

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"The belief in progress is a sluggard's doctrine. . . . It is the individual relying on his neighbours to do his job. There can be no progress—true, that, is, moral—except in and through the individual himself."
—Baudelaire.

RELEASE OF SOVIET DOCTORS

Exposes "Confessions"

THE release and public exoneration of the Jewish doctors accused in January of plotting to kill Soviet leaders obviously serves some policy purpose of the Soviet government. It may be that the United Nations debate on Soviet anti-semitic manifestations is a source of uneasiness, or there may be other causes. But the admissions involved in this reversal of a prosecution before any public trial are more important than any questions of day-to-day policy.

The *Daily Worker* for January 14th announcing the "medical conspiracy against Soviet leaders" printed the official Tass message "It was established with the help of documents, inquiries, statements by medical experts and confessions by those guilty that the criminals were secret enemies of the people. They sabotaged the treatment of the sick, damaging their health" said Tass.

The statement continued by instancing in detail the prominent Soviet leaders (Zhdanov, Gorki, Scherbakov and others) who had been "medically murdered". It spoke of the espionage work of these doctors on behalf of "Joint" the American Joint Distribution Committee which distributes aid to Jewish people, and it used the usual foul language of abuse which are a feature of any political prosecution in Soviet countries. In brief the accusation was made in the minutest detail. Ralph Parker, the *Daily Worker* Moscow correspondent described the evidence as "irrefutable".

The *Daily Worker* for April 6th through the same correspondent, announces the reversal of all these charges and speaks of "an act of true statesmanship of the boldest character". Again they quote the official version of the "confessions": "It has been established that the testimony of the arrested men alleg-

edly confirming the charges made against them was obtained by workers in the investigating section of the former Ministry of State Security through the use of methods of investigation which are inadmissible and most strictly forbidden by Soviet law."

In other words, either the accused never did confess, or their confessions were wrung from them by some kind of torture (it has been described in detail, for example, by the Polish lawyer Stypulkowski who was one of the 16 members of the Polish government in exile in London who disappeared in Moscow after the war). The implication that these confessions were bogus whereas "ordinarily" they are true is not likely to be believed either in the West or in the Soviet Empire.

Black Becomes White

The Communist newspapers abroad have thus been left to present this new somersault to the world, and, as usual, they carry it out unblushingly. The act of "bold statesmanship" is indeed as bold as brass—quite shameless.

It is necessary to dwell on this latest reversal with considerable emphasis because the moral implications are so far-reaching. The Soviet leaders have, in fact, admitted that their method of propaganda trials is based on torture, on lies,

and is without the slightest regard for judicial ethics. These doctors—in common with every other political accused—were denounced as criminals, their guilt proclaimed officially as soon as they were arrested, before the outcome of any trial. Now their release is ordered without any trial. The whole procedure of "clemency" is just as unconcerned with justice as the act of denunciation.

Similarly with the new scapegoats. The woman doctor who "unmasked" the medical conspiracy was awarded (again, be it noted, before any trial of the accused) the Order of Lenin. This has now been revoked. The "persons guilty of the improper conduct of the investigation have been arrested and are held criminally responsible." If scapegoats were not such a continual necessity under Soviet rule, one might think that this act would throw all the investigating commissions into panic about using methods "most strictly forbidden by Soviet law"—but yet universally applied by it!

Explanations

No doubt the explanation for this latest somersault, with its official admissions, lies in part in questions of foreign relations. But it may also arise from internal necessities too. Of these speculation is all that is possible. It may be that the evident anti-semitism was failing in

Continued on p. 3

The Asian Socialists

IN the early days of this year there was held in Rangoon an Asian Conference representing the Socialist Parties* of the East. Two hundred delegates were present, but accustomed as one is to the essentially phoney atmosphere of most international conferences (not unfortunately, confined to social-democracy), it was a little hard to tell exactly what most of them represented.

Eight countries (Burma, India, Indonesia, Israel, Japan, Malaya, Pakistan and Egypt) sent full delegations, but not all of these countries have Socialist Parties. The Socialist parties, such as they are, of Lebanon, Iraq and Syria boycotted the conference because of the admission of Israel. Observers from Nepal (where the very name socialism is unknown) turned up, also Tunisia, while the Nigerian and Algerian Nationalist parties regretted their non-attendance because of financial difficulties. Some Western observers and delegates came. Mr. Attlee "naturally represented" Britain, while the Kenya African Union "sent a cable saying that their delegates had been delayed." No doubt Comrade Clem could explain.

The whole represented a further attempt to cling to the illusion of a Socialist International. Socialists might fight socialists in national wars, or they might detain one another in imperial oppression, but the old illusion was to be maintained. In view of the suppression of social-democracy in totalitarian countries, it would be useful to keep up an International. German Social Democrats might be prepared to help Hitler (at least, the workers with social-democratic sympathies might listen by radio to their erstwhile leaders) where they followed the Kaiser blindly. The Asian Conference attempted to switch this Western International idea to the East. It was stressed that, when ultimately the Con-

ference decided to form an independent Asian Socialist International, it was not a break with the West, but solely a recognition of the fact that the "Asian nations have some common problems and a certain identity of views," as Mr. M. S. Gokhale (mover of the resolution) put it.

That workers everywhere have common problems and a certain identity of views is essential in an international. But what was meant was that there were national problems held in common by many Asian nations against those of the West. It was impossible for social-democrats to make any headway in the East while they were so closely bound with Imperialist politicians. They did not want to break with them, for the only "national political" alternative they saw was the totalitarianism of Mao-Tse-Tung and Moscow. These were unhandicapped by first-hand knowledge of their imperialistic methods. In their statement of principles, therefore, the Socialist Conference in Burma gave the impression that they favoured the idea of a "third force." This was opposed by Mr. Attlee, as well as by Mr. Sharett of Israel and Mr. Mohammed Sopiee of Malaya. It was supported by India and Burma. The Indian delegate, however, merely followed the national political Nehru line, while the Burmese delegates followed the line of their government, adding that "a third force should not cut itself adrift from the world Socialist movement."

What, then, became of internationalism? No party suggested anything that could not as well have been said by their country's Foreign Minister (indeed, in several cases it was said by the Foreign Minister himself). The Egyptian delegate finally walked out because of national differences with Israel, while everybody else put forward the case for their country's diplomacy. The colonial nations were appeased by a colonial bureau to investigate imperialism, but it was agreed that this should not mean a break from Britain, Holland, France and other imperial nations represented in the European International.

One or two daring resolutions were passed in the manner of "Spring Morn" where the lady delicately poises her foot in the sea, e.g., political emancipation of women was recommended after the Egyptian delegate left the conference. The "tendency of Asian politicians to avoid implicating themselves on Asian issues for fear of displeasing one or the other country" was denounced as a weakness, but obviously nobody referred to themselves. The "employment of religious fanaticism as a weapon for political ends" was also condemned, and as the Asian Socialists went so far as to commit themselves on this issue, we trust that the European Socialists will dare to run the risk of incurring Rome's displeasure on a similar resolution.

