

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"There are only two principles—freedom and equality, and without them we are nothing. The absence of the one involves obligatorily the corruption of the other."

NORMAN MAILER
 ("Barbary Shore")

Vol. 13, No. 50

December 13th, 1952

Threepence

AFTER TITO'S CONGRESS The Dilemma of Mapam

(From our Balkan correspondent)

LESS than a month after Generalissimo Stalin, Marshal Tito held the congress of his own C.P. The hand-picked delegates listened to the monotonous speeches, cheered or jeered when required and even acted as chuckers-out when the Secretary-general of Tito's government accused a member of the Central Committee of "stealing" his vote. All the resolutions were passed unanimously and the party programme modified. (As in the Soviet Union the term "Politbureau" was abolished and certain, purely technological changes introduced because the old ones no longer served their purpose).

The congress had, of course, a marked anti-Soviet tendency. The speakers who a few years ago would not pronounce the word "Stalin" without adding the adjective "great" or make a speech without singing the praises of the model of socialism now accused of the same man and country of beating the working-class and using Leninist methods. All this was contrasted with conditions in Yugoslavia where—according to them—a classless society was almost in being provided everyone was prepared to make additional sacrifices and maintained "monolithic unity" around Marshal Tito, of course.

The latter used the occasion to precise his attitude towards the West: he needs its arms and financial aid, but refuses to accept the form of government which exists there. The reason for this is quite simple: the former he needs to remain in power, while a general election would show his widespread popularity. It is much safer for him to stick to the methods he used to gain power and keep himself there against the opposition of most of his fellow-countrymen who have

fewer illusions about Tito than American generals, Tory members of the House of Lords or Socialist M.P.s. These gentlemen are capable of telling their audiences after a week's stay in Yugoslavia what fifteen million inhabitants think and want.

The Bureaucracy

The bureaucracy and the secret police, dominated by Communists, are the main pillars of the régime. Together with the officer corps. Kept together by a common past, joint interests and big privileges, they are, on the surface at least, for Tito though some of the more far-sighted ones try to make private arrangements with Stalinist agents or anti-Communists. In spite of much talk about decentralisation and the withering away of the State their total number shows no sign of decrease. On the contrary, as may be seen from the following figures: while the total labour force increased by only 2% since 1934 the bureaucracy augmented by 30%. In capitalist Yugoslavia the ratio between white collar and manual workers in industry was 1:10; in 1948 it was 1:3.4, and two years later 1:2.8. Their number and "needs" as well as their inability to solve the basic economic and social problems are one of the main causes for the present hunger or the "drought" as Tito prefers to call it.

The Secret Police

The everyday work of the unpopular bureaucracy would be of little avail without the secret police (UDBA) in the not too distant background. Its concentration camps and torture cells have had several hundred thousand "guests" whose crimes ranged from the failure to hand over the right quantity of wheat, to belonging to the wrong sort of guerrilla band during or after the war. Some even did a few months of "socially useful labour" simply because they cracked jokes about Tito or maintained before the quarrel with Stalin that American planes were faster than Russian. On the other hand, successful police bosses obtain all sorts of jobs. For example, the commander of the UDBA in Macedonia was "elected" president of the trade unions there, the assistant head of the UDBA became Minister of Metallurgy and then got transferred to a post at the Yugoslav Foreign Office. The head of the espionage department was put in charge of the Shipping Ministry

while one of his associates who sent thousands to prison was for three years Tito's representative at the Commission for Human Rights at the United Nations!

How the People Fare

During the party congress, Tito and his henchmen confessed that the economic situation in Yugoslavia is very bad. They put the blame on the Soviet Union, the drought and the lack of sufficient dollar aid at the right time, without mentioning of course that their own methods were the main cause for the serious food shortage in a country which before the war was an exporter of it. The measures taken by them to combat the crisis included the doubling of rent, higher taxes for the peasants, the freezing of wages and even the lowering by 10% in more than 1,500 enterprises. A few days after these spartan decrees were promulgated, the Communist press was full of reports of workers everywhere agreeing of their own "free will" to surrender a part of their wages to help in the struggle against the drought. (Needless to say, none of Tito's numerous ministers or generals made a similar statement).

