

# Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"Ultimately, modern war appears as a struggle led by all the State apparatuses and their general staffs against all men old enough to bear arms... The great error of nearly all studies of war, an error into which all socialists have fallen, has been to consider war as an episode in foreign politics, when it is especially an act of interior politics, and the most atrocious act of all."  
—SIMON WEIL

Vol. 13, No. 35

August 30th, 1952

Threepence

## KRUPPS (ALLIES) INC.

WHEN the notorious Herr Alfred Krupp von Bohlen was released eighteen months ago after serving only a part of the 12 year sentence of imprisonment imposed on him by the Nuremberg Court for being a war criminal (his factories were manned by slave labour), it was pointed out by the American representative, Mr. Cloy, that the Krupp property would be returned to the family since the confiscation decree that was attached to his sentence was the sole such decree in all the wartime trials, and was generally repugnant to American concepts of justice."

The three Western allies have now worked out a plan for compensating Krupp, which, if finally approved will mean that he gets back directly all the family holdings in real estate, shipping and shipyards, valued at about 300 million marks (£25,000,000). In addition, he is to be compensated to the tune of approximately 360 million marks (£30,000,000 for his holding in the iron, steel and coal industries which, under the provisions of the Allied Law No. 27, are officially supposed to be de-cartellised.

The *Tribune* (28/8/52) points out that this is only part of the story.

"Herr Krupp's compensation will be in the form of saleable non-voting bonds, equal in value to the shares of the new companies into which the Krupp combine is to be broken up. What is more, these bonds will be automatically transferred into guaranteed voting shares if and when Herr Krupp decides to sell them.

"In other words, in order to regain a decisive influence over the voting shareholders all Herr Krupp need do is to find some straw men to whom he formally sells his shares. Thanks to the Allied compensation plan, he will not only be as rich as he was in the past, but he can also once again wield his old sinister influence over the basic industries of the Ruhr."

Apart from the fact that confiscation is distasteful to the upholders of Capitalist Imperialism, in that it might create a precedent and even put ideas into the heads of the Dr. Moussadeks of this world, there are other reasons for wooing Herr Krupp. In the words of the *Manchester Guardian's* Bonn correspondent (19/8/52):

"The Allies are anxious to mollify German industrialists in order to persuade them to start manufacturing arms. Last week a director of the Krupp company, Dr. Hardach, told foreign students at Bonn University that the Krupp concern was no longer interested in making arms. He said, in part, that the Nuremberg judgments, under which directors

of the company had been imprisoned for doing that very thing, had made it seem imprudent to manufacture arms again.

"The Krupp company is not alone in its decisions. The Allies have found to their distress that very few German companies are willing to help them to make the Ruhr an arsenal again. Unless the Germans do produce arms for their own army at least West German industry, as British officials are aware, must continue to exploit its present commercial advantages over other industrial countries. Unless German factories can be made to make guns instead of motor cars they will inevitably succeed in taking trade away from other countries now intent upon rearmament. There are, therefore, commercial as well as military reasons for keeping in with Krupps."

It is said by some that we anarchists are cynics, in that we always suspect the motives behind the actions of politicians. We are not in fact cynics, but simply realists.. At the time when Mr. Cloy was talking about "American concepts of justice" for releasing Krupp and reviewing the confiscation of his property ordered by the Nuremberg Court, we commented: \* "The fact that protests about the German war criminals came from influential circles in Germany—circles which the Americans needed on their side to put into effect their rearmament

programme in Germany—played an important rôle in the revision of sentences, etc. . . ." Now also is revealed the fact that rearmament of Germany by German industry, so far as Britain is concerned at least, serves a double purpose, since it will also mean that German industry will have to cut down on its output of exportable goods, and so relieve the competition in foreign markets which has been operating in Germany's favour (because her industry has not been bogged down by armament production and has in that way succeeded in executing orders in less time than her competitors) and at the expense of Britain.

In the past, the motives behind policies was only revealed by the historians many years after the event. To-day, the motives, however base, are admitted at the time of the event. Is it that the politicians are convinced that there is so much fear and apathy among the people that they have lost all sense of dignity and of indignation?

LIBERTARIAN.

\*FREEDOM (17/2/51) and reproduced in the volume of "Selections from FREEDOM, 1951"—*Mankind is One*, p. 14.

## Templer Strikes Again

TEN days ago, General Sir Gerald Templer—the man to whom the British Government has given *carte blanche* to crush the Resistance and to make Malay safe for the white man to continue his exploitation of the country—arrived in the village of Matang Tinggi (79 inhabitants) with an escort of eight armoured cars and spoke about the shooting of the resettlement officer to the adult population in the school-hall. He said that in villages like theirs the "Communists" (note that it used to be "bandits" and "terrorists"). But the General realises that the most repulsive measures are permissible and acceptable to the Democracies if the enemies are "Communists" could get food and supplies whenever they wanted, and he warned the villagers that silence would mean that "you will never live here again as a little community; you will sever all connection with this village and district for ever". He said that the 24-hour curfew imposed after the murder would remain in force. "If you want food, ask a policeman and he will get it for you," he said. "There will be plenty of them here."

[The resettlement officer was shot by terrorists in a coffee-shop in the village last week. Half-drunk cups of coffee and cigarette ends left in the shop indicated that at least twelve people were

present when the murder took place. The district officer last week imposed a collective fine of £542 for withholding information on eighteen owners of shops and houses. When the villagers still maintained their silence General Templer decided to take action himself.]

The four days' "grace" given to the villagers to break their silence expired last Monday. Templer's threats (and his eight armoured cars) failed to turn the villagers into informers with the result that the Malaya Government ordered the destruction of Permatang Tinggi. A Reuter report states that policemen rounded up the villagers in drizzling rain, herded them into lorries and drove them off into detention camps. It is interesting to note that before destroying the village, the Government gave the Chin Heng estate instructions to remove nineteen buildings which it owns. Obviously, the General believes in keeping business interests on his side.

An official announcement made last Monday said the villagers had refused to answer a series of questions put to them about the murder of the official—a Chinese assistant resettlement officer—in a cafe two weeks ago. A spokesman said the villagers had been interviewed individually by a Special Branch officer and a local district officer and that, during a period of house arrest, they were given several opportunities to make statements.

Commenting on the report, the *Manchester Guardian* (28/8/52) writes: "From five thousand miles away this may seem to be 'rough justice' for people who, after all, had become silent abettors of crime". It is a pity that the *Manchester Guardian* has become so officially-minded (except in its staunch defence of the Rights of Horses) that it accepts without question that in Malaya it is the duty of the inhabitants to support the British authorities in their campaign to exterminate the Resistance. Did it take the same attitude when, during the late war, local populations helped prisoners of war to escape from German camps, or when these people refused to give information about the movements of members of the Resistance, or of parachutists dropped behind the lines? Did it write that by their silence "they were 'abettors of crime', or were they heroes. The only excuse the *Manchester Guardian's* editor can put forward for this silence in the villages of Malaya is that the inhabitants would give information if they were protected from reprisals by the "terrorists". This is General Templer's excuse for the signal failure of his threats. Presumably the *M.G.* is in favour of the General's latest proposal to "improve and strengthen wire fences round villages and light them at night" so that the "people may feel more secure". To us, such measures make it appear more likely that the General's intention is to convert Malaya into a series of concentration camps. Fences may keep out the intruders; but what about the people inside the fenced enclosures?

## Steel and Profits

THE first annual report of the nationalised Iron and Steel Corporation showed that the 300 companies and firms under its control had made a profit, in seven and a half months, of no less than £40,000,000.

Socialists (that is, of the Labour and Co-op kind) find this a great source of satisfaction, and maintain that it proved the success of nationalisation. In *Reynolds' News* (24/8/52), for example, Gordon Schaffer declares, "Even the most rabid anti-Socialist, after reading the first annual report of the Iron and Steel Corporation, cannot deny that denationalisation of steel would be a major blow to Britain's recovery."

Frankly, the reasoning behind that statement entirely escaped me. The fact that State monopoly can show a profit as well as the private monopolists could, does not seem to me to prove the case for socialism. The great iron and steel industry of this country has always shown vast profits—which is precisely why the Tories are so anxious that it should be returned to private hands. We have pointed out before that the only two industries which have been nationalised for which the Conservatives are putting up any sort of fight are the two which were making the fattest profits for their owners—steel and road transport.

