

Rivalry between great powers has brought present situation in Korea IS THERE A SOLUTION IN ASIA?

COAL!!

THE advocates of economic planning and centralised organisation should have been blinking and gulping a little during the last few weeks as information has been forthcoming about production in our premier nationalised industry.

Hard on the proud announcement that long-term plans had been devised by the National Coal Board to spend £500 million on the development and modernisation of British coal mines, came the news that the production of coal was falling, that stocks were below danger level, that miners were leaving the industry and that, most surprising of all, we shall now have to import coal in order to get through the winter.

When the mines were nationalised in January 1947, we were promised great things. Not only were the miners to be treated to a new deal, with marvellously new conditions and rights, but because of the new spirit that public (?) ownership would engender, strife in that struggle-torn industry would vanish and harmony between worker and management would send production soaring.

Little of this has come about. True, until quite recently, production in many pits has steadily increased. Home needs were being satisfied, and a sufficient surplus was being created to enable a certain tonnage of coal to be exported, and since we are assured that the British must "Export or Die", we may take it that the sweat of the miners was helping to keep the Old Country alive. As far as the miners themselves were concerned, the five-day week was established, with a minimum wage guaranteed—providing a full week's attendance was recorded—and wages on the whole were higher than they have ever been.

And yet—the new spirit has not been very noticeable. Where production has risen it has been almost exclusively the result of increased mechanisation or of monetary incentive. In fact, of course, these two factors go together—modern machinery gives the face workers the opportunity to take full advantage of piece-work rates. But this means large increases for a very small number of

skilled workers, and the majority—of haulage and surface workers on day rates—have to handle increased tonnage without the corresponding increase in pay. The recent pay increases to these classes of workers, earning around £5/10/0 per week, were regarded as so inadequate that 10,000 Scottish miners went on strike in protest against the niggardly award. As with all workers, miners are feeling the pressure of the rising cost of living, and so although, as I mentioned above, wages are higher than before, they are steadily falling below the level of the miners' needs.

Money Not All

But the wage is by no means the whole story. The passing of control from private owners to the State was supposed to herald the end of exploitation. No longer were the miners to slave for a boss; they were to serve the community with a new status, a new dignity; they were themselves to have more control in the running of their industry. This has been shown to be a myth.

Miners on the whole are proud of their work. It demands courage, strength and solidarity. No weakling, no coward, no selfish grabber would take on that job. It is work in which your very life may depend upon you comrades' skill, and such interdependence breeds a sense of community—together with the close grouping of miners' homes around the pit—in which the ideas of communal control of the industry find fertile ground.

Imagine, then, the disappointments nationalisation has brought to the mine-workers. Instead of a fundamental change in the relationships between management and workers, they have seen, for all the Joint Production Committees and parleys between Board and Union, that there is a hierarchy of bureaucrats directing policy, the union acting purely as a disciplinary organisation, and the workers themselves simply being exhorted all the time to work harder and harder and subject to penalties for disobedience.

It seems to me not surprising then, that mine-workers who gave more than their share of the blood, toil, sweat and tears so necessary to "win" the war, who have

(Continued on page 4)

Is it Subversive to Oppose Atomic War?

THE recent Peace Pledge Union pamphlet, *Civil Defence—What you should do now*, copies of which have been sent to *Freedom* readers, has been the subject of attacks in the House of Commons. On November 23rd, Mr. Russell (Cons.) asked the Home Secretary if he has seen a four-page leaflet, which he has been sent, which is being distributed to householders entitled *Civil Defence—What you should do now*, and published by the Peace Pledge Union; and if he has any comments to make on it.

The Home Secretary, Mr. Ede replied, "I have seen this pamphlet. Although it contains gross distortions of fact, I am advised that I have no power to prevent it being circulated. As I have explained on numerous occasions, the defeatist attitude of the pamphlet is quite unwarranted by the facts."

On November 30th, Mr. Nicholls asked what steps were being taken to prevent the Peace Pledge Union from hindering recruitment for Civil Defence by circulating a defeatist pamphlet.

Mr. Chuter Ede, the Home Secretary, said, "I think he is exaggerating the influence of this particular pamphlet. I am not anxious to take unnecessary powers to restrict freedom of expression no matter how foolish."

Replying in the *News Chronicle* (28/11/50) to the Home Secretary's remarks in that paper, Alex Comfort wrote:

"The estimated casualties at Hiroshima

and Nagasaki were 141,000 and 76,000 respectively. Mr. Chuter Ede (*News Chronicle*, November 20th) expects to reduce these figures by half—an average of 50,000 per incident.

"On the experience of the last war, and with faster attacking aircraft, ten atomic bombs a week would not seem an impossible figure.

"At the same time, damage to structures within the main area can be little if at all reduced by passive defence. If we assume a mean destruction per incident of 3.3 square miles that gives us a total weekly casualty roll of 500,000 and the destruction of 33 square miles of city, with the likelihood of lighter damage to another 30 or more square miles.

"For how long does Mr. Ede estimate that such casualties could be sustained in a country of this size?

"As author of the 'subversive pamphlet' which he quotes, or one very like it, may I say that my intention was to advocate not the passive acceptance of slavery but an independent foreign policy for a country which, compared with Russia and America, would be irreparably damaged by atomic attack."

It will be seen from the last sentence of Dr. Comfort's reply, that the position advocated in the pamphlet is not precisely that of *Freedom*, but who can deny that the gross distortions and irresponsible folly lie with Mr. Ede and his government and not with the "defeatist" P.P.U. pamphlet.

BY the time these lines are in print, the situation of world politics regarding Korea may have completely changed the headlines of the newspapers, for the parallel between Attlee's Flight to Washington and Chamberlain's to Munich twelve years ago is obvious enough. But just as Munich made no change in the fundamental pattern of affairs, so the present international rivalries will remain the same, whatever is the result of the Washington meeting. And since it is this basic pattern which is the most decisive factor in shaping events, it is important to keep it constantly in mind, and not to permit revulsion in the face of the threat of war—natural enough to all men, and all the more so for anarchists with their traditional and well-founded anti-militarism—to deceive our judgment.

The basic pattern is the rivalry between the great powers. And it is this pattern which has brought the present situation into being. The American occupation of Japan after the war was clearly motivated by the military necessity to possess a base overlooking the Far East. Such a base could only be regarded by the rulers of Russia as—what in fact it is—a military threat. And here let us state that it matters not at all that politicians and publicists claim "unaggressive intentions" for such bases. Even if one allows that they are taken and fortified "in case" of aggression by another power, then one must also logically admit that another power must take these fortified bases into account and seek to neutralise them militarily "in case" . . . etc., etc.

Move and Counter Move

When the Soviet-assisted Red Chinese army ousted the American-assisted Koutintang army from China, the pendulum of international rivalry had swung once again. So America neutralised Formosa. It is not difficult to see that the next step was the Chinese neutralisation of Korea. (If we use colourless terms like "neutralise", it is for convenience and brevity. We do not for one minute forget what we have already written regarding the moral baseness of fighting out international rivalries on the territory of a small nation, and to a considerable extent with the lives of its nationals, in an undeclared war which is also conducted—bloodlessly—in the embassies and at Lake Success.)

The situation which the Americans face in Korea is the bargaining pressure of Chinese Communists in their demands on Formosa, and the factors which operate in these political auctions are just these factors of force and strength, although they are always rigged out in fancy dress for public viewing. A writer in the *Observer* (3/12/50), discussing "How it may look to the Chinese," obligingly supplies this diplomatic camouflage in advance, tinged nevertheless with contemporary realism:

"Then came the American neutralisation of Formosa last June. There is no doubt that it hit the Chinese hard. Formosa had not only been promised to China at Cairo and Potsdam. The Chinese regard it as their own territory, taken from them by foreigners—Japanese—at a time of Chinese weakness and humiliation fifty-five years ago. Moreover, it is the last stronghold of the little-loved Chiang

Kai-shek, the base from which a damaging blockade of the Chinese coast was being operated, and from which Chinese coastal cities were being wantonly bombed. It is fairly certain that the Chinese were actively preparing to invade and take Formosa, and that they felt wholly within their rights in doing so. The American interdiction of this, however reasonable and justified it seemed to the Americans, could appear to most Chinese only as a hostile act."

