

## In this Issue:

- Delinquency by  
Alex Comfort - p. 2  
Paris Letter - p. 2  
Impressions of  
Germany - p. 3  
Facts for Tito Fans - p. 3

# Freedom

AN ANARCHIST FORTNIGHTLY

Vol. 11, No. 18

September 2nd, 1950

Threepence

"Downing Street: happy spot, where they draw up constitutions for Syria and treaties for China with the same self-complacency and the same success!"

BENJAMIN DISRAELI

On the 11th Anniversary of World War II we ask: Do you accept

# PERMANENT WAR?

THIS issue of *Freedom* will be in the hands of its readers in time for an anniversary—the eleventh since the outbreak of the Second World War on September 3rd, 1939. For many, these eleven years represent a substantial fraction of their lives; for younger people, almost the whole of their adult lives. The conditions of war have been the main external factors pressing on the existence of our generation; the events of recent months make it nearly certain that war conditions, if not war itself, are likely to remain the dominant social factor.

For English people, war has hitherto only been acceptable as a temporary expedient to meet an apparently pressing political situation. That it was losing this temporary, improvised character began to suggest itself when, after "the ending of hostilities", permanent conscription was retained instead of being repealed with relief, as the politicians promised. Now it is "peace" which has a partial, temporary character. The permanent war preparedness of Lenin-Stalinist Russia, of Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany is now the lot of the Western Democracies also. Just as they were ahead of us in the trend towards permanent war, so Britain is slightly ahead of America. Eleven years ago, there were many in this country who deluded themselves that the so-called "anti-Fascist" war was necessary for the safeguarding of peace; but there are few so naive as to find acceptable the American wishful illusion of "Let's get World War III over and done with."

This is the world we live in. Those who find it an acceptable world may also be able to accept its permanent war. But for those who find the social structure of our society so faulty that they wish to alter it, the growing dominance of war appears as a ghastly symptom requiring analysis and explanation.

## THE "ANNIVERSARY"

First of all, it is apparent that to consider September 3rd as a starting point, "eleven years from then . . .", is illogical and absurd. A better, though still by no means an initial date is 1931, the outbreak of the war of China and Japan. Besides making clearer that war has longer roots in our lives than our "anniversary" suggests, consideration of some aspects of the 1931 war helps to clarify the general problems of war for us.

In those days there were many statesmen and captains of industry who supported or apologised for Japan, whose colonial war seemed to them to be no different from the ventures of the British for two hundred years before. With Sir John Simon and Mr. L. S. Amery as their spokesmen they formed a tactless group of the Right. The Left had for many years denounced Imperialism and colonial methods of rule. That the British had got away with it in less enlightened times seemed to them no reason at all for letting Japan get away with it in the mid-twentieth century. The Left therefore supported China ("Arms for China, etc.")—and also Chiang Kai-Shek. They laid the foundation for that wartime build-up of the Chinese leader as a champion of the "free" nations. This is a significant point because it illustrates the necessity which war lays upon its supporters of "adjusting" the truth to suit political requirements—as much or more for the Left as for the Right. To support Chiang Kai-Shek the Left had to forget that only a few years before he had been the "Butcher of the Chinese Revolution" who had fought his way to power through an appalling political slaughter of Chinese workers.

As *War Commentary* pointed out during the time of the Churchill-Roosevelt-Chiang conversations at Cairo, he has more blood on his hands than any other successful politician with the exception of Stalin. Political fashions have now stripped the veneer from this particular leader. The truth, however, has always been there, however much the Left sought to gloss or conceal it. It is perhaps unnecessary to do more than point to the glorification of Churchill by the pro-war-Left.

The important matter here is that the claims of truth are largely incompatible with the waging of war or with acceptance of the war-pressed social structure. The more one adheres to the truth—both for moral reasons and in order to understand the modern dilemma—the less can one put up with the half-truths and downright lies of war propaganda.

## WHY IS IT ACCEPTABLE?

To turn from those who manipulate the facts of history for the purposes of propaganda to those at the receiving end is equally disillusioning, perhaps more so. For it soon becomes apparent that however flimsy the propaganda pretends, and however much "we all hate war", there is something about war which is highly acceptable to modern men and women. Even before 1939 there were those who were prepared to admit that the only time they had ever been really happy was in 1914

to 1918, and who were frank enough to say that they would welcome the outbreak of hostilities.

Psychologists have somewhat differently explained satisfaction in war by reference to "release of aggressive drives in a socially acceptable form." The layman is often aware that the pulse beats quicker in wartime, that the sense (one should say, the illusion) of purpose lends point to life. Many are able to recognise that Army life with all its squalor has something to offer

PAGE FOUR

## RESISTANCE TO MILITARY CONSCRIPTION

THE *Los Angeles Daily News* is quoted by the Paris weekly *Libertaire* as stating that in Germany, in spite of Adenauer's new position, the German people in general are resolutely hostile to any plans for rearmament; that in France it is estimated that in the event of war half the conscripts will ignore the call-up. In America the position is stated to be that in New York of 1,402 men called up 329 failed to respond; in Portland (Oregon) the comparative figures were 191 and 82, Washington 100 and 22, Cleveland (Ohio) 100 and 38, Boston 154 and 10, Kansas City 200 and 25, Miami (Florida) 103 and 27, and in Chicago only a third of those called up presented themselves.

We can only hope that these figures are accurate.

## KOREA—A Phoney Crusade

Taegu is accepting tragedy and disaster with the expressionless calm of a people well-adjusted to despair. One gets the impression, irresistibly, that for total victory, whichever way it went, Taegu would put out no flags and shed no tears.

War report in "The Observer", 27/8/50.

IF you went to the cinema the week before last, you probably saw the news-reel of war-planes and ships being taken out of storage and refitted "after the long years of peace" as the commentator put it without a trace of irony in his plummy voice. You saw, too, the bombing of Korean villages and towns in the name of "freedom and democracy". The news-reels, the radio, the press and the politicians are all preparing us for the idea that the Korean war is the first stage of the Third World War.

While a rational and calm approach will show that neither the Russian nor the American government is prepared technologically for a full-scale war, and that Russia will not be for a long time, it is obvious that they may well have created a situation from which they cannot withdraw. The American government in particular is so deeply committed, that, no matter what the cost in soldiers' lives, it must continue to defend what its own advisers considered last year to be strategically undefendable. Defeat in Korea would be so disastrous to American prestige that, however great the losses, the government whose prestige is at stake dare not end the war. Men may die, the country (which was once called *Chao Hsien*—Land of the Morning Calm) may be utterly ruined, but prestige must not be lost.

The manner in which the "values of the free world" are being defended should be enlightening to those who imagine that the Korean war is being fought "for civilisation".

The war correspondent of the American paper *Time* (21/8/50) writes that the war in Korea is forcing upon the American troops "acts and attitudes of the utmost savagery, not the usual inevitable savagery of combat in the field, but savagery in detail—the blotting out of villages where the enemy may be hiding, the shooting and shelling of refugees who may include North Koreans . . . And there is savagery by proxy . . . The South Korean police, and the South Korean marines who I observed in front line areas are brutal. They murder to save themselves the trouble of escorting prisoners to the rear; they murder civilians simply to get them out of the way, or to avoid the trouble of searching and cross-examining them. And they extort information—information our forces need and require of the South Korean interrogators—by means so brutal that they cannot be described."