The Tories made no fight for the mines or the railways because these two industries had had to be State subsidised for years. They had been flogged to death for profits and were worn out. Only the vast resources of the State could capitalise them sufficiently to breath new life into them. Which, capitalistically speaking, means drag new profits out of them.

But steel flourished. With the world determined to remain a vast armed camp; with a nice cozy little war like that in Korea keeping the nations on edge, the steel industry was all set for fairly continuous prosperity. Hence the Tories' determination to hang on to it. Hence, also, the Labour gang's determination to get hold of it. After all the nasty things that had been said about State ownership of coal and the railways—because they continued to lose at first—the Labour Party badly wanted an industry that would show a handsome profit right from the start.

In iron and steel they found it—it couldn't lose. And now the handsome profit is put forward as a proof of the efficiency and necessity of nationalisation!

But what happens to the profits? Five million pounds are put by for depreciation, and the remaining £35,000,000? Mr. Schaffer says: "Publicly-owned steel has thus paid *guaranteed dividends* to shareholders, *considerable sums* in taxation, and is still booming." (My italics.) One of the arguments for nationalisation was always that it was quite wrong

for profits from social production to pass into private hands. So the Labour Party's schemes for nationalisation included ample provision for compensation, so that the ex-owners and shareholders who had benefitted for so long from the labours of others—could go on benefiting from the labours of others. And under State control, those profits are not subject to the ups and downs of the free market (although in fact the Iron and Steel Federation always made sure they were mostly ups and not often downs) but are *guaranteed*.

So the workers in the mighty steel plants, sweating in the glare of the great furnaces, can console themselves with the thought that a good proportion of their production helps to keep the shareholders who, in most cases, know nothing whatever about the work—and don't want to know—but have invested in industrial holdings the money left them by dear Uncle Charlie who died in Australia.

Mr. Schaffer goes on to give figures of world steel production—and shows that in fact the 53-day strike in America

actually helped to avert "over-production"—and then goes on to say "the terrible fact emerges that the capitalist world is only avoiding slump at the moment by turning steel into armaments." Astonishing discovery! FREEDOM has been saying that for two years!

But what is Mr. Schaffer's solution? So that the world's steel can be directed towards great schemes of national and international rehabilitation, we must see "that in nationalised steel there are far more men with a Socialist outlook".

What sloppy thinking this is. It was a "Socialist" government which launched the re-armament drive in this country. So-called socialists everywhere are backing their national governments in their squandering of the world's riches on preparation for war. Socialists of the Labour Party brand are supporting the Tories' wage freeze, holding down the workers' standards of living to pay for the steel for re-armament—to maintain "guaranteed dividends to shareholders".

There is only one answer to the waste of the world's products and exploitation of the world's workers that are to be seen in every State—and that is the abolition of the State. The choice is not, as Socialists like to pretend, between private profit and State profit; the choice is between production for profit and production for use.

The answer is not to have more Socialists or anybody else on the nationalised boards but to have more control for the workers on the job. The choice is not between private boss and State boss; the choice is between Boss Control and Workers' Control. P.S.

## The Colour Bar in High Places

ANTI-SEMITISM did not end with Hitler any more than the colour-bar has been abolished by legislation giving equal rights to white and coloured people. Too many people still consider the association of white women and coloured men as being reprehensible (though it is significant that in our man-governed world the contrary is not so frowned upon), and one cannot therefore allow any occasion when these prejudices are voiced by people in authority to pass unchallenged.

Norwich which is now being "invaded" by American Air Force personnel stationed in that area, is faced with the usual problem of thousands of young men far from home and their women friends, needing an outlet. An artificial situation can only seek artificial solutions, and in the cathedral town of Norwich there is an increase of prostitution, brothels and so on. The authorities reply by organising an "anti-vice" campaign, and already a number of men and women

have appeared before the magistrates on charges of procuring and of prostitution.

One woman who appeared before the Bench on charges of "improper behaviour", said that she received coloured servicemen at a man's house; that this man also brought them to her and that she shared money with him. Sentencing the man to six months imprisonment, the Chairman of the Bench told him that his offence was "the lowest and most despicable form of human depravity and debauchery, adding "Not only were you living on the earnings of a white woman but you were introducing her to coloured people."

In the case that followed, two women aged 50 and 36 respectively, were each fined £3 for "improper behaviour". An officer of the anti-vice squad told the court that the elder of the two women had told him: "I have been a widow for three months and I am now having a good time and you're trying to stop me. She was associating with

American negroes and was alleged to have said, "Can't I do as I like? This is a free country?" After she had promised to lead a "decent life" the Chairman, Sir Robert Bignold, said to her: "If you cannot, at least confine yourself to your own race."

The task of the Court is to uphold the laws of the country and not to air the personal prejudices of its members. In the two cases to which we have referred, the Chairman obviously exceeded his functions and displayed prejudices which single him out as being unfitted for his office. What does the Lord Chancellor think about it?

Whatever the legal aspects of these anti-negro outbursts, we must recognise that such sentiments can only be expressed publicly with impunity because they represent the prejudices held among people in all sections of the community, and until the people as a whole rid their minds of such irrational ideas, the coloured man in our midst will continue to be the victim of discrimination. R.

### STORM OVER UNESCO

Opposition has been growing to the use of U.N. literature in certain of the schools in the United States. This has now become organised and articulate in Los Angeles, California. The controversy came before the Board of Education on July 22nd in connection with the "Unesco study programme".

A resolution of the American Flag Committee refers to the effort of Unesco to bring about "the suppression of the teaching of American history and American geography in the public schools," through the use of a series of booklets entitled "Toward World Understanding." It was alleged that these booklets contained material offensive to the patriotic and moral sensibilities of the citizens of the United States, including the State of California and the city of Los Angeles. The committee petitioned the Board of Education of Los Angeles to make an immediate investigation of the booklets in question with a view to suitable action to prevent their objectionable contents from being used.

—*Times Educational Supplement*, 22/8/52.

# SACCO & VANZETTI: 25 Years have Passed

"Readers of these letters of Sacco and Vanzetti will be struck by the depth of their reliance on the doctrines of anarchy, and the consistency of their belief that what happened to them in those fatal seven years happened because they were anarchists. It explained to them the relentless failure of every effort to secure justice through the courts, and in the extremity of their suffering became their pride and solace. Who can say they were mistaken?"

—Marion Denman Frankfurter and Gardner Jackson (in their Introduction to *The Letters of Sacco and Vanzetti*).

AT 12.19 on August 23, 1927, Nicola Sacco, aged 36, shoemaker and anarchist, was seated in the electric chair at Charleston Prison, Massachusetts, and electrocuted.

At 12.26 a.m. on August 23, 1927, Bartolomeo Vanzetti, aged 39, fish-peddler and anarchist, was seated in the electric chair at Charleston Prison, Massachusetts, and electrocuted.

In spite of seven years of suffering; of proof after proof of their innocence; of appeal after appeal to one court after another; of a mighty volume of international protest that reached thunderous and at time violent proportions—in spite of all this, these two men were sacrificed to appease the wrath of the capitalist class of America. Who were they, and why were they legally murdered?

### The Men

Nicola Sacco was born on April 22, 1891, in the village of Torremaggiore, Foggia, Italy. His father, Michele Sacco, was a well-to-do peasant and a member of the local republican club. His brother, Sabino, was a socialist. When Sacco was seventeen, he emigrated with his brother to America. After various jobs he eventually became an edger in a shoe factory in Webster. Later, he moved to Milford and it was there that he met Rosa. John dos Passos writes: "At that time he was a socialist interested in *Il Proletario*, a paper that Giovannianni edited, fond of acting in plays with titles like 'Senza Padrone,' 'Tempest Sociale.'" It was at a dance he had gotten up as a benefit for an old accordion player who was paralysed, that he first met Rosa, his wife. She won a box of candy in the raffle. She was from the north of Italy and had the dark auburn hair Lombard women are famous for. They married and were very happy; a son was born to them whom they named Dante.

In 1913, Sacco took part in a textile machinery workers' strike and became interested in an anarchist group called the "Circolo di Studi Sociali" which was under the influence of the ideas of Luigi Galleani, editor of the weekly anarchist paper *Cronaca Sovversiva*. In 1916, the group held meetings in support of the strike led by Carlo Tresca in Minnesota. The Milford police suppressed the meetings and arrested the speakers, among whom was Sacco. Though convicted for "disturbing the peace," they were later discharged by a higher court.