In spite of all the legislation by the Communist dictatorship, food prices have been going up steadily. Nor can there be any doubt that they will be higher still in March when Marshal Tito pays his State visit to London. Still, in the absence of bread the people of Yugoslavia will be supplied with long-distance circuses in the form of lengthy articles about the welcome accorded to "their far-sighted and beloved leader".

THE burning of the Jerusalem H.Q. of the Communist Party one night recently, obviously reflected a considerable indignation against the anti-Semitism revealed in Prague, to which we referred last week. For some time the Communist Party in Israel has largely depended for its support on the Arab minority, dissatisfied with its position in the new State, and in seeking to exploit racial dissensions for the benefit of Soviet Imperialism the Stalinists have followed, as in so much else, a path worn for them by the Tsarists. (In Turkish Palestine, the Russian Orthodox priests carried out much the same activity as the Stalinist priests do to-day, building up a cadre of support for the never far-distant Empire under the mask of ideology.)

Events will soon enough come along to show the anti-imperialist Arabs the falsity of "Communist" anti-imperialist pretensions. Meanwhile, the Jerusalem incident reveals that amongst the Jewish citizens of Israel such revelations are beginning to be made, but it is not enough, and Stalinism must be driven away altogether. There are working-class organisations in Israel which can take the lead in opposing Stalinism there and likewise blackening and dishonouring it throughout working-class Jewish populations in other countries, where it seeks to implant itself on a basis similar to that which it does amongst the Palestinian Arabs.

First of all, however, Mapam must be dealt with. The Czech trials have caught it out in a very interesting manner. In Israel there exist two Labour parties, Mapai and Mapam; the former being orientated more or less on British "Socialist" lines, the latter similar to perhaps the "Nenni Socialists" of Italy, supporting Stalinism in every other country. (This is not so illogical by British standards as it seems—does not the British Socialist support Republicanism in every other country?) Stalinist foreign policy is consistently praised by Mapam, just as it was in England from time to time by various so-called "Leftists" who

sooner or later came to heel, or who will eventually do so. They sent their fraternal representative to the "New Democracy" of Czechoslovakia, the name of the stooge being Mordecai Oren. Alas, it is all very well to support Stalin but first be sure that Stalin supports you! Mordecai Oren was arrested in Prague alongside other "Zionist-Imperialists" and agents of Wall Street and "international Jewry".

Poor old Mapam is caught out hopping on one foot. True to its usual line it denounces all opposition to the trials, but then, if the trials are not phoney, it stands condemned itself! So they try weakly to maintain that the trials are genuine, the confessions are true... all but Mordecai Oren! He is the one mistake made by Prague, the innocent man wrongly condemned by well-meaning Communists, a lone lamb amongst Zionist-Imperialist wolves! All the rest deserve all they get, and all the other allegations (with the grosser anti-Semitic slanders lauded out) are justified by Mapam. But only one mistake has been made! Mordecai Oren was innocent, and Mapam is not really a tool of Wall Street!

Nobody is fooled by such nonsense and Ben Gurion scornfully attacked the hypocrisy of the Mapam representatives in the Knesset. What is believed by some is that Stalin hopes to divide and smash the Mapam, alienating the section he despises—that is merely the sort of shrimp fished up with "peace conferences"—from the section that is more Stalinist and may pass to the Communist Party proper. This section is perhaps less "Communist" than it is haunted by the fear of a Russian victory in the Middle East should a world conflict ensue (but then, what are "Communists" else these days?)

Whether that be the case or not, it is certain that once more the Kremlin has kicked its stooges in the teeth. It is to be hoped that public contempt in Israel will strip the Mapam of all pretensions to working-class support.

INTERNATIONALIST.

Very Un-British

MR. Charles Lawson told a judge at Tunbridge Wells: "The situation is so un-English that it might better have taken place behind a certain curtain."

Mr. Lawson appeared for Mr. George Alfred Payne, of the Pembury Dairy, Pembury, who is claiming damages from the Ministry of Food.

