

Freedom

AN ANARCHIST FOR NIGHTLY

CAN PEACE BE ENFORCED?

The "Progressives" Provide the Justification

EVEN before the tide of events turned in favour of America and the "United" Nations, the question was being asked. "Is there a new Spain?" It is a question which serves as a focussing point for left-wingers and progressives to discuss their attitude towards the post-war power rivalries. Since left-wingers and progressives are now the most important intellectual current which provides justification for wars, this discussion has an importance far beyond immediate appearances.

In 1914 it was the H. G. Wells who provided rallying points sufficiently cogent to bring those who might otherwise have followed the instinct which actively recognizes that wars have been major powers having to do with ethical considerations. The post-1918 No-Wars feeling was more actively swept away by the fascists of the Left Book Company, literary figures like Spenser and Auden—and we must not forget Orwell and Koestler—by frank warmongers. It is these rather than the warmongers who provided the arguments which enabled the fascist left to line up behind Chamberlain and Churchill.

DO WARS ACHIEVE PROGRESS?

H. G. Wells was personally questioned after 1918 about the part he played in the manufacture of propaganda during

the preceding four years. But however much revolutionists may have seen that the post-war world differed but slightly from pre-1914, the League of Nations provided a seeming achievement for the progressives and gave justification of their support for the war. H. G. Wells could not undo his war work. It was, of course, impossible to argue whether the price of so many million dead was "worth" the apparent gains in progress at that time; it only became a dead loss with the development of the new war. But here the feeling of a new crusade again had the effect of stilling doubts.

From an objective standpoint it seems clear that the world of to-day is more totalitarian than the world of 1939. Yet the fascist régimes of Italy and Germany were terminated, and this seems a sufficient gain to many; especially if they can persuade themselves that the

Russian system is somehow less bad than those overthrown. The point which emerges is that for progressives and left-wingers the last war can still be represented as having been "worth while". Hence they approach the question "Is Korea a new Spain?" without really having learned anything from the past.

APPEASEMENT OR FIRM STAND?

Anarchists have to adjust their minds somewhat in considering the question. For those who ask it, Spain represented principally a trial of strength between the fascist countries against the democracies. The Spanish people were just one more among those sacrifices to fascist aggression which began with Abyssinia and ended with Austria and Czechoslovakia and Albania.

Anarchists (and a very few other revolutionary thinkers) see Spain rather differently; the Spanish revolution has a special and enormous significance to them. That George Orwell saw this aspect of Spain is clear from his *Homage to Catalonia*, and he was by far the most perceptive and sensitive thinker on the pro-war left. But even for Orwell the main significance of Spain lay in the conflict which he imagined existed between the fascist and the democratic systems. For more

humdrum anti-fascists the issue was the simple one of "standing up to aggression", or of failing to do so. The Left have for years blamed the last war on the policy of appeasement culminating in Munich. They are joined by Churchill, and they say that the 1939 war would not have been "necessary" if the democracies had shown strength instead of weakness. The same argument obtains to-day. "Russia will not dare to go to war if

PAGE FOUR

Tito's Phoney Syndicalism

(from our Balkan Correspondent)

A STUDENT of Soviet affairs once wrote that the great success of Marxists, in spite of all their boasts about the continuously rising standard of living and culture in the Socialist fatherlands, lies in the field of mass-propaganda, where they can safely teach a number of tricks to their less imaginative bourgeois rivals (or partners, as the case may be). Thus what is known among the sane as a prison becomes a "camp for re-education", forced labour turns "voluntary" when working in a "Socialist" State, inhuman productions drives are labelled "Socialist Competitions" when occurring between Trieste and Shanghai, while the most pervasive dictatorship in the world to-day is provided with a constitution proclaiming all sorts of freedoms. To this long and steadily increasing list of 1984 "double-think" words and schemes we can now add that of "workers' control" and "decentralisation" introduced by Marshal Tito, who, in his twenty-years career as a Stalinist, has learned and, to the great sorrow of his former master, perfected the art of Marxist politics to suit his own ends.

At a meeting of his servile Parliament in June, Tito introduced a Bill which, like so many other blueprints all over the world, seemed perfect. Each factory was to elect by secret ballot and for a short period a workers' council with an executive committee which would meet regularly with the director to plan the general activities of the factory. While the director would be appointed by the State, the executive of the workers' council could ask for his removal. This was done in several cases because the régime had to find scapegoats for the worsening labour conditions and the appalling shortage and low quality of consumer goods. At the same time a number of the 114 ministries were closed and their less reliable officials from the Communist point of view, sent to the factories or mines amid a great deal

of talk about the dangers of bureaucracy in the U.S.S.R., the eventual "withering away of the State" and why Tito and not Stalin, is the true heir of Marx and Lenin.

In view of the cold and hot war with its need for allies however disreputable they are and the growing disillusionment with the policies of both the Social Democratic and Communist parties in the West, it is not surprising that a steady stream of visitors (mostly guests of various Titoist authoritarian organisations) returned from Yugoslavia stating that Tito is on the way to solving problems which had baffled social reformers during the past 150 years. None of them, out of gullibility or complacency, bothered to examine the scheme more closely before giving their verdict. It took, for example, Mr. Morgan Phillips, the secretary of the Labour Party, only a few days' stay in Titoland to proclaim that "the people of Yugoslavia are building new forms of democracy", and is would probably take

★ PAGE THREE

THE GAS STRIKE

WE have pointed out before that when the Labour Government repealed the Trades Disputes Act of 1927, it was a mere shop-window gesture depriving itself of none of the powers that that Act gave to the Tory Government which introduced it.

There still remain Emergency regulations, war-time Orders like the Conditions of Employment and National Arbitration Order, 1940, and, as we were reminded last week, the Conspiracy and Protection of Property Act of 1875.

And the Labour Government has not hesitated to use any of them. A State of Emergency has been declared three times during the last three years to deal with dock strikes, and last week in order to pick out and prosecute a representative handful of gas-workers from the 1,430 on strike, the 1875 Act was brought out, dusted and used.

Inconvenience

Only a half-hearted attempt was made to smear this strike with the "Communist" slur, for the good reason that it could have stuck even less to the patient gas-workers than to the dockers or busmen. The gas-men's claims for wage increases were first put forward in 1948, through all the "proper" channels, and even the union leaders did not have the face to deny the ponderous delay in dealing with the claims.

The public, of course, are inconvenienced by a stoppage in a public utility, but it should never be forgotten that it is very inconvenient for workers to be faced over a period of years with rising prices in nearly all necessities with a very inelastic pay packet.

In all the confusion and eyewash trotted out in connection with this strike, however, it has been left to the staid *Observer* to bring a little impartial examination of the legal aspects of the prosecution brought against 10 of the strikers. Pointing out how unsatisfactory it was to pick out ten men only when, as all the strikers agreed, they should all have been prosecuted, if any, the *Observer* goes on to say:

"The intention of the 1875 Act, it must appear, was to treat workers in essential public services on the same sort of basis as soldiers or police, who are not allowed to strike but are given some compensatory benefits, including security of employment and pension rights. This might be a desirable reform, but in spite of the 1873 Act it has not been put into practice, and it would be a step so far-reaching that it could scarcely be undertaken without being made an election issue.

"As things are, it seems wrong to keep on the Statute Book this ancient Act, which has never been enforced. It cannot fairly be used to prosecute strikers who are not, in fact, employed on the national service terms which the Act implies."