In 1917, Woodrow Wilson, elected a few months previously on a "keep us out of the war" vote, led America into the First World War. With several of his comrades, Sacco went to Mexico to avoid conscription. It was here that he became a close friend of Bartolomeo Vanzetti. Thirty anarchists lived communally in a set of adobe houses and for a short time succeeded in putting into practice their ideas of equality. But living in Mexico was hard and difficult and one by one they returned to the U.S.A. Sacco went with his family to live in Stoughton and there became an employee of the Three-K shoe factory.

It was about this time that there began the infamous mass deportations of radicals from America. Attorney General Palmer Mitchell, seizing upon the recent Russian Revolution as an excuse, fanned to fever heat the anti-radical hysteria which began during the war. His agents began the arrest of thousands

of socialists, syndicalists and anarchists. Beatings-up were common, "treat 'em rough being the order of the day. Among those arrested was an active comrade of both Sacco and Vanzetti, Andrea Salsedo, who, with another comrade, Robert Elia, was held incommunicado in the Department of Justice Building in Brooklyn. On May 3, 1920, Salsedo's body hurtled fourteen stories down on to the pavement below. It was smashed into pulp. The authorities alleged that he committed suicide, but his friends accused them of deliberate murder.

On the evening of May 5, Sacco, in company with Vanzetti, had on him a leaflet advertising a meeting of protest at Salsedo's murder at which Vanzetti was to speak. They were both arrested while on a trolley car. They were charged with murders committed during a hold-up in Braintree on April 15. Vanzetti was also charged with taking part in an armed robbery at Bridgewater on December 24, 1919. The authorities tried to charge Sacco with the same crime, but he was able to prove that he was at work the day it took place. Defence witnesses also proved that on the day of the Braintree robbery he was in Boston seeing about a passport and meeting friends... but the witnesses were all Italians and every 100% American knows that these dagoes are all liars, so Sacco was sentenced to death—officially for the murder, in fact for being an anarchist.

Bartolomeo Vanzetti was born on June 11, 1888, in the town of Villafalletto, Piedmont, Italy. He was a studious boy and attended local schools until he was thirteen, winning prizes in school examinations, including a second prize in the religious catechism. In 1901 he was sent to work in a pastry shop in the city of Cuneo, where he worked from seven in the morning until ten at night with a three-hour "vacation" twice a month. He became seriously ill in 1907 and returned home. Soon after the death of his mother, he decided to go to America and on June 9, 1908, he left Italy for the last time.

The United States of America received him as it had received thousands of his compatriots. In his autobiography<sup>2</sup> Vanzetti writes:

"After a two-day railway ride across France and more than seven days on the ocean, I arrived in the Promised Land. New York loomed on the horizon in all its grandness and illusion of happiness. I strained my eyes from the steamer deck, trying to see through the mass of masonry that was at once in-

viting and threatening the huddled men and women in the third class.

"In the immigration station I had my first great surprise. I saw the steerage passengers handled by the officials like so many animals. Not a word of kindness, of encouragement, to lighten the burden of fears that rest heavily upon the newly arrived on American shores. Hope, which lured these immigrants to the new land, withers under the touch of harsh officials. Little children who should be alert with expectancy, cling instead to their mothers' skirts, weeping with fright. Such is the unfriendly spirit which exists in the immigration barracks.

"How well I remember standing at the Battery in lower New York, upon my

arrival, alone, with a few poor belongings in the way of clothes and very little money. Until yesterday I was among folks who understood me. This morning I seem to have awakened in a land where my language meant little more to the native (so far as meaning is concerned) than the pitiful noises of a dumb animal. Where was I to go? What was I to do? The elevated rattled by and did not answer. The automobiles and the trolleys sped by, heedless of me."

Vanzetti wandered through town and state, working at labouring jobs beyond his strength, with hunger and cold as constant companions. He eventually went to live in Plymouth, Massachusetts,

which remained his home until his arrest. Here he became active in the anarchist and radical movements and took an active part in the Cordage Company's strike. A few months before his arrest he entered into business on his own account as a fish-peddler. Of his arrest he writes:<sup>3</sup>

"Another deportation case,' we said to one another.

"But it wasn't. The horrible charges of which the whole world now knows were brought against us. I was accused of a crime in Bridgewater, convicted after eleven days of the most farcical trial I have ever witnessed and sentenced to fifteen years' imprisonment. Judge Webster Thayer, the same man who later presided at the murder trial, imposed the sentence.

3 Op cit.

Continued on p. 3

## What the Miners Think

ONE of the reasons for the strength of the anarchist case is that anarchism is not a theory to which the facts have to be fitted—it is based upon fact and reality and has grown out of the struggles and experiences of peoples faced with government.

Thus it is with no surprise that anarchists see corroboration of their views coming, as so often happens, from sources quite uninfluenced by conscious anarchism.

A report has just been published by the Acton Society Trust, on what the British miner thinks about the mining industry. It should prove enlightening for the advocates of nationalisation who fondly imagine that relationships within the coal industry are harmonious, and the miners grateful for the benefits they have gained since the State took over.

Let us not deny that there have been benefits. Some miners—mind you, only some—are making weekly wages quite unheard of before the war, and the new pension scheme, mean as it is, still represents a hope of something a bit better for their old age than the present miners' fathers had.

Nevertheless, the miners are obviously acutely aware of the bureaucratic nature of the new structure of their industry, and this report\* shows how the contempt in which the parasites are held by the productive workers.

"The intensity of the hatred and scorn felt for the administration," the report says, "is perhaps conveyed by some of the names freely given to them:

\*"The Worker's Point of View," published at 2s. by the Acton Society Trust, 39 Welbeck Street, London, W.1.

Glamour Boys, Fantailed Peacocks, Little Caesars."

Few of the miners had any personal knowledge of the staff. Of the miners questioned, 25 per cent. did not know who was chairman of the Coal Board. Twenty-six per cent. did not know who was their own area general manager, and 74 per cent. of them had never seen him.

The report is the work of a research worker who went to live for three months in the home of a miner. In the report he has given the coalfield in which he lived the fictitious name of "Pollockfield", where he discovered the miners have generally no notion of what Coal Board administrators and technicians are supposed to do and often conclude that they have no function at all.

On the issue of the unnecessary staff carried on their backs, the writer says that often he was told "that any woman could get a post at head office whether she could type or not; that two men were employed full-time to empty the baskets containing the wastepaper created in teaching (these women) to type; that there was at least one full-time car-cleaner who cleaned any car that stopped anywhere near the building; that there was a full-time staff of four persons and a typist dealing with transport questions which had previously been disposed of by the secretary before 10 o'clock in the morning."

That irresponsibility is a source of demoralisation is shown by the "expressions of a feeling that the men's services, and hence the men themselves, are undervalued." What the miners resented about Poles and Italians in the pits was the implication that "only un-

employed foreigners can be conscripted to do miners' work." The miners also resented the fact that when they went to the Area office they were required to use a side door and to state their business through a sliding hatch.

The miner was found to be dominated by three fixed attitudes—a persistent fear of the return of unemployment; a deep suspicion of all those in authority; and a belief that the public regards the miner as an inferior type.

Who can wonder at the miner feeling this way? His own experiences have taught him the readiness with which his bosses throw him aside when it suits them—and who would believe that the National Coal Board will be any different from the private bosses?

The suspicion of those in authority is a perfectly healthy sentiment, and again—like anarchism—based upon experience.

As to the public regarding the miner as an inferior type, that is something only the public can eradicate. The miners are a body of men to whom the whole of society is very much in debt, but it is certainly true that the general public are careless of the terrible toll the miners have to pay to win coal from the bowels of the earth. Too often complaints about slaty coal or apparent envy of a well-earned wage overshadow the comparison and gratitude that should be felt by the rest of society for men who do such arduous and dangerous work.

We who have a conception of the dignity of labour can do much to counteract the ignorance and prejudice in this matter. And, as this report shows, the anarchist attitude finds its echoes in that of the miners. P.S.

