

OUTLOOK FOR 1952:

A Military World

Churchill's visit to President Truman might almost be a symbolism of our world in the mid-twentieth century. Every part of this trip reflects the leading motifs of our age and social structure. There is the pre-eminence accorded to military discussion: interdependence of two great powers which are yet commercial and political rivals: the increasing concentration of power in the world which is regarded as a salutary trend towards world government: the direction of affairs in the hands of the heads of States, and the complimentary attitude on the part of populations towards these father-figures, with all its psychological immaturity which it implies. A symbol and a cosm.

As well as treating the larger issues, we who live in the twentieth century industrial world cannot disregard the questions of the immediate present, and we must therefore glance at Mr. Churchill's journey in more detail.

Military Questions

In his Christmas speech of foreign policy, Churchill said that he did not think war was likely. The British Government did not want a Truman-Churchill agenda published, but the U.S. State Department has nevertheless done this and has revealed that every item is connected up with the preparation for the event (of) war. The agenda is given as follows:

- (1) The future of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation.
- (2) The nature and personnel of the command of the military organisations involved.
- (3) The question of weapons and the problem of sharing atomic secrets between the U.K. and the U.S.
- (4) Policy in the Far East in the event of a Korean truce.
- (5) Persia, oil and the world bank.
- (6) American Aid, now to be seen in the light of European re-armament.
- (7) Raw materials, especially steel, coal and tin.

It will be seen that every one of these refers to questions of military significance. The practical commentators declare that the British Government party is fully briefed to discuss details in special committees—that is, something more active and practical than mere declarations upon general principles.

It is said that the British Government will press their "right" to influence American policies towards Russia "in view of the risk incurred by the grant of East Anglian bomber bases". The British seek to secure a British com-

mander in the Middle East in return for conceding American naval command in the North Atlantic. Obviously, the protection of British assets and imperial communications in the Middle East is aimed at.

No comment need be made on the question of atomic secrecy and sharing, but the question of weapons is expected to be detailed enough to involve a debate on the disputed merits of British and American rifles.

The question of the Far East is clearly one of finding a working arrangement despite the clash of imperial interests in this part of the world.

On Persia it is said that if Mr. Moussadek's government makes it difficult for the World Bank to operate the oil industry it "should no longer be propped up (by America) as a barrier against Communism". This is clear admission that the Persian dispute covers a struggle between Britain and America for control of Persian oil, with the Persian Government as a mere puppet.

Little need be said on the question of American aid. But as to raw materials, the steel shortage is likely to be stressed by the British, while the Americans may press for a reduction in the price of Malayan tin. Paradoxically, if the British make a concession to free enterprise America here, it will be in the direction of controlling prices by governmental action—a thoroughly Fabian socialistic manoeuvre!

American Dependence on Britain

A curious aspect of the Truman-Churchill meeting is its domestic political repercussions. These are almost nil in this country. The Conservative Government has little to gain or lose

by the discussions from the point of view of their popularity and standing at home. But it seems that the Truman administration hopes to receive some reflected glory from Churchill's war-glamour in the U.S., and also to deflect attention from the administrative corruption scandals. For Truman, therefore, the visit is also an aspect of election policy and the struggle with the Republicans. Doubtless this is why the State Department disregarded the British desire for non-publication of an agenda.

"Co-operation at a High Level"

Finally, there is the matter of how affairs should be governed. There is little use lamenting that 1952 should start off with military discussions. FREEDOM has repeatedly stressed the fact that war and war preparation are not merely by-products of national rivalry, but also occupy an institutional position in the maintenance of market economy. These things will not be changed by lamentations but only by social and economic re-organisation of a depth and radical character that is called revolutionary.

But we may still with advantage draw attention to the high light which these "high level discussions" throw on the disposition of initiative in our society. While decisions are clearly expected to be made at these meetings it becomes even clearer that such "high level discussion" can only rest on low-level inertia and lack of responsible control of decisions. We do not, as anarchists, press democratic criticisms, but the free hand allowed to the British delegation is indicated by the *Observer's* remark that "the Cabinet has approved the briefs, but has not hampered the Prime Minister with many policy decisions".