And the *Observer* goes on to show how unfair and illogical it is for the Government to steadfastly refuse, as they have done, to institute a national wages policy, while taking legal measures against strikers. In effect they are leaving the workers free to do their own bargaining, but punishing them when they use the only weapons they have when their unions do not do the job for them.

Government's Way

This is a typical social-democratic government's way of doing things. Trying to make the best of both worlds, free enterprise and planned economy, the best is maintained for employers and office holders, but the workers get the worst of both worlds.

Without a regular wages policy, without any brake upon rising prices, the workers are also, because of union loyalty to the Labour Party, without the protection their own organisations are supposed to give them.

The Attorney-General has called on the trade union movement for "voluntary discipline and loyalty to the elected leaders." To allow discipline to be voluntary, and a little loyalty from the union leaders might not be a bad idea.

P.S.

Form D.406: Sorry Not Interested

IN the recent issue of *Freedom*, I wrote on "Class Z Impudence". This was written purely unprejudiced and unbiassed, and without the least knowledge that the Ministry of Labour & National Service and the War Office were going to make a personal matter of it. Shortly after it appeared, however, these worthy gentlemen were undeterred by their scrutiny of an interesting crime-sheet which it is hoped to include in the official records of the British Army to show posterity the sort of thing the combined wits of the Service chiefs (as preserved for history in a match-box) were up against. They made a personal matter of it, and sent me a questionnaire wanting to know my employer and, more or less, how important he is to a wartime economy. Naturally, the Ministry of Langour and the Snore Office do not realise how unimportant an employer is to any economy.

This Army Form D.406 was sent under what was quaintly known as the Armed Forces (Conditions of Service) Act, 1939. Had one known in 1939 that there were actually conditions of service, it is doubtful if so many would have entered into it. It rather sounds as if the conditions were laid down so that we should not be dazzled by the attractions of the Armed Forces.

It made four points. The first said, "You are hereby requested as an Officer on the Unemployed List or as a Reservist of Class 'Z' . . . to complete Parts I and II of this form." If I considered myself an unemployed officer or a reluctant reservist I might have done so. As a free and independent human being, I saw no reason.

This, however, they endeavoured to explain in Point 2. "The object of asking you to supply this information is to enable the Ministry of Labour and National Service to consider the question of your

availability for recall should the need ever arise." In the first World War, Kitchener pointed an accusing finger at the passer-by from every hoarding, and said, "Your King and Country Need YOU!" In the second, there was a slight emphasis on trade unions and internationalism wanting a bit of support, but we have slid into the position where it is just a question of the Ministry of Labour & National Service wanting you. The sheer impudence of the tea-sipping flat-hoggers considering one's availability for recall is one that is purely centred on our time and life. In feudal Europe, the press gang of the robber baron certainly sat back and thought about who they should grab hold of; these armed brigands then went round and swooped on the defenceless peasantry, who thought perhaps with quiet consolation how different things would be in 200 years' time say, in a free country like England. The difference is that to-day, Mr. Wetnose of the Min. of Lab. studies his register in one of the former luxury flats or newly-built office blocks his department has grabbed, and phones up an officer on the re-employed list at the War Office to see if there's any objection to the defenceless peasant he's picked out. Having considered the availability for recall, you've had it.

This clause goes on to remind you to "fill the form in correctly and return it promptly; failure to do so may mean that you will be regarded as available for recall whatever your occupation may be." Such advice would certainly not be lost on anyone who had recently joined the works of a munitions factory, but the majority of people will obviously be available for recall the minute they know what their occupation now is. One is tempted to the reflection that Whitehall would have made Hitler a different man. Before

people were sent to the gas-chambers they would have had to fill out forms stating their life history and antecedents, and those with the appropriate answers would have been taken off. As proof of the English love of liberty, nobody would have dreamed of giving incorrect answers and the results would have been exactly the same.

Point 3 emphasises that the form is a purely routine measure to bring their records up to date. It "does not necessarily mean that you would be recalled in the event of an emergency". In the time-honoured Cockney phrase, "The band played, 'Believe it if you like'."

Point 4 merely tells you to fold up the form and show the stamped address of the Records Office. To show how generous they are, they put "stamped" in capitals to show they don't begrudge a stamp. Alas, one knows fools enough who would even put a stamp on themselves for fear they might not be called up in order. Give me the good old press gang. They came round in the old days grabbing men from the docksides forcing them on to the ships, but they had to face a fight for their money and might well have been thrown in the Thames or the Severn. Mr. Wetnose, however, has no dangers. He is surprised when an occasional "trouble-maker" wangles his way through the doors of his comfortable hide-out and finds out the striped-pants-man who is "considering his availability". I recall what he actually said to me on that occasion: "If everybody made as much as you do about doing his duty, where should we be?" The press gang knew where they would be. What a commentary on our age and civilisation that after ten years of conscription people are not even prepared to throw Army Form D.406 into the river.

INTERNATIONALIST.

AUTUMN BOOK REVIEWS

A FLOATING STATE

THE DEATH SHIP by B. Traven. (Pan Books, 2s.)

In a copy of New Road, Fred Marnau has written, "A man discarding his identity in order to walk across Europe, not heeding teeth, terror, and zones, is a hero. He is a lonely European dream of true liberty. He is a poet."

Much of this book concerns a sailor stranded in Europe, without papers or money, and who is ejected from one country to another by frontier police who find nothing more embarrassing than a man without his number.

It is not difficult to believe, and the "blurb" seems to support this, that much of this book is autobiographical. The author's knowledge of the way in which the police handle men without papers, the brilliant manner in which he conveys his indignation, the debunking of hypocritical consuls... one knows it is the truth.

The State comes to life as one of the leading characters in his story, as when, for instance, the consul turns down his request for a duplicate passport. "Perhaps after all. Why should men be brutes, anyway? The State is the brute, I fancy. The State that takes sons from their mothers and flings them to idols. This man is the servant of the Beast, just as the executioner is the servant of the Beast. Everything the man said was learnt by heart. He had to seek it all up, of course, when he took his consul's exam. It just slipped off his tongue. For everything I said he had the right answer to stop my mouth. But when he asked me if I was hungry, if I had had anything to eat, then he suddenly became a man, and was no longer a servant of the Beast... The Beast can't use men; they make too much work. It's easier to drill dummy figures and put them into uniform, to make life more comfortable for the servants of the Beast. Yes, sir. Yes, sir."

The second part of the book may be seen as a parallel. A floating State with an Authority of its own, in which everything is subordinated to the ship and its contraband cargo. And the men are still slaves, without rights, without voices. The descriptive passages dealing with a trimmer's life are outstanding, and the meaning of "Death Ship" is brought home with intensity. The one freely expendable commodity is man. And if he is without identity papers, and therefore without a right to exist, his disappearance can never be proved.

From the hero's experiences, we can learn such valuable lessons as that of never trusting Authority, of never expecting sympathy. If the Law has been broken, the Keepers of Law have only one answer. And it isn't their hearts that speak. To all of us who have the honour of being law-breakers or potential law-breakers, this novel will convey a wider meaning.

C.H.

Psychopaths in Power

EUGEN KOGON, born in Munich in 1903, is an economist and sociologist who served several years' imprisonment in the worst Nazi camps. In this book he gives a documented account of the concentration camp system.

THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF HELL by Eugen Kogon. (Secker & Warburg, 18/-)

When the initial reports of conditions in these places were published in England, many readers, including this reviewer, were inclined to treat the worst excesses with incredulity. A good many of the reported activities of the SS were of a kind which had already figured largely in belligerent propaganda of both wars. Reported atrocities are commonly recognisable as psychopathic fantasy—our error in doubting them lay chiefly in a failure to recognise how far the Nazi régime was, in fact, a psychopathic manifestation. The psychopath who invents atrocities is undoubtedly liable, in certain circumstances, to enact them, and this, under Nazism, was precisely what happened. Documentation of these horrors had an important function in removing our scepticism about the limits to which group-delinquency could go: the facts being established, the reports and documents have a secondary function in preventive medicine.

