Guild Socialism

Re-stated - p. 3

Whose 'Interests' - - p. 3

reedulli ANARCHIST

"I don't believe there is any one solution to the social problem, but rather a thousand diverse and changing solutions, as social life, in time and space, is diverse and changing."

-ERRICO MALATESTA.

Vol. 17, No. 25

June 23rd, 1956

Threepence

DEFENCE OF

THE PRINCIPLE IS-LOOT!

THE most straight-forward reason for the present British behaviour in Cyprus was that supplied by Sir Anthony Eden a fortnight ago.

He told a Tory Party gathering in Norwich: "Our country's industrial life and that of Western Europe depend to-day, and must depend for many years, on oil supplies from the Middle East. If ever our oil resources were imperilled, we should be compelled to defend them. The facilities we need in Cyprus are part of that defence.

"No Cyprus—no certain facilities to protect our supply of oil. No oil -hunger and unemployment in Britain. It's as simple as that."

It must be rather comfortable to be able to reduce the problems of half-a million people's self-respect and dignity to a cool and simple assessment like that. Only a thoroughly closed and conditioned mind, unimaginative and unfeeling, could seriously justify domination for such reasons.

But even on its own slight terms, Eden's justification hardly holds water. For, as we have argued in these columns before, a Cyprus held down by force is not going to provide a very secure base from which to defend Britain's interests in the event of war. And the disruptive effect of present events on the island is seriously weakening Britain's defensive arrangements in the Eastern Mediterranean anyway.

A Dead Loss

Not that anarchists concern themselves with that; but even from the Government's own point of view, its Cyprus policy is a dead loss. From our point of view it represents a cynical and immoral disregard for public opinion, both here and abroad; a brutal contempt for the feelings and desire for independence of a whole community; and an outdated reversion to a naked imperialism which demands the vigorous opposition of free-thinking people everywhere.

The fact that Sir Anthony Eden thinks that Britain's oil interests are so important that he is justified in behaving in a totalitarian fashion to defend them, does not seem to square up exactly with his Gov-

ernment's attitude on the Trinidad Oil Company deal.

A storm in the Parliamentary teacup blew up last week when it was announced that the Texas Oil Company—one of the American giants of the oil world—had made a takeover bid for control of Trinidad Oil. Patriots on both sides of the House of Commons rose up in anger at the horrible thought of beastly American dollars buying up lovely 'British' oil.

Advantages

Until the full situation was gently explained to them by Mr. Macmillan, Chancellor of the Exchequer, who pointed out the financial advantages accruing from the deal. It seems that Trinidad Oil is in need of capital for expansion, and Mr. Macmillan said that if the Government refused permission for the transaction we would be under a moral obligation to see that the necessary capital was forthcoming to extend the undertaking.

The provision of this capital from private sources, even if it could be obtained, would represent a considerable burden on the United Kingdom.

Our Conservative Government, therefore, which shows itself in Cyprus to be devoted to the cause of hanging on to British oil interests, after weighing all the many and complicated issues involved and following close consultation with the Government of Trinidad and being concerned purely and simply with the interests of the United Kingdom and Trinidad and subject to safeguards for the existing personnel the Conservative Government, which was voted into office by the colonels of Cheltenham and the workers of Woodford to defend the Empah and all its economic wealth, agreed to the sale of the Trinidad Oil Company to American competitors.

Lovely Dollars

Why? Well first of all for the selling price—£63 million pounds in lovely dollars. Secondly because, although Britain has millions of pounds to spend holding down Cypriots, there's nothing in the kitty

to capitalise oil in Trinidad, so the

Thirdly, because American takeover of Trinidad Oil will bring dollars into the Sterling area and fourthly because Britain will still be able to buy oil from the company in Sterling and probably cheaper as a result of modification of plant, which will cost her nothing.

There is of course nothing new about American investment in British industry. In this country General Motors have long been the owners of Vauxhall Motors, Standard Oil are the vast Esso petrol network and so on. In the Empire, too, there is already plenty of dollar investment-in Rhodesia particu-

Trinidad produces only one-sixth of one per cent. of the 'free' world's oil—but the economy of the whole country is affected by it. Now it follows Mexico, where Britain's oil interests were swallowed up by America in the early 'cash-andcarry' days of the war, before either America or Russia were united with Britain with the defence of democracy.* The oil produced in Triniday is clearly not nearly so impor-

*See Neither East Nor West, by Marie Louise Berneri.

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT! WEEK 24

Contributions received £489 SURPLUS

June 8 to June 14 Wahroonga: H.E.M. 6/-; Granite City: E.J.C. 3/6; Torino: G.R. 14/-. 1 3 6 Total ...

Previously acknowledged ... 488 7 4 1956 TOTAL TO DATE ... £489 10 10

Americans can come and do it.

It Happened in Mexico

Continued on p. 4

£480 Deficit on Freedom

*Indicates regular contributors.

Two Views on Annihilation

T INFORTUNATELY the Sunday Express has a circulation of over five million, and most of its readers no doubt adopt as their own views, that which is proclaimed in its columns. This means that a large percentage of the population of Britain will by now have adopted the latest, and only faintly disguised, oldstyle reactionary point of view on what should be done to Egypt.

Last Sunday an article appeared in this Beaverbrook monstrosity, under the title "Why not Crush this phoney Pharoah". written by the Tory M.P. for Stafford and Stone, Hugh Fraser. In this masterpiece he outlined the methods which he thought should be used for bringing Nasser "to heel", and maintained that this should be a "moment of ruthless re-appraisal" of Britain's policy towards Egypt. His method is certainly ruthless -we quote:

"It is not Suez which controls Egypt. It is the Nile.

Were it not for the Nile Egypt would starve to-morrow.

Yet who controls the constant-flowing Nile? Who controls this great stream which is Egypt's life-blood?

NOT NASSER. Nor any of Nasser's allies. The head waters of the White Nile are our great Equatorial lakes in East Africa. The Nile is controlled by Britain.

This is our hold on Egypt."

Perhaps we may be forgiven if we thrust the point home—he says: "Were it not for the Nile Egypt would starve to-morrow . . . The Nile is controlled by Britain . . . This is our hold on Egypt." The threat could hardly be put more plainly.

He adds: "I do not suggest . . . that we should set about diverting the waters of the Nile without notice." But this does not soften the threat, for he knows quite well that if Britain were to indulge in this sort of fantastic blackmail, she would have to carry it through if necessary, just as she carried through the so obviously mistaken Cyprus policy.

One would like to think that even democratic Britain, despite the bombing of Kenya and the armed repression of Malaya and Cyprus (which are current colonialist measures), would draw the line at starving a whole people into submission—especially when the people themselves have no say as to what should be done.

We hold no brief for Nasser, and there is no doubt that he is playing the political game of East v. West, but even by Tory standards of a hundred years ago, this is not sufficiently good reason for imposing famine and death-by-starvation, upon the total population of Egypt.

TIELD-MARSHAL MONTGOMERY

has also permitted himself a major indiscretion just recently. As deputy commander of N.A.T.O. he has a nice, steady job looking after military matters all over the place. He held a press con ference in British Columbia (right next door to Russia), and made the following statement in respect of the action which should be taken against an aggressor:

"We should give them the works from the word go with atom bombs, hydrogen bombs, with the biggest thing we've got and with everything we've got. I wouldn't mind the consequences, but would drop a bomb an anyone committing an aggression. Drop the biggest bomb you can on them. Finish them."

He added: "My political superiors probably would not agree."

