

# Freedom

ANARCHIST FORTNIGHTLY

Vol. 11, No. 15

July 22nd, 1950

Threepence

"How many British airmen's and sailors' lives are we ready to sacrifice to back the Americans against the Russian Empire and to restore private enterprise (qualified by graft and cruelty) up to the 38th parallel? For my part, not a man, not a boy."

H. N. BRAILSFORD.

## Governments Thrive on Fear and Anxiety, and POLITICS IS WAR

### KOREA

THE Korean struggle still goes on—still a trial of strength between the great powers fought out on the territory of another people, and mostly with their blood and lives. The newspapers still continue to treat it as though the important thing was solely the question of the "aggressor" and the authority and prestige of U.N.O. For us it underlines once again the whole injustice and cruelty of imperialism. We do not demand for the North or the South Koreans the right to choose which imperialist power they will be dominated by. The people of Korea did not choose Japan in 1910, or Russia or America in 1945. These rulers were imposed on them. For the people of Korea we demand the right to organise their own lives, without domination from outside imperialisms, and, we would add, without domination from a class or a hierarchy among their own countrymen. These are the elementary rights that every people require for the development of their own capacities and their own happiness.

But Korea demonstrates how far the workers of the world are from placing such elementary considerations in the forefront of their demands. Instead they are so involved in the struggles between the great powers that they see world events solely in terms of the cold war, scarcely ever in terms of the struggle for social justice. In the abstract, how desirable is the struggle for peace! In practice, how distasteful to see behind the most vociferous propaganda for peace to-day, the manoeuvrings of the Communist Parties on behalf of the Russian Foreign Office.

How often have we called upon workers to defeat militarism by refusing to make or transport war materials? How disillusioning therefore is it to see the Australian port workers refusing to embark aeroplane parts for Korea, knowing that it is not revolutionary anti-militarism which inspires them, but a party directive acting through trade union channels? The work of anti-militarist struggle is made harder by the necessity to dissociate it from the machinations of one protagonist in the cold war. Once again the Communist Party contrives to besmirch everything it touches.

### But the People Could Build a Better World

IN any paper which discusses political and social affairs to-day the principal subject-matter must, of necessity, be gloomy. The shadows of the last war are yet with us in various restrictions and wartime-like institutions now treated as permanencies; while the coming shadows of the next war overhang our lives like forboding clouds in the so-called cold war. Clausewitz's aphorism that war is only politics carried on by other means, could now be turned round the other way so that it is truer to-day to say that politics is only war carried on by other means.

Yet if we face the social facts without deceiving ourselves or our fellows it should not be in any spirit of pessimism. *Freedom* has pointed out on many occasions that governments seek to create anxiety because it makes people more dependent and so facilitates the business of ruling them. If we are alive to this problem (and it is obvious enough in totalitarian regimes to make it easier to recognise under democratic ones), we shall clearly be unwilling to promote anxiety ourselves, since it is our aim to create a self-reliant attitude among men and women. If we dwell on the harsher aspects of contemporary social and political events, and deny to ourselves the comforts of hysterical passions and wishfulness, it is because in the social sphere, as in any other, one has to see facts as they are in order to achieve a balanced judgment. It goes without saying that such a process provides the only basis for successful and satisfactory action.

But that is not to say that the avoidance of pessimism and anxiety is easy—it is not. In the new dark ages of the twentieth century it is especially necessary to consider as much of the other

side of the picture as we can, in the more or less fleeting glimpses that have been achieved. For in the darkness, the despair almost, of the last forty years of politics, there have been a few brilliant flashes of revolutionary light. If general history shows men stumbling along the road through wars and reaction to the present impasse, revolutionary action shows them seeking positive objectives. Instead of being driven willy-nilly into impossible

PAGE FOUR

### FRANK LLOYD WRIGHT'S MESSAGE FOR FREEDOM

★

#### Hearts Not Heads

FRANK LLOYD WRIGHT, 83-year-old American humanist and pioneer modern architect, who has paid tribute to Kropotkin as the source of his libertarian and decentralist ideas, made a brief visit to this country last week.

He told *Freedom's* correspondent, "You've got to have it here" (pointing to heart), "not up here" (pointing to head).

## BLOOD AND INK IN KOREA

MR. DRIBERG'S recent remarks that in times like the present the Tories bayed for blood drew forth howls of protest from the Conservative benches, an oratorical outburst by Mr. Churchill, and some criticism from the Press. But they did not make as much of it as of other perhaps demagogical remarks by Labour Partyites in violation of the "Don't let's be beastly to the Tories" campaign. After all, the Press knows exactly what baying for blood means. It is most instructive to watch the war situation develop and see how the Press works itself up into a pitch of hysteria. Being always somewhat high-pitched it is naturally difficult to meet a crisis without being positively hysterical—it roared against Stanley and must howl against Stalin.

If any critic of Mr. Driberg's wanted to know how one bayed for blood, I must refer him to a well-known evening newspaper (one of the Beaverbrook combine for which Mr. Driberg was himself once a shining light). There is no need to ask for it by its name—I have asked several London newspaper sellers for the *Deadly Nightshade* and have never received the *News* or the *Star*. The *Evening Standard* (12th July) had a special message on the Korean war.

Naturally, the article concludes with the "keep off" warning. "Copyright 1950 by Chicago Daily News Foreign Service. World rights reserved. Reproduction in whole or part forbidden." We can hardly think (said he unconvincedly) that the *Standard* intends this notice to preclude honest criticism. We rather fancy that if the editors of *Freedom* were to behave in the way in which Fleet Street editors

two or three generations back alleged Anarchists acted, and published an article or two calling for some of the remaining crowned heads of Europe to be blown up, the *Evening Standard* would want to say a few words on the subject, even if it was claimed to be copyright, reserved and forbidden. As we are rather concerned with human life even if it is not blue-blooded, we take the same liberty.

★

The article ran:—

"Perhaps more important than any of these factors is that the North Koreans are willing to die and our boys are not . . .

"With a few notable exceptions our men have little taste for fighting. Most of them expected the gooks to run. Instead, we have been doing the running."

"The present situation will be corrected as soon as the full weight of American might can be brought against the enemy—provided the GI's are willing to face the sad but inescapable fact that in war men must fight and die."

Can't you hear the typewriters being greased to go into action—can't you see the journalists thirsting to fight to the last drop of ink? The GI's must get used to the idea that life is nothing much to lose, and our tame correspondent sounds as if it's far less sad than inescapable. The fact that men must die may be all very well in the abstract, but if I were a GI and happened to meet the chair-borne warrior who propounded the theory, I should feel like throwing concrete. The personal application comes home a bit too much.

Of course, it is a pity that human life counts for so much with us. "Life in the Orient is cheaper than in the West," claims our copyright, reserved and forbidden hero. At least, for the warlords of China, but not for the losers of the lives, themselves. The truth is that to the ordinary citizen of Korea, China or Japan, whether under feudalism, capitalism, bolshevism or fascism, his own life is the one that counts. He has so much against him in the way of war, famine, conquest and exploitation that it doesn't last so long as ours and he can afford to take chances. But he is not taking chances in Korea, any more than the Press Gang. See how they run! What is there to fight for? What have they to offer him? And will not any intelligent GI think the same (just as any Russian soldier)—is this cause worth my blood? Perhaps next year things will be changed.