It can however be seen that the old idea of what a "Socialist International" should be is as dead as mutton. Consider that famous international conference when the century was a few years old, when a Russian and a Japanese delegate shook hands before a wildly-applauding hall, in the midst of the Russo-Japanese war. Compare it with the fact that "Socialists" cannot sit together because of national difference, that their discussion takes place on national policy and diplomacy, and is not now centred on how to propagate socialism internationally, but how to put forward national views in the socialist international.

"We are all internationalists now," say some. I wonder. In the sense as opposed to nationalism it is rare enough. In the sense of a supporter of the International as a revolutionary idea, the term seems to be forgotten.

A.M.

* For the benefit of the occasional Marxist critic, in practically every case the parties do indeed call themselves the Socialist Party of the national country concerned. It is only in some few Anglo-Saxon countries that this title is relegated to a negligible faction of Marxists. But, of course, like the Holy Roman Empire, which was neither holy, Roman nor an empire, the Asian Socialist International is not Asiatic, not Socialist, and not an International.

Foreign Commentary

IN this column two weeks ago we gave as an example of how truth can be as immoral as a lie, the American revelations as to the real reasons for bombing Dresden. Now, the sensational "discovery" in Moscow that the fifteen "doctor poisoners" are in fact innocent is just another example on this same theme. We do not propose here to attempt an analysis of the motives behind these revelations as this is dealt with in another column. But what is interesting is to see how the French communist paper *l'Humanité* reveals its utter dishonesty in handling this very embarrassing situation. Not that Communist journalists lack the experience necessary for explaining to their gullible flock how from one day to the next black has become white. After all their biggest assignment, of explaining the Hitler-Stalin pact occurred during the life-time of most of them, and was a much tougher proposition than that of the "doctors' plot." The public is ready at present to welcome any news which they believe indicates a lessening of the cold war tension. And this is more noticeable in

French C.P. "Explains"

the British Press which has tended to accept the news of the release of the doctors without rubbing the noses of the Communists in the statements they made in January as to the doctors' guilt and their connivance with American and British Imperialists. But in France the anti-Communists have not spared the Stalinists. This may in part be due to the fact that the Communists power is on the wane (and again one must bear in mind that the British C.P. is chicken-feed compared with its French counterpart which controls the largest number of organised workers and is the largest single party in the Chamber of Deputies); that a determined anti-Communist drive has been instigated by the government with orders to arrest five of the leaders of the C.P.; and finally that the internal struggle in the Party itself, which has resulted in the expulsion of Marty and Tillon, made the present, not an opportune moment for the Moscow bombshell!

In such difficult circumstances the editors of *l'Humanité* decided that attack was the best means of defence:

"The commentators [of the bourgeois Press] do not conceal their surprise. They have repeated so often the calumnies of a Koestler that they ended by believing them. Once again their lies collapse and everyone can see what they tried to deny, namely that Soviet justice preserves better than any other individual liberty and the rights of the human person.

"That men illegally arrested should be liberated and fully rehabilitated is naturally stupefying for the supporters of a regime that deported an innocent Dreyfus for years to Devil's Island. In fact, what is so shocking to the representatives of the capitalists' old world is that the Soviet Union does not respect what they consider to be the rules of the game, that there should be a new social order so self-confident that it does not make sacrosanct *raison d'Etat* a supreme law. That is enough to enrage those who have kept Henri Martin in jail for three years, to infuriate those who are not shocked by the shameless pressure recently exercised by the American Minister of Justice on the Supreme Court to send the Rosenbergs to the electric chair.

"For the same people it is naturally an outrage that the arrests should be

announced of those responsible for the irregularities committed in the investigation of the doctors' case. What a contrast with what happens in France, where those who foment the plot are in power! Honest men of good sense will note that in the land of socialism the best-laid plots cannot remain unmasked for long. In the Soviet Union the vigilance rendered necessary by survival from the capitalist regime is not blind and the regime built up by Lenin and Stalin after the destruction of ancient social and economic injustices is in every respect the most just that history has ever known."

But somehow one feels that this counter-blast is but a squeak compared with the effect created by the non-Communist press which has reproduced in facsimile the front page of the *l'Humanité* for last January (when it produced Moscow's first bombshell of the international conspiracy to poison the Russian leaders), and draws damaging conclusions as to the veracity of other spy trials. *Combat* goes as far as suggesting that: "It might have been better for Communist propaganda that the 'white-clad assassins' should not have been rehabilitated.

"Their sacrifice to the cause of Stalin would have followed that of others and would not have undermined the confidence of believers. Have not the Soviet leaders added to a crime of accusing innocent men the error of admitting that their regime was capable of it?"

The answer, of course, is that the Moscow *volte face* has not been hastily decided on, and is intended for internal consumption and to be turned to the new leaders' advantage within Russia itself. That it may prove embarrassing or disastrous so far as the foreign Communist parties are concerned is of as little concern to the present leaders as it was to their predecessors, who have never put loyalty to their foreign minions before their own interests. But the rulers in Moscow also realise that the politicians of the West are as little concerned with morality as they themselves, and that in a few weeks this sordid incident will become just one more of the forgotten crimes in a world concerned with "practical issues" and the solution of (politician-made) crises. LIBERTARIAN.

World Output Up

The United Nations world economic report for 1951-52 shows that world production reached a new high level but that world income is now more unevenly distributed among nations than before the war. Industrial and agricultural production showed a 2 per cent increase over the previous year, but food production rose only 1 per cent, barely keeping up with population increases, the report said.

High percentage increases in industrial production were reported for countries with "centrally planned economies," including the Soviet satellites in Europe and Communist China. Military expansion in the Eastern European countries caused the output of heavy industries to rise faster than the produc-

tion of consumer industries.

Total national production in the industrialised countries of North America and Western Europe rose on the average from 1951 to 1952 by 2 per cent, according to the report. Although world production reached a new high last year, the rate of increase has fallen off considerably.

The report said that an expansion in the world supply of dollars could result from "a rise in economic activity in the United States, an easing of tariff barriers, and increased long-term capital loans." It said the most important single symptom of the unequal world economic situation "is the inability of most countries to balance their accounts with the United States."

NIGHTMARE BECOMES REALITY

IT is perhaps unjust to say that the twentieth century is living the utopias of the past. A world which has experienced two major wars in the span of thirty years, a world ravaged by epidemics and starvation, can hardly be compared with the utopias which claim to abolish poverty, unemployment, and even establish a world government that would put an end to wars. But it is true to say that, to a large extent, the structure of the societies advocated by past utopians has become a reality, and as the results bear little resemblance to those which they had led us to expect, one may be justified in thinking that the structure is a faulty one. When the twentieth century has tried to carry out the utopian plans of the past it has failed miserably; it has created all-powerful States which control the means of production and distribution, but which have not abolished starvation; States encouraging scientific discoveries and developing production, but failing to give to every citizen a decent standard of life; States which claimed to institute perfect equality, but which have given birth instead to privileged classes and new inequalities perhaps more appalling than the old; States which have made people into Taylorised robots, subordinated to the machines they serve, brutalised by propaganda; States which have created conditions where all individual thought is regarded as criminal, where literature, music and art cease to be the expression of the individual and instead enlodge the régime where servitude to the old religion is replaced by that to the State and its new gods.