It would seem that Britain's great heroof-the-Western desert, teetotaller, puritan and amateur politician, has decided that if anyone attacks us, he will immediately turn it into a complete holocaust if he gets the chance. He will see to it that most, if not all of the principal cities in Europe and Russia shall be annihiliated, with their populations, and quite possibly he may cause the extermination of the human race.

We can only hope that his political superiors do not agree. But the extraordinary thing about Montgomery's remarks is that he should be permitted to make them without being called to order, or better still being given the sack. As an important official in an international, military organisation, one might have supposed that whatever his own views were he would be made to keep them to himself, and either give the official political view or say nothing at all.

By saying what he has said, he has left us all in some doubt as to whether it may not be that he has the power to issue catastrophic orders of the kind which he would like to, in the event of being attacked; or alternatively, that his views are unofficially (if not officially) shared by his political superiors.

The Political World's Reaction to

The De-Stalinisation of Russia

TO assume that Khrushchev would not have given prior consideration to the possible effect of his "revelations" is surely to underestimate the political acumen and experience of the men in the Kremlin. Indeed, it would be safer to assume that the Report was a carefully calculated step in Soviet internal and foreign politics from which it hopes to derive benefit. No politician "comes clean" because of a troubled conscience. He does so either because he is with his back to the wall and doesn't know of any other way of wriggling out, or because he feels confident that what he apparently concedes with one hand he will more than take back with the other. There is no evidence, to our minds, that Mr. K. and his friends were in a tight spot politically speaking. But we think it is clear that the Russian rulers have become aware of the fact that the "ideological" political curtain that has been woven around them, principally by American propaganda and dollars, has effectively halted their expansion in certain areas of the world. And this is an important consideration if it is true that war has been ruled-out (since it has ceased to be a means . . . and now spells the End for

every nation!) as an effective wea-

pon in the struggle for world domination.

Considering the vast sums of money, the personnel, the propaganda from Russia and satellites radiated to every corner of the world, and the internal grievances in the countries in which the Communist Parties operate, their attack has been a signal failure. Discounting Britain and America where their fiasco has been complete, the fact remains that in their two numerical strongholds, France and Italy, the Communists are to-day as far from the seat of power as they were eleven years ago when Stalin was all that he no longer is, and Russia was democracy's gallant ally!

In Italy in particular it seems to us that the strength of the Communist Party is more a reaction against the stranglehold, of the Right and the Catholics, on the life (the very livelihood of the masses) of the country and the spinelessness of the Socialist Party and the opportunism of its leaders, than a fanatical allegiance to the workers' fatherland.

IN France the first reactions of the Party to the Khrushchev revelations was apparently a reluctance to swallow it hook line and sinker. In Britain the way had been prepared

for many weeks past, if one is to judge by the correspondence columns of the Daily Worker, for the "new line" and obviously a weak party cannot afford to cut itself off from its life-line. But Togliatti in Italy not only adds his damnation of Stalin, but criticises also the present leadership for having allowed Stalin to be the man of Iron who had, apparently, feet of clay. Is Togliatti another Tito? Not, we think, unless Moscow assigns such a rôle to him. For surely, on the evidence Togaliatti has shown himself to be a good Party man, twisting and turning in unison with Moscow: he has only denounced Stalin when denunciation has become Moscow's new line. And one can only assume that his denunciation of those "comrades who to-day take the lead in denouncing him [Stalin] "for co-responsibility" is one face-saving measure. For Togliatti, more than any of the European Communists was aware of the real nature of the Russian system under Stalin, as well as being responsible for seeing that Stalin's policies were carried out in Spain in 1936-39, for instance, at the expense of the social revolution as well as by the cold-blooded murder

Continued on p. 3

moral concepts look out for the catch. Mr. Dulles' statement on the relationship of the U.S.A. to other countries sounds strange after his war-like utterances of a few months ago. Addressing students from Iowa State College last Saturday, he said that the principle of neutrality "which pretends that

WHEN politicians start talking about

a nation can best gain safety for itself by being indifferent to the fate of others" had "become an obsolete conception and except under very exceptional circumstances it is an immoral and shortsighted conception".

The "exceptional circumstances" no

doubt being indifference to countries that have little to offer the United States in terms of powerful political backing. And underneath the fine talk of indifference to the fates of others are the real reasons for Mr. Dulles' desire to extend aid. We find that the United States and the Soviet Union are strenuous competitors for the allegiance of the less economically powerful countries; the United States has no intentions of allowing the Soviet Union to be the highest bidder. Mr. Dulles gives his reason and expands his policy for buying support in the follow-

ing report in the Observer (10/6/56).

POLITICAL JUDASES 'The United States thought it prudent to help Yugoslavia, "so long as it remains determined to maintain genuine

independence." The Soviet rulers were engaged in a gigantic effort to build up their military establishment and extend the area of their dominance. They maintained a military establishment approximately comparable to that of the U.S. and spared no cost in striving to excel it.

They gave military aid to China and satellite allies measured in billions of dollars, and wooed free nations by offers of credit. Credits totalling about £178,500,000 had been concluded, and several hundred more million had been offered. About £178,500,000 was devoted a year to foreign propaganda. About 20 per cent. of Russia's gross national product was spent for purposes hostile to the U.S. America was spending about 10 per cent. of its gross national product in "peace insurance."

The new Communist tactics of extending credits to other countries made it more than ever imperative that the U.S. should continue, and perhaps enlarge, the economic phase of its mutual security programme. It would be ironical if they dropped out of that field just when the Soviet Union was moving into it.'

The Legacy of Nestor Makhno

"During these strikes, a black flag waved over the camps. This flag was the symbol of the anarchist peasant partisans of Nestor Makhno who had won a legendary glory fighting in the Southern Ukraine against the Austro-German occupants and the Cossack chief Skoropadsky until the end of 1918, against the nationalist government of Simeon Petliura until February 1919, against the White troops of General Denikin until the autumn of 1919 and those of General Wrangel until the autumn of 1920, and against the Red Army until the summer of 1921".

> -PAUL BARTON: "Strikes in the Russian Camps" (Dissent, New York, Spring 1956).

THESE two sentences from an account of the strikes in Camp 5 at Norilsk and Camp 13 at Taichet, which followed those at Karaganda and Vortuka, and which preceded the recent easing of conditions in the Soviet concentration camps, are testimony to a remarkable fact. That after nearly forty years of falsification, indoctrination, and the re-writing of history, after Makhno had been described as a bandit, a brigand and a pogromist in a hundred Soviet best-sellers from Makarenko's Road to Life to Alexey Tolstoy's Road to Calvary, after all this, Makhno still has his legacy in the hearts of his fellow-countrymen. And from time to time scraps of evidence seep through to show that it is kept alive, not only in the camps and not only amongst the old. You may remember the incident last year when a 17-year-old Russian boy Valery Lysikov turned up in the American zone of Berlin. (He was hawked around like a performing animal by the American authorities, and later decided to go home). He had been at a school of about six hundred pupils where "he had belonged to a group of about fifty 'anarchists' who were anti-Communist" (Manchester Guardian, 25/3/55). These young 'anarchists' were "inspired by a Ukrainian leader, who, Valery Lysikov knew, had fought both against the Tsarists armies as well as the Bolsheviks during the revolution" (New

York Times 25/3/55). This could refer to no-one but Makhno.