We may be sure that whether the victory in Korea should go to America and its puppets or to the Soviet Union and its, the people of the country will be the losers. C. P. Fitzgerald, an anthropologist of the Australian National University, writing in *The Listener*, (24/8/50) says, "The Korean people wanted independence and unity—liberty from the Japanese yoke. Instead they

were given a country divided by a preposterous artificial parallel, a frontier conforming to no natural feature, cutting off the towns from their electric power, the harbours from their hinterland, the rice-fields from the head waters of the fertilising streams. One half of the country had thrust upon it a Russian inspired Communist regime, the other received under American protection a feeble government of former exiles, men who had spent their lives abroad, wholly out of touch with the Korean generation which had grown up under the Japanese. It can safely be said that the great mass of the Korean people would never willingly have chosen the one or the other, and least of all a division between the two."

And another authority, Mary Linley Taylor, who has known the country for over thirty years, tells us (in *The Listener*, 17/8/50), that "even to-day the Koreans sing a little chanty when they see us coming:

"Foreigner, foreigner,  
From the Western Seas,  
What is your business here?  
Go away, go away,  
Foreigner from the Western Seas."

Mary Taylor's article is entitled "What do the Koreans themselves want?" Her Koreans street-song supplies the answer. *The New Statesman* remarks that "the war in Korea will settle nothing, and will degenerate into an increasingly bestial and savage butchery on both sides unless it is made clear that its conclusion is to be followed by a political settlement acceptable in Asia." But what do the silent anonymous Asiatic millions want? Not the half-baked commissars, the ruthless idealists or the ambitious Westernised smart-alecs. Not the decrepit imperial-commercialism of the white sahibs and planters. Not the hard-boiled civilisation of juke-boxes, pin-ups and Coca-Cola. Surely what Asia wants is freedom to live, freedom from sudden death and from slow death from famine and avoidable disease. Freedom to live its own life in its own way.

## Foreign Commentary

## Crab Politics

Plays into the hands of Stalinist Propagandists

THE embargo by New York stevedores on all goods of Russian origin must not be mistaken as a sign of working-class militancy against authoritarianism. Indeed, the political manoeuvre which resulted in their action is much less savoury than the Russian crab meat which they refused to unload.

Three million dollars' worth of this commodity had already been imported and sold in the United States without any objection from the dockers. The first ideological protest came from a group of senators who, to quote the well-known American commentator, Alistair Cooke, "by a coincidence happened to be the representatives in the United States Senate of the crab-infested shores of such States as Maine, California, Oregon, Louisiana and Maryland." These senators eventually found a longshoreman, Patrick Brown by name, and who is also a commander of a local post of the American Legion, to champion their cause. It is reported that it took him only forty-five minutes to win over one of the branches of the A.F. of L.'s International Longshoremen's Association, not on the

grounds that American crab interests were suffering by this invasion of Russian crab naturally, but to the patriotic slogan of "we are at war with Russia." The conversion to the Senators' cause seems too sudden for one to suspect that we have not been told the whole story; one day we presume the whole dirty story will come out.

## Helping Communist Propaganda

Meanwhile such action helps Communist propaganda. For the Communists will be pointing to the fact that while longshoremen were boycotting Russia, the House of Representatives was agreeing to the granting to Franco, Europe's arch-Fascist, a £22,000,000 loan. On this action, it will be pointed out, the dockers are silent though they will be called upon to load ships with goods which will be used by Franco to consolidate his totalitarian regime, and to strengthen his own prestige among the Spanish people.

If dockers—and other workers, were to boycott all totalitarian countries then one might even applaud their militancy, but they don't; and Capitalism knows no frontiers—not even iron curtains or rival *isms*. We pointed out in *Freedom's* wartime predecessor, *War Commentary*, how Germany was receiving scrap metal, rubber and meals from this country right up to a week before the outbreak of war, and the same occurred in the case of Japan and America. Why should it be different now?

In fact, the same situation exists to-day. In Germany for instance the embargo on steel exports from Western Germany to the Eastern zone has been lifted. It should be noted that the embargo was imposed in the first place, not in order to prevent Russia using the steel for war preparations but simply because the East zone failed to meet its promises of payment in kind and also ran out of Deutschmarks! Besides lifting the ban, it was learned in Bonn, last month, that a big West German iron and steel company was negotiating for a direct deal with the Russians amounting to more than £2,000,000.

In the city columns of the Press, one also reads that heavy buying of rubber in the East by Russia and some of her satellites has "added to the recent pressure on supplies."

## Spain Exports to Russia

But the most perfect example of the Capitalist International is the report that huge quantities of mercury (used in explosives as well as in instruments) are being exported by Spain to Russia via Finland and are being transported in American ships. And to complete the picture one should add that it is more than likely that the exporting firms are largely financed by Wall Street and the City!

One thing about the Russian crab meat is that it is palatable; which is more than one can say about politics on both sides of the Curtain.

[More Foreign Commentary on p. 3.]



# Autumn Reading

AMONG the books announced for publication this Autumn, are a number which will have a particular interest for readers of *Freedom*.

★

*The Anarchist Prince* by George Woodcock and Ivan Avacumovic (T. V. Boardman & Co.) will be the first full-length biography of Kropotkin.

Marie Lousie Berneri's *Journey Through Utopia* is to be published by Routledge and Kegan Paul. Readers are reminded that the special edition published by the M. L. Berneri Memorial Committee will be available to them.

A new Freedom Press publication is Bakunin's *Marxism, Freedom and the State*, translated and edited with an introduction by K. J. Kenafick.

Those who heard Alex Comfort's talk at the recent Anarchist Summer School on Delinquency will be interested in his *Authority and Delinquency in the Modern State*, a criminological approach to the problem of power. The same author's fifth volume of poems, *And All But He Departed* is also to be published by Routledge and Kegan Paul.

*Of Fear and Freedom* (Cassell) is a philosophical work by Carlo Levi, the author of *Christ Stopped at Eboli*.

Secker and Warburg will be publishing *Shooting an Elephant*, a collection of essays by George Orwell. This book will be in three sections, one of autobiographical articles, one of literary essays, and one from his contributions to *Tribune*.

One of the most important books on Spain published in this country was Gerald Brenan's *The Spanish Labyrinth*. The author has recently revisited the country, and *The Face of Spain* (Turnstile Press) is an account of what he saw.

Allen and Unwin announce a book by Prof. David Fleisher on *William Godwin*, described as "a study in liberalism."

Eugen Kogon's *The Theory and Practice of Hell* (Secker & Warburg) is a book on the Nazi concentration camp system, which has been very widely read in Germany. (Kogon's federalist ideas are discussed by Helmut Rudiger in the latest issue of *Estudios*.)

Another book which has been very widely discussed on the continent is a novel

## From our stock . . .

<i>The House by the Medlar Tree</i>	Giovanni Verga	10/6
<i>The Flea of Sodom</i>	Edward Dahlberg	7/6
<i>Ethics</i>	Peter Kropotkin	12/6
<i>Scottsboro Boy</i>	Heywood Patterson	16/-
<i>The Colossus of Maroussi</i>	Henry Miller	1/6
<i>The Death Ship</i>	B. Traven	2/-
<i>Orgone Energy Bulletin</i> , No. 3, July 1950		6/-
<i>Earth Abides</i>	George R. Stewart	12/6
<i>The Legacy of Islam</i>	ed. Arnold & Guillaume	15/-
<i>Estudios</i> (Havana), No. 4 July 1950		2/-

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

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

# Esperanto or Desperanto?

## PARIS LETTER

AN Esperanto Congress with 700 delegates has been held here; and the Stalinist papers have at the same time published a sensational declaration by Stalin himself about the coming unification of all idioms into one single Marxist lingo; so linguistics are on the order of the day, and they must be the subject of my letter anyway.