If I seem to be taking Kogon's testimony calmly (and it is harrowing enough in all conscience) it is because the most important feature of all this beastliness to-day is the need to ensure that it does not recur. Almost everything which took place in the camps, and which reached the limit of human cruelty, is a commonplace in psychiatry as fantasy. In our own society it may break into reality as individual action, but no individual possesses the opportunity to enact it undisguised on a larger scale. The peculiar danger which concerns social medicine (and anarchism) is the tendency of societies to provide such opportunity through the structure of government, at a time when, by their pattern of life, they encourage the growth of large numbers of individuals abnormal enough to avail themselves of it.

What Kogon's testimony does show, to a remarkable degree, is that there is a distinction between most current examples of sadistic behaviour within civilised societies and the sadistic behaviour of Nazism. Brutality in prisons and by executive authorities recurs in all contemporary cultures to a greater or lesser degree, but Nazi Germany has been the

first large culture to be deranged bodily to the point at which the sadistic pattern is primary and over-rides all practical and political considerations. It has been stated that Soviet Russia has an even larger number of political prisoners than Hitler had, but an examination of their evidence, where it is available, shows definite points of difference between the Nazi and the Communist attitude. In this respect, the Communist treatment of prisoners is an exaggeration of our own, or, more accurately, it represents the type of attitude which is apt to develop in any culture which has a repressive and power-centred form of government unrestrained by public opinion or by any contrary stream of tradition. The mental forces at work may be the same as in Germany, but in no other culture within recent record has the process of coincidence between individual sadistic fantasy and social acceptance gone so far as in Nazism.

The German camps originally served clear-cut purposes of intimidation and repression, but it is clear from Kogon's

evidence that the élite created to man them very soon got wholly out of control. The final picture is a particularly terrifying one, of a repressive and militaristic government relying for the maintenance of its power, not upon a limited number of executioners, as in many previous and present tyrannies, but upon an executioner-élite, serving no function but the refinement of punishment, and numbering over 940,000 men out of a population of about 73,000,000. We can look at it in two ways—on one hand, it may be true that the peculiar set of circumstances which brought this about in Germany are unlikely to recur. On the other, it is unquestionable that the growing reliance of coercive societies on enforcement executives makes for a repetition of the pattern which the SS exemplified.

It is precisely upon the individual character-structure of the SS that we need information. Kogon's section on their psychology is unfortunately not helpful about this. Some at least were normal personalities gradually acclimatised to brutality—their delinquent behaviour came from a culturally-determined obedience to orders. Others were drawn from all the known psychopathies. Particularly informative on the mental state of the policy-makers is the section on scientific research in the camps. In hundreds of

human experiments, not one single fact worth mentioning was obtained. Huge energy was devoted to the search for a quick means of sterilisation—even a research on exposure to cold, which would have been within the bounds of reasonable utility to men who treated their subjects with far less humanity than experimental animals, ended by assessing the results of sexual intercourse in reviving the frozen.

The obverse and equally important study, that of the psychology of the imprisoned, is matter for a longer review than can be written here. Kogon provides new facts from his own experience. Seen as a whole, the book is an important and probably a reliable contribution to the literature of concentration camps: it lacks the immediacy and economy of Ellis Lingsen-Reiner's classic,* but it has its own value. If we wonder whether our own society contains some or any of the seeds which germinated in the SS, we may perhaps reflect that this book, in any description of sexually-determined cruelty, will be bound to have a definite audience as pornography. Buchenwald undoubtedly exists, potentially, in the consciousness of a great many individuals who would pass muster as normal. Given certain social conditions, it can re-emerge as cold fact, whether as the open violence of the SS, or as the concealed equivalent which produced the atomic bomb and unlimited warfare.

ALEX COMFORT
* Prisoners of Fear.

Creating Delinquents

AUTHORITY AND DELINQUENCY IN THE MODERN STATE by Alex Comfort. (Routledge and Kegan Paul, 8/6)

THERE is an old and tried English saying, "Set a thief to catch a thief," and, although this dates from the days when the old Bow Street Runners were selected from the ranks of criminals because of their superior knowledge of the kind of people they would have to hunt, it has maintained a deserved longevity, and is hardly less applicable to present conditions. We have all detected in the bullying policeman the same psychological manifestations as those shown by the robber with violence, and seen in the deceptive politician the larger image of the confidence trickster. That there is a close connection between the wielding of authority and what is commonly called crime is something which has become evident to the mass of the people from the sheer pressure of experience.

In his most recent book, Authority and

Delinquency in the Modern State, Alex Comfort has sought to give psychological and sociological support to this point of view by demonstrating the motives which induce certain types of individuals to accept executive and legislative positions, and by tracing the pattern of anti-social delinquency which often inspires their behaviour. There has perhaps been too great a tendency in recent years to seek the explanations for conduct in psychological disorders, and to find in

the criminal an inner morbidity when explanation of his conduct is more readily to be discovered in a natural and human reaction against adverse circumstances. Similarly, while there is nothing manly or healthy about the way in which a policeman or the politician takes advantage of his office, it can also be attended with a great deal of reason, and in most cases it is the corrupting nature of power which creates the delinquent attitude. Nevertheless, it is true that among criminals and politicians there does exist a higher proportion of psychological abnormality than among the population as a whole, and Dr. Comfort's essay, with its emphasis on the criminal potentialities of the state itself, and its standing criminal and anti-social, is a stimulating sketch of a neglected field of sociology; it will be useful to the student and interesting to the general reader.

It is, however, hardly more than a sketch, either in proportions or depth. It contains scanty background information, and the author has made little attempt to illustrate his thesis with concrete examples, though the past quarter of a century has been rich in instances which might very profitably have been used without any need to fear the laws of libel. Nevertheless, even without drawing on any large mass of evidence, Comfort does make a convincing case for his thesis of the mutual independence of criminality and an abnormal, authoritarian society.

Equally important is the positive side of his book, in which he rejects those parts of anarchist doctrine which have reference to a past situation, and brings forward a conception of the revolutionary process as "experimental and tentative rather than dogmatic and Messianic". He envisages an attitude which retains all the fundamental aims of classic anarchism, but which rejects the Marxist and Blanquist excesses of the past century—in other words a revolution which "is not a single act of redress or vengeance followed by a golden age, but a continuous human activity whose objectives recede as it progresses".

To those who do not accept unreservedly some of Comfort's favourite ideas, such as the beneficial nature of the family, his proposals he make may nevertheless seem to represent an intelligent and sound summary of what can be done in present circumstances. Briefly, they are as follows:

- 1. Measures to increase public awareness of the state of society and of the result of research into social psychology.
- 2. Experiments in communal living and the control of resources, which have a demonstration value.
- 3. Pressure for decentralisation and workers' control.
- 4. Propaganda to introduce sociality into the family and the school.
- 5. Individual psychiatry, in which Comfort includes "the building of a morale based on negative resistance to bad institutions and positive determination to experiment in social living so that they can be superseded"; in this its turn he considers may involve propaganda and specific revolutionary activity.

Comfort's book is very largely a call to sociologists and other related scientists to realise in the full their social responsibilities, and, while we may not always share his respect for the experts, there is no doubt that in this, as in other respects, his plea is fulfilling a necessary function.

