
"We hold Man has no higher inspiration than
"Bold disobedience to a law that rules
"His peaceful liberty—no higher duty to
"Mankind than breaking every law of property
"Or thought which keeps men slaves."
The mirage melted and the voices hushed.
My soul knew—Freedom is God—
And disobedience to Tyranny Divine.
Like a frightened child I cried
Truth, must the glorious sunrise always come so
red?

"Ask of the Masters who have snatched
"The roseate nipple from between their brother's
lips."

But who will teach the people, who will lead?

"The Masters—Makers of bloody Revolution.

"The end" is always packed in the beginning,

"The apple is in the bud, and the worm is in the
blossom.

"Never have the Masters yielded—as the lion does

"Not yield the prey on which he holds his paw.

"Always the Masters scourge the people to

"The sacrament of blood, from which.

"The Resurrection and the Life—Look."

I read the inscription on the monument, "Our silence in the grave will be more powerful than the voices you strangle today."

BEN REITMAN

What Anarchists Stand for

Aim.

The setting up of a Libertarian society which will render impossible the growth of a privileged class and the exploitation and oppression of man by man.

Expropriation of Land and Industry.

We therefore aim at the common ownership of the land, industry and all the places of work and means of production, directly under workers' control.

Class Struggle.

We recognize the fundamental nature of the class struggle and assert that the exploiting class and the working class can have no interests in common. For the workers solidarity with their own class both at home and abroad is the fundamental consideration, which must take precedence over all others.

The State.

We are therefore opposed to all monopolies of power whereby the division of society into a ruled and ruling class are maintained. Similarly we oppose all the auxiliary means of maintaining the class-divided society—parliament, the legal system, the police, the armed forces, the Church, etc. All such means find their final expression in the State, which always exists to protect the interests of a privileged minority. We are therefore unalterably opposed to the State.

Militarism.

We oppose militarism as one of the instruments of class rule. The armed forces are used by the ruling class to maintain their class rule.

Nationalism and Imperialism.

We assert that national frontiers have no significance for the workers, being merely the lines of division between the spheres of exploitation of the national sections of the bourgeoisie. The interests of the workers being everywhere the same (the struggle against their rulers), are international. We therefore declare our solidarity with the workers' struggle in every country. We join with the colonial workers enslaved to imperialism in their struggle against it.

War.

We oppose the war as the outcome of the clashing interests of rival imperialisms. Since empires exist only to serve the interests of the ruling classes, wars undertaken for their extension or defence have nothing in common with the interests of the workers. The rivalries between the national sections of the ruling class weakens them in the class struggle, and the workers should utilize the advantage thereby offered them to prosecute the class

struggle more vigorously. Nationalist sentiment aroused by war is the most effective means employed by the ruling class to deceive the workers and conceal the underlying fundamental class struggle.

We expose and reject the facile slogan "Democracy versus Fascism." Under capitalist "democracy" the ruling class has everywhere shown itself ready to compromise with Fascism rather than make concessions to the workers. In Spain the forces of bourgeois "democracy," aided by the Stalinists, strangled the social revolution under cover of this treacherous slogan, and thereby drained the life blood from the only effective resistance to Fascism—the spontaneous direct action of the armed workers. Rather than face social revolution "democracy" will join hands with fascism: but at home and abroad social revolution alone can defeat Fascism.

Direct Action.

Victory in the fight against class domination can only be achieved by the direct action of the workers themselves. We reject all parliamentary and similar activity as deflecting the workers from the class struggle into paths of class collaboration.

Organisation of the Workers.

Since direct action on the part of individuals produces only partial and inadequate results, it is necessary for the working class to organise collectively. Anarchists seek to organise the workers into Syndicalist unions free from the craft divisions and bureaucracy of trade unions. While trade unions seek to be permanent wage bargaining institutions, Syndicalism fights for the abolition of the wage system, and the destruction of the property-relations of existing society. To do this the workers must organise at the places of work.

Syndicates and Reconstruction.

The workshop committees will be federated into industrial syndicates. These industrial syndicates will be able to control each industry when the workers have locked out the employing class. All industries will then cooperate in a Federation of Labour, controlling and coordinating the whole economy of society. Production will be freed from wage slavery and profit-seeking, and the whole energies of labour will be directed towards the satisfaction of human needs. There will be no capitalism and no State.

Social Revolution.

As the imperialist war drags on it is time for the scattered forces of the world revolution to redouble their efforts for the task of preparing to meet social collapse with the revolutionary message to the workers:

**No compromise with forces of reformism or reaction.
Organisation for the social revolution. ANARCHISM.**

A Red and Black Notebook

(Owing to pressure of space part of this notebook has had to be held over until next issue. Ed.)

IT seems there is no limit to the disgrace the Stalinists bring to the once honoured name of the shop steward. The April issue of the *New Propellor*, a Communist pseudo-trade union paper, carries a remarkable letter on firewatching from one of its supporters (remember, such papers publish only letters they approve). Claiming to be a shop-steward at Saunders-Roe, Weybridge, he complains of the administration of the fire-watching act, and states "In this locality there are five factories. This act—supposedly a compulsory one—compels one firm out of five to do fire-watching. . . One of the largest of these firms pays firewatchers 2/- an hour. Where is this money coming from? Is it coming from the shareholders' capital, or does the firm draw its six per cent? The whole thing is very fishy, and we ask that this compulsory act be made compulsory for all. Yours etc., Shop Steward."

If this Stalinist has his demand granted, and compulsion (it is the workers and not the directors who are compelled, as Morrison said) is enforced, the fire-watchers won't have their two shillings an hour, and the Bosheviks could stop worrying about the shareholders' capital. What a pal!

Why Go Home?

In the same paper a correspondent regrets the time the workers spend shopping and thinks that it ought to be spent in the factory. "In his factory there is a monthly cigarette ration of eighty cigarettes and four bars of chocolate. Not a lot, but it's regular. Another feature is a hairdressers shop, inside the factory, a ration of halibut liver oil tablets to guard against colds, etc., and a programme of music during working hours."

Next they can bring their beds to work and ask their wives along for the week end.

Syndicalist

MAY DAY and the TWO

AN English premier pays homage at the White House. The heel of an American army of occupation walks the pavements of London and the cliffs of Northern Ireland. And the symbol of hands across the sea is converted to the eagle claw of Yankee imperialism stretching towards Europe as its fellow clamps on the vassalised republics of South and Central America.

Yet this America which has become immediate to English people, the America which is senior partner in the axis of Anglo-Saxon imperialism, is not the only America. And this festival of May Day which we celebrate to demonstrate international revolutionary solidarity shows in its origins the essential conflict between the two Americas.