The epic of the Makhnovists was described in Peter Archinov's History of the Makhnovist Movement, published by Russian anarchist exiles in Berlin in 1923. This book was translated into German, French, Spanish, Italian and Yiddish, but never into English. (The only account of any length in English was a chapter in Max Nomad's Apostles of Revolution. This makes especialy welcome the new Freedom Press publication of the final part of Volin's La Revolution Inconnue, consisting of his history of the Kronstadt revolt in 1921, the last armed uprising against the Bolsheviks, and, in greater detail, that of the struggle of the Ukrainian peasants, led by Makhno, from 1918 to 1921.*

As readers of the earlier part of his text (Nineteen-Seventeen: the Russian Revolution Betrayed, Freedom Press, 1954) will know, Volin (which was the pen-name of Vsevolod Mikhailovitch Eichenbaum), was especially well-qualified to write an account of the events of the Russian Revolution. He participated in both the 1905 revolution and that of 1917. He was a member of Makhno's staff from the spring of 1919 until his arrest by the Bolsheviks early in the following year. Volin is not 'impartial' -what historian worth reading ever was? He writes from an anarchist standpoint, and seeks to show, as his translator says, "with a wealth of concrete detail, that at all times the people acted on their own initiative, and that the political parties did little more than take advantage of the people's credulousness and inexperience to promote their own interests, after the decisive action had been taken". But he is a critical

*THE UNKNOWN REVOLU-TION, by Voline, translated by Holly Cantine, (Freedom Press, 270 pp. 12s. 6d.). The American edition is published by the Libertarian Book Club, New York.

and analytical chronicler, he wants to know why the popular revolution was defeated and why the Bolsheviks succeeded.

TOLIN'S account of the Kronstadt rebellion does not differ from that given in the well-known pamphlets of Berkman, Goldman, and Ciliga1, but he is able to go into greater detail with more documentation, and until the publication of I. Mett's Russia's Third Revolution, this will be the most complete history in English. Like Maximov, who declared that the Kronstadt Revolt was

that: "There was no 'revolt' at Kronstadt in the true sense of the word. There was a spontaneous and peaceful movement, absolutely legitimate and natural in the given circumstances, which rapidly embraced the whole city, the garrison and the fleet. Frightened for their power, their positions and their privileges, the Bolsheviks forced events and obliged Kron-

better described as "Lenin's revolt against

the Kronstadt sailors",2 Volin remarks

stadt to accept an armed struggle." He shows how the sailors and workers of Kronstadt had made their revolution before the Bolsheviks appeared on the scene. Seizing the city and naval base in February 1917, setting up their local soviets, opposing the Kerensky government in July, defeating the Kornilov putsch in August, and all the while setting about "a complex of peaceful and creative measures, which pointed towards a fundamental transformation of the very basis of social life". He describes how the men of Kronstadt, on the advent of the Bolsheviks, saw the local autonomy, freedom of expression and the spontaneous popular revolution dwindling away, until the rising of the Petrograd workers in February 1921, crushed by Trotsky's 'iron hand', led to the famous Resolution of the General Meeting of the Baltic Fleet of March 1st, and the ultimatum of the Bolsheviks, followed by Trotsky's threat: "If you persist you will be shot like partridges", and the ultimate butchery and nightly executions.

Emma Goldman mentioned in her

autobiography the scene at the meeting of the Petrograd Soviet on March 4th when a delegate of the striking arsenal workers denounced the Bolsheviks a few days before the massacre began:

"The old worker remained standing, his voice rising above the tumult, 'Barely three years ago Lenin, Trotsky, Zinoviev, and all of you,' he shouted, 'were denounced as traitors and German spies. We, the workers and sailors, had come to your rescue and saved you from the Kerensky Government. It is we who placed you in power. Have you forgotten that? Now you threaten us with the sword. Remember you are playing with fire. You are repeating the blunders and the crimes of the Kerensky Government. Beware that a similar fate does not overtake you'!"3

Years later a similar fate did overtake them. Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Dybenko and Tuchachevsky, the butchers of Kronstadt, were overtaken by the terror they themselves had started. When some future Khrushchev discovers that they were guiltless of the charges laid against them in the nineteen-thirties, it will be well to remember their real guilt as grave-diggers of the revolution.

Continued on p.

A LONG TIME DYING

"TEN DAYS TO DIE" "A SHORT VISION"-Cameo-Poly

THESE two films in one programme provide an excellent balance of programme and to the discerning, one provides an ironic commentary on the other.

One is a film of the end of Hitler in the Berlin bunker, the other is a short cartoon showing the end of life on earth and ultimately of the earth through the explosion of a super-bomb.

It has been said that Hitler in his promise to make Germany great or perish was the only statesman to keep his war aim. But this shabby Götterdammerung is but a whisper against the bang of the Foldes cartoon.

One gets rather tired of the apologia of the good Germans that they were anti-Nazi all the time. One wonders how the Nazi state maintained itself. In such a situation everybody in involved. Particularly nauseating are the military explanations of honourable actions. The worst crime of Hitler (apart from losing the war), was, in the eyes of the military, to flood the Berlin Underground and drown women, children and wounded. Might not the plea of military necessity have passed as an excuse for this crime as it has excused the A-bomb? Provided of course, that it was accompanied by victory.

The message of the Hitler film is explicit in the words of the dying Captain: "Never say 'Yes' always". The implicit message of the film is never lose a war, and don't have unbalanced meglomaniacs as leaders. Stick to sound leaders like Churchill, Roosevelt-and Stalin!

The message of "A Short Vision" is the same as Wolfgang Borchert's "Say

Technically, "Ten Days To Die" is impeccable. Directed by Pabst it has that art which conceals art.

The scene in the Underground where the informer has the tables turned on him by the crowd, first denying that they had heard anti-Nazi statements and then imputing anti-Nazi statements to the informer is one of the few testifying to the solidarity of humanity.

The most telling shot is that when one realizes that Hitler is indeed dead when the 'yes-men' in the bunker light up previously forbidden cigarettes on hearing confirmation.

Oskar Werner as Captain Richard Wuest is the only actor who is allowed to be himself, but his rôle is more wooden than his part in "Decision Before Dawn" which was a more genuine examination of the dilemma of the anti-Nazi.

"A Short Vision" is more concentrated in its impact and more simple in its message which is that life is too good to be destroyed and that we may yet invent a bomb which will do just this. This is conveyed by a series of animated figures and a panoramic background accompanied by a vivid score composed by Matyas Sieber. Unfortunately, it could inspire one to A.R.P. or anti-Communism and pure horror, which is the impact of this film, is a two-edged weapon.

Nevertheless it administers a short, sharp shock which in conjunction with the slow impact of the "Ten Days to Die" gives the affirmation of the virtue of disobedience.

