

Russian Attitude to Child Sexuality - p. 2
 Yugoslavia and the West - p. 3
 America Liberates Krupp - p. 3
 A Labour Party Purge? p. 4

Freedom

AN ANARCHIST FORTNIGHTLY

"If my soldiers would really think, not one would remain in the ranks."
 —FREDERICK THE GREAT

Shawcross Brings Out the Dockers

WHERE the London Port Workers' Committee failed to cause a major stoppage in the London docks last week, Sir Hartley Shawcross, Labour Attorney-General, has succeeded. For whereas the Committee could manage to bring out only 200 dockers in support of the Merseyside strikers, Shawcross, by the simple procedure of having seven strike leaders arrested, caused the walk-out of 8,000.

Did this "socialist" intellectual really think that men like the London dockers were going to stand idly by while seven of their fellow-workers are arrested for no greater crime than exercising rights which a democratic country proclaimed part of its way of life?

The Conflict Begins

But let us trace the course of events which have led up to this major political blunder on the part of the Labour Government.

The unofficial Port Workers' Committees in British ports (those in London and Merseyside are the most militant) have for some time been agitating for improvements in conditions and pay as laid down in their "Dockers' Charter". This has demanded, among other things, pensions and holidays with pay, and an increase of the basic wage from 19s. to 25s. a day. The basic pay, incidentally, was fixed when, during the war, Ernest Bevin introduced the "decasualisation" scheme which guaranteed dock workers, till then employed only on a casual basis, a basic daily wage if there is no work for them. We have pointed out before how, in return for this "great advance" the grateful union officials have guaranteed to keep the docks free from strike and stoppage. Unfortunately for them, the rank-and-file have frequently thought differently.

For their part, the trade union—most dockers are organised in the

Transport and General—has been negotiating with the nationalised port authorities for a wage increase, and has proudly announced that, on behalf of all the nation's dockers, it has accepted an increase of 2s. a day—bringing the basic up to 21s.

London Slow to Move

On this announcement, 17,500 dockers in Liverpool and Birkenhead came out on strike, demanding the full increase to 25s. and attempts were made to bring all London dockers out as well.

In London, however, the workers were not inclined to come out at this time on this issue. Clever propaganda by Arthur Deakin, T. & G.W.U. leader, relating to the 1949 Canadian Seamen's strike, when the London dockers came out in full support of what turned out to be a Communist-inspired Canadian union squabble, had sapped some of the support the Port Workers' Committee has hitherto been able to count upon. This, coupled with the fact that London men enjoy better conditions and pay through higher piece-rates meant that only 200 dockers came out in response to the call for support for Merseyside, and they were preparing to go back when the Special Branch moved in.

The Vital Issues

And this brings us to the important issues involved in these significant events as we see them. While fully realising the necessity of defending our day-to-day conditions in the face of rapid rises in the cost of living, we cannot regard disputes over 2s. or 6s. a

day as fundamental or, in themselves, vitally important. While a money system exists, wage bargaining is a necessity, but it is one which helps to perpetuate that money system under which workers, with only their labour power to sell, must always be exploited and robbed of the wealth they create. The only answer to the economic enslavement of the workers which the money and wage systems entail is their complete abolition, with production and distribution, controlled by the workers for the satisfaction of the needs of society.

But these issues did not arise. The dispute was originally a pure and simple wage-argument, uncomplicated by anything more than Deakin's routine natter about a "Red Plot".

And originally, it seemed, the Government had no intention of interfering in a dispute which never at any time looked like assuming large proportions in London. For instance, on Feb. 5th, in reply to questions in the House of Commons, the new Minister of Labour, Aneurin Bevan, said: "It is hardly wise for the Government to intervene when the men themselves are putting matters right." (For that erstwhile militant, "putting matters right" means simply going back to work at the behest of the union.) And yet, only three days later, on Feb. 8th, Scotland Yard swooped on the Committee's meeting place and arrested six men, a seventh being brought down from Liverpool to face a charge in court the next morning. They have been released on bail and appear in court again on Feb. 20th.

The Defence Regulations

The charges against the men ("conspiracy to incite strikes") were brought under the Defence Regulations, which, it is well to remember, were put into force as emergency measures at the beginning of the late war. At the time and since, successive Home Secretaries—Sir John Anderson, Herbert Morrison, Chuter Ede—have proclaimed their

distaste for the Defence Regulations and stressed their temporary nature. But like so many temporary measures, like pre-fab housing, identity cards, rationing and conscription, the Defence Regulations have passed imperceptibly into "the British way of life". The Home Secretaries who say they dislike them so, and who have the power to repeal them, do not do so because, they say, the time is not opportune.

Meanwhile, the British people, traditionally so jealous of their liberties, are shrugging themselves into a situation where, without the rubber truncheons, the jack-boots and the concentration camps, they are as carefully controlled as in the openly totalitarian states.

Without the rubber truncheons . . . But not without the police who would wield them if the "necessity" arose. On Tuesday, Feb. 6th, pickets were ejected from the Royal group of docks by the police; on Friday, Feb. 9th, groups of dockers who attempted to march to Bow Street Magistrates' Court to support their arrested mates, and others who gathered outside, were broken up by the police; on Thursday, Feb. 8th, 22 plain clothes police in eight squad cars moved in on The White Hart, where the dockers meet, at a signal from a plain clothes police stooge who had mingled with the workers inside; on Monday, Feb. 12th, plain clothes police spies snooped and took notes at a mass meeting in Victoria Park, then reported back to Scotland Yard, where additions were made to the already considerable dossiers the police

have compiled about every militant docker.

The operations are carried out by the Special Branch, Britain's political police.

To the Dockers' Credit

It is immensely to the credit of London dockers that, whereas they were relatively unmoved by an issue involving money, and they have shown themselves to be chary of anything which may be a Communist stunt, they unhesitatingly walked out in protest when the seven committee-men were prosecuted. At the moment of writing they are back at work, with the promise of coming out again when the adjourned case again comes up in court. Forgetting their Charter for the moment, they are now demanding the repeal of the hated Arbitration Order 1305, which prohibits strikes without prior notice to the Minister of Labour, and forbids "incitement" to strike.

In faraway Korea, young men are dying, being told that they are fighting totalitarianism. So they may be. They may be fighting against one particular tyranny, but what are they fighting for? For the right of the Special Branch to shove London dockers about? For the right of Sir Hartley Shawcross, from his comfortable environment, to wield the big stick on workers and their families? For the British Police State?

Perhaps the London dockers are realising, as the anarchists have so often stressed, that the fight for freedom begins at home.

FOREIGN COMMENTARY

The Democratic Line-Up for the Next Crusade for Freedom

ONE of the most blatant deceptions being practised on the people of the world to-day is to make them believe that the issues which will eventually result in war, are ideological. And it would appear that memories are so short that the experiences of the recent world conflict have taught nothing to the survivors as to the real nature of wars. One even reads statements by otherwise enlightened men and women who really believe that the coming war can be halted if Stalin and Truman get together and compromises are made on both sides. This to our mind is dangerous thinking for it obscures the real issues which are that wars are the inevitable products of the economies of our society. This theme has been often discussed in *Freedom* and we do not therefore propose to elaborate it now. We know that many critics think we simplify the problem when we make such assertions, or that our ideas are behind the times. Yet we think there is an overwhelming mass of evidence to show that, apart from the heroic struggle in Spain, none of the conflicts in our time have been ideological. It can also be asserted that the last war created as many (if not more) problems as those it allegedly set out to solve.

The next war, if it materialises, will be fought out between two vast power blocs relying not on ideas to achieve victory but on military strength in the shape of machines and men. We are at present passing through the building up phase and in this connection alone one realises the cynicism of the ruling classes. The tactless statement of Churchill in the last war—tactless so far as those who believed the war was an ideological one—that anyone prepared to kill Germans was an ally—has been adopted as the watchword in the present rearmament race.

The rearmament of Germany five years after the end of a war, though we were assured that Germany would be disarmed and physically occupied for fifty years, and the liberation of "war criminals" to ensure German co-operation (referred to elsewhere in this issue) is but one of a series of steps taken by the Western Powers to build up an invincible military

machine. Whether it will be a convincing army of liberators or, indeed, a 20th century band of crusaders, we leave our readers to judge.