The Future

But supposing the present international tension is relieved by "concessions" on both sides ("wiser counsels have prevailed, etc., etc.") is the situation basically altered? American concessions in Formosa only increase the military importance of Japan, while Chinese withdrawals in Korea will not stop the Asiatic

struggle to drive the British out of Malaya. The Chinese and Russians (in the context of the present world, these terms mean their governments) cannot ignore military threats, potential or otherwise. Nor can the Americans ignore threats to their pacific outposts, or the British forget the importance of Singapore to the defence of Australia. The pattern of international rivalry which underlies it all remains unchanged. When it comes to an issue, the headlines only obscure the reality. If active intervention, as in Korea, is embarked upon, a "much-needed demonstration of resolution and solidarity by the freedom-loving peoples" has taken place; if a retreat is sounded, "the voice of moderation has at last prevailed among the nations." But all that has really happened is that the point of attrition has changed. When settlement is reached in Korea, the Formosans or the Malaysians had better look out.

The situation is actually worse than this even; for the last twelve years since Munich have shown us that the pattern of international rivalry is independent even of its principal actors. How often were we told that Germany was the aggressor in Europe, Japan the aggressor in Asia? Yet the total elimination of these major factors in the international

➡ PAGE FOUR

AT THE ANARCHISTS' TRIAL IN GENOA THEY PUT FRANCO ON TRIAL

A YEAR has passed since our young comrades of Genoa made their gesture, a year which they have spent in prison awaiting the hearing of their case. Finally, last month, they came up for trial, and it was made an occasion for exposing to the Italian people all the horrors of Franco's regime, which by American loans and the restoration of diplomatic representation by the United Nations, is being condoned and even strengthened.

The facts of the case are that in November of last year, three anarchists in their twenties, comrades Busico, Deluchi and Mancuso, forced an entry into the Spanish Consulate in Genoa, locked-up the staff in a room of the Consulate and then made a search of the building for the Consul himself. Their objective, in the words of Busico, was to "make an *attentat* on the life of the Consul with a view to shocking public opinion into taking up a definite anti-Franco position". But the Consul was away and the three young men burned a few papers, destroyed a portrait of Franco, and caused small damage in the offices with a German hand grenade. They then took down the Spanish flag and in its place hoisted the flag of the Anarchist Federation, "because we are not the kind of people who do something and then hide so that no-one shall know whence the blow came". One was caught, the other was at large for two days, the third escaped to France, but later gave himself up in order to share the fate of his comrades.

The first hearing of the case last June ended in uproar: the prisoners were cited for contempt (*Freedom*, 24/6/50) and they were committed for trial by a High Court. Their defence was in the able hands of a group of sympathetic lawyers who had offered their services without fees, and since there was no intention on the part of the prisoners to deny the facts, the defence was one of justification. In the words of one of the arrested comrades, Busico, "We had to do something. We had to shake public opinion out of

the apathy so prevalent to-day and oblige it to look beyond our frontiers at people oppressed and in chains; to move the people to protest against Franco's persecutions, and oblige him to stop once for all." The witnesses called by the defence included anarchists, such as Federica Montseny and sympathetic non-anarchists such as the writers Aldo Garosci and Carlo Levi, who is best known in this country for his book *Christ Stopped at Eboli*. His statement included these very significant remarks: "The Spanish anarchist movement . . . was and still is a movement of the people and represents the most genuine historical expression of the Spanish nation and of its tradition of age-long defence of individual values, of honour and of the dignity of the individual against every form of oppression and tyranny. One can say without fear of appearing paradoxical that all Spain has lived and goes on living because of its fundamentally libertarian spirit."

Even the prosecution recognised the extenuating plea of the high moral and social characters of the prisoners and this was taken into account by the court when sentencing Busico Ubo to 2 years 9 months imprisonment, Mancuso to 1 year 7 months and De Lucchi to 2 years 11 months, for they were then ordered to be released immediately. When the announcement was made, a wave of enthusiasm swept through the courtroom, and our young comrades were given a warm welcome by the many comrades and sympathisers who had attended the court during the trial, when they appeared outside. The successful outcome of the trial is considered as a condemnation of Franco's regime. It may, at the same time, draw the attention of progressive Italians to a scandal much nearer home: namely, that our three young comrades were kept in prison for one year awaiting trial. And their case was not an exception to the rule as our readers know from other cases reported in *Freedom* at various times.

A Biographical Study of Kropotkin



THE ANARCHIST PRINCE,
a Biographical study of Peter Kropotkin. By George Woodcock and Ivan Avakumovic. (Boardman, 21s.)

NO-ONE can read Kropotkin's books and pamphlets without perceiving some of his personal qualities; his clarity of thought and of expression, his geniality, his indignation at social injustice, his scorn of dishonest methods among socialists. Then there are the outlines of his early life; his upbringing at the Tsar's court, his paradoxical choice of a Siberian regiment, his imprisonment and escape from the Peter and Paul fortress—they all catch the imagination and whet the appetite for closer understanding of Kropotkin as a man. His own autobiography, *Memoirs of a Revolutionist*,

is an enchanting book, clothing in some detail the outlines of his early life, and evoking in vivid fashion the atmosphere of Tsarist Russia in the latter half of the nineteenth century. But once again, the man himself escapes one. Kropotkin was altogether too modest, too extroverted, to write his own biography, and he wrote instead of his times, being content to introduce as much of himself as played a public part in what he describes—but no more.

Then the *Memoirs* were written before the turn of the century, and materials for his life after that time are very scattered and shadowy. But it is just in this latter part of his long life that the problems arise which are of special interest to anarchists; the strange anomaly of Kropotkin's support for the Allies in the 1914 war, and the part he played in Russia after his return there in 1917.

These gaps and questions give a special interest to the new biography of Kropotkin by George Woodcock and Ivan Avakumovic, quite apart from the interest which the first definitive biography of any great social thinker naturally arouses, and it will be eagerly read by all who have been captivated by Kropotkin's elusive personality in his writings, whether they share his social outlook or not.

For the first part of the book, the authors have had Kropotkin's own memoirs as their chief source of material, and they give an able summary of it. But

inevitably they work at a disadvantage, for the two volumes of the *Memoirs* are a literary masterpiece, not readily susceptible of paraphrasing. Nevertheless, they have been able to add what the *Memoirs* lacked, an account of Kropotkin's geographical theories, and so give the reader some measure of his actual stature as a man of science, as distinct from his position in the socialist world. And from a variety of sources they have been able to give some details about the daily life of the ménage at Harrow and Bromley, of the friends and refugees who visited there; and some flashes of Kropotkin as a father and of his whole-hearted entry into children's ideas and games. In the background moves the shadowy figure of Sophie Kropotkin, never quite coming to life. If the book could have been longer, how much one would have liked to know more of her!

Quite rightly, the authors devote some space to the ideological struggle within the First International between the libertarian, federalist ideas of Bakunin, and the authoritarian, centralist ideas of Marx. For it is these differences which lie at the root of the differing attitudes of anarchists and socialists towards the State, and it was mainly due to Kropotkin's systematic work that the anarchist attitude crystallised out so clearly in the last two decades of the nineteenth century. Not all readers will find interesting the necessarily sketchy account of the differences between the various sections of the English socialist movement—the Socialist League and the Social Democratic Federation, the Fabian Society and the ILP, the Individualist and Communist Anarchists. Yet these differences reflect vital points of variance

in socialist theory and tactics, and they are made all the more instructive since the intervening sixty years act as a commentary on their premises and forecasts. From this scrutiny the anarchists emerge with fair credit, though it is pleasing to note that the biographers are not so blinded by loyalty to their subject, that they omit to point out instances where other, less well-known, but nevertheless influential anarchists differed from Kropotkin, and proved to be more practical than he on certain points.