I have no competence at all the matter, of course—being no Russian, no Com-

munist, and no General Statesman: just a proof-reader, and, occasionally, a translator of English, German, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, Dutch, Hungarian into French. (By the way, I was told that Uncle Joe-Mustachio does not get a word of any foreign language. Is it so?)

I hear that the Esperantist char-a-bancs from Holland, Belgium, West Germany and Scandinavian countries had a daily meeting every night in the neighbourhood of the Folies Bergère. The Congress was not, however, celebrated there, as at first supposed, and the variety show "Feeries-Folies" does not as a matter of fact require great linguistic knowledge. It consists of the same mass production of Bare-Breast-and Bottoms as usual, plus a fluorescent-mystical impersonation of Our Lady by Josephine Baker (with Schubert's *Ave Maria* played on the wave organ). It is therefore, a manifestation of international artistic catholicity. A ticket for the Folies is, I presume, included in the cost of the Pilgrimage to Rome for the *Annus Sanctus* (is that good Latin?) as well as the Pope's blessings and the visit to the Old Roman Lupanar at Pompeii . . .

As for Esperanto, I considered until lately that it was a sort of Sanskrit (holy or hieratic language) like those that children invent for the sake of mystery. I thought that the pleasure the *gesamideoj* ("comrades", in esperanto. Literally: people-of-both-sexes-who-partake-of-the-same-idea), found in its use was to be understood by nobody else, under the pretext of being understood by everybody. But I probably misunderstood myself . . . the *Spirit of the Time*.

A great number of the Congress members did not speak a word of Esperanto either, but were all the more emphatic supporters of its beauties and of the introduction of its obligatory use in all schools. Every Esperantist I met avowed that the case was hopeless if some kind of compulsory measure was not obtained from governments.

The difference between that naive state-ideology of the followers of Dr. Zamenhoff, and the hard-boiled state-ideology of Generalissimo Stalin is, of course, a question of their amount of power. As Marx would have styled it, a theory is just a theory so long as it does not have the means to take hold of the masses. If it does, it enters into the Kingdom of "Reality" and, therefore, of "Rationality": it becomes "true". Garry Davis' World Government on the steps of the Palais de Chaillot, and the "true" world government of Washington or Moscow—Cabet's socialism in his book *Journey to Icaria* and the "true" socialism of *Icaria* realized over one sixth of the earth—Lenin's bolshevism of the Kienthal valley and Lenin's "true" bolshevism of the Kremlin Tower, are not at one. Things on an inter-individual scale are not the same when they are on a superhuman scale. The cat is nice, the tiger terrible. We prefer cat-dimensioned institutions. All Marxists want tiger-institutions! A newborn tiger may be quite nice: it is the growing up that makes the tiger. The only difference between the lunatic asylum and the palace of the Emperor is that the Emperor is obeyed by his attendants!

As you may see, I am terribly depressed by the idea that all the dear mother-tongues of Europe are to disappear and be superseded by an international lingo. A sort of Basic Georgian, maybe? Or is Stalin already mixing in his great cauldron the water of the Indo-European, with the oils of the Uralo-Altaic, with the Semitic sands and perhaps a pinch of Bantu, a spoonful of Caribbean, and so on? Are our next masters, the Kalmucks of the Red Army, already instructed in the way to teach us a sort of *Desperanto*?

Anyhow, my trade is in danger of disappearing completely, together with all the pre-Stalin idioms and values. What will happen to my family? What will happen to Europe? Who will read Shakespeare, Heine, Petrarca, Calderon, Camoens, Dekker, Ady and Montaigne—in the future? Were there not enough of the 3,276 national languages and the

(continued in next c 1.)

# DELIQUENCY

By Alex Comfort

In this and the next issue of *Freedom* we are publishing the text of Alex Comfort's lecture at the Anarchist Summer School on August 6th last. Despite the expression of highly reactionary views in debates on penal reform in the Houses of Parliament, such views are clearly on the defensive at the present time, and psychiatrists and others connected with the penal system are developing an outlook which would have been unthinkable fifty years ago. Surveying the subject of "Delinquency" in an entirely masterly fashion, Alex Comfort distinguishes between "crime" on the one hand and "delinquency" on the other, showing the relevance of the latter activity to revolutionary thought.

THE Mikado, you may remember, prided himself on making the punishment fit the crime. If he had been one of the more progressively-minded English Home Secretaries, he would have talked about making it fit the delinquent. A great many people use the word as a rather genteel term for criminal. I want to begin by pointing out that this is technically incorrect. Crime is something which the law punishes, and that is all it is. You probably know that the leading maxim of criminal law is that nothing is punishable unless the law expressly forbids it: crimes are those actions which are prohibited and which are punishable, and the term is a legal one. Delinquency is a psychiatric term, and it usually means that kind of behaviour disorder which expresses itself in injury to other people, or general mischief to society.

Now it is delinquency, and not crime, which psychiatry studies. I think you will see that this must be so—statistical data on the prevalence of crime, for example, are almost meaningless, because any action can become a crime or cease to be a crime overnight. If Parliament passes a Bill, or the Minister issues an order, forbidding the sale of herrings less than four inches long, it is going to be reflected in the criminal statistics. I'm choosing an extreme instance to illustrate the distinction. In most societies, including our own, it is quite true that most crimes, at least the important ones, are acts of delinquency, but in the last hundred years this has become very much less true, owing to the growth of a very large body of administrative law. And the distinction becomes highly important as soon as one begins to try to use psychiatric methods in dealing with those whom the courts convict. It must be quite obvious, I think, when we hear people saying that all convicted criminals ought to receive psychiatric treatment, that psychiatry would have very little to say to Robin Hood convicted of shooting the King's deer, or to the man who steals when he is starving, or to the Tolpuddle martyrs, or to the individual who is convicted of street betting. Those are not extreme instances. In the last few years we have seen psychiatrists being asked to rehabilitate people and readjust them in society because they refused to drop bombs on civilians or to conform to the Nazi racial laws. I don't think I need say any more to stress the distinction between criminal and delinquent, except to point out something I am coming back to later, that while some delinquents commit crimes, those who do are quite arbitrarily selected by the form of the law at the time, and that others of identical makeup are either unpunishable or are essential members of our present type of society. They may even make the laws which determine the selection.

I want to begin, however, by confining myself the delinquents who are criminals, in the sense that they persistently fall foul of society and of the people round them in ways which bring them into conflict with the law, because they present a definite challenge to the ideas of society which we, at this conference, have been discussing.