This is the story as told by Mr. Lawson:

Mr. Payne bought milk from the Ministry, who charged him extra because it was sold as Channel Islands milk. So he sold it at 3½d. per half pint, the price payable for Channel Islands milk, which is required to have a 4 per cent. butter-fat content.

The Ministry bought back half a pint of the milk and then summoned Mr. Payne because it was deficient in butter-fat.

Mr. Payne was fined £5 with six guineas costs. Because of the conviction he had lost business.

There is only one way a dairyman can buy milk—from the Ministry of Food, said Mr. Lawson.

Mr. Angus Forbes, of Lamberhurst, the farmer from whom the Ministry bought the milk, is co-defendant in the case, which was adjourned.

—News Chronicle, 6/12/52.

It is very popular to think that bureaucratic fumbling like this can only exist in other countries. But can it not be admitted that bureaucracy anywhere is hamfisted and wasteful?

The Docks: THE BRUSH-OFF

THE long-awaited scheme to deal with the unemployment situation in the docks has now been announced by Sir Walter Monckton, the Minister of Labour.

It is, of course, not a "solution" at all in the real sense of the word. It is simply a let-out for the Dock Labour Board, who found that their much-vaunted de-casualisation scheme only worked well when things were going well—and when things went badly, the scheme was no good either.

We have pointed out often enough before how all the "advantages" which the Labour Government brought in were strictly dependent upon economic

prosperity. "Full employment" was not a result of efforts by the Labour Government, it was a result of the post-war trade boom. When the slump came neither the Labour Party nor anybody else could maintain employment at its 1945-49 figure.

And as long as there was plenty of work in the docks, our leaders could talk about the great advantages of de-casualisation. Now they are keeping quiet, and Monckton is able to tell the dockers that their unions have agreed to the Tory Minister's scheme for reducing the number of dockers.

Briefly, the scheme is this: the Dock Labour Board in each port are to open "dormant" registers. Any docker can apply to have his name entered in this register, when he will be released from the pool to seek work elsewhere. This release is to be regarded as temporary, and if his services are required during 1953 he will be given the opportunity of returning to the "live" register.

If, however, he wishes to remain at his new employment, he will be allowed to do so—during 1953. But if in 1954 he is recalled to dock work, he must return within six weeks, or his name will be removed from the register altogether.

If he is still on the dormant register on January 1st, 1955, he can on application be reinstated forthwith on the live register. But if he fails to apply before February 12th, 1955, his name will be

removed from the register permanently, and he will forfeit all rights of reinstatement.

So far the scheme is voluntary, and there is no doubt that plenty of dockers will take advantage of it. All those who would get more than £4 8s. in unemployment benefit and national assistance for instance, as well as those who have other trades at their finger-tips, although most of these will have left the docks already.

What is distasteful about the whole thing is the way in which workers can be simply brushed off when the bosses have no further use for them. But brushed off in such a way that when it suits the bosses, they can be called back.

One point to remember, too, is that the figure given as "surplus" labour in the docks is 12,000—16,000. During 1951, however, no less than 11,000 dockers were added to the register. But early in 1951, dockers were asking for the register to be closed.

If, eighteen months ago, the workers had been listened to, and the mad scramble to turn ships round had been considered in the light of its effects upon the workers concerned, to-day's present miserable situation could have been avoided.

But it is clearly too much to expect employers, Labour Boards or trade union officials to consider the interests of the workers. Day-to-day policies, the interests and profits of the hour have to take preference. The fact that the long-term effects of the system always operate against the workers, however, should be recognised and acted upon.

Or is it too much to expect workers to consider the interests of workers, and realise they gain nothing from reforms or schemes which come from above?

REPRIEVE FOR THE PARTNERS

THE 10,500 "partners" in the John Lewis Partnership, can thank the general public for coming off their "buying strike" and thereby causing a sharp upswing of trade.

The improvement in retail trading—clearly a result of the fall in prices of textile goods, furniture and other goods affected by the slump—has enabled John Spedan Lewis, not-so-benevolent despot of the profit-sharing partnership, to announce that the cuts in wages and salaries (from 5 to 20 per cent.) which have already taken effect, could be restored as from February 1.