Anarchism suffered much from Kropotkin's strange support for the Allies in the 1914 war. Following Lenin, the Bolshevik propagandists have used Kropotkin's position to imply that the anarchist movement as a whole abandoned its traditional anti-militarism; but Woodcock points out that only a minority—amongst whom, however, were numbered other eminent figures like Jean Grave, Charles Malato, Cherkosov, Paul Reclus and Christian Cornelissen—followed Kropotkin. Nevertheless, many other outstanding figures Malatesta, Emma Goldman, Berkman, Bortoni, Sebastian Faure, Luigi Fabbri, Shapiro, Domela Nieuwenhuis, Rudolf Rocker, Tom Keell and George Barrett, and a host of less well-known names) and the great bulk of the rank and file of the movement affirmed the traditional anti-war attitude of anarchism. It is to the credit of the movement, but also inherent in the anarchist conception of self-acting initiative and independence of "leaders", that even so eminent and well-loved a figure as Kropotkin was unable to divert the main stream of the movement.

Kropotkin's antipathy towards the form socialism had taken in Germany,

and towards German social institutions in general, are already expressed in his *Memoirs*, and further evidence is here adduced to explain his pro-war attitude. But this reviewer did not feel that the explanation was fully convincing, did not feel that it was now possible to understand Kropotkin's strange stand. Probably further research and a more detailed treatment of the subject is required than was found possible within the scope of this book.

Kropotkin maintained his pro-war attitude after his return to Russia in 1917, and in this book there is implied an unfavourable contrast (though a regretful one) with the Bolsheviks. This seems to me rather misleading, for a large number of Bolsheviks within Russia (including Stalin, whose writings during the war years have been completely suppressed—a fact which Trotsky suggested could only mean wide differences from Lenin's opinion) repudiated the revolutionary defeatism of Lenin. Indeed, the latter had to win over the rest of his party, on his arrival in Russia, with his *April Theses*. Once again, the majority of Russian anarchists took an anti-militarist stand.

Kropotkin's position would be easier to understand if he had become reactionary in his general views. But amid his extraordinary outbursts against Germany, his social views often make their appearance substantially unchanged. And his political judgment remained as acute as ever, as for example his remark that the October coup "buries the Revolution" showing that he recognised it as the triumph of the counter-revolution.

Nor in those last years did his courage desert him, for he used to the full the immunity which his international reputation gave him—even from the Bolshevik secret police gaols—by criticising openly the "revolutionary" government. His searing denunciation of Lenin's revival of the brutal and morally indefensible practice of taking hostages, and his messages to the workers of the west, were even more timely and required even more courage than Tolstoy's attacks on the Tsarist administration.

The authors shirk little on the debit side of Kropotkin's life and thought; occasionally their desire to be impartial gives rise to an ungenerous estimate here and there. But the extraordinary warmth and sincerity of his character emerge unscathed from the most searching criticism, and his teachings, which are now the heritage of anarchism, are seen to be a part and an expression of that profoundly attractive character. With his tremendous gifts and his relatively insignificant failings, Kropotkin remained a thoroughgoing anarchist and an outstanding man. Laying down this book, the anarchist reader will feel proud, for though men of Kropotkin's stamp are often found in our movement—Malatesta, Durruti, Berneri, Mühsam—they are very far to seek in the political parties.

ANARCHIST.

THE SOCIAL PSYCHIATRY OF COMMUNISM

Ideology and Practice

It is clearly necessary to stress the difference between the pattern of a culture and the political use which is made of this pattern by rulers. But it is the cultural pattern which matters in sociology, both for prediction of the future and for deliberate attempts to understand and modify the picture, since it limits the type of action which the rulers can undertake or impose. At first sight one tends to emphasize discrepancies between ideology and action—Communism both exalts and coerces the workers—but the fact that no cultural group implements all its implicit standards is universal. "Brotherhood" is no less a cultural stereotype in the U.S.A. because it co-exists with racialism, or public integrity in England because it coexists with the Zinovieff letter. A culture tends to absorb standards which are dinned into it as intensively as competition in American films and art, or social solidarity in Russia. Absolutist state machines are the least limited by such factors, but they are limited by them. Not even Stalin could impose American cultural and ideological patterns on the Soviet Union overnight, even if he employed the full weight of his authority to do so. Communism has, however, been able to impose a uniform culture-pattern on widely dissimilar societies by virtue of its dynamic elements. One cannot imagine Hitlerism either wishing to incorporate, or succeeding in incorporating, groups as diverse as the Greater Russians, the Manchurians, and the Tajiks, even though these groups were already within the political orbit of Czarism. The important feature of this is that only assimilative cultures of this kind stand any chance of setting up long-term, widespread civilisations such as those created by past imperial nations. The combination of sociality with absolutism has far greater powers of this kind than any group which lacks primary social cohesion—our own, and American, society, do at the present time lack that type of cohesion: the individual in them is far more isolated. For this reason there is no sociological ground for thinking that in their present form they can compete effectively with Communism except in societies such as those of Western Europe which are already closely similar to themselves. In Asia and Africa, they have very little assimilative power, and in view of the geographical extent of Communism to-day it is historically and sociologically far more likely that any attempts which we may make to alter the pattern of society will have to be made against an ideological setting comparable to that of the Soviet Union than in one of the social-democratic type.

This is a point which should very seriously influence our thinking. We know the practical difficulties of modifying any type of absolutism by individual initiative. It also raises the question how far a compact culture like that of Great Britain could influence the development of a different and far larger cultural system if it became a vehicle, either in practice or in ideas, of the type of society we have been attempting to encourage. In the past self-contained, creative cultures like that of Greece have had

In the second part of his article on the sociological analysis of Russian Communism, Alex Comfort discusses the aims of social anthropology and seeks to apply them to the Russian problem. Does Communism possess a stabilising dynamic, and how far can it assimilate other cultural patterns without destroying itself? These are important questions, and Comfort deals with them in controversial fashion.

disproportionately wide influence within widespread, assimilative cultures like that of Rome. Island-groups of this kind tend to resist assimilation if they can escape extermination. At the present moment, there is a considerably better chance of incorporating some elements of libertarian practice, and more elements of libertarian theory, into English culture than into any other of comparable size and coherence, a fact which places a very heavy responsibility on English libertarians. American culture is both too unwieldy and too disorientated at the individual level to exert such an influence, except through individuals. The recurrence of competitive and sadistic symbols in its literature and the line of its political development suggest that it runs the risk of falling into a state of endemic neurosis comparable with that of Nazi Germany.⁴

Since the Revolution a stream of visitors to Russia have come back depicting the Communist culture-pattern as either heaven or hell. These views are not incompatible or necessarily propagandist. It is apt to appear as heaven to those individuals who feel more need for social cohesion than for intellectual liberty, and as hell to those who prefer individual freedom to sociality. The objective of anarchism has been, and still is, by definition to secure both. In trying to do this we are undertaking a piece of sociological engineering far more complicated than that undertaken by Lenin, who secured one without regard to the other. Attempts to do this at a crudely political level, or without extensive research and observation, are like trying to build a hydroelectric scheme with flint implements.