The majority of utopias assumed that the interests of the individual coincided with those of the State and that a conflict between the two was unthinkable. Modern writers have dealt, on the contrary, with all kinds of possible conflicts between the State and the individual. The individual may be one of the "cafoni" described by Ignazio Silone, or one of the starving, malaria-stricken peasants whom Carlo Levi had known in Southern Italy; he may be a poet committing suicide rather than become a cog in the propaganda machine; he may be a Soldier Schweik; he may be an old revolutionary reduced to betraying his ideals; he may be a civil servant or a storm trooper; or he may be one of Kafka's characters fighting against the blind stupidity of the law and bureaucracy. All of us have, at some time or other, felt like K. in *The Trial*, lost and defenceless, completely unable to comprehend the meaning of the machinery which regulates, and often dominates, our lives. Kafka's criticism of society is not directed against any particular

The Writings of Marie Louise Berneri

MARIE LOUISE BERNERI died four years ago, on April 13th, 1949, at the age of 31. She was one of the editors of this paper for eleven years. Since her death her book *Journey Through Utopia*, a memorial brochure, and a collection of her articles, *Neither East nor West*, have been published.

For new readers who may be unfamiliar with the penetrating and generous understanding, so rare in political journalism, which she brought to her social criticism, we reprint below some extracts from her writings.

State, but the struggles of K. are those of any modern man.

Utopians have been apt to forget that society is a living organism and that its organisation must be an expression of life and not a dead structure. The realisation of this fact has led contemporary writers to attack the State, and any form of authority, whether springing from religion or from political parties, and to return to the ideal of independent communities, united in a free federation and offering the greatest opportunity for the development of man's personality. They have reasserted the need for a true ethic, not taught at school like a catechism and based on obedience to authority, not justifying sacrifices and compromises for the "good of the community," but asserting the right of the individual to think for himself and to defend his freedom, since a man who is not free cannot be a worthy member of the community; if he sacrifices his individuality, his spirit of initiative and even of revolt, he harms the community instead of serving it.

—JOURNEY THROUGH UTOPIA

HUMAN NATURE IS A WHOLE

THE problem of sexuality permeates by its very nature every field of scientific investigation. This is too often ignored by revolutionaries who are willing to discuss Marx's economic doctrines or Kropotkin's sociological theories, but who regard with the greatest suspicion the work of psycho-analysts. Yet the experience of mass neuroses is only too obvious today. It is glaringly displayed in the cult of leadership which has taken an acute form in totalitarian states, but which is equally evident in so-called democratic countries. It has given rise to outbursts of public sadism, in the glamourised versions of Hollywood producers or, in their crudest form, at Buchenwald and Belsen. It appears more obviously in the numerous cases of war neurosis, sadism, impotence and frigidity.

To reduce these problems to a question of family allowances, maternity benefits or old age pensions is ridiculous; to resolve it in terms of insurrection, or overthrow of the ruling class and the power of the State, is not enough. Human nature is a whole. The worker is not merely the producer in the factory or the field; he is also the lover, the father. The problems which he faces in his home

are no less important than those at his place of work. By trying to separate biological and psychological problems from the sociological ones, we not only mutilate our theories, but are bound to reach false conclusions.

—SEXUALITY & FREEDOM (Now. No. 5, 1945)

THE REAL IRON CURTAIN

THE conviction of the Russians that they live in a privileged country, that starvation, unemployment and prostitution are to be found everywhere outside the Soviet Union has amazed all foreign observers. They were told by Russians, in all seriousness and with self-assurance that they were often unable to shake, that Paris has no Underground, that Russian films were not shown in foreign countries, that wives of French miners had to prostitute themselves in order to live. This attitude would be very difficult to understand if one forgot that a great proportion of the population was born after the revolution and was therefore unable to hear anything but the official bolshevik propaganda. Most of them have never had a chance to know the meaning of good meals, of a comfortable life, of leisure and, most important of all, of liberty. For anyone who has been able to observe the Nazi or Fascist Youth the attitude of the Russians will not appear incredible. A young fascist if told that he lives under a dictatorship will deny this most strongly and will endeavour to demonstrate that he is completely free. It has not occurred to him that he has never had a chance to listen to men whose opinions differ from that of the Fascist power.

The Russian dictatorship has been in power longer than any of the fascists and its method of propaganda have been equally efficient. Since Stalin seized power he was able to work on the new generation who had not been influenced by the Revolution. In 1939 the population of Russia was 170 millions; of these 61 millions were children under 15, and 71 millions men and women between 15—39. At the time when the war started therefore, one can say that the majority of the population of the U.S.S.R. was born after the Revolution. One has also to keep in mind that vast masses of Russian people were illiterate and thus unable to read anything about life in foreign countries and that their geographical position made it extremely unlikely

that they would come in touch with the way of life in other countries.

The Russian people were pictured abroad as being free and happy; they were a lie to the world and they became a lie to themselves. The new generations grew up convinced of the superiority of their country, of the régime, of their leaders and finally of themselves. Injustice and oppression together with complete isolation bred their inevitable companion, nationalism. Like all people living under a dictatorship the Russian people have been degraded by a blind nationalism which makes them consider themselves as a superior nation, surrounded by brutal and stupid people whom they have to fight to destroy. Of course this attitude characterises the privileged classes much more than the workers. People who work hard for a meagre wage are generally refractory to governments' propaganda not only in Russia but in every country. They are much more prepared to show feelings of solidarity towards their brothers in poverty of other countries.

—WORKERS IN STALIN'S RUSSIA

NO PROGRAMME

WE admit that our readers will not find in our pages prescriptions for curing humanity from all the ills that beset us. What some of our readers

obviously would like are slogans, manifestos, and programmes which offer to the working-class in a few lines the means of achieving not only the end of fascism but also of bringing about the era of workers' happiness.

We refuse to adopt such recipe-programmes because we are convinced that the present weakness of the working-class is due to the fact that every party, in order to gain popularity and power, has simplified its programmes, reducing to ridiculous proportions the nature of the struggle that will bring freedom to the exploited.

Political slogans have become like patent medicine advertisements promising health, beauty, and happiness in exchange for a tablet of soap or a cup of cocoa. Vote Labour, and everything will be all right! Pay your trade union dues and security will be assured! A workers' government will achieve the revolution! Write to your M.P. or such-and-such Minister, march through the streets in a disciplined manner, with a powerful band shout till you're hoarse, and all your wishes (demands) will be granted!

This is what parties alleged to have a "realist" policy and holding in the greatest contempt the "anarchist Utopians," have been advocating for a quarter of a century whenever a difficulty arose. . . .

The leit-motiv of left parties is that the workers should take as much control as they can of the government. This appears constructive enough. But it only means that Labour leaders will enter the Government by adopting the policy of the Right. For the workers it means sacrifices and the loss of every kind of liberty in order to secure the privilege of seeing "their" Ministers sitting on the Cabinet benches. No improvements are obtained and all official channels for making discontent heard are lost.

—NEITHER EAST NOR WEST.