★

A few years back we were called on to go out and fight and give our blood in order that Russia might survive. Remember Stalingrad? If we had died that Russia might not be subjugated by Hitlerism we could not very well die a second time so that Russia might not subjugate Korea. It would be very easy if we had a cat's nine lives, or were reincarnated on the Eastern plan—one could cheerfully give one's blood to every call of the Press. But working on the assumption we only have one life, we prefer to escape from what Fleet Street may consider "inescapable". I know I survived last time.

"Wot, no white feathers?"

INTERNATIONALIST.

### THE CLASS STRUGGLE

#### Is it Re-Emerging?

THE recent wave of industrial unrest among miners, railwaymen, meat market and transport workers leads us to wonder if the class struggle, dormant for so long in this country, is soon to burst into life again.

The strongest factor likely to send it back into hibernation is the imminence of another World War. The classic method for a ruling class to side-track revolutionary tendencies is to become embroiled in a war, which provides scapegoats, objects of hate and blame and strong reason for patriotic propaganda and appeals for national unity and extra effort. We all know that stuff only too well.

#### Labour Party Attitude— Now

But an interesting point about the class struggle to-day is the view which the Labour Party now put forward on this question. The class struggle, they maintain, no longer exists. It is all old stuff, part of the struggle against capitalism; now that we are building Socialism, the workers no longer need to struggle against the ruling-class.

This is the old, old argument put forward by the erstwhile reformist or revolutionary party which has now gained power. The class struggle, after all, is only advocated by the underdog—the one who feels the oppression of class division. The ruling-class itself always deprecates the struggle; it is quite satisfied with the way things are—why should anybody wish to change them? It is rather laughable now to see Tory newspapers accuse the Labour Party of stirring up bitterness between the classes, for obviously, however much Labourites may have used the class struggle in the past, now that they are the rulers, the less said about it the better for them.

Inevitably, a reformist or revolutionary party becomes reactionary in power. So the class struggle has to go on, against the new rulers instead of the old.

#### Transition to What?

The transition period in which we are living to-day is not the one envisaged by Socialists of the change-over from capitalism to socialism, but the change-over from free capitalism to state capitalism—and under the Labour Party it is not going to be a very complete change anyway, since they deny intention to nationalise more than about 20% of the nation's industry. They will be content with a hybrid society in which basic industries and social services are run by the State and free enterprise runs the rest. So on yet another count the class struggle has to go on.

In the course of their political development, the Labour Party and the Trades Unions have become authoritarian and completely divorced from the cause of the workers' emancipation. They are now the defenders of the *status quo*—the one running the political set-up, the other maintaining industrial discipline. And during this period of change, they have managed to cloud over the real issues and to gull the majority of workers into acceptance of wage-freeze, no embarrassment-for-our-Government and so forth. But now the honeymoon is ending and the workers are beginning to fidget under the obvious shortcomings of nationalisation, the pressure of the rising cost of living and the threat of another war. And the realisation that things have changed but are still the same.

We still have the possessors and the dispossessed, the privileged and the under-privileged, rulers and ruled. We still have a class-divided society, and so we still need the class struggle. If present straws in the wind foretell its revival, and the workers' energies are not allowed to be used by the Stalinists, we may see the experience of the last twenty years benefited from and an industrial movement develop in which syndicalist ideas find their expression in the day-to-day struggle.

P.S.

London Anarchist Group  
UAG SUMMER SCHOOL, 1950  
to be held at the  
TRADE UNION CLUB  
Great Newport Street, London, W.C.2  
(Near Leicester Square Station)  
on August 5th, 6th and 7th

#### PROGRAMME:

Saturday, 5th August  
2—4.30 p.m. "Concepts of Anarchism." John Hewetson  
5—6 p.m. Tea.  
6.30—9 p.m. "Industry, Agriculture and the Commune." Sam Fanaroff

Sunday, 6th August  
10.30—1 p.m. "Delinquency." Alex Comfort  
1 p.m. Lunch.  
Afternoon Open Air Meeting at Hyde Park.  
Evening Social.

Monday, 7th August  
10.30—1 p.m. "Anarchism and Resistance to War." Jimmy Raeside  
(This lecture is subject to confirmation)  
1 p.m. Lunch.  
2.30—5 p.m. "Anarchism and the World Picture." Albert Meltzer

Chairman: Philip Sansom

These lectures are open to all

Charge for individual lectures, 2/- Social on Sunday evening, 2/-



# The Congress of Cultural Freedom

THE idea was to call together artists and intellectuals to re-affirm their faith in cultural freedom, their love of peace, their solidarity with those of similar views now restricted in totalitarian countries. The hope was that something might be achieved towards upholding these ideas in face of increasing threats. The venue, Berlin, was chosen because of its strategic value a hundred miles behind the Iron Curtain, and perhaps to offer some encouragement to the local cold war victims.

As Silone put it: "We have come to Berlin conscious of our responsibilities and of the increased authority and efficacy that can derive from our union to the cause of freedom, which we mean to defend and which is the *raison d'être* of our art. This congress responds to an imperious and urgent inner need of many of us—to consult our friends from other countries about what is to be done . . ."

From the beginning, however, it was apparent that the participants had varying ideas as to the meaning of a congress for cultural freedom. Some had come for a strict examination of the specified subjects, some imagined that the "cold war" had first to be won before such independent discussions had any validity. Others thought that their own private obsessions or interests were as necessary as anything else.

In this confused setting two events served to give the Congress a sense of urgency and direction. First, the outbreak of fighting in Korea and the possibility of Berlin itself being involved. The second event was the formation of a pressure group, imagining themselves to be the only "realists" present, who considered that the purpose of the Congress must be a rhetorical challenge to Communism. Only in this way could cultural freedom be defended. This group was led by Koestler, Burnham and Hook, and supported by the organizers. They were successful to the extent that not one of the discussions ever reached an objective study of the particular subject.

Their attitude was stated by Koestler at the opening session. The words used were the very contrary to those needed to encourage a free discussion. He said: "Imbued with the mental habit of the neither-nor attitude, of looking for compromise or synthesis—a profoundly human attitude of essential value in its proper field—they are incapable of admitting even to themselves that there are situations in which an unambiguous decision is vital for spiritual and physical survival. Faced with destiny's challenge, they act like clever imbeciles and preach neutrality towards the bubonic plague."

Over the Berlin radio, Koestler exclaimed to his old friend of the Le Vernet concentration camp, Gerhart Eisler: "What you are saying about our Congress shows that you and your fellow comrades,

On June 26-30 a Congress for Cultural Freedom was held in the Western Zone of Berlin. Among the speakers were Ignazio Silone, Arthur Koestler, Herbert Read, André Philip, Jules Romains, Sidney Hook, and James (Managerial Revolution) Burnham. Here is an account of the Congress by Freedom's special correspondent.

you poor suckers, still shake in your boots when you hear the word 'freedom'."