The aim of Lenin was, though he would not have phrased it in this form, to turn Communism from a political ideology into part of the culture-pattern of Russia, and this he succeeded in doing. Both Soviet Russia and some at least of the other cultures she has influenced are now at least as stable in their new form as Roman Imperial society. As culture-patterns they contain a bewildering mixture of positive and negative elements: centralisation and decentralisation, co-operation and coercion, repression and realisation, considerably more complex than in any single unidirectional pattern such as Nazism. Like other cultures, they are going to be determined almost wholly by the type of character-structure

they produce in individuals, and this in turn will depend on everything from ideology and propaganda to patterns of infant feeding behaviour. Some of these forces are under control by the administration—others, especially in a system which discounts much recent work on character-formation, by forces which the administration does not recognise.

Clearly, however, the problems raised by such cultures are not radically different from those in our own—the tendency of certain individuals to think in terms of coercion as a result of forces in their own personalities, and to write power-centred standards into the cultures they control. This we have always recognised as the fundamental historical problem for psychiatry. What I have said is not an apology for communism, but an attempt to show that our ideas here as elsewhere have got to be formulated in terms of observational science, rather than of political propaganda, if we hope to affect the direction in which these cultures grow. In summary, Communism is now a working and stable culture-pattern in Russia: it may easily adjust itself to other societies and assimilate them. If this occurs, history suggests that it is unlikely to be seriously modified by any sort of revolutionary agitation, but might well be modified by psychiatrically-directed action, or by incorporating other and equally stable cultures. As libertarians working in one such stable culture, where we have at present considerable scope for spreading our ideas, we have a peculiar responsibility to realise what we are about. In view of the fact that some elements of sociality and spontaneity are essential for the continuance of any culture, even one which is partly coercive, psychiatry always works with, not against, "human nature", but it has a far tougher assignment in dealing with the complex authoritarian cultures of our time, especially when they do in fact contain enough socially valid attitudes to ensure that individuals derive positive strength and satisfaction from association with them, than can be discharged in terms of political action at any level. From now on, whether we like it or not, in attempting to develop the implications of social science we are research workers, facing the risks and problems of social public health. In other words it is as useless to begin our assessment of Communism by dismissing it as "Red Fascism", and assuming that all individuals in its orbit are yearning to terminate it, as to adopt the attitude of Victorian missionaries among the heathen. Unless we prefer the emotive satisfaction of being political agitators on the 19th century activist model, we have got to become social anthropologists, on a strictly

therapeutic and objective basis. We are dealing not with "Communism", but with Communists.

In Margaret Mead's words, anthropology consists not only in an observation of cultures which includes an active emotional perception of how their members live and think, but in the establishment of a positive relationship. The political dissident in a society has a positive relationship to that society, as we have in our own, but it is a resented and therefore a limited one. Perhaps the best example of a minority setting out to change a culture in which it has to live, without accepting a limited relationship of this kind, has been the Quaker movement. Social psychiatry of the type which I think is our obligation depends increasingly upon a group relationship with other individuals who do not share our convictions, but who know themselves to be accepted as individuals, and anarchism, as an individualistic view of society, is to-day the only non-religious ideology capable of doing this. In a culture like our own, where group action and propaganda are traditionally tolerated up to a point, the problem is not so acute, but such cultures are becoming less common. The adjustment with an intolerant society which one intends to modify is one of the hardest there is—revolutionaries in the past have attempted every approach from fellow-travelling to deliberate martyrdom with varying results: most of us would reject any compromise which involved the suppression of our own views of what is right, yet, for psychiatry, a personal relationship with the opposition is something we must have.⁵

I think that this adjustment is something which has so far been peculiar to medicine, and doctors are in a unique position to make it: for us, at least, there is no ground to think that Gen. Franco is less accessible to psychiatry than any other delinquent, provided we can get at him—we have long since become so used to dealing personally and without anger with individuals whose conduct seems to us foolish, wicked or psychopathic that no patient however obnoxious seems quite inaccessible. I am biased by this traditional approach—medicine is used to entering into the thoughts and even the friendship of delinquents and psychopaths without sacrificing its own orientation. Sometimes the delinquents knock us on the head. But in the problem of modifying intolerant societies, I think it is an attitude from which all who have that aim must begin to learn.

ALEX COMFORT.

⁵ We would agree that mere name-calling is unproductive, though we think Comfort unjust in implying that this is all revolutionary anti-Soviet propaganda amounts to. On our own examination of the evidence, particularly that supplied by workers and peasants who utilised war imprisonment to effect their escape from the Soviet Union, we are less inclined to accept Russian Communism as the stable society Comfort seems to envisage. The difficulty he himself glances at, that of entering into a relationship with the subject, is more overwhelming in regard to Russian society than any which have ever existed before. It is certainly not a difficulty to be easily overcome or lightly brushed aside, and hence Comfort's alternative to what he pejoratively calls "nineteenth century political actionism" loses much of its potentialities for realistic application. Nevertheless, we vigorously support the idea that to assess the stability and future of an undesirable form of society, one has to make use of the sociological approach. We have always supported it.—Eds.

⁴ This seems to us an overstatement. As a matter of fact, race violence in America has considerably diminished during the last twenty years. Where some progress—admittedly slow—has been made in the Negro question it is surely an exaggeration to imply that a decline towards the standards of Nazi anti-Semitism is in progress towards the American Negro.—Eds.

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

Recommended Books . . .

Woodcock and Avakumovic:	
The Anarchist Prince	21/-
P. Kropotkin:	
Ethics	12/6
Alex Comfort:	
Authority & Delinquency in the Modern State	8/6
George Orwell:	
Shooting an Elephant	10/-
Henry Miller:	
The Colossus of Maroussi	1/6
Avro Manhattan:	
Catholic Church against 20th Century	5/-
Lowell Naeve:	
A Field of Broken Stones	12/6
Gerald Brenan:	
The Spanish Labyrinth	25/-
Wilhelm Reich:	
Character Analysis	35/-
B. Traven:	
The Death Ship	2/-
Virgil Gheorgiu:	
The 25th Hour	10/6
K. J. Kenafick:	
Marx and Bakunin	6/-
★	
Resistance, Oct.-Nov. 1950	3d.
Adelphi, quarterly, Nov. 1950	2/6
Orgone Energy Bulletin, Vol. 2, No. 4	6/-
★	

Our Special Bargains . . .

George Woodcock:	
William Godwin	5/- (from 12/6)
George Woodcock:	
The Writer & Politics	3/6 (from 10/6)
Ivan Edwards:	
No Gold on My Shovel	2/6 (from 7/6)
The 3 volumes 10/- (U.S. \$2.00)	
post free	

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

Neither Sheffield Nor Berlin

IN June of this year, a Congress for Cultural Freedom was held in Berlin. It turned out to be as bogus as the Sheffield "Peace" Congress for, if the latter were engineered by the Communists the former was simply a counter blast by those committed to the "democratic" cause. And just as the delegates to Sheffield could be divided into the sheep and the wolves, so the Berlin show succeeded, by falsely representing its real motives, in drawing many independent intellectuals who must now regret their association with that body. The document issued last month by the Executive Committee of the Congress for Cultural Freedom with the title "We Put Freedom First" should leave them in no doubt as to its true nature.

The document we are examining consists in the main of a series of questions and answers: the questions being "typical" of those they have received from people throughout the world since the Berlin Congress launched its Manifesto.

In the introductory note the Executive Committee (which includes such names as David Rousset, Arthur Koestler and Ignazio Silone) declare that "we want our civilisation to survive" and two conditions are essential, "freedom and peace". For them freedom is the more important "since peace is a function of freedom. A nation enslaved can at any time be whipped by its leaders into war hysteria and aggression."

That wars are an inevitable concomitant of Capitalism is not even considered by these gentlemen of "the educated classes who determine the intellectual climate of the nation", or is it that such a point of view would obviously drive them out of both camps—into the third camp where Ignazio Silone once stood? Yet they also tell us that the task they have set for themselves is "to change the present confused and poisoned intellectual climate". When they baldly state that "the threat to peace came successively from countries in various degrees of enslavement: militarist Prussia, Fascist Italy, Nazi Germany, Japan, Soviet Russia" by such a half-truth they are

simply adding to the confusion which they so deplore.