Spain

The Spanish envoy to America has been telling reporters that Spain is ready to help defend Europe against any aggressor, and could increase the strength of her army from its present 400,000 men to one million men in two weeks. Discussing this, the *New York Herald Tribune* whilst feeling a little uncomfortable ideologically: "Deep differences of values and social organisation separated [Spain] from the democratic nations", hastens to add: "Yet in the test to which our whole civilisation may be put by further Communist advances, all these factors seem of secondary importance. A strong army, prepared to fight with ardor against Communism, is an asset which the West will ignore or minimise at its peril."

And in support of this argument the *Herald Tribune* quotes that well-known "democrat" General de Gaulle who, in a speech at Nimes last month, "asserted that Spain must be included in the mobilisation against Communism; he spoke with that authority on military matters which even those most opposed politically have never been able to deny him. Where he has struck out boldly other Europeans must follow; and the whole Western community must weigh anew the resources and strength which Spain offers."

Yugoslavia

We know what the democrats and the Russians had to say about Tito a few years ago. Their attitudes have been in the short space of two years almost reversed!

Of the "Yugoslav dictator" the *N.Y. Herald Tribune* (13/1/51) has these significant remarks to make: "One does not have to agree with what Tito said, or even take it entirely at its face value, in order to fit it into an understanding place in the pattern of European thinking to-day . . . His value to the West at

present lies not in his talents as a military adviser but in his command of Europe's largest army outside of Russia; a force which seems well able to withstand Bulgaria, Roumania and Hungary—the bulk of Russia's European satellite armies . . . No one to-day is following the war and diplomatic news more closely or more thoughtfully than Tito—a fact worth remembering when one tries to envisage the way Europe might line up for a world struggle.

Japan

The American newspaper *Richmond Times Dispatch* in an editorial reported in the *N.Y. Herald Tribune* (11/1/51) complains that little has been said concerning the rearmament of Japan, "but it is a matter about which there must be frank discussion. There would be a calculated risk involved, just as in the case of rearming Germany . . . Yet Japan is the most important available reservoir of man power and fighting know-how in the Pacific theatre capable of offering any appreciable check to the Russian and Chinese Communists. The crisis is such that we must try to build up Japan militarily as quickly as possible.

Argentina, Brazil and Chile

A Washington report (4/1/51) states that the United States has sold two light cruisers each to the Argentine, Brazil, and Chile, for Western Hemisphere defence under the mutual defence pact of 1949. The terms have not been made public. The vessels originally cost over £100 millions shortly before the last war.

This is an incomplete list, but long enough to give an idea of the composition of the army of liberation we can expect if an when hell is let loose between the rival imperialist blocs.

How much more perceptive than our "come together" woolly-headed intellectuals, is that elderly Korean peasant (quoted in *Picture Post*) who, when asked what his people felt about the war replied, "It does not matter to a blade of grass whether it is eaten by a horse or a cow."

LIBERTARIAN.

THE MEAT MUDDLE

A VARIETY of reasons are being given for the muddle over meat. The Minister of Food explained to Parliament that the reduction of the ration to eight pennyworth a week is because his government is unwilling to be blackmailed into paying the price which the Argentine authorities demand. It was originally thought that the loss of the British contracts would make General Peron see reason and agree on a reasonable price, but while the negotiations were going on, the American Army authorities decided to hoard beef and began its own talks, without telling the British, and since steak costs 10/- a pound in the United States the Argentine price seemed quite low to the American Generals. Mr. Webb explained that if he accepted the terms offered, he would have to accept higher prices for Australian and New Zealand lamb and mutton. But he has now had to do that anyway because it is so much more profitable for the producers to rear sheep for wool rather than for meat because huge American purchases there have caused the highest wool prices ever known.

The difference between the Argentine meat and the price the Ministry of Food was willing to pay was £16 a ton, which when applied to all the meat imported annually to this country, would amount to about £13 million a year. Now Mr. Webb announced also that he was increasing the rebate to butchers from 2s. 3d. in the £ to four shillings. (This "rebate" to butchers is paid as a compensation for their loss of trade.) The result of them, the *New Statesman* points out, is "paying butchers for not selling

meat, £14 millions more a year than it would have cost to get the meat and subsidise its consumption." The Ministry of Food is convinced that "our people are prepared to accept the situation."

One cannot help thinking of the man describing to his friend the experiment he made with his horse. He gradually reduced its rations until the poor horse was eating one grain of oats a day. "What did you do then?" asked his friend. "Oh, the horse died," he explained. The Ministry of Food, or rather, the Treasury, which controls the purse, is reducing our ration in order to keep down its fallacious cost of living index figure—and it is costing more to do so.

The Government's political opponents are, quite naturally, making capital out of this final absurdity and advising a return to a free market in meat, and the abandonment of bulk buying and food subsidies. In other words, the American system of plenty to eat, at prices only a minority can afford.

No Quick Solution

There is in fact only one permanent solution to the meat problem and the food problem in general—to produce our food at home. This has long been advocated by anarchists for sociological reasons, and from the point of view of revolutionary strategy (see Kropotkin's *Fields, Factories and Workshops*; George Woodcock's *New Life to the Land*; and the series by J.H. on *Agriculture and Social Revolution*, published in *Freedom* in 1948.) And it has gained ground amongst the more far-sighted agricultural thinkers as a result of the experience of the two

TO PAGE FOUR

A New Freedom Press publication:

Marxism, Freedom & the State

by Michael Bakunin

Edited and translated with a biographical note by K. J. Kenafick

These extracts from the writings of Michael Bakunin are published for the first time in the English language. They deal with a question of supreme importance to our generation: man's freedom in relation to society and to the community. They also throw light on the system that now exists in Soviet Russia and which calls itself "socialist" and "democratic", whereas it is, in reality neither, but essentially capitalistic and totalitarian. Bakunin showed that such a system must result if it is attempted to transform society on an authoritarian basis; and events have proved him right.

64 pp. Demy 8vo. Cloth 5s., paper 2s. 6d.*

*The paper edition is available only to readers of *Freedom*.

FREEDOM PRESS, 27 Red Lion Street, London, W.C.1

"To What Gods, Oh Fool?"

I BELIEVED, by Douglas Hyde.
Heinemann, 10/6

"I believed," says Mr. Hyde, and he is a believer still. He has merely transferred his faith from one religion to another. The former news editor of the *Daily Worker*, who in 1948 joined the Catholic Church (a transition not unknown amongst Communists—the same thing happened to Louis Budenz, editor of the *New York Daily Worker*), has written a book describing how he was drawn into the Party in 1929, how the Party works, how its well-known figures behave, how its paper is produced, and why he left it.

The book is having a great success—it comes at such a suitable time for the Cold War propagandists, and is certainly interesting as a "human document" and for its "inside revelations", but it contains little which will surprise the intelligent outsider, who can hardly have any doubt about the dishonesty, the deception, the "double-think", or the exploitation of the gullible, which are characteristics of the Communist Parties in this country and abroad. And it is not likely to disillusion the hard core of party members—was it not hurriedly "discovered" that Mr. Hyde had been a "Vatican agent" for some time before his defection? Nor is the serialisation of the book in Lord Beaverbrook's *Daily Express*, likely to commend it to them.

What the book does reveal is Mr. Hyde's passionate desire to believe in something. He started as a Methodist boy preacher, dabbled with Theosophy and Hinduism and the art of Doing

Without Sleep, and tried to combine primitive Christianity with Marxism. (On the fly-leaf of his copy of Lenin's *Preparing for Revolt* is drawn a Cross on which hangs a hammer and sickle. Written in an immature hand beneath it is: *For God and the Workers' Commonwealth*.) His final break with Communism arose from his emotional disillusionment—the faith had lost its hold on him—rather than from the use of his reasoning or moral sense. "... My missionary zeal had grown less because of my growing mental conflict... Marxist analysis was becoming a science to me without being an apostolic faith." When he read a Catholic Truth Society pamphlet by Hilaire Belloc, "its vigorous polemical style appealed, for it had a certain similarity to that of some of our own Marxist writers."

The stumbling-block for Mr. Hyde on his Road to Damascus was belief in God. One would not have thought that for a person with such an infinite capacity for belief, it would be very difficult. This was how it came about:

"I heard my voice saying, 'It is five to ten and we still don't believe in God as a living reality. In five minutes' time, at ten o'clock let's start. Let's act and think as though there really were one.'"

When he crept surreptitiously into a Catholic Church and knelt before the blessed Virgin he did not know what to say. "The candle spluttered and flickered, growing shorter and shorter but no words came." At last the words came out and, "I knew my search was at an end. I had not talked to nothing." What did Mr.