One of the standing arguments in favour of the coercive power wielded by the State is that delinquents of this type exist, and that we need to be protected against them. Now I know that most of us here don't accept that argument, any more than we accept punishment. What I want to do to-day is to give you a clearer idea of the evidence which, to my mind, justifies our rejection of it, but nevertheless I feel, from reading a good deal of our literature, that we are in danger of under-estimating the activity of these delinquents, and of assuming rather blithely that in a society of the kind we envisage they will disappear and give no more trouble. It is quite true, I believe, that we can eradicate this kind of delinquency almost entirely by altering the form of society, but only if we have a very clear idea of the exact causes which produce them. If we talk in general terms about getting rid of capitalism or of coercion, we are really being just as vague as the elderly magistrates who talk about improving the moral standards of the nation. The only hope of getting rid of delinquency, in an anarchist society or in any other, depends on our having as accurate a picture of its causes as we have of the causes of epidemic disease, and we can get that information by exactly the same methods. I want to look at some of the ideas of causation in delinquency which have been held in the past, then at more recent studies, and lastly at the implications of this work in any planning of new social patterns which we undertake.

During the period when our criminal law was formed, the normal explanation of delinquency was that it arose from spiritual wickedness. In other words, it had a supernatural cause. So long as that view persisted, attempts to analyse this construct any further were rather limited and scattered, though they were not by any means absent. With the growth of deism and rationalism, the idea of original sin and of the Devil did not decay at all rapidly—they became translated into the ideas of a basic human tendency to relapse into aggression against others, and in the idea of antisocial instinctual drives which had to be curbed. We no longer accept the "basic human tendency", or rather, we recognise that aggressive impulses are normally the obverse of social impulses, but we have to accept the idea that some people have strongly-developed antisocial impulses—the starting-point of rational criminology came when individual workers began to try to ascertain where these impulses originate, why some people show them more strongly than others, and how they can be remedied. The book which is usually regarded as the start of modern psychiatry of delinquents is Beccaria's *Dei Delitti e Delle Pene*, published in 1764, but that book is a plea for humane treatment rather than a study of causes. Perhaps the first serious study of causes, though it was rather a mistaken one, came from the physiognomist Lavater, who originated two of the longest-lived and most misleading ideas in psychology, that of the criminal type and that of the personality-trait, which he claimed to be able to recognise in the face.

His influence is very manifest in the work of Lombroso at the start of the century. The tendency of Lombroso's work, as you probably know, was to assume that crime was an innate predisposition, similar to artistic proficiency or high intelligence. Ideas of this kind did much to limit the attempt to treat delinquents with a view to cure, by assuming that the man who commits crimes is generically different from the man who does not, but it did rest on one very important observation, which still holds good, that those who commit crimes fall into two very sharp groups—those who commit one crime from a fairly obvious cause, who steal when they are hungry or murder someone under the influence of extreme provocation, and those who are recurring decimals and commit crime after crime, very often identical in detail.

I think it is important to recognise this fact, when we try to assess the claim of political theory that the law and the coercive forces of the State are our main protection against delinquents. Quite apart from any consideration of anarchism, the facts show that a relatively large proportion of the crimes which occur, and which are delinquent crimes, as opposed to administrative offences, are the work of a relatively small number of people. The evidence which we have to-day suggests that any of us here to-day are good for one criminal-delinquent act, given sufficient provocation—the fear of punishment may play some small part in keeping us in order, but if it were withdrawn, very few of us would rush out to steal something or kill the person we like least. Our internal standards of conduct would stop us from doing so. On the other hand, there is this very definite group of individuals who repeatedly do such things, and who do them in spite of the law, in spite of repeated punishment, and very often without any great personal advantage accruing to them. The problem of crime is not the problem of stray, innate, or natural antisocial impulses. Stable societies control these very effectively without coercion by the same kind of group-custom which would make any of us here very loth to walk down Oxford Street naked, even if we would not be arrested for doing so. The problem of crime as a serious menace to individual life and rights is the problem of the persistent offender, and the only protection the State gives us against him is that which we get from his absence in jail. I don't need in the present company to argue against mere incarceration for preventive purposes. If we can rehabilitate these people, we ought to—there is quite as good a case, on grounds of policy, for imprisoning those who have open tuberculosis, but we don't consider it just or equitable to do this. From our point of view, the important thing is that this threat to society, upon which the State bases so many of its claims, would disappear if we could ascertain why individuals become persistent offenders, remove the causes which make them so, spot and rehabilitate the early case, and thereby remove the supply, even if we did nothing to rehabilitate the hardened cases.

The second thing which Lombroso recognised, and which led him to regard crime as congenital, was that the persistent offender almost invariably begins his antisocial activities at a very early age. And it is generally agreed that if we can focus our attention on the juvenile delinquent, pick out the group who are going to become persistent offenders, as opposed to the group of naughty boys, and arrest the process there, crime as an administrative problem will virtually disappear. That is why so much psychiatric attention is being focussed on juvenile delinquency to-day.

(To be continued)



653 schemes of artificial Volapuks (I have not time to look up the real figures)—all of them fighting for universality?

But the whole terror still remains a nightmare or dream. "The curse of Babel is ever with us." And that will perhaps save us from a new World War, because to have real misunderstandings it is necessary to talk the same mother tongue! People who speak the same are a mutual plague to each other because they can more easily cheat, excite, command and obey, spy and denounce each other!

On the other hand, people who speak differently are conscious of the necessity for an effort in order to fraternize—the difficulty of learning languages provides them with an avenue of approach which is at the same time patient and silent, and can be profound, even without words.

What is the use of a Volapuk? The first act of sympathy and the first effort of comprehension that a man can offer when he meets some odd-looking stranger is to learn the other's language. Is it not delightful to be child-like again and receive the first lessons in the mood and soul of a new people by repeating new words pronounced by the sweet lips of a friend (preferably a girl friend, if you are a man)?

The free creations of language, what a marvellous solidity they have! I don't think there is a longer or a shorter way of understanding the secrets of life. You cannot steal the mysteries from a woman by raping her, can you? Violence spoils everything, just as fraud does. And even if there could be a shorter way to knowledge than the long way of learning and love, if a master-key could open all the locks at once—what would be the use of life then?

A soulless world, of course, would use a soulless language, and the language would be learned without joy and without pain; it would be without difficulties, synthetic, official, compulsory, ciphered, universal . . .

But a living world . . . ?

A.P.

[We are, of course, aware that there are also Esperantists who are anarchists and who would certainly ridicule the idea that

# IMPRESSIONS OF GERMANY-4

THE Anarchist Groups in Germany have a long tradition of militancy dating back to the revolutionary struggles against the Kaiser's Reich, and the name of John Most is, of course, familiar to English and American readers. Since the bitter struggles of Most's day, the Anarchist movement has come through many severe trials of wars and reaction and one hardly has to mention the worst of all, Hitlerism. Some old militants still remain to link up with the past—Rudolf Oesterreich is probably the oldest Anarchist militant in Germany, and still remains active; others like Carl Langer in Hamburg are the centres of a new movement amongst the youth; and it is indeed a cause for reflection when one considers that their earliest struggles were those against the laws originally laid down by Bismarck. The industrial Ruhr was always the most fruitful point for Anarchist and Syndicalist propaganda, and from there comes the Anarchist papers to-day, *Befreiung und der freie Arbeiter* (the two have now joined together in one issue; presumably they will later have one title). Amongst the possibilities before the Anarchist groups is one that is being discussed of a building co-operative to let the workers see for themselves what solidarity can mean. This type of action is one that must certainly grow and is a new symptom for activity—strike action is outmoded for many in lands where unemployment is so heavy, and some other form of industrial action is called for in place of the industrial peace which Social-Democrats think is called for. The idea of rebuilding in

stricken Germany is in laying the axe to the root, and whether or not this venture is successful it does point to a new tendency in Anarchism which must be seriously considered. New ideas, particularly on education (which is a serious problem in Germany, with the conflict between State and religion in education) have been welcomed from abroad since the years of darkness.