With this as an example, it was to be expected that James Burnham would consider the following as valid material for a congress of cultural freedom: "I am not, under any and all circumstances, against atomic bombs. I am against those bombs now stored or to be stored later in Siberia or the Caucasus, which are designed for the destruction of Paris, London, Rome. . . . But I am—yesterday and to-day at any rate—for those bombs made in Los Alamos, Hanford and Oak Ridge . . ." And, on pacifism, to say, "The primary social consequence of the spread of pacifist sentiment within any given group—class, nation, etc.—is to weaken the will and relative ability of the group to survive. . . . Pacifism marks a decline in the group's self-confidence, and in its willingness to use means which are required in order to maintain its competitive position. Within any group, therefore, pacifism must lead to a relative weakening."

Before turning to the speeches and opinions of more independent delegates, it is interesting to follow further the arguments of the Koestler-Burnham pressure group. In their efforts to achieve unanimity among the delegates they attacked the whole democratic political terminology. They considered that Capitalism and Socialism, parties of the Left and of the Right, in democratic countries, signified unreal and petty differences which served only to conceal the basic unity of their whole outlook. In view of the urgency ("The hour of midnight is long past") it was dangerous to hold opinions that might divide and weaken.

In Koestler's words: "While the majority of Europeans are still hypnotised by the anachronistic battlecries of Left and Right, Capitalism and Socialism, history has moved on to a new alternative, a new conflict which cuts across the old lines of division. The real content of the conflict can be summed up in one phrase: total tyranny against relative freedom."

Since most of the Rhetorical Challenges were Americans it was natural that a little background colouring, illustrating such "relative freedom", should be introduced. George Schuyler, editorial writer for the leading Negro newspaper, the *Pittsburgh Courier*, proclaimed, "... the progressive improvement of inter-racial relations in the United States is the most flattering of the many examples of the superiority of the free American civilisation over the soul-shaking reactionism of totalitarian regimes. It is this capacity for change and adjustment inherent in the system of individual initiative and decentralised authority to which we must attribute the unprecedented economic, social and educational progress of the Negroes of the United States."

"The chattel slave system, or any slave system, is not inherent in Capitalism which for growth directly depends upon pleasing the Consumer and increasing his purchasing power. Whatever its flaws, the history of Capitalism is one of constant mass improvement that everyone can see."

And Sydney Hook to stress the point of the relative unimportance of political differences, "From the point of view of the processes of freedom—there is no illumination in the use of labels like 'right', 'left' and 'centre'. . . . The fundamental distinction of our time must be drawn not in terms of programmes,

about which we may legitimately differ, but in terms of whether decisions are coerced or uncoerced, not in terms of a free market in goods or a closed market but only in terms of a free market of ideas."

It would have been interesting had this debunking of political labels continued to its logical conclusion of exposing the function and purpose of all political parties. Nor did anyone point out, accepting the idea of democratic government, that the result would be a one-party monopoly, which was just what they were so critical of in Russia. Alas, it was more important to achieve a physical unity against Communism than to investigate thoroughly ones own faulty system.

Opposition did come from two well-known European Socialists, Haakon Lie and André Philip, conscious of the situation in which they were now placed. Philip declared: "I am not afraid of the atom bomb, nor of the hydrogen bomb, but of the misery-bomb of unhappiness of the working man." He went on to ask for an immediate political and economic unification of Europe, as a distinct entity from either Russia or America.

Perhaps he was recalling that war scares can often serve many purposes quite unconnected with war. The idea of sacrificing all ones legitimate social

## ANARCHIST PAINTERS

WE are reminded by two current exhibitions in London\* of the work of the anarchist painters, Camille Pissarro and Jankel Adler. It would be difficult to find two painters differing more widely in their individual approach to their art. Pissarro's calm and pleasant scenes of the countryside and of the open spaces of Paris bely his revolutionary views in other fields. These were expressed in his letters to his son, Lucien, and also in his friendship with the anarchist Elisee Reclus. When the terrorist Vaillant was sentenced to death, Pissarro subscribed openly to the fund for the support of his child. Amongst others who demonstrated their solidarity in this way were Pissarro's son, Lucien (some of whose work is also currently shown in London), and the pointilliste, Paul Signac.

Adler, on the other hand, seems to have carried the revolution into his paintings. He has departed a long way from a purely representational art, and yet his works retain the warm and sympathetic qualities which we know him to have possessed also as a man. His early working years were spent in Düsseldorf, where he was closely associated with his friend Erich Mühsam, the German anarchist poet and revolutionary. With Hitler's accession to power he left Germany, finally settling in Britain in 1940. For a painter with a great European reputation he has received surprisingly little recognition in this country, although he exerted a profound effect upon the younger painters until his death last year. The pictures in this exhibition are not representative of his best work, with one or two exceptions, but we welcome one of the rare opportunities to see his painting.

\* Camille Pissarro—Matthiesen Gallery. Pictures by Jankel Adler in the Summer Exhibition of the Redfern Gallery.

## CENSORSHIP IN NAVAL LIBRARIES

BOOKS for the libraries of ships in the Royal Navy are selected by the Director of Vetting—who in acquiring a discriminating taste for rum and ships' biscuits, apparently also develops a very discriminating taste in literature. He knows what is healthy fare for the men. Apparently unhealthy is James Hanley's *Winter Song*, a novel of a sea-going family. When the publishers (Felix House) sent a proof to the Director of Vetting, they received a reply that the book was "not considered suitable". But when a question was asked in the Commons as to why it was rejected, the excuse was that it was too expensive—at 12s. 6d.

We wonder whether Winston Churchill's books on the Second World War have been rejected by the Director of Vetting? They cost 18s. a volume.

aims in the face of a potential threat was a common capitalist manoeuvre.

At intervals during the Congress for Cultural Freedom, when the rhetorical challenge to Communism was interrupted, it was possible for independently-minded speakers to examine objectively their own particular subjects. The "nimble-witted navigators in no-man's land", to quote Koestler, were able to bring a genuine spirit of enquiry and opinion to the proceedings."

A. J. Ayer gave a lucid definition of freedom based on J. S. Mill's *Essay on Liberty*. "If all mankind minus one were of one opinion, and only one person were of the contrary opinion, mankind would be no more justified in silencing that one person than he, if he had the power, would be justified in silencing mankind." Turning to the very real problem of allowing complete freedom to groups and doctrines which did not tolerate or advocate a similar freedom, Ayer said, "This is a familiar question, which it is notoriously difficult to answer. My own inclination is to say that no restraint should be put on the advocacy of such doctrines, and it is only an attempt at their forcible imposition that should be forcibly resisted. But the difficulty with this is that advocacy passes into force: it is not always possible to draw a definite line between them. There are occasions when even the threat of force, the incitement to violence, to employ a legal term, may fairly be held to pass the bounds of advocacy. Moreover, there is a danger that if resistance waits upon an actual show of force, it will come too late to be effective. It is a fate of honest liberals to be condemned, or rather to condemn themselves, to what Thorstein Veblen, in another context called 'a certain amiable inefficiency when confronted with force or fraud'. But once we allow exceptions to the principles of tolerance, we incur a considerable danger. The price paid for efficiency may also be too high. All this is excessively familiar; but the problem which it expresses is genuine enough. Nor do I think there is any hope in solving it in general terms. We have to make a separate decision in each particular case, erring, I hope, rather on the side of inefficiency than intolerance."

