

# Freedom

AN ANARCHIST FORTNIGHTLY

Vol. 12, No. 1

January 6th, 1951

Threepence

## FESTIVAL YEAR

As inveterate believers in fun and gaiety, we await with interest the 1951 Exhibition whose exciting architectural shapes are altering the appearance of the south bank of the Thames in central London. But while we are enjoying ourselves in the new Concert Hall, or at the "Live Architecture" exhibition at Poplar, or (except on Sundays) at the Fun Fair in Battersea Park, we will still be wondering what exactly the Festival will be celebrating, and what we have to get festive about.

We were warned last week that our prospects are grim, that we shall have to scorn delights and live laborious days, and that "the immediate outlook is bleak, the challenge very terrible" (Observer, 24/12/50). Mr. Herbert Morrison on the other hand, explaining the purposes of the Festival of Britain, tells us (Illustrated, 2/12/50), "As a matter of fact, the country's doing pretty well now... Between us all, we've mastered the post-war economic crisis. Now we really ought to think of ourselves a little." The Festival, he says, is going to record the progress in science and the arts, and their application to everyday life, made in Britain during the last hundred years. "Celebrating the centenary of the Great Exhibition of 1851 is a very good opportunity to see how we have been doing."

A hundred years ago, Queen Victoria, after opening the Great Exhibition, which her husband had organised in the Crystal Palace, described it in her diary as a "Peace Festival which united the industry of all nations of the earth." This could certainly not be said of this year's Festival. It will not be international, but strictly British, and it cannot be described as a festival of peace, for while it may have been conceived to demonstrate our industrial and social recovery from the last war, its function in the situation of 1951 will be to demonstrate Britain's "morale", strength and industrial capacity for the next one.

There is something deeply ironical in the fact that at the time when we are exhibiting our creative effort in, for instance, education, housing and public health, we should be curtailing our expenditure on them to make way for our destructive effort in becoming the arsenal of Western Europe, and that when our scientific and technological achievements are on show in the Dome of Discovery and the Pavilion of Industry, the housewife will find it hard to buy a kitchen pail or a coal-scuttle.

### Economic Fallacies

A few years ago, an exhibition was held of this country's manufactures, with the title "Britain Can Make It", and was promptly renamed by a cynical public, "Britain Can't Have It", since the goods displayed were reserved for the export market. Since the war the economic fallacies of the export drive have dominated our industry. The argument, with which we are all too familiar, is that in order to pay for our imported foodstuffs and raw materials we must export more and more manufactured goods, and consequently go without them ourselves. But many of the countries to which the goods were to be exported either don't need them, or cannot afford them, or prefer to encourage their own newly-established industries. This tendency is one which time intensifies rather than diminishes. An economy based on human values, instead of the nineteenth century conception of Britain as the workshop of the world, would be concerned with redressing the balance of agriculture and industry in these islands, so as to make us less dependent on the agricultural produce of the rest of the world and more able to supply our own needs from our own factories.

### Permanent Emergency

For years a large number of British workers had no work to do, then the threat of war brought them jobs again. Then for six years, if they weren't in the army, they were urged to "go to it", to work long hours, to think of the needs of our allies. When all this was over, the worker discovered that he must not slacken his efforts, or think of satisfying his own needs, he must think of the export drive. And now he is hurriedly told that the Dollar Gap has been closed, and that we must devote ourselves to re-armament and exports, and that while the governments are busy hoarding raw materials (they

call it stock-piling) it would be anti-social for us to build a reserve of those household goods which may disappear from the market during 1951, even assuming that we could afford to.

### "Airstrip One"

When we bear in mind that war preparation is invariably followed by war itself (it always has been), it is not very easy for thoughtful people to feel festive about the Festival Year. The war which is being prepared, or, to be accurate, has already started, between America and Russia is a struggle which cannot possibly be won by either side. The words 'victory' and 'defeat' have lost their meaning, we can only think of war in terms of priva-

tion, destruction and death. The rôle which Britain is expected to play has already been decided. Firstly an arsenal and then an advance air base.

The memorial to Prince Albert in Kensington shows him sitting reading the catalogue to his Great Exhibition of a hundred years ago. If a monument survives to the anonymous citizen of 1951 it should depict him reading the Government's Atomic Warfare Manual of Basic Training, which has been published with four pages omitted because the authorities dare not tell its Civil Defence volunteers the full biological effects of the atomic bomb.

What is our own attitude to be towards the situation of 1951? Since our influence is negligible, and since our position incurs the enmity of both the conflicting authoritarian forces, we can have no illusions about our power to alter the shape of the near future. We can only resolve to refuse our support, and to encourage others to refuse theirs, to any authority; and to try to build on a human scale those social forms which by nurturing responsibility and creative activity are our one hope of survival and freedom.

## That Stone!

EVEN in its wildest flights of fancy the bourgeois press has never accused the Anarchists of such an "atrocious" as walking off with the Coronation Stone, it being so unlikely they would do such a thing (unless, perhaps, the king were just going to sit on it).

It is a pity the aunts of the B.B.C. have censored reference to it on music-halls as it would be interesting to know if the comedians could have beaten the Dean of Westminster's broadcast. He said that if anybody listening would turn copper's nark he would go "to the ends of the earth", and we trust that a few postcards from Australia or Japan will reach him, telling him that a chunk of Perth sandstone has been seen.

For a Churchman the Dean is singularly lacking in astuteness. They arrange these things so much better in the East. The Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil, standing in Mesopotamia since God created Adam, was broken by a soldier climbing up it, but it mysteriously reappeared to tourists intact next morning, and the Dean might have saved many people the anguish he felt by sending up to Scotland on the quiet for an identical stone for a couple of bob. That's not the way to earn dollars!

★

Turning from the comedy of the missing stone to the sinister aspects of the affair,

"We owe respect to the living, to the dead we owe only the truth."

VOLTAIRE

we find illustrated once again the trend in modern methods of police detection. Up to the moment of writing, some time after the discovery of the disappearance of the stone, the police have not the foggiest idea of the identity of the culprits, but they know their political convictions! The Press in its wisdom even knows the degree of intensity with which the unknown raiders hold those convictions ("fanatical Scottish Nationalists," etc.)!

This is something that wants close watching, because it presents the danger that after any such incident the party in power gets the chance of suppressing its opponents, or at any rate harassing them by police visits and the like, or the fact that the police may try to fit the accused to the already formulated idea of the responsible party. Nobody would be so blind or foolish as to say that this has never happened, both in this country and elsewhere. This is perhaps hardly a serious case (though enough police are employed on it) but consider the results when it is applied to cases of sabotage, etc.

Of course, the reaction of Scottish Nationalists to the incident has brought their cause into the foreground during the past few weeks. While we cannot help smiling at the Press, which regards it as fanatical to worry about taking the Stone back to Scotland, but perfectly proper to keep it in Westminster Abbey, there is no doubt that the "romantic" associations of mediaevalism have puzzled a lot of people north of the Border, particularly those of recent Anglo-Saxon origin. However, there is no doubt that there must be a solid core of sanity in the independence idea, despite the Jacobite attitude of some of the partisans of Scottish Nationalism, because quite obviously it is absurd to rule Scotland from Westminster.

The result of central rule from Westminster—which becomes yearly more and more intensified as central government tightens its grip—causes the stagnation and decay of local associations and the inflated and artificial importance of London. In a free society a city like London would inevitably become decentralised and associations would be localised. When many people call themselves Scottish Nationalists they do so not because they have any hankering for the bygone kingdom nor because they are specifically patriotic, but because they are opposed to the effects of central government from Westminster. This, however, is in fact, an acceptance of the anarchist case, since it is clear that wherever the capital of a government was, the same effect of stagnation on the outer regions it controlled would become apparent. Only in the absence of government can people on the spot determine the way they are going to live their own lives.

A.M.