The limitations of the Congress for Cultural Freedom (we shall in future refer to it as the C.C.F.) are revealed in the first Answer: "We do not pretend that our democracies are anywhere approaching an ideal State. We are defending our relative freedoms against the total unfreedom of dictatorial regimes." With such a starting point it is inevitable that this C.C.F. should become simply a tool of the Americans (and their satellites) and a recruiting sergeant for the next war. We suggest that they adopt Mr. Churchill's high moral slogan of the last war that anyone prepared to kill a Nazi was an ally, with of course the substitution of Russian for Prussian, as the Nazis will be our allies this time.

Let us see to what depths this 'lesser evil' policy can drag these men of the "educated classes". To the question whether a real collaboration between "Socialists and right-wing parties is possible or even desirable" our brains-trust answers "We believe such a collaboration to be both possible and desirable—with certain reservations." It is desirable "if its objectives are limited to the task of uniting each free nation against threats to its freedom from within and without and thus acting as a deterrent against aggression. It is undesirable if the slogan of unity serves as a cloak for attempts to suppress the democratic rivalry between political parties and groups." But this is exactly what all "democratic" governments tell us and since we have been living in the shadow of aggression—first it was Germany, now Russia—for the past twelve years and this seems to have become a permanent state, the C.C.F. may as well 'come clean' and forget about the long-term policy altogether.

To the question "What about Spain?" they answer that they abhor Franco's regime but as it is "unlikely that fifteen million Spaniards will start a war of aggression against the world", whereas Russia will continue the "war of aggression they started in Korea", we can forget about Spain for the time being. Actually these are not their words. Theirs is a much more responsible and diplomatic language; the language of strategists and men who "determine the intellectual climate of a nation". "Therefore our emphasis"—they answer—"is on the immediate and principal danger from the East, and we refuse to fall into the trap of Cominform propagandists who want to divert our attention and energies from the real threat into a crusade against Francisco Franco."

Another questioner asks: "Your Manifesto protests against totalitarian slavery, but is silent on matters like racial discrimination against Negroes in the United States. Why?" Once more the Communist bogey is the excuse for their silence. "Communist propaganda deliberately plays up the Negro question to divert attention from the totalitarian threat and to spread confusion in the progressive camp."

The "lesser evil" philosophy is well summed-up in a footnote to their answer to the above question:

"Incidentally during the last decade the number of negroes lynched in the United States has never exceeded two a year. However horrifying even two such crimes are, they only represent a fraction of one per cent. of the number of crimes against humanity committed annually by the totalitarian regimes."

We have said enough, we believe, to expose the Congress for Cultural Freedom as yet another phoney organisation from which we can hope for nothing. Their ineffectuality is only matched by their vanity and their impertinence.

"Tolerance of mental aberrations cannot be extended to members of the professional intelligentsia. Farmhands and factory workers labour under the handicap of a fragmentary education, and often it is physically impossible for them to get at the facts. The professional intelligentsia has no such excuses. Refusal to acknowledge facts, conscious or unconscious distortion of facts, frivolity and foolishness on the part of those who influence public opinion, are crimes against the spirit even if rarely definable by law."

"Before the last war, intellectuals who supported Hitler's policy of concentration camps, or refused to admit that German concentration camps existed, were ostracized by progressive intellectuals. The writers and scientists who to-day support Russian concentration camps and mass deportations, or refuse to admit the facts concerning them, are still regarded as 'progressive', 'idealistic', and so on. We are opposed to the persecution of the ignorant and the innocent. We are opposed to the toleration of the totalitarian creed in the professional intelligentsia. We refuse to grant intellectual respecta-

bility to the active or passive accomplices of tyranny, terror and defamation."

Silone and Koestler were for many years active members of the Communist Party. Of the other members' political pasts we know nothing. But to Silone and Koestler we must put this question: As prominent Communist Party members for many years, were you aware that concentration camps and a secret police existed in Russia long before you left the Party?

As we have repeatedly pointed out in *Freedom*, there is room for an international Manifesto drawn up by men and women above party politics, and whose concern is not as to which is the lesser or the greater evil, but between what is good and what is evil. For this they must have the courage to concentrate on the long-term struggle. The C.C.F. condemns such an approach. "A nation is doomed to perish if a considerable part of its population refuses to fight against an immediate threat unless and until an ideal state of social justice is achieved." It must be pointed out that what is becoming a permanent struggle against an "immediate threat"—and to-day every country is declaring that it is being threatened by a potential aggressor—is the most potent weapon for the ultimate destruction of all values.

Koestler and Silone to-day support expediency, and all the somersaults it implies, against those "highbrow French intellectuals" who maintain that what is most important in our political conduct is that "our revolutionary conscience should be kept clean." What now separates Silone from the Ilya Ehrenburgs and other Soviet writers, is only time. As admirers of Silone's works we write these words with a deep feeling of regret.

The C.C.F. will in fact, if successful, tie the writers of the "West" hand and foot to the American military machine in the name of "relative freedom against total unfreedom". Their slogan is: "Who is not with us is with the Stalinists." They must be challenged by those men and women with the courage to say: "We stand alone, against both American and Russian imperialism, for what we consider to be the truth and man's real social aspirations." V.R.

INDIAN COMMENTARY

Bombay Strike Balance Sheet

THE strike of textile workers in Bombay was only briefly referred to as a news item in the British Press. Press cuttings we have received from a correspondent in India, however, reveal what a widespread and determined strike it actually was, and though it has been ended for some time, we think the facts still of interest to our readers.

This Socialist-sponsored strike involving nearly 250,000 textile workers and lasting 62 days, was over the refusal of the millowners to accept the workers' demands for three months' wages with allowance as bonus instead of two months' wages awarded by the Bombay Industrial Court on July 7th last.

The cost of the strike is summed-up by the *Bombay Free Press Journal* (Oct. 16th) as follows:—

"The country will have lost about 235 million yards of cloth and 58 million pounds of yarn."

"The strikers have lost Rs. 41 million in wages and the textile industry has lost a total business turnover of about Rs. 230 million."

"The strike, the biggest so far in the industrial history of the country, started on August 14th."

"Six hundred strike leaders arrested in connection with the strike are still in jail, while cases against 600 more Socialist workers are pending before the various police courts in the city."

"Twelve mill hands lost their lives due to police firing which was resorted to on five occasions. The police lathi-charged workers several times and tear-gassed them on eight occasions. The ban on meetings was defied on no less than 22 occasions by Sabha volunteers."

The strike ended without the workers obtaining their demands, yet the Socialist leaders have described the decision to return as "not a surrender but a graceful retreat" and praised the "magnificent solidarity, discipline and spirit of sacrifice" of the workers. Another Socialist leader, Dr. Lohia, told the workers that the strike had lit the torch of consciousness not only among the working class of Bombay but the workers, the kisans, the middle class and millions of "the victims of social injustice" all over the country. The strike led by the Socialist Mill Mazdoor Sabha had raised, side by side with the issue of bonus, the question of profits made by the mill-owners and that was a great factor which would decide the "legitimate profits made by mill-owners" in the future.

It is interesting—one dare not say, encouraging without being better acquainted with the history of the Indian Socialist Party—in these days of lukewarm and respectable Labourites to read of a Socialist leader prophesying, as did Dr. Lohia, that "there would be a Social Revolution in India in two or three years' time, or of another Socialist, Mr. Narayan, speaking in Madras at the time of the recent elections when he declared that the Socialist Party's programme was the abolition of the existing princely order and the capitalistic form of society and for bringing about an agrarian revolution.

In this connection he said that, even though in the past Congress leaders like Pandit Nehru had been telling that the Congress stood for liquidation of the princely order, nothing had been done so far in that direction.