Hyde says to Our Lady? "They were those of a dance tune of the nineteen-twenties, a gramophone record of which I had bought in my adolescence:

*O sweet and lovely lady be good
O lady be good to me.*

Mr. Hyde's proselytising zeal is not diminished. He has found his niche on the staff of the *Catholic Herald*. There is something truly pathetic (or contemptible) about this frantic search for an all-embracing faith in which the lonely individual can bury himself. The passionate desire to have all problems solved, all decisions made and no questions to ask. If Mother Russia proves a bad parent, there is always Mother Church to keep him warm and snug in her ample bosom. If he's suffocated he won't even notice it.

And our attitude? It was stated years ago by George Barrett. Their lives, he wrote, in their own small way are like that of Ibsen's Emperor Julian, and with him, they cry with their petty voices: "I must call upon something without and above me... I will sacrifice to this god and to that. I will sacrifice to many. One or the other must surely hear me." The philosopher Maximus tries in vain to stimulate self-reliance in the Emperor: "To what gods, oh fool? Where are they... and what are they?... I believe in you."

C.W.



Russian Attitude to Child Sexuality

THE SEXUAL PROBLEM IN EARLY CHILDHOOD. (Extract from "The Pre-School Age Group" by E. A. Arkin. 5th ed. Uchpedgiz, Moscow, 1948. English translation published by S.C.R., 1950. 1/6d.)

IN view of the use which Western sociologists have made of attitudes toward infantile and child sexuality as a cultural index, this translation is of great interest, both to anarchists and to psychological readers in general. It comes from a textbook for Soviet kindergarten and child health workers which has run through four editions, and as such it probably represents a fair picture of the approach to infant sexuality which Soviet psychology is trying to inculcate. The pre-school institution (nursery, kindergarten, etc.) seems to be widely developed in Russia, and probably plays a very considerable part in the character-formation of both urban and rural children, and its principles have been the subject of several major controversies in Soviet journals.

Arkin's paper begins with the rather staggering statement, to Western ears, that "questions of sexual development, hygiene and education find little reflection in scientific literature" (from the point of view of shelf space, English psychiatrists would be relieved if they could share this view). The object of the chapter is to provide kindergarten workers with an objective picture of infantile sexuality and of the attitude toward it which they ought to adopt. Much of the existing literature, Arkin says, is misleading or downright harmful—a good deal of it regards all sexual manifestations in infancy as pathological: Metchnikov, on the other hand, long since pointed out that sexual feeling normally arises long before physical puberty, and Arkin, from his own experience, concludes that the vast majority of its manifestations fall well within normality. The widespread scientific and public idea of a correlation between infant masturbation and ill-health is quite unfounded, though it seems to go with day-dreaming (the under-six age-group rather than the infant is clearly meant) and

"cruelty of character is much more frequently observed in boys who show sexuality than in girls". Other manifestations include an excessive desire for cuddling and fondling, curiosity over sex, exhibitionism and drawings with sexual content.

The interpretation of these phenomena is more difficult—Freud's "narrowly biological and arbitrary" view, and especially the idea of the primacy of sexual drives and of amnesia due to inhibition are condemned, though the Oedipus concept is not mentioned as such. (Freud himself is partly to blame for the construction put on his theory by Arkin, as by a great many English workers, through his use of the word "sexual" in relation to drives which eventually become specifically sexual.) "The fate of sexuality proceeds in close dependence on the path of development of the whole personality," and psychotherapy in childhood should treat the whole and not the part.

"The facts say that in the early years of life, as well as in the others, sexuality is not in itself pathological"—the task of the child hygienist is therefore to distinguish between manifestations which can be safely left alone and those which need to be discouraged, such as "lewdness and coarseness", which can very easily spread by imitation. The view that masturbation leads to exhaustion and mental illness is entirely without foundation, but the author finds it "impossible to align oneself with those who are ready to look on it as a harmless act." The dangers are not physical but social—masturbation is a bad thing because it gives rise to "spiritual conflict" with the sexual attitudes of others, since "children closely conceal their sexual activities and curiosity from adults". It is this conflict which leads to mischief. The remedy is to fill the child's entire time with socially-useful activities and strengthen his self-confidence. Children who masturbate should certainly not be segregated or "branded with infamy", unless they show aggressive behaviour marked by "coarse, shameless lewdness". Co-education for older children, and the practice in some kindergartens of the teacher bathing with the children, if they are over six years old, should be avoided (most English child psychologists would feel that the child's curiosity about the anatomy of the other sex should have been met before this age). On the other hand, the school cannot provide a proper background without the assistance of the family. "Socialist culture has not yet dislodged from the life of adults such scenes and words as give rise to vulgar behaviour"—it is all-important, moreover, to avoid linking sexuality with fear. Under no circumstances should corporal punishment, "one of the characteristic features of bourgeois pedagogics", fright, humiliation or threats be used to counter undesirable sexual manifestations. Corporal punishment in particular is "in irreconcilable contradiction with the fundamental principles of Communist education". As a general summary of the argument, "personal impressions gathered in observing children who later became famous... persuade one to this conviction, that profundity and complexity of sexual experience manifested in early years testify to a more complex organisation and a faster tempo of general spiritual development."

On sex education, Arkin stresses its importance to the teacher and parent far more than to the child—lies should never be told, but it is not necessary to go into details for the benefit of "little children". Of six dated references in the bibliography,

none is later than 1926.

To the non-Communist observer, the most striking feature of this account is its familiarity: roughly speaking, this is where most educationists stood in 1920, and Arkin himself seems to be having to contend with public attitudes and public ignorance not unlike those in Western countries. The least encouraging part of the discourse, from the sociological point of view, is its extremely muddled, or at least inexplicit, view of the factors which influence character-formation all of which are stated in general idealistic terms, and the absence of any discussion of the normally-observable phases through which infantile sexuality develops. This lack of a coherent theory of psychodynamics seems to be general in Communist psychiatry. Arkin's position is hardly authoritarian—he does at least go out of his way to insist on the need to combat any tendency towards cruelty, by or to the child—but to anarchist readers it is certainly negative, and, to borrow Arkin's own term, "bourgeois": it makes no attempt to employ sexuality as a source of individual spontaneity, and repudiates the idea that early sexual attitudes have any key position in the formation of character. How far Arkin's ideas are actually carried out in practice it is hard to judge, though they have probably been widely read by would-be kindergarten teachers in training: in view of the other emphases in Soviet education, especially in political and social indoctrination, one cannot predict what sort of individuals the schools are likely to turn out, and it is precisely on this that the future course of Russia is likely to depend. The religious emphasis in England is largely replaced by a rather romanticised "Socialist modesty" and there is an unstated assumption that sexual enjoyment, being a purely individual activity unless it is reproductive, is morally inferior to corporate endeavour—a view which is in line with the Marxist view of civilisation in terms of labour. Most striking of all is the virtual isolation, whether by accident or design, of Russian educationists from the recent work done by their "bourgeois" colleagues, and the likeness between the outcomes of ideology in Russia and "commonsense" as a psychological critique in England. Readers who wish to examine the Soviet attitude to child development in the light of their own opinions would do well to read the original pamphlet. ALEX COMFORT.

THE GOOD SOLDIER SCHWEIK by Jaroslav Hasek (Penguin, 2/6)

JOSEPH SCHWEIK is a legendary Czech private soldier in the army of the Austro-Hungarian Empire in the war of 1914-18, whose adventures were described by Jaroslav Hasek after that war.

Schweik, as a good soldier believes all he is told, obeys all orders, and carries out his duties as a model citizen-soldier, to their logical and absurd conclusions. His resulting experiences at the police station, the medical board, the detention barracks, as the Chaplain's orderly, and on the way to the front, are masterly satire which does not lose its point by being directed at Imperial Austria, from the point of view of Czech nationalism. The military system is much the same everywhere. The book contains, amongst other things, what must be the most devastating satire on the practices of the Christian faith, to be found in any book in print.