## Isolationists and America's War Policy War Clouds Need no Smoke Screen

THE public discussion in America of Isolationism is plain evidence of the prominent part which the possibility of war on a national scale is playing in current American life. The Republican apostles of Isolationism appropriately resurrected as their spokesman, a ghost from the political past in the shape of Herbert Hoover, the last Republican President of the United States. The threadbare nature of his arguments and the much more realistic approach of John Foster Dulles and Dean Acheson serve to emphasize the distance we have travelled in twenty years.

Let us make our own position clear once more. We have often stated our belief that it is the economic structure of the modern state which makes wars inevitable. While capitalism (transitional between private and state in Britain and America, frankly state capitalism in Russia) continues, wars cannot be "avoided"; on the contrary they are becoming an increasingly integral part of the economic structure of society.

Hence Isolationism versus "Mutual Aid" and sticking-by-our-Allies is an unreal antithesis: whichever policy is followed, war will come (unless, of course, capitalism is superseded by a revolutionary economy). The important thing about the question is the light it sheds on modern war-acceptance. Isolationism is an illusion, because economic necessity drives all major nations into war. The economic interests of the American banks dictated the U.S. entry into the first world war in 1916. Similar interests brought them into the last war in 1941. Even if Hoover's arguments won the day, the same forces would produce the same results in the next war. Isolationism is an illusion; but it is a useful illusion when a population are hostile to the idea of war. The Baldwin government had to disguise its rearmament programme in 1935 by phrases about peace and dis-

armament. The more forceful arguments of Dulles are not only more realistic: they are in their way more "honest". The depressing thing is that the populations of the west are so inured to war that they do not require to be bamboozled.

### Economic Arguments

Dulles used certain economic arguments: notably that Europe is a valuable source of raw materials for America and that Isolationism was not feasible from the point of view of raw materials. Point was added to this argument by an editorial in *The Times* for 29/12/50, on Europe's steel industry:

"In the opening months of 1950, German output and exports of steel rose at the expense of neighbouring steelmakers on the Continent—in France, Belgium and Luxembourg—

whose export sales declined and whose output was correspondingly reduced. It seemed likely, as a much quoted report of the steel committee of the Economic Commission for Europe then emphasized, that there would be over-capacity in steelmaking as new equipment came into use. The position changed rapidly as the American industrial boom developed and when the needs of rearmament had to be faced. By the autumn steel output was no longer kept down by the limited size of the market; in practically all centres it was bigger than ever."

And *The Times* goes on to remark that "steel is still the sinews of war-making and a crucial measure of a country's capacity to make modern war, but the great military demand for steel does not come until war itself arrives with its prodigious expenditure of shot and shell and machines." It is surely a commentary upon our times that plain speaking of this kind would have been impossible before 1939.

## Scottsboro Boy Arrested

HAYWOOD PATTERSON, the 38-year-old negro who escaped from Alabama prison while serving a 75-year sentence in connection with the famous Scottsboro rape case (which had been compared with the Sacco and Vanzetti case, as an example of American "justice") has been re-arrested. Not over his escape, since Governor Williams refused to extradite him to Alabama, and the Federal District Attorney at Montgomery, Alabama, had intimated that he did not wish to prosecute Patterson for escaping. But he has now been arrested, and bail refused, on a charge of the first-degree murder of another Negro, Willie Mitchell, by stabbing him during a bar-room brawl.

The police state that five witnesses have identified Patterson as having been in the bar when Mitchell was stabbed and of having seen him with a knife, while one of them has sworn he saw Patterson stab Mitchell. Haywood Patterson claims he had not

been in the bar since November 23rd, and denies he stabbed the man.

This is all the information we have at present, but we think it necessary that this case should be followed very closely by all men and women interested in seeing that this unhappy man has a chance of a fair trial. We do not know whether Patterson is guilty or otherwise of the murder charge. But, knowing how he and his companions, mere boys (Patterson was only 19 at the time of the Scottsboro case), were framed the first time on charges of rape, and knowing the vindictiveness of the police aided and abetted by the strong anti-negro elements in the country, we feel very uneasy about the murder charge on which the "Scottsboro Boy" is being held. After all, the police can always find witnesses. Indeed, as we know, in the case of Sacco and Vanzetti, they can even find the right juries to send innocent men to the electric chair.

(More Foreign Commentary on p. 4)

## Russia's Internal Strain

Part of the technique of Russian Imperialism (as of Nazi Imperialism before it) is the use of internal dissension to soften-up a country prior to over-running it. It must be emphasized, however, that Soviet methods have never included the fostering of revolutionary movements, i.e., those which seek to place initiative in the hands of the population as a whole. Instead they infiltrate the State Departments, Police, Army, etc., and seek to make a Palace Revolution, a *coup d'état*. At the same time they seek to immobilise or liquidate the revolutionary elements, by such methods as denunciation, assassination, or kidnapping. They are as much afraid of the social revolution as any frankly bourgeois country.

Now the democracies hesitantly follow suit. Dulles in his recent "clarification" speech, spoke of the internal dissension in Russia and its satellites, and indicated that the fostering of such dissensions was a method of defence (when Russia does it through national communist parties, their conduct is, of course, traitorous).

However, we may be sure that the Democracies, no more than Russia, will avoid promoting revolutionary unrest.

Some reports have come through regarding Moscow criticisms of the Czech Communist Party, which seem to have met with something less than the usual bootlicking on such occasions. Such "defiance" is obviously something to be watched, though it is difficult to draw any definite conclusions.

Czechoslovakia, however, is the most modern, industrialised and generally advanced of the Russian satellites. Moreover its wealth has been more openly plundered and its trading interests more flagrantly disregarded or subordinated to Russian interests than any other of the satellite countries. It may well be that Prague is a source of weakness to the Soviet Empire.



# FREEDOM TO BE A WEEKLY

MORE than two years have passed since we last discussed the "Future of Freedom" (August 7th, 1948). On that occasion we had to announce a reverse in the forward trend of our activities: the reduction of Freedom from 8 pages to 4 pages.

To-day, with the first issue of the New Year, we again wish to discuss the future of our paper. But this time it is to announce what, we hope, will be a very important step forward: that, beginning with the first issue in May, Freedom will appear as a 4-page weekly newspaper.

The problems of an editorial and administrative nature that such a step involves are innumerable, and will be discussed during the coming weeks in a series of short informative articles in Freedom. For the present we shall confine our remarks to the broad implications of such a development in our activities.

Compared with a commercial publication, some of the problems that face us are greater (not having any paid staff we shall find it increasingly difficult to deal efficiently with office work and editorial work) others, simpler (that because we have no salaries to pay, the cost of production is reduced to a minimum, and we can therefore make our paper self-supporting on a much smaller circulation than would be necessary if we had to pay ourselves and our contributors for their articles). But these are still problems to which we must find a solution if we are to carry out our project in May and, more important, succeed in maintaining Freedom as a weekly in the future.

Firstly, we must briefly describe how we envisage the weekly Freedom. Its first function is to contain more topical material than is possible at present with a fortnightly paper. We shall attempt to present facts objectively and where we consider them of value, our comments. In this way our readers will not only be able to learn our point of view but will also be able, with the facts before them, to draw their own conclusions.

We shall also develop our international columns, for we believe that only by an international outlook on social problems can we ever hope to build a world without constant strife, injustice and economic oppression and inequality. Already Freedom has correspondents in many parts of the world, and we are now laying our plans for extending this collaboration. Besides regular correspondence from Europe, we have arranged for our American friends to be responsible for a half-page in each issue on topical material from the American Continent.

Nor will our Feature page (page 2) suffer. In fact we hope considerably to develop this section of Freedom by publishing a four-page supplement, six times a year which will attempt to deal, not only with critical notices of books with a social content, reprints of

articles published elsewhere (including translations) in our time or in the forgotten past (but which have a message for our time) but also material which may not, according to some among us, have direct bearing on the urgent issues of the day, but which are, nevertheless, important in that they enrich our lives and thought. We will deal with these questions in another article, but if we must in a few words justify the inclusion of such material, we would say that most anarchists in advocating a world in which there is less toil and more leisure, do so because they feel that only in this way will it be possible for us all to live fuller and more satisfying lives. To-day, many people can only conceive of one kind of life; they are conditioned to the acceptance of existing patterns of social behaviour. Without indicating to them the many other aspects which they now ignore, how can we expect them to desire change?