The Tradition of Workers' Control - 8

Guild Socialism Re-stated

theory but the latter's criticisms led Cole to revise words, all true representation is functional in his conception of the consumer and consequently character and the democratic representative prinof the State. At the same time the influence of ciple is not "one man, one vote", but "one man ment's powers over subordinate groups are now the early Soviet form of organisation was mani- as many votes as interests, but only one vote in fested in a further development of guild theories. relation to each interest."50 True representative much nearer to the federalist society envisaged by In the final and most complete picture of the democracy, therefore, is not to be found in a Guild Commonwealth which is to be found in single omnicompetent representative assembly ist State. Certainly, in response to the growing Cole's Guild Socialism Re-Stated, 1920, there is such as Parliament but in a system of co-ordinaa more rigorous attempt to apply the functional ted functional representative bodies. Hence, the principle to all forms of social and industrial moral to be drawn is that "the omnicompetent organisation and also a marked tendency towards State with its omnicompetent Parliament . . . must System, and the establishment of Self-Government decentralisation. In Hobson's original formula- be destroyed or painlessly extinguished . . . (for) in Industry through a system of National Guilds tion of the guild system national rather than local whatever the structure of the new society may be units had been chosen because he felt that local the Guildsman is sure that it will have no place working in conjunction with other democratic guilds "would be altogether ineffectual and inap- for the survival of the factotum State of to-day".51 propriate to modern requirements".47 This was, in effect, as Penty argued, to acquiesce in the The Withering Away of the State large-scale organisation, and critics had not been Those interested in the details of Cole's bluewanting who urged that the National Guilds would print of the Guild Commonwealth should read inevitably develop into highly bureaucratic bodies Guild Socialism Re-Stated. Briefly, Cole pro- the furthest development of guild theories. At such as the State Departments were alleged to be. vided for four distinct forms of functional organ- the time of its publication the guildsmen appeared By 1920 most guildsmen were prepared to admit isation: producers' guilds, consumers' councils to have succeeded in displacing the old-fashioned these criticisms and, while retaining National and co-operatives, civic services, and citizens' Fabians as the acknowledged leaders of socialist be opposed and that guild organisation must be parts of a single system, there was to be a com- minent Fabians of the pre-war days had been highly decentralised.

Functional Democracy

others".48 What it is possible to represent, con- ever, clear that Cole's intention was to delineate

a substitute for, or representative of, the wills of Whatever the force of these criticisms, it is, how- had made substantial progress during the war

a society in which the communal power which existed would be widely dispersed. Moreover, the powers that he assigned to the communes AMONG Guildsmen Cole's co-sovereignty views cluded Cole, are not men but "certain purposes would originate from the functional units that prevailed over Hobson's civic-sovereignty common to groups of individuals." In other composed them, and the exercise of these powers, when it was necessary, would not have been felt as a purely external force in the way that Parliafelt. Cole's Guild Commonwealth was, in fact, the anarchists than it was to the Fabian Collectivanti-statism in the movement, the objects of the National Guilds League were altered at its 1920 conference from: "The abolition of the Wageworking in conjunction with the State" to " . . . functional organisations in the Community."

Guild Socialist Prospects

Cole's re-statement of Guild Socialism marked Guilds, to agree that centralising tendencies must organisations. In order that these might work as thought in this country. Several of the most promunal as distinct from a functional organisation either converted to the new philosophy or forced and working of guild society. "Communes" would to compromise with it. The only serious opposineed to be established at three levels-local, tion on the intellectual plane came not from the The working out of the functional principle led regional and national. The National Commune right-wing socialists but from the small and to a rejection of the current theory of democratic would not, however, be an extension of the pre- vociferous band of Marxists. Had the National representation and of the political institutions sent political State, nor would the local communes Guilds League been seeking merely to replace the which were based on it. The present theory of be extensions of the existing local authorities since Fabian Society as the centre of socialist policypolitical representation, it was argued, assumes these are non-functional in character and the making, its prospects in 1920 would have seemed that one man can represent a number of other Commune is essentially a body on which func- very bright, for it embraced a large number of the men as men; but this assumption is unjustified. tional organisations are represented for the pur- best publicists and the most prominent socialist Each individual is a "universal" with several poses of co-ordination. "The co-ordinating body intellectuals of the day. However, the very nature interests and many facets to his personality. To which is required cannot be, in any real sense, of Guild Socialist doctrines set the League a more further their various interests, each of which is historically continuous with the present State, and difficult task than had faced the Fabians. The more or less limited and specific, men unite in a it must not reproduce in any important respect the principal object of the latter had been to permeate number of associations, such as the church, the structure of the present State".52 Echoing Engels' with "socialist" ideas the people who "really trade unions and the co-operative societies, whose famous prophecy, Cole opined that the present mattered"—the legislators, the local councillors, "function" is to promote those interests. A gene- political machine, losing its economic and civic the administrators, and the trade union officials ral and inclusive association such as the State functions to new bodies, would "wither away". and Labour leaders—those who, on the Fabian claims to be cannot possibly possess a function in Cole's vision of the Guild Commonwealth was plan, would be chiefly responsible for the introthis sense since it is supposed to represent in an criticised by the advocates of the civic-sovereignty duction and administration of the Collectivist unlimited and unspecific way all men's interests, theory who maintained that he had destroyed the State. The objects of the League, on the other however different or divergent they may be. It State only to create a new State representative of hand, could not be achieved thereby. Guild is, therefore, not a "true association". Because all the major interests of society. Others, such Socialism could be effective only if it won the no particular interest or set of interests exhausts as Carpenter, argued that the Commune would allegiance of the mass of the trade union world the personality of a man, "no man can represent have the substance if not the form of sovereignty the people who alone could make industrial demoanother man and no man's will can be treated as to which Cole was in theory so much opposed. cracy a reality. In this connection the movement

Continued on p. 3

OPEN DAILY

OPEN 10 a.m. to 6.30; 5.0 SATURDAYS All books sent post free, so please get your books from us. We can supply any book required, including text-books. Please supply publisher's name if possible, but if not, we can find it. Scarce and out-of-print books searched for.

New Books . . . Long Day's Journey into Night Eugene O'Neill 12/6

Cheap Editions & Reprints . . . The Heart of Jade Salvador de Madariaga 3/6 Man Makes Himself C. Gordon Childe 5/-The Origin of Species

Charles Darwin (Everyman) 7/-Salammbo Gustave Flaubert 7/-The Vicar of Wakefield Oliver Goldsmith 7/-The Sayings of Confucius

(Mentor) 2/6 The Meaning of Evolution G. C. Simpson 2/6 The Uses of the Past

H. J. Muller 3/6 Cultural Patterns & Technical Change (ed.) Margaret Mead 3/6 American Essays (Thoreau,

Bourne, Mencken, etc.) 3/6 Second-Hand . . . Edward Bellamy 3/-Equality

More Fellow Countrymen James T. Farrell 3/6 A Study in Forgery (The Lublin Government) Scaevola 3/-

Essays and Adventures of a Labour M.P. Josiah Wedgwood 2/6 Who is to be Master of the World? A. M. Ludovici 2/6

My Days and Dreams Edward Carpenter 3/6 The Labour Party in Perspective

C. R. Attlee 2/6 'National' Capitalism Ernest Davies 2/6

Pamphlets . . . Socialism and the Churches Rosa Luxemburg 6d. Militarism in Education Bromfield, Buck, Einstein 1/-

The Road to War, 1949-51 Postage free on all items Obtainable from

RED LION STREET, LONDON, W.C.I

reedom

Vol. 17, No. 25.

June 23, 1956

Whose 'Interests'?

TWO reports which appeared in the Press during the last fortnight reminded us of the remarks put forward in the course of a lively controversy last year on the subject of taxation by a valued contributor to our columns who, as a staunch advocate of the "conscious egoist angle", chided us for our naiveté in hoping that human beings could be expected to think and act in a way which might conflict with their "interests". Had we taken up his point we might have found that there was not, in fact, any disagreement between us, if only we had, in the first place agreed on a common definition of what we meant by "interests". Let the Press reports illustrate our point.

AT the annual conference of the Tobacco Workers' Union held at Hove recently, an "emergency resolution" was passed "urging" the Government to take "immediate steps" to reduce atmospheric pollution by diesel, petrol, and industrial smoke fumes, in the campaign to combat lung cancer.