For May Day is a festival peculiarly American and also peculiarly anarchist. It was founded in memory of the murder by the law and the American State of the five Chicago Anarchists, August Spiès, George Engel, Adolph Fischer and Albert Parsons, hanged on the 11th November, 1887—and Louis Lingg who killed himself the night before his execution—for an offence of which they were proved innocent six years later by the representative of the very system that had destroyed them. In May of the year in which they died, during an agitation for the eight-hour day, the police of Chicago had attacked a peaceable demonstration and killed and injured many workers. At a meeting in protest against this outrage, the police were again about to attack the demonstrators when a bomb was thrown by a person whose identity has remained unknown to this day. Six policemen died, and the five anarchists were arrested and tried for inciting the perpetrator of the bombing. The trial was a complete frame-up, with faked evidence and a packed jury—as was proved later by Governor Altgeld—and the men were condemned to death for an act of terrorism in which they had no hand. The crime for which they really died was their opposition to the state and capitalism in the name of the freedom of the workers.

The America which is England's ally and master in this war, the bastion of democracy which the guileful proclaim and the simple hope will defeat (with a little

help from libertarian Joe Stalin and Chiang Kai-Shek) the forces of oppression and reaction, is the America that slew the anarchists of Chicago for their resistance to its purposes.

This America represents the most highly developed capitalism the world has yet known, a capitalism uncompromising in all its deeds, ruthless and inhumane. Politically corrupt, culturally vulgar, governed by no principle save that of acquisition, it stands opposed to all that was good in the old European world and to all the qualities of the new world we hope to build on its ruins.

It is this America of ingenious and cruel factory systems where men work like dehumanised tools until their nerves break down from the strain, the America of sweatshops and child labour, the America of Pinkerton guards and strike breaking on a scale more gigantic than ever in Europe. It is the America where for years the gang chiefs maintained an open terror in the great cities, controlled municipalities and police forces, and, by a tacit agreement with the Government itself, remained unmolested until their rivals the respectable capitalists, decided they were becoming too powerful and must be removed. It is the America where negroes are still lynched and trades unionists horsewhipped, where the Ku Klux Klan, precursor of Hitler's Black Guard, still persecutes minorities of race and opinion. It is the America of corrupt politicians and packed courts, the America of rackets and frame ups, the America that sent Sacco and Vanzetti to the electric chair and gave Tom Mooney a life sentence, for offences of which they were as innocent as the Chicago martyrs had been before them. It is the America from which every known revolutionary is debarred, and whose domestic movements against the state are crushed by Fascist methods that existed on its soil long before Fascism was born in Europe.

It is the America in which vulgarity has kept pace with capitalist expansion, and in which the debased standards of financial success have corrupted all the arts. It is the America in which journalism reached its depth in tabloid newspapers; whose early seizure of the film industry set a standard of corruption from which the cinema re-

AMERICAS

covered only partially in France and whose grandiose productions have notably assisted universal education and the press in keeping the workers mentally attuned to the requirements of the upper classes. It is the America which drove a generation of its best writers and artists, Henry James and T. S. Eliot, Wyndham Lewis and Ezra Pound, Gertrude Stein and Laura Riding, to seek refuge in the decaying societies of Europe where some civilisation at least remained rather than in the hard and inhumane environment of the new American society. It is the America in whose backward states it is still an offence to teach evolution!

It is the America where the poor can expect nothing but oppression, the negro nothing but persecution, the artist nothing but frustration, the revolutionary nothing but penitentiary or death.

But there is another America, which has grown with the America of capitalism, hidden under its oppression and cruelty but always living on and spreading in the lives and spirits of American men and women.

It is the America of individuals who protested against the corruption of their country, who rebelled against the monstrous exploitation almost inseparably connected with its name, who resisted oppression and persecution, fought against the frustration of the spirit, and went fearlessly to the jail, or,

GLASGOW MAY-DAY 1942

*Workers Boycott the "Labour"
and "Communist" Warmongers.*

Rally instead to the Anarchist Meeting

**Brunswick Street at 1 p.m.
on Sunday, May 3rd.**

George Woodcock

many, to death, when their actions made them feared by the state.

It is the America of Thoreau, who declared that in the American state the only place for the just man was the prison cell—and went there for his refusal to obey that state. It is the America of Whitman, with his protests against the evils of industrialism and his demand for a reintegration of the individual as the basis of society. It is the America of the Anarchist movement which led the struggles of the working class in the latter part of the 19th century, and of the I.W.W., the native syndical movement which remains today the leading revolutionary workers' organisation of America. It is the America of conscientious objectors and revolutionaries who suffered a brutal persecution in the Civil War and the first world war, and for whom the present war means a renewal of suffering.

It is the America of writers like Upton Sinclair who exposed the corruption and inhumanity of its social and economic systems, and of conscientious artists and scientists who have striven against a hostile environment to produce disinterested works of creation and research. It is the America of the live and spontaneous negro culture and of negro scholars and artists who have defeated the colour bar by the quality of their work.

It is above all the America of the thousands of nameless workers who have participated in revolutionary movements and industrial action in the endeavour to establish in America a society based on the principles of justice and freedom.

These are the two Americas which face us today. The first can be only the enemy of the English people as it has been of their American comrades. The second can be its friend in the struggle towards a new world society. It is for the workers and intellectuals of England to take their choice. Will they accept and support capitalist America, and so place on their shoulders the yoke of vassaldom to this most ruthless of exploiting systems? Or will they make common cause with the revolutionary elements of America in the fight for the world of peace and freedom for which died the five men whose memory we celebrate today?

Educating African Natives

"Africa's native peoples, to whom modern war and its weapons are dark mysteries, are to be shown up-to-date newsreels of the war made specially for them.

The Allied cause is explained by parable. One film, says Reuter from Johannesburg, shows a fight to the death between a mongoose and a snake, Mr. Churchill being the mongoose and Hitler the snake.

At first the mongoose has a tough time of it; but by biding his time he kills the snake in the end.

A favourite film is "Mr. English at home," so arranged that Africans can appreciate through their own family lives how the white man lives."

Reynolds News, 26.4.42

No doubt after having seen Mr. English mixing his whisky and soda and Mrs. English's elegant dresses the African will thank God (of the British) for their mud hut and scanty food.