★

Having briefly discussed the direction of our paper, we must now pass to the concrete problems of how we shall produce such a paper.

In the two years 1948-1949 we have succeeded in publishing Freedom every

fortnight and paying off a large part of the debt which had accumulated during the post-war "slump" years which affected all "political" publications. This has been achieved (1) by contributions to our Special Appeal Fund, (2) by sales of our publications from existing stocks already paid for, (3) by Freedom Bookshop cash and mail-order sales. These sources of income have supplemented that from the sales of and subscriptions to Freedom. Which means, in other words, that Freedom has not by itself paid its way. Yet the "gap" is not as large as it may at first sight appear. For, besides publishing Freedom, we have added some new titles to our Freedom Press publications list and have reprinted a number of works which continue to be in demand. We have therefore converted some of our income into "capital goods" (books). We have taken all these factors into account in considering to what extent we need to be "financed" during the current year in order to ensure the regular publication of Freedom as a weekly. And we have also carefully considered what minimum increase in our circulation will be necessary in order to establish our paper on a secure footing. These conclusions we now present to our readers: to those who are our comrades or who, without giving themselves labels, wish to support our work.

● We ask that all our present subscribers renew their subscriptions when they lapse. At this period of the year such a request affects a very large number, and they were all notified last week by a postcard.

● We ask those readers who have omitted to send their subscriptions in spite of our reminders, and who have now been sent a letter drawing their attention to the fact that they have been removed from our lists—we ask them to send at least their subscriptions for the current year and to let us have the arrears as soon as they are able to do so.

● We ask our comrades and friends to show their confidence in our determination to establish Freedom as a weekly by contributing as much as they possibly can to our Freedom, Weekly, Special Appeal Fund. We need £600 this year to launch the weekly and to cover any losses we may incur during the coming months.

We ask those friends who are able, to donate large sums, but above all we appeal to those many more readers who can afford a small regular contribution to assess for themselves the sum they will contribute each month to the fund.

● We ask our friends to obtain new readers preferably postal subscribers) to Freedom. To consolidate Freedom as a weekly we must increase our circulation during this year by 1,000 copies.

★

This is our first attempt to publish an Anarchist weekly in this country. We think it will also be the first weekly publication in this country to be published without any paid staff. Above all we think the moment propitious for putting forward with increased strength and vigour the anarchist case against war, and against the political manoeuvrings of both East and West!

FREEDOM PRESS GROUP.

## DOES POWER CORRUPT?

ANARCHISTS have always pointed out the corruption associated with power, and recent history has amply justified their warnings. We have seen in this century the rise of a mass Trade Union movement, and a great mass political party from humble beginnings, and its leaders have taken the road that anarchists condemned, the road of seeking political power. Events have proved that the anarchists were right, monotonously right. All that they predicted in the way of the corruption of the leadership by political power, the separation of the rank and file from its alleged representatives, the perversion of the aims of the struggle of the Labour movement, has been confirmed by events.

No one doubts nowadays that political power corrupts. This fact is recognised by people of all shades of political opinion and it is reflected in the cartoons, the films, the literature of our time. People are conditioned to a degree of jaded acceptance of the fact that the men they elect to be their "representatives" either in parliament, the Trades Union movement, or in other organisations, will "do" them in one way or another. The anarchists who have proved so right in their predictions, have now nothing much to teach in this matter; the sterile victory of saying, "We told you so," brings our revolutionary ends no further. Now people are mainly concerned with which mob will exploit them the least, and they take it for granted that they must be exploited anyhow.

Preoccupation with this matter leads to a certain amount of confusion within the revolutionary movement. We eschew political power; we see that all parties and organisations which make a bid for political power are embracing the very evils which they claim to condemn. Now power-seeking parties remain comparatively unsullied only when they remain permanently ineffectual (like the Socialist Party of Great Britain), and some anarchists are perturbed by the idea that perhaps their abstention from power politics, although morally praiseworthy, is a guarantee of permanent ineffectuality.

To accept this thesis is sadly to misunderstand the nature of power. Power corrupts—yes, but by its absence. The masses who cheer a bloated Mussolini,

Readers who attended the 1950 Anarchist Summer School will remember the remarks on "power" made during the discussion there by Tony Gibson. He was asked to develop the theme in a Sunday-night talk to the L.A.G. We print below the substance of his lecture.

who fawn upon the god-like Stalin, who leave their own vital destiny in the hands of a bunch of muddlers in Whitehall, they are the root of corruption. They have surrendered their power; too willingly they have given up the power of coming to their own decisions, of living their own lives, to the inflated figures of politicians, army chiefs, bureaucrats and policemen. Whenever atrocious and wildly stupid events take place, they are carried out by powerless men, such as soldiers acting under orders, civil servants obeying printed forms, devoted mugs carrying out the party line, blockheaded policemen doing their duty. All the man-made horrors of our time are carried out through the agency of men corrupted by their powerlessness; one could make an endless list of dreary sordid industrial oppression, famine-stricken populations, useless corpses and scarred cripples, etc., which owe their origin to simple powerlessness.

We have taught that power corrupts, and there is no end to that lesson; but we must not leave it at that, or by implication, it may be thought that we advocate the abrogation of all power. On the contrary, anarchism implies the exercise of power by each and all of us. If everybody seeks to increase and exercise the power that is proper to his person the word revolution will have some meaning.

That the power of the political poobah is not in fact personal power, is plain for all to see. Such "mighty" figures as Richard II, Charles I, Zinoviev, Mussolini and Hitler had, in fact, little personal power. They were great inflated balloons, inflated by their party apparatus with all the unwanted egos, all the personal power that properly belonged to the millions of other men who had not the wit to retain and use it themselves. Once the party apparatus cracked or disowned the figureheads, the powers they seemed to have rushed out of them like a great gust of wind, leaving them deflated and at the mercy of any assassin with few to weep their passing. According to Shakespeare,

King Richard II declared:  
"Not all the water in the rough rude sea  
Can wash off the balm of an appointed king;  
The breath of worldly men cannot depose  
The deputy elected by the Lord."

But he found to his cost that his power was an utterly nebulous thing, no shred of which became really attached to his person. He railed, as other deposed tyrants have done, against the fickleness of the people who had once seemed to revere him—but how can people be true to an emptied bag that has no known personality as an individual man?

The corruption of the ruler, be he elected politician or arbitrarily imposed tyrant, would seem to stem from the falsity of his position. He himself may possibly be a very pleasant sort of fellow in his personal qualities, but as a ruler he takes on all the huge corruption of the powerlessness of the mass. Millions of diverse egos which should properly be used in the lives of diverse men and women, are given up, supposedly for the common good, but in reality in the service of an anthropomorphic deity, be it the State, the Nation, Communism or Democracy, or some other abstraction. The interests of such deities seldom coincide with those of the individual persons who have surrendered their personal power, and any wholesale abuse of individuals in their millions is glibly justified by their ruler's homage to some idealised concept of Man. In reality, Man does not exist; all that exists is you and I and the other fellow—with our various desires and interests, which we can adjust to some sort of harmony provided that we each retain the power of controlling our personal destinies. Once we give up this power, we become irresponsible in the full and literal meaning of the word.

★

THE road to the establishment of our individual power is not to be found by a self-conscious quest. As the political racket leads to the subjugation of the

individual politician to the party machine, so the quest for power through the monetary system leads to sterile ends. Financial magnates are notoriously liable to throw themselves off high buildings when their markets slump. If working men had as little consciousness of their own value to themselves, the streets would be full of corpses every time a factory closed down. Monetary power engenders a pathetic helplessness in the bourgeoisie; without their bank balances they are as helpless babes, and the fear of losing their wealth makes them timid as a class. Who has not been moved to some genuine pity by the sad spectacle of the decayed rich? With the reduction of their incomes to a level that most working people would live well on and enjoy, these wretched families eke out a miserable life trying to keep up appearances, sadly conscious of their own worthlessness without the prop of money. Money is the power-magic of our civilisation, but pursuit of it and dependence on it debauches its devotees. A great deal of Marxist sentimentality has been wasted on the messianic nature of the working class, but working people as a whole have a sounder conceit of themselves than the moneyed classes.