Another of the delegates to offer a refreshing statement of idealism was Herman Broch. The intellectual, he claimed, was always a Utopian, always a lover of knowledge and humanism, and not interested in the material acquisitiveness of the average citizen. Broch went on to define real and unreal Utopias. To demand cash payments from an insolvent man was to be the victim of an unreal Utopia. Real and practical Utopias, however, are rooted in facts. "We must take it for granted that any of our claims for humanitarianism, modest though it may be, will batter gaps in the present system of inhumanity . . . and we must therefore reckon with the stiffest resistance."

He continued with an attack on the death penalty and called for the abolition of the ghastly number of gallows which were being erected all over the world. If this were not possible, because of the widespread ignorance and prejudice, then the U.N. should set up a permanent Senate for Amnesties, accommodating the reprieved in neutral institutions of its own. As Broch illustrated, particularly concerning trials of high treason, espionage and sedition, the State was at the same time prosecutor and judge in its own case.

Of positive action, he said, "We are obliged to resume our revolutionary legacy—the anti-institutional and anti-political policy of humanism of the intellectual workers, and to renew it. We have to pursue our practical and real Utopia, directing our attack against State sovereignties."

Another speaker to see further than the "cold war" was Herbert Read. In a paper on "The Artist and his Community," he condemned both the authori-

tarian and the democratic treatment of the artist. After defining art, in its inmost nature, as biological, he stated that its vitality depended on its freedom to contribute to the evolutionary processes of life itself. As such it implied responsibility and integration. And, as such, it contributed to the creation of a culture, which was the spontaneous expression of an integrated community. A culture was not the isolated achievements of a few individuals, a Picasso, a Braque, and so on. Nowhere in the world to-day, was there a culture arising from a truly integrated society. In the past, on the rare occasions when such integrated communities existed, it was significant that they were never large. The integrity of the craftsman was always respected and he had a functional position within the body of the community. As Herbert Read declared, of these small communities, "They did not patronise their artists—they were not even conscious of artists as a separate and peculiar type of man. They were only conscious of a living community, its members differentiated according to their individual skills, and all contributing to the common glory."

The Congress concluded after three days and, despite the inadequacy of the discussions and the possibility of its having been unduly rushed and influenced by the Koestler-Burnham pressure group, it managed to announce certain positive results. One was the setting up of a working committee of 25, which would organise two further congresses in the near future. They would also investigate conditions behind the Iron Curtain, particularly as it affected artists and intellectuals. It would make a study of forced labour and concentration camps in the Eastern States with a view to producing documents of vital interest. They would examine the possibility of establishing an international university for refugees from the East. And, as practical proof of their desire to help, the delegates would present parts of their private libraries to the students of the Free University of Western Berlin. They would also contribute towards the expenses for the printing and distribution of the main speeches of the week.

And, of course, they issued a manifesto.

CHARLES HUMANA.

## ANOTHER ISSUE OF THE DELPHIC REVIEW

THE second issue of the *Delphic Review*, which courageously appears now at a time when literary magazines are dying right and left, should appeal to many of our readers, although it still lacks that well-knit, cohesive quality which distinguished *Now*.

There is a bitter, slightly hysterical, chronicle of disillusionment in Israel by Samuel Suliman; two exceptional translated extracts from *The Man of No Properties* by the later Robert Musil; and a study by C. E. M. Kay of the Egyptian writer Albert Cossery. George Woodcock, writing from Canada, gives his *Reflections on a Colonial Culture*; Tom Farrell describes the language difficulties of the "intellectual", and Ser Krai takes a rise out of the Archbishop of York. There are also book reviews, and poems by Dachine Rainer, Eithne Wilkins, and Alex Comfort.

In his editorial, Albert McCarthy, in discussing (like everybody else) the Problem of To-day, says:

"Even the more enlightened social movements, and this includes many of an anarchist nature, seem to remain embedded in the past. Anarchist papers urging mass revolution have lost contact with the contemporary situation and too many individual anarchists are nineteenth century romantics who refuse to accept the accomplished facts of the present."

Perhaps he will give examples?

**DELPHIC REVIEW, An Anarchist Quarterly. No. 2. Spring, 1950. 2/6.**

## SEX EDUCATION

**JOURNAL OF SEX EDUCATION, Vol. 2, No. 6, June-July, 1950. 2/-.**

THE editorial of this issue discusses the Public Morality Council's demand for punishment of men who patronise prostitutes. "We desire to place on record," says Norman Haire, "our opinion that the Public Morality Council is an impudent body, which strives to impose its own views, which are those of a very small minority, as a standard to limit the freedom of action of the vast majority of the population, who do not share those views at all."

René Guyon continues his discussion of "Sexual Offences in the Future Penal Law," demonstrating the absurdity and futility of sexual legislation, and the President of the Malthusian League continues his article on population problems. This issue also reprints from *Freedom* the controversy between 'G' and Alex Comfort on "Free Unions and Free Love". There is another series of informative answers to readers' questions and the usual trenchant book reviews.

W.

### From our stock . . .

Stories, Plays, Essays and Poems  
Oscar Wilde 12/6  
Fontamara Ignazio Silone 8/6  
Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy Burckhardt 7/6

### Some Second hand books:

Emma Goldman's  
My Disillusionment in Russia 6/-  
Koestler's Spanish Testament 5/-  
Kropotkin's  
Mutual Aid (Heinemann's edition) 7/6  
Kropotkin's  
Fields, Factories and Workshops 3/6  
Bellamy's Equality 2/6

Don't forget to order your Penguin, Pelican, Thinker's Library and Everyman's Library books from Freedom Bookshop!

Delphic Review, Spring 1950 2/6  
Plan 7, 1950 2/6  
Journal of Sex Education 2/-  
June-July  
Estudios (Cuba), No. 3 2/-  
Volontà (Naples), June 1950 1/-

Copies of *Now*, numbers 4, 6, 7 and 9, are available at 1/- each or 3/6d. for the five issues (postage 4d., or 2d. single copies).

**FREEDOM BOOKSHOP**

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

## SPECIAL OFFER TO OUR READERS FOR ONE MONTH ONLY

**THERE IS STILL TIME TO TAKE ADVANTAGE OF THE OFFER PUBLISHED IN THE LAST ISSUE OF FREEDOM FOR**

**Almost complete files of War Commentary and Freedom, covering the years 1940-1949 inclusive (about 200 issues) for a nominal charge of 10/-, postage 2/6 extra. (U.S.A. \$3 including postage; other countries 15/- including postage)**

This offer is made to *Freedom* readers only and will not apply after July 31st for readers in London and the Provinces, but is extended to August 31st for readers abroad.

Send your orders now as the number of sets is limited and this offer can never be repeated.