READERS VIEWPOINTS

Power, Freedom and Personality

TONY GIBSON'S article in *Freedom*, 6th January, 1951, comes as a very welcome shock, and is as bracing and vital a challenge as one would wish to meet. I called it a shock because it is rare indeed that one finds words used in their own right, i.e., free from moral overtones and sentimentalities. I feel, however, that he could go even further. True, he talks of people using power for their own true self-interest, yet that seems to be diluting the meaning a little. What in fact egoism, or the exercise of personal power means to me, is what the public at large would call sheer unadulterated selfishness. Let us not be frightened of words. What each and every one of us must do to achieve power, liberation, freedom and individuality, is to do exactly what pleases us as individuals and no more. Freedom in fact means freedom from external restraint—yet this mode of existence need not imply greediness, ruthless self-centredness and egocentricity. If man is a social animal as so many anarchists maintain, then it is possible that he would have social feelings, would in fact get genuine pleasure from helping others, from being kind and from pleasing people. Moreover, he would not, if he is an individual, force himself into self-sacrifice against his will under a sense of duty. Having no faith or belief in creeds, systems or religions such an individual would be more sensitive to the feelings of others and if he acted in sympathy with his group would do so from genuine desire. A creed or faith acts as an insulation and a protection against other faiths or ideas so that a Communist or Roman Catholic is convinced that he has self-evident, external, truth within his grasp, and thus is certain, that those who do not believe are malicious, spiteful, traitors—heretics not out of conviction, but out of downright evil and should thus be destroyed. And as we know from contact with individual fanatics, a faith acts not only as a pair of blinkers but also as a distorting lens so that only the evidence that suits the faith in question is seen. Thus facts, documentary evidence, incontrovertible proofs, statistics, etc., are all disregarded if any "known truth" is challenged. This would explain the time lag required for "new truths" to get a hold upon the populace and the exclusiveness of political faiths and religious creeds.

Max Stirner in *The Ego and his Own* said close on a century ago, that a man would sacrifice his own desires, his property, his family, even his own life for the abstract ideal of humanity but wouldn't cross the road to help a blind

beggar. Erich Fromm, in *The Fear of Freedom* and *Man for Himself*, points out that a man does not belong to himself nowadays but to the taboos and attitudes of his group or class. Many people are clear-thinking enough to see how the major beliefs of the age hypnotise their adherents, but do many notice how the minor beliefs have the same effect. Codes of honour drilled into the plastic souls of children, the constant homage and lip service paid to ideals, even trite little aphorisms, all have the effect of forcing the individual to suppress and distort his personal will, desires and urges. Nowadays, people are asked to sacrifice themselves or to stifle their personal feelings for the sake of an "integrated" society or in the name of a "healthy" or a "free" society. Even the phrase "one can't have freedom without responsibility" can be twisted to mean responsibility to other people which, in the last analysis, means responsibility to an abstract ideal such as truth, justice, moderation, or freedom.

As Tony Gibson has pointed out, the man who takes refuge behind platitudes, general moral standards or a sense of righteousness and self-justification is the irresponsible one, for so long as he can convince himself that he is in the right when he acts, then the results of his actions do not concern him. An individual needs not only a consistently critical intelligence and a cynical attitude towards his own personal motives but a hedonistic approach to life into the bargain. Regeneration lies not through faith and self-denial as the Christians would have it, but through disbelief and self-indulgence. It might be noted here that a pig rooting in a trough and a mother sacrificing herself for her children are both indulging themselves—one cannot easily escape the limitations of one's nature. Let us beware of self-righteousness, of making a virtue out of our necessities. Men have different desires, urges, impulses and internal pressures one from another, only some feel impelled to mutilate themselves at the behest of ideologies. The Christians who postulate a creator deny the creations and fail to see that such a creator would welcome the full flowering of all of man's potentialities. Finally, if visions of murderers running amok under freedom are induced because of this article, it might be remarked that all the law, power, force and might of the State cannot stop rape and violence if the urge is there.

BOB LINDON

Organization

"Anyone who tells you that anarchists don't believe in organization is talking nonsense. Organization is everything and everything is organization."

—ALEXANDER BERKMAN.

"We do not want any societies, we do not want any organizations."

—The Russian anarchist GERSHKOVICH. (According to E. Yaraslavsky.)

PRACTICALLY every anarchist who has engaged in the propagation of his ideas, whether publicly or privately, has been told time after time, "But I thought anarchists do not believe in organization." And most anarchists have, when thus reproached, time after time wearily replied that anarchists have no objection to organization as such, but are merely concerned with *how* things are organized and by *whom*.

Nevertheless, one still meets with this 'objection' from people who should, but don't, know better. One even meets anarchists who claim they are opposed to organization, or who apologetically remark that "Of course, I know that one should not mention organization to anarchists, but..."

Obviously, the best way to deal with statements like this is to find out what exactly the term 'organization' means. According to the dictionary, to organise anything means to "give a definite structure; to get up, arrange, put into working order". In other words, when we talk of workers organizing production in a factory, what we mean is that they would decide what is to be produced, how it is to be produced, and who would be the best persons to perform the various jobs necessary to the process of production. Similarly, when anarchists talk of 'organizing' something, we are simply saying that we intend to make the arrangements necessary for that something to be done.

Where people go wrong when they assume that anarchists do not believe in organization, is in thinking that authority and organization are synonymous: that organization must of necessity be done from 'above'. Anyone who thinks at all intelligently about this matter will soon see that organization is essential to social life; that, indeed, life itself would be impossible without organization. Where the fundamental difference between the anarchist conception of organization and that of other social doctrines, lies, is in the anarchist view that organization

be on a free, i.e., voluntary basis; whereas our opponents believe that organization should, immediately or ultimately, be effected by the use of coercion.

Organization is not a partisan term. Those 'anti-organizers' who imagine that it is, are as illogical as one who contends that the terms 'society' or 'life' or 'universe' necessarily imply that a person who uses them is an adherent, say, of theosophy, just because a theosophist uses them. To quote Alexander Berkman again:

"The whole of life is organization, conscious or unconscious. Every nation, every family, why, even every individual is an organization or organism. Every part of every living thing is organized in such a way that the whole works in harmony. Otherwise the different organs could not function properly and life could not exist."

"But there is organization and organization. Capitalist society is so badly organized that its various members suffer, just as when you have pain in some part of you, your whole body aches and you are ill."

"There is organization that is painful because it is ill, and organization that is joyous because it means health and strength. An organization is ill or evil when it neglects or suppresses any of its organs or members. In the healthy organism all parts are equally valuable and none is discriminated against. The organization built on compulsion, which coerces and forces, is bad and unhealthy. The libertarian organization, formed voluntarily and in which every member is free and equal, is a sound body and can work well. Such an organization is a free union of equal parts. It is the kind of organization the anarchists believe in."

GERMINAL.

"When a government intends war, then the attitude of the ordinary man who lives in its jurisdiction must be the same as it would be towards a foreign invader. Both are his enemies."

ALEX COMFORT

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

- The Good Soldier Schweik Jaroslav Hasek 2/6
Conditions of Freedom John MacMurray 6/-
Byron Herbert Read 1/6
Evolution of Modern Capitalism J. A. Hobson 12/6
Translations from Greek Poetry R. C. Trevelyan 5/-
Freedom and Culture U.N.E.S.C.O. 15/-
Language Truth and Logic A. J. Ayer 9/-
Ethics for Unbelievers A. Blanco White 12/6
Tudor England S. T. Bindoff 2/6
Sexual Life in Ancient Rome Otto Kiefer 21/-
Diagnosis of Our Time Karl Mannheim 10/6
Essays on Contemporary Events C. G. Jung 8/6
A Field of Broken Stones Lowell Naeve 12/6

Plan, Nos. 2, 4, 6, 7 and 8 2/6 each
Now, Nos. 4, 5, 6, 7 and 9 1/- each

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

JUGOSLAVIA AND THE WEST

BEFORE 28th June, 1948, when Russia expelled Yugoslavia from the Cominform, Marshal Tito's regime was generally execrated in all the British Press, with the exception of the *Daily Worker*. We have already pointed out that as the Cold War developed practical considerations have brought about a changed attitude in the West. Now that the struggle between East and West has been intensified, it was inevitable that the white-washing of the Yugoslav regime should also proceed apace, and result in strange somersaults.

On 4th February, the *Observer* wrote a "profile" on Milovan Djilas, the Yugoslav Minister of Education and Propaganda. "One of the most important men in Yugoslavia, Milovan Djilas, has been spending a week in London. He came to give a private talk at Chatham House (the Royal Institute of International Affairs). The Government held a reception for him at Lancaster House. And he had private conversations with Mr. Attlee and Mr. Morrison, and a very long talk with Mr. Churchill. All publicity was deliberately avoided." The "profile" the followed was almost an eulogy.