Gauleiter Laval

Newspapers are full of articles about 'gauleiter Laval' painting him with the darker colours. Not only is he cunning, lazy, ignorant, selfish, suspicious, a plotter, an arch traitor, a master crook, a yes-man, but we are informed that he is a vulgar eater, an endless smoker etc., etc. All this may be true of course but it is curious how the corruption of politicians is exposed only when they are on the other side. It will be well to remember that Laval came to London in 1931 to attend the Seven Powers conference and that he was at that time received as a guest of honour (what the newspapers said of him at the time would be interesting to look up).

Laval is now made responsible for the sell out of Abyssinia to Mussolini. *Reynolds News (19.4.42)* says "Laval's dabbling in international politics was disastrous to France. His sell out to Mussolini over Abyssinia, his complete subservience to international financiers and industrialists, made him the most dangerous statesman in Europe." Has the *Reynolds* journalist forgotten that the pact selling Abyssinia to Italy was called the Hoare-Laval pact (and is said to have been hatched by Lord Vansittart) which means that at the time when Laval was considered an honest man he was probably the stooge of British financiers and industrialists.

It is thanks to a corrupted press which praises or blames according to those who are in power that men like Laval are able to carry on. It is not for journalists to assume the air of moralists.

I wish I were a Horse

"Nearco was invincible on the racecourse winning all the 14 races in which he started. He earns 16,000 guineas a year in stud fees, at 400 guineas a time. He is well insured, but Mr. Benson decided that the loss of such a horse would be serious for English thoroughbred breeding. So at a cost of more than £500 an air-conditioned underground shelter was built. Every night Nearco walks from his box to the shelter, every morning he is brought up again."

Evening Standard 10.4.42

Surface brick shelters are good enough for London people.

Tactless Comment

"The Whist Club Committee has decided to win the war this year, and has sent its plans to Churchill—a member who said we should win the war quicker if the committee worked out Hitler's plans for him has been asked to resign."

Nat Gubbins in the *Sunday Express 5.4.42*

Democratic Army

Headline in the evening newspapers for 21st of April:

PRINCESS REVIEWS HER REGIMENT

"Princess Elizabeth, who is 16 to-day, made her first appearance in public at an official ceremony.

As colonel, she reviewed the Grenadier Guards, at a special birthday parade of the regiment at Windsor Castle.

Princess Elizabeth wore a coat and skirt of powder blue material, cut on utility lines, with no unnecessary trimmings and only two pockets."

(Emphasis not ours)

The "Manchester Guardian" carried a photograph measuring 9 x 8 ins., of the princess reviewing her regiment. Talk about waste of paper!

Through

Eating for Victory

"I understand that organisations which have been holding regular luncheons or dinners may shortly cease to do so. An official statement is expected from the Government discouraging these functions.

It has been my duty to attend a good many of these functions. Rarely have I heard anything that could not be said equally well from the platform of a public meeting. More than once I have come away wondering what the point of it all was.

Some of these luncheons are attended by 500 or 600 people. You may ask how all these people can spend two or three hours in the middle of the day sitting round a table to eat. I have asked myself the question many times."

Evening Standard 11.4.42

What we are fighting for

Lord Halifax in a speech in New York (Reported in the "Manchester Guardian" 9.4.42) did not talk about the independence of the Indian people but assured his audience that we were ready to sacrifice ourselves for the independence of the Indian...princes.

"They and their States do not fit easily into the picture of India as the Congress party would like to draw it. Yet the independence of the Princes is enshrined in solemn treaties between their King Emperor, and such treaties are only alterable by negotiation. To scrap these or any other treaties unilaterally would be to scrap one of the principles for which we went to war with Germany."

Beating the Japs

"Four men offered themselves to the R.A.A.F. as "human bombs," but Mr. Drakeford said today that there is no intention of accepting the offers.

"It is gratifying, however, that Australia still breeds men who place their country above life itself," he added.—Express News Service."

Japanese human torpedoes were described as barbaric.

Atrocity Pictures

"I have in front of me copies of the same picture published in two Sunday papers. The picture shows corpses lying on the ground in the snow and a man in a Russian cap supporting in his arms a woman with her arms outstretched. According to one paper this is a picture of a Russian father raising the murdered body of his daughter in Kerch. According to the other this is the picture of a mother who "has searched among the bodies of the slain, dreading to see a well-loved face upturned in death. Her worst fears are realised. She finds her son slain, and in an abandonment of grief flings wide her arms and cries her anguish aloud." Somebody ought to have made up his mind whether this woman with her arms outstretched was a corpse or not."

Critic in *The New Statesman and Nation*, 18.4.41

the Press

Learning from Dr. Funk

The City Editor of the "News Chronicle" is prepared to learn from Dr. Funk. Why not? Dr. Funk has very good ideas about how to make the workers work harder without greater compensation. It is unkind of the City Editor to call Dr. Funk an enemy, from his article it is quite obvious that he does not mean it. The enemies are the workers who must be twisted and exploited as much as possible.

"On the principle that it is right to learn from your enemy, two points in the recent speech of Dr. Funk, President of the Reichsbank, to the annual meeting of shareholders are worth a little attention.

One which our own rather indiscriminating exponents of inflation as an "incentive" to war workers might note was his assertion that surplus money is liable to lead to a "lowering of the will to work."

It is not possible, in his view, to limit the creation of new money during the war or to keep it strictly in step with the volume of available goods, but the State must at all costs reabsorb the surplus money by taxation or savings drives, lest the expansion of war production be checked and social discontents arise. It seems to me a good point. The plea for more "incentive at the margin" by reducing taxation on overtime pay, etc., not only rests on a fundamental dishonesty (since in wartime you just can't afford to give extra material satisfactions), but, according to this German testimony is psychologically fallacious, since the worker who gets too much money is liable to slack off when he finds he can't spend it."

KINGSTON

— Every Saturday at 6 p.m. —

MARKET PLACE

— Speakers on the Anarchist platform —

Overworked Children

Thanks merely to the use made by German propaganda of Bevin's Order enabling children in the pottery industry to work 53 hours a week the order has been revoked. But at the same time Bevin, hoping probably to get away with it, has renewed the hours of child labour in the cotton industry from 44 hours to 52 hours a week. The failure to attract adult labour in the cotton industry is due to the bosses themselves who always refused to supply any guarantee of social security. Why Mr. Bevin should come to the rescue of the cotton order at the expense of children's health is difficult to understand. Will he revoke his order only when scared by Goebbels propaganda?

N. Gubbins on Anarchism!

All Governments hate or despise the people. All people hate or despise their Governments.

Query: Why have Governments?

Answer: To avoid anarchy.

Query: What is anarchy?

Answer: Dictionary definition: "The extreme theory of individual liberty."