In the Ruhr particularly, as elsewhere, the Anarchists also founded a syndicalist movement. In pre-war Germany this was the F.A.U.D. (Free Workers Union).

Since the war some of the old militants of the F.A.U.D. have endeavoured to recreate it, and have formed the F.F.S. (Free Socialist Federation). They do not appear, however, to want to have much to do with Anarchism and certainly eschew the name. Their aim is, of course, a Syndicalist movement, but their syndicalism approximates more to the revolutionary syndicalism of Sweden than that of pre-1936 Spain; in other words, to make compromises in order to maintain their union in the present society. This tendency towards defensiveness characterises most revolutionary syndicalist movements which keep a bit quiet about their anarcho-syndicalism, as if anarchism was a poor relation and whom one acknowledged to the family but didn't care to speak of before strangers. It does not seem to be a policy for to-day. One can certainly see this trend in the Swedish movement in later years, when it found itself in a fairly responsible position, with a couple of daily papers and a cohesive union organisation, while the dead weight of reaction came around. It

moved to defence instead of attack. But applied to Germany there is really nothing to defend; only a revolutionary policy will wake up the workers, who are really thirsting for just such ideas and whose present-day apathy is fully comprehensible when one realises that they are right and politics is a racket.

The Syndicalist paper *Freie Gesellschaft* is well-produced and quite an interesting libertarian review somewhat on *Now* lines. It is a pity this "family influence" persists, particularly as anarchism is the poor relation not mentioned. However, in the event of an upsurge of anarchist thought and ideas in Germany, it is natural that the prejudices of the older generation and the appeal of pre-1914 names will disappear. It is not really a bad thing that Anarchism no longer has the "great names" it once boasted and that there is nobody to take over from the Kropotkins, Bakunins, Malatesta, etc. These pioneers were necessary and indispensable in its early stages but this is a stage we have passed some time ago. When Mat Kavanagh reported back from the Congress at Paris he told us that the difference between the 1949 Congress and the 1905 was that the latter was one of the "lions" of the movement but to-day it was all rank-and-file workers and this was really something that corresponded much nearer to the reality of Anarchism.

This is true of all countries, and the progress of Anarchism in Germany in the next few years, like that of this country, will depend not only on the efforts of the militants to reach the workers but also in appreciating the true relation between Anarchism and Syndicalism. The fact that Anarchism is a revolutionary idea which has produced different develop-

ments in different fields—education, environment, etc.—and its effect on the industrial side is anarcho-syndicalism. A syndicalist movement not acknowledging anarchism is indeed an improvement on reformist trade unionism but it has little defence against reformist and none at all against Bolshevik infiltration.

Is there any chance for a revived Anarchist movement in Germany? There are many popular myths about national tendencies (the amusing Continental legend about English liberalism should be locked at least in Dublin Castle) and one of them is that about German distrust for liberty. But the federalist tendencies are much stronger in Germany than in England where local associations have for so long been wiped out by centralism. The aim of German reaction since Bismarck has been to try to run Germany on Whitehall lines yet even after Hitler decentralism persists. Decentralism is a good footing for a revolutionary libertarian movement, and the average worker is certainly saying all that an Anarchist could expect in regard to politicians, capitalists and militarists. The choice here as elsewhere is towards revolutionary Anarchism or else a new illusion, for the old ones are too tarnished ever to be used again.

A.M.

## EARTH-BOUND

Here are some random observations on an international youth rally organised by the Salvation Army . . . The enthusiasm of the singing, with the women going off on their own so that the male voices sound weary and earth-bound . . . "Christ is the Way for Youth To-day" is one song and another goes, "He's such a wonderful friend, so very wonderful, He's such a wonderful friend."

Observer, 20/8/50.

## Foreign Commentary

★ Continued from p. 1

## Facts for Tito Fans

TITO'S regime in Yugoslavia continues to gain supporters, mainly from disillusioned Stalinist fellow-travellers and Marxists, who are hoping that he will replace the God that Failed; these are his ideological supporters. But there are also those who will give him support, not on ideological grounds, but on the same principle as enunciated by Churchill ten years ago, when he welcomed Stalin's Russia on the side of democracy, on the grounds that anyone willing to kill Germans was an ally, that anyone now hostile to Moscow is an ally in the present cold war.

Thus we learn that the Labour Party's National Executive Committee have decided to accept Yugoslavia's official invitation to send a delegation in the near future. It will be a delegation of stooges, but will include the Chairman and the Secretary of the Labour Party. The acceptance of the invitation is even more important since it is the first time the Labour Party has accepted an invitation from a country whose recognised Socialist leader is in exile. It is said that the delegation regards the visit as exploratory. It is also significant that Mr. Ernest Davies, Under-Secretary to the Foreign Office has spent the past fortnight in Yugoslavia on what is described as "an unofficial visit" to study the general situation in that country.

We wonder whether Mr. Davies and Tito's friends in this country have read how the regime deals with such crimes as stealing and the punishments it inflicts on offenders?

A *Manchester Guardian's* correspondent (19/8/50) describes the novel procedure of trying offenders in their place of work instead of a court-room, which has recently been introduced in Belgrade. Seventeen workers were tried in a big workshop of an engineering works for having committed numerous thefts. One man was sentenced to death and 16 to penal servitude ranging from two months to twenty years. The whole staff of the works had to attend the trial that was designed to serve as a warning.

And have the friends of Tito read

The Belgrade paper *Politika* said that local Communist authorities "have turned this sending of the work power surplus to the mines into a punishment measure and have presented the mines as prisons, the mention of which should frighten those who are 'disobedient'."

Mr. Will Ballantine, I.L.P. apologist of Tito's regime, may be right when he says that Yugoslavia is returning to the teachings of Lenin for, as far as we are concerned, Stalin is the faithful disciple of Lenin—but when he says—as he did at the I.L.P. Summer School that "he saw a country emerging from a feudal, almost medieval past" and that the "people were slowly building a Socialist State" (*Socialist Leader*, 12/8/50) we can only assume that he speaks a different language to us. Who ever suggested that the Press gang and the death penalty for stealing were progressive—other than Lord Eldon when hanging for stealing was abolished in capitalist Britain more than a century ago.

LIBERTARIAN.

## STRIKES IN BOMBAY COTTON MILLS

A REUTER report from Bombay last week stated that fifty-four of Bombay's cotton mills were closed in a Socialist-sponsored strike for a wage bonus. Only 7,000 of the city's 250,000 mills hands were at work. Three workers were arrested for trying to defy the ban on meetings in the city.

## War's Living Victims

IT is a not insignificant paradox of what a Cambridge historian has grimly and not unjustly termed "The Era of Violence", that a generation suicidally preparing for a third world war is concerning itself increasingly with the welfare of the disabled of the two great conflicts that disfigured the first half of the twentieth century.

Symptomatic of the spirit of the age was the recent visit of the Rt. Hon. H. A. Marquand, M.P., Britain's Minister of Pensions, to France to study pensions problems there. This laudable initiative, in perfect keeping with the Government's policy of transforming a grudging service into one gladly given, followed immediately on the visit to Queen Mary's Hospital, Roehampton, of Mons. Etienne Nouveau, President-general of the Fédération des Amputés de Guerre de France, and Mons. Edouard Besnard, Secretary-general of the South West Region of the Fédération.