The Press, meanwhile, plays up the relief which the man in the street is said to feel at this get-together of the heads of States. If this relief is felt indeed it indicates the dependence of attitude of ruled on their rulers, which makes the oft-remarked "father-figure" analogy a very real feeling. "Our daddies will talk it over, so we can go on playing with our toys". This is not the place to discuss the psychological implications of all this any further, than to say that any kind of real control by the populations of their alleged democracies is negated by such psychological infantilism.

Unemployment in Textile Industry

A "new respect" among clothing workers is coming into evidence as more go on to short time or out of work, said a Manchester manufacturer to-day. —Manchester Evening Chronicle, 15/11/51.

UNEMPLOYMENT is rapidly growing in the cotton trade. The woollen textile towns in the West Riding of Yorkshire reported 3,600 unemployed in December, against 900 a year ago. Fifteen thousand workers in the mills are on short time—6,000 of them in Leeds, according to the Tailors' and Garment Workers' Union. In the Lancashire cotton towns extended Christmas "holidays" were given in an attempt to restrict output. The *Manchester Guardian* reported on December 28th that, "Within a week of enjoying their most affluent Christmas for years, twelve thousand Burnley weavers will be taking home unemployment benefit instead of wage packets... the temporary unemployment caused by the stoppages is higher even than in the worst of the 1930's. The Burnley office of the Ministry of Labour has not enough staff to cope with the payment of unemployment benefits." The boot and shoe trade and the hosiery industry are also affected. In the latter there are 3,000 unemployed against 600 a year ago. Makers of industrial overalls say that "Many firms are kept going only by Government orders."

Throughout the country, there are about 23,000 registered unemployed in the tailoring trades, or just over 13,000 more than at the end of September. The *Observer's* industrial correspondent says, "It is believed that even these figures do not show the true situation, because many of the women do not register. About 80 per cent. of the workers in the industry are women. Moreover, no account is taken of the number of workers on short time and this is said to be considerable. In normal times, this is a period of full employment and overtime working. There is a seasonal falling off in employment after Christmas. The number without work is expected to rise in January."

In the East London boroughs of Stepney and Hackney, Bethnal Green, Shoreditch and Finsbury queues are growing outside the labour exchanges. Of the 12,000 members of the London mantle and costume branch of the National Union of Tailors and Garment Workers, 4,000 are unemployed and 6,000 are on short time. *Reynolds News* reported last Sunday that, "In London

there are some clothing firms with staffs ranging from half a dozen to 30 or 40, who make up goods at the order of the manufacturers. At this moment 400 of them are totally unemployed and another 200 are on short time.

"Prices are being cut to a point where the job is simply not worth undertaking, and the little sweat shops, where families and unorganised workers turn out goods on cut wages and long hours, are becoming a menace to the whole industry."

The furniture trade in East London is also affected, and a spokesman of the National Union of Furniture Trade Operatives said that unemployment was "terrific" throughout the country. Other industries, particularly those using such metals as steel, copper and zinc are meeting a similar crisis through lack of raw materials.

The clothing trade depression is symptomatic. It does not mean that we are all well-clothed. It means that in this country we cannot afford to buy, and that the overseas markets that the fallacious economics of the export drive are aimed at, are also unable to buy, or else prefer to satisfy their needs themselves. What is the remedy? The Tailors' and Garment Workers' Union in a statement issued to M.P.'s suggested that "the Government should speed up the issue of contracts for clothing under the defence programme." This is the classical solution to a capitalist crisis—war.

The economic correspondent of the *Sunday Times*, Mr. George Schwartz, a cheerful reactionary, declared last Sunday: "According to the Keynesian doctrine, we should have had public works in the 30's to deal with the depression. The author of that doctrine would, if he were alive, I am sure agree that we now have to have a depression to deal with the public works, namely rearmaments. In the 30's public works were required to take up the slack. We now have to create the slack to take up the public works."