Query: Then what's wrong with anarchy?

Answer: Absolute individual liberty means that silly or wicked people can do as they like without considering the needs or desires of other members of the community.

Query: Is Hitler an anarchist?

Answer: No. Hitler is a Government man.

Query: Then the difference between government and anarchy is that in the first system a few silly or wicked people can do as they like and in the second all silly and wicked people can do as they like?

Answer: That is true if you compare Hitler's Government with anarchy, but not if you compare the British Government with anarchy.

Query: Why?

Answer: Because the British Government is a democracy, wise, kind and tolerant.

Query: What about Mr. Morrison?

Answer: There you go again. You'll get yourself suppressed if you're not careful.

Sunday Express, 26.4.42

More Anarchism from Kingsley Martin

"But supposing Congress had been successful and the British had been forced to withdraw, then, however triumphant Congress would have been, Gandhi, at the head of the Government, would have had to behave as a head of the Government. Would he not have had to use force if necessary to prevent Fascist risings or Fascist invasions? And if he were prepared to use police, where draw the line between them and soldiers, if Fascism, national or international were armed? Non-violence is an individual technique of holiness which may in certain circumstances be the best technique for resistance, but it cannot be the basis on which a State is founded, for its character is essentially negative, and the State by definition involves coercion."

Kingsley Martin

The New Statesman and Nation, 11.4.42

Film Studio Workers and Trade Unions

THE Association of Cine-Technicians, trade union of those workers in the Film Industry who handle negative film (i.e. directors, cutters, camera-men and laboratory workers) held its ninth annual General Meeting on April 19.

The majority of these workers have in the past resisted unionisation on the grounds that they were artists and their future could best be assured by their talents rather than by organisation. The growth of monopoly among their employers has brought them to the view that their problems are not essentially different from those of other workers although their estimates of what constitutes a fair wage may be more generous.

The most active officers of the union have always been a strongly pro-Stalinist group, and although the membership has been aware of this and resented it, the 'clique' concerned, being connected with the documentary film side of the industry rather than with feature films, has tended to be better able to meet in Central London than are the representatives from the studios. A suggestion was in fact placed before a previous Annual General Meeting to the effect that is the industry is located in three main areas, London, Elstree and Uxbridge, the union should be correspondingly decentralised. Unfortunately the General Council were successful in getting this motion defeated.

The combination of the War, with its increase in the use of short propaganda films, and Russia's entry into the war has made the power of the pro-Stalinist Documentary film people almost absolute. At General Meetings, red tape rules forbidding the proposal of resolutions or amendments at the meeting itself, and preventing any member speaking twice on the same resolution are rigidly enforced. Thus a member speaking at the commencement of a discussion is precluded from replying to points arising subsequently, but this, says the chairman, is just the bad luck of the person so silenced!

Such a parody of democracy is justified by the usual excuse that "*Unless we enforced this we should be here all night.*" Time can nevertheless be spared for such futilities as "Greetings to anti-Fascist peoples" (i.e., the U.S.S.R.), "Lift the ban on the Daily Worker," and proposed affiliation to the Labour Party, which later was incidentally thrown out for the second time. The net result of all this is that the members, new to the ranks of organised labour, are frustrated in their efforts to discuss grievances relating to their work, and instead of developing into class-conscious workers become resigned to paying over their dues and entrusting their fate to the Stalinists and union bureaucrats.

A.C.T. (Association of Cine-Technicians) is considering enrolling clerical workers in the film industry, but only if no other union claims them. To union officials the proper observation of professional courtesy between one craft union and another is of far greater importance than giving to the workers the powerful strike weapon they would have under a policy of "One Industry, One Union." It must not be forgotten that when, during the E.T.U. strike just before the war, Gainsborough Studio electricians came out in support of fellow E.T.U. men in the cinemas owned by the same company they all lost

their jobs to blacklegs from A.C.T. and N.A.T.K.E. (National Association of Theatre and Kinema Employees) Yet A.C.T. annual report states "Inter-union agreements continue in co-operation between the three unions." The obvious need is for a union that really unites all film studio workers—technicians, electricians, studio projectionists and clerical workers, etc.

The General Council wants to add a paid organiser to its staff and is trying to lure one from another union. It has also paid fees for three members to take correspondence courses for trade union officials.

Trade union leading is of course a profession, and apparently also a reserved occupation. It is handed down from father to son (A.C.T. General Secretary is the son of a former T.U.C. President) and when you have reached the highest salary your present union can afford, you simply get transferred to a richer union. It does not matter if you know nothing about the industry that will have to support you, it will be all right so long as you've taken the appropriate correspondence course.

Books on Anarchism and Russia

POETRY AND ANARCHISM

by Herbert Read 3s 6d.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF ANARCHISM

by Herbert Read. 3rd impression 1s.

REVOLUTIONARY GOVERNMENT

by P. Kropotkin 3d.

ANARCHISM AND DEMOCRACY

by J. Wakeman 2d.

THE GENERAL IDEA OF THE REVOLUTION in the 19th Century

by P. J. Proudhon 2s.

Incomplete files of SPAIN AND THE WORLD

(prices on application)

WAR COMMENTARY—For Anarchism

Files of Vol. 2. November 1940—October 1941
including Supplements 3s. 6d. post free

THE RUSSIAN MYTH (2nd printing) 3d.

BOLSHEVISM—PROMISES AND REALITY

By P G. Maximov 2d.

AFTERTHOUGHTS ON THE U.S.S.R.

by A. Gide 2s. 6d.

STALIN: A CRITICAL SURVEY OF

BOLSHEVISM by Boris Souvarine (690 p.) 16s.

TROTSKY PROTESTS TOO MUCH

by E. Goldman 2d.

THE KRONSTADT REVOLT

by A. Ciliga 2d

THE RUSSIAN ENIGMA by A. Ciliga...2s. 6d.

(Please add 2d. in the 1s. to all orders for postage)

Orders for books advertised in

WAR COMMENTARY should be sent to
Freedom Press, 27 Belsize Rd., London N.W.6.

INDIA

Big fleas have little fleas. . . .

INDIA is now in the war, and the Nationalist leaders are urging the Indian people to preserve "national unity" at all costs in order to repel the Japanese invasion which threatens. This is the actual situation in concrete terms. And it is necessary to state it thus, because with the break up of the Cripps-Congress negotiations, it appeared that neither side had made any concessions, that there had been a reversion to the previous position. Actually the Congress leaders have compromised, while trying to give the impression that their position has been one of uncompromising adherence to principle.