**FREEDOM PRESS, 27, Red Lion St., London, W.C.1**



# IMPRESSIONS OF GERMANY-2

IT is impossible to go through the experiences of Germany in the last generations and escape unscathed. The First World War struck Germany equally with France and England, but the bitterness of the tragedy with which Germany has since been faced is of a nature which is (in England especially) quite incomprehensible. The aftermath of war in a defeated country led not merely to occu-

pation and a defeated revolution; there followed the boundary changes which altered the lives of thousands, whose nationalities changed perhaps three or four times in a lifetime, although they never moved until the 1945 upheaval; the years of utter stagnation in the unemployment crisis, of which we also had a taste; and then the overwhelming calamity of Nazism, which struck out at its opponents, introduced racist laws, and while it was able (owing to the new confidence of capitalist countries in a "revived" Germany) to eliminate unemployment and introduce many public works, finished inevitably in a second war. The war hit Germany with a force one has hardly realised. Night after night and day after day came the bombing raids, so that the housewives suffered more in the war than the front-line troops. Then the incredible years of "attrition" as the blood was sucked out of the two largest European nations in the Russian front. Finally, years of prisoner-of-war captivity (which is by no means finished so far as the "Communist" victors are concerned), and occupation that brings the calendar back to 1918, with the certain prospect of a third war.

Who can in such circumstances expect normality? The barbed wire is in the background all the time. After all, there are few men in Germany who have never been prisoners. Hitler struck out at his active and formerly active opponents, and there are thousands who have served four to ten years in the "K.Z." (concentration camp), some of whom have never really yet recovered—who perhaps are still unable to lie at ease in a bed, or to appreciate the need for any furniture in the house. And of the thousands who have served their term in the Russian P.O.W. camps, down the mines in Poland, or elsewhere behind the Iron Curtain, there are many who have lost every incentive for life.

## Police Politics

After the years of abnormal Gestapo conditions, followed by a political witch-hunt which at least scared the minor so-called Nazis—that it is to say, the professional politicians and civil service class, who were Nazi for what they could get out of it—it is natural that political life mainly consists of looking over one's shoulder and trying to find out what way the wind is blowing. Any idea of a social dynamic is impossible to find. The Communists are the objects of attack by the capitalist class not because they are revolutionaries (a phase which ceased twenty-five years ago) but because they represent a rival imperialism; while in the East Zone they comprise just the same type of stick-in-the-mud carpet-baggers that carry off the jobs in the Western Zone in the name of capitalist democracy. The parties have all varying programmes and policies, and a bewildering mass of initials confronts the observer at election times, where perhaps sixteen parties may be standing, but by and large all their

programmes may be compressed into the same, and that is trying to find out how far they can go with concessions to the popular mood—which really demands houses, employment and neutrality (but the latter has to be toned down to suit the occupation authorities)—without unpleasant consequences.

From conversation with several Social-Democrats, it has dawned on me how the Labour Party at home have such an advantage over all attempts to set up parties as near as can be, which is being tried all over Europe (as well as Asia). The programme of the Labour Party really sounds incomprehensible to a German when concrete proposals are put to him. Take the hullabaloo about nationalisation of the railways. How can a German worker understand the arguments put forward in the British Press—for "socialism" or more often against "socialism" when socialism is equated with nationalisation of the railways? At that rate they have already had socialism for sixty years. The reformism of the Labour Party represents in many cases accepted practice on the Continent. Nobody can understand that rationing, price control, and other forms of stabilising capitalist economy in a crisis have anything to do with socialism. And also, of course, the non-political labour movement that supports the Labour Party is something not achieved by Continental Socialists. There are Christian trade unions as well as Socialist, and sometimes Communist, Protestant and independent unions also. Thus Social-Democracy is not thought of as exclusively the workers' party, as it is in industrial England.

The police having no longer the abnormal Gestapo powers, but being compelled to follow legal channels, it follows that they have to act more on British lines. That is to say, they cannot any more arrest a man and throw him into jail without charge. They must go round about and harass and worry, working up to a prosecution. We saw the sort of thing in England when the crescendo of petty actions—tapping telephones, hunting through soldiers' kit-bags in camps at home and abroad, raids, led up to the trial of the editors of *Freedom* and other arrests.

In Hamburg, our comrade Carl Langer

## EVEN CHANCES

THERE is good news for all prospective atom-bomb victims. W. Stuart Symington, chairman of the National Resources Security Board, said in Detroit that casualties could be reduced in an atom-bombed city by 50 per cent. with well-planned civil defence.

Since the biggest and best bombs can now (it is claimed) wipe out 1,000,000 people, it is great consolation to know that it may be only 500,000. But what if the swines drop two bombs?

carries on an active propaganda for Anarchism under exceptional difficulties. He is, of course, hated as one of the "bandits" who have survived the "K.Z." and has been subjected to a long series of actions. Some of the raids and counter-demonstrations by members of the "Federation of Free Socialists and Anti-Militarists" have already been reported in *Freedom*. Last year was also reported his death. This was an error—he was actually once again in prison—and it is abundantly clear how this error arose. He is under constant supervision as the secretary of the Federation, subject to continued arrests, as is also his wife and daughter, who was only a few weeks ago released after a fresh charge.

Why should one bother to examine all the fresh charges that come and go against the secretary of the Federation—the plain fact is that they are determined to stop him, but in spite of his age and the effects of imprisonment he is carrying on and there are many others in Hamburg, veterans and young comrades, who are prepared to carry on, too.

I was stopped by a possibly phoney agent who warned that they would receive a fresh charge of illegal assembly if I spoke in Hamburg; this regardless of the fact that the Federation has been after long difficulties licensed by the occupation authorities. The edicts and decrees and prohibitions that flow from the top, whether foreign or native, are there to check and inhibit, and then come the small fry who interpret laws in their own way, still regretting the old days when it was so easy to dispose of opponents by chalking on the door and waiting for the S.S. to turn up.

## The Revolutionaries' Task

This in itself can and does effectively control public life so far as the careerists are concerned. Added to this is the fact that so many feel they have lost all worth having—their best years, their relatives and friends, their homes (even in the case of thousands of so-called refugees, their homelands which have been swallowed up by East European nationalism), all associations with the past, everything they had or did that made life slightly pleasant—now they do not feel disposed to stir, they have forgotten how to defend and extend the liberties that have been granted, they have become used to orders from above and cannot see why one should get excited about petty infractions of liberty and human dignity when so far as they see the whole world has collapsed and will very soon blow up altogether. This is understandable but it is an attitude too easy for the tyrants and one that must be fought, and that is what gives significance to the revolutionary groups that have reappeared in Germany, for however small and weak they may be at the moment they have at least the potentialities of the future, and for good or ill nobody else can see beyond next week.

A.M.

(To be continued)

## ZENSL MUHSAM

THE international Anarchist movement has for some years been concerned with the fate of Zensl Mühsam, and an agitation for her release has gone on continually. Zensl was the companion of Erich Mühsam, the well-known German Anarchist who was a victim of Hitlerism. After Erich Mühsam was taken into concentration camp, Zensl escaped from Germany and was given sanctuary in Russia. She was promised that an edition of his works would be published there, and was persuaded to go by several such offers. On arrival, little has been heard of her except that she has been under arrest as a "deviationist". In 1936, a letter was received from her by the late Emma Goldman—it stated that she was well, but it was all typewritten—including the signature!