This will give heart to those faithful employees—sorry, partners—who stuck by the old firm when the cuts were announced last summer. It will give them the strength to face the Christmas rush and also the January Sales.

Whether trade will improve sufficiently

to enable the staff to view the Coronation procession through the Oxford Street store's windows without paying remains to be seen. (It was announced, too, recently, that they would be expected to pay for this privilege, as the possession of those windows represented an asset to the concern that Mr. Lewis thought should most definitely be turned to good financial account.)

On this point it is interesting to note that whereas a "progressive", profit-sharing partnership had to charge its workers for this, a frankly capitalist firm like Selfridges, and indeed other Oxford Street stores, were able to make arrangements for their staffs to see the Coronation show without any charge whatsoever. And have not announced any pay cuts, either. One may ask just where the advantages are, in profit-sharing?

Have you renewed your Subscription to FREEDOM?

CAUSE AND EFFECT IN KENYA

IN this issue we reprint an article by Jomo Kenyatta which appeared in FREEDOM's predecessor, *War Commentary*, more than ten years ago. It describes conditions in Kenya—conditions which the more truthful and responsible journalists to-day recognise as underlying the present crisis.

But Kenyatta's article was written more than a decade ago, and the conditions he described were not new then. Although it was left for a minority paper to publish such a description, the facts themselves must have been well known to government officials and their advisers responsible for the administration of Kenya. It is important to remember this when considering practical politics in such a situation as the present one. The "crisis" may be new to the British public, but the situation described a decade ago by Kenyatta is the daily life of the native inhabitants of Kenya and their fathers. The daily misery and poverty and injustice provides the basis and a background for their lives, but have for years and years evoked only indifference and inertia in the whole administration.

This is the situation which faces the man of good will when he tries to see what ought to be done in such a crisis. But always the answer must be that such a crisis might never to have been allowed to develop. Injustice, both economic and social, should never have been allowed to develop, or be tolerated when it did develop. Once it has been tolerated—and indeed attempts to remedy it in the past have been steadily ignored or frustrated by the Administration—for years, the man of good will is in a hopeless position. If he is himself connected with the Administration he is compromised by its past crimes of omission and commission. If he is not he is an outsider, without power or influence on either the government or the governed.

The problems of African life—or indeed of life in any colonial country—are not being solved by the white administration. Nor would they hasten to add would they be by a mixed white and coloured administration on the same general lines. A solution is not to be found either in the complete withdrawal of Europeans, though it is not surprising that so many Africans (perhaps a majority) consider this, in the circumstances, to be the best solution. Ideally, what is required is mutual action on a practical level between Europeans and Africans to achieve a better life and living conditions in each village and township.

Colonialism, however, makes such a simple practical action impossible. The high-handed injustice of the white people and their assumption of superiority evoke not only fear and hatred, but also the colonial struggle with its nationalism, its own simplifications—ultimately its own system of injustice and repression in the terrorism attributed to the Mau Mau. (It should, however, be borne in mind that the extent of this activity is not so large in government figures as in newspaper propaganda.) When the situation has developed so far, ideal solutions are clearly impossible as practical, immediate politics.

But we have been assuming that the "man of good will" is in fact active in the present crisis. In fact, however, the men who have tolerated the perpetuated injustice, who have been indifferent in the face of African poverty and discontent, are now the men who are dealing with the crisis. Is it surprising that their methods are not those of redress, far-sighted reform, but instead of

HOW KENYA IS GOVERNED

by
JOMO KENYATTA

* The article below appeared in *Freedom's* predecessor, *War Commentary*, in September, 1941. Present circumstances give it an especial interest.

IN considering the question of civil liberties and the effect of European civilisation on African tribal communities, it is necessary to have some ideas of how the African people lived before the advent of the Europeans. Cut off as they were from the outside world, they lived in their isolation with natural contentment, each group acting independently and satisfying its immediate needs and desires with material near at hand. As to their mode of government, they managed their own affairs as best they could, through democratic tribal organisations formed according to the local customs and the stage of development which the particular tribe had reached. Tribal affairs were in the hands of several groups or councils which every tribesman had the right to join. Thus they lived as the masters of their destiny, roaming freely within the boundaries of their own fertile territories, and enjoying the gifts which nature had bestowed upon them; fertile lands with favourable climatic conditions, and, in addition, with abundance of game of every kind.