Anarchists have never been slow to sum up their attitude to a particular regime. Our movement denounced the Bolshevik counter-revolution, not in 1936 or 1945, but in 1918 and 1919 and especially after the final decisive defeat of the revolution at Kronstadt in 1921. Nor was there any temporizing with Mussolini or Hitler or Franco. Similarly, when the Russian-controlled Partisan movement under Tito seized power in Yugoslavia with more than the usual show of brutality and terror, anarchists had no hesitation in expressing detestation of the new regime.

To turn round now and eulogize this terrorist dictatorship is no different in principle from the Molotov-Ribbentrop volte face in August, 1939. We have already pointed out that the political right has always openly espoused political expediency as its guide; but the left claims to have moral scruples and aims, and hence it is the left wing apologists for Tito who are most nauseating. In this article there can be no attempt at completeness: we shall simply point to some factors which give a fair insight into the regime.

Tito as a Military Ally

First, as to "practical" orientations. The *New York Herald Tribune* on 27/12/50, remarks that, "In all likelihood, Yugoslavia right now has the most powerful army on the European continent outside of Russia . . . To Western Europeans who are desperate enough to lay aside their natural misgivings and arm the Germans, Tito's guns and men must come as a welcome addition to a none too plentiful arsenal." It goes on to say that all this "does not necessarily mean that Tito is now fit for inclusion in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or that the United States has the slightest intention of inviting him in. It does mean, however, that the Russians have a formidable and increasingly implacable foe at their doorstep . . ." What could be plainer than that?

When it comes to details, however, the plainness becomes blurred. *Associated Press* in the same issue of the *New York Herald Tribune* states that defence costs which in 1950 amounted to 15.43 per cent. of the total budget, rose to 16.9 per cent. in Tito's budget for 1951. *British United Press*, also reporting from Belgrade, stated on the same day that the new defence expenditure will represent a record of 11 per cent. as against 7.5 per cent. last year. We shall see that a similar blurring of statistics occurs in agriculture.

Political Prisoners

The *Manchester Guardian* commendably seized the opportunity when Djilas was in England to ask for the release of Dr. Dragoljub Jovanovic, the Socialist Peasant Party's leader, who was imprisoned after the usual farcical trial to nine years' imprisonment in 1947. He demanded less subservience to Russia but was too far ahead of the leaders. At his trial his "connections" with "Western imperialists" were denounced—again he was in advance of Tito and the others. But—he is still in prison and said to be failing in health.

On 31st December last, Tito announced a New Year amnesty for more than 11,000 political prisoners—clearly as a propaganda sop to the West. We have no means of telling how real is this gesture. What revolts us is the fact that the *Manchester Guardian* is almost alone in raising the issue of political prisoners in Yugoslavia, or in mentioning names.

Meanwhile, an unseemly bargaining is going on between the British and German administrations regarding the future of 38 Yugoslav generals who cannot return to their country because of political opposition (itself a speaking comment on the regime). They are at present accommodated as displaced persons, but the British Government demands that if they are sent to Britain, the German Federal Government should pay a "lump sum for their upkeep which would equal an aggregate of 70 marks a head per month for the rest of their lives—this would amount to about 50,000 marks or roughly £4,000. The German Minister of Refugees remarks that "no government in the world would accept such an arrangement." The *Manchester Guardian* adds that the generals may therefore, "soon find themselves on the poor rate without even the guarantee of reasonable accommodation."

H. N. Brailsford's Praise

We have pointed out that for the left, moral issues count—at least as propaganda. That Tito has a large army may

be good enough reason for the right to seek him as an ally; but for the left, preliminary white-washing is a necessity. It is with great regret and some surprise that we see H. N. Brailsford contributing to this ignoble masking of the general truth in his series of four articles in the *New Statesman and Nation*.

Let us try to make a clear position on this. No country's administration, however vile, can afford to be without some good features if only to maintain itself at home. But such do not redeem a general tyranny. The happy "voluntary collectives" that Brailsford describes, do not atone for the murders and brutality which brought Tito to power; do not cancel the political trials, nor the political secret police. Nor do they obliterate the suppression of countless rank and file workers and peasants who have opposed the regime: nor the economic misery accentuated by administrative centralization. Nor should the achievements of workers and peasants be credited to the administration. Brailsford finds a happy working group in the mountains, and the readers of the *New Statesman* are by implication invited to feel warmer towards Tito. Such a method is a travesty of the truth.

Collectivization

Brailsford says the collectives are self-governing and are voluntary. Yet even

he has to concede that, in fact, they are not voluntary where the peasants' interests are not advanced by collectivization. "The Yugoslavs would not use Stalin's methods of coercion, but their milder devices had the same effect in antagonizing the villagers. The local officials, most of them young men, were often, as a leading Communist put it, more ruthless dictators than any one at the top. They have been known to assess a peasant so heavily for the farm produce he is required to deliver at low fixed prices, that to make up his quota he was driven to buy what was lacking in the free market, which charges about ten times the rationed price. He could escape such exactions by joining a "zadruga" (collective). With unconscious irony, Brailsford adds that "the total number of zadrugas increased from 1,318 to 6,603 in 1949." Where is the difference between this and "Stalin's methods" of "Those for the collective farm, on the left; those for Siberia, on the right!" Stalin also claimed that collectivization was voluntary.

Statistics are vague here. Brailsford speaks of "disappointment over the slow progress of collectivization" and gives the figure for the whole of Yugoslavia as embracing "only 17 per cent of the peasant families". The *Times* in two long articles on Yugoslavia declares that "the

changes (i.e., collectivization) have been made too fast for the country's economic stability . . . already about a third of all the cultivated land is in collective farms or State farms." Gaston Coblenz, writing in the *New York Herald Tribune*, says that in five years Tito "has collectivized about 20 per cent of the Yugoslav farms."

Some Collectives distintegrating

Coblenz reports a Communist deputy from Osijek, in Croatia, as saying that "there have been many attempts by peasants to 'break up' collectives from within during 1950". "In the Bjelovar district," Coblenz goes on, "4 out of 42 [collectives] were disbanded and in the Cazina region, 3 out of 14 had gone out of existence during the year." Despite the "voluntary" character of collectivization, the Government calls for "a daily unrelenting fight against the enemies of the collectives."

The whole subject is deeply interesting and significant. But it requires much more accurate and full information, and would require much more space than is possible here. Nevertheless, enough has been said to show that Tito's regime is still only a Communist dictatorship that has changed sides.

ANARCHIST.

American "Clemency" Liberates Krupp and Sends 7 Negroes to the Chair on Rape Charge

AN editorial comment in a recent issue of the *Manchester Guardian* opens with these words: "When the *Daily Worker* and its friends take up a cause, others become suspicious." That is our view, too, because having read the *Daily Worker* for many years we have come to realise that the Communists are only interested in "civil liberties" in so far as they can make political capital out of such cases. It is significant that they never discover violations of "civil liberties" in Russia or the satellite countries. Having said this, however, one must add that if one examines the cases of injustice taken up by the national press in general, one also finds that very often behind the campaign is a political consideration: that of embarrassing the government in power if it happens not to be the kind of government that suits the particular newspaper proprietor. Fortunately there are still a few exceptions to this rule, but their number is becoming rarer in this world permanently in a state of cold or hot war.

It is, for instance, significant that the recent execution of seven young American Negroes for the rape of a white woman has hardly been mentioned in the British Press. If this curtain of silence is due to the fact that the Communists throughout the world have taken up the cause of the negroes in question, that in itself is a significant trend, for it would indicate that the democracies are as politically conscious of "civil liberties" as are the Communists and that in future we may expect only to read of abuses of justice behind the iron curtain and condonation by silence of the injustices which are perpetrated in our midst.

★

NO section of the British Press has, to our knowledge, compared in any detail the case of the seven negroes (referred to in America as the "Martinsville case") with that of the German War Criminals, whose sentences have again been reviewed by the American authorities in Germany. Such a comparison reveals the political expediency governing "justice" and "clemency" in a country which poses for the rest of the world as a model in democracy and of the rights of man!

For the facts of the Martinsville case we must rely on scanty Press reports. Alistair Cooke, the usually sympathetic and reliable correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian*, appears to be affected by the Communists' exploitation of this case, for his report (*M.G.*, 1/2/51) is particularly luke-warm:

"On January 9th, 1949, seven negroes were arrested on the complaint of a white girl in Martinsville, a tobacco and furniture manufacturing town in the lee of the Blue Ridge Mountains. The girl had been in mental institutions and is in one to-day. The seven men were tried before an all-white jury. Three of them declined to testify, but the other four who did came to admit their part in the incident but tried to shift the responsibility of inciting it on to the silent three. Negro women witnesses testified that the men had told them the whole story."