A short report appearing in the German *Zeitung Ohne Namen* (the weekly organ of the union of concentration camp prisoners of the Nazi regime) will therefore be of interest. This comes from a comrade of the "Heimatlosen Linken", who was for three years from 1938 to 1941 a prisoner in Soviet custody on political grounds and then in a German jail. He reports that he met Zensl Mühsam. He states that she was bad in health, "living in miserable conditions in a small room, whose furniture consisted of bed, table and chair. Frau Mühsam has not changed in her appreciation of the truth. The Soviet authorities know that she will certainly report on conditions in Russia when she is at liberty again, and so they will never let her go. At present, she is believed to be detained in Ivanovo."

## THROUGH THE PRESS

### OLD STORY

Mr. Ede, the Home Secretary, said he hoped that national registration cards were only temporary. The national register and the identity card were quite alien to the English way of life. Anything which suggested that the Committee or the House thought that the National Registration Act should be a permanent part of our legislation was to be deeply deplored.

The Times, 28/6/50.

### They told us that eleven years ago! ARTS OF PEACE

A double-duty ocean liner, built for peace-time luxury cruises or war-time assault, was launched yesterday, and Vice-President Alben W. Barkley said the United States would need fifty more ships as big or bigger to be ready for war. About 200 passengers will loll on decks which can be converted on a few hours' notice to battle stations bristling with gun-mounts. The troop-carrying capacity will be 2,500 men.

New York Herald Tribune, 29/6/50.

### FRIENDSHIP FOR WHOM?

A Scottish society for friendship with the Spanish people is to be formed following a meeting in Glasgow yesterday, at which Maj.-Gen. Sir Walter Maxwell-Scott and Cmdr. Martel, naval attaché at the Spanish Embassy in London, spoke. Restoration of diplomatic relations will be the only political aim.

Daily Telegraph, 8/7/50.

It is hard to see how this will benefit the Spanish people.

### OH GOD!

Teaching of religion is compulsory in all Spanish schools and in every classroom of all State schools a portrait of Franco and a crucifix hang side by side—by order. A working man in a town in the south complained that his boy of 18 knew no more than a child of nine because of the amount of his time at school which had been spent on religion. He also said that it was impossible for his boy to get a scholarship to a university without a personal recommendation from the priest. And his story is typical of many.

Times Educational Supplement, 14/7/50.

In Portugal the school walls bears a crucifix with the president on one side and Salazar on the other. The children call it "Christ hung between two robbers.")

# CZECHOSLOVAKIA

## Purging the Party and Liquidating the Opposition

IT is officially announced from Prague that a second purge of the Communist Party will take place this year between September 1st and December 15th, and that new party cards will be issued on New Year's Day. In the last probationary period from October 1st, 1948 to January 31st, 1949, the party got rid of 107,133 members, and its strength was then given as 2,311,066 made up of 1,788,383 members and 522,683 candidates.

The Central Committee in announcing the purge states that "this time, probation will be much stricter and more thorough" than last time. "We shall judge far more strictly the relations of every member and candidate toward the party."

It set out that each member must show "how he understands the historic importance of the building of Socialism and the fight for world peace" and whether he knows how to get the help of non-Communists in these tasks.

Each member also, it said, must demonstrate "how he refutes incorrect opinions and prejudices and fights against the intentional spreading of lies by the enemies of the republic and party."

Discussing "the probationary period", Madame Marie Svermova, chief party organiser said that "strict scrutiny does not mean that the party will lightly expel members and candidates after a set pattern."

"We shall justly judge everyone according to what he can give the party, even though he is not doing so yet. We shall differentiate between honest people who can be educated to be Communists and between those who are harmful to the party."

The party paper, *Rude Pravo*, made the significant statement that the forthcoming purge was necessary as the last "verification of membership" failed because of "lack of courage for open criticism".

"Many members who should have been expelled in the purge, became candidates," the paper said.

Does "lack of courage" for open criticism mean that there were not enough denunciations?

Perhaps it was more than a coincidence that a few days after this announcement the Government published the new law code, which has been in preparation since October, 1948, in which various penalties are awarded for the now familiar crimes of High Treason and Sabotage. Anyone who, for instance, endangers fulfilment

## FOREIGN COMMENTARY

of the five-year plan because he fails to do his job properly can get from five to ten years' imprisonment. And how reminiscent of Mussolini's regime is the crime, punished by a years' imprisonment, of "showing contempt for the name, flag, anthem or other symbol of the republic or the portrait of the President"; and for "leaving Czechoslovak territory without permission" the punishment is from one to five years' imprisonment.

Meanwhile the political trials go on. Earlier this month it was officially announced in Prague that thirty more people, three of them women, have been sentenced to terms of imprisonment varying from life to one year for "spying and anti-Communist activities".

Three of the defendants were members of the former Czech Socialist party (Dr. Benes's).

A CASE that has aroused strong feelings amongst French intellectuals, but which seems to have been almost completely ignored in this country, is that of Zavis Kalandra, the Czech surrealist writer and historian, who was found guilty of sabotage and spying and hanged a day after the receipt by President Gottwald of a protest telegram signed by well-known French intellectuals, including André Breton, Albert Camus, Sartre and Duhamel. A correspondent in the *New Statesman* and *Nation* gives the following

biographical note on the Stalinists' latest victim who "for 30 years had devoted his life to the cause of truly international Socialism—this was his real crime—and who for the last 16 years, ever since his expulsion from the Communist Party in 1934, had opposed the formidable apparatus of Stalinism and Soviet expansionism. In 1939, Kalandra refused to escape from Czechoslovakia because he foresaw what would happen to his country if, following an Allied victory, the field were left clear to the Communists. He was arrested by the Gestapo and barely survived the concentration camp. In 1948, Kalandra again refused to escape abroad, although his flight had been prepared by his friends for May, 1948. "What would happen to our country," he said, "if all true Socialists fled abroad?" Again he was arrested; but this time his foes did not let him off with a few years' detention: they hanged him."

The French Anarchist paper, *Le Libertaire*, adds its protest to those of the "groups of International Co-ordination", and also publishes a statement by the National Committee of the French Anarchist Federation in support since "Anarchists have always opposed political sentences, as they oppose all totalitarian methods."

★

IT is one of the tragic signs of our times that human indignation at the injustices being perpetrated every day, either in the name of democracy or in the name of socialism, has lost its face. The intellectuals must accept their responsibility for this. So many of them have allowed themselves to be used by the rival political factions in the present cold war that their protests are suspect and no longer carry the moral force which in the past not even the worst tyrant could ignore.

LIBERTARIAN.

## POLITICS IN AUSTRALIA

(From our Correspondent)

Melbourne.

THE political situation here is in a state of suspension, like the Federal Parliament, which has adjourned, probably for three months. Menzies, having failed to get his legislation, particularly the Anti-Communist Bill through the Senate, is openly threatening double dissolution, and the Labour Party does not appear to be averse to this. Menzies thinks he can win on the anti-Communist issue and the Labour Party thinks it can on the anti-Fascist issue. I think, however, the odds favour Menzies, for the reason that he will link anti-Communism with the defence of Australia, with Imperialistic "patriotism", with religion and with anti-Russian and anti-Asiatic feeling.