Under the tribal system of land tenure, every tribesman had the right of access to as much land as he needed for the maintenance of himself and his de-

pendents; this was possible because land-ownership was not based on profit-making—as it is in European countries—but on the principle of producing materials necessary for the progress and happiness of the whole community.

When the Europeans appeared on the scene, bringing with them stronger weapons than those possessed by any of the African tribes, things began to take a different course. British Government in Kenya took possession of all the land previously owned and occupied by the African tribes, thus with one stroke of the pen, depriving the African of his sole means of production. The African legal position with regard to land is defined by the following quotation from a judgment of the High Court of East Africa, in a civil case heard in Nairobi in 1921: "In my view the effects of the Crown Lands Ordinance, 1915, and the Kenya (Annexation) Order in Council, 1920, by which no native rights were reserved, and the Kenya Colony Order in Council, 1921, as I have already stated is clearly, *inter alia*, to vest land reserved for the use of a native tribe in the Crown. If that be so, then all native rights in such reserved land, whatever they were under the Gethaka system" (the term refers to the system of inalienable freeholds among the Kikuyu tribe) "disappeared, and natives in occupation of such Crown Land became tenants at will of the Crown of the land actually occupied."

From 1895 to 1920, their territory was known as British East Africa Protectorate, and subsequently as Kenya Colony. In 1923 the following declaration of Native policy was made: "Primarily Kenya is an African territory, and His Majesty's Government think it necessary definitely to record their considered opinion that the interests of the African Native must be paramount and that if and when these interests and the interests of the immigrant races should conflict, the former should prevail." (CMD. 1022).

In spite of this declaration the history of native policy in Kenya shows clearly that the African, the man of sorrows in the human family, is the one who is shouldering the burden: especially with regard to the land and labour questions, for around this issue revolve all the trials, burdens, hardships and sufferings of the subject races in the Colonial countries.

The present population of Kenya consists of about 19,000 Europeans, about 45,000 Indians and Goanese, 13,000 Arabs, and over 3,000,000 Africans. The Government is administered by a Governor, supported by an Executive Council made up of eight *ex-officio* members, and about four unofficial members. Besides this, there is a Legislative Council which passes laws, subject to the authority of the Colonial Office. It consists of forty members, including the Governor, who is the President, twenty official members, including one nominated Arab, 11 Europeans elected by the European non-official community to represent landed and commercial interest, five Indians elected by the Indian community, one elected Arab, and two Europeans nominated by the Governor to represent the interests of over three million

Africans! The Africans have no direct representative on the Council.

The Governor is subjected to great political and social pressure by the white community of Kenya. For this reason, his position is one of exceeding difficulty. If he acts according to the settlers' demands he is hailed with satisfaction; but if he devotes his energies to encouraging the development of the unrepresented African population he runs the risk of being denounced as "pro-Native". As it is pointed out in the Ormsby-Gore Report of 1925, few, if any Governors have been able to withstand organised white pressure, and, therefore, African rights have been violated and African interests neglected. The official members are under the order of the Governor who can not only order their votes, but can silence their criticism of legislative measures.

According to the Hilton Young Report, 1929, the eleven elected European members representing white constituencies, exercise large control over general legislation and Budget expenditure. Though in a permanent minority on the Council they are given far greater actual powers than their numbers would normally warrant. Their first duty is to their white constituents. They have little, if any, knowledge of the language, customs and home life of the Africans, and are chiefly interested in the African as a present or prospective wage-earner. It is obvious, therefore, that they cannot be regarded as representatives of the African interests.

The two Europeans who are nominated to represent (?) the Africans are usually missionaries. They have, therefore, a definitely specialised view of African interests. From the imperialist point of view they are a nuisance; from that of the Africans they are neither independent, disinterested nor equipped with sufficient knowledge of African needs, and as the Africans have no say in appointing them, they cannot bring pressure to bear on them to express their real desires.