GERMINAL.

GEORGE WOODCOCK.

STALIN ON ANARCHISM

ANARCHISM OR SOCIALISM by J. Stalin. (Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 6d.)

DURING the years of 1905-8, in Czarist Russia, published a series of articles criticising the theories of the Social Democrats (Marxists) in their papers *Nobati* (The Call), *Musha* (The Worker), *Khima* (The Voice) and other journals. These criticisms provoked a reply in the contemporary Bolshevik papers of that area, which took the form of a counter series of articles written by a little-known political revolutionist known by the name of Koba, better-known to the modern world as Joseph Stalin. The first English translation of this reply has now been published with the title *Anarchism or Socialism*.

In this pamphlet, Stalin set out to:— "... compare Marxism with Anarchism, and thereby throw light on their respective virtues and defects" and "... explain the dialectical method, the Anarchists' view of this method, and our criticism; the materialist theory, the Anarchists' views and our criticism; the philosophy of the Anarchists' and our criticism; the Socialism of the Anarchists and our criticism; Anarchists' tactics and organisation."

Unfortunately, Stalin only deals with the Georgian Anarchists' criticisms of the Marxist dialectic, historical materialism, and the theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The sections which would be of the greatest interest to Anarchists, i.e., those dealing with the socialism, philosophy and tactics of Anarchism having been lost when the Czarist police raided his quarters in 1907. All we are left with is an unoriginal restatement of classical Marxist theories and a somewhat ham-handed "refutation" of a few isolated quotations from the Anarchist journals mentioned above. Not being in a position to obtain or, for that matter, if they were obtainable, to understand the articles in question, the present reviewer must pass over whether or not Stalin's "refutation" possesses any validity—except to remark that Stalin, with that usual myopia characteristic of the vulgar Marxist, ignores the fact that it is impossible to pin Anarchists down to one particular philosophical or sociological interpretation of events, since very often the sole "common denominator" we possess is our conviction that a really free society can exist in the absence of government of any kind.

One interesting feature about this fragment, however, is the way in which it illustrates the bankruptcy of the Bolshevik conception of the "dictatorship of the proletariat" as a way of attaining a free and equitable society. In reply to the Georgian Anarchists' criticism that:

"Collectivism, or more correctly, state capitalism, is based on the following principle: each must work as much as he likes, or as much as the state determines, and receives the value of his labour in the shape of goods" and that, consequently, "... there is needed an executive power, i.e., ministers, all sorts of administrators, gendarmes and spies, and, perhaps, also, troops, if there are too many discontented"

Milchako Tsereteli (Baton), *Nobati*, Stalin states: "... socialist society is a society in which there will be room for the so-called state, political power, with its

ministers, governors, gendarmes, police and soldiers. The last stage in the existence of the state will be the period of the socialist revolution when the proletariat will capture political power and set up its own government... for the final abolition of the bourgeoisie. But when the bourgeoisie is abolished, when classes are abolished, when Socialism becomes firmly established, there will be no need for any political power, and the so-called state will retire into the sphere of history" (p. 89).

"As you see, the above-mentioned 'accusation' of the Anarchists is mere title-tattle devoid of all foundation" (p. 89). [My italics.—Reviewer.]

Peculiarly enough, Article 4 of the "Constitution of the U.S.S.R." reads: "The economic foundation of the U.S.S.R. consists of the Socialist ownership of the implements and means of production, firmly established as a result of the liquidation of the capitalist system of economy, the abolition of the private ownership of the instruments and means of production and the abolition of the exploitation of man by man." [My italics.—Reviewer.]

Yet, in spite of Stalinist Russia fulfilling, according to its constitution, the conditions laid down by Stalin in 1906 for the retirement of the state into history, ministers, gendarmes, soldiers, and all the other paraphernalia of the "so-called state" still remain and, as Freedom pointed out recently, Stalin has lately proclaimed that the state will not "with away" in Russia (a statement which his old pal Tito has recently cashed in on with his decrees for the inauguration of "workers' control" Yugoslavia, as the first step towards the "withering away" of the state) and is, furthermore, to be strengthened. So much for the "title-tattle" of the Anarchists, which seemed to have some foundation, after all.

No doubt other contradictions could be pointed out, but they would serve little purpose, though we must feel flattered by these unexpected (and, I am quite sure, unconscious) compliments to the correctness of the Anarchists' prognosis, on the part of the most mighty and vile of contemporary dictators, we cannot help but feel that the publication of this work of his unsullied youth will hardly contribute to the continued existence of the Bolshevik myth among intelligent revolutionaries.

From our stock... George Orwell's Shooting an Elephant... B. Traven's The Death Ship... Alex Comfort's Authority and Delinquency in the Modern State... Theory and Practice of Hell... The 25th Hour... Unpopular Essays... Roads to Freedom... A Field of Broken Stones... 1001 Nights... The Air-Conditioned Nightmare... William Godwin... Don't forget to order your Penguin, Pelican, Thinker's Library and Everyman's Library books from Freedom Bookshop! FREEDOM BOOKSHOP 27 red lion st, london, W.C.1

Men of Destiny

STUDIES IN REVOLUTION
by E. H. Carr. (Macmillan, 9/6)

AS those who read their way with exasperated fascination through his life of Bakunin will admit, there is little that E. H. Carr writes which is uninteresting or completely unrewarding. As a voluminous scholar, as a caustic and evocative writer, he has few rivals among political commentators, and I, for one, find his power of debunking so great that I can rarely fail to be amused when I realise that he is poking fun at thinkers who should be treated with respect and exaggerating inconsistencies of all proportion to their real importance.

They were only a gadfly and a cynic, and his witty and persuasive books and articles could be read with profit as well as for there is no fundamentally unimpeachable authority that is not the better off for its pretences subjected to a certain amount of Voltairian fun. The aspect of Carr lies in the particular of Hegelianism which leads him to propagate the view that power is the essential force in international life, and that any moral factor is merely futile. Considerations of social morality do not impress him, and whether power is desirable or corrupt, whether it corrupts or does not, does not appear to interest him. Carr, therefore, says Carr; we have to take it, and therefore we should be glad if we did not make use of it and the right side of those who control it effectively.

His attitude runs in an implied and almost explicit thread through his most recent book, *Studies in Revolution*. This is a collection of essays which appeared originally as anonymous contributions in the *Times Literary Supplement*. It begins with a study of Saint-Simon, and goes through such nineteenth century names as Proudhon, Herzen, Lassalle, and nihilists, Plekhanov and Sorel, and ends with a number of studies of aspects of the Communist movement, including one each on Communism in Russia and Germany, one on Lenin and one on Stalin.

This book is a curious combination of historical scholarship and a totally unimpeachable opportunism in political outlook. Carr's view of socialist history is factually correct, but that of the majority of more orthodox writers. Unlike the orthodox socialist and Communist historians, he does not attempt in any way to suppress the importance of libertarian tendencies

in the Socialist movement. On the contrary, he emphasises the position of Godwin as an ancestor of the whole Socialist movement, and points out that up to the advent of Marx, and even after that time, Socialism was predominantly anti-state and libertarian. Nor does he minimise the influence of anarchist and gear-anarchist thought in the Russian revolutionary movement before the advent of the Bolsheviks.

Yet in his interpretation of this history, Carr emerges as a worshipper of naked power, and as such he is a fellow traveller whose praise is of an embarrassingly frank kind which the Communists themselves are hardly likely to relish. Virtually, what he says is that power is the basic factor of social life, whether we like it or not, and that these Communists are the boys who know how to wield it. Perhaps their methods have not been any too savoury; they are men of destiny in our age, and it behoves us to keep in with them. You will not find this opinion stated in so many words, but it is there nevertheless, as the underlying theme of all these essays.