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP
OPEN DAILY

(OPEN 9—6.30; 5.30 SATURDAYS)

Journey through Utopia

Marie Louise Berneri 16/-

"What gives it even more merit is the fact that it is such a book as only a brave intelligence and an ardent spirit can produce: one who was an enemy to the forces that would degrade man into a servile automaton, and a friend to all that fosters freedom and creative expression."
—LEWIS MUMFORD.

Workers in Stalin's Russia

Marie Louise Berneri 1/-

The fundamental test of a political régime is "How do the workers fare under it?" The author discusses the Russian régime from this standpoint, and in the opinion of one reviewer, "it is a thoroughly conscientious piece of work which deserves equally conscientious readers; for the questions which it poses to the reflecting mind are of first-rate importance."

Neither East Nor West

Marie Louise Berneri cloth 10/6, paper 7/6

"This is a valuable book, simply and directly concerned with the events of 1940-48 as they affected the voiceless people upon whom their impact was most dire. Marie Louise Berneri, in making herself their voice, set an example of independent and untiring criticism which cannot be too widely known or too numerously followed."
—SOCIALIST LEADER.

Marie Louise Berneri, 1918-1949—A Tribute

5/-

This volume contains appreciations by friends and comrades with whom M.L.B. worked in this country and in France, and includes fourteen illustrations.

NOW No. 5

1/-

Containing the article SEXUALITY & FREEDOM by Marie Louise Berneri

Obtainable from
**27, RED LION STREET,
LONDON, W.C.1**

(Continued from our last issue)

IN Chicago a group of workmen of various nationalities began publishing the *Alarm*, a weekly paper, Socialistic in its economic teachings, and openly advocating the preparation of the workmen for a forcible revolution—not of offence, as has been alleged, but of defence. Two German papers of similar advocacy were likewise published in Chicago and New York, the *Arbeiter Zeitung* edited by August Spies and *Freiheit* by John Most.

In 1885, a hitherto weak and little known union of workers, the Knights of Labour, leaped into sudden and gigantic proportions. Seven hundred thousand workmen felt the fever of unrest and swarmed together in numbers which might have been formidable had there been a corresponding coherency; a wave of strikes swept over the country, and during the progress of one of these, on the evening of May 4th, 1886, the social atmosphere felt the cleavings of an electric bolt. A bomb had been thrown in Chicago! Some Anarchists being suspected of committing this deed were arrested. Then came the long and tedious trial, prolonged through a year and a half, and finally resulting in the execution of five of the accused men and life imprisonment of two. The justice of the trial has been questioned not only by the Anarchists, but by men of impartial spirit in all ranks, and the pardon of the prisoners seven years later was justified by Governor Altgeld in a precise and concise review of the legal procedure.

Meanwhile, the trial made manifest to the public that Anarchism must be something more than was proclaimed in the first hue and cry—whether a good thing or a bad thing, it certainly was not the thing it had been represented by the

The Origins & Creed of Anarchism

press in the first furore after May 4th. For from all over the world came the evidence that good men and great men in the world of science and letters as well as among the ignorant and wretched had adopted the obnoxious label. Elisee Reclus, whose magnificent work on geography is a standard reference the world over, saluted the doomed prisoners of Chicago as his brothers. Peter Kropotkin, a Russian prince, had stepped down and out of his nobility, and taking his rank with the earth's toilers, declared himself Communist and Anarchist. Escaping from his Russian prison, he helped to establish several papers in France, in Switzerland, in Italy, and in England. Several of the great English and American reviews have published articles by Kropotkin in which he has sought to establish Anarchist Communism upon a biological and historic foundation, under the caption of "Scientific Bases of Anarchism."

Reading these articles, as well as others, by the various writers who in the several languages of Europe voice the present development of the idea, it is seen that there has been considerable drift from the original point of divergence in the Socialist organisation, and that while Social Democracy has pursued a steadily narrowing and simplifying direction, its objects having been condensed within the limits of a political platform, Anarchism has, on the contrary, broadened to include the whole scope of human activity, i.e., spiritual, intellectual, and moral, as well as purely material effort. The result of this broadening has been to diminish the relative importance of mere economics and to supplant an extensive

centralised association for action in that direction by the spontaneous group devoted, here to inquiry into social relations, there to the application of the Anarchist principle to education, elsewhere to some other phase of the problem; an association having no machinery, no constitution or laws, no regulation or officialism within itself, and no connection with other groups save that of a spiritual union, such a union being sometimes expressed in the form of a conference in which opinions are exchanged but no decisions rendered, the execution of any proposed project being left entirely to the voluntary selection of the persons present or such as they can persuade to co-operate with them. The rigidity of the "thoroughly organised" body has thus given way to the flexible, intangible, ever dissolving and ever re-forming autonomous group whose strength lies in its weakness. The order of mind which seeks for visible accomplishment of definite reforms has no appreciation of such strength, and turns aside in disgust from so indefinite a design, so ineffective a method. To such the old International with its positive and limited programme of expropriating landlord, usurer, and capitalist, appealed much more strongly. But those to whom economy is of value only as a means to a greater end, the liberation of the human intellect and spirit, are instinctively drawn with increased attraction to this free association which endeavours to realise individuality and equality within itself, and to embody the principle of voluntary action as the only means of genuine release from all forms of slavery.

With this relative exaltation of the spiritual side of the problem, and decline

of the preponderating influence of the material, there has grown up a conviction among the newer disciples of both the Individualist and Communist schools of economy, that fixed plans as to the future material development of society are not so important. The Communism of Kropotkin and William Morris is not the Socialism of Bakunin, nor even of the Chicago men. The concentration of capital, production on the large scale, vast aggregations of workmen, federated groups of administration, with their threatened bureaucracy, form no part of modern Communism.

Basing itself on a few simple principles, communal possession of land and all tools necessary to production in common, it accepts the redistribution of the population over the liberated land as a necessary sequence, and the multiplication of small communities out of the division of the great city; local production, in the place of the feverish world exchange of present commerce. The elaborate schemes of Marx and his successors for the determining of each man's production and the amount of his claim against society is abolished by the simple proposition: Let each give and take freely, without worrying as to the balance; true economy arranges so that each shall have enough without undue exhaustion, and as to what is over and above it is a common possession free to the first comer.

Individualists, on the other hand, they who were at first inclined to refuse the title of Anarchist to their Communist contemporaries, saying that Communism invariably led to government, have like-

Continued on p. 3

RELEASE OF SOVIET DOCTORS

Continued from p. 1
its object of finding scapegoats for internal miseries and was instead bringing the government into open disrepute. It may be necessary to placate a very serious rise in public feeling which may have arisen at Stalin's death. FREEDOM has pointed out before and as recently as at Stalin's death that the existence of massive instruments of repression itself augurs a popular feeling of great power. Often, in history, the death of a symbol of unpopular government has acted as a trigger for popular feeling. That some such process was feared at Stalin's death was suggested by the manner in which the news was conveyed. The amnesty, and now this reversal of a government action, may well be intended to deal with such a surge of anti-government feeling. Even the reversal of foreign policy may be dictated by a wish to utilize the Russian people's desire for peace as a source of popularity for the new government. How far these factors contribute to the shifts in policy since Stalin's death can only be a matter for speculation at the present time.