While waiting in the queue outside the Labour Exchanges the workers may speculate whether it is slumps which cause war preparations which cause wars, or whether it is war preparations which cause slumps which cause wars, but they would be more profitably employed in hastening the end of the economic system in which they are caught. But there is little sign of this. What a pity it is, that we always have to learn the hard way!

African Imperialism and Trust Territories

AT the meeting of the United Nations Trusteeship Committee in Paris last month, representatives of the Ewe tribe in British and French Togoland (which are trust territories of the United Nations) accused the British and French Governments of preventing their unification by "force and oppression". The Ewe tribe number 300,000 in the Gold Coast, 140,000 in British Togoland, and 300,000 in French Togoland.

The representatives of the All-Ewe Conference, the Joint Togoland Congress, and the Comité de l'Unité Togolaise, declared that by dividing the country into two, the British and French had broken natural economic ties, and that their own efforts at economic development were "constantly suppressed to serve the interests of colonial British and French firms."

Dr. Martin Aku said that the Ewe problem had been falsely isolated and that concealed beneath the demand for unification lay the desire of "all Togoland" for self-government and a desire to be rid of those who "brought this European plague upon us."

The British representative told the Committee that the British and French Governments proposed to set up a Joint Popular Council for Togoland, "to advise the Administration on matters of common concern to the people of the two territories."

The Ewe spokesman said that they had had no previous knowledge of this proposal and consequently could not comment on it.

The Herero Tribe

AS was expected (see FREEDOM, 1/12/51) the Herero chiefs from South-West Africa were prevented by the South African Government from stating their case to the Trusteeship Committee. The Rev. Michael Scott, telling the Committee that the Union

had made it "physically impossible" for the chiefs to leave the area. Mr. Scott declined to speak instead of the Negro tribesman but pointed out that there were 15,000 Herero refugees from South-West Africa in the British Protectorate of Bechuanaland who might be invited instead to send representatives to plead the tribal case. He reminded the Committee that these people "have lived in appalling conditions ever since the massacres at the time of the German conquest. Their traditional lands were never restored to them, and the Hereros, for example, are still artificially and arbitrarily divided into eight different reserves which they are not allowed to

leave without passes. There is shocking lack of even the most rudimentary social services. There are no hospitals in the reserves, and the tribes suffer from all sorts of discriminatory legislation. As long as the South African Government continues to rule supreme, the tribes have no hope of redress or reform. On the contrary, as in the Union itself, the bad conditions of the African people go from bad to worse. But South-West Africa is not part of the Union. The Union Government administers the territory under a mandate from the former League of Nations. Since the League's demise South Africa has treated the territory as its own private concern for which it is

Technical Aid for Yugoslavia

NOT only is Tito to be given military aid by the Western Powers, but industrial and technical knowledge is also to be put at his disposal.

The I.L.O.—the International Labour Organisation—has drawn up a scheme to make scholarships available in Britain and America for Yugoslavs to study latest technical processes and developments.

They will stay for about a year, on grants allowed by the I.L.O., and will then return to help make Tito's paradise a more efficient one, armed with the British and American "know-how".

The international circulation of knowledge—scientific, social, or technical—is, of course, something which Anarchists have always advocated. But this scheme to strengthen Tito has no social significance—only political. Anarchists are internationalists. The Western Powers are nationalistic, trying to make use of another nationalistic power. America and Britain are not interested in the free

circulation of knowledge, however much the peoples of the world would benefit from it; they are interested in strengthening an ally.

That this can be a dangerous game is a risk which apparently the West is prepared to take. Hitler was helped to power by British capital; Stalin was supplied with materials and information during and just after the war—was, for example, given Rolls Royce aircraft engines, and similar models are now being used against British forces in Korea.

Who knows but that a shift in the slimy alignment of forces will not result in Tito using the knowledge he is gaining from us, against us?

We would like to see the Yugoslav people benefiting from any technical advancements we have made in the West. The same applies to the Spanish people. But we hate to see that advancement used to strengthen Tito and Franco as allies for the coming war and that is all that interests the governments of Britain and America.

no longer accountable to any international authority."