Even though the princely states had been liquidated. Mr. Narayan said, the princely order continued to exist and it had been receiving all the encouragement.

But then, even Mr. Nehru spoke in this way when he was not in power. And Mr. Narayan appears to us to be only criticising the existing Congress Party

leaders and not all governments as such. He calls on the workers to "capture power" and "establish their own government". We have heard that one before!

POLICE DISPERSE DEMONSTRATORS WITH TEAR GAS AND LATHIS

The police used tear gas and lathis to disperse more than 1,000 workers of the European-managed Kankinara Jute Mills when they had been demonstrating in front of the Management's offices. Thirteen workers, including a pregnant woman, were arrested.

It is stated the Management of the Jute Mills had assured the workers that their demand for payment of wages for the lock-out period of three days would be met within seven days.

On the failure of the Management to meet the demand, workers in batches went on hunger-strike inside the mill. Police were posted inside the mill.

The demonstration was simply to demand the release of arrested workers and payment of the wages to which they were entitled.

BLACK MARKET FLOURISHES

INDIA is not without her black-market. A state-wide round-up ordered by the Government of Bihar has resulted in the seizure of vast quantities of cloth and food grains, and a number of arrests, including, according to one journal, "several influential businessmen—two were millionaires" and "a member of the Bihar legislative Council".

FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

THE Patna High Court has reluctantly taken the view that Section 4 (I) (A) of the Indian Press (Emergency Powers) Act is illegal and void.

The case arose out of a petition filed by a publisher against the order of the Government of Bihar demanding from her a security of Rs. 2,000 for publishing a pamphlet, which in the opinion of the Government purported to preach violence and bloodshed.

The judges declared the Act void because, to quote their words, "In the scheme of the Constitution freedom of speech and expression has been designated as a fundamental right. The phrase is not an empty one and so not lightly used. It reflects the belief of the framers of the Constitution that the exercise of these rights at the foundation of the free Government, that without the freedom of speech, the appeal of reason, which is the basis of democracy, cannot be made."

The one dissenting judge, however, made no bones about what he thought of this view: "The Constitution of India contains no express declaration in favour of the freedom of liberty of the Press and at no period in history and in no country in the world has the Press been free. A judiciary ought not to declare an existing law to be void unless it is driven to the conclusion that it is, and it ought also to hesitate to come to the conclusion, when the consequence of it will be to deprive the Executive of a weapon which it may need to combat subversive movements and preserve the safety of the infant staff of the infant state."

Without being a sceptic one is inclined to consider the latter a more honest statement of reality: that there is no free Press in the world to-day.

LIBERTARIAN.

JOURNEY THROUGH UTOPIA

by Marie Louise Berneri
330 pages + Index. Cloth 16s.
(Special edition for readers of
Freedom 10s. 6d. post free.
U.S. \$1.75).

LEWIS MUMFORD writes:

"As an old student of utopias, I have special regard for Marie Louise Berneri's 'Journey Through Utopia'; for it is the most comprehensive and most perceptive study of that ideal land that I have come across in any language. As a work of scholarship, it is superior, both to my own study and that of Hertzler; but what gives it even more special merit is the fact that it is such a book as only a brave intelligence and an ardent spirit can produce: one who was an enemy to the forces that would degrade man into a servile automaton, and a friend to all that fosters freedom and creative expression. Utopia itself has almost as many circles as the Hell and Heaven that Dante visited under Virgil's tutelage; and Marie Louise Berneri is the best of guides to this super-world: not afraid to let its inhabitants speak for themselves or to let the reader draw his own conclusions. Altogether an admirable book on a subject too important to be neglected because of the contempt expressed by the dogmatic right wing (Macaulay) or the authoritarian 'Left' (Marx and Engels). Those who retain a healthy hope for the future will find sustenance for their faith in this book."

Marie Louise Berneri—A Tribute.

This volume contains 14 photographs and a number of appreciations by friends of Marie Louise Berneri who were closely associated with her work.

Cloth 5/3 post free (U.S. \$1.00).

M. L. BERNERI MEMORIAL COMMITTEE, 27 Red Lion St., London, W.C.1.

Roman Catholic Pressure

The following is taken from *Time*, for 4/12/50.

Doctor's Dilemma

Teresa Gonzales is the wife of a brick-layer living in Colonia Mexicana, the dirt-poor shack town of Brownsville, Texas. Now 35, Mrs. Gonzales has had four children in 13 years. The first died in infancy. The next two, both girls, were delivered by dangerous high-forceps methods. Fortnight ago, Teresa Gonzales was to be delivered of her fourth child.

The family physician, Dr. John M. Stephens, 37, a rangy, moustached Californian, had his patient X-rayed. The foetus, he found, was lying in a wrong position and its head was much too big for normal delivery. Delivery by Caesarean section (less risky than high forceps) was decided on. Worried Husband Mariano Gonzales asked the doctor to do something to keep his wife from having more babies. Dr. Stephens said he would see about it.

Dr. Stephens was in a dilemma. He believed that another pregnancy might endanger Teresa Gonzales' life, and that therefore sterilization was medically advisable. It would also be legal. But Brownsville's only hospital is run by the Roman Catholic Sisters of Mercy; its rules forbid such an operation and Dr. Stephens had signed a promise to abide by the hospital's rules.

Dr. Stephens delivered the boy baby by Caesarean section. It took but a minute for him to tie off the Fallopian tubes with surgical thread, so that Mrs. Gonzales would not become pregnant again. Dr. Stephens closed the peritoneum (the membrane lining the abdominal cavity).

Standing by in the delivery room at this time was Sister Mary Adele, in charge of Mercy Hospital's obstetrical department. She asked to see the patient's tubes. She was told that they were all closed up. The sister asked Stephens whether he would admit that he had tied them. He did. She told him that he would have to untie them.

Again Dr. Stephens was in a dilemma. He felt that he could not defy the sister. He decided it would be quickest, and least dangerous for the patient to reopen the peritoneum and untie the tubes. That is what he did.

For violating its code of ethics (which it shares with other Roman Catholic hospitals in the U.S.), Mercy Hospital denied Dr. Stephens the use of its facilities for his patients. Within hours, another of his patients reached hospital, going into labour. She was told that she would have to get another doctor. She

went back home, where Dr. Stephens delivered her baby.

In the ruckus last week over the case, most of Brownsville's townspeople backed Dr. Stephens. So did fellow doctors, though none could raise his voice for fear that he, too, would find the doors of Mercy Hospital shut in his patients' faces.

Little comment is required here. It is to be noted however that the Mercy Hospital is the only hospital in the town. It sees nothing wrong in using this monopoly to force its Roman Catholic opinions on all and sundry. English people have long been accustomed to the idea of religious toleration, and since the Catholics are a minority here they cannot force their opinions upon others, because there is always somewhere else to go. Perhaps this instance will show one reason why the anarchist movement in Catholic countries is so bitterly anti-clerical.

WAR and its Alternatives

RESISTANCE, an anarchist review (U.S.A.), Vol. 9, No. 2. Oct.-Nov., 1950. Price 3d.

THE main feature of the new *Resistance* is a long article on war and its alternatives by David Wieck, who concludes:

"There are in these years only small sources of hope, only small achievements to look at with satisfaction. We should be used to this fact; at any rate we shall have to learn to be used to it. The sensible alternative is just what finds no audience, and the alternative to the patterns laid down by these institutions that are crushing us to death is just our powers set intelligently to our problems. Nevertheless, when we are told to help out with the war, when we are told of our duty and responsibility to the State, we answer that we have more worthwhile things to do, we have the business of survival to attend to, we will act so far as possible out of simple consistency with our ideas, because this is the way a man maintains his sanity and dignity, we will act as far as possible to bring people to their senses, at the worst we will not spend our life and energies on the useless and evil."

There are also articles by Irving Feldman and Howard Griffen, and poems and reviews.