And, indeed, if you take the political attitude towards society, Carr is as difficult to refute as Machiavelli was in his day. It is only if you realise that politics is only a perversion of sociality, and that the basic elements of human life are non-political, even, in their fully realised form, anti-political, that you will see how dependent the politician is on forces which, though he may control them temporarily, will ultimately go beyond his grasp and undermine the edifice of power he has constructed. The ruins of empires which clutter up the history of mankind are a sufficient comment on the ultimate value of power, from any point of view. Nevertheless, the exercise and worship of power are no less harmful because they are impermanent.

Carr, while he does give the anarchists their true importance in socialist history, pokes a great deal of fun at them precisely because they have not been the kind of political realists he admires. Yet what Carr does not say is that the anarchists, from Godwin onwards, have always declared that, in a world where political values are accepted as the determinant factors, the fruits of the struggle will always go to those who are most ruthless in the exercise of power. We, as well as Carr, recognise that Stalinism is not a perversion, but the logical conclusion of Marxist ideas. Where we differ is in our recognition that this progression, inevitable while social life is governed by a political attitude, is incapable of producing any constructive result; any result, indeed, other than a steady intensification of the processes of force at the expense of the organic processes of social growth.

GEORGE WOODCOCK.

The 38th Parallel

POWER politics has its ludicrous moments. The jockeying for a "correct" position over the 38th parallel provided such a one, when American (United Nations) troops paused at the frontier between North and South Korea in order, it was said, to await the directions of the United Nations. With this legalistic blessing they resumed their advance.

One wonders how much the man in the street is impressed by this respect for "law"? If the war in Korea can be made to have any moral justification at all, it can only be that a totalitarian régime (in the North) is overthrown, and the corrupt régime (of the South) replaced by something better. Such an aim is not incompatible with the fundamental power question—that of Korea as an American base on the mainland, which if in Russian hands constituted a grave threat to American Japan. It seems likely that the American administration will have absorbed the lessons of the South Korean collapse and institute some kind of land reform which will enable their kind of régime to hold both the North and the South. The expressed aim of free elections over the whole country may well give them the chance to drop Syngman Rhee and so get clear of the unsavoury aspects of his rule which have been given such prominent publicity.

None of these aims conflicts with an ideological gloss in the shape of an anti-totalitarian crusade. Yet the Anglo-American ruling class seems curiously unwilling to take up such a line. Even during the last war, Anthony Eden saw nothing wrong in his declaration to the effect that we had no quarrel with the German (Nazi) régime inside Germany; it was only when they began to export it that we became interested. For ordinary people who are concerned with right and wrong, and who instinctively react in a hostile manner to tyranny, such a position is hideously immoral. Yet it is the same attitude which informs the legalistic rectitude of the U.S.A. posing as dutiful U.N. member.

We have made our position on Korea plain. We are sickened by these wars between great powers fought on other peoples' territory, and largely with other peoples' lives. Vicarious wars, which provide the war offices with "valuable technical data", and the opportunity to experiment with new weapons and young lives. That is the basic aspect of Korea that we can never forget. Nevertheless, granted that Korea has fallen between the jaws of rival powers, we would not be human if we did not wish that some social progress may result, though only as a by-product.

The democratic powers utilize the man-in-the-street's desire for freedom, and paint an ideological gloss with it. One would respect them more if they paid as much attention to giving some slight reality to this gloss rather than striking pious attitudes of rectitude at the United Nations.

Trading With The Enemy

In past wars it has always—and not unnaturally—aroused great indignation when it has been found that "our boys" have often been killed with weapons made at home. That such should happen causes no surprise to those who look upon war with an objective eye. But it is very shocking to those bred on the history book tripe about just wars, defending right causes, and the rest.

After Hitler's rape of Czechoslovakia in the spring of 1939, it was perfectly clear that war was a likely event. Yet trade in war materials between Britain and Germany became increasingly brisk right up to September 3rd itself.

On September 23rd this year, the B.B.C. Home Service News declared that Russian exports to America had increased by two million dollars' worth in the last six months, and that the principal exports from Russia were furs, chrome and manganese. American exports to Russia had increased by one-and-a-half times.

Churchill has recently been complaining about the sale of "vital war material to Russia", and the government, not without a certain unwillingness, has agreed to hold all material necessary to the defence of Britain even if it means breaking trade agreements.

It appears that the great Czech armaments firm of Skoda have also been exporting arms to South Africa, even though the amounts involved are small.

Now, in *Freedom*, we have consistently pressed the view that war is an economic activity as market contracts and "normal" trade is tied up in various tortuous ways. Trading with the enemy therefore is quite a natural proceeding, as armaments manufacturers have always clearly seen. We, therefore, don't raise our hands in scandalized horror like those who support and glamourise war, but don't want to see its ugly side. We know that trading with the enemy doesn't even stop with the outbreak of war, for it is one of the functions of neutral countries to act as brokers between the contestants, as in the case of the submarine nets sold to Sweden during the last war.

Tortuous Thinking

What interests us now that the matter is being rather more openly ventilated is the extraordinarily tortuous thinking displayed. The main principle is clear enough. It is obviously outrageous to supply your enemy with the means to kill your sons, and perhaps, yourself, also. But the strange thing about our distracted civilization is that one doesn't accept obvious propositions. The manufacture and sale of armaments is obviously a much more immoral and destructive traffic than, say, the traffic in narcotic drugs, or prostitution. Yet the United Nations and the League of Nations busy themselves with these, but not with armaments. Bernard Shaw, who is one of the ablest apologists for a twisted civilization, also defended armaments manufacturers in the character of Undershaft in *Major Barbara*.

Shaw is to be commended for his honesty. Most "realists" are content to support detestable causes without admitting it, and make use of the most ludicrous circumlocutions to justify themselves. Here is the *Times Educational (sic) Supplement* for 22/9/50: "the member who said it would be a scandal if a single British soldier were killed by a weapon made out of materials exported by Britain summed-up most people's first reaction. It is, however, a fallacy to suggest that anyone who makes or authorizes the export of potential war materials must be held responsible for the purposes for which they are used. Moral responsibility only enters when the manufacturer or the government department authorizing export could have foreseen the use to which the material would be put. Even then it has to be proved that the disadvantages of introducing political discrimination into peace-time commerce are less than the disadvantages of slightly increasing the war potential of a probable enemy. The question is really one of expediency, not morals."

Such arguments require little comment, and we will confine ourselves to pointing out that the light-hearted irresponsibility which the writer permits to the governments would never be tolerated in an engineer charged with building a bridge, or a physician treating a patient. Governments, it seems are immune from professional responsibility.

A Touchstone

Such arguments may, however, be used as a kind of touchstone. On the one hand are people (regrettably, a minority) who think so simply that they think wars are bad, that one should not even then trade with the enemy; who think that the homeless should be housed, the sick attended to, and the hungry fed. Who think, moreover, that it is not beyond the organizing capacity of man to arrange that where there is plenty, goods should be transported to where there is scarcity or famine even. The more radical among these people think it unnatural that the needs of everyone for love and for sexual happiness should be obstructed.

On the other hand are those who, when confronted with simple, self-evident propositions, react by a slight shrinking away, and then by arguments of the "Yes, but..." type. These are the practical folk. Their practical hard-headedness acts as a cushion between simple indignation and getting things done; and it preserves the world for us as it is, instead of as it ought to be. Their practical arguments dissipate the power of thought and prevent it being transformed into action. Be on your guard against them.