We pointed out in an article "Who Will Defend India?" in our last issue, that the position of privilege occupied by the Indian bourgeoisie and their Congress representatives is itself dependent on the maintenance of the present position in India. With the expulsion of the British, the position of the Congress leaders and the native bourgeoisie would be very weak indeed, as the struggle between the small possessing class and the vast numbers of dispossessed workers and peasants would then break out and overwhelm them. Similarly, they would suffer eclipse in the event of a successful Japanese invasion. Hence, they cannot turn to their own people to overthrow the Japanese invader by a great revolutionary uprising; instead they turn to the British.

From a position in which they declared that "Congress cannot in any way, directly or indirectly, participate in such a war which means the perpetuation of exploitation," they have moved into a position of actual support for the war, which in the circumstances means support for the British Imperialists.

It is from this angle that the Cripps Mission must be regarded. In spite of its apparently sterile result, it will be seen, on analysis, to have produced advantages for both the British Government and the Indian Congress. The only people who are worse off are the Indian workers and peasants.

BLAMING THE INDIANS

What did the British gain? The defeats in Malaya and Burma, had given the demands in this country, and America, for "Independence for India" a new impetus. The upholders of democracy had to make some sort of gesture to rally their failing support. Knowing the position of the Congress leaders, the Cripps gesture could easily be made with Cripps playing the now familiar part of Labour stooge to the Tory Imperialists. In the circumstances, the Imperialists stood to gain either way. If the mission succeeded, Churchill and Amery had proved that they were fighting for democracy by promising India Dominion Status after the war (the question of getting out of it could safely be left till after the war!). If it "failed"—as has actually happened—it can be claimed that it only shows how right the Tories have always been about the necessity for the Indians to solve their communal problems first (are they really

ready to forego British tutelage yet? etc., etc.). They win either way, and a special correspondent in New Delhi already wrote on April 13th. (*Manchester Guardian*) "the outcome does not reflect the "failure of a mission," rather does it exemplify the unwillingness of the Indian political leaders to compromise." Blame the other chap!

BLAMING THE BRITISH

If Churchill and Co. have succeeded in confusing their anti-imperialist critics, and contrived to put the blame on the Indian leaders, what have the latter got out of it?

That they were ready to compromise is shown by the fact that they took part in discussions lasting several weeks. Now, however, they can turn round and say "Look, we wouldn't compromise with the Imperialists." After all this negotiation Gandhi waits till now to say that British proposals "on the face of them, were too ridiculous to find acceptance anywhere" (*News Chronicle*, 20.4.42). Meanwhile, Nehru declares that "naturally the average reaction of India will be one of irritation against the British Government" (*Manchester Guardian*, 13.4.42) They know how to blame the other fellow too.

The Congress leaders do not trust the Indian people; they will not call on them to throw off all oppressors by means of a revolutionary uprising. Hence their only alternative is to seek help from the British themselves. Faced with the Japanese threat to their class positions and privileges, they are compelled to abate their opposition to Britain's Imperialist war. Nehru declares that "today the question of non-co-operation with Britain does not arise, because it would inevitably mean an invitation to the Japanese to come to India and would be an enormous help to Japan. In India it was absurd to call this a people's war and it was equally absurd to call it an imperialistic war. It was a war, ultimately for each country that was involved in it, for survival." He has chosen the lesser evil of British Imperialism, rather than the greater evil of Japanese Imperialism; it does not occur to him, nor to any other Social Democrat, that the workers should reject both evil choices, and instead throw off all oppression and take the initiative themselves by social revolution. For the nationalist Nehru, the Marxist and Friend of Soviet Russia, as for Churchill and Pollitt, war is no longer a matter of struggle between the ruling classes for the spoils wrenched from the dispossessed workers; it is a struggle between nations for survival.

The position of the Indian leaders is thus filled with contradictions. Following hard upon the Congress denunciations of the Imperialist war, Nehru now declares that is "absurd to call this an imperialistic war." While "deprecating the idea of embarrassing the Government by obstructing the war effort" (*Manchester Guardian*, 21.4.42), he also says "we cannot participate in Britain's war effort" (*Manchester Guardian*, 13.4.42). What then are the proposals put forward by the Congress? "The problem for us" declares Nehru "is how to organize our own war effort on our own basis of a free and independent India. I hope that the All-India Congress Committee, meeting in a fortnight's time, will consider this and tell us what to do."

It is a little difficult to see how one can organize a war effort on a basis of freedom which doesn't exist; still more difficult to see how that freedom can be achieved without "embarrassing the Government."

CARDIFF EAST BY-ELECTION

(From our correspondent)

SOME interesting facts came out in this campaign. First, that the Government was unable to arouse any enthusiasm, in spite of the backing of the Press all round. It was a little too evident that it was only the old game—a man put into the Cabinet, a seat to be found, an irritating formality in the way of a bye-election. Even if he had been defeated, some other and safer seat would

INDIA continued.

For the one thing that is absolutely certain is that the Cripps mission has not effected in the slightest the servitude of the Indian workers and peasants. There is only one thing that the All-India Congress Committee can constructively advise, and that is to secure freedom first. But since that would involve revolutionary struggle, we may be sure that they will not in fact advise that. Indeed, as we have seen, faced with the choice of looking to the Indian people or the British Imperialists for support, they have already chosen the latter.

UNCHAIN THE GIANT

It cannot be too often pointed out that a war for freedom *against foreign aggression* can only be fought by people who are already free. The recent examples of Malay and Burma only confirm the general lessons of the last ten years. Fascist aggression succeeds because the governments of the countries it attacks, are afraid to allow their people the freedom necessary to conduct an effective struggle. Fascism's strength is in its opponents weakness—in the inability of workers already enchained to fight against their master's foes. Only when the workers throw off their own parasitic ruling class, as the Spanish workers did in 1936, can they put up a successful fight against fascism.

In India, the British have to keep the workers and peasants unarmed and helpless, in order that their own tiny minority can garrison the vast country for the shareholders in London. India is a giant in chains—and it is those chains alone which make it possible for the Japanese to contemplate a successful attack. As in Malaya, Burma, and the Dutch East Indies, the fact of Imperialist subjection has been their trump card. The Congress leaders, because of their own dependence on British Imperialism, have shown themselves unable and unwilling to strike this card from their hands. Only the social revolution can do that. In India, as in Spain, fascism within and without can only be crushed by the workers themselves; they must first free themselves from their present yoke by revolutionary action, seizing the land, the mines and factories. And having overthrown their rulers and exploiters, they must see to it that control does not pass from their hands (as it did in Spain and Russia) into those of some new political minority, who will enslave them anew.