### Lessons of the Spanish Revolution - 7

## The C.N.T. enters the Catalan Government

(Continued)

THE social Revolution and the armed struggle against Franco at no time suffered from a shortage of men or of a spirit of self-sacrifice and a determination to win the struggle and reconstruct a Spain based on new concepts of freedom and equity. What the Spanish workers lacked were weapons, both in quantity as well as quality, raw materials for their industries, fertilisers and modern equipment for their agriculture, food and, last but not least, experience both in organising the new economy and in waging a prolonged armed struggle. But it was only the political leaders and some of the most representative members of the workers' organisations who were so horrified by the situation and not knowing which way to turn, sought refuge in the institutions of the State. Instead, the workers, with their usual good sense, faced the situation with the available materials and the knowledge at their command. Their method of taking over the public services and the distribution of food may have been chaotic, but no critic has yet told us that anyone died of starvation; their improvised defence of Barcelona, Madrid, Valencia may have been unorganised but just the same they defeated the well-organised and armed military formations which were intended to seize all Spain; their (badly) armed columns may not have taken Saragossa and other key towns but they nevertheless contained the enemy for many weeks. They may have been chaotic but, as a professional soldier (Colonel Jiménez de la Beraza) so succinctly put it when asked what he thought of these improvised columns: "From a military point of view it is chaos, but it is chaos which works. Don't disturb it!"

Let us forestall criticism by saying that we are fully aware of the disadvantages of this "chaos": of the fact, as Garcia Oliver has told us, that transport was so chaotic that militiamen at the front stayed sometimes four days without food; that no medical services had been organised to tend the wounded militiamen; and even the extreme case of those militiamen defending Madrid, who at seven o'clock in the evenings would leave their places in the front line to go and see their sweethearts in Madrid! All we have said is that the Spanish workers were able in a situation which had paralysed the government (except for its ability to publish unheeded and useless decrees in the *Gazette*) and the politicians, to improvise and organise beyond anyone's expectations. And if further resistance to Franco's armies was possible it is thanks to this glorious "chaos" in the first weeks of the struggle. The rôle of the anarchists it seems to us to be to seek to support this vast mass of goodwill and energy and to work for its consolidation, and co-ordination by explaining the problems to their fellow workers, suggesting solutions and always encouraging the idea that all power and initiative had to remain with the workers. And not only to the workers of the C.N.T. but to those of the U.G.T., as well, who, disillusioned with "socialist" governments which had proved no different from others, would have

lent a more receptive ear to such arguments than to the weak and timorous counsels of most of their leaders.

"Without disorder, the Revolution is impossible," wrote Kropotkin.† So preoccupied instead were many of the influential members of the revolutionary organisations with the struggle against Franco that their exhortations to the workers were from the first moment for order, return to work, longer working hours to supply the needs of the armed struggle. This attitude can be summed up in two sentences contained in an article by Juan Peiró in which he opposes the idea of a reduction in the working day for factory workers in Catalonia: "Napoleon's celebrated phrase is too often forgotten. Wars and their success always depend on money, because wars in all times have rested on an economic basis." How true this was in the case of Spain in August 1936! But, instead of telling the workers that their first step should therefore be to make sure that the banks and the gold reserve were securely in their hands, he exhorts the workers in the rearguard to work more and more hours in order to produce more! Not that what he wrote was not true. But it was also a fact that who controlled the gold reserve would also control the direction of the war and the economy of Spain.

### VIII

#### The C.N.T. Enters the Catalan Government

In those early days of the struggle the immediate need was for arms and raw materials. For the Catalan workers to produce arms it was necessary to re-equip and re-tool factories for the purpose; machinery had to be bought outside Spain with gold. Aeroplanes, motorised transport, rifles, guns and munitions had to be bought outside Spain, and for gold even German and Italian armament could be obtained! The gold reserve was the key to the armed workers being able to pass from the defence to the attack. For, whilst it is true that they lacked training and there was a need for co-ordination of the militias, yet without adequate armament and transport these were of little consequence.

To add to the confusion in financial matters, was the rivalry between the Governments of Catalonia and Madrid, a rivalry which ignored the common enemy at the door, and in which the Madrid government, controlling the gold, had the whip hand. An advantage which it used in its attempts to stifle the Revolution in Catalonia, and to sabotage the Aragon front and the campaign for the Balearic Islands which were initiatives taken by the C.N.T. According to Santillan, the same attitude prevailed when Caballero took over from the Giral government in September 1936.

Let us observe further the evil that was wreaked by the gold remaining in the wrong hands.

† From a letter to a friend during the Russian Revolution. Quoted by Wodcock and Avakumovic in *The Anarchist Prince* (London, 1950).

On September 24th, 1936, a Regional Plenum of Syndicates was held in Barcelona at which were present 505 delegates representing 327 syndicates. At that Plenum, Juan P. Fabregas, C.N.T. delegate in the Economic Council, after outlining the activity of the syndicates, dealt with Catalonia's financial difficulties created by the Madrid Government's refusal to "give any assistance in economic and financial questions, presumably because it has little sympathy with the work of a practical order which is being carried out in Catalonia. . . . There was a change of Government, but we continue to come up against the same difficulties". Fabregas went on to recount that a Commission which went to Madrid to ask for credits to purchase war materials and raw materials, offering 1,000 million pesetas in securities lodged in the Bank of Spain, met with a blank refusal. It was sufficient that the new war industry in Catalonia was controlled by the C.N.T. for the Madrid Government to refuse any unconditional aid. Only in exchange for government control would they give financial assistance.

What this open sabotage by the Government signifies in terms of production of armaments is revealed in a report of the conversations which took place on September 1st, 1937, between Eugenio Vallejo representing the C.N.T.-controlled Catalan war industry and the sub-secretariat of Munitions and Armament attached to the Central Government, during which the latter before witnesses admitted that "the war industry of Catalonia had produced ten times more than the rest of Spanish industry put together and agreed with Vallejo that this output could have been quadrupled as from the beginning of September if Catalonia had had access to the necessary means for purchasing raw materials that were unobtainable in Spanish territory."<sup>19</sup>

But to return to September, 1936. The regional Plenum of Syndicates completed its deliberations on September 26th. On the following day, the Press announced the entry of the C.N.T. into the government of Catalonia. In a Press statement the C.N.T. denies it is a Government and insists that they have joined a Regional Defence Council! Who took this decision? Neither Peirats nor Santillan enlighten us. There is not even an indication that the matter was discussed at the Regional Plenum. A National Plenum of Regional

Continued on p. 4

<sup>19</sup> *De Companys a Indalecio Prieto. Documentacion sobre las Industrias de Guerra en Cataluña* (Buenos Aires, 1939). This 90-page volume contains a number of documents including a letter from Companys (President of Catalonia) to Indalecio Prieto, Minister of National Defence in the Central Government, in which he demonstrates with figures what Catalonia's war industry had contributed to the armed struggle, pointing out that much more could have been achieved had the means for expanding the industry not been denied by the Central Government. Other documents deal with the achievements of the C.N.T. in Catalonia's war industry, statistics showing quantities produced, and drawing attention to the fact that during this period Catalonia had produced articles which had never before been manufactured in Spain. Finally, there is the Report on *Tentativas de acuerdo entre Cataluña y Madrid* (Attempts at agreement between Catalonia and Madrid) from which our quotation is taken.

### FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

- The Fear of Freedom Erich Fromm 15/-  
"The more the drive towards life is thwarted, the stronger is the drive towards destruction; the more life is realised, the less is the strength of destructive-ness. Destructiveness is the outcome of un-lived life," says the author of this valuable book.
  - People of the Deer Farley Mowat 15/-  
Story of a journey among the Eskimos of the Canadian far north.
  - Journal of Sex Education, June-July, 1952 2/6  
A popular-scientific journal for the sexual enlightenment of adults.
  - Crime and Punishment F. Dostoyevsky 5/-  
A new translation by David Magarshack in the Penguin Classics series.
- Obtainable from  
**27, RED LION STREET,  
LONDON, W.C.1**

\* Quoted by Santillan in *Por que perdimos la guerra*.

## TWO GERMANS

IT is usually to the frankly totalitarian states that one looks for examples of blatant governmental cynicism, but in the degree of their contempt for public opinion, the "democracies" are catching up fast.

Anarchists, however, have long since ceased to be surprised at the twists and turns into which the necessities of power politics compel those who play that sinister game. What never ceases to surprise us is that those who suffer from it so often allow themselves to be deceived by it.

For the deception is clear enough for all to see. No clairvoyance is necessary when governments so boldly show their hands, as they have done in their attitude towards Alfred Krupp, the German armament king, recently awarded a fantastic fortune as compensation and given back control of his industrial empire.