The way to power lies in the pursuit of human aims. It is easy to talk of personal integrity, of altruism, of righteousness, but these poor words have had to serve many masters, and are charged with dubious meanings. It is better to cull from our own experience of people, their actions and their probable motives, than to play at semantics. Our observation of people teaches us that the

## READER'S VIEWPOINT ON

### Picasso's Second Spring

Picasso in Provence Exhibition  
(Arts Council)

THE war must have been a very sombre one for Picasso, and victory brought him real personal liberation, peace and happiness. Being an old man of exceptional vitality, he enjoys a second youth, an entirely happy youth, and in his recent work fauns and centaurs dance in acrobatic ecstasy, and frenzied nymphs sprout out all over with leaves.

Some spectators moralise as they look at the playful pottery, and the abandoned eroticism, saying: "Is this the time for plastic jokes, for preoccupation with sex, for aesthetic fun and games? At this moment of history, and this time of Picasso's life, surely he should be serious, and considerate of the suffering of the world, and mindful of disaster?"

Picasso, apparently, has found personal happiness, and this is a praiseworthy achievement, for the poor are with us always, but every individual has but one life to enjoy. Picasso's recent work says much for his family life; at times one even suspects (of some of the plates), that they are a family affair and the little children have assisted in the plate-making games. Yet there is something macabre about the frivolity of this old man's work, for youth, contrary to customary belief, is very serious in its attitude to life, and rightly so, for love and life are quite as serious matters as are suffering and death, and deserve far more attention than the problems of survival or annihilation after death. The work shown recently at the New Burlington Galleries is not serious in its attitude to anything, though I realise that other, more important recent works by Picasso may be. But of those I cannot speak, for I have not seen them.

These angular ecstasies, hysterical gaieties and earthenware jokes may be the fruits of despair at being unable to affect his fellow men, either by showing them their crimes, expressing positive human values, or stirring human pity. His great artistic fecundity has earned him a fortune, his name is a household word (meaning incomprehensible art that our Johnny could do better), and his pictures are all over the world. Yet their apparent social influence is nothing, though their aesthetic influence is enormous. The Spanish poor who provoked the blue pictures are as poor as ever, war is yet more brutal, and people are still repressed and frightened of themselves. I do not think he has exhausted his indignation, but he has divorced his social conscience from his art, and has handled the perplexities of independence over to a political movement, so that these works of Picasso are irresponsible art.

ANNA T. BUTT.

people most powerful in themselves, are those who are remarkable in their individuality, who have resolutely pursued their own line, depending on no party machine or State apparatus for support.

In this connection it is illustrative to consider the condition of Russia under the terrorism which the Bolsheviks had newly-imposed after they seized the State apparatus. Obscure Russian anarchists were being steadily murdered by the Cheka, but individuals such as Kropotkin, Berkman, Goldman and Maximoff were immune because the Bolsheviks did not dare to touch people of such great personal power, even though they were the first revolutionaries to denounce the regime from within both loudly and effectively. How did these famous anarchists achieve such distinctive personal power? They had no storm-troop at their command, no foreign State to protect them, no party to study their interests. Their power was attached to them as individuals, built up by a lifetime of courageous struggle, the expression of their unique selves. Their personal distinction evoked solidarity even from the tools of their enemies, who therefore let them alone. By contrast we may look at

(Continued on page 3)

### FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

Origin and Ideals of the Modern School	Francisco Ferrer	6d.
The Horse's Mouth	Joyce Cary	2/-
Mahomedism	H. A. Gibb	5/-
The Problem Family	A. S. Neill	7/6
Nineteen-Eighty-Four	George Orwell	10/-
Authority and Delinquency	Alex Comfort	8/6
Confessions	St. Augustine	4/6
Field of Broken Stones	Lowell Naeve	12/6
Don Quixote	Cervantes	5/-

JOURNEY THROUGH UTOPIA  
Marie Louise Berneri 16/-  
(Special Edition for Freedom Readers 10/6)

Some Periodicals  
Nine, No. 5, Autumn 1950 2/6  
Journal of Sex Education, Dec.-Jan. 2/-

★  
Ready January 19th  
The new COMPLETE Penguin edition of The Good Soldier Schweik, by Jaroslav Hasek 2/6

27 red lion st, london,  
W.C.1

# IRAQ TO EXPEL ALL JEWS

Basra, December.

**I**N the popular Middle East game of "cutting off one's nose to spite one's face" which the Arab countries (not to mention India and Pakistan) have been playing for the last few years with a ferocious concentration and to the greater glory of national prestige, Iraq should certainly be awarded a suitable medal for the assiduity with which it is hacking off not only its nose but its very limbs with a patriotic cry of "Alhamdulillah", in the interests of racial purity and Arab unity. There is no doubt that the ignominious slap dealt by Israeli forces to what remained of the military prestige of the Arab countries (except Jordan), following the withdrawal of British forces from Palestine, has left a festering sore of shame and resentment in the breasts of Arab nationalist demagogues which has become the more unbearable in view of the continued impotence and hopeless corruption of the political machines in the various Middle East States (exception made for Jordan: but Jordan's long subservience to British policy and its consequent application of traditional British political methods of compromise and expediency in its relations with Israel, backed by an efficient British-trained, British-equipped and British-officered army, have led that country to implement a profitable "working agreement" with Israel rather than to join in the doleful chorus of "sour grapes" being sung discordantly by the other Middle East political leaders under the windows of the Arab League).

Iraq may perhaps be compared to a small boy who, with other members of his street gang, has started punching the even smaller boy next door,

when, to his indignation and dismay he has got back such a resounding whack from the intended victim that he has had to take to his heels. Not daring to attempt a second assault on this nasty, rough little boy, he can think of nothing better to restore his injured vanity than to punch every other little boy smaller than he is who may happen to be within reach, even if this means that in the end he has no more playmates left outside the members of his own gang) all nasty little sneaks with whom he's always squabbling, in any case).

Translated into terms of national policy, Iraq has simply decided to expel, if possible, its whole Jewish population, in a spirit of childish vindictiveness inspired, no doubt, additionally by the continuing fiasco of the Arab countries' economic "blockade" of Israel, which has certainly harmed Arab economy more than it has hurt Israel. A few days ago I saw 134 Iraqi Jews leave Basra on board a Skymaster plane bound for Israel (normal commercial passenger load for this aircraft is 40), and this was already the twentieth load to leave Iraq by air. These are people speaking only Arabic, who had been living in this country since the start of the Christian era, and were in every way indistinguishable from their Arab fellow-countrymen. They are mostly merchants, small traders, clerks and minor bureaucrats, accountants and so on, together with their families, and I should be fascinated to know how these people are going to fit into Israel's creaking economy, crying out as it is for agricultural labourers and skilled industrial workers and craftsmen—but that is another question again. Now,

in Basra, which has a normal Jewish population of about 20,000, more than 95% of the merchants and small business-men are Jewish; in the vast Basra Port Authority organisation practically all the accountants, book-keepers and clerks are Jewish. Already the gradual exodus of Jews has had its effect in the commercial and administrative spheres of the city's existence, and there seems no doubt whatever that if the government has its way and expels practically the whole of Iraq's Jewish population, the country's whole economy will be completely disrupted, with adverse results which will affect the government itself as much as they will the ordinary citizen.

Even the most elementary consideration given to this problem by Iraq's political leaders (dulled though their wits may be as a result of chronic inflammation due to excessive nationalist fervour) must surely have indicated exactly the results which are now being felt, and yet the government, with the chauvinistic Yellow Press yapping like so many dingoes at its heels, carries sublimely on, heaping invective on Jewish "crime" and Jewish "imperialism", sticking out its tongue at Israel from a safe distance—and knocking out its own most hard-working citizens.