They were all found guilty on May 3rd, 1949, and sentenced to death. Appeals were successively rejected by the Supreme Courts of Virginia and the United States. Their case was then taken up by the National Association for the Advancement of Coloured People. It filed a petition of *habeas corpus* in Richmond alleging that the conviction and sentence of death was unlawful since the State of Virginia had rescinded, as long ago as the eighties, the law making the death penalty for rape one reserved for negroes. But

this argument was not accepted by the Supreme Court.

Alistair Cooke sums up: "The bare facts of the Martinsville case are that seven negroes were found guilty of raping a white woman, that they had an able defence which failed to save them, through the long and elaborate course of American justice, and that while there is no Virginia law that forbids the death sentences for rape, it has never been imposed on a white man and is being imposed on these men."

A plea of clemency was later rejected both by President Truman and the Governor of Virginia, and four of the men were executed on February 2nd and the other three a few days later.

★
WHETHER the Martinsville negroes were guilty of rape or not is, to our mind, of no great importance compared with the enormity of the crime of executing seven men—six boys and one man, since all but one were under twenty—on such a charge. But even so, we cannot be as sure as Alistair Cooke that there was doubt about their guilt, or that they had a fair trial.

The atmosphere in such cases is perhaps fairly presented when he writes: "Whenever a case of rape comes up in the South the colour of the accused provokes an automatic response. Southern conservatives refuse on principle to believe that a white man has ever raped a coloured woman. The American Left and the professional New York liberals (who are great connoisseurs of southern customs) automatically refuse to believe that any negro can be guilty of raping a white woman."

★

He should have added, however, that since 1908 52 negroes have gone to the electric chair for rape in the State of Virginia. But there is no record of a white man having suffered a similar fate. Does Mr. Cooke explain this fact by sharing the views of the "Southern Conservatives" or must he admit that there is one kind of justice for the white man and another for the coloured man?

★
And what of clemency?

★
THIS consideration brings us to the case of the German War Criminals. Only a few days before Truman and the Governor of Virginia had refused clemency for the Martinsville negroes, General Handy and Mr. McCloy, Commander-in-Chief of American Forces in Germany and American High Commissioner respectively, announced the fate of 28 German war criminals who had been condemned to death. Twenty-one were reprieved and seven will be executed. "I am satisfied that the dispositions now finally made in the individual cases are just to the individual and society," Mr. McCloy said in a statement on his decisions. "I have attempted to apply the standards of executive clemency as they

are understood in a democratic society. I have made every effort to decide each individual case objectively, dispassionately and on its merits."

Both he and General Handy emphasised that in no case has one of the 21 commuted death sentences been revised on legal grounds. The Germans in question were guilty of the crimes attributed to them and their lives had been spared only by an act of clemency.

Writes one correspondent, following the announcement: "One remarkable example of the moderation of the Americans is the story of the 'Malmédy case', in which 142 unarmed American soldiers who had surrendered during the Ardennes offensive were grouped in a field and machine gunned or clubbed to death. In July, 1946, 43 Germans were sentenced to death at Dachau for this crime. In March, 1948, General Clay reduced the number of death sentences to twelve. In May, 1949, he brought them down to six. These six sentences were commuted to-day to life imprisonment."

Not one single German, in fact, has been executed for this mass murder at the Malmédy crossroads."

The Americans have also decided to release 28 prisoners. They include ex-General Speidel, the brother of the ex-General Speidel who is a member of the German delegation discussing rearmament with the Western Powers in Bonn, and the titular head of the steel complex of Krupp, Herr Alfred Krupp von Bohlen und Halbach who had previously been sentenced to twelve years' imprisonment and confiscation of all property.

Krupp's property will be returned to him on the grounds that a confiscation decree which was attached to his sentence was the sole such decree in all the war-time trials, "and is, according to Mr. McCloy, 'generally repugnant to American concepts of justice.'" That Krupp manned his factories with slave labour apparently is not repugnant to American concepts of justice!

★
BOTH with the Martinsville negroes and the war criminals, pressure has been brought to bear on the authorities for a revision of the sentences. The fact that the Communists were the spearhead of the protests on behalf of the Martinsville negroes undoubtedly operated against the victims, as it was obvious that the American authorities would refuse to be intimidated by Communists. The fact that protests about the German war criminals came from influential circles in Germany—circles which the Americans need on their side to put into effect their rearmament programme in Germany—played an important rôle in the revision of sentences. Of particular interest are the lengths to which the Americans have gone to rehabilitate the "honour" of the German Army. Mr. McCloy, states that the sentences which must now be carried out "reflect upon the individuals concerned, and not upon the honour of the whole German Army."

★
THE two cases outlined in this article are, we think, an answer to those critics who accuse us of cynicism when we suspect not only the motives of the Communists but of all politicians. More than this we do not feel called upon to say. The opportunism and expediency shown in the case of seven negroes sent to their death and twenty-one "war criminals" saved from death to fight another day, speaks for itself in exposing the hollowness of those words "justice" and "clemency" when uttered by politicians.

V.R.

HELIGOLAND

BIRD SANCTUARY OR BOMBING TARGET?

IF Eisenhower and Company have their way, we shall soon be recognising "gallant little Germany" as our glorious Ally, until the re-alignment of forces for World War Four at any rate. In the meantime there are certain set-backs. It is much easier to explain on paper that Nazis are militarists and that militarism must go when Nazism goes; but that now Nazism has gone militarism must come back. As the sacrifice demanded from cannon-fodder is precisely the same, however, they have a few ideas on the subject themselves. Having told us for so long that the Germans are militarists by birth and tradition, the Powers-that-be are now seriously worried by those wicked Germans who won't be militarised and have obstinately declared that they have had enough. It is necessary that they should recognise their place of things as second-class soldiers, ready to fall into line at a respectable distance behind their superiors (not necessarily in time of actual fighting,

when they will probably be right in the front as scorched-earth "expendables").

Oddly enough they are failing to do so. In this context it is not out of place to consider the continual bombardment of Heligoland. Its name, of course ("Holy Land") is simply asking for trouble, but in point of fact it has not always been a bone of contention. It was one of the many captures of Britain in the nineteenth century (taken from Denmark in 1807), possibly intended as a Gibraltar, for which it was unsuited. It was then for many years a peaceful island, noted as a bird sanctuary, celebrated for its sea-bathing, somewhat of a sleepy seaside resort, without the least significance to anybody except sufferers from hay-fever, who found it of use on account of the lack of vegetation. Amongst its greatest admirers was the poet Heine, who sang the praises of Heligoland in the North Sea, and was not one of the least opponents of Prussianism. When Britain was expanding her commercial empire, she traded the island with Germany (it is only 40 miles from the mouth of the Elbe river) for Zanzibar. Germany fortified Heligoland and used it as a submarine base in two wars; for this reason she is not to have it back. What Britain has done in Zanzibar is nobody's business but Whitehall's, and any reference to same internationally is clearly motivated by anti-British sentiments.

It would seem quite appropriate that Heligoland should revert to becoming a sanctuary for birds and sufferers from hay-fever. Not so. Having destroyed its fortifications, the R.A.F. is bombing the island by night and day, within sight of the mainland, in order to demonstrate our peaceful intentions towards the citizens of our newest Ally. One can hear the bombardment as far as Hamburg, a city which has perhaps been martyred for its anti-Nazism and also by aerial destruction more than any other town in the world. The British authorities provide a

(Continued on page 4)

CLASS Z MEN, PLEASE NOTE!

GENERAL Eisenhower, in his speech at Frankfurt on January 20th, said:

"I would not consent to command an organisation where there were sizable contingents put in by force and feeling disgruntled." (*Sunday Times*, 21/1/51.)

According to the *Sunday Pictorial*, he said that he would never agree to command a force "in which the soldiers did not feel they were equal and were fighting for freedom."

WHY PURGE THE LABOUR PARTY?