The arguments on which this "emergency resolution" were passed were put forward by a Mr. Smith of Nottingham (in which Players Please) who said that

the tobacco trade had been singled out as providing the cause of lung cancer, but statistics had not proved that cigarette smoking was the cause. The Government should put more into cancer research to find out the real cause.

Mr. Smith said it had been shown that the incidence of lung cancer was highest in industrial areas. Industry was increasing, there were more petrol and diesel fumes and air pollution, and the fall-out from H-bomb tests had a cancerous effect on bone marrow. Investigations should be made before "dieselisation" on the railways was increased.

A LETTER was published recently in the correspondence columns of the Manchester Guardian on the subject of the proposed Bill to make illegal the sale or movement of live rabbits in this country. The writer of the letter, Mr. Mc-Nulty, argues that "if this bill becomes law it will be a further step in the campaign to exterminate the wild rabbit population". And he questions whether total extermination, should it be possible, is to the economic advantage of the country as a whole. In his opinion myxomatosis has been treated primarily as an agricultural matter. On the other hand in December 1953, the organisation his federation represented (namely that of "the British Felt Hat Manufacturers") together with the National Federation of Meat Traders' Associations presented to the Board of Trade details of "the commercial value to the country of wild rabbits in the form of meat, skins, fur and fur-felt hats amounting to an annual average figure of £15½ millions".

The writer goes on to point out that no definite figure could be provided for the saving in the harvest yield as a result of the extermination of the rabbit population but quotes various figures from the original one of £50 millions to the "modified" one of between £10 and £15 millions which he hastens to point out have not been "ascertained with any degree of accuracy". He concludes with this solemn warning to all concerned:

In the two and a half years since our figures were presented, a world shortage of rabbit skins through the effect of myxomatosis has increased their value considerably.

Before the Government commits itself further to the policy of extermination we think that the interests of our industries and the value of our contribution to the

national economy, especially in export markets, should be compared again with the latest figures claimed for the saving to agriculture.

Now if we examine the arguments as presented by the Tobacco Union and the Federation of Manufacturers we are convinced that though they are ostensibly expressing views in the public interest they are in fact seeking to defend narrow, sectional interests! The tobacco workers' resolution is concerned with reducing the incidence of lung cancer. So concerned are they with the problem that it was specially discussed as an "emergency" resolution. But in fact all they have done is to seek to remove the spotlight from tobacco as a powerful factor in lung cancer by pointing an accusing finger at diesel fumes, among others, and adopting an ostrich-like attitude to the effects of tobacco simply because their livelihood is in the tobacco industry. Does their interest really lie in an industry that is producing a commodity which is responsible for the death of thousands of their fellow beings each year?

The felt hat manufacturers seek to defend their sectional interests by bandying the magic words "national economy" and "export markets" which they feel will win them more sympathy than if they asked us to accept that the saving of so many thousand tons of grain was less valuable than the production of so many thousand felt hats (and Davy Crockett horrors).

THE conscious egoists we know, and they neither smoke nor wear felt hats (though in premyxomatosis days they probably ate rabbit disguised as chicken), will, when presented with these two cases, find no difficulty in providing an explanation (in a way they are like the fervent Christians who credit God with everything that is good and Man for all that is bad, for they attribute all that they approve of to conscious egoism what they disapprove of is misguided egoism!)

But surely "conscious egoism", in the progressive sense can be no more than an intellectual concept, for its attainment depends on a world of conscious egoists (a hellon-earth defying human imagination), the existence of which, in its turn would nullify the force and purpose of such a philosophy of

Perhaps our "egoist" friends will put us right, and interpret the two cases to which we have referred.

The De-Stalinisation of Russia

Continued from p. 1

of hundreds of anti-Stalinist revolutionary militants by the Russian organised Spanish Cheka*

In the circumstances we cannot believe that an ageing Togliatti has either the strength, the independence of mind, or a conscience (with which he could understand the problems of more than two million starving workers and their families, as human problems and not as political clay to mould and twist for his own political ambitions), to suddenly raise anchor and steam under his own power. For Tito the struggle was leadership of a nation, whereas for Togliatti it is only a matter of leadership of a political party numerically strong, it is true, but not holding the reins of government. To defy Moscow would split the Party and what is more, he would have to reckon with Signor Nenni (the former pro-Stalinist Socialist who is now denouncing Stalin and the present leaders as loudly as Togliatti, but with the advantage of being able to supply his own halo in the form of an article he wrote in 1938, at the time of the Russian trials, in which he denounced the "deathly effect" of the "bureaucratisation" of the régime†. No, we have no hopes that the Communist Party in Italy or in any other country will have a change of heart. But there is quite obviously a change of tactics, and a change dictated from Moscow. As we see it Khrushchev has issued the directives for Popular-Front tactics; Russia is not the Pole Star, but just another star in the firmament; that the Russian citizen is no longer to be the Man from Mars but just an ordinary human being like you and me; who drinks Vodka instead of beer not because he is stronger than the miserable British worker but because it's colder out there! That fundamentally we are all the same, we have similar problems, we all make mistakes, comrades, but we believe that if only we try to understand each other we can achieve peace and prosperity for everybody,

And though Mr. K. in a moment of pique declared that he preferred the Conservatives to the Labour Party

*See Hugo Dewer Assassins at Large (London 1951) and Yo fui Ministro de Stalin (I was Stalin's Minister) (Mexico, 1953), by an ex-buddy of Togliatti, Jesus Hernandez, ex-Com-munist, a leader of the Spanish C.P. at the time of the Franco rising, and Minister in the Negrin government.

†To anybody but a politician the publication of such an article would be an added condemnation of his post-war pro-Stalinism rather than an exculpation to be exploited!

we have no doubt that Mr. Gollan (when he returns from Moscow minus his ulcers (Stalinism perhaps?), and with the new directives firmly grafted in its place, the new Secretary General of the Party will woo the L.P. (the Bevanites); rather than the Tories!

But the Communist new-look is only a mask covering the real look of Stalinism, of Trotskyism, of Leninism . . . and of Khrushchev-Bulganin-etceterism!

WE may be excused for devoting the major part of our comments to the Communist satraps, since the mask of the democracies has worn so thin that it is no longer necessary to read their utterances between the lines. They stand exposed by their hypocrisy and sloganmongering arrogance. From the utterances of the present Republican American Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, who declared last week in comment on the K. speech that

"there is only one cure for the evils of the imposed Soviet dictatorship—that is government which derives its powers from the consent of the governed . . . to the statement by a former, and likely future Democrat Secretary of State, Mr. Dean Acheson, that

"It was not Stalin's revolutionary fervour that made him dangerous but imperialistic ambition . . . In this respect the new leaders seem to me no different."

In case it might be said that Mr. Acheson is a supporter of revolution and anti-imperialist, therefore a potential comrade, let us enlarge on his thoughts by quoting from the Manchester Guardian report which summarises his further reflections in these terms:

They might have turned towards political manoeuvring and economic penetration and less to military pressure. But

The New Statesman obviously needs wooing (and Mr. Kinsley Martin has been asked to write for a Russian publication), for if one can understand where that journal stands from its article on Holy Leninism in last week's issue, it has progressed from crypto- through fencesitting to a curious combination of Trotsky and Rosa Luxembourg. Poor Rosa Luxembourg!

this "does not change the basic fact of the mid-twentieth century, which is the great and growing productive power of the Soviet Union. This fact—so hard to keep always in our minds-will mould our thoughts and conduct the whole course of our lives,"

"The great and growing productive power" not revolution, is what troubles Mr. Acheson. And later in his statement he refers to:

"By being of any use," he said, "I mean being effective instruments in aiding those who wish to resist giving the Soviet leaders their way. This includes resisting the use of threat of force. But it is not limited to this. It includes also resisting the will of the Soviet leaders to require others to increase their production of goods in the Communist way and as part of the Communist system.