The Labour Party is opposing the Anti-Communist Bill, not out of love of the Communists—labourites are well aware that they are only stooges of Stalin, and utterly unscrupulous and treacherous—but because Labour fears that it will be the next one to be a victim. The Menzies Government to-day is almost identical in personnel with the same government in 1940-41, and at that time it showed its anti-democratic character so clearly that even tepid democrats like our Labourites cannot trust it. Even Dr. Evatt, himself no Radical, strongly condemns the anti-democratic character of the Anti-Communist Bill.

The Trade Unions do not like it, but the Communists have made themselves so unpopular that they cannot be openly defended, therefore, in effect, the Australian Council of Trade Unions (A.C.T.U.) decided to follow the Labour Party lead, that is, accept the principle but fight specific clauses. The A.C.T.U. President, Albert Monk, a non-Communist Left-winger, would have preferred outright rejection because of the clauses that Communist Trade Union leaders can be removed from office by the Government; but both the A.C.T.U. Congress and the Labour Party accepted this, most of them having had so much vilification, intrigue and victimisation to suffer at the hands of "gangster" Trade Union leaders like Thornton Elliott, Healy, etc., that they would be glad to see the last of these gentry. Hence, the Communists have succeeded so far, not in capturing the Trade Union and Labour movement, but in driving it towards reaction, as the lesser of two evils. Such is the position at present.

K.J.K.

C. Berneri:	
KROPOTKIN—HIS FEDERALIST IDEAS	2d.
Errico Malatesta:	
ANARCHY	6d.
VOTE WHAT FOR?	1d.
M. L. Berneri:	
WORKERS IN STALIN'S RUSSIA	1/-
F. A. Ridley:	
THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH AND THE MODERN AGE	2d.
Gaston Léval:	
COLLECTIVES IN SPAIN	1d.
Charles Duff:	
A HANDBOOK ON HANGING	2/-
John Olday:	
THE MARCH TO DEATH	1/6
THE LIFE WE LIVE, THE DEATH WE DIE	2/6
A. Cilliga:	
THE KRONSTADT REVOLT	2d.
Icarus:	
THE WILHELMSHAVEN REVOLT	6d.
"Equity":	
THE STRUGGLE IN THE FACTORY	3d.
McCartney:	
THE FRENCH COOKS SYNDICATE	3d.
William Godwin:	
SELECTIONS FROM POLITICAL JUSTICE	3d.
ON LAW	1d.
P. J. Proudhon:	
GENERAL IDEA OF THE REVOLUTION IN THE 19th CENTURY	Cloth 5/-

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



# The International Congress

We conclude below the publication of translations of the resolutions of the International Anarchist Congress held in Paris at the end of last year.

## ANARCHISM AND MARXISM

(Continued from our last issue)

WE turn now to the second series of facts:—

(1) The masses are not psychologically prepared for the rapid acceptance of anarchism.

(2) They lack the habit of organising themselves on a large scale and in an autonomous way, and thus are denied the social background which encourages people to think for themselves. Anarchism often demands an effort which they are not capable of accomplishing. The defeat of the Commune and of the insurrectionary attempts by our Italian comrades at the time of the First International and immediately afterwards, proved this, as did the defeat of the Spanish provincial revolutions.

(3) The repressions which it has suffered have weakened our movement and dispersed our forces. One has only to think of the legal impossibility of anarchist propaganda in many countries for many years, or of, for example, the massacre of the Commune where many anti-authoritarians (Varlin, Delécluze, etc.) fell, to understand the importance of this factor. This dispersal of forces has often led to the anarchists confining their activities with their own groups, limited to themselves. They have addressed themselves to the masses, but not organised them. Thus there has often prevailed a minority, intellectual or "aristocratic" tendency, or else a multitude of activities—educational, individualist, vegetarian, malthusian, etc.—not without value, but absolutely secondary.

(4) Absence of organic work among the masses. We insist on the importance of this aspect of the question. Often the anarchists have "gone to the people". But only for fleeting contacts. Despite the admirable foresight of the anti-authoritarian core of the First International, they have not helped the masses to organise themselves. The only country where this work has been accomplished in a systematic fashion, in spite of all the repressions, was Spain. And we know the results.

(5) Anarchism has thus become, in a general sense, a current whose activity has been almost exclusively negative. We have, in effect, appeared predominantly as formulators of criticisms. Criticism of capitalism, the bourgeoisie, the State, government, laws, militarism, parliamentarianism, the political parties, trade unions, etc. Even though we have almost always been right, anarchism has only been, in the eyes of public opinion and the workers and many interested people, a collection of "antis".

But life is a continual creation. It is by their creative capacity that one judges men and movements. Even if it is limited, this is an indication of future possibilities. This general criticism has engendered an intellectual retreat by our movement. Because in the intellectual, as well as the material sphere, it is by continual creation that life continues. It is not necessary to have a vast culture and a great intelligence in order to criticise.

(6) Thus, part of the responsibility for the success of Marxist movements lies with anarchism. And it is important for us to remedy those deficiencies which

depend upon ourselves. We consider that in its anti-authoritarian, anti-State, and anti-government principles, the anarchists must keep to, and widen, the road marked out by Bakunin and his comrades of the First International. We must once again agitate amongst the industrial proletariat, amongst rural workers, ready to be won to our ideas, and among the technicians whose influence is crucial in modern society.

(7) The excess of Fascist and Stalinist totalitarianism have provoked, even in the countries occupied by the U.S.S.R., a reaction favourable to the acceptance of our ideas. Again, it is necessary to give them, and above all, to give to our movement, that constructive content, in practice and in theory which we have not so far given it.

We cannot establish a uniform programme. We believe, however, that in different degrees, and with the methods appropriate to the time and place, our activities should follow the lines indicated in the various resolutions put before the present Congress.

(8) On the other hand, we must revise our methods, and our propaganda, through studies and experiments, which will give, even to our criticisms, a content and a new spirit in keeping with the needs, the aspirations, the culture and the life of our times. This represents a return to a constructive spirit, on both the practical and the intellectual planes.

If we do not act, Marxism or other authoritarian doctrines and movements will take the field where we have not known how to achieve a positive activity.

This concludes the series. We must remind our readers that the views of the Congress are not necessarily those of the *Freedom Press* group and we would welcome the opinions of our readers. The previous articles in the series have been:

- 21/1/50. *General Affirmations.*
- 4/3/50. *Developing our ideas throughout the World.*
- 1/4/50. *War; U.N.O., European Federation, etc.; Problems of the Revolution (1) Violence and Non-Violence.*
- 15/4/50. *Problems of the Revolution (2) Armed Defence; Pacts and Alliances.*
- 29/4/50. *International Anarchist Solidarity.*
- 27/5/50. *Anarchism and Trade-Unionism.*
- 10/6/50. *Relations with other Movements.*
- 8/7/50. *Anarchism and Marxism (1).* [These issues can be obtained from Freedom Bookshop at 3d. each.]

FROM PAGE ONE

## WAR IS POLITICS

situations, they have on such occasions sought to create a new world out of their own endeavour. If general history is the record of governmental action, revolutions—as Kropotkin said—demonstrate the creative ability of the masses of ordinary people.