IT WILL ONLY ALL HAPPEN AGAIN

IN a letter published in *Tribune* recently, Mr. John Atkins voices the disillusionment with the Labour Party in power that must be felt to-day by many of the party's supporters in the past. He says:

"For many of us the Labour Party and in consequence the Labour Government has represented the chief barrier against war, in our recent history. Now even this hope seems to be evaporating. The Ministry of Supply are considering to what extent it will be possible to increase the £3,600 million three-year arms programme.

"To those many people whose minds have not been warped by years of over-subtle political argument this policy is one of idiocy. If it is not seen immediately that such a programme must end in disaster, no amount of persuasion will make an atom of difference. After the first world war it was agreed that all military victories were hollow; since then it has been pretty generally agreed that you cannot coerce a great power. So what happens to the hoary old argument that we are rearming for peace? Politicians can make out a case because that is their profession and many of them are skilled advocates, but they have to employ so much sophistry in the course of it that large numbers of people remain unconvinced.

"Our attitude is not a simple one for the situation is not simple. We detest the Russian slave camps as wholeheartedly as we detested the Nazi concentration camps but that does not make us any more susceptible to American hysteria. We are neither pro-Russian nor anti-Russian. We are anti-war. Or perhaps the phrase has been worn to a frazzle and now means nothing. Let's say we're pro-life.

"But, of course, these arguments have been trotted out almost *ad nauseam* and the slick answer comes back from the dreadful Westminster-Fleet Street machine like the Puddy Tat song from a juke-box. A great responsibility rests upon those M.P.s who can still see the issues directly and without distortion. If they are going to be true to themselves they are going to revolt against the Labour Government's Tory policy. If they revolt they will split the Party.

"They have got to face up to that and accept it, and never vote for destruction merely to keep a Party united. In any case, in the long run there won't be much left to unite. They can be assured that support in the country will be considerable. They can also justify their action by pointing out that the Government's present policy would be carried out far more appropriately by the Tories.

"Reform parties must continually jettison their leaders who continually succumb to what I can only call a condition of Elder Statesmanship, i.e., taking the line of least resistance plus the corrosion of their previous honesty. We can spare the present lot if it will save us from being dragged at the heels of America. The press has been fooled but millions of ordinary people haven't. Let's purge the Party again!"

It is strange that a man who can see so clearly what has happened to his party, and can even see that it is a continual and recurring process should think that a purge will do the trick. The whole history of the Labour Party is a history of sacrifice and hard work by the rank-and-file and of betrayals by the leadership.

Mr. Atkins says elsewhere in his letter, "Somehow the very many ordinary citizens such as myself whose political weight is largely limited to an occasional choice between Mr. X and Mr. Y, both of whom believe in Peace Through Bombs, must make up our minds how best to combat this policy." But none of the members of our government believed in "Peace Through Bombs" (or admitted they did) when they were elected. Mr. Atkins, and the many others like him, should carry their analysis of party politics a stage further, and set about finding other ways of expressing their "pro-life" attitude, than by purging their party so that the same miserable history can be repeated all over again.

★
ANOTHER disappointed Socialist is G. D. H. Cole, Professor of Social and Political Theory at Oxford, who for very many years has been one of the leading theoreticians of the Labour Party and who recently resigned from the chairmanship of the Fabian Society. In an article in the *New Statesman*, after explaining that he thought "that the unification of Korea under the North Korean Government was the least unpleasant way out of a very unpleasant situation," he declared:

"I am deeply distrustful of Communists and fellow-travellers in the light of past experience. I am not prepared to associate myself in any protest in which I may find myself being made a tool of Communist policy. I want, not to side with the Soviet Union or the Western Communists against the Americans, but to make a stand for peace and democratic Socialism against them both.

"How to do this, except by writing down frankly what I believe and hoping that it will serve as some encouragement to others who broadly agree with me, I do not know. I must, however, say this. If Great Britain gets dragged into war with China by the Americans, I shall be on the side of China, and so, I believe, will be enough of my fellow-countrymen to make a deep rift in our national solidarity. If Great Britain agrees to rearm Western Germany, I shall feel unable to take any further part in exhorting the British workers to make an all-out productive effort in order to produce arms for a war in Europe that will no longer be in any sense a war of freedom and democracy. Not, of course, that what I do personally will make a ha'porth of difference. I am writing this down, not out of any belief in my own importance, but because I believe much of it represents what many good Socialists and democrats are feeling, with a chill at their hearts, and because it is about time someone said it in print."

The editor of the journal in which Professor Cole's article appeared says that it has evoked "a huge post-bag" revealing "a pent-up longing for a simple, strong anti-war line."

★
This fundamental disagreement between the governmental and many of its party members raises this question. Is it logical for them to stay in the party? The *Manchester Guardian*, which regards this longing for peace as "the spirit of the Dodo", comments:

"Professor G. D. H. Cole is declaring that he wants the North Koreans (against whom British soldiers, sent by the Labour Government, happen to be fighting) 'to

win', and the Labour candidate in the West Bristol by-election disagrees with the whole policy of rearmament which the Government he is asking the electors of West Bristol to support is trying to carry out."

And the *Guardian* asks, perfectly correctly, "how can Labour 'supporters' who make no secret of their disapproval of the Government's major policies continue to claim that they 'support' the Government?"

If they want to make their opposition useful they must make it felt. In the words used by Alex Comfort several years ago, "Up till now, it has been an article of pride among English politicians that the public would shove its head into any old noose that they might show it—unflinching steadfast patriotism, unshakable morale—obedience and an absence of direct action. When enough people respond to the invitation to die, not with a salute but a smack in the mouth, and the mention of war empties the factories and fills the streets, we may be able to talk about freedom."

MEAT MUDDLE

FROM PAGE ONE

world wars (see Lt-Col. G. P. Pollitt's *Britain Can Feed Herself*), for economic and strategic reasons. The Government has talked of a new deal for agriculture and taken steps to encourage agricultural production, but this has been more with a view to securing the rural vote, than with giving a more rational balance to industry and agriculture in this country. They are in fact wedded to the traditional capitalist view of Britain as a great importer of food and exporter of manufactured goods, in spite of the fact that the food exporting countries are endeavouring to develop their own industries to the exclusion of ours.

The authorities, unless they are as blind as they are irresponsible will, purely for defence purposes—or rather, survival purposes, have to increase our agricultural production. But this cannot be done quickly and a short-term attempt to increase meat supplies will merely mean "up horn, down corn"—it will be at the expense of the production of dairy products and cereals.

Capitalist Economies

Meanwhile, 50,000 farm acres are being lost each year for building, roads, air-fields and so on. The building of the runway for the Brabazon airliner swept away an entire village, while the £35 millions spent on that other gigantic failure of the ground-nut scheme, if it had been spent on the development of hill pastures could have provided grazing for enough store cattle and sheep to provide more than half the meat we get from the Argentine.

The building of the Brabazon, like that of the uneconomical enormous trans-Atlantic liners *Queen Mary* and *Queen Elizabeth* are examples of the sterile "bigger and bigger" obsession which characterises monopoly capitalism. The Ground-nuts Scheme, in theory an attempt to increase supplies of oils and fats, and to "develop" a colonial territory, bears the same distinguishing marks in practice—a centralised and hierarchic organisation—with regimented native labour at the bottom. The meat muddle is another aspect of the same thing—the economics of the planned socialist state are the economics of the old sterile capitalist system reduced to absurdity. This economic system can be condemned for a variety of reasons, moral and ethical. But one condemnation is enough—it cannot produce the goods.

HELIGOLAND

well-appointed centre in most towns in Germany, to illustrate for everyone the English way of life, love of peace, benevolence towards the Germans, etc., and while they go merrily through the Pay-As-You-Earn rake-off paying for this type of propaganda, they continue to bombard an uninhabited island night after night as "practice". To pretend that this is the only place that they could use for practice, or that the reason they have chosen Heligoland is not pure malice, is absurd. It would be simpler to stop the bombardment and not send out books telling of the English honouring bargains. The general belief at least is that they pick on Heligoland in the first place to make sure it never returns to Germany and (while retaining Zanzibar) to carry on until no living creature can ever again inhabit its rocks; and secondly, as a "friendly gesture" to the mainland.

Amongst all sections of German society, and naturally principally amongst Heligolanders, there has been an understandable resentment. It is here worth remarking that especially amongst old people, there may still remain British citizens amongst the Heligolanders. When the deal was done in 1890, those Heligolanders who wished could retain their British citizenship, and many did so. In those far-off times, the free Britisher did not do military service like the pressed men abroad. It wasn't yet necessary for Britannia to rule the waves. Hence many did retain their nationality and it may be that some of these are still alive while the R.A.F. bombards their island home.