A feature of this inspection of Roehampton was the party's introduction to three teen-age French boys there for artificial arm fitting, and the presence of a Parisian girl student of Roehampton's uniquely diversiform service for the disabled. Not long ago, four German ex-servicemen, two on whom the Krukenberg operation had been performed, and two with Cineplastic operated arms, visited this country and demonstrated the results of these operations before British ex-servicemen and women and our most famous surgeons.

Infirmary, disease and disablement know no frontiers. It is remarkable how long the majority of thinking people have remained indifferent to this manifest truth. The professional healers have long recognised the gain to be had from a co-operative tackling of the universal problems of the disabled, by combined research and the pooling of invention. But it is only after the second instalment of large-scale war in our time, and with a third instalment feared, that people generally have become thoroughly alive to—and apprehensive of—the totality of the situation.

Hitherto public memory has been notoriously short and spasmodic. When we had finished crying in public each November over the lads who had been killed—an exhibition reinforced by the wearing of an artificial poppy whose size was held to denote the extent of sympathy with those of us who were only half killed—the artificially-limbed victims of artificially-inflicted injuries had "had it" once more. But to-day's concern cannot be ascribed to any spontaneous rush of ephemeral and emotional pity. It arises from a sober realisation of the all-in quality of modern war, and a growing conviction that war and disablement are inseparable from the civilisation we have no intention of renouncing.

The historian may cite The Disabled Persons (Employment) Act of 1944. I will offer only two personal experiences, as an individual who travels around on harnessed crutches, minus one arm and one leg, in illustration of the general change of viewpoint.

In 1937, I was hailed by an elderly and

apparently near-sighted woman in my Lancashire home-town. She evidently thought she had known me at some time or other and said: "Eee, I hardly knew you. Have you been to the War, then? And is this what it did to you? Don't answer! I know very well. Here, have a nice peppermint!"

In 1942, in London, another lady, similar in age and class to the first, and a perfect stranger, asked me: "Did that happen in the blitz?" On my answering, "Oh no, I was wounded in the LAST war," the old lady's interest faded immediately, and she left me without another word, to, I must confess, my great amusement.

The significance of these incidents is that they are representative of a staggering transformation. The old Lancashire woman's vaguely comprehending interest was typical of those pre-1939 days. Had I in 1937 still been the slim youth in Khaki, probably the good dame would have kissed me as one kisses a child who has fallen and hurt himself on the hard pavement. But the abrupt turning away of the Londoner reflected the view that nowadays war is no distant thing of deceiving enchantment inflicting disillusion and disablement upon young warriors in foreign fields, but something that his literally come home to us.

The ending of the 1939-1945 shooting war with the freeing of atomic energy was the final factor in a consistent swing of public opinion which has come down heavily on the side of pessimism. Thus since 1939 has been bred a spirit of doing one's duty by the disabled, illumined only by the dangerous notion that as we certainly cannot be assured of immunity against disablement our policy must necessarily be one of monetary and rehabilitatory insurance.

If it is objected that our thoroughly representative legislators, in decreeing thus that disablement, "natural" or "acquired", is an inevitable feature of the civilisation to which man clings more desperately than he clings to life itself, were moved only by the generous desire of the community to guarantee compensation to the unfortunately handicapped, I can only assert that this is beside my point. I am concerned with the peculiar quality of the despairing spirit behind such otherwise excellent legislation.

We may measure the stumps of limbs and assess the value of eyes by the timid method of tape measure and the relative gauge of any remaining range of vision. But to insure these at the price of the complete renunciation of hope is to begin at the wrong end. Can it be denied that so long as society prefers war to the sharing of privilege, that the corollary of industrial and military disablement will be as inevitable as death? When the hydrogen bombs have been dropped and the survivors among us sorted as between the disabled and the non-disabled, we may very well be faced with the situation in which the present percentages of pensionable and otherwise are reversed.

How ironical if the new Poppy Day must needs be for the benefit of the few NOT in receipt of a Government pension!

SAM WALSH.

OUR multi-millionaires are, it is true, fond of pointing to the honest toil by which their first savings were earned as evidence of a blameless career.

So could many inhabitants of our jails point with pride to the innocence of their early manhood. Even so, when these men of enormous wealth began piling up their millions, it was by far other means than their first dollars were earned.

HENRY LAURENS BALL  
(The Concentration of  
Wealth—U.S.A.)

## Through the Press

### LIVING IN A MAKE-BELIEVE STATE

The late premier's political record is one of great integrity and wisdom. In fifteen months' time he managed to achieve, among other things, the formation and a successful development of a Polish National Council in London, a firm establishment of public controls in the political life of Poles abroad, the creation of a Special Commission for investigating into the past and present economic activities of the Polish Government in exile, budget based on a voluntary taxation of all the Poles abroad, an extensive preparatory work for a new electoral decree which will enable all Polish Communities outside their homeland, to take part in the voting to the National Council, and the promulgation of a law on Polish Tribunals abroad.

—Obituary of Mr. Tadeusz Tomaszewski, premier of the Polish Cabinet in exile, in *Peasant International Agency Bulletin*, 18/8/50.

### ON ELLIS ISLAND

Dr. Angelica Balabanoff for certain mysterious reasons, recently spent three days on Ellis Island. Old-time socialist, close associate of Mussolini in his Avanti days, and later of Lenin, and long since a leading socialist opponent of the Kremlin power, she blamed the detention as something stirred up by Communists.

Angelica Balabanoff is playing along with the Norman Thomas Socialists and their Italian counterpart. Their *Call* recently came out with the headline: "Socialists Support U.N., Truman, on Korea; Urge a New Drive to Halt World Arms Race."

Of her stay on Ellis Island, Angelica Balabanoff commented that she saw "so much tragedy that I was almost ashamed to leave." Helpful hint: Repetition of such inconvenience might be avoided by one with her reportorial ability and "good press", by telling the world the "human tragedy" she witnessed on Ellis Island.

*Industrial Worker* (Chicago), 21/7/50.

### COOL HYSTERIA

Hysteria is generally planted by cool calculation. It is fed by an appetite for publicity and power, political advantage or personal jealousy. Its sponsors seem to show little or no respect for the facts. Their appeal is shrewdly addressed to that lowest form of patriotism, the patriotism of fear.

—Dixon Wecter in  
*Saturday Evening Review* (U.S.A.)

## FREEDOM PRESS

Herbert Read:  
POETRY AND ANARCHISM Cloth 5/-  
Paper 2/6  
THE PHILOSOPHY OF ANARCHISM  
Boards 2/6, Paper 1/-  
THE EDUCATION OF FREE MEN 1/-  
EXISTENTIALISM, MARXISM &  
ANARCHISM 3/6  
Alexander Berkman:  
A.B.C. OF ANARCHISM 1/-  
George Woodcock:  
ANARCHY OR CHAOS 2/6, Cloth 4/6  
NEW LIFE TO THE LAND 6d.  
RAILWAYS AND SOCIETY 3d.  
HOMES OR HOVELS? 6d.  
ANARCHISM AND MORALITY 2d.  
WHAT IS ANARCHISM? 1d.  
THE BASIS OF COMMUNAL  
LIVING 1/-

Alex Comfort:  
BARBARISM AND SEXUAL FREEDOM  
Boards 3/6, Paper 2/6

Rudolf Rocker:  
NATIONALISM & CULTURE 21/-  
John Hewetson:  
ITALY AFTER MUSSOLINI 6d.  
ILL-HEALTH, POVERTY AND THE  
STATE Cloth 2/6, Paper 1/-

Peter Kropotkin:  
THE STATE: ITS HISTORIC ROLE 1/-  
THE WAGE SYSTEM 3d.  
REVOLUTIONARY GOVERNMENT 3d.  
SELECTIONS FROM HIS WRITINGS  
(Chosen by Herbert Read) 13/6  
ORGANISED VENGEANCE  
CALLED JUSTICE 2d.