RANK & FILE INITIATIVE HOME MADE HALL

EVERY now and then the justified gloom of the columns of *Freedom* is punctuated by a report of some small example of people taking the initiative, getting together and solving their own problems or making life pleasanter for themselves without regard to the paralyzing effect of our permanent state of emergency, and our absurd economics.

This capacity to get on with things irrespective of governments and powers-that-be, which may well become a condition of survival is illustrated by Arnold Toynbee, the historian, in his *Civilisation on Trial*, where he says, "A simpler social structure has far greater recuperative powers than a more complicated one. When I see our rebuilding programmes in Great Britain being retarded by stoppages of labour and of highly processed materials, and perhaps not least by the mere complications of the administrative machine, my mind goes back to a glimpse that I had in 1923 of a Turkish village re-constructing itself after it had been devastated in the last phase of the Graeco-Turkish war of A.D. 1919-22. Those Turkish villagers were not dependent on materials or labour from outside and they were not at the mercy of red tape. They were rebuilding their houses and replacing their household utensils and agricultural implements with their own hands out of wood and clay within their reach."

★
Ickford, in Buckinghamshire, with only 300 inhabitants, is, says the *Times Educational Supplement*, one of those outlying villages which are sometimes condemned, on grounds of size and situation, as unpractical social units.

The people of Ickford wanted a village hall and four years ago architect Lawrence Dale prepared a design for one.

Two years ago, a small band of enthusiasts staked out the site. To-day, the building is ready for use—for theatre, cinema, dance hall, etc.—the result of the voluntary labour of the village.

Every evening and week-end these determined villagers have worked on their hall, and now it stands, as a monument to their own independence, good sense and initiative.

Will America Use Atom Bomb?

(Continued from page 1)

scene has found worthy understudies immediately ready to take the footlights. What an irony that one of them is the war-stricken China for which collections and Red Cross work were such a feature of the pre-war Left!

Can one escape the conclusion of the anarchists that the existence of States not only affronts the natural solidarity of mankind, but provides actively the cause for internecine strife?

But to leave the matter on this abstract level would be to ignore another question, which involves the atomic bomb, but which ought to be discussed in a more fundamental and analytical way. When Mr. Peter Roberts, Conservative M.P. for Keeley, asked in Parliament on June 27th whether the government would advise the use of the atomic bomb on the North Korean capital if the North Korean Government ignored the U.N. resolution on Korea, he was greeted with shocked cries from the Government benches, and was finally ruled politely out of order by the Speaker. The impression conveyed was that "of course" the Western governments had never even dreamed of using the atom bomb.

It now appears that in fact the whole question was thoroughly considered at the time, for the *Manchester Guardian* (27.11.50) reports that, "authoritative sources in Washington say that the United States Joint Chiefs of Staff considered—but voted against—dropping atomic bombs on North Korean troops early in the campaign."

The proposal is said to have been made almost simultaneously, but independently, by army and air force officers when the bulk of the North Korean

army was concentrated in a small area near the town of Suwon, south of Seoul, the South Korean capital. Because the approval of the President is required before atomic weapons can be used in war, the question was put first to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who apparently decided on their own that it would be unwise and did not refer the matter to President Truman. As might be expected, the decision not to use the bomb was tactical rather than moral, for the report continues: "At that time the United States was seeking wide support for the stand against aggression in Korea, and it was feared that world sympathy might be alienated by what might have been considered a hasty resort to atomic warfare."

The military situation, however, now offers many good tactical reasons in the opposite direction. The Chinese armies are far less well equipped than the Americans and British, but they achieve success by an overwhelming expenditure of the one factor in which they have vast superiority—manpower. Their "human sea" tactics involve a fantastic toll of human life. "We are killing them by the thousand," one correspondent was told, "but they just come marching on." He goes on to say that this tactic "has emphasised as never before the grave handicap confronting a Western country, where human life rates higher than anything else, in fighting the fatalistic Asiatic armies where men are the cheapest and most expendable commodity."

We will pass over here the demoralising effect on men who to save their own lives have to inflict a ghastly

carnage on less well equipped, less educated, altogether poorer fellow-men. Long may human life rate higher than anything else in the West. Progress demands that the same respect should be extended to the coolie workers in the East, but this kind of war clearly does not favour progress there.

Now the United Nations' reverses show that the Chinese superiority in expendable manpower is greater than the American superiority in arms. Since the U.N. Forces can only with difficulty be increased and relieved, the military problem is clearly to increase still further the technical power of the troops in the field to inflict even greater slaughter on the advancing "human seas". It does not need very much imagination to see that to use the atomic bomb would achieve this result to some extent, and could be justified on the grounds that not to use it would be to sacrifice unnecessarily "our boys' lives". It will also be seen that there will always be a strong temptation—and strong military arguments—for using it against the limitless armies of the peasant countries.

It is a grave prospect. But underlying it there remains the world pattern of sovereign states—handfuls of men ruling over millions and all drawing daggers on each other. This is not a necessary form of human organisation, but an arbitrary one. It can be changed. But only if men of good will give up struggling for alleviations of present "pressing" problems, and give themselves to the revolutionary problem of changing the pattern of social and economic life.

Coal!

(Continued from p. 1)

been exhausting themselves in a production drive which has brought them neither reward nor satisfaction, should have no desire to face again the stress and strain of the industry at war, and should be pulling out while the going is good and before a new Essential Works Order ties them to the pits whether they like it or not.

Still Paying the Owners

It is not even as though the old owners are really off the backs of the miners. The mines were not expropriated by the community, they were taken over by the State on terms of compensation. The miners, who kept the owners for so many generations, have still to work for the profit of the N.C.B. so that the State can pay interest on the loans floated to compensate the old owners, for presumably these interests are paid out of these profits and from taxation. So that as producers, consumers and taxpayers, the workers in all nationalised industries are paying for the State to become their boss.

Another big payment (there was one last June of £19 million) is expected by the colliery companies. It is believed to total about £20 million, to be divided between 84 companies, and is an interim payment only. The total to be paid in compensation is not yet fixed—but on the scale of these interim payments will be much more generous than the recent wage awards to the miners. To cover this payment a quantity of "Coal" stock—Treasury 3½ per cent. 1977-80—will soon be finding its way to the Gilt-edged market of the Stock Exchange. It seems there may soon be more coal stocks available in the City of London than in the bunkers of industry—to the greater profit of City gents!

To make up the Shortage

And what are the measures suggested to deal with the crisis in the coal situation? Well, of course, the first and usual one is—more work from the workers. The five-day week, so proudly introduced, is now to be thrown overboard, and six full shifts a week to be required from every mine-worker. So far, it is regarded only as an "appeal" by the union, but Sir William Lawther is already uttering ominous phrases about "toeing the line". The second remedy is the importing

of coal from abroad. So proud were the N.C.B. about their export figures that they apparently did not notice the decreasing coal stocks here. Our export drive is aimed mainly at the dollar market, but now we have coal contracts with—for instance—Sweden, which we must continue to fulfil, while we import coal from America, paying out those precious dollars in return!

The third remedy suggested is one in which the miners themselves—or their unions—show themselves in a poor light. It is on the question of foreign labour. Britain has been offered the services of 10,000 skilled Italian miners who are at the moment unemployed in Italy. They have gained their experience in Belgian mines (for Italy has no coal herself) but now are no longer needed there and so have been sent back home.

In at least four districts, Yorks, Lancs, West Midlands and South Wales, miners' representatives have turned down the scheme of bringing in these workers on the grounds of the British miners' own fear of unemployment and lowering of wage standards. On these grounds, the objections cannot hold water. There is no likelihood that there will be unemployment in the industry for years ahead, as far as one can see, and in any case agreement could be made that the Italians were the first to go if any miners had to be sacked. Similarly, it could be stipulated that the Italians received the same wage as British miners so there would be no question of undercutting.