In these circumstances, six people decided on a squatting movement on Heligoland. Six was the word. It is, by the way, significant how once again it is proved (as in the Garry Davis affair, for instance) that the individual still has—*for good, bad or indifferent*—the power to achieve something that will make the world sit up and talk, even in these days of the whittling away of liberty. These six were nationalists, and Right-Wingers, but they were in this affair taking an initiative which irrespective of politics bound most Germans. The British Press has been referring to the squatting incident as "a revival of Nazism" and the "biggest Nazi and anti-British demonstration in Germany since the war." The utter disregard of the truth in their reports is comparable to anything of Hitler's. Those who joined them on the island later, with the intention of squatting there and risking bombardment by the R.A.F., were a few former Heligolanders who naturally followed such an initiative, disregarding the politics of the six. The British military authorities evicted them; others took their place; the Occupation managed once more to make itself a laughing-stock and likewise made the original six into "national heroes"; while the German Government itself was not prepared to risk political odium by taking any vigorous steps, and indeed, declared itself sympathetic to the idea behind the squatting.

That a bit of direct action in these affairs certainly does no harm is a lesson

ANARCHIST PUNCH

No less an authority than M. Obraszov, described as a leading Russian exponent of the craft, attended the conference of puppet shows which has just concluded in the Soviet sector of Berlin.

He caused some consternation by announcing that Punch has now been eliminated from Soviet Punch and Judy shows.

A careful analysis, it seems, had revealed that Punch was "an anarchist element."

Daily Telegraph, 17/1/51.

Growing Interest in the Anarchist Attitude

AT three meetings, of widely different character, during the past month, the Anarchist attitude to sexuality and censorship has found appreciative response.

On Sunday, January 14th, the London Anarchist Group meeting heard John Hewetson on the subject "Sexual Life Considered as a Problem of the Working Class".

Outlining the Anarchist attitude to sexual relationships, and stressing the need for freedom from the repressions of conventional or religious morality, Comrade Hewetson drew on his experience as a doctor in a working-class district to illustrate what he called "the prevailing sexual misery".

He showed how the economic and material circumstances of the workers influenced them, from their very earliest days, into an anti-sexual attitude; how lack of privacy and cramped housing conditions prevented young people from expressing their sexual natures in anything but a furtive manner, and how even after marriage, economic pressure—the inability to "afford" children—created a fear of pregnancy which restricted the woman's pleasure and finally produced frigidity and a sex-negative attitude. And this repression inevitably led to nervous and physical disorder.

The meeting was very well attended

and most of us went home realising anew the price the workers have to pay in health and happiness for a society based on money and morality.

"Prosecutions for Obscenity"

THE following evening, Monday, January 15th, the Sex Education Society held a meeting at the Conway Hall* to draw attention to prosecutions against booksellers for "exposing for sale to the public" books which the law considered obscene. The main incident referred to was a case in Blackpool where 15 books of a medical and scientific nature (including the *Encyclopaedia of Sexual Knowledge*) were ordered by the magistrates to be destroyed.

The chairman was Norman Haire (President of the Sex Education Society) and the guest speakers included two lawyers, Philip Kimber and R. W. S. Pollard; a publisher, Mr. Skelton; and our comrade, Philip Sansom.

The sympathetic reception our comrade received from the packed audience showed how the anarchist attitude can bring home to people otherwise unaware of it, the connection between sexual repression, censorship and the more

* A full report of this meeting, with verbatim report of the speeches, is included in the next issue of the *Journal of Sex Education*, available from Freedom Bookshop, price 2/- postage 3d.)

obvious evils of our society.

GLASGOW MEETING

ON Sunday, January 21st, our Glasgow comrades held their weekly meeting in the Central Halls, where Jimmy Raeside, Eddie Shaw and Frank Leech (chairman), were joined on the platform by a London comrade, Rita Milton.

For over ten years, indoors in the winter, outdoors in the summer, the Glasgow workers have heard the anarchist case from a fine team of speakers (Johnnie Gaffney is usually also on the platform), so it was only to be expected that over 200 were present to hear Rita Milton, following Jimmy Raeside's opening attack on Franco, show the connection between compulsive marriage and sex repression, and the political and economic tyranny of the State.

Outlining the economic nature of marriage, and attacking the authoritarian family as the basis of class-divided society, Comrade Milton reminded the audience how both the Communists and the Nazis had attacked sexual freedom. "Youth who are sexually free are potentially revolutionary youth," she claimed.

In the discussion following, the audience made clear their great interest in this subject, and many of the points were developed and elaborated by the other speakers.

that needs to be learned. It is not an incident which does credit to the peaceful intentions of the West, however, and it is a revelation for the people of this country when they hear of the crying need of the Services for more men. They can always use a few more; if it is not to provide a guard of honour for Joe Bloggs, Terror of the Tyneside in the Twenties and now His Majesty's Whatnot, they can always use a few for actual military manoeuvres, so beloved of the brass-hat brigade. When they have more men they will want more Heligolands. Of course, the military authorities will scream if we take Heligoland from them, like destructive children deprived of their plaything. But perhaps there would not be the demand for more and more conscripts if they did not have these adventures. After all, they now have Korea and Malaya to play with. Must they have Heligoland, too?

INTERNATIONALIST.

Letter

SOCIAL PSYCHIATRY OF COMMUNISM

I WOULD like to add my comment on Alex Comfort's article: "The Psychiatry of Communism."

Comrade Comfort is a theorist, and his ideas have all the marks of a theory, i.e., they are in part very good, and in other parts practically impossible to apply with any chance of success.

His theory is very good to apply in countries which are not under Communist rule, and has been applied by Anarchists in parts of Europe with good results since the days when Communism unmasked itself, i.e., since the days of Makhno and the rebellion of Kronstadt. And these ideas are applied by Anarchists in Europe to-day, although these Anarchists have suffered severely and personally by a tyrannical regime. Comrade Comfort holds this as quite impossible (*Freedom*, 20/1/51).

But to apply these ideas to countries which are under Communist rule, like Russia or its satellite states is quite fantastic, it would mean martyrdom without a chance in a hundred of success.

It would only be a successful attempt to break into a concentration camp for the rest of one's life.

It is in the nature of the work which Comrade Comfort proposes that it cannot be kept secret for any length of time; sooner or later it will be discovered, and that depends not on the instigator nor on the participators of the work, so this fact makes it a hopeless case.

Many good comrades lost their lives without any good for the cause coming out of their death, because they did not know how a tyrannical regime is prepared to fight any attempt to shake its conception of a state, and what kind of institution it has at its disposition for this purpose, and what means it cunningly and ruthlessly employs to this end.

But not every country in the world is under the rule of Communist, and here is a chance for us Anarchists to be psychiatrists of Communists, to employ the ideas of Comrade Comfort.

Wuportal, Germany. W.F.

Freedom — Weekly Special Appeal

January 28th to February 7th :

Edinburgh: T.O.M.* 5/-; Bromley: C.O.D. 1/6; London: Anon 6/-; Leyton: D.G.W. 5/-; Stroud: Anon* 2/6; York: H.A.A. 9/6; Llanely: E.G.R. 1/6; London: W.G. 13/6; Cambridge: C.L.D.* 10/-; Helston: P.B. 6/6; New Malden: G.B. 1/6; London: R.H. 1/-; Glasgow: A.M.C.D.* 4/-; Los Angeles: R.B.S. £6/3/0; Ipswich: W.D. 3/-; London: F.E.D.* 5/-; Rochdale: V.H.L. 5/-; Chelmsford: R.W.M. 5/-; Stirling: R.A.B. 10/-; London: L.G.W. 5/-; Gosport: F.G. 5/-; London: C.W. 10/-; Risley: L.H. 3/-; Edinburgh: B.G.* 10/-; London: J.P.B.* 2/6.

Previously acknowledged ... £13 13 0

1951 TOTAL TO DATE ... £57 6 5

GIFT OF BOOKS:

Stroud: M.K.; London: H.M.

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.

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 Sta.

FEB. 18 **CONSCIOUS EGOISM AND ANARCHISM** Eddie Shaw

FEB. 25th **"WAYS AND MEANS OF WAR RESISTANCE"** Tony Gibson

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.

FEB. 20th **"FUTURE GROUP ACTIVITY"**

MAR. 6th **"MAN FOR HIMSELF"** Bob Lindon

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