His conclusions were that a balance of military power should be kept which would act as a deterrent against a risky military adventure

to open as wide as possible the opportunity for nations to develop their own economic system without having to accept the system which to-day the Soviet leaders told them was inevitable.

Apart from acknowledging Mr. Acheson's perception in writing-off Stalin as a revolutionary, we would point out that by so doing, and in emphasising the "imperialistic" ambitions of the Russian régime, he is destroying the very foundations on which the anti-Russian propaganda of the West is based!

It is time it was recognised that the "tensions" in the world to-day are not between rival, but between similar, ideologies, aspiring to world domination, in which the "common man" is but a pawn and a victim. They are never conducive to human progress which, to-day more than ever in man's history (since we possess the "know-how" of virtually unlimited production) depends on the supplanting of existing concepts of economics, government and life based on privilege and elites, by those based on equality, responsibility and happiness.

Have you ordered your copy of SELECTIONS FROM 'FREEDOM'

Vol. 4: Living on a Volcano

260 pages :

paper 7/6* cloth 10/6

(*5/- for Freedom readers ordering direct)

The Tradition of Workers' Control - 8 Continued from P. 2

years, especially among the shop stewards and the With the thought of offering the guild idea as their trade unions, especially those in the coal mining Mellor-hastened to join the new organisation. Nevertheless, for a movement which staked so League, mainly the more religious-minded, includnot in the Metropolis.

Conflicts With the Movement

resolved these issues, a deeper and more signifi- had "gone Bolshevik". cant one came to the fore. The influence of the Bolshevik Revolution was not to be confined to Social Credit the utopian drawing office but was to extend to A further factor which helped to undermine the the realm of revolutionary tactics. The question movement was the espousal by The New Age of was now raised: Could the reconstruction of the Douglas Social Credit schemes. Orage had society on guild lines proceed without the prior always remained somewhat aloof from the activiseizure of political power by the proletariat? To ties of the League itself and, as the war progressed, a number of the more influential guildsmen the he became increasingly unsympathetic towards the experience of Russia demanded a negative answer. syndicalist element in guild doctrines. From the

workshop committees. In this field, the petering contribution to the building of a Communist themselves, at least until they had undergone a out of the syndicalist movement had been a gain society after the transference of power from the long process of technical education. When, thereto guild socialism, since a number of the former ruling to the working class had taken place, they fore, in 1919 he added to his long list of "editorial syndicalists, notably John Paton, transferred their began to regard themselves as Communists first discoveries" the name of Major C. H. Douglas loyalties to the new movement. In addition, guild and Guildsmen second. When the C.P.G.B. was who claimed to have found that, not property socialism could claim a substantial following founded in 1920, they-including Ellen Wilkinson, but money and the manipulation of money was among the official leaders of several of the larger Hobson, R. P. Dutt, Page Arnot and William the root of the social evil, Orage was ready to

was a sign of weakness that the membership of strenuously resisted the Communist arguments The struggle against the extension of conscription conferences and finally came to a head in January, the movement. and for a negotiated peace occupied more and 1921, when six of the right-wing members of the 47 National Guilds, p. 276. more attention. When the conclusion of the war executive resigned protesting that the organisation 48 Cole: Social Theory, p. 103.

experience of the Bolshevik Revolution, he and his immediate circle concluded that the workers were not capable of managing the larger industries champion the new cause with all his accustomed and railway industries and in the postal services. However, an important section within the verve. Although Social Credit theories were at first given a guild flavour, they were in certain much on the conversion of the trade unions, it ing Penty, Tawney, Reckitt and Bechhofer, respects fundamentally opposed to guild doctrines. The general thesis put forward by Douglas was the League, like that of the Fabian Society, was In April, 1920, The Guildsman reported a crisis that industrial democracy could never be achieved concentrated so much in London: in the trade within the League: the Communists who believed so long as "finance" remained untouched and that union world, the centre of gravity lay in the North, that a sharp break with the existing order was im. the important point was not workers' control of minent and that guild ideas could be applied only industry or even the common ownership of the after the revolution; the constitutionalists who means of production but the control of credit rejected the idea of a catastrophic and violent up. power by the consumer. It was too much to This weakness began to manifest itself after the heaval and saw guild socialism as primarily a expect that the majority of guildsmen would Bolshevik Revolution in Russia. The same fac- method of industrial organisation; and, finally, the accept this new interpretation of "economic demotors which had undermined the syndicalist move- small centre party, led by G. D. H. & Margaret cracy". The 1920 conference of the League ment served to undermine the guild socialist move- Cole, who, while sympathetic towards the Bolshe. turned down the Social Credit proposals by a large ment. The attention of the militant trade union- viks, were not prepared to subordinate guild majority, further resignations and secessions took ists—chiefly the shop stewards—began to be socialism to any political party.53 The differences place on this score, and, henceforward, Douglas diverted from the economic to the political plane. within the League found expression at its annual and Orage pursued their new course apart from

49 Ibid. p. 106.

50 Ibid. p. 115. 51 Guild Socialism Restated, p. 32. 52 Op. cit. p. 121.

53 Cole's attitude inspired M. B. Reckitt's triolet: Mr. G. D. H. Cole Is a bit of a puzzle, A curious rôle That of G. D. H. Cole, With a Bolshevik soul In a Fabian muzzle; Mr. G. D. H. Cole Is a bit of a puzzle.

(To be continued)

G.N.O.

Continued from p. 2

Ukraine between 1918 and 1921, Volin draws largely on Archinov's book. As a colleague of Archinov's in the Makhnovist movement, as the translator and editor of his text thirty years ago, Volin, who wrote La Revolution Inconnue shortly before his death at the 2nd of the last war, must have pondered for years on the events described, and supplements Archinov's account with his personal reminiscences and critical 2valuation, and from Makhno's own incomplete memoirs.

Nestor Makhno was born, the son of poor peasants, at Gulyai Polya in the Southern Ukraine, in 1889, and went to work at the age of 8. The abortive revolution of 1905 brought him into contact with the anarchists. In 1908 he was arrested and imprisoned in the Butirki prison in Moscow, where he attempted to educate himself, until his release by the insurrection in Moscow on March 1st, 1917. He returned to his native town where he became president of the Peasants' and Workers' Soviet of Gulyai-Polya. (It is worth mentioning here that the early soviets (councils) had no necessary connection with the Bolsheviks or Mensheviks. The Communists usurped the slogan 'All power to the Soviets', which was in fact a cry for local autonomy, just as they usurped the Narodnik watchword 'Land and Liberty'. In March 1920, by which time the Bolsheviks had transformed the local soviets into organs of the central administration, Lenin said to Emma Goldman, "Why, even your great comrade Errico Malatesta has declared himself for the

OIL Continued from p. 1

of the Middle East—so the talk about 'no oil—hunger and unemployment' does not seem to apply.

The British attitude to both these small island possessions, Cyprus and Trinidad, exposes clearly the principle on which the Government works. The principle is: LOOT.