It is clear, then, that Iraq deserves a special award of some sort for colossal fat-headedness and impudence (though Egypt must certainly be a close runner-up) and I hereby recommend that a special Booby Prize be established by the Nobel Committee for annual competition by the Arab States, winning points being: stupidity, hypocrisy, gullibility, bravado and self-hypnotism. S.W.T.

## MORE REFLECTIONS ON THE

# "JUNGLE GIRL" CASE

**I**T is doubtful if the most subordinate Press in the world could behave in the manner in which the British Press behaves voluntarily. We see yet another instance in the treatment of the Bertha Hertogh case, which has been depicted as the "Jungle Girl" episode, in the manner inspired by Edgar Rice Burroughs. As incidental parts of the narrative one learns that British soldiers are being killed in Singapore. This is by no means newsworthy, as there is no outpost of the world where, thanks to the bloody course of empire, British soldiers are not buried for the most fantastic of causes, and it might not even be newsworthy if the Press by some streak of lunacy were to tell its readers the truth! That while at one end of Malaya their sons were dying in the jungle owing to the struggle between Bolshevik Russia and Capitalist America, occasioned by the Socialist Government's policy of peace-time conscription, at the other end (in spite of the purely fictitious "Jungle Girl" caption) the soldiers of traditionally Protestant England, whose King still takes the oath of Protestant supremacy, were dying in the cause of Roman Catholic supremacy.

The case of Bertha Hertogh was summed-up in the last issue of *Freedom*, and so far as the snatchings from parent to parent and mother to foster-mother are concerned, I can only echo the wonderment at the apparent callousness of parents at the damage done to the child. Behind most of these snatchings, however, lies the black power of the Roman Catholic Church, and the doctrine of Catholic supremacy so supinely assented to by Protestants, that the child of "mixed" marriages should be brought up in the Catholic religion. Hence the bitterness in so many cases, and the adroitness of the Church in recognising that it cannot control its adherents' choice of marriages, but can keep a grip on the children—with the Jesuit dictum that it only needs to get them young to keep them for life.

So far as the case of Bertha Hertogh goes, I am glad for her sake she has got out of her Malayan marriage into Holland. No libertarian could feel any sympathy for the Muslim religion and least of all for its attitude to women. Those who followed the much-publicised divorce of Queen Farida will realise that the poorest and most degraded child in Holland stands a better chance than a princess in Islam. The most progressive-minded Moslem sees no farther than the liberation of women from polygamous marriages and one-sided divorces. The riots in Singapore—and some sympathy with them, since they are so obviously not Communist-inspired in spite of the attempted links between the fanatic muzzins of Singapore and the Chinese Communists in the Malayan jungle, made by such champions of loyalty as Mr. Malcolm MacDonald—are not primarily based on a determination to keep Bertha Hertogh married to Mansoor Adabi, but on the insult they feel to the Moslem religion by the British court's acceptance of Catholic supremacy. This the average Moslem feels rather more strongly than the lukewarm Protestant of England. And since it is mixed up with feelings of anti-

imperialism, it is much stronger than the hell-and-brimstone Protestants of Belfast.

Consider the facts! Bertha Hertogh was a Dutch Catholic girl, stolen (in fact) by her nurse, Che Aminah, brought up in the Moslem faith and married off to a Malayan Moslem. The parents want to reclaim her and this is granted. She is taken from her foster-mother and husband because, says the judge, Che Aminah knew very well she is a baptised Catholic, a Dutch subject and therefore the marriage was illegal.

The Moslems riot because (as incidents in Pakistan show) they believe in forced conversions. But what of Rome? What would have been the case if Bertha Hertogh had been a Moslem and Che Aminah a Catholic?

We have the answer for that. *The case of Edgar Montara*. This case caused a furore not so many years ago. It shocked the Jewish communities of the world in the middle of the "liberal" 19th century, and contributed to the formation of most of the modern international Jewish defence organisations. It is exactly parallel to the Bertha Hertogh case. Edgar Montara was a happy child in a Jewish family living in Italy. His Italian nurse, like Che Aminah, was devoted to her charge. She with equal fanaticism to Che Aminah's, determined to save his soul, and baptised him a Catholic in secret. Later she told it "in secret" in the confessional.

The Papal police raided the Montara family, seized the child and took him to a monastery to be brought up as a baptised Catholic. The Montara family protested (the mother died of grief), the entire (panic-stricken) Jewish community of Italy protested, protests came in from all over the world, not only from Jews, headed by the Anglo-Jewish Sir Moses Montefiore (who accordingly formed the Alliance Israelite), who secured an audience with the Pope in person. To no avail. The Pope had the power. Edgar Montara was incarcerated in the jungle of Roman monasticism and grew up a spiritual eunuch, guided by his "foster-parents in Christ" into becoming a Catholic priest, a worse fate than that of a Moslem bride.

Compare the parallel cases of Edgar Montara and Bertha Hertogh. The lesson is clear.

Bertha was a Catholic and must remain so. Edgar was made a Catholic and must remain so. The doctrine of Catholic supremacy, so readily understood by the Singapore mob, who rush to attack Europeans, not differentiating (as how can they?) between the soldiers of the Protestant King and the black-robed Jesuits. If we read of British soldiers killing and dying in more battles to defend churches in Singapore during these riots, let us remember that it is not fighting against Moscow reaction which fears competition of its rival dope-peddling gang, nor against the sort of anti-clerical revolutionary feeling that was seen in Barcelona, but merely fighting (such being the twists of fate that imperialism brings) against the rebellion against Rome that cost Charles his head and ultimately gives George VI his throne.

INTERNATIONALIST.

## Does Power Corrupt? (Continued from page 2)

the figures of that time who stood enthroned in the nebulous power of political office—Bukharin, Zinoviev, Radek—when they stepped out of line with the Party, and uttered criticisms far less outspoken than those of the anarchists, the Party swiftly discredited their reputations and murdered them. As men they had no power, they had only the reflection of the power of the Party.

It may be pointed out that courage and personal integrity do not always save the skin of their possessor. The deaths of Francesco Ferrer, Sacco and Vanzetti and many others may be quoted as examples of the murderers in authority defying the tide of public feelings and blindly risking the consequences. The making of "martyrs" is, of course, a bad practical policy and is avoided by shrewd governors, but authority is often crassly stupid. It must be remembered, however, that a martyrdom of the inarticulate mass of the people goes on all the time; their humility and obedience invite a ruthless abuse far more consistently than the recalcitrance of the minority. The regimes of Hitler and Franco have murdered far fewer Communists than the number that have met their death under Stalin. In Nazi Germany and Spain the Communists have been in opposition, wily and tough; in Stalinist Russia they have been poor stooges going to their death intoning "mea Culpa" with every swing of the party line over thirty years.

In Britain we have seen in the last war how anarchists and other war-resisters sometimes suffered imprisonment and economic hardship, but on the whole they were better off than the compliant mass. They permitted no lasting violence to be done to themselves, whereas thousands of co-operative stooges were emotionally debauched, killed, crippled, driven mad, and otherwise rendered incapable of enjoying the rest of their lives. Even in the U.S.A. where war-resisters were treated with greater harshness, would you honestly prefer to be the average war-resister risking his loss of 'liberty', or the average chicken-fed, chicken-livered G.I. with his liberty to do as he's told, chew gum and wonder where the hell civilisation is getting him anyway.

In countries where objection to military service is simply not recognised, war-resistance, like other forms of resistance to the demands of the State, must take whatever varied forms the circumstances indicate, but the same broad principle hold good—resistance is healthier for the individual than meek compliance.