It is less than six years since Alfred Krupp was in the dock at Nuremberg being condemned to twelve years' imprisonment as a war criminal. Hundreds of thousands of workers from Nazi-occupied Europe had been whipped, starved and worked to death as slave labour in Herr Krupp's factories, foundries, shipyards and mines. Last year he was released, last week he was compensated—to the staggering tune, altogether, of £55,000,000! The Allies now have need themselves of Herr Krupp's crooked genius.

Consider another German, but one of the wrong religion. Philipp Auerbach fled from the Nazis in 1934, but in 1940 was handed over to the Gestapo by the Vichy Government of France, where he had sought asylum. He finished up in Buchenwald, where only an elementary knowledge of chemistry saved him from the gas chamber. He was made pest exterminator for the camp. After the war, Auerbach was put in charge of an organisation in Bavaria to administer funds to make restitution to Jewish victims of the Nazis. He was too enthusiastic, and paid out over 3,000,000 marks to Jews who were not "entitled" to them. He was tried in court before an ex-Nazi judge, Josef Mulzer, in an action which began, in spite of defending counsel's protest, at Passover, in an atmosphere of resurgent anti-Semitism.

Auerbach was sentenced to two and a half years' imprisonment and a fine of approximately £250. He committed suicide.

The glaring contrast of these two cases must strike bewilderment and fear into the hearts of all those who sincerely supported the last war, believing it to be truly a war against German militarism and the lunatic filth of Nazism. But the Anarchists are not bewildered—and were not while the war was being fought under all its fine-sounding slogans. For we opposed it then because we knew perfectly well what was going to happen now, and the re-arming of the Nazis and of the Japanese, the British Government's attitude to Franco and Tito, and all the other apparent contradictions only fall into place when one adopts the attitude of distrust of governments which only Anarchists can honestly pronounce.

The reinstatement of Krupp's industrial might represents a stark betrayal of the millions of dead and maimed from the Allied side in the last war—in fact in the last two wars. Must it lead again to a third

## BEYOND NIHILISM by Herbert Read

THE subject of the latest book by Albert Camus (*L'homme révolté*, Gallimard, 590 frs.) might be described as the philosophy of politics. It is the kind of book that appears only in France, devoted, in a passionate intellectual sense, to the examination of such concepts as liberty and terror. Not that it is a theoretical work—on the contrary, it is an examination of the actual situation of Europe to-day, informed by the precise historical knowledge of the past two centuries of its social development.

Camus believes that revolt is one of the "essential dimensions" of mankind. It is useless to deny its historical reality—rather we must seek in it a principle of existence. But the nature of revolt has changed radically in our times. It is no longer the revolt of the slave against the master, nor even the revolt of the poor against the rich; it is a metaphysical revolt, the revolt of man against the conditions of life, against creation itself. At the same time it is an aspiration towards clarity and unity of thought, even, paradoxically, towards order. That, at least, is what it becomes under the intellectual guidance of Camus.

## Sacco & Vanzetti

Continued from p. 2

"There was not a vibration of sympathy in his tone when he did so. I wondered as I listened to him, why he hated me so. Is not a judge supposed to be impartial? But now I think I know—I must have looked like a strange animal to him, being a plain worker, an alien, and a radical to boot. And why was it that all my witnesses, simple people who were anxious to tell the simple truth, were laughed at and disregarded? No credence was given their words because they, too, were merely aliens... the testimony of human beings is acceptable, but aliens... pooh!"

As with Sacco the testimony of the defence witnesses was ignored and although incontrovertible proof of Vanzetti's activities on December 24 was brought forward and his defence counsels shattered the contradictory evidence offered by the prosecution witnesses regarding April 15, Vanzetti was sentenced to death for "opinion's sake".

### Their Characters

Though close friends and comrades, Sacco and Vanzetti were representative of two different types of character. Sacco was essentially a militant, kind to those he loved, harsh to those who were his enemies; Vanzetti was a thinker and writer, a philosopher who was gentle even to those who were his opponents. (It is reported that his last words before he died were: "I wish to forgive some people for what they are now doing to me.") This is not to say that Sacco had no time for books and theory, or that Vanzetti did not participate in militant activity, but simply to indicate where their main bent lay. Ironically enough, Sacco who loved to use his hands, was prevented from doing so for the greater part of his imprisonment because technically he was an unsentenced prisoner. Vanzetti, on the other hand, because of his sentence for the Bridgewater hold-up, was able to occupy himself with the work given to sentenced prisoners, though had he not been able to do so, he could have found greater solace in books and writing than did Sacco. In spite of his prison tasks, however, Vanzetti still found time to write letters, articles and pamphlets, many of which showed an original interpretation of the world about him.

S. E. PARKER.

(To be concluded)

or even more before the obvious conclusions are drawn? And how about those who called themselves Anarchists who supported the war—the Spaniards who thought that an Allied victory would mean the end of Franco's grip on the Spanish people, or the Jewish comrades whose natural sympathy for their fellows in Germany overcame their Anarchist clarity of thought? Will they make the same mistake again and support the next war, choosing to defend the lesser evil—that will, for its own purposes, create the greater evil once again?

The cases of Alfred Krupp and Philipp Auerbach vindicate up to the hilt the Anarchist attitude to the State and its wars.

He reviews the history of this metaphysical revolt, beginning with the absolute negation of Sade, glancing at Baudelaire and the "dandies", passing on to Stirner, Nietzsche, Lautréamont and our contemporary surrealists. His attitude to all these figures is not unsympathetic, and this section of the book is particularly notable for a warm appreciation of the significance of André Breton's ideas. Camus then turns to the history of revolt in the political sense, his main object being to draw a clear distinction between revolt and revolution. Here, and not for the first time, Camus's ideas come close to anarchism, for he recognises that revolution always implies the establishment of a new government, whereas revolt is action without planned issue—it is spontaneous protestation. Camus reviews the history of the French Revolution, of the regicides and the deciders, and shows how inevitably, from Rousseau to Stalin, the course of revolution leads to authoritarian dictatorship. Saint-Just is the precursor of Lenin. Even Bakunin, to whom Camus devotes some extremely interesting pages (pointing out, for example, that he alone of his time, with exceptional profundity, declared war against the idolatry of science)—even Bakunin, if we examine the statutes of the Fraternité Internationale (1864-7) which he drew up, is found insisting on the absolute subordination of the individual to a central committee of action.

All revolutions in modern times, Camus points out, have led to a reinforcement of the power of the state. "The strange and terrifying growth of the modern state may be considered as the logical conclusion of unrestrained technical and philosophical ambitions, foreign to the

true spirit of revolt but nevertheless giving birth to the revolutionary spirit of our times. The prophetic dream of Marx and the powerful anticipations of Hegel and Nietzsche have ended by building up, in the place of the city of God which they have destroyed, a state rational or irrational, but in any case terrorist." The counter-revolutions of fascism only serve to reinforce the general argument.

Camus shows the real quality of his thought in his final pages. It would have been easy, on the facts accumulated, to have retreated into despair or reaction. Camus substitutes the idea of "limits". "Now, at the end of our long enquiry into revolt and nihilism, we realise that revolution without any limits other than historical efficacy signifies servitude without any limits. To escape this fate the revolutionary spirit, if it is to remain alive, should recruit its forces at the source of revolt and become inspired with the only idea which is true to these origins, the idea of limits." To illustrate his meaning, Camus refers to syndicalism, that movement in politics which is based on the organic unity of the cell, and which is the negation of abstract and bureaucratic centralism. He quotes Tolain: "Les êtres humains ne s'émancipent qu'au sein des groupes naturels"—human beings only emancipate themselves on the basis of natural groups. "The commune against the state, concrete society against absolutist society, considered liberty against rational tyranny, altruistic individualism against the colonisation of the masses—these are the antinomies which reflect once more the endless confrontation in the history of the Western world, of restraint and unrestraint." The tradition of "measure" belongs to the Mediterranean world, and has

been destroyed by the excesses of German ideology and Christian otherworldliness.

Restraint is not the contrary of revolt. It is revolt that carries with it the very idea of restraint. "Restraint, born from revolt, can only live by revolt. It is a continuous conflict, perpetually maintained and controlled by the intelligence. . . . Whatever we may do, lack of restraint will always find a place in the human breast, in the heart of solitude. We all carry within us our prisons, our crimes and our destructive instincts. But our task is not to let them loose on the world—to combat them in ourselves and in others. Revolt, the secular will not to go under of which Barrés speaks, is still to-day behind this struggle. The source of true life, it keeps us ever upright in the formless and furious stress of history."