★

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



# Anarchist Activity—1

"Daily experience confirms the truth that the understanding may have renounced a thing many years before the heart has ceased to beat for it."  
—Max Stirner & Eddie Shaw.

At a private meeting held after the recent Anarchist Summer School in London, the question of anarchist groups was discussed. No conclusion was reached but the meeting was valuable in revealing the wide divergence of opinion which exists in our movement on basic issues of *ssnsip am anunos siq u qiqm* seldom, and because it was yet another illustration of the way in which political, legalistic and authoritarian attitudes cling to us long after our "understanding has renounced them".

The "Union of Anarchist Groups" (I think that one can take the word union to mean a "coming together"; it does not necessarily imply a coming together of identical objects), was formed at a congress held in Glasgow on December 1st and 2nd, 1945, from groups which drew up and adopted a statement of aims and principles (*Aims and Principles of the Union of Anarchist Groups*, published by the L.A.G.; obtainable from Freedom Bookshop, 1d.) and was "to consist of autonomous groups united in a federal manner".

It seems to me that any group which supports those aims and principles (and nobody suggests that they constitute a definition of anarchism, least of all an "official" one—they merely represent a basis of agreement reached at a certain congress), is quite right in describing itself as a member of the U.A.G. Thus I am not worried about the nebulous nature of the U.A.G.—if any group feels a need to keep in touch with any others and to co-ordinate their activities (and I think it is natural and desirable that they should) they will presumably set up the necessary functional machinery—perhaps a group might be formed purely for purposes of contacts and information.

It was pointed out at the meeting on August 6th, that the disagreement between organisers and non-organisers is as old as the anarchist movement itself and that it was discussed at length by some of the most able theoreticians of the movement at the Amsterdam Congress of 1907 without any conclusion being reached. There is only one solution and it should not be necessary to point out that it is the only, and the obvious, anarchist solution: Let the organisers organise and the non-organisers abstain from organising.

In any case, one organises the work, but not the workers. As Jimmy Raeside said, "I've no objection to organisation, but I've a hell of an objection to being organised." Such organisation as our work requires should be functional arising when the need for it is felt and disappearing when it is no longer useful. We know too much of that absurd hunger for authority, or for make-believe, which makes people start organisations and then look around for people to join them.

But while I believe that a union of groups can quite well be nebulous except when, for specific purposes or times, its adherent parts feel the need for it to be concrete, I think that a group is only a group when it sets itself some concrete and well-defined task. It seems to me that those anarchist groups which survive at all are those which consist of

people who have come together to do some particular thing; for example, the Freedom Press group which exists to publish an anarchist newspaper and books; or the Glasgow group which conducts street-corner meetings; or that street-chalking group that existed in Glasgow during the war, which when Frank Leech was on hunger-strike in Barlinnie, made it impossible for the city to be "unaware of it; or the group in Italy which at the end of the war, instead of moaning like everyone else because no-one would rebuild the village bridge, rebuilt it themselves; or the group in Italy to-day which set itself the task of building a children's holiday home in memory of M. L. Berneri. These seem to me to be examples of groups which did not fail, because it's members were linked together, not necessarily by the same conception of anarchism, or the same eventual aims, but by the processes of doing a particular job which seemed worthwhile to them.

I don't think that the question of what are the qualifications for membership of an anarchist group arises at all. Somebody talked about intending members having two "sponsors", but this, while it may be appropriate for a cricket club, seems to me to be meaningless in this context. As I see it, people do not apply to join an anarchist group. If they are interested in the work of the group, they will, of their own volition assist it, and if the members of the group are unanimous in wanting the newcomers to join their group, they will be asked to. There is nothing more laughable than a multiplicity of nominal groups which have no purpose, but nothing more valuable for our purposes than a loose association of a multiplicity of small groups each with its own chosen function.

This conception of anarchist organisation is, perhaps, a reflection of the sort of social organisation that one envisages in an anarchist society and I think that the social groupings envisaged in anarchist theory, the commune as the territorial organisation and the syndicate as the industrial one, would in fact take this form.

William Reich, who is regarded by some anarchists as a modern Moses, and by some as a lunatic, has, whatever you think of the theories which have made him famous, some very illuminating comments to make on the nature of work in functional groups, which he calls (rather misleadingly, I think, "work democracy"). In an article, "Work Democracy in Action" (*Annals of the Orgone Institute*, No. 1, 1947):

"... On what principle, then, was our organisation based, if there were no votes, no directives and commands, no secretaries, presidents, vice-presidents, etc.?"

"What kept us together was our work, our mutual interdependencies in this work, our factual interest in one gigantic problem with its many specialist ramifications. I had not solicited co-workers. They had come of themselves. They remained, or they left when the work no longer held them. We had not formed a political group or worked out a program of action... Each one made his contribution according to his interest in the work... There are, then, objective biological work interests and work functions capable of regulating human co-operation. Exemplary work organises its forms of functioning organically and spontaneously, even though only gradually, gropingly and often making mistakes. In contradistinction, the political organisations, with their "campaigns" and "platforms", proceed without any connection with the tasks and problems of daily life."

Elsewhere in his article he says:

"If personal enmities, intrigues and political manoeuvres make their appearance in an organisation, one can be sure that its members no longer have a factual meeting-ground in common, that they are no longer held together by a common work-interest... Just as organisational ties result from common work-interests, so they dissolve when the work-interests dissolve or begin to conflict with each other."

## Do You Accept Permanent War?

FROM PAGE ONE  
which wage labour on a clerk's stool cannot.

That this is so—and who can deny it?—is a formidable criticism of peacetime society. Students of militaristic totalitarianism know that the dictators make political use of this pseudo-corporate spirit, and can feel that there is something severely wrong with a social structure that gives such psychological handles to reaction. Radical psychologists like Reich have been courageous enough to state outright that war provides sexual gratifications which peace denies, and that such a perversion of natural sexual desires itself stems from the sexual repression of our society. The "drift to war" is not a drift at all; it is a drive, all the more uncontrolled because its motivating forces—the need for an outlet (a socially tolerated outlet) for repressed sexual urges—are unconscious. That they are unconscious is again due to the structure and mores of our society.

Sexual repression has an answer to all this—it is simply nonsense, say those whose training forces them to be blind to everything which an anti-sexual training has dubbed taboo. But the band of those who say this with "sincerity" (that is, complete self-deception in this case) is a diminishing one. The army and the forces generally are careful not to diminish the appeal of their known opportunities for sexual licence, though they do not openly offer such.