The other factor is the rivalry between Malenkov and Beria: the new moves may be seen as reflecting this struggle. Again one cannot know. But whatever the explanation it seems likely that the Russian situation is still in flux, and for anarchists the most important question is the struggle between the ruled and the rulers. Matters of foreign policy are of inferior interest and as has been suggested may well be mainly a reflection of this struggle.

Meanwhile, there is something contemptible about the readiness of the Western newspapers to accept the present "explanations" more in the spirit of giving credit to the new administration than insisting on the show up of the whole method of Soviet "justice". In this connexion it will be a matter of importance to find out what has happened to two of the doctors who have been exonerated—Professor B. M. Kogan and Professor Y. Etlinger—but whose names are not among those who have been released. Have they died under interrogation? Will Western public opinion concern itself with the fate of these two men?

Origins & Creed of Anarchism

Continued from p. 2
wise seen that the sequence of free land, free capital and exchange, would be co-operation, with a form of Communism in the distance, when price, upon the Proudhonian principle of continuous reduction, shall have been lowered to "nil."

Both seem to acknowledge that in the absence of government economic arrangements of very different nature might be tried in varying localities, according to the social traditions and instincts of a people, without destroying freedom.

Again the advocates of aggressive attack upon government and the advocates of peace at all costs, as well as the intermediates who advocate expediency as the measure of either course, have so far agreed to admit that the final arbiter of any individual's action must be none other than himself; and therefore while the abstract principle of aggression or of non-resistance may be reciprocally disapproved, no man conscientiously putting his own principle into action, even by an act of assassination, may be condemned. The act may be deplored, the individual may not be judged.

Thus it will be seen that the "creed of Anarchism" is, in the usual acceptance of the word, non-existent. The single principle upon which all Anarchists unite is that of the supreme sovereignty of the individual over his own thoughts, speech, and action. With this declaration upon their lips, meet prince and proletarian, student, artisan, peasant, each in his own respective way, labouring for the up-

(Continued from our last issue)
IN the chapter on *The Abuse of Land*, Massingham quotes figures from a progress report of the Research Committee of the Rural Reconstruction Association which is studying the extent to which this country could become self-supporting in staple foodstuffs, on the basis of Dr. Dudley Stamp's survey, *The Land of Britain: Its Use and Misuse*. He concludes that, "in order to square the amount of land producing food with the numbers of the population consuming it, we are faced with a deficit of just under 40% or 14 million acres. Without question, this is the very lowest figure to be quoted and so barely on the right side of the line between enough and not enough to eat. For that very reason, we cannot rely simply on stepping up production of the farmland we still possess." He goes on to discuss the demands made on agricultural land by housing, industry, open-cast workings, roads, afforestation, airfields, military training areas and sports grounds, and the effect on agriculture of the wasteful use of water and of rural depopulation.

"It is more than time," he declares, "to bring home the brutal fact that each Briton in our Islands has just 0.8 of an acre of his homeland from which to still the cravings of his belly. He and she must take their choice either to frame a new policy which will squarely meet such a reality or to take the way of want."

Mr. Hyams in his chapter on *What We Eat, and Where it could come From*, the corollary of the *Where it comes from* chapter, itemises our staple foodstuffs and discusses the extent to which we could meet our own needs in them. Britain has, he says, about 50 million acres not yet built on or otherwise "sterilised" of which 24 million acres are good land. "Off 24 million acres she can, by intensive high farming, feed about 24 million people. If the 50 million acres were all as productive as the best land, she could feed her population. She must face, very soon, the necessity of feeding that population, or most of it. What is to be done? Make all our land good land. Can it be done? Why not? A score of ancient peoples did it, without one hundredth part of our technical resources."

The Regional Approach

Massingham's chapter on *The Use of Land* asks for an ecological and consequently regional approach to farming. The idea of the conquest of nature he thinks comes from Thomas Henry Huxley's famous lecture contrasting "the moral forces of mankind with apish and tigerish disorder of the cosmic scheme from which man was descended." Massingham comments: "Actually, the ferocious trade competition of the Victorian age was far more tigerish than the rivalry in the most savage of jungles, and there can be little doubt that Huxley quite unconsciously translated the conditions of

PROPHECY OF FAMINE by H. J. Massingham and Edward Hyams (Thames & Hudson, 12s. 6d.)

building of a free humanity. If this nebulous mass shall ever succeed in evolving a creed it will be in pursuance of a development utterly opposed to its present tendency, which is, as I have shown, away from system making either in economics or ethics. A party which includes the revolutionist Kropotkin and the non-resistant Tolstoy (whose recent book *The Slavery of Our Times* as well as his *Resurrection* contain the most direct and severe arraignment of government from a moral point of view), a party which includes the Communist Reclus and the Individualist Tucker, the altruist Lloyd and the egoist Mackay, can have no creed appreciable as such.

It may be said that a party without a creed will forever remain non-effective, and it is quite true that visible results in social change are generally produced by groups of men who want few things but want them clearly and unite to obtain them. Visible results however are but the final link in a long chain of invisible ones; and long periods of history show that the unreckoned factors were often the most powerful, partly because so long undetected or disregarded. It is unphilosophical therefore to conclude that the great permeating influence of Anarchism, however elusive when we seek to define it, will not have a powerful effect in modifying the course of history—whether for good or ill depending upon the degree of enlightenment with which it shall be received or rejected.

ALBERT STRICKLER.

PROPHECY OF FAMINE - 2

the age in which he lived into his reading of the natural world."

The first step in re-integrating our agriculture, Massingham thinks is "to rearrange our entire food-bearing acreage upon a regional basis; and nothing could be more regional than the structure and surface of our native land. Not only is each region of it distinct in vegetation, rock-formation, landscape, rainfall and sometimes even in climate, but this natural diversity of characteristics extends to individual fields. . . . Notice how we deal with the land when it is not marked off, as it ought to be, into its appropriate regions. Government legislation for agriculture is almost invariably piecemeal and hand-to-mouth; it concentrates now on one crop, now on another; it is all for corn one day and cattle the next, not for a balanced system of crop and animal husbandry. The object is to prop up the tottering structure by a new buttress when it sways in the wind of crisis, not to rebuild its foundations nor even to underpin them. Specialisation from office and laboratory has reached such a pitch of minute subdivision that not only does knowledge become more and more about less and less, but co-ordination between its interacting parts breaks down completely. This is the industrial way but it is certainly not the way of the good farmer or of the natural landscape he farms. Only by the regional approach can the parts be observed as integral to the whole."

He goes on to ask for "Regional Land Wardens" to advise farmers on all issues relating to the maintenance of fertility, "responsible to a new central Ministry of Lands." The utmost encouragement ought to be given to "local Producers' Marketing Boards and to co-operative buying and selling societies serving both local producers and consumers. One such group already exists — the independent Village Produce Associations, which take in hundreds of villages and whose main object is for each village to become self-supporting on its own home produce throughout the year." He criticises the way in which our "dealer's civilisation" nourishes the distributor at the expense of the producer, the system of land purchase, and the effect of death duties and taxation which "fall upon the just and the unjust alike, upon the landowner who farms his own land and applies an eco-

logical conscience to his estate, as upon the landowner who turns his land into a pheasant reserve. We even encourage the bad farmer by culling the small farm 'uneconomic,' when we do nothing to prevent a company director acquiring a farm or estate in order, by misfarming it and running it at a loss, to evade income tax in his urban business."