In his last pages, Camus rises to fine height of eloquence which I will not attempt to translate. It is an inspiring book. It is particularly a book which should be read by all those who wish to see the movement of revolt inspired by a new spirit of idealism and action. Camus mentions, as an illustration of his final message, those condemned Catholics in the Spanish prisons who have recently refused to take communion because the priests of the régime have made it obligatory. "They, too," he says, "refuse salvation if it must be paid for with injustice and oppression. Such mad generosity is of the spirit of revolt, which gives of its love without hesitation and rejects injustice without delay. Its honour is not to calculate, to give everything for the sake of the present life and the living brother. In that way it serves the life to come. True generosity towards the future consists in giving everything to the present."

## Comment on Canals

## Decayed Relics or National Assets?

MR. G. W. Stonier confessed in last week's *New Statesman* that he had for years dreamed of hiring a canoe and crossing London by canal from Twyford Abbey to Limehouse Reach. His dream never materialised but he describes his delight at finding that he could take a trip on the narrow boat *Jason*, from Paddington Pool, where the Regents Canal meets the Grand Union Canal, eastwards through Regents Park to Chalk Farm.

Since the days when I used to take a canoe down the empty and overgrown reaches of the Basingstoke Canal, I have shared Mr. Stonier's unfulfilled dream of circumnavigating London, but like him, the nearest I ever got to it was a journey on the *Jason*, when late on a June night, I was lucky enough to be asked on a trial trip in the opposite direction, westwards to Alperton. Even Mr. Stonier in his determined search for the picturesque would have found little to rival the willows and chestnuts of Regents Park and the hollyhock rows and ruined church of Chalk Farm, unless it be the mysterious stretch with Wormwood Scrubs to the south and Kensal Green Cemetery to the north, with convolvulus flowers blowing like ghosts among the tombstones. For this journey was of more interest to the student of industrial location than to the devotee of "pleasing decay". Here was the backside of urban landscape ("Queen Anne in front, and Mary Ann behind," as Eric Gill used to say). We began in the "Little Venice" of Blomfield Road and slid from the Broadwater behind the bed-sitting rooms of Paddington and the Irish colony of the Harrow Road, and we ended among the smells of tomato sauce and paper pulp beyond the factories and phosphorescent lights of Western Avenue.

Canals have developed a strange popularity in the last few years, an indication of which is the number of books which have appeared about them since the war. Quite apart from personal narratives like Mr. Rolt's *Narrow Boat*, and Miss Emma Smith's *Maiden's Trip*, there have been three thorough-going surveys which appeared almost simultaneously two years ago—probably to the dismay of the publishers.\* When the National Transport Act was passed in 1948 almost all the canals in this

country—about 2,000 miles—became national property, and members of the Inland Waterways Association visited a high official of the Ministry of Transport. "He was asked," says Mr. Eric de Maré, "if the Ministry, having taken over the railways, had any plans for the future use of the railway-owned canals. The high official looked astonished. So also did his callers when he cried out in a loud voice, "Oh, do we get them, too?"

The Inland Waterways Association is not a boating club, nor a society of connoisseurs of dilapidation like Mr. Stonier and me, but a propagandist body which seeks to get proper use made of the country's rivers and canals.

Most people know that water transport is by far the cheapest means of carrying many types of goods, because of the low friction of movement in water which is strikingly illustrated by the fact that a single horse can move two tons on level road, ten tons by rail and eighty tons by water. Many people know, too, the miserable story of the way in which with the coming of railways, the canals were deliberately and systematically impeded and neglected. "The tradition and consequence of this longstanding policy," says the I.W.A., "have been inherited by the state now that most waterways have come into its hands. Much will have to be done by the public if the vast benefits to be derived from a well-run river and canal system are not to go by default. In the last fifty years, commission after commission has recommended the development of our canal system, but railway policy continued unchecked, and as recently as 1943 one Company obtained powers to abandon nearly two hundred miles of waterway from which traffic had been driven by neglect. Every consumer in the country pays extra for almost everything he consumes because the canals are not allowed to exercise their repeatedly proved capacity for carrying raw materials at the lowest price in terms of real cost."

The I.W.A. is also making effective propaganda for the proper use and conservation of rivers themselves and in their pamphlet on "The Future of the Waterways" they give this disturbing picture, which anyone with eyes can verify, of the state of our rivers: "To-day, the ancient life of the river has almost ceased to exist, and consequently the river is threatened by neglect and dereliction on the one hand, and ignorant and wanton exploitation on the

other. Rail and road transport has brought about the decline, and, in some cases the extinction of river navigation. Net fishing, instead of being controlled to allow for the interests of rod fishermen, has been virtually abolished. By a process very similar to that of the Enclosures the net fisherman has been deprived of a calling which his ancestors followed for unnumbered generations and, on some rivers, the fishing strictly preserved for a few wealthy individuals and syndicates. As a result of the milling monopoly, thousands of country mills with their ponds, weirs and sluices have become derelict, while owing to the decay of agriculture in the years between the two world wars, the old systems of land drainage, irrigation and water conservation have become choked up, ruinous, and in many cases lost to local memory. River towing paths have become impassable because of erosion or enclosure, while withy beds have reverted to boggy wilderness owing to the eclipse of the craft of basket-making. Rushes, once regularly cut back for use for baskets, thatch or litter, have either grown up to choke watercourses or been uprooted wholesale. Serious and uncontrollable flooding has been the result of all this dereliction.

"Meanwhile, active forces of disruption have accelerated the process of decay and dissolution. The bitumen laden surface water from modern roads, and industrial pollution (the latter readily preventable) have been steadily and surely destroying the wild life of our rivers both above and below water. The ultimate result of this destruction upon natural ecology cannot be measured. The establishment of large riverside power stations has not only destroyed river amenities but, by discharging hot condensate, has raised the temperature of many rivers to such an extent that, in summer periods of low water, great fish mortality is caused. Finally, excessive pumping for urban and industrial purposes has, in some districts, so lowered the water-table that in periods of drought the upper courses of rivers and tributaries dry up completely."

Is all this important? Not if you are one of those people who think that all our economic problems will be solved by atomic power, plastics and helicopters, but if you regard economics as Kropotkin did, as "a sort of physiology of society," as "the economy of energy required for the satisfaction of human needs," you are bound to see in rivers and canals the true arteries of the town and country physiology. C.W.

\*Charles Hadfield: *British Canals* (Phoenix House, 16/-). L. T. C. Rolt: *The Inland Waterways of England* (Allen & Unwin, 21/-). Eric de Maré: *The Canals of England* (Architectural Press, 18/-).

## MEANING OF THE "Z" CALL-UP

IN an article in last week's *Socialist Leader*, Mr. Allan Marshall, discussing the "Class Z" reserve call-up, writes:

"At the termination of hostilities servicemen were so anxious to get out of the Forces that they did not fully comprehend that they were being not discharged, but only demobilised to a Reserve category. They returned to civilian life not as free men but as servicemen temporarily disbanded.

"In 1950, after a typical 'softening-up' process in which the Press and other organs of propaganda were stimulated by official hand-outs and Ministerial speeches to discuss Z recall, and the Government had issued its 'sincere' denials of any such intention, ex-servicemen discovered, in consternation, that they were liable to recall whenever the military chiefs, increasingly gaining power and influence, were able to persuade the State of the need for it.

"This, however, was not all. In a few short years after the holocaust of 1939-45, international diplomacy had managed to transfer our enemies into allies and our allies into enemies. No one to-day even pretends to accept that our rearmament and conscription are for general defence. It is directed against the Soviet Union; and defence, as Professor MacIver has pointed out, is merely the obverse of offence. The more each insures against the other, the less security there is for all."

"The effect of this, as far as the Z scheme is concerned, is to transfer by sharp practice an allegiance gained for one purpose to an entirely different objective.

"This simply cannot be equated with the concept of liberty. In seeking the allegiance of its members the State must compete with other calls on that allegiance. It has no overriding right to allegiance; it must deserve it. For its edicts are not legal solely by virtue of

the source from which they emanate, but only because they find a basis of consent in the minds of those upon whom their incidence impinges.

"The Z recall scheme is immoral because it treats the individual as a non-thinking automaton, as a means rather than as an end, and demands his allegiance without regard to the purpose for which it is demanded. And because immoral, it is illegal. Any Z reservist who is outraged by the fact of recall can, therefore, base an objection upon legality. Even more—such a person must do so; for only in steadfast objection to Z recall and a refusal to accept it can he fulfil the duty which democracy lays upon him to contribute the value of his personality and experience to the formulation of public policy.