An article in *Picture Post* (26/8/50) on why recruits volunteered for Korean service is remarkably frank within the repressive framework of our times. Almost all the men interviewed found civvy street unsatisfactory. One, aged 25, "went all over the Far East in the war, wants to go back. Says he's a free-lance, has no relations and... 'well it's not the Army actually I'm going in for...'" (our italics). Another, aged 27, "Admits there are also unspecified possibilities in the Far East. Like those he found in Hamburg. But if you press him too closely, again draw your attention to the news." That there are reasons which most are unwilling to put into words (still less into print) is clearly implied in this article, and *Picture Post* are to be congratulated on avoidance of the hypocrisy of stressing patriotic motives whose superficial character are only too apparent.

What is one to think of a society whose sexual mores are such that war is a necessity to provide an outlet for them? How trifling is the sexual "delinquency" of adolescents in the *News of the World* compared with this vast delinquency of the social structure?

### THE ECONOMIC WAR

Who shall say what is the funda-

mental, the underlying factor which makes war inevitable in our society? Sexual repression is necessary to make war acceptable—in Army ideology licence goes hand in hand with chastity for "decent" women, and all that revolting farrago about "honour" in sexual affairs of an open character. But it seems unlikely that sexual repression, or any other psychological factor, is a cause of war; they only operate within the framework provided by war, and in its absence find other outlets. But they do not create the form of such outlets.

For this reason it seems to us that a more fundamental (though not necessarily more important) cause is the economic system of competition made necessary by the inherent expansionist demands of the capitalist mode of production, with its demand to "export or burst". Eight years ago, *War Commentary* published an article with the significant title, "War Without End". It pointed to the economic causes of war, and described how a war, far from relieving (still less removing) those causes, only exacerbated them. Hence the "end" of the war would see the foundations of a "new" conflict. And all this at the expense of the living standards of the workers of the world.

### IN SUM

An analysis such as the above—and we believe it to be a truthful, and not a merely partisan account—shows that every aspect of war, if viewed without hypocrisy or idle gesturing, exhibits the social structure in a discreditable light. And our analysis has done this without once referring to another side—the actual horrors, miseries, bereavements, psychological deformities which individuals suffer in the course of war. Politicians are either cynical, like the imperialists Simon and Amery; or, like the Left, willing to travesty the truth for the sake of "progressive" propaganda. We could have added those pacifists who seek to whitewash the other side, or who delude themselves that "goodwill" on both sides "is all that's necessary". Briefly, they can be all described as either shameless or lying, cynical or wishful.

The individuals who accept war with open reluctance, but secret anticipation—and it is important not to shy away from this truth which is becoming more and more manifest—are also seen to be driven to the immorality of war by the frustration of natural and human urges. Finally, war is itself the product of an economic method which also provides misery and psychological defeat for millions of men and women the world over.

It does not require much logic to see that war and our society are intimately tied up with one another; that criticism of war leads to basic criticism of society. Nor is it a long step from war-reluctance or war-resistance to the

## COMMENTARY

### ABOLISH M.P.s? — QUEER VALUES — INHUMANITY OF THE LAW — DEMOCRATIC MARGARINE

#### • DO WITHOUT M.P.s?

A reader of the *Sunday Pictorial* talks sense when, in connection with Churchill's campaign for the early recall of the House of Commons, he says, "Let M.P.s have their holiday; I don't believe recalling 'em would make the least difference to the present trouble."

And we would add: And why not let them have a permanent holiday and then we can start learning how to run our own lives?

#### • SAD COMMENTARY ON VALUES

A man of 35, who said his wife had left him and he had no home since he left the Army, told Thetford magistrates that he has stolen a bicycle so that he could go to prison—"which as far as I concerned," he said, "will be my home now."

The magistrates apparently did not try to convince him of his wrong values nor did they attempt to understand the desperate plight which drives some people to such extremes, for they passed a sentence of three months' imprisonment.

#### • IS SHE A MURDERESS?

A mother, devoted to her child, which was going blind, decided to kill it and then commit suicide, the prosecution stated at Aberystwyth Magistrates' Court when a 20-year-old woman was committed for trial charged with the murder of her daughter, aged 15 months.

Reich specifically denies that his kind of organisation is "anarchistic", but I believe that his experience exactly mirrors that of, for instance, the Freedom Press Group and the Glasgow Anarchist Group, and probably many others.

I think we might well learn from these experiences and not attempt to apply to anarchist activities the methods of authoritarian organisation. C.W.

According to the prosecution, the child had a disease of the bone and was practically blind. Although devoted to the child, the young woman decided that the best thing was to kill it and then kill herself. She waited for 12 months to see if the child's health would improve.

Since the woman has been committed for trial we cannot comment on this case. But is comment necessary?

#### • TWO BLACKS DON'T MAKE A WHITE

It is becoming increasingly rare these days for people to apply the same moral values to themselves as they use in attacking their enemies. The Stalinists are notorious in this respect, but anti-red hysteria has so warped the minds of many so-called democrats that there is little to distinguish them from the Stalinists so far as intellectual dishonesty is concerned.

When, therefore one reads letters in the Press from members of the Public who refuse to be panicked into blindly accepting that the "Democrats" are always moral and the Stalinists immoral (or vice versa) one feels there is still hope!

The particular letter we had in mind was printed in the *Manchester Guardian* from a Hull reader, who writes: "Lord Vansittart hates cruelty and oppression but supports a regime in Formosa whose cruelty has been mitigated only by its inefficiency. He justifies this position with the argument that no concession can be made in the struggle against the supreme evil of world Communism. The Stalinists denounce cruelty and oppression except where the Russian Government or its allies are responsible. They justify this position with the argument that solidarity must be maintained in the struggle against the supreme evil of capitalist imperialism. The similarity of the arguments is obvious. Both rest on the very dubious assumption that one form of cruelty and oppression can be effectively opposed by supporting another form of the same evils."

#### • DEMOCRATIC MARGARINE

A Press report stated that a Miss Norah Edwards (21), secretary of the Merseyside Peace Committee and a member of the Liverpool Unity Theatre Players, said to-day that she had lost her job as a clerk in the personnel department at the Stork Margarine Works, Bromborough, because, according to the firm, she had Communist sympathies.

Her crime was that for the past two months she had been collecting signatures for the Communist-inspired petition and she recently addressed a large audience of pacifists in London. The Liverpool office of the Clerical and Administrative Workers' Union said that the firm had been approached with a request for her reinstatement.

We have had the experience of tasting Chutney which the manufacturers assured us, on the green label affixed to the jar, had been "untouched by native hands". That in 1950 we should also be able to have democratic margarine, untouched by Communist hands, is yet another example of the advantages of private enterprise. R.

#### The Future of South Africa

We very much regret that in the last issue of *Freedom* the name of the author of this article was inadvertently omitted. It was by Freda Troup and was circulated by Worldover Press.

## Special Appeal

Aug. 10th to Aug. 25th:

London: Auguste, per V.T. £1; London: V.T. £1; Glasgow: J.T. 8/6; London: J.P.B. 5/-; Denver: R.B. 14/-; Wooler: J.R. 2/6.

Total	£3 10 0
Previously acknowledged	£171 9 4
TOTAL TO DATE	£174 19 4

\*After initials indicates contributors to the 5/- a month scheme proposed by a London reader.

## 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.  
Sept. 10th 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.  
Enquiries c/o Freedom Press

SEPT. 5th Peter Green  
"THE INTERNATIONAL ANARCHIST  
MOVEMENT"

SEPT. 19th Round Table  
"FUTURE GROUP ACTIVITY"