The way of power is the way of courage, but not the courage of a fool. The sort of courage that gladly embraces martyrdom, that meets the violence of authority with a bared breast, is self-

destructive. The method of non-violent resistance is effective when used intelligently and appropriately, but it does not simply consist of holding out one's head to the axe. To use our power we must recognise that a wily obduracy must be employed to resist the cunning of those who would persuade honest men to commit suicide as a matter of honour. Too many high-principled men and women have surrendered themselves up to jails, concentration camps and shambles under the mistaken impression that they were striking a blow for freedom. In actual fact such action destroys freedom; it makes the work of the oppressors too easy. A certain propagandist once enjoined his followers to be "as wily as serpents and as gentle as doves"; his Church has certainly embraced the former quality if not the latter, to the Greater Glory of God. It is fitting, therefore, that we individual men and women should use as much williness in studying our own self-interest, to the greater glory of ourselves.

When individuals come to use their own power for their own true self-interest, there will be no unwanted and latent power with which tyrants and inhuman machines like the modern State may become inflated. When idealists abandon the vain struggle to liberate Man, with a capital M, and recognise that this is just an airy concept, an idol, then they may turn their attention to the practical task of liberating men—their own flesh. Here again courage is needed, and courage of the highest order, the courage to admit amongst comrades that it is our own selfish ends we serve, whatever our actions may be, and that the attainment of real personal power is a part of our programme, in spite of the training in hypocrisy that we all receive at the hands of hypocritical society.

And what of altruism, of the values set out in the Sermon on the Mount? Whatever the meaning of the author or authors of this we do not know. As with most mystical writing every man may read into it what he chooses. Some hold that it is the perfect ethic, some that it is a net of lies spread to catch fools, some that it is an intelligently subtle exposition of egoism. But codes of ethics have been claimed to justify every sort of action, including the liberation of Man with fire and sword, a process that the great States are hammering out right lustily at this present moment. "By their fruits ye shall know them." We who seek personal power intelligently have the greatest claim to altruism, for we recognise that we can rise to our full stature only when power is wrested from the institutions which cramp us, and is vested properly in every individual man and woman.

G.

## WITHOUT COMMENT

TOKIO, December 31.

General MacArthur, the United Nations Commander-in-Chief, said here to-day that Japan may have to rearm if "international lawlessness" continues to threaten peace.

In a New Year message, he said that renunciation of war as an instrument of policy in the Japanese Constitution was "one of the highest, if not the highest ideal the modern world has ever known," but added that if international lawlessness continues to threaten peace and exercise its dominion over the lives of men, "it is inherent that this ideal must give way to the overweening law of self-preservation, and it will become your duty within the principles of the United Nations, in concert with others who cherish freedom, to mount force to repel force."

General MacArthur said it was his fervent hope that such an eventuality would never come to pass, but if it should, Japan's security would be the "deep concern of all the other free nations in the Pacific area." He hoped that 1951 would bring Japan the blessings of complete political freedom through an effective peace treaty, and that Japan "may be counted upon to exercise profound influence upon the course of destiny in Asia." The message was addressed "to the people of Japan."

—*Reuter and Associated Press.*

★

NEW YORK, December 26.

Dr. Hideki Yukawa, the Japanese atomic scientist who won the 1949 Nobel Prize in physics, has accepted the permanent post of Professor at Columbia University. The announcement was made to-day by the university.

## EDUCATION

The "A for Apple" alphabet will soon be replaced in Washington schools by "A for Atom" and "B for Bomb". The new alphabet is described in a manual which the Washington Board of Education says will be used in schools to train children in elementary civil defence.

It explains in simple terms the nature of atomic energy and how to behave in an attack. In the new alphabet "A is for Atom—that indivisible which has been split.

"B is for Bomb—an explosive package, of which atom is the new brand. C is for Civil Defence—our protection against attack."

The children are told: "Be calm. Try to reach shelter. Drop flat on your face. Cover all exposed parts of the body."

Manchester Guardian, 22/12/50.

## SOME AMERICAN STUDENTS DEFEND

# A Negro's Rights

**J**OFFRE Stewart, who is a Negro student at Roosevelt College, Chicago, was arrested in October for his third attempt to get a haircut at the barber's shop in the college, which is permitted him by the Illinois Civil Rights Statutes which guarantees to enforce equal rights for "all citizens of every race and colour". The barber refused to cut his hair and Stewart was arrested for "disorderly conduct", and fined \$100 plus costs and sent to the House of Correction to serve out the fine at \$2 a day. Although by law the barber should pay a fine for denying Joffre Stewart his equal rights, it was Stewart who was sent to jail.

The student's paper, *Roosevelt Torch*, opened an appeal among the 4,700 students and 300 teachers of the college, to pay the fine and get Stewart back to his studies. Answering criticisms in the press of his methods and his attitude of non-cooperation, Joffre Stewart wrote:

"In refusing to walk (or eat) I was acting out my philosophy of non-cooperation with the State. The State, i.e., violence in its institutional aspect or more simply: a body of armed men, continues only because people lend it their consent. By not contributing one's vitality to political relations, by courageously denying the State one's loyalty and practising disobedience and insubordination wherever it presumes to infringe on one's existence, by refusing taxes and service (as soldier or "civilian") this social evil would necessarily become organised—out of society. He/she who participates in the State participates in his/her own exploitation as well as sharing responsibility for the oppression of others.

"Consequently I did not want anybody to pay my fine as that would be contributing to the evil. If I believed in fine-paying, I might have arranged for that myself. It was not at all so important that the college community's energy should have been channelled into getting me out of jail, as in removing the cause of my having been put in jail. Namely, the segregation in barbershops, specifically: that of the Fine Arts Building.

If there should be a fund in my name, I wish it were not called "Civil Rights" as to claim "civil rights" implies affirmation of the State with all the consequences that carries of war, coercion, exploitation, etc. A memorial so named would be a travesty on my beliefs. I do not accept the discrimination between alien and non-alien that citizenship entails. I claim only human rights. (I make no demand on how the money is used.)"

Commenting on the case an editorial in the students' paper wrote tartly:

"While collecting money to release Joffre Stewart from jail, we found a paradox in this Liberal Ghetto called Roosevelt College. We found that it is the students of this school who demand justice and equality and back their demands with cash. Interestingly enough those teachers who pride themselves on their Social Democratic beliefs were the most niggardly with their pennies. This is indeed a peculiar kind of democracy fostered by these Socialists, who are with us in such number. It belies their pious, prolific, publicity platitudes when materially they shy away when the chips are down."

We send our greetings to reader Stewart and to those who support him in fighting not for "civil rights" but for human rights.

# Are We Civilised?

MANY opponents of Anarchism, on first hearing our economic and social ideas, react by getting red in the face, pretending to be very civilised, and say "But you want us to go back to the Stone Age!" This, you notice, because we criticise the existing order to the extent of suggesting that perhaps we could get along perfectly well without any of the institutions of the modern state.

Now it is true that Anarchists are prone to point to the virtues of such primitive societies as still exist, and to show how communities can survive without centralised authority, without the private ownership of property and without money or the exploitation of wage slavery. But this we do, not because we desire a standard of living as sparse as, say, that of the Eskimo, or wish in any way to relinquish the control over our environment which modern science could ensure for us, but because the continued existence over centuries of such so-called primitive societies, and their peaceful and harmonious ways of life, contradict directly those arguments about "human nature" which

tell us that mankind is inherently greedy, competitive and warlike.

NO, when we point to the lessons of principle we can learn from simpler societies, we do so because we are not particularly proud of the achievements of our own complex social structures, because we do not consider ourselves, mechanised as we are, superior to those who sustain themselves by hunting and fishing, building their own houses and making their own clothes. Not because we ourselves think we should all "go back" to hunting and fishing for food, but because it is painfully obvious that people who live closer to the soil, closer to the source of their sustenance, appear to find a satisfaction in life which the tin-opening, frozen-food-eaters of our great cities have lost.

In fact, it looks as though it is the defenders of modern capitalism and its material benefits, who are going to be the ones to lead us back to the mud-hut and the cave. For certainly the ability of 20th century society to house its populations has not kept pace with its ability to render them homeless. Or, to be more precise, the technical possibilities of the 20th century are nullified by the political absurdities which its populations tolerate. For it seems to me ridiculous to even speak of the benefits of civilizations, when the social systems which give them with one hand, snatch them away with the other. The same modern science which has opened the door to health and well-being, straddles the threshold with ghastly means of destruction that no savage would ever dream of producing.