Certainly there is the point that easing the labour shortage might weaken the bargaining power of the unions, but if the unions were prepared to fight for the demands of the men instead of not wishing to "embarrass" the Government, which seems their main concern, that would not apply either. But if the arguments against bringing the Italians here, thereby lifting them and their families out of the misery of unemployment, have any basis in nationalism, distrust of the foreigner, or such-like patriotic nonsense, then the miners are certainly betraying the fine sense of international working-class solidarity which once they showed.

★
The Anarchist answer to the crisis is more fundamental. We maintain that permanent solutions are not to be found at all within the framework of capitalism. The first step is for the miners themselves to take control of the mines, thereby gaining at the same time both freedom and security. With the establishment of workers' control, the frustrations inseparable from centralisation and managerial control could be abolished, to be replaced by the satisfaction of those who actually do the work on their own responsibility. The second step is for our society to stop using coal in the manufacture of things we don't need (armaments, for one thing), and then to develop alternative sources of power to eliminate the drudgery of coal-mining altogether as soon as possible.

But these solutions are revolutionary ones and will not recommend themselves to the powers that be. This means that the miners' task is to prepare themselves to work against the powers over them to-day, that they may have power over themselves to-morrow.

WHO IS HE?
"WE greet in you the outstanding leader of the British working-class..." Who is this super-man who has "tirelessly" worked for Socialism; who has made an "immense contribution to the struggle for peace and against imperialist war"; who "saw immediately the historic significance of the victory of the Russian workers"; who played a "leading part" in the "hands off Russia" movement; who was "the principal inspirer and organiser" of the International brigade, "foremost in defence" of the national independence of the Czech people; who gave the same "self-sacrificing and unsparring effort" to the cause of "victory over Fascism in the Second World War"; whose "brilliant grasp of strategy and tactics" have enabled him to "chart a correct course for the party and the working-class"? Who is this gentle giant who takes "a craftsman's pride in attention to details and in efficiency in the small things as well as the big"; whose "hatred of the class enemy" has been accompanied by "the greatest solicitude for hundreds of comrades in the movement, by care for the old..."; whose life-long experience is embodied in the "penetrating and helpful advice" that he gives "so readily"; whose "incomparable ability" as a speaker has given the multitudes "renewed faith in the working-class"; who is this "incorruptible leader of the working-class", this colossus whose "courage, tireless energy, humour and loyalty" leaves us speechless and breathless?

No, dear reader, it is not Stalin the Great; for He, besides possessing all these attributes, is also the inspirer of the Arts, of Genetics and of Linguistics; the general of generals, father of us all! Then Who is He!—The answer is Harry Pollitt. The occasion: his 60th birthday. The boot-lickers: the Executive Committee of the Communist Party.

Later, at a birthday party given to our Harry (by the Party), the hall was decorated with "flowers, Union Jacks, Red flags and Party banners", reports the *Daily Worker* (27/11/50), and at the side of "a smiling portrait of the guest of honour were the words 'Greetings, Great Leader in the Fight for Working-class Unity, Peace and Socialism'." Then "Harry entered the hall and walked to the platform through a guard of honour of young Communists."

★
But we hope, for Harry's sake, that Stalin hasn't read this paean in his praise. For Stalin is a jealous god, and has ordered many an "outstanding leader" of the Party to take a rest cure in Moscow for lesser things than the Executive Committee's letter to Harry!

★
Many gifts were showered on our hero. Indeed, with the "beautiful cake" and "standard rose bushes" it was almost a harvest festival. But the two most useful (and one almost feels there is some deeper significance in these two gifts) were an overcoat from the London District Committee of the C.P. with their wishes that "it will keep him as warm in the bitterest weather as the feelings in our hearts", and a travelling rug to keep his body warm as well as his heart" from the C.P.'ers at Fords. For they certainly have cold winters in Moscow!

But let us pray that Harry will be spared to us. We can ill-afford to lose the super-man who J. R. Campbell described in these simple words: "Probably no-one living in Britain at the present time has such a sense of British reality, such a knowledge of the British labour movement and its ways, such an underlying confidence in the British people to conquer power and construct Socialism in this country of ours."

My—what a head he must have!
R.

P.S.—Mr. Campbell is a seasoned Party man and Editor of the *Daily Worker*. He made sure of not arousing Stalin's jealousy, in praising Harry, when he said, "Probably no-one living in Britain, etc." It is naturally understood that outside Britain there is an even greater authority, whose image is engraved on the hearts of countless millions, whose name is on the lips of every self-respecting person throughout the world!

Syndicalist Notebook

Closed Shop Pressure

IT is not merely because trade unions enforce the closed-shop that we oppose it. We should still be against it if workers' syndicates were strong enough to enforce it.

Just as we are against enforced collectivisation, but support the idea of collectivisation of industry by the workers on a basis of mutual agreement, so we regard as ideal 100 per cent. syndicalism, but as completely against our principles of revolutionary freedom any measures to compel workers to unite. If unity under a certain banner or for a certain cause does not have enough significance or advantage for all to see, they will not see it after pressure has been applied.

Meetings and Announcements

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

Lecture-Discussion Meetings are held

Every Sunday at 7.30 at

THE TRADE UNION CLUB,

Great Newport Street W.C.1

(near Leicester Square Station)

DEC. 10th FILM SHOW
"CIVILISATION ON TRIAL IN SOUTH AFRICA"

Michael Scott's famous film, with a speaker from S. Africa

DEC. 17th, 24th, 31st, NO MEETINGS
The Meetings will resume in January
See this column for particulars

ALL WELCOME

ADMISSION FREE FULL DISCUSSION

GLASGOW ANARCHIST GROUP

INDOOR MEETINGS

EVERY SUNDAY AT 7 p.m.

at the

CENTRAL HALLS, 25 Bath Street.

with

Frank Leech, John Gaffney, Eddie Shaw.

J. Raeside

NORTH-EAST LONDON GROUP

Discussion Meetings Fortnightly

7.30 p.m.

Enquiries c/o Freedom Press

DEC. 12th Bob Linden

"1984: THE SOCIAL SATIRE"

DEC. 26th NO MEETING

JAN. 9th USUAL MEETINGS RESUMED

LONDON BOYS CHOOSE BUILDING

SHOWING a highly commendable regard for fundamentals, London boys on leaving school are shunning white-collar jobs for more constructive occupations.

The London County Council youth employment service have just published their first annual report, which shows that there is practically no industry in which employment for boys cannot be found in London. So the lads are choosing, not the soft jobs, but those in which some satisfaction is to be found. First, building and contracting work takes the greatest number; engineering, shipbuilding, electrical and distributive trades follow in that order. Girls are choosing distributive trades and the clothing industry.

These figures are for girls and boys leaving elementary schools at 15 years of age. It would be interesting to know which occupations are being chosen by those leaving secondary and grammar schools.

DISCONTENT BREWING ON RAILWAYS

THE railwaymen have put up with low wages and bad conditions for a long time out of loyalty to their unions and the idea of nationalisation. There are signs of patience wearing out, however.

London footplate men, seeking a 15 per cent. increase in wages, have resolutely refused a Railway Executive offer with too many strings attached. They are also seeking unity with N.U.R. members to combat Compulsory Arbitration Order 1305. Discontent of new lodging turns is also increasing again.

★ The Rail Board had better look out!
P.S.

AGE OF ENLIGHTENMENT

(1)

A conference of Protestant churches in the Transvaal to-day unanimously approved a request to the Government that no Roman Catholic immigrants should be admitted to South Africa.

Manchester Guardian, 1/11/50.

(2)

On September 23rd, one of the London daily papers published a report from Johannesburg saying that a 12-year-old boy, seriously ill in a hospital, refused, for two days, food prepared by an Indian cook. In appreciation of his action, the South African Protection Society awarded him a gold medal.

Picture Post, 14/10/50.