J.H.

INDIA

THE latest issue of *Libertarian Socialist* (formerly *Indian Sociologist*) has been received from Bombay. It is produced by the Libertarian Institute, and contains the reprint of a well-known article on Anarchism by Emma Goldman.

As announced in *Freedom* (5th August) the project for an English-language Asiatic review in Lucknow is going ahead, and preliminary announcements will soon be ready. Comrades here and abroad are asked to send articles and translations for reproduction and also original material (including stories and poems). Please note that the correct address is:—

D. N. Wanchoo, 21 Radice Road, Lucknow, U.P., India (not 12 as incorrectly stated previously).

SONG-STRUCK

Fifty girl workers in a bakery who went on strike because they were not allowed to sing while at work returned to their jobs yesterday.

A compromise had been reached: They were told that humming was permissible. Singing was, too, provided it was "soft and low".

Daily Mirror, 4/10/50.

Through the Press

LIBERATED SEOUL

This is what happens to humanity when it is liberated twice within three months. When humanity get given "the works" in mid-twentieth century style, it passes around tragedy. Its old ones caper round the crazy goats, its young ones put out those crazy flags in a confused desire to dance, its crazy infants surrender in advance, and its spokesmen utter their mad crazy verdict: "Sank you!" Each, being interpreted, means that humanity, with the best will in the world, can stand no more liberations like this. —Caption to Korean photograph in *Picture Post*, 7/10/50.

LIBERTARIAN ?

Allow me, as a member of the Labour Party, to support your leading article on "Party Manners". A genuine libertarian will avoid like the plague not only the smallest interference with liberty of expression, but anything that might conceivably look like it.

—Letter from Victor Gollancz in *News Chronicle*, 5/10/50.

Yes, but does the Labour Party consist of "genuine libertarians"?

WASTAGE

A colleague who has been investigating the conscription business says that rather more than half of the 292,000 18-year-olds who are registering this year will not be called up. A tenth of them will be scrubbed-out as medically unfit; of the rest 70,000 will be deferred as apprentices in the engineering, metal and shipbuilding industries. The builders' unions alone account for 23,000. Another 32,000 will claim exemption through agriculture, coal mining or the merchant navy. There are also expected to be about 8,000 students, 3,000 conscientious objectors or hardship cases, and 12,000 more fall into an un-fortunate category known as "wastage" which includes, without irony one hopes, the sick, the dead, and the volunteers for regular services.

Public Opinion, 29/9/50. Aren't the other half "wastage", too?

OPTIMISM

In 16 months, Holborn Council have been unable to build a single flat, house or maisonette.

At the present rate, the borough's housing programme would take 300 years to complete.

Star, 22/9/50.

"Workers' Control" in Yugoslavia

★ Continued from Page One

him just as long to denounce violently such a scheme if it were introduced tomorrow in one of the Cominform countries.

What he and others forget to mention is that during the partisan war, when it was necessary to win the support of the population and of the West, Tito explicitly promised to respect private property. When in power, everything in the towns, including lemonade kiosks, was put under State ownership. Nearly a hundred new ministries were created and run by Tito's "experts": the oil industry by a mathematics mistress, forestry by a University professor of history, trade by a former student of medicine, and housing by an ex-priest! When "decentralisation" was decreed by the Marshal, eager to stress the differences between the structure of the U.S.S.R. and Yugoslavia, many ministries were abolished and replaced by "Economic Councils" with the former ministers (unless purged as Cominform agents) acting usually as chairmen of these

councils and thus remaining in full control.

While after the war factories and mines became State property, the workers were repeatedly encouraged and later forced to speed-up production. The small minority who did so were proclaimed shock-workers, received much higher pay, better food, clothing and shelter, in many cases joined the C.P. and were allowed to share with Marshal Tito all sorts of medals, including that of "Hero of Socialist Work". Their eagerness to act as stooges of the régime to whose secret police they even denounced their mates, made them very unpopular among their fellow-workers who in spite of the long hours of work, paid and "voluntary", found their already low standard of living falling amid challenges for new "Socialist Competitions" and propaganda about "the dignity of labour in a Socialist State".

When, following the steps of Salazar, Franco and Mussolini in Northern Italy (1943-1945), who all had "syndicalist" legislation inscribed in the statute books

of their dictatorships, Tito announced his latest pet scheme (and it is anybody's guess what he will produce next year as long as he thinks it will help him), it was naturally the shock-workers and, as old State directors of factories who, as the most reliable elements repeatedly got "elected" to the works councils and immediately sent telegrams thanking the Marshal for his "brilliant idea" and promising, as in the past, to increase production. The bulk of the workers, as in the past, to increase production. The bulk of the workers, on the other hand, continued to use their old weapons: absenteeism to an extent unparalleled in Western Europe, "go slow", and in more extreme cases sabotage. They, unlike the foreign visitors and the press liars, see the farce of "workers' control" in a society held together by a brutal secret police, C.P. and army, who unfortunately not only show no signs of withering away but sentenced to death only last August a worker for stealing in an engineering factory which he, too, was supposed to "control".

I.A.

FREEDOM PRESS

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

★
27, Red Lion Street, London, W.C.1.

Up the Garden Path

In the last issue of Freedom, we published a long letter by Gladys Bing entitled "Social Credit Path to Anarchism?" which we promised to answer in this issue. Our reply follows:

It is a source of some sadness to the producers of Freedom to reflect, as we often do, that quite a considerable minority of our readers are not primarily interested in Anarchism, but find the paper in order to try and read excuses to write to us on the pet subjects in which they are interested.

Now, the purpose of Freedom's existence is to propound Anarchism, both in "pure" and "applied", in articles on other subjects or comment on topical events from the Anarchist point of view. Our space is limited, and although we have pleased to open our columns to as wide a range of opinion and interest as possible, it is both impossible and undesirable that we publish all the letters we receive on subject like Christian Science, Nature or the Occult, Save the Children Fund, Anti-Vivisection, Hymns for Prisoners, Flying Saucers, Catholicism, Kissing, and Social Credit.

The particular bee in Mrs. Bing's bonnet is the last named, and it is painfully obvious that she buys Freedom merely to look for an opportunity to bang us in a letter on Social Credit. She has bought Freedom for some years, apparently, and yet it is clear that she just hasn't the foggiest notion of what Anarchism is all about. This may be our fault, and if all the other readers of our long standing as Mrs. Bing remained as ignorant of the subject as she, we would indeed feel we had fallen down on the job. But they don't, and many new readers, after reading only a few issues, grasp enough of the matter to want to know more, and they invest in some or all of the many pamphlets through which we try to back up the introductory work of Freedom.

But not so Mrs. Bing, for her mind is enclosed within the Social Credit Theory to such an extent that she cannot assimilate anything that goes beyond it, but can only resort to the extent of saying that anarchists have little understanding of their own philosophy, let alone anyone else's. But in saying that we proclaim "the beauty and joy of the uttermost brotherly love", we can only assume that Mrs. Bing's sarcasm is running away with her.

We do not proclaim the uttermost brotherly love, for the simple reason we don't feel it. There are a hell of a lot of people we don't love—don't even like—but we have no wish to rule them or be ruled by them and shall be quite content to let them go their way as we go ours. We do propagate solidarity and mutual aid, but for the reason that the only way that an oppressive society can be overthrown is through the solidarity of the oppressed—who are most likely to be the ones wanting to overthrow it—and

an ink-pot". We rather gasped then to see that "under Social Credit the ink-pot would be nationalised"! And that all we would have to do to build houses, for example, would be to tell our "local banker" to phone Cripps and order him to credit [us] with whatever figure is written on a cheque" to supply the money we need to buy the tackle. And the collateral security would be what it now is!