Kenya administration as a whole is influenced in favour of European capitalist development in exactly the same way as the Governor and legislature. Heavy indirect pressure can be brought to bear on heads of Departments in the Legislative Council, by the Convention of Associations and the Press, to devote their main energies to furthering European development. In that direction lies their path of advancement, appreciation and popularity. Work done for the African carries but little outward reward.

From the above observations, I can say definitely that Kenya as at present constituted, is not "primarily an African territory" in any but a statistical sense.

The African Handbook (1935) gives the total of Native Reserves in 1933 as 48,345 square miles, or about 31,000,000 acres, which include arid desert or semi-desert tracts, such as Taru-desert. Here, are herded together the bulk of over 3,000,000 Africans, having among them at the end of 1933 4,965,963 head of cattle, 2,960,827 sheep, and 4,321,543 goats.

On the other hand, there were 4,700 Europeans, holding among them at the

end of 1935, 5,206,264 acres of the most eligible land in the country, some of it originally granted to them free of all costs in 5,000 acre blocks, the bulk held in 999-year leases on merely nominal terms. Thirty years after the country was opened up for white settlement, and with a total population of 17,620, less than 12% of this land was under cultivation. Europeans held at the end of 1933, 256,157 head of cattle and 252,250 sheep. The Africans, who were pushed out of a large part of this alienated land to accommodate the Europeans are to-day crowded in Reserves with a density of ranging from 165 to 1,100 to the square mile. A report on Kikuyu Land Tenure published in November, 1929, states:—

"... a very large number of native holdings were alienated to Europeans in the days before the Reserve boundaries were fixed, and then a great many natives who had land rights on the holdings of their clans suddenly found themselves homeless and with no land on which they could cultivate in their own right."

The necessity to earn money is corollary of the whole land question, for, being landless, Africans are unable to maintain an independent economic existence. They are, therefore forced to go and work in the mines and on the farms owned by settlers or vested interest, in order to obtain money to pay their Hut, Head and other taxes, not only for themselves but also for their dependents. Even those Africans who can find a piece of land within the reserves, are not allowed to cultivate economic crops, such as coffee, which would enable them to find a ready market and thereby obtain their tax money. To-day every African male above the age of sixteen has to pay 12 shillings tax, and those who have more than one hut have to pay twelve shillings per hut. About 450,000 able-bodied African males pay £600,000 in hut and poll tax, or 27 shillings a head. In spite of the heavy taxation which the Africans pay, the education of their children is very poor. There is no official estimate of the number of African children of school age, but it can be safely said that there are between 500,000 and 600,000 children of school age. According to the Kenya Education Department Report, 1937, it is stated that there were 100,872 pupils in elementary schools in Kenya. Of these, 3,175 were in Government schools, 36,477 in aided schools (mission or church) and 61,220 in unaided schools, built and financed by the Africans out of their own scanty earnings, not only with no help from the Government but often against considerable discouragement. The Government spends about 8 shillings a head for the education of African children, while it spends £49,255 for the education of less than 2,000 European children. It seems therefore that the poor are taxed to pay for the education of the well-to-do. Most Europeans in Kenya are free from Income Tax, for it is only those earning over £700 who pay Income Tax.

This, briefly, is the kind of democracy which Mr. Churchill and his Labour Party colleagues ask us to defend.

Lessons of the Spanish Revolution--22

As it is at present, all sincere war resisters should have intervened systematically on behalf of the Spanish people and especially on behalf of the libertarian revolution, by fighting Franco with the methods indicated above... whatever the methods used by the Spanish people to defend itself, it is in a legitimate state of defence, and this is truer still of those revolutionaries who—during the Civil War—are striving to bring about the social revolution.

"Once again the international working-class movement has neglected one of the noblest of its historic tasks by falling in with the deceitful measures of Imperialist Governments, either self-styled democracies or actually Fascist countries, and abandoning those who fought in Spain with unequalled heroism for the emancipation of the working-class and for social justice. If it had intervened in time, the masses of Spain would still have been able to dispose of the military clique in 1936 and to concentrate on social reconstruction. If it had done so, violence would have been kept down to a minimum and the possibility of a real revolution would have been so great as to change the face of the world."