The Congress leaders' appeals represent one more example of the Social Democrats' nationalistic sell-out of the workers' struggle into the hands of the exploiters, *and at the same time to the foreign enemy, Japan.*

have been found, as with the MacDonalds. Sir James Grigg the man could not hope to arouse any welcome. But Sir James Grigg the representative of Churchill's cabinet ought to have done, and the fact that he didn't showed the apathy with which the government is regarded. A very small crowd in front of the City Hall heard the result of the victory for Churchill's man, and (as reported by the *Cardiff and Suburban News* 18.4.42) "*there were scarcely any cheers, and Sir James and Lady Grigg caught the afternoon train to London.*" One might have added "and that's the last we'll see of *them.*"

Mr. Fenner Brockway, representing the I.L.P., undoubtedly did well to poll 3,300 votes against 10,000; but of course his policy did not bring out a clear revolutionary case, and unquestionably many Labour Party votes went to the I.L.P., simply out of dislike of the Tory shoved on to East Cardiff, a working class district quite unsuited to the gentleman.

Proselyte Zeal

The Communist Party showed itself once again as the stooge of the Tories. It is, to do it credit, quite frank now about its policy. Idris Cox, (the South Wales Communist Organizer), explains in a letter to the Editor of the above named paper:

"... It is a disturbing fact that Mr. Fenner Brockway succeeded in getting over 3,000 anti-Government votes. We Communists supported Sir James Grigg because we believe in building national unity behind the Government. . . I agree with Mr. Brockway that his 3,311 votes are *not* votes for Hitler. They are votes which express indignation at the weakness and failures of the present Government, and the low pay and allowances of the armed forces and their dependents, and the inequalities of sacrifices and the suspicion that Britain will let Russia down. . . Cardiff East is a signal that this discontent can be used to assist Hitler unless the British Government changes its policy.

We Communists would have liked to do more in the Campaign. But while the Tories were glad to announce our support for Sir James Grigg they were reluctant to work in active co-operation with the Communists. This was most unfortunate for we Communists were in a strong position to expose the real meaning of I.L.P. policy than were the Tories who are associated in the minds of Labour supporters with policies which have always been detrimental to the workers."

Why are the Communists in a stronger position to expose the "real meaning" of the I.L.P. Policy? Because the Communists can pretend to be pro-working class and the Tories can't. If Sir James Grigg had encouraged Idris Cox and her friends a bit more, they would have given him a bigger vote expressing satisfaction with the "*weakness and failures of the present Government etc.*" The Carlton Club must shake off its prejudices and recognize King Street.

Every Friday Evening

at 7.30 p.m.

LECTURES

FREEDOM PRESS ROOMS

27 Belsize Road, N.W.6. (Swiss Cottage Und)

C. Berneri

PETER KROPOTKIN

His Federalist Ideas

ONE of the most interesting aspects of Kropotkin's political thought is the federalist idea which constantly recurs in his writings and forms one of the basic factors in his anarchist ideology. Although Kropotkin's federalism is not a systematic theory and cannot be very clearly differentiated from that of Proudhon or Bakunin, it nevertheless presents various characteristics which make its study of interest.

For such a study a biographical excursus is needed in order to illuminate for us the beginnings of Kropotkin's federalist thought in relation to the surroundings in which it formed itself and developed. Tilgher, writing about Kropotkin rightly remarks: "*It is impossible to understand the intimate spirit of the anarchist movement if one does not consider it historically as a radical and violent reaction against the profound transformation undergone during the nineteenth century by the institution of the State.*"

Kropotkin, the anarchist-prince, provides the best example of this assertion.

Kropotkin's clear and detailed biography enables us to follow the different phases in the development of his federalist thought step by step.

At the age of nineteen, when he was an officer of the Cossacks, he went to Transbaikalia where he took a passionate interest in the great reforms undertaken by the government in 1862, and carried out by the Higher Administration of Siberia. As secretary to government committees he was in touch with the best of the civil servants and began to study the various projects of local government administration. But he very soon saw that the reforms proposed by the District Chiefs and protected by the Governors General, were submitted to the orders and influence of the central government. Administrative life revealed to him every day absurdities in system and method. Seeing the impossibility of achieving any kind of reforms, he took part in 1863 in an expedition along the Amur.

During a storm forty barges were sunk with the loss of 2,000 tons of flour. This catastrophe gave him an opportunity of getting to know the bureaucratic system still better. The authorities refused to believe in the disaster, while the civil servants concerned with *Siberian affairs* in Petrograd revealed a complete ignorance of all that concerned their particular . . . speciality. A high functionary said to him: "*But my dear fellow, how would it be possible for 40 barges to be destroyed on the Neva without someone jumping in to save them!*" When Kropotkin replied that the Amur is four times as big as the Neva, the astonished functionary asked: "*But is it really as big as all that?*"—and passed on, annoyed, to talk of some frivolity.

Kropotkin went to Manchuria more than ever distrustful of the central government. He probably thought of the Petrograd bureaucrats when at the Chinese frontier an official of the Celestial Empire refused his passport because it was only composed

of a modest sheet of stamped paper, but showed the greatest respect for an old copy of the bulky Moscow gazette which was shown to him as a passport.

As an attache of the "Governor General for Cossack affairs," Kropotkin made an accurate enquiry into the economic conditions of the Cossacks of the Usuri. On his return to Petrograd he was congratulated, promoted, and got special rewards. But his proposals were not put into practice because of the officials who stole money and continued to flog the peasants, instead of furnishing them with cattle and, by prompt and suitable assistance, relieving the effects of famine. "And thus it went on in all directions, beginning with the winter palace at St. Petersburg and ending with the Usuri and Kamchátka." The higher administration of Siberia was influenced by excellent intentions, and I can only repeat that, everything considered, it was far better, far more enlightened, and far more interested in the welfare of the people than the administration of any other province in Russia. But it was an administration—a branch of the tree which had its roots at St. Petersburg—and that was enough to paralyse all its excellent intentions, enough to make it interfere with and kill all the beginnings of local life and progress. Whatever was started for the good of the country by local men was looked at with distrust, and was immediately paralysed by hosts of difficulties which came, not so much from the bad intentions of the administrators, but simply from the fact that these officials belonged to a pyramidal, centralised administration. The very fact of their belonging to a government which radiated from a distant capital caused them to look upon everything from the point of view of functionaries of the government, who think first of all about what their superiors will say, and how this or that will appear in the administrative machinery. The interests of the country are a secondary matter."