In defence of oil interests in the Middle East the British Government will squander millions of pounds and hundreds of British lives trampling underfoot the aspirations for self-determination of the Cypriot Greeks. It will use the brutal methods of the curfew, the collective punishment, the prison, the bullet and the hangman's rope. It will incur the wrath of a people longing for independence, which has inevitably burst forth into violence—and then denounce them as terrorists and murderers.

At the same time it will sell out British oil possessions in Trinidad because it cannot afford to pay for development! It seems that a dollar in the hand is worth more than oil in the ground.

Count Us Out!

Thus is demonstrated the shabby, sordid motives for which we are expected to tighten our belts, suffer credit squeezes (or 'austerity' under Labour), fight, die and be proud of it.

Well the Government can count us out. And not merely out but against it. Even though we have no sympathy for the 'Enosis' cry of the Greek Cypriots, and do not care for all of their methods, still we despise the British Government and its methods and motives even more. And we raise our voice, small as it is, to encourage every section of the British people to withdraw its support from the British Government, which is making us hated right round the globe.

The oil of the world should belong to the people of the world, not to those minorities with the most money, or guns, or hirelings to use them. The oil, the coal, the land, the raw materials in it and the means of production on it, should be at the disposal of the peoples of the world to sansi; their needs, their wants and desires.

Anything short of this must mean exploitation and domination of somebody, somewhere. When our goal has been achieved it will bring the end of human conflict everywhere.

soviets". "Yes," she replied, "For the free soviets".)

The treaty of Brest-Litovsk, which brought Russia out of the First World War, opened the Ukraine to the Austrian and German armies, who installed a puppet government under the cossack Hetman Skoropadsky and systematically foraged and looted the territory. Makhno organised his first partisan units of peasants to fight them but was driven steadily back. He went into hiding, and, says Archinov:

"In June, 1918, Makhno went to Moscow to consult several old anarchist militants on methods and directions to follow in his revolutionary liberation work among the peasants of the Ukraine. But the anarchists whom he met were at this time indecisive and passive in their attitude, and he obtained no satisfactory suggestions or advice."4

In July Makhno returned to the Ukraine and set about two tasks, 'Pursuing energetically the work of propaganda and organisation among the peasants and carrying on a stubborn armed struggle against all their enemies.' The end of the World War in November brought the withdrawal of the Austro-German troops together with the Hetman and the landlords. The Makhnovists captured large quantities of war material from the retreating armies, and from then until 1921, had to fight first the Ukrainian nationalists of Petliura, and then the Tsarist generals Denikin and Wrangel, advancing from the south, armed by Britain and France. During this period of fantastic chaos, the Bolsheviks pursued a policy of unbelievable duplicity, courting Makhno when they desperately needed him to stem the White advances, and then seeking to destroy him. And all the while, the peasants in the wake of Makhno's

VOLIN describes and analyses these events, and in setting forth the essential characteristics of the Makhnovist movement, divides them into advantages and disadvantages. Among the advantages he claims:

"Its complete independence of all tutelage, of any party, of politics in any form . . . the really libertarian spirit of the movement. This fundamental and highly important quality was due (a) to the initial spontaneity of the peasant insurrection; (b) to the personal influence of the libertarian Makhno; (c) to the activity of other libertarian elements in the region (Makhno being himself absorbed by the task of fighting did his best to attract other libertarians who were able to work in complete freedom).

"The free, federative (and hence more solid) co-ordination of all the forces of the movement into a vast, freely organised and disciplined social movement.

armies were striving to create and maintain their free communes.

"The rapidity with which the peasant masses and the insurgents, despite extremely unfavourable circumstances, became acquainted with libertarian ideas and sought to apply them."

Among the disadvantages he notes:

"The almost continual necessity of fighting and defending itself against all kinds of enemies, without being able to concentrate on peaceful and truly positive works.

"The continued existence of an army within the movement. For an army, of whatever kind it may be, always and inevitably ends by being affected by certain serious faults, by a special kind of evil mentality.

"The insufficiency of libertarian intellectual forces within the movement.

"Certain personal defects of Makhno. Outside of his organisational and military genius . . . Makhno possessed serious weaknesses of character and education. In certain respects, he was not equal to his task. These weaknesses diminished the scope and the moral significance of the movement."

Later in the work Volin returns to this theme, the way an army of whatever kind, and however noble its cause, becomes, the longer it lasts,

"detached from the people and the world of labour, becomes a collection of idlers who acquire anti-social, authoritarian and even dictatorial leanings, who acquire also a taste for violence as a thing in itself, for the use of brute force even in cases where recourse to such means is contrary to the very cause it purports to defend".

He supports Archinov's conclusion that, ultimately,

"it was neither Makhno nor the commanders who counted; it was the masses. They retained all their independence, all their freedom of opinion and action. One can be sure that, in this general atmosphere of a free movement, the activity of the masses would have ended by correcting the errors of the 'chiefs'.

"How many times, during my stay in the Ukraine, could I observe, in contrast to the culpable attitude of certain 'chiefs', the simple and healthy reaction of the masses, when they were still free! And how many times I reflected: It is not the chief, it is not the commander, it is not the professional revolutionary, it is not the elite that counts in a real revolution, it is the revolutionary mass. It is in them that truth and health reside. The rôle of the animator, of the real chief, of the real revolutionary, of the elite, is to aid the masses and remain worthy of the task".

*

THIS is the lesson of Volin's book. Lenin, having crushed the sailors and workers of Kronstadt and the peasants of the Ukraine, introduced the 'New Economic Policy' because the only alternative would have been to yield to the demands for local autonomy. But it was not only Lenin and Trotsky who dug the grave of the revolution. They would have been powerless had not the rank-and-file Bolsheviks and Red Army men, shackled by their belief in political action, surrendered their individual power and judgment and freedom of action to them. It is the lesson of all revolutions. Political revolution is merely changing the scenery in the perennial tragedy of victims and executioners.

Tragic indeed was the end of the Makhnovist movement, The Ukraine was subjugated. Makhno fled to

Rumania, where he was imprisoned. He escaped to Poland, where he was accused of fomenting a pro-Soviet rising in Galicia, and finally to Paris. Slandered on all sides, described by the Bolsheviks as an agent of the Whites, as a brigand, and as an anti-semite, and finally as an allied agent (by the French Communist intellectuals), he died in 1935 of the tuberculosis he had first contracted in his nine years in a Tsarist jail. Of his last years, Max Nomad writes:

"Consumption, never-healing wounds, brooding over the black ingratitude on the part of the Revolution which his heroism had saved, disappointment with the moribund state of the anarchist movement—all this was gradually breaking him physically and mentally. At times the consoling bottle became his only refuge from suicide or worse. He lost many of his old friends and admirers. It was chiefly the assistance of the Spanish anarchists which kept him from actual starvation".

Ten years later, Volin, after four years of evading arrest by the Nazis, "going from one hiding place to another, compelled to live amid constant tragedy and in dire misery", died in Paris, also of tuberculosis. He left behind this book in which, as he says, his "only ambition is to explain the events of 1917 in the light of exact facts, for only such an explanation permits one to formulate correct and useful conclusions".

And Makhno? He left behind a legend, still cherished in Russia, in spite of everything. C.W.

Alexander Berkman: The Kronstadt Rebellion (Berlin: Der Syndikalist, London: Freedom Press, New York: Freie Arbeiter Stimme, 1922) Emma Goldman: Trotsky Protests Too Much (Glasgow: Anarchist-Communist Federation, 1948).
 Anton Ciliga: The Kronstadt Revolt (London: Freedom Press, 1942).