The Peasant

Both the authors have chapters on the "peasant." Massingham on *The Return of the Peasant*, says: "The peasant in our country today is the most despised and rejected among men. Not the meanest of bottle-washers holds a lower place in public and learned estimation." We despise the peasant and depend upon him." It hardly seems the last word in wisdom to play down the peasant as we do today, when a comparison between the yields of the West European peasant and those of the U.S.A. farmer show that the former produces from 50 to 70 bushels per acre, the latter from 15 to 20. He gives four instructive examples of what he means by peasant farming from present-day Britain. The theme is continued by Mr. Hyams on *Modern Peasantry*. "We have laid ourselves open to criticism," he says "by using the awful word 'peasant'! This word will conjure up, in the minds of those hostile to our ideas, a mud-bespattered and illiterate boor, brutalised by toil and living in squalour; or, on the other hand, it will suggest a pretty, buxom girl in a fancy blouse, starched wimple and full-skirt dancing a morris. Our peasant, however, is a small farmer; he may own a television receiver and a car and a nice suit of clothes and some books; he may be a university graduate. He is a peasant because his farm will be run with two kinds of increase in mind: crops and fertility; subsistence and cash-crops."

"We need very large crops per acre; highly industrialised, very large farms worked by huge and specialised machines do not produce such crops; by the criterion of crops-per-acre they are very inefficient. We agree that such farms are very satisfying manifestations of man's power and glory, but most unfortunately we need to eat! In short, we cannot afford the expensive luxury of 'industrial' farming."

Use and Ownership

It is at this point that the idea of the two authors part company, for Mr. Hyams' views lead him to recommend the nationalisation of the land, a policy which H. J. Massingham's widow emphasises in a preface was contrary to everything Massingham, champion of the "responsible landowner," believed.

Mr. Hyams develops his view in this way: Nothing emerges more clearly from a study of economic history than the fact that the best can be got out of the land only by its owners. "Everywhere in the world, including Britain, the best-farmed land is that of the owner-occupier-farmer, and whenever land has been taken away from the peasant, and the peasant reduced to the status of a tenant or labourer-for-hire, the land has suffered.

"Yet property in land is a relatively modern idea, and when this idea was carried by Europeans to peoples less advanced in technics overseas, it was generally rejected with horror as a kind of blasphemy. With very rare exceptions, agricultural and pastoral cultures and civilisations have been founded, and have risen, on the axiom that the land belongs to everyone in common." He describes the ways in which various cultures have reconciled this paradox, all of them by the same principle—"The land remained the property of the people, in the person of the Monarch, or the State, or the Republic. But the peasant became the owner *de facto*, the trustee *de jure*." In what sense, asks Mr. Hyams, was such a peasant not a land-owner? "In our modern sense, he was certainly not a land-owner. For he could not alienate the land he occupied and cultivated; he could not sell it, give it away, use it for any purpose other than husbandry, leave it by will to a friend. In the last analysis,

Moscow and McCarran Please Note!

Paris, April 5.

Nineteen Russian seamen went on a sight-seeing tour of Paris this afternoon. The captain of the Leningrad cargo ship, Kama, now docked at Rouen, asked for permission to visit Paris. The prefect telephoned the Ministry of the Interior, which approached the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and in a few minutes permission was granted. The captain and eighteen of his sailors then left for their visit to Paris. They are due to return to their ship to-night.—Reuter.

it was not his to dispose of, he held it in trust for the 'people.' He had all the advantages of ownership — freedom of farming, security of tenure, continuity of purpose and responsibility because his sons would inherit. But he was not free to commit the crimes of ownership. . . . This is the sense in which Mr. Hyams demands "nationalisation."

High Farming

The system of farming which the "new peasantry will practise is high farming," that is "farming in which arable farming and stock-raising are combined to support each other, and both practised as intensively as possible. The object of high farming may be expressed thus: it is to turn over the available capital in soil fertility as often and as fast as possible, while constantly increasing it." He points out that high farming is expensive, requiring much labour and machinery. It was devised and practised in Britain in the 18th and 19th centuries. "It was more or less abandoned because the 'Liberal' anti-rural industrial interests refused to pay their factory hands decent wages. Consequently, urban populations could not afford to eat at the prices which made high farming profitable. Cheap food was bought abroad by destroying the fertility of America and exploiting half-starved 'lesser-tribes,' and high farming was ruined. . . . The criterion in those days was, then, the price of food in cash (or exports). What should it be today? The cost of food in acreage of land required to grow it. The only farming we can afford is, therefore, high farming, intensive farming."

The necessity of this type of farming if we are to have a self-supporting, self-renewing soil is emphasised by Massingham in the next chapter which is a plea for organic husbandry. In the final chapter on *Change and Education* Mr. Hyams touches upon the changes in social attitudes implied by the economic changes the authors have demanded. Changes in our attitude to the use of raw materials to the value of labour, and to education, for as Massingham says in an earlier chapter the effect of our overwhelmingly urban-biased educational system is in effect not to educate the pupils in rural life but to train them to get out of it, since being a clerk or a typist is thought superior to working on the land.

A New Society

"What, once again, are our objects?" asks Mr. Hyams, and he answers:

"To feed the British people off the British soil and in so doing to restore to them a pleasant, dignified and meaningful way of life. What is the primary condition of such a way of life? That men be engaged in the making of things, whether works of thought, of art, of science, of craft, of industry, of agriculture, which are useful, plentiful and socially valuable. And how do we propose to do this? Firstly, by rejecting the false ways of thinking and acting imposed by steam-powered industry and 'Liberal' economics and sociology. Secondly, by putting at the service of a new society the means made available by modern organic and mechanical science, not by the 'dark satanic mills' of the Victorians. To aim, in short, at making a people of farmers, craftsmen and artists emancipated from brutal and degrading toil by light machinery, and from the brutal and degrading social licence which is the proper name for capitalist-industrialist 'freedom'."

From our summary of the contents of this book the reader will have seen how close it is in many respects to the ideas which this paper has advocated since its founder, Peter Kropotkin published in 1898 his *Fields Factories and Workshops* a book with a similar theme which as we have often pointed out is more topical today than ever. We have in fact thought and written so much on the subject that we may consider ourselves connoisseurs of the literature of the subject. And tapping the wheels of *Prophecy of Famine*, how true it rings. Of the innumerable books on the future of agriculture, on our "food problem" and so on, that we have seen since the war, this is quite the wisest, from our point of view, and the nearest to our own attitude in its criticism of the export fallacy, of the colonial exploitation which is still the basis of our food imports, and its exposition of regionalism.

Mr. Hyams wryly reminds us that "the real experts—you know the men, with their quiet and confident manner, their rather neat suits, their gently sardonic smile, their polite refusal to argue, their little shrug of deprecation—will say, *Oh well, you know, Hyams and Massingham . . . muck and mysticism . . . of course, there's something in what they say, but, like all amateurs, they've only got hold of a bit of the story . . .*"

We too, of course, have our differences with the authors of this book, but their arguments are so important that we would rather our readers read it for themselves.