## COLNE AND NELSON ANTI-MILITARIST CAMPAIGN

ABOUT two months ago, the Colne and Nelson Libertarian Group asked various other local societies to co-operate with them in forming an Anti-Militarist Committee. In this way we hoped that our efforts to rally local anti-war feeling would cover a wider field than would have been possible had any of the societies continued to work alone. So far the I.L.P., the P.P.U., and the S.W.F. have joined us on the Anti-Militarist Committee. In our refusal to accept war as the ultimate resort of international disputes we are all united, and we shall welcome any other local societies which are prepared to work with us on this particular issue.

During the first week of November, 11,000 of Alex Comfort's pamphlet "Civil Defence" were distributed house to house in Nelson. At the same time we took part in considerable local press controversy and followed this by a sandwich board parade advertising an anti-militarist public meeting, which was held on Sunday, 19th November, at 2.30 p.m., in the Weavers' Institute. About 120 people were present. We hoped to adjourn to an out-door pitch for the evening but the weather was on the side of Mars.

A speaker from each of the groups addressed the meeting, Mat Kavanagh speaking for us, pointed out that wars are never made by peoples, but by governments, who sacrifice the interests of the many to those of the few. He stressed that we must cultivate the will to peace just as the government in its insidious propaganda daily cultivates the will to war. While paying tribute to the ideals of the well-meaning advocates of World Government, he pointed out that as governments in themselves are the cause of war, the only way to peace is to secure freedom from all governments whatsoever.

The local press attended the meeting, and most of the points made were fully reported. Early in the new year we hope to arrange a Debate between a representative of the Anti-Militarist Committee and the prospective Conservative candidate for the division.

One of the most disappointing aspects of the work of the Committee so far has been that the public response we have received has been from middle-aged people. In the audience at our public meeting, very few were under thirty. Not one youth who faces conscription has got into touch with the local C.B.C.O. adviser nor with any of our organisations. Why? Is it that there is less desire for independence of thought and action among the children of the Welfare State?

K.R.

## FREEDOM Anarchist Fortnightly Price 3d.

Postal Subscription Rates  
6 months 4/6 (U.S.A. \$1).  
12 months 8/6 (U.S.A. \$2).

Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies  
6 months 7/6 (\$1.50).  
12 months 15/- (\$3).

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

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

SO that a comparison of "civilised" and "primitive" societies, leads us inevitably to the conclusion that commerce and competition are the grave-diggers of the community, and centralised authority the enemy of progress. For, far from being the source of material advancement, history can show that commercial expansion has created divisions between peoples which have led to social strife, economic competition and finally, war. It is not, in my opinion, too much to say that what material progress we have seen during the wars inseparable from it as has been *in spite* of it and not because of it, for although it may seem that capitalism has been responsible for the industrial development on which our ideas of material progress are based, still its competitive nature has led to as much restriction of the human genius as its use, and nearly as much destruction during the fars inseparable from it as construction during the uneasy periods of peace.

How many pioneer inventors have been encouraged and financed in their experiments, and how many, like Faraday, Edison, Pasteur and countless others, have been sneered at by the narrow-minded bigots who have always been the leaders of Big Business? But those same block-heads will be quick to see the market possibilities of the other fellow's ideas! And will soon jump in to capitalise them—once they have been

proved!

★  
APOLOGISTS for capitalism, no doubt delight in thinking of the last two hundred years as the Golden Age of Opportunity. And yet I doubt if there has ever been an age in which the outstanding characteristics have been so obviously frustration and misery. The terrible toll which from the beginning the Industrial Revolution took of the dispossessed workers; the savage exploitation of women and children as well as of grown men—these have abated in their worst aspects, only to be replaced in the 20th century by the extent to which militarism eats into our lives, by the shadow of more-frequent, more terrible warfare.

The steady economic progress on which Marx based his revolutionary optimism has not worked out as he anticipated. The State, the centralisation, which he thought could be used for emancipation, have been used as Bakunin foretold, only for greater slavery—and that by a "revolutionary workers' Government" just as much as by the bourgeoisie.

Those of us who have grown into maturity during the 20th century—who stand to-day in its middle years looking back on its achievements and forward to its prospects—may have much to be thankful for. But we have even more to fear. Our technical civilisation has brought us to a point when we could produce abundance, health, well-being and leisure for all the peoples of the earth. It has also brought into being monstrous institutions which threaten not only our material standards of living but our very chances of living at all.

★  
SOMETIMES, when listening to the clichés of the politicians, I wonder if they have any notion at all of the magnitude of the task we face. Still, it seems, they imagine that adjustments, compromises, pacts and agreements can save us from destruction. We must, however, expect them to be hidebound by such conceptions, which are their stock-in-trade. Certainly, to be charitable (though one scarcely feels like being charitable to our own destroyers) we have to accept that probably they have not the vaguest notion of the fate into which they are leading their peoples. They blunder on, the blind leading the blind, imagining fondly that they are doing good, but all the time trampling on our chances of reaching the heights to which the human genius could guide us.

As for civilisation, then, I think it is about time that we began to make efforts to achieve it. About time that we began to see to it that we benefit from science instead of fearing it. That entails the freeing of science from its authoritarian masters, the freeing of production from its financial shackles, the release of the constructive human genius from the cause of destruction.

That will mean the end of government, the end of capitalism, the end of the State and the possibility of beginning a free society and a true civilisation for all the peoples of the world. P.S.

## FOREIGN COMMENTARY (cont. from p. 1)

# The Irish Railmen's Strike

THE Irish railwaymen's strike, which started on December 17th, and which at the time of writing has not yet been settled is yet another example of the weakness of Trade Unionism. In Ireland, as in this country, the railway workers are organised in a number of unions, and in the present strike we have the fantastic situation of the railway members of three unions having accepted unanimously the terms offered by the Companies, which are the same terms that the fourth union—the Irish Transport & General Workers—have rejected. The result is that the strike is a partial one; bitter feelings will be worked up between the workers, and it seems more than likely that a prolonged stoppage will end in capitulation by the strikers who will be economically worse off at the end than they were when the strike started.

Support is coming, however, from the Irish Transport Union's members working at docks and goods depots who are refusing to handle goods normally carried by train.

## AMERICAN INSPIRED PEACE LOVERS...

ENOUGH has been written about the Communist-inspired Peace Congress and the millions of signatures to its petition for the banning of Atomic warfare, for the whole business to be dismissed as phoney.

But equally phoney, in our opinion, is the American-sponsored Freedom Scroll with its fifteen million signatures. Apparently, the signatories have contributed not only their names but also £500,000 for the expansion of the Free Europe radio which beams its broadcasts to Communist satellite countries." When we will read that 15 million citizens have protested at the political witch-hunt in America, which has now reached unbelievable proportions, then we shall believe that Americans are really beginning to believe in Freedom!