Now, if all this isn't combining the vices of nationalisation and money-created-out-of-an-inkpot, we just can't see from Mrs. Bing's argument what else it is. She accuses us of being vague, but when she tells us that this sort of jiggery-pokery is going to supersede the wage system by incomes earned under workers' own control (when Cripps is sitting on the nationalised inkpot), we can only ask—"Aren't you really a little mixed up?"

Let us state the Anarchist case on money, briefly, as space is running out, and simply, so that Mrs. Bing will not misunderstand.

The money system is no good—and it cannot be made good by pretending that its character can be altered. As long as there is money there must be someone to manipulate it and someone else to do the office work and other useless toil it necessitates. As long as money exists, everyone's needs are measured by it—we are rationed by the pay-package—or else it becomes meaningless and can be abolished. And that is the Anarchist answer—abolish money and let the local banker and Cripps get out on the building site and so some useful work for a change. The Social Creditors know that wealth and money are not the same thing—let us so organise the production and use of the first by balancing them with our needs, distributing freely to all so that

WHEN Marx says, "Will you marry me? How much money have you got?—Answer the second question first!" I know I am being presented with some pretty fundamental economic reasoning.

Before our Marxist critics start getting apologetic, perhaps I should point out that it is Groucho, not Karl, who has the property relationship inherent in bourgeois marriage so nicely weighed up.

In "Duck Soup", the Marx Brothers (Groucho, Chico and Harpo) romp their way through the most hilarious satire on government, militarism, espionage, official pomposity, nationalism, patriotism, war and jobs for the boys, that we are likely to see on the screen for many a long day. It is not merely, as has been said, a skit on dictators, but an attack with the damaging weapons of ridicule upon all the above features of every modern State.

With his job bought at the price of a \$20,000,000 loan by the wealthy Mrs. Teesdale, Groucho, as Rufus T. Firefly, becomes Leader of the State of Freedonia. Chico, spy for a foreign power, masquerading as a peanut seller outside Firefly's

palace, is offered the job of Minister of War. Harpo, also a spy, becomes... but what's the use of describing it? This is vintage Marx Brothers, and for those of us who have bonds of sympathy for their contempt for respectability and uninhibited attacks on pomposity and coat-tails, this film is one of the classics.

Although "Duck Soup" contains at least two scenes of unsurpassed clowning, it's not just funny stuff and that's all. In all their films, the Marx Brothers portray with complete abandon the rebellion we all have against stifled-shirt law and order. "Duck Soup" penetrating insight is betrayed also, as in a large-scale musical scene and the idioms of the Hollywood extravaganza and the revivalist meeting to convey impression of war hysteria.

And during the battle scene, Groucho expresses what is probably in the mind of every war-leader, when, having told Harpo to face fire and shot to let us, he says: "You go out there and let us, and we'll stay here and think of a sucker you are!"

In olden times, only the Czar could speak plain truths to the people. Today, we have the Marx Brothers.

"Duck Soup" is showing with film "Flesh Will Surrender" at the Cinema, London, and also in a series of Marx Bros. films at Everyman, Hampstead, London. There is a real all the old Marx Bros. films in the moment (The Academy, Oxford are also showing some), and producers are advised to make special arrangements at any local cinemas not bound to three circuits to get showings of "Duck Soup" is a must for Anarchists.

CONTROVERSY

that we can all get the best out of life by mutual aid and not by competition. These are practical reasons and nothing to do with brotherly love.

Mrs. Bing refers to "curious experiments in workers' control and isolation in remote villages" being either ridiculous or tragic failures. The tragic failure of the Spanish revolution (as one example) was not due to any lack of understanding of the money machine, as she glibly claims, but to a whole series of complex reasons varying from political intrigue within the anti-Franco forces, to the bombing planes of Hitler and Mussolini and the apathy of the peoples outside Spain.

We agree that "workers' control without responsibility to the community is a myth". Anarchists never advocate it, so why write as though we do? We agree with her attitude towards the "State Boards of bankers' stooges," the "totalitarian nightmare" of Fabian socialism, and the various arguments against the "creation by banks of cheque-money out

all may give freely to the community of their capabilities, and the social prostitution inseparable from the money and wages systems will be ended for ever.

The Social Creditors, of course, are not against either private property or the profit motive. They obviously have no ethical (or economic!) arguments against the worker/boss set-up. What they are probably opposed to most in Anarchism is the fact that Anarchy would do them out of a job. If there is no money—how can they work their theory!

NEUROSIS AND SOCIETY

RECENT work in psychiatric theory, especially that of Wilhelm Reich, seems to have raised issues, as regards both the characterisation and treatment of neurosis, the controversial implications of which are not yet fully recognised. The first question raised is as to the degree of objectivity or universality which the concept of neurosis shall be held to connote. The relevance to the determination of this question of comparative social study and in particular of ethnographic material is perhaps less apparent to psychologists than to anthropologists, who have done a good service by pointing out (e.g., Ruth Benedict in *Patterns of Culture*: Routledge, 1935) that behaviour traits, together with affective and conative dispositions, which are commonly called "neurotic" in any given society—pacifist convictions, for instance, or homosexual tendencies—are so not absolutely, but merely in virtue of their incompatibility with accepted social norms or moral and religious principles. The practical implications of the view that the normality of behaviour traits is not definable in naturalistic terms but only by the criterion of social valuation are obvious, and it will follow that a satisfactory definition of neurosis must take into account this relativity. Such a definition may perhaps be arrived at if we say that a neurotic condition is constituted not by the mere occurrence of statistically or culturally abnormal behaviour traits in themselves, but by a certain type of reaction (e.g., "persecution mania") to social disapproval of such traits.

THE WILL TO POWER

Acceptance of such formulation as this is not, however, a matter of academic interest only. It may entail important modifications in theory as to the origin of or necessary conditions for neurosis, and thus in turn have repercussions on the methods and aims of treatment. The basic tenet of the Adlerian school and its point of departure from Freud, that neurosis is set up by frustration not of infant sexuality, but of a will to power,

may illustrate this. Whether or not Adler intended his concept to be of universal application, it must appear to a social anthropologist that it cannot be made the basis of a plausible explanation of a neurosis occurring in a society in which the pursuit of power is not valued or made a criterion of "normality". This is not, however, to say that his hypothesis

READERS' OPINION

may not be all the more successful when applied to a society, like our own, in which competition or "emulation" is normal. A similar but more flexible theory is that of Karen Horney, who, in *The Neurotic Personality of our Time*, maintains that in many cases neurosis may be precipitated as a reaction to an "objective" conflict: "objective", that is, within the bounds of the contemporary stage of the culture to which the sufferer belongs.

"LIBERATION" OR "INTEGRATION"

In the light of this examination of the content of neurosis it may now be possible to see what, if I do not oversimplify it, is the impending issue with regard to the aims and methods of treatment of psychological disorders. There is, I believe, a sharp opposition between two sorts of aim, which I would call respectively "liberation" and "integration". Liberation of the impulses, and in particular of the sexual drive, as the aim of psychoanalytic treatment seems especially to be the doctrine of Reich, though having plainly Freudian antecedents. I do not associate the ideal of integration or "rational sublimation" with any one name, though it is not difficult to see that the method it pre-supposes, what might almost be called "socio-therapy", is consonant with Marxian social theory, as well as being halloved by boy-scout tradition. But, while acknowledging the rôle which this ideal

might have in schemes of political or industrial regimentation, it is fair to add that "integration" describes also the numerous amateur resolutions of conflict achieved by all of us in the interest of social harmony.