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.
Food Production and Population 6d.
Who will do the Dirty Work? 2d.
- PHILIP SANSOM :
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.
- RUDOLF ROCKER :
Nationalism and Culture. cloth 21s.
- ALEX COMFORT :
Delinquency 6d.
Barbarism & Sexual Freedom. paper 2s. 6d., stiff boards 3s. 6d.
- 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.
- F. A. RIDLEY :
The Roman Catholic Church and the Modern Age. 2d.
- 27, Red Lion Street, London, W.C.1.

Cold-War Catholicism

IN a recent pamphlet published by the Fellowship of Reconciliation,* Dr. E. L. Allen mentioned some of the factors being overlooked by apologists on both sides of the "East-West" conflict. It suits Marxist theoreticians to demonstrate that the cold war is between the capitalist nations and the proletarian State; it suits Democratic politicians to point to the lack of basic freedom in their opponents' territories (but only so long as they are opponents). Neither are ready to admit that the imperialist rivalries between "East" and "West" of Europe have their roots in history, and that despite modern veneers, these are ingrained in the stuff of European division.

Stalin, however, dug up the ancient history of Tsarist Russia to glorify Russian resistance to Germany in the last war. As a realist, he knew there was not much use in relying on any appeal of the "proletarian State"—that history was a little too recent, but seen over the centuries, the Peters and Ivans and Catherine might take on a national lustre built up by pseudo-historians. It may be that in due course some neo-Vansittart (it might well be Vansittart himself!) might write a "Black Record" of the Russians. But hankerings after the Tsarist past prevent it. In the meantime, speaking as a Christian Pacifist, Dr. Allen has brought out some of the features in the Russian tradition which has separated that empire from the others. In so doing he has perhaps given over-emphasis to Christian traditions but these might be considered in relation to Rome.

The early Christian Church split between two Popes, the respective vicars of Christ at Rome and Byzantium (or Constantinople). This left a gap between the two centres of Christianity in the Middle Ages—both hating each other as heretics and schismatics, both horrified by the cruelties of the other side—Rome in the slaughters of the Crusades and its readiness to support Islam against the Greek Church; Orthodoxy in the years of Tsarist tyranny and serfdom. Rome, which had allowed further interpretation of the Gospels thus splitting from Orthodoxy, found itself faced with the Renaissance and the Reformation which insisted on still further interpretations, and finally into a struggle between Church and State which led it into political action. After the fall of Constantinople, however, Orthodoxy came under the control of the Tsars.

In this schism we see the interpretation of much of Catholic political action, as laid down by the Jesuits. They were prepared to seize any ally against Orthodoxy—that is to say, since Constantinople fell to Islam—against Russia. Invasion of Russia has been Catholic policy for centuries, and when the Pope allies himself with heretical materialists in the United States, it is not so much because of his fear of "Communism" as it is for the same reasons that led Popes to ally themselves with Mahomedans throughout the Middle Ages and up to modern times.

Orthodox priests and followers throughout the Middle East were used as tools of Russian foreign policy in the past. Stalin, not content with his "Communist" priests, also turned up in the Middle East as a champion of orthodoxy, and by wooing the Armenians, forming them a newly-constituted "national home" in the soviet prison.

* "Neglected Factors in the East-West Conflict," E. L. Allen, D.D.: (F.O.R., 1/-).

This England!

"A WONDERFUL GESTURE"

Councillor F. Richards, of Truro, the Grand Chief Templar of England, in his presidential address to the Congress of the International Order of Good Templars at Devonport, said that the drinking habit "cannot create a truly Christian outlook so necessary in this Coronation year, when youth will have such an inspiring lead by the crowning of our youthful Queen.

"Our Royal Family shows a wonderful example of home and family life, and I am happy to record the fact that our Queen has been graciously pleased to permit loyal toasts to be taken in non-alcoholic drinks. This is a wonderful gesture," he said.

"The drink fiend is getting a serious grip on the country. Each year a new menace presents itself. Now, under the guise of charity, the promoting of harvest festivals in public houses, particularly in the West, is gaining ground. I have very grave doubts as to the Christian value of services in public houses."

During the war the Catholic Church collaborated with the Nazis in a somewhat left-handed fashion. While not supporting racial extermination, they made use of the fact that the Nazis practised it, to enforce compulsory conversion. This technique was used even in the West, particularly against Jews. A large number of orphans were "rescued" from the gas-chamber to become compulsory converts, and while in the majority of cases such a rescue was obviously preferable even though dictated by religious dogmatism, in the cases where (such as the Finaly case) there was a "danger" of the relatives claiming them, or the baptism not being very effectual (as Jewish baptisms seldom are), it has meant what is virtually life imprisonment in monasteries and convents.

This applied against Serbs in Yugoslavia, where the Orthodox Catholics were forcibly baptised into the Latin Church. Rome did not hesitate to use the Nazis' attack on racial grounds upon these "Easterners" in order to round them up into the Roman fold. Some apologists have said this was done solely to rescue them from death. But they know full well the dogma that insists on the validity of a baptismal ceremony even if compulsory. Had not the Yugoslavs persecuted the Church after 1945, these Serbs would be in the position of the Finaly children in France. The attack on the Catholic Church there was not due to Tito's "militant atheism." He did not dare do otherwise. His own preservation means more to him than Rome!

In referring to Dr. Allen's pamphlet, attention is given to Christian interpretations of Russian thought, without drawing the political conclusions I have done. However, where we come to agree with

him most decidedly is his view of the place of anarchism in Russian history. "Anarchism . . . has in fact been one of the main contributions of Russia to political philosophy, the other being autocracy." He refers to the story of Bakunin and Kropotkin. He gives us his conclusions:

"The implication of all this is clear. It is not true that the Russians do not value freedom; they value it so highly and want so much of it that it is difficult for any government to allow them any!"

However, here again Dr. Allen does not draw the conclusions we should draw: that the end of the empire will come when the Russian workers and peasants are able to take the freedom they value so much. Rather he looks at it that "the Communists have not opened a breach between themselves and the West; they have merely settled down in and deepened one that had been there long before they came to power."

The breach is in fact one that existed by virtue of the political clashes between the Roman Catholic Church and Russia, and the former shed no tears at the fall of the Tsar whom it considered as much of a persecutor as his successors. Likewise it existed by the imperial rivalry occasioned between Russia and Britain by virtue of the former's encroachment on the West and the latter's on the East; and between Russia and Germany. These have not been widened because of "Communism"; new names have been given, and a new form of political abuse invented. Greater resources are at the disposal of rival camps. Our hope for the future must be in the crashing of all these empires, and so far as Russia is concerned, the spirit of resistance to authority implicit in the anarchist tradition is the only way out.

INTERNATIONALIST.....

Anarchism and Syndicalism

TODAY, Anarchists and near-Anarchists are practically the only people supporting the ideas of Syndicalism. The Marxists, of all their various brands, have turned in varying degrees away from belief in industrial action as a means of emancipation, towards acceptance of political action alone.