## ... COLD WAR LOVERS PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S ANNOUNCED EMERGENCY MEASURES WHICH AS FAR AS WE UNDERSTAND THEM, LITERALLY CONSCRIPT THE NATION (INCLUDING THE 15 MILLION SIGNATORIES OF THE FREEDOM SCROLL!) HAVE ALSO SERIOUSLY AFFECTED WALL STREET. THE N. YORK HERALD TRIBUNE (Dec. 18) REPORTS THAT "THE STOCK MARKET ADVANCED TO AROUND THE HIGHEST LEVELS SINCE 1931 TO-DAY AS AGGRESSIVE BUYING, CENTRING ON THE SO-CALLED WAR SHARES, BOOSTED VOLUME TO A PEAK SINCE JUNE 27... THE CRUSH OF ORDERS WHICH HAD FLOWED INTO WALL STREET OVER THE WEEK-END WAS SO GREAT THAT TICKERS RAN LATE DURING THE TWO MOST ACTIVE PERIODS." ALTOGETHER 4½ MILLION SHARES WERE SOLD! AND THIS IS HOW THE "INVESTORS AS WELL AS MARKET OPERATORS" FIGURED OUT TRUMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENT:

Emergency Measures which as far as we understand them, literally conscript the nation (including the 15 million signatories of the Freedom Scroll!) have also seriously affected Wall Street. The N. York Herald Tribune (Dec. 18) reports that "the stock market advanced to around the highest levels since 1931 to-day as aggressive buying, centring on the so-called war shares, boosted volume to a peak since June 27... The crush of orders which had flowed into Wall Street over the week-end was so great that tickers ran late during the two most active periods." Altogether 4½ million shares were sold! And this is how the "investors as well as market operators" figured out Truman's announcement:

## READER'S LETTER

# The Ex-Anarchist's Case

DEAR COMRADES,

I noted with some amusement the publication in your journal of what purports to be the anti-anarchist "case" in the shape of a highly critical letter by A. T. Butt. The amusement springs from a certain scepticism that has grown on me as the result of some years' acquaintance with the so-called anarchist movement. The scepticism itself is derived from a firm conviction that there is no case for "anarchism", and that therefore there cannot be a case against it. Anarchism has come to mean everything and anything, and is defined according to the particular set of principles one or other sub-sect of anarchists may choose to create. For instance, anarchism may be interpreted as revolutionary bomb-throwing à la Nechayev, or a Third Programme talk on the relation of Anarchism to Poetry. It all depends on what you mean by anarchism as a set of "principles" for the achievement of a free society, a society desired by all socialists.<sup>1</sup>

Anarchism boils down to either a naughty belief of high-brow intellectuals or a violent form of syndicalism. In the former case it serves no useful purpose except to convince some of our writers that they are performing a revolutionary function—at best, ill-defined—and in the latter case the syndicalism becomes transformed into a half-hearted appendage of the working-class in the struggle for political power. Spain thoroughly exposed the dilemma of the anarchist movement, the main sections participating in the Popular Front Government in 1936 at the most critical point in the unfolding of the Spanish Revolution, and the revolutionary sections making common cause with the POUM and the Bolshevik-Leninists who were the bitterest enemies of the anarchist betrayal of Barcelona to the capitalist-Stalinist bloc. In other words, when anarchism as a philosophy becomes something other than the frivolous occupation of armchair revolutionaries it becomes reformism or a pure socialist party, aiming at the establishment of power "in the name of the proletariat".<sup>2</sup>

The political results of applied anarchism in the 20th century are rooted in the rather diffuse history of the classical anarchist movements founded in the 19th century by Bakunin and Kropotkin. The anarchists wax indignant about Marx's authoritarianism and brutal political methods, yet refuse to confront themselves with the equally damning facts about Bakunin's unsavoury machinations in the First International. The fact that Bakunin was at the receiving end of the expulsion notice instead of Marx is more or less incidental—Marx was probably more efficient at rigging the expulsion of "undesirables". To conclude that Bakunin was the valiant fighter for democracy within the workers' movement where Marx was the upholder of bureaucratic tyranny is as fantastic as to assume that just because Trotsky was expelled from the Communist Party of the Soviet Union by Stalin that Trotsky was a democrat while Stalin was a bureaucrat.

No, my former friends, the "founders"

of anarchism, like the "founders" of Marxism, were birds of a feather. This unpalatable fact was indicated in Max Nomad's devastating exposure of the common traits of the early Marxists and Anarchists in his *Rebels and Renegades*. The anarchists, I am afraid, will have to concoct a better syncretic system than they have done so far to convince libertarian revolutionary socialists that they are something other than sour grape Marxists and inverted authoritarians.<sup>3</sup>

Fraternally,

ALLAN VAUGHAN.

<sup>1</sup> Allan Vaughan's main case depends on these assertions that anarchism is vague and ill-defined. For a succinct statement on anarchism, Kropotkin's contribution under this heading in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*: Kropotkin's main writings—not to mention those of Godwin, Proudhon, Bakunin, Malatesta, and many others—provide a wider, but not less well-defined, view of the main tenets of anarchism. Vaughan seems to regret that anarchists, being anti-authoritarian, do not lay down a "party-line" which must be rigidly adhered to by all "loyal party members."  
—Eds.

<sup>2</sup> The Spanish Revolution displayed the strength of anarchism, in the success of the workers' militias, and the economic achievements of the industrial and peasant collectives. It also displayed the difficulties of working with political anti-fascists, for the anarchists were not merely the instigators of revolutionary achievements in Spain; they were also the backbone of the anti-fascist struggle, and had to face the problem of working with reformists and authoritarians on the Joint Anti-Fascist Committee. The Stalinists cynically exploited the desire of sincere anti-fascists to work together. To describe the bitter struggle between the Anarchists and Stalinists during the May Days of 1937, in Barcelona, as a betrayal of the part of the former is typically Leninist mud-slinging. The interested reader is referred to Souczy's pamphlet, *The Tragic Week in May, Orwell's Homage to Catalonia*, and the files of *Spain and the World*.—Eds.

<sup>3</sup> As in the case of Spain, Vaughan relies on mere assertion, giving a distorted view of a large subject. It will suffice to point out that the section of the First International which shared Bakunin's ideas called themselves Federalists and insisted on local autonomy as against the centralist, authoritarian tendency represented by Marx and Engels. Marx's attitude has been bitterly criticized, even by Marxist historians like Otto Rühle in his *Life of Marx*, and by socialist critics of anarchism like Robert Hunter in his *Violence and the Labour Movement*. These writers contrast Marx's manoeuvres unfavourably with Bakunin's attitude. It is not necessary therefore to cite anarchist writers (e.g., K. J. Kenafick's *Bakunin and Marx*) to refute these rather puerile statements. Nor are Max Nomad's writings (like Vaughan, "Nomad" is an ex-anarchist) taken seriously by well-informed readers.

Vaughan's whole letter is an example of misrepresentation—"argument" by assertion, and the sourness of disillusion. It is, however, clear that there is a need for fuller discussion of such important topics as the revolution and counter-revolution in Spain, and the history of the First International. When *Freedom* appears weekly it may be possible to treat these questions more fully.—Eds.

## Meetings and Announcements

### LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP CENTRAL LONDON

Regular Sunday evening meetings will be held in future at 7.30 p.m., at

THE PORCUPINE PUBLIC HOUSE,

corner Charing Cross Rd. and Gt. Newport St., next Leicester Square Underground Stn.

JAN. 7th Stuart Morris

"CONSCRIPTION"

JAN. 14th John Hewetson  
"SEXUAL LIFE CONSIDERED AS A PROBLEM OF THE WORKING CLASS"

### COMRADES IN WEST LONDON

Will any Anarchists interested in forming a group in the West London area, please write to FREEDOM PRESS.

### NORTH-EAST LONDON GROUP

Discussion Meetings fortnightly, 7.30 p.m. Enquiries c/o Freedom Press.

JAN. 9th Ted Mann  
"FREEDOM & THE CHILD"

JAN. 23rd SOCIAL EVENING

### GLASGOW ANARCHIST GROUP

INDOOR MEETINGS EVERY SUNDAY AT 7 p.m.

at the CENTRAL HALLS, 25 Bath Street.

with Frank Leech, John Gaffney, Eddie Shaw, J. Raeside

## PRESS FUND

Dec. 15th to Dec. 31st:

Bolton: R.T.S. 1/2; Anon\* 2/6; San Francisco: A.G. £3/10/11; Cambridge: C.L.D. & E.A.A. 7/6; Anon 2/6; Margate: T.L. 10/-; London: M.C.\* 5/-; London: Anon 2/-; Chicago: Free Society Group £44/5/5; London: B.G. 10/-

Total	£49 17 0
Previously acknowledged	£243 8 7
TOTAL FOR 1950	£293 5 7

NOTE: The sum of £44/5/5 acknowledged above from the Free Society Group of Chicago is from the estate of the late Celia Goldberg.

\*After initials indicates contributors to the 5/- a month scheme proposed by a London reader.

LIBERTARIAN.