Parallel with his knowledge of the inefficiency of the central administration bodies, his observations on the *free association of those engaged in common interests* which he made throughout his long journeys in Siberia and Manchuria also contributed to the formation of his anarchist personality. He saw clearly the role played by the anonymous masses in great historic events and in the development of civilisation. This realization, as we shall see later, influenced the whole of his sociological criticism, and was fundamental to his method of historical research.

When Kropotkin went to Switzerland, his libertarian and federalist tendencies were greatly influenced by his contact with the Jura Federation, which in 1872 had assumed marked autonomist and anti-authoritarian tendencies. One should note that the development of these tendencies was in great part due to the strongly centralized, not to say tyrannical, domination of the International.*

It is necessary to add that the militants of the Jura Federation were imbued with the anarchism of Bakunin which was essentially federalist. Kropotkin, as he himself states, was never in direct contact with Bakunin.

On his return to Russia, he got in touch with the groups of left-wing intellectuals, and he realized anew the uselessness of the attempts made by those who tried to regenerate the country through the *zemstvos*. Such work was suspected of being separatist, of trying to form a State within the State, and was persecuted to such a point that any attempt to improve the rural administration with regard to health services or schools was a miserable failure, and carried with it the ruin of entire groups of members elected to the *zemstvos*.

Notwithstanding the disappointments attendant on his administrative experience, before he left Russia, Kropotkin set to work once more. Having inherited his father's property at Tambov, he went to live there and devoted all his energies to the local *zemstvo*. But he was compelled once more to realise the impossibility of setting up schools, co-operatives, or model factories without creating new victims of the central government.

From the articles that Kropotkin published between 1879 and 1882 in the *Revolte* of Geneva, it seems clear that the administrative system of the West only provided him with new material for his criticisms against the State, and confirmed him still further in his federalist and libertarian ideas. Wherever centralism existed he found a powerful bureaucracy.

"It creates an army of office-holders, sitting like spiders in their webs, who have never seen the world except through the dingy panes of their office windows and only know it from their files and absurd formulae—a black band, who have no other religion except money, and no other thought but of sticking to any party, black, purple or white, so long as it guarantees a maximum salary for a minimum of work."

P. Kropotkin, *Paroles d'un revolté*

Centralism, resulting in excessive bureaucracy, appeared to Kropotkin as one of the characteristics of the representative system. He saw in the parliamentary regime the triumph of incompetence, and he described with picturesque irony the administrative and legislative activities of the M.P. who is not called upon to judge and deal with matters for which he is specially fitted, but is asked to vote on a series of questions, of an infinite variety, arising from those elephantine machines that are the centralised State.

"He will have to vote taxes on dogs and the reform of university education, without ever having set foot in a university or ever knowing a country dog. He will have to give his opinion on the advantages of the Gras rifle and on the site for the State stables. He will have to vote on the Phylloxera, on grain, tobacco, primary education and urban sanitation; on Cochin China and Guiana, on chimneys and the Paris Observatory. He has never seen soldiers except on manoeuvres, but he will dispose army corps; never having met an Arab, he will make and re-make the Mussulman legal code in Algeria. He will vote for the shako or the kepi according to the tastes of his wife. He will protect sugar and sacrifice grain. Will destroy the vine under the impression that he is protecting it. Will vote for afforestation against pasturage, and protect pasturage against the forest. He will have to show his ability in banking. He will sacrifice a canal or a railway without knowing in what part of France they are situated. He will add new articles to the legal code without ever consulting it. A veritable Proteus, omniscient and omnipotent, to-day a soldier and to-morrow a pig-man, suc-

cessively a banker, an academician, a street-sweeper, doctor, astronomer, drug-manufacturer, tanner, or contractor according to the orders of the day in Parliament, he never knows a moment's hesitation. Accustomed in his capacity as lawyer journalist or public orator, to speak of things he knows nothing of, he votes for all these and other questions as well, with only this difference; while in the newspapers he merely amused with his gossip, and in the court room his voice only awoke the sleeping judges, in Parliament he will make laws for thirty or forty million inhabitants."

P. Kropotkin, *Paroles d'un revolté*.

But the western countries, together with the ridiculous administrations of the centralised parliamentary regimes, revealed to him the immense strength, vaster and more complex, observed in the Russian *Mir*: that of the free associations which "extend themselves and cover every branch of human activity," and which made him declare that "the future is in the hands of free associations and not of centralized governments." Especially the years spent in England, a country where the independence of the people and the enormous development of free initiative could not fail to strike the foreigner coming from Slav or Latin countries, made Kropotkin attach great, sometimes even excessive, importance to associations.

From his direct knowledge of the Western world, Kropotkin added a new tendency in his studies. A geographer in Russia, he became an ardent historian in Britain. He wished to understand the State and knew that in order to do so "there is only one way; that of studying it in its historic development." He discovered with enthusiasm that the general tendency of science is that "of studying nature not from its large results and great conclusions, but rather through single phenomena, through separate elements." History also ceases to be the history of dynasties, and becomes the history of peoples. So much the better for historical method, but also for the federalist conception, for it will become obvious that great progressive changes have not taken place in courts and parliaments, but in the city, in the countryside. Devoting himself to historical studies, Kropotkin saw in the excessive centralization of the Roman Empire the cause of its collapse, and in the epoch of the Communes the renaissance of the western world. "It is in the enfranchisement of the Communes and in the uprisings of the people and the Communes against the State, that we find the most beautiful pages of history."

(to be concluded)

DEBATE

Anarchism v. Socialism

Anarchist & Socialist Party of Great Britain
speakers.

CONWAY HALL

Red Lion Square, Holborn.

MAY 31st, 7.30 p.m.

Admission Free

MAN versus MACHINE

IT is apparent that today man is in a condition of slavery, not only in the sense that he is not free from the domination of other men through political and economic channels, but also in that he has harnessed himself to machinery and the technique of mass production. Much has been written on the development of the "mass man"—the process of changing self-reliant men and women, capable of originality and initiative, into units capable of playing their part in machine 'civilisation,' and many are aware of the danger of this de-humanising process. But the problem is not being seriously tackled. Perhaps this is not surprising from the point of view of those whose ideal is 'nationalisation' and centralised control, and who visualise the society of the future as one of immense technical and industrial efficiency. But a solution must be found by those who believe that the basis of a genuinely free and happy society is to be found in the individual and not the state.

To those whose god is industrial efficiency the suggestion that individuality should be re-introduced into work conjures up a picture of return to 'primitive' methods of production—handicrafts etc., and it is true that this is the extreme at the other end of the scale. Happiness, in the minds of most people, is associated with great abundance of material goods, and this is not unnatural when one considers the artificial shortage of commodities suffered by the majority under the existing capitalist system. This of course also applies to all other systems throughout the world at the present time, although no doubt the accent on materialism is heavier in 'western' countries.