2. G. P. Maximoff: The Guillotine at Work (Chicago, 1940).

Emma Goldman: Living My Life (New York: Knopf, 1931).
 I have in front of me Camillo Berneri's copy

of the French edition of Archinov's History, in which this passage is heavily underlined. It bears out the remarks made at this time by the aged Kropotkin to Berkman and Goldman. "We anarchists have talked much of revolutions, but few of us have prepared for the actual work to be done during the process . . . The anarchists have not given sufficient consideration to the fundamental elements of the social revolution. The real facts in a revolutionary process do not consist so much in the actual fighting-that is, merely the destructive phase necessary to clear the way for constructive effort. The basic factor in a revolution is the organisation of the economic life of the country."

MUTUAL AID

EVEN in these days of 'free' Health Service and the Welfare State there is still room for mutual aid among neighbours. Take the case of three-year-old Janet Rowe of Gateshead, for instance. She has been blind from birth, and local doctors regarded her case as hopeless.

Then a neighbour heard of a new operation that, it was thought, might enable her to see, so all the people in the street clubbed together and raised the cost of sending her up to London to see a Harley Street specialist.

His verdict was that she had a chance, that the operation would cost £500 plus expensive extras. This, you would think, was just the sort of case for which the National Health Service existed—to provide services which the ordinary people could never pay for on their own.

But no. The NHS decided that the chances of the operation being a success were too slight to justify it putting up the money. So Rowe's neighbours decided that they would find the funds themselves, and they are now contributing enough to give little Janet her chance to be able to see.

It would be interesting to know on what principle the NHS weighs the cash value of a little blind girl of three being given a chance to see—however slender the chance may be.

For a handful of working people in Gateshead £500 means a lot more than it does to the mighty National Health Service. But they were prepared to give the money freely in the hope that the operation would work, and we don't think they'll regard the money as wasted even if Janet is not given her sight.

This is mutual aid in a community, showing itself to be superior to State aid through a bureaucracy. This is the social principle against the government principle. This is anarchy!

MAKHNO & VOROSHILOV

Khrushchev's speech to the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the USSR last February was more interesting for what he omitted to say than for his belated revelations about Stalin. But surely the most cynical of his remarks was the exhortation he addressed to the President of the Soviet Union, Marshal Kliment Voroshilov. Having referred to the dubious historical value of films showing Stalin in 1919, brandishing his sabre from an armoured train, Khrushchev said:

"Let Kliment Yefremovich, our dear friend, find the necessary courage and write the truth about Stalin; after all, he knows how Stalin had fought. It will be difficult for Comrade Voroshilov to undertake this, but it would be good if he did it. Everyone will approve of it, both the people and the party. Even his grandsons will thank him."

But Khrushchev knows, and Voroshilov knows, that neither will tell the truth about what happened in 1919, when both Voroshilov and Stalin were still faithful henchmen of Leon Trotsky, the creator and supreme commander of the Red Army. However, it may one day be Trotsky's turn to be posthumously rehabilitated...

What Voroshilov might usefully tell his grandsons is the unedifying story of what he was doing at the time. From January to June 1919 the Makhnovist troops held a front of nearly seventy miles against Denikin's army in the Ukraine. In March an agreement had been reached for the co-operation of the Makhnovists with the Red Army, keeping their own aroanisation intact. In May, Denikin began a counter-offensive. On June 4th Trotsky as President of the Revolutionary Military Committee issued his order of the day No. 1824 ordering an attack from the north on Makhno. On June 7th he sent Makhno an armoured train, and urged

him to resist Denikin and 'advance to the end'. Voroshilov as Commanderin Chief arrived at Gaichur and invited Makhno to come onto the armoured train to direct operations jointly.

"All this", write Volin, "was only a cynical comedy. At that very moment Voroshilov had in his pocket an order signed by Trotsky, commanding him to capture Makhno and all the other responsible leaders of the movement, to disarm the insurgent troops and to shoot without quarter all those who attempted the least resistance. Voroshilov was only awaiting a propitious moment to carry out this order".

Makhno was warned by friends and wrote to Voroshilov:

"I know of Trotsky's order and the rôle imposed upon your conscience, Comrade Voroshilov, in connection with that order. I therefore consider it impossible to discuss with you plans for a further campaign. But these are my own plans: I intend to get in the rear of Denikin's army and to attempt his destruction. This is important just now when he has undertaken a decisive advance on all fronts.

"Your former friend in the struggle for the triumph of the Revolution.

June 15, 1919. BATKO MAKHNO.

On the day of this letter Voroshilov captured members of Makhno's staff and executed them two days later. The Red Army evacuated the Ukraine as Denikin's White Armies advanced. On the night of September 25-26 at Uman, Makhno's troops routed Denikin's Southern Army, and the White Army's advance towards Moscow was turned two weeks later into a retreat. In November the Red Army began the re-occupation of the Ukraine and the Makhnovists were again faced with the attempts of Trotsky and Voroshilov to exterminate them.

This was the rôle of Kliment Yefrmovich Voroshilov in 1919. Kapilavaddho

THE Sunday evening meetings of the London Anarchist Group vary considerably, not only in subject but in merit; a too-well-remembered few of them have been a disgrace to the Group and an insult to the audience. But the average LAG lecture is of quite a high standard. Often, the speaker has special or even unique qualifications to speak on his particular subject; sometimes the speaker has a certain fame or curio value; occasionally a speaker has both these qualities.

One of these latter is Kapilavaddho, the Buddhist monk who has kindly agreed to address the meeting of June 24.

Buddhism resolves the need for a religious routine and the rejection of the God idea, and perhaps because of this has been gaining converts in England recently. Some years ago an English convert shaved his head, put on a yellow robe and joined a Siamese monastery, where he took the name of Kapilavaddho.

He has now returned to England with the title of Bukkhi, the highest honour ever achieved by an Englishman in Buddhist learning, to found an order of English mendicants. What drew the attention of the LAG to him was his remark, during a recent address to the London Buddhist Society, that since Buddhism had no God, every Buddhist must be emotionally self-sufficient, which meant he must be an anarchist!

It is never safe to prophecy whether a particular meeting will be good, mediocre or bad, but June 24 certainly promises to be good.

D.R.

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

Every Sunday at 7.30 at
THE MALATESTA CLUB,
32 Percy Street,
Tottenham Court Road, W.1.

JUNE 24.—Kapilavaddho Bukkhi on ANARCHISM AND BUDDHISM

INFORMAL DISCUSSIONS
Every Thursday at 8.15.

Weather Permitting
HYDE PARK
Sundays at 3.30 p.m.

MANETTE STREET (Charing X Road) Saturdays at 5.30 p.m.

GLASGOW

At 200 BUCHANAN STREET,
GLASGOW
OUTDOOR meetings at Maxwell Street,
every Sunday, commencing April 1st at
7.30 p.m.

LIBERTARIAN FORUM
813 BROADWAY,
(Bet. 11 & 12 Sts.)
NEW YORK CITY
Round-Table Youth Discussions
Friday Evenings at 8.30

FREEDOM

The Anarchist Weekly

Postal Subscription Rates:

12 months 19/- (U.S.A. \$3.00)
6 months 9/6 (U.S.A. \$1.50)
3 months 5/- (U.S.A. \$0.75)

Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies
12 months 29/- (U.S.A. \$4.50)
6 months 14/6 (U.S.A. \$4.50)
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.I. England Tel.: Chancery 8364