"No one who has watched carefully the development of the Z scheme can doubt the malevolent purpose behind it.

"The Labour Government, making a weak gesture to its past ideals, originally restricted the recall to men who had served after the war, and stipulated that it was to be a 'once-for-all' recall. The Service authorities, tasked with the administrative details, immediately overrode the first restriction, and in the second year of its operation have, with the connivance of the Conservative Government, now overridden the second. Commanding Officers are now openly briefing recalled Z reservists to expect recall at intervals of about four years. This, they contend, is the only way they can keep abreast of modern developments in military technique."

## ANARCHISM IN BRADFORD

BROADWAY Car Park, Bradford, is a wonderful place for holding open air meetings on Sunday evenings, when it is not fulfilling its function as a car park. Political parties hold rallies there, religious bodies hold services there, and speakers for all kinds of ideas hold regular meetings there.

It is a reflection, perhaps, on the Bradford comrades, that for years no anarchist spoke there. But they were redeemed on August 17th, 1952, when the first anarchist meeting there, competing with Communists, Secularists and four different kinds of Christian, was the biggest and most successful meeting on the ground.

These meetings will be held regularly for the rest of the summer. Speakers, literature sellers and support for the platform are urgently needed and will be equally welcomed.

## The Choice of a Job--What School Leavers Think

AN article in the July issue of *Occupational Psychology* by Dr. Gustav Jahoda, of Manchester University, discusses "Job Attitudes and Job Choice among Secondary Modern School Leavers." His research was carried out among the 56 boys and 77 girls who left the four main secondary modern schools of an industrial town in Lancashire in the summer of 1950.

One test showed that the things which the boys considered most important, were good chances of "getting on," security, good pay and friendly people at the place of work, in that order. The girls ranked prospects, security and friendliness as of almost equal importance and put less emphasis on pay, but they were more concerned that the work should be clean. Another test showed that both boys and girls believed firmly in the value of learning a trade, even if it meant lower pay for a long time.

Among the boys, about a quarter wanted short hours and the minimum of boredom—conditions of much less interest to the girls. Few of the young people cared if the work was heavy. Boys were confident that they could learn the trade of their choice, but were afraid that vacancies might not be avail-

able. Many girls thought that the jobs were there but that they would not be good enough for them.

Dr. Jahoda found that the boys favoured skilled manual work, disliked office jobs and rejected unskilled labour. The girls liked work in offices but objected to factory jobs. Boys objected to coal mining because of its dangerous and unhealthy nature. The girls who rejected factory work usually did so on the grounds that it was dirty, smelly and noisy, though many described the work and the people doing it as "common", or said that other people had advised them against it. He thinks that this last reason plays a bigger part in forming the young people's attitude than they know, and he noticed that when the replies were based on personal experience or that of friends and relatives, they were succinct, but the boys and girls often gave vague, hesitant answers when asked for the objections to a job. These seemed to be rationalisations of prejudices acquired in their social group, though class and income had little to do with it.

## HOW THE BOMBERS CAME TO TO BRITAIN

On the 15th of July, 1948, the matter was still under consideration in Washington; and Forrestal, arguing for a quick decision, advised the President that the sending of the B-29s to England would "accustom the British to the necessary habits and routines that go into the accommodation of an alien, even though an allied Power." The President agreed and the bombers came.

Apparently the Americans put no pressure on the Labour Government; indeed, they were disconcerted by the easy British acceptance of what they saw to be a desperately dangerous commitment. Early in October, Sir Stafford Cripps visited Washington and said, "Britain must be regarded as the main base for the deployment of American power and the chief offensive against Russia must be by air." And on the 12th November, Mr. Attlee told Forrestal: "There was no division in the British public mind about the use of the atomic bomb—they were for its use. Even the Church in recent days had publicly taken this position."

—R. H. S. Crossman, reviewing *The Forrestal Diaries* (Cassell, 25/-).

## CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE IN S. AFRICA

MORE than 2,500 Africans and Indians have now been arrested since the beginning, on June 26th, of the civil disobedience campaign against racial laws in South Africa.

## Letter

### THE QUAKERS AND ANTI-SLAVERY

T.D. criticises my remark that "the Quakers supported the anti-slavery crusade, but took no part to end slavery," and cites as evidence Quaker support of the anti-slavery crusade. Surely I said that in the above remark?

Quakers helped to liberate slaves and assisted most materially the Underground Railroad (an attitude similar to their rescue work in our time for Jews in Germany). They campaigned for the abolition of slavery but this could not take place legally until the slave-owners agreed to it—i.e., never. Hence the Republican's attitude was "to contain slavery" by opposing its extension.

John Brown proposed to end slavery—not as the Republicans later did, as a subsidiary to war, but by a Negro Insurrection. This the Quakers did not support.

It is fair to say that Brown himself regarded both the Quaker attitude and his own as receiving favour "in the eyes of Heaven", but so far as Negro Emancipation was concerned, only a Negro Insurrection could have been effective.

Despite their magnificent rescue work, the Quakers remained adamantly hostile to slavery being so ended, hoping instead for changes in heart, etc. London. A.M.

**FREEDOM**  
The Anarchist Weekly  
Postal Subscription Rates  
12 months 17/- (U.S.A. \$3.00)  
6 months 8/6 (U.S.A. \$1.50)  
3 months 4/6 (U.S.A. \$0.75)  
Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies  
12 months 27/- (U.S.A. \$4.50)  
6 months 13/6 (U.S.A. \$2.25)  
Cheques, P.O.'s and Money Orders should be made out to FREEDOM PRESS, c/o c/o Payne, and addressed to the publishers  
**FREEDOM PRESS**  
27 Red Lion Street  
London, W.C.1 England  
Tel.: Chancery 8364

## FREEDOM PRESS

- MARIE-LOUISE BERNERI:  
*Neither East nor West*  
cloth 10s. 6d., paper 7s. 6d.  
*Workers in Stalin's Russia.* 1s.
- SELECTIONS FROM FREEDOM  
Vol. 1, 1951, *Mankind is One*  
paper 7s. 6d.
- TONY GIBSON:  
*Youth for Freedom* paper 2s.
- PHILIP SANSON:  
*Syndicalism—The Workers' Next Step* 1s.
- ERRICO MALATESTA:  
*Anarchy.* 6d.  
*Vote—What For?* 1d.
- M. BAKUNIN:  
*Marxism, Freedom and the State.*  
paper 2s. 6d., cloth 5s.
- HERBERT READ:  
*Art and the Evolution of Man.* 4s.  
*Existentialism, Marxism and Anarchism.* 3s. 6d.  
*Poetry and Anarchism.*  
cloth 5s., paper 2s. 6d.  
*The Philosophy of Anarchism.*  
boards 2s. 6d., paper 1s.  
*The Education of Free Men.* 1s.
- ALEX COMFORT:  
*Delinquency* 6d.  
*Barbarism & Sexual Freedom.*  
paper 2s. 6d., stiff boards 3s. 6d.
- RUDOLF ROCKER:  
*Nationalism and Culture.*  
cloth 21s.
- ALEXANDER BERKMAN:  
*ABC of Anarchism.* 1s.
- PETER KROPOTKIN:  
*The State: Its Historic Role.* 1s.  
*The Wage System.* 3d.  
*Revolutionary Government.* 3d.  
*Organised Vengeance Called Justice.* 2d.
- JOHN HEWETSON:  
*Sexual Freedom for the Young* 6d.  
*Ill-Health, Poverty and the State.*  
cloth 2s. 6d., paper 1s.
- GEORGE WOODCOCK:  
*Anarchy or Chaos.* 2s. 6d.  
*New Life to the Land.* 6d.  
*Railways and Society.* 3d.  
*Homes orhovels?* 6d.  
*What is Anarchism?* 1d.  
*The Basis of Communal Living.* 1s.
- WILLIAM GODWIN:  
*Selections from Political Justice.* 3d.  
*On Law.* 1d.
- F. A. RIDLEY:  
*The Roman Catholic Church and the Modern Age.* 2d.
- K. J. KENAFICK:  
*Michael Bakunin and Karl Marx.*  
Paper 6s.
- 27, Red Lion Street, London, W.C.1.**

## MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

- LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP**  
OPEN AIR MEETINGS  
Weather Permitting  
HYDE PARK  
Every Sunday at 4.30 p.m.  
MANETTE STREET  
(by Foyles, Charing Cross Road)  
Every Saturday at 6.0 p.m.
- NORTH-EAST LONDON**  
DISCUSSION MEETINGS  
IN EAST HAM  
Alternate Wednesdays  
at 7.30  
SEPT. 3—S. E. Parker on  
ANARCHISM—WHAT IS IT?  
SEPT. 17—Tedd Mann  
"THE MODERN NOVEL"
- LIVERPOOL**  
DISCUSSION MEETINGS at  
101 Upper Parliament Street,  
Liverpool, 8  
Every Sunday at 8 p.m.
- GLASGOW**  
OUTDOOR MEETINGS  
at  
MAXWELL STREET  
Every Sunday at 7 p.m.  
With John Gaffney, Frank Leech,  
Jane Strachan, Eddie Shaw  
Frank Carlin
- BRADFORD**  
OPEN AIR MEETINGS:  
(weather permitting)  
BROADWAY CAR PARK  
every Sunday at 8.30 p.m.
- LEEDS**  
Anyone interested in forming a group  
in Leeds, please contact Freedom Press  
in first instance.
- COVENTRY**  
Anyone interested in forming a group  
in Coventry, please write Freedom  
Press.

## Lessons of the Spanish Revolution - 7

Continued from p. 2  
Committees presided over by the National Committee of the C.N.T. was held, however, on about September 20th, following the formation of the Caballero Government, the object of which was to seek a face-saving formula whereby "collaboration" might be possible. It was resolved that a "National Defence Council" should be formed and that the existing Ministries should be transformed into Departments. Various decisions regarding the Militias, the Banks, Church properties, etc., are included in the resolution. But the document has no real importance since the use of the term National Defence Council was only a less terrifying word for C.N.T. ears than government. This the political parties understood so well that they paid no attention to the proposals and called the C.N.T. bluff, so that when ten days later a further Plenum was held, the C.N.T. could only lament that their proposals had not been accepted. At the end of this document they imply, however, that the formation of the Regional Defence Council (as they euphemistically call the Government of Catalonia with C.N.T. participation) was the result of the previous Plenum, and add that they will continue to agitate for a National Defence Council. But since, the Regional Defence Council was the Government of Catalonia, it is not surprising that in November the C.N.T. capitulated and four members entered the Caballero Government.

The formation of a government in Catalonia with C.N.T. participation ended the duality of power between the Anti-Fascist Militias Committee and the Government of the Generalitat, until then, as we have already pointed out, a rubber stamp for the Committee, by the elimination of the Militias Committee. With all its shortcomings, the Committee was more representative of the aspirations of the revolution than the Government; and it had no real powers to impose its decisions. It need hardly be added that in the new Government the workers' organisations were a minority and the political parties the majority. So, in a matter of some two months, the humble Companys of July 20th who had offered to "become one soldier more in the struggle" if the C.N.T. so desired, now held the reins of political power in his hands. The next step was to see whether he could also crack the whip!

In what way would the struggle against Franco benefit by this change? Santillan offers the following explanation: "If it had been simply a question of the revolution, the very existence of the government would have been not only an unfavourable factor but an obstacle to be destroyed; but we were faced with the demands of a fierce war, international ramifications, and of being forcibly tied to international markets, to relations with a statal world, and for the organisation and direction of this war, and in the conditions in which we found ourselves, we did not possess the instrument that could have replaced the old governmental

apparatus." Santillan goes on to point out that "a modern war" required a vast war industry, and this presupposes, in the case of countries that are not entirely self-dependent, political, industrial and commercial relations with the centres of world capitalism which hold a monopoly of raw materials. And the outside world was hostile to the revolution, and might refuse to supply raw materials if there were no semblance of government. The dissolution of the Committee of Militias was not the last sacrifice that we made to "demonstrate our good faith and our overriding desire to win the war. But the more we have given in for the common interest the more have we found ourselves trampled on by the counter-revolution, in the person of the central power." With what results? asks Santillan. "Certainly not to the benefit of the war or at least not to the benefit of victory over the enemy."

By this time, Moscow had entered the fray, and the handful of Communist in Catalonia<sup>20</sup> who had started by absorbing the various Socialist groups into a single party, the P.S.U.C. (Partit Socialista Unificat de Catalunya) were emboldened by the growing control exercised by Russian agents and technicians in all departments of the State. It was Moscow's intention to destroy Revolutionary Catalonia by starving the region of armament and by direct assault. But the time was not yet ripe for this, and it is therefore not surprising to see that the Communists were prepared on October 25th, 1936, to sign a pact of Unity of Action between the C.N.T.-F.A.I.-U.G.T. and P.S.U.C. The pact represented yet another step towards the complete concentration of power in the hands of the Catalan Government. The points of agreement include collectivisation of the means of production and expropriation without compensation but with the proviso: "We agree that this collectivisation would not give the results desired if not directed and co-ordinated by a genuinely representative organism of the collectivity which in this case can be no other than the Council of the Generalitat in which all the social forces are represented." Agreement also on the municipalisation of housing in general, and the fixing of maximum rents by the municipalities. Agreement on a single command to co-ordinate the action of all the fighting forces, creation of conscript Militias converted into a vast popular Army and the strengthening of discipline. Agreement on the nationalisation of Banks and workers' control, through the

<sup>20</sup> The Communists claimed to have 30,000 members at the end of 1935. Most observers, such as Borkenau and Brennan, give 3,000 as a more likely figure. This is the view of General Krivitsky who was closely connected with the party's activities during the struggle against Franco. Frank Jellinek in his pro-Communist *The Spanish Civil War* (London, 1938), gives one an idea of the weakness of the Spanish C.P.: "It had to be recognised that the Communists, although they were even yet [Oct. 1934] insignificant, had increased their membership four hundred fold (our italics). What must they have been before!

Committees of employees, of all Banking transactions effected by the Chancellery of Finances of the Council of the Generalitat. Agreement on "common action to liquidate the harmful activities of uncontrollable groups which, through lack of understanding or dishonesty, imperil the implementing of this programme."

Two days later, a large public meeting was held to celebrate this new victory of the counter-revolution. The speakers included the Regional Secretary of the C.N.T., Mariano Vasquez, the future anarchist Minister of Health, Federica Montseny, that sinister figure of Catalan Socialism, Comorera . . . and the Russian Consul General in Barcelona, Antonov Ovsenko!

The pact of Unity was simply a stepping stone for the Communists in their plan to seize power. From the beginning, the petit bourgeoisie had been a stumbling block in achieving the social revolution. The C.N.T. had respected their interests and now the Communists were directing their attention to winning over these supporters of Companys. The crisis that occurred in the Catalan Government in December 1936, was ostensibly over the indiscretions of the dissident-Communist organisation P.O.U.M. (with one representative in the Government) in exposing Russia's international policy. The occasion was also used by the Communists to discredit the C.N.T. by asking in its Press why no offensive was taking place on the Aragon front (chiefly manned by the Anarchist).<sup>21</sup> Two days later, the crisis was "resolved" with the removal of the P.O.U.M. Minister.

What a tragic balance sheet of defeat faced the C.N.T. in Catalonia by the end of 1936. They were not defeated for the work of collectivisation in which the workers had extended and consolidated their early victories. The defeats for the workers were the successes of the politicians in transferring step, by step, all those powers which, so long as they remained in the hands of the workers, made it impossible for the Government to re-emerge from its deserved obscurity. By the end of 1936, Companys was literally in control, but he, too, would have to pay a price for this victory: to the Communists. And from such a new situation the C.N.T., had it remained outside the political struggle, might have drawn advantage. But it was floundering in a sea of compromise and facing away from the land. What could there be more disastrous to the revolutionary movement than leaders so blind that they could say, with Garcia Oliver, "The Committees of Anti-Fascist Militias have been dissolved because now the Generalitat represent all of us!"

(To be continued) V.R.  
<sup>21</sup> This propaganda about the inactivity of the Aragon front was used by the Communists throughout the world to discredit the Anarchists. It will be found in this country in the C.P.'s pamphlet *Spain's Left Critics* by J. R. Campbell. It follows in every detail the Spanish C.P.'s campaign against the P.O.U.M. which, it was alleged, was driving a wedge between the Anarchists and Communists. At the same time, Campbell makes the disparaging reference to the Aragon front!