The average 'progressive' continues to look upon work as something which one unfortunately has to perform in order to provide the means of existence. Therefore the more one can reduce hours by means of higher technical efficiency the better—the height of achievement being when no-one need work for more than about an hour a day. The rest of one's time may then be spent in *enjoyable* pursuits—music, art, sport and so on. This appears to presuppose a sort of Jekyll and Hyde phenomenon on the part of the people: for a short period they work like efficient machines in their factories and afterwards become transformed into free and individualistic people for the rest of the time.

This, surely, is an unrealistic and in any case an undesirable aim. Our efforts should be directed towards the integration of our various activities into an harmonious whole. Work, which is now more often than not looked upon as something to be avoided, something unpleasant, must be looked upon as a pleasure, and this changed outlook can only be brought about when work means more to people than a method by which they can scrape a mere existence. It must become the essential part of their existence—a means of not only producing articles of use to mankind but also a means of self-expression. This brings us back to the problem—can this be achieved in spite of the continuous drive towards more and more efficient machine production?

If there is one phrase I have always abhorred it is "Steering a middle course," but I must confess that this seems to be the only solution to the problem posed above. It is obviously impossible for a man to take a deep and personal interest in the production of an article if he is only responsible for say a fiftieth part of it, and that requiring no great measure of skill—perhaps only the occasional feeding or re-starting of a machine. At the same time it would be ridiculous to propose the scrapping of all the wonderful machines designed and made by engineers and draughtsmen, and a reversion to purely handicraft methods. What is required is a changed attitude towards machinery. It should not be looked upon as something to *replace* human beings, but as a means of supplementing human effort. In other words, if machinery can be utilised by men and women in whatever occupation they may be pursuing without eliminating the essential personal nature of their work, so well and good. But the machine must be subordinate to the worker's creative ideas.

Even if the majority 'philosophically' agreed with the foregoing it would of course be useless merely to advocate the ideas in the form of a policy—something to be accepted or rejected. A change in the direction indicated can only come when and if the people feel its vital necessity to the point of acting, and I personally believe that in its advocacy of syndicalist organisation (particularly in such an over-industrialised country as this) the anarchist movement should express its antagonism towards the de-humanising process of the machine age.

L.A.H.

JUST OUT!

ANARCHY

by

E. Malatesta

26 pp.

3d.

(postage 1d.)

Preceded by a Biographical Note
A clear exposition of Anarchism

A.B.C. of ANARCHISM

by

Alexander Berkman

128 pp.

1s.

(Postage 3d.)

This book explains Anarchism in a simple language. The ideas expressed by the author go to the roots of the class struggle which he knew well from his own experience in the American working class movement.

Freedom Press

27 Belsize Road, London, N. W. 6.

WHEN YOU HAVE FINISHED
WITH YOUR COPY OF WAR
COMMENTARY PASS IT ON TO
A FRIEND

Glasgow Anarchist in Court

Sentenced before Committing Offence!

COMRADE Denis Francis McGlynn (Glasgow Group), aged 27, appeared before Sheriff Burns at Dunbartonshire, on Wednesday the 11th March, charged with refusing to attend for "Medical" examination by the Military Authorities.

He had previously appeared before the C.O. Tribunals in Glasgow and Edinburgh refusing to recognise the right of the State to decide how he should conduct his life.

Thos. Gardner Wilson, John Murphy and Alex. Smith White, all Officials at the Ministry of Labour and John Allen, detective, testified in the witness box against him.

Asked if he had anything to say, he replied: "Yes. I think I should say something, since I am going to be sentenced despite my demonstrated opposition not only to Imperialist war, but also to the Class system which produces War.

"I exercised my right as a Conscientious Objector to refuse to place my name on the Military Register, and whoever has placed my name on that register is guilty of forgery.

"I am an Anarchist. Now I know that you people are concerned only with the legal aspect of this case, but I am interested in the moral issues involved, as also to the extent to which my individual liberty is threatened. I am no partner to the making of the laws of this or any country, and therefore do not consider these laws bind me. It is by force and not by reason all governments enforce their laws.

We Anarchists are entitled to ask; "Since when did you people become opponents of 'Hitlerism'? Hitlerism is not peculiar to one country alone—it exists wherever man thrives on the exploitation of man. The Sheriff interrupted here—"I am not concerned with all this. The Court has a duty to perform. You failed to attend for medical examination because you are an Anarchist" Denis replied: Yes, I refuse at this or any other time to outrage my principles.

The Sheriff: Oh, Go on.

McGlynn "I am not one of those who have opposed 'Hitlerism' since 3rd September only, I have opposed authority and dictatorship since I was 18 years of age.

Sheriff: All this is irrelevant.

I wouldn't like to think I was going to be gagged.

Sheriff: I want none of your impertinence. I'll—I'll show you—I'll sentence you to contempt of court.

McGlynn: I have ignored all communications sent by the authorities in connection with Military Service, but I have come here to-day in answer to your summons in order to show that I am still an Anti-militarist, the decision of this or any other court notwithstanding.

Sheriff: What would the World be like if we were all Anarchist. We would be living without law back to the Stone-age, back to the rule of the club.

(My thoughts immediately jumped to the Policeman's baton, to the bayonets, the bullets, the bombs etc., of this highly law regulated society. In the Stone Age if you were a good runner, you could get away from "the club" but not so today)

The Sheriff continued "We cannot do as we wish without consideration for our neighbours. Every legal method gives absolute liberty to the individual, but the individual must curb his individuality for the liberty of his neighbour. You are a citizen of the State. The State gives you all the services that enable you to enjoy the privileges you do today. The rule of Law is the rule of reason and proceeds from the highest. I find you guilty, and sentence you to twelve months imprisonment.

The Procurator Fiscal: Your honour, that is not the sentence at this stage.

Denis was then ordered to appear for medical examination on 16th March. He appeared on that date but again refused, was arrested, and later appeared before the same sheriff who then sentenced him to twelve months imprisonment.

Denis lived in Clydebank and during the concentrated blitz there, he was caught in the blast from a land-mine, but escaped with only a few bruises. Amidst those harrowing scenes there stood Denis in contemplation with lips tight and jaw set. Since those days he has flung himself with greater vigour into our cause. Denis' greatest wish is to see others stepping into his shoes whilst he is incarcerated. Will you be one?

FRANK LEECH