The Labour Party and the official Trade Union movement have steadfastly, over the last twenty-five years, suppressed the use of industrial action by the workers. We may remember last year's panic at Transport House when railwaymen and miners called for industrial action against the Tories' economy cuts, or last January's hasty activity by Arthur Deakin and his office-boys at the threat of action by the road transport workers against the de-nationalisation act.

"No industrial action for political ends," was the cry from the Labour leaders. "No industrial action for industrial ends," has been in fact their cry for years. In effect, "no industrial action" at all.

And the lesser parties under the patchwork quilt of "Socialism" adjust their attitudes towards industrial action strictly according to how it fits in with their political aims. For, fundamentally, all the Marxist parties see the working class as the step-ladder to power, and if their political interests can be furthered by industrial action by the workers, they are for it; if not, they are against it.

Small wonder then, as reformism has waxed strong, that syndicalism has waned, together with all revolutionary movements. But syndicalism, as it originally developed in this country, carried within itself the seed of its own destruction—to borrow a Marxist phrase—for it was in the first place allied ideologically with socialism.

True, not the Labour Party travesty of socialism, but certainly the industrial syndicalism which flourished in Britain during the first twenty years of this century did not specifically cut itself off from political activity, although it was much clearer about the limitations of politics than the majority of workers today seem to be.

Political Action

For instance, in the first issue of *The Industrialist Syndicalist* ("Prepare for Action"), July 1910, Tom Mann writes:

"Does this mean that we should become anti-political? Certainly not. Let the politicians do as much as they can, and the chances are that, once there is an economic fighting force in the country, ready to back them up by action, they will actually be able to do what now would be hopeless for them to attempt to do."

This apparently meaningless concession to political action ran through syndicalist

thought, although all the time the emphasis was on industrial action, and the syndicalists maintained strongly that it was through the use of direct industrial action that the workers could gain most.

But this syndicalism was in reality little more than industrial unionism, though it undoubtedly had a revolutionary aim—"the overthrow of capitalism and the realisation of Socialism." Further, the syndicalists were concerned not to antagonise the already existing craft unions, but only to teach them what they should be.

We still get that attitude today among those syndicalists who advocate working within the unions—even talking in terms of capturing them—because workers resent criticism of their organisation, will remain loyal to them and will not readily think in terms of starting new organisations. There was some excuse in Mann's day for thinking along these lines, for even though there were plenty of grounds for criticism of the craft unions from the industrial unionist standpoint, the unions had not then shown themselves to be as corrupt and reactionary as they have since.

C. P. Influence

It was inevitable that this sort of syndicalism should die out. It was too closely allied to the reformist "Labour Movement" to be able to resist the general corrosion and decay, the collapse of internationalism during the 1914-18 war and, above all, the creation of the Communist Party on the crest of the wave of enthusiasm for the Russian revolution—a revolution which, ironically enough, started through the spontaneous rising of workers, peasants and soldiers, much as anarchists and syndicalists had hoped, but had in fact been halted by Lenin's *coup d'état* in October, 1917, so that the counter-revolution was well under way before the Communist Party was founded in Britain in 1921.

UNPATRIOTIC SPOIL-SPORTS

By four votes to three, Dundee Coronation Committee rejected a proposal for a 21-gun salute on Coronation Day because the council would have to pay for the ammunition, which would cost £25.

At the last Coronation, a salute was fired free; but new Army regulations say the 25-pounder blanks, costing £1 3s. 6d. a round, must be paid for.

The treasurer, Mr. James Gillies, said: "We don't like to be standing by with ratepayers saying 'bang goes another pound,' at each round."

One can sympathise with the Dundee Council's feelings but what about protesting at the taxpayers having to find £1 million to finance the whole show?

Protecting the Young Ladies

Some years ago, when the National Coal Board first planned to begin open-cast mining in the grounds of Lord Fitzwilliam's mansion, Wentworth Woodhouse, near Rotherham, we drew attention to the fact that the miners of the area were opposed to the idea.

They maintained that Wentworth Woodhouse was a local asset, an historical beauty-spot which gave pleasure to all who lived locally. Open-cast operations ruthlessly tear up the land—in the last five years many good arable acres have been destroyed—and so far no satisfactory means have been evolved to repair the damage done. It is a matter of years before nature's slow work makes the land useable at all.

And as well as this, the coal that is won by this method is poor quality stuff anyway.

So there are good arguments against open-cast mining, but now that the Ministry of Fuel and Power has announced its intention to requisition 52 acres of Wentworth, some very different arguments are coming forth.

It now transpires that one wing of Lord Fitzwilliam's mansion is now used to house 150 young ladies of the Lady Mabel College of Physical Education, and the proposed mining operations would deprive the college of its hockey, net-ball and other playing pitches, which cost £5,000.

In a letter to the Ministry of Fuel and Power, lodging the "strongest possible objections," Mr. Bernard Kenyon, clerk to the county council, points out that recruitment to the college may be seriously affected and that if there are not enough students the college may have to close.

"It is understood that foreign labour is largely employed in open-cast work and there is a danger in a community of male labourers living and working in close proximity to 150 young women," he adds. "The principal of the college and her staff already have a great responsibility in caring for the students, and the influx of men into the vicinity would make this a very onerous task which, somewhat naturally, they may not be willing to shoulder.

"It is quite certain that recruitment to the college would be adversely affected by open-cast work, for the beautiful surroundings have great value to parents and students alike. Parents will hesitate to send their daughters to a college where they will live between two open-cast workings, where sleep will be difficult and where there may exist a moral danger from gangs of workmen."

One has the feeling, while reading the above, that the gangs of awful foreign labourers are held to be the real menace.

Whether the girls themselves look at it quite like that is another matter, as also we are sure it would be if it were a training school for young officers that was to come next door.

But, after all, Lady Mabel's College is for physical education, isn't it?

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

OPEN AIR MEETINGS

Weather Permitting
HYDE PARK
Every Sunday at 4.30 p.m.

INDOOR MEETINGS

At 9, Fitzroy Square, Warren Street, London, W.1.

APRIL 14—Jack Robinson on PROPAGANDA

APRIL 21—Arthur Uloth on LIBERTARIANS & LUNATICS

The meetings will be held on TUESDAYS at 7.30 p.m.

NORTH-EAST LONDON

DISCUSSION MEETINGS IN EAST HAM

Alternate Wednesdays at 7.30 p.m.

LIVERPOOL

DISCUSSION MEETINGS at

101 Upper Parliament Street, Liverpool, 8.

Every Sunday at 8 p.m.

GLASGOW

INDOOR MEETINGS at

CENTRAL HALLS, 25 Bath Street

Every Sunday at 7 p.m. With John Gaffney, Frank Carlin Jane Strachan, Eddie Shaw,

MANCHESTER LIBERTARIAN GROUP

A Libertarian Group has been formed in Manchester. All those interested are invited to a meeting at CROWN HOTEL, Gt. Ancoats Street, Sunday, April 12, at 7 p.m.

Enquiries to:

J. Pinkerton, 12 Alt Road, Ashton-under-Lyne, Lancs.

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, crossed a/c Payee, and addressed to the publishers:

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

(To be continued.)