Earlier in his analysis of Spain, Bart de Ligt pointed out that:

"Considering the ideological traditions and the social, political and moral conditions under which this civil war broke out in July 1936, the Spanish anti-militarists could do nothing else than resort to arms before the military invaders. But by so doing they found themselves obliged to use the same weapons as their enemies. They had to engage in a devastating war which, even in the event of victory, must bring about conditions both objective and subjective as unfavourable as could be to the realisation of the social revolution. If we look at things closely we see here again a kind of dictatorship; if men wish to defend themselves against a violent invader, it is the invader who dictates to the defender what methods of combat he shall use. On the other hand, if the defender can rise immediately above violence, he is free to use his own, and really humane methods.

"It goes without saying that we would rather see victory go, if only partially, to those who fight for justice, peace and freedom, even with gun in hand, than to those who can only prolong injustice, slavery and war. But we must admit that the Spanish people, in its fight against Fascism, has chosen the most costly and ineffective method it could, and that it did neglect to get rid of the military clique at the proper time, which is to say, long before the Civil War broke out..."

Any Spanish reader of the above must be permitted to shake his head and sigh at the naivety displayed in this presentation of the non-violent case. If the international proletariat had supported the Spanish workers; if the military clique had been sacked and if a thousand and one other condition had been fulfilled... who knows what might have happened in Spain! But let us not forget the all-important sentence in what we have quoted above. If all these *ifs* had been realised, Bart de Ligt admits that "Violence would have been kept down to a minimum and the possibility of a real revolution would have been so great as to change the face of the world." In other words, an admission that under certain conditions violence need not degenerate, a position which George Woodcock sweeps aside with his generalisations and his carefully selected examples to prove his thesis.

Though this is now a matter of academic interest and is only raised in order to counter the point of view put forward by George Woodcock and other advocates of the non-violent tactic (that the insurrectionary revolutionary workers stand no chance against the organised military power which will be hurled against them), the accounts which we have read of the militarist putsch in Spain, lead us to believe that but for the treachery of high civil officials appointed by the Popular Front Government, and hesitation in certain sections of the workers' organisations, Franco might have been defeated in a matter of days. As it was, two-thirds of Spain was wrested from his grasp at the beginning. It is a point of view held by many well-informed Spanish militants and it is to be hoped that a documented study on this aspect of the struggle will one day be published

It is when the use of violence is prolonged, and the armed struggle ceases to be related to its objectives, that we find ourselves on common ground with the so-called non-violent anarchists, and consider that anarchists in justice to themselves and to their fellow workers, must question the validity of the prolongation of the armed struggle. In Spain that situation arose after a few months. The delays in following up the initial successes and the failure to prevent the establishment of a bridgehead from Morocco, permitted Franco to re-organise and reinforce his army and to launch his large-scale offensive from the South and threaten Madrid with encirclement. Faced with this situation, the leaders of the C.N.T.-F.A.I. capitulated to the Popular Front point of view for militarisation. The consequences of this capitulation have been dealt with at some length in the course of this study. Could the C.N.T.-F.A.I. have acted otherwise? That is a question which perhaps one day our Spanish comrades will be prepared to face objectively and will answer.

We will limit ourselves to the expression of an opinion in general terms. We believe that anarchists can only participate in those struggles which are the expression of a people's will to freedom and justice. But when such struggles should be organised and conducted with the same ruthlessness as that of the enemy, with armies of conscripts schooled in blind obedience to leaders; by the militarisation of the rearguard, and the censorship of the Press and of opinion; when secret prisons are connived at, and to express criticisms is considered High Treason (as in the trial of the P.O.U.M. leaders); before that stage has been reached, anarchists who are not afraid of unpopularity or the "judgment of history" should declare their inability to co-operate and conduct their struggles against both régimes in whatever way they consider consistent with their aspirations and their principles. *Renunciamos a todo menos a la victoria* (Let us give up everything except victory) is not an anarchist slogan, for, in Malatesta's words:

"If to win it is necessary to erect the gallows in the public square, then I would prefer to lose."

(To be continued)