### Spain in 1936

It is from such flashes that we can redress the balance, and recoil from the feeling that war and want and poverty are inevitable. And in our own time we can draw from the most brilliant of all revolutionary experiments, that of Spain in 1936. For anarchists, July 19th is a day on which revolutionary hopes can be reborn. If the heroic defeat of the Spanish workers and peasants had no other effect than to keep workers elsewhere from despair, that would be an achievement incalculable, no doubt, but nevertheless of tremendous significance.

But when we look back on 1936 in this light a certain disquiet is bound to arise. In our own movement there are many younger comrades who were still children during the Spanish revolution. It is now fourteen years since and there is still no definitive history of the revolution. Actually the situation is still worse, for if there is little enough reliable matter on Spain,

## LETTERS TO THE EDITORS

### U.N.O. ILLUSION

DEAR COMRADES,

The refusal of Egypt to back U.N.O. action in Korea is interesting, not on account of the Egyptian case itself but because of the light it throws on U.N.O. for those who still cherish this illusion.

Egypt's case is not that she denies Russian aggression but that she considers U.N.O. has failed to check aggression in the past and that it should either check all cases or none. This obviously refers to the Egyptian case against Israel. Whether or not the Egyptian Government is in the right makes little difference—it could be (and is) argued to the limit as to whether Egypt or Israel was the aggressor. However, according to political imperialist points of view, so can the situation in Korea be argued, both U.S. and Soviet Imperialists accusing each other of aggression.

The point is that the U.S.A.'s claim that aggression has taken place can be backed by U.N.O. action, and Egypt's claim cannot, and it should be quite clear that the "token forces" rallying to "U.N.O. action" in Korea are plainly acting as U.S. satellites. It is U.S.A. intervention, and not U.N.O. decisions, that count.

K.A.B.

### SHOULD WE ATTACK THE CHRISTIANS?

COMRADES,

If we attack religious beliefs as such, are we in fact depriving man of free expression? Is it only when religious convictions become institutionalised that they represent a danger to freedom?

George Woodcock says (*Freedom*, July 8th): "Clearly the libertarian is not concerned with attacking religious beliefs as such, since the first foundation of his attitude lies on the assumption that every man should be free to believe what he likes and to express that belief freely."

None of us will disagree that every man has the right to express his beliefs, but if we ever hope to change society, surely the rôle of the anarchist is to point out to man the fallacy of looking to a

higher power to do it for him. Whether or not the Christian attaches himself to the Church he will invariably regard whatever calamities befall us as an act of God, or if he really desires to prevent them he will look to a power outside himself to do so.

If we believe that it is only when man

owns himself, and realises that he alone is the power which will bring about a free society, we must certainly attack those beliefs which make him an easy tool for the powerful. By doing so, we are not depriving him of free expression, but helping him towards a fuller life.

R.M.

## MEETINGS IN GLASGOW

Our outdoor meetings are going fine. There was only one night we had to call off as the weather was against us and we can always reckon on a crowd of 500 at least. It was a grand meeting to-night (25/6/50), I reckon at its peak there must have been close on a 1,000.

There is nothing very exciting to report except that last Sunday one of the Christian groups tried to muscle in on our meeting. They call themselves the "Tabernacle" and they came down into Maxwell Street, which as you know is a dead end (and we've been using it for five years) just as our meeting was going well. They have a van—it's more like a bus—with a loudspeaker, a guy with an accordion and about half a dozen dames chanting hymns. We approached them and asked them to go on to the next street, but no, it was obvious what

they were trying to do, so we let them have it! We turned on our loudspeaker full blast—and you know what we can do to the God idea, Christianity and the Bible.

It was comrade Raeside who happened to be speaking at the time and you know how forceful he can be—he tore them to ribbons! They made it more easy for him by two of them questioning. The subject at the time happened to be the Hiroshima atom bomb. One said as a Christian he would say it was right to drop it, the other, also a Christian, said no, it wasn't right, so there was Jimmy playing one off against the other and all the time flaying them and their ideas. We even gave one of them a few minutes on the platform. You know the sort of nonsense they spout, about "since they found Christ"—I think this lad found Him one day when he was walking up Argyle Street. What a mess "He" has left him in! Incidentally, he said he would have nothing to do with the "Tabernacle" crowd, so you can imagine what it was like—two loudspeakers blaring Christianity and denouncing each other—we enjoyed it. Then the van gave up, the lad who was their speaker saying he could not compete with us. So we had the street to ourselves to-night.

How did the audience take it? They ignored their meeting and when the young Christians wanted another shot on our platform, we put it to them and they said No—once of him was enough! It could have been a rough night, but the audience sensed along with us what they were trying to do and, as I said, ignored them.

By the way, these Christians hold lunch-hour meetings, and they ask the audience questions on the Bible—if anyone answers them right they give him a toothbrush.

Fraternal Greetings,  
J. GAFFNEY.

## THE I.L.P. AND TITO'S REGIME

REPLYING to *Freedom's* reference to Will Ballantine's pro-Tito articles published in recent issues of the *Socialist Leader*, the Editor of that journal has now stated his position in the following terms:

"The editor of the *Socialist Leader* does not in any way share his [Ballantine's] belief that Yugoslavia is a socialist state... Our political philosophy is that of democratic socialism. We are utterly opposed to dictatorship whether of the Right or the Left and, insofar that many of the trappings of Stalinism are evident in Titoism, we do not share any of the current enthusiasm for the latter regime. Tito not only accepts most of the Stalinist version of Marxism, he is apparently an apt pupil of the Soviet regime insofar as it is alleged the jails of Yugoslavia are full of political dissidents.

"Furthermore, it is fairly obvious that the two main features of socialism—freedom and democracy—would be as disastrous to Tito as they would be to Stalin."

The Editor also draws our attention to the fact that Will Ballantine has never been Chairman of the I.L.P. He does not deny, however, our suggestion that Ballantine is a "prominent member" of the party.

## APOLOGY

We apologise to contributors to the Press Fund for having to hold over acknowledgement for one issue.

**FREEDOM**  
Anarchist Fortnightly  
Price 3d.

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

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

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

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

## Meetings and Announcements

**GLASGOW ANARCHIST GROUP**  
OUTDOOR MEETINGS every Sunday at 7 p.m. at  
MAXWELL STREET  
with  
Frank Leech, John Gaffney, Eddie Shaw,  
J. Raeside

**LIVERPOOL ANARCHIST GROUP**  
Open Air Meetings  
every Sunday, 7.30 p.m.  
on Lewis's blitzed site

**COLNE & NELSON DISTRICT**  
Discussion Group held fortnightly,  
August 5th at 2.30 p.m.  
at  
Twisters and Drawers Club,  
Cambridge Street, Colne (Lancs.)

**HAMPSTEAD**  
Open-air meetings will be held at White-  
stone Pond every Sunday at 3.30 p.m.

**NORTH EAST LONDON GROUP**  
DISCUSSION MEETINGS-FORTNIGHTLY  
7.30 p.m.

JULY 25th Don Taylor  
"TRENDS OF MODERN CAPITALISM"  
Enquiries c/o Freedom Press  
AUGUST 8th Round Table Discussion  
THE GROUP AND THE INDIVIDUAL