The distinction between aim and method in treatment is indicated by the criticism which is frequently made by anarchists and others of Freud, that he neutralised the benefit conferred by him on mankind by his pioneer work in the method of analysis in advocating some sort of voluntary, conscious "re-inhibition" of the drives unleashed by analysis, out of deference to bourgeois standards of morality. It appears, therefore, that the value of a psychotherapeutic technique, although in a sense determined by purely scientific criteria, will in fact be judged by its efficacy in producing what the practitioner considers desirable by ethical or political criteria. This is the point at which speaking of "psychiatric methods of healing" and, in fact, the whole medical analogy, may become very misleading. For the physician, although some organic diseases, such as epilepsy, leprosy, silicosis or syphilis, have a peculiar social significance, the aim of treatment is fairly well defined in naturalistic terms. But the psychiatrist has in many cases to be moralist as well as technician: he has to weigh the claims of an individual against those of society. It is not entirely surprising, therefore, if he concludes, as Reich and others have done, that a case of neurosis implies a defect in society rather than in the individual, in the "healthy" rather than in the "sick". Analysis, on this view, is a process analogous less to healing than to conversion: or it may be said that the relationship of doctor and patient is replaced by that of fellow-revolutionaries.

IS "CIVILISATION" WORTH ITS RESULTS?

"Liberation", as thus outlined, is, as I suggested, plainly the very reverse of "integration" and is distasteful to many as an ideal of treatment on that account.

In reply to this charge, however, "liberation" school might claim, does seek to apply "socio-therapy" not to individuals but to society, as long as the "objective" conflicts with Karen Horney continue to exist. The radical elimination of at least some of neurosis will be impossible, however, that this theory of neurosis lends strong support to the demand for a transformation of social structure—"moors", what sort of society is to be as resulting from this change. "Liberation" school, applying Freud's theory while lacking his preferences, seems to make something of the prime postulate of its new school to look to support from the anthropological field in particular for the association with the reality of sexual freedom correlated not only absence of neurosis but also the positive constituent of more rational type of society to which we are accustomed. I do not by suggesting (I lack the details to be able requisite to do more than to say that, insofar as savage peoples are liable to neurosis than "civilised" may be due less to their freedom of sexual inhibition than to the degree of conformity to social norms played by them, and that it remains to be disproved Freud's assertion about correlation of civilisation and neurosis, conceding that, to persuade us that the former is not worth the latter.

MARCUS WHEELER

PRESS FUND

- Sept. 23rd to Oct. 6th: Newark, N.J.: per O.M. £16/16/0; Nymn 7/-; A. Mezzo Uno £3/10/0; Angeles Picnic £7; A. Carbone 14/-; Bonfante £5/5/0; Strafford-on-Avon: C. 1/6; Stirling: R.A.B.* 10/-; Anon. 2/-; London: M.C.* 2/6; London: J.B.P.* 2/-; Cambridge: C.L.D.* 10/-; Glasgow: M.C.* 4/-; London: L.G.W.* 5/-; Bolton: R.T.S. 2/-; York: H.A.A.* 9/6; Edinburgh: B.G.* 5/-; London: F.E.D.* 5/-; London: Anon. 2/3.

Total ... £19 17 6
Previously acknowledged ... £193 9 5
1950 TOTAL TO DATE ... £213 6 11

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

FROM PAGE ONE

Is Korea a New Spain?

we show that we are not afraid to stand up to her." The success of the United Nations in Korea is hailed with great enthusiasm by those who take this view, not unaturally.

In Freedom we have consistently advanced the view that wars are not caused by ideological rivalries (as Churchill and the lefties claim) but are necessary to the continuance of the system of market economy called capitalism. Unhappily, time will almost certainly show that this view is the more correct one, even if the democracies "stand up" to Russia with the same determination elsewhere as they have shown in Korea.

WHERE THE REAL STRUGGLE LIES

The importance of this question of Korea and Spain lies in this: that for simple anti-appearance the main question is being stronger than Russia. If this is the main consideration, all other

problems are secondary—and such secondary problems include the defence of civil liberty, the struggle for better living conditions, against the encroachments of the militarized State. In short, the secondary considerations include even the struggle to extend the difference between the democratic State and the fully developed totalitarian tyranny exemplified by Russia.

For anarchists, the main problem is elsewhere. War is not merely an evil in itself—it is that for everyone who is sane; it is also a process which is ineffectual to stem tyranny, but rather advances the spread of totalitarian patterns. Moreover, we see the mentality of war acceptance and war preparedness as being a precursor of the totalitarian mentality. Since we see this mentality, already frankly entrenched not only in frankly totalitarian régimes but also in our own country and America, acceptance of war only

hastens the advance of the very thing which the honest left wing or progressive war acceptors seek to prevent.

For us therefore the real struggle is against the principles for which Russia stands as a symbol, but which are by no means confined to the Iron Curtain. For this struggle to be effective it must be absolutely thoroughgoing, and must seek completely to transform the thought and outlook of society. To do so it must not simply react against totalitarian trends in their separate manifestations, but must have a positive outlook on life and towards the living, outlook on life and towards the living, outlook is very much wider. Such an alive forces in human society. That that outlook is very much wider, than that of the democratic war acceptors like Koestler and his proposed "Legion of Liberty"; but it is more difficult to explain, to reduce to slogans, to "get across". Nevertheless, it is possible that such a viewpoint is more acceptable to peace hungry people than might appear at first sight.

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) October 15th Speaker: Philip Sansom "CONSTRUCTIVE ANARCHY" October 22nd Speaker: Digean "SOUTH AFRICA—AN EXAMPLE OF THE POLITICAL RACKET" October 29th Speaker: Jack Reubens "TOTALITARIAN TRENDS IN SOCIETY TO-DAY" ALL WELCOME ADMISSION FREE FULL DISCUSSION OPEN-AIR MEETINGS Every Sunday at 3.30 at Regent's Park (near Zoo South Entrance) Speakers: Albert Meltzer, S. E. Parker, Jack Rubin, Philip Sansom

GLASGOW ANARCHIST GROUP

INDOOR MEETINGS EVERY SUNDAY AT 7 p.m. at the CENTRAL HALLS, 25 Bath Street, with Frank Leach, John Gaffney, Eddie Shaw, J. Raeside

COLNE & NELSON DISTRICT

Discussion Group held fortnightly. October 15th, at 2.30 p.m. "PROPAGANDA" OCT. 29th "DELINQUENCY" at Twisters and Drawers Club, Cambridge Street, Colne (Lancs.)

NORTH-EAST LONDON GROUP

Discussion Meetings Fortnightly 7.30 p.m. Enquiries c/o Freedom Press OCT. 17th Ted Mann "ANARCHISM AND EDUCATION" OCT. 31st Irene Priddy "THE INSUFFICIENCY OF PACIFISM"

FREEDOM
Anarchist Fortnightly
Price 3d.
Postal Subscription Rates
6 months 4/6 (U.S.A. \$1).
12 months 8/6 (U.S.A. \$2).
Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies
6 months 7/6 (U.S.A. \$1.50).
12 months 15/- (\$3).
Cheques, P.O.'s and Money Orders should be made out to FREEDOM PRESS, crossed a/c Please, and addressed to the publishers.
FREEDOM PRESS
27 Red Lion Street
London, W.C.1 England
Tel: Chancery 8364.