APPEASING MALAN IN S.W. AFRICA

WHEN the question was put to the vote in the Trusteeship Committee on December 10th, Britain took what the *Manchester Guardian* calls the "inglorious" course of abstaining, the British delegate, Lord Tweedsmuir, declaring that the resolution "impeded agreement". He was also "surprised that the committee wished to hear the Herero chiefs, as their testimony would certainly further harm any chances of agreement with South Africa. It would be even less relevant to fetch exiled chiefs out of Bechuanaland." The *Guardian's* correspondent in Winkhoek, S.W. Africa, wrote that:

"Britain's support for South Africa in her protest against the invitation of the South-West African chiefs to the United Nations is beyond the understanding of the Africans of the territory. An African, wisely anonymous, in a letter to the *Windhoek Advertiser*, says: 'One can hardly understand why Britain is insisting on legal points rather than on moral points. If Britain alleges that the action of the Trusteeship Committee in inviting African chiefs is illegal and contrary to the findings of the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice, how much more is South Africa's decision not to submit reports on the administration of the territory, if not a violation of international law, contrary to the findings of the Court. . . . If the British Government tries to keep the world from knowing about the condition and considers us to be a remote black race then she is busy ruining our confidence in the British people which has existed for a long time, and Britain will be held responsible for the consequences.'"

THE DECLINE OF CRAFTSMANSHIP

AT the congress of the Educational Institute of Scotland last week, Mr. Sam Black, principal lecturer in art at the Jordanhill Training College, Glasgow, said that the decline of craftsmanship in face of industrialisation was to be deplored. He also referred to "the monotonous uniformity" of mass production, in which a man lost his individuality and became another piece of the growing mechanism.

Industrialisation had to a great extent robbed labour of its craftsmanship, and pride of workmanship hardly existed. Children no longer learned from father, working as the creative village craftsman. He now went off to the vague things called factory, works or shop.

"Little time is available for contemplation, and concentration is superficial and shallow," said Mr. Black. "Little is taken in and less is turned over in the mind. Our literature has become the digest and our art gallery the raucous, undignified hoardings."

"Such a people become easy prey to the rule of the herd. Cultural interests are undeveloped in too large a proportion of our people leaving school."

Dr. H. J. L. Robbie, Edinburgh, said he would like to see art teachers educate children in good taste, appreciation of good shape and fitness of purpose.

Dr. Ann H. McAllister, principal teacher of speech training at Jordanhill, said that all teachers wanted that freedom which was being sought for art. The release of the curriculum might well be fought on the plane of the higher subjects.

NOTES ON THE POPULAR BASIS OF TOTALITARIANISM by GEORGE WOODCOCK

THE facts about anti-Negro discrimination in the southern States of America are well-known to anybody who follows the news at all carefully, and, if they are not, or if some elucidation is wanted on their grimmer aspects, I think everything that will be needed for intellectual conviction will be found in a book called *Scottsboro Boy*, written by one of the victims of the notorious frame-up case, Haywood Patterson, who spent years of imprisonment in Alabama. What Patterson reveals is a really devastating condemnation of the mockery of justice which goes on in a society of this type, and it reveals the extent to which the presence of a discriminated-against minority can make the situation worse for the rest of the people. The poor whites suffer as well because the persecution of the Negroes gives a licence to brutality, just as the persecution of the Jews in Germany was a prelude to an attack on the whole German people.

However, there is something in the direct experience of a society of this kind which makes even its slightest indications more striking than any amount of written matter. I know that I had read so much about the south, before I passed through it, that my mind was sated with the horrors that have been perpetrated against the Negroes. But one should always remember that in such situations the really sensational features, the lynchings and burnings, are only the high points of a humiliation that goes on all the time to the oppressed section of the population. And when I did eventually travel through the South—not even the south, but merely the northern edge of Missouri from Kansas City to St. Louis, it was such a piece of everyday, un-spectacular discrimination that really impressed me with the human meaning and implications of Southern colour prejudice.

I travelled by bus, starting at Denver, in Colorado, a non-Jimcrow State. There was a Negro army sergeant on board, and, since Southern Jimcrow laws cannot apply to an inter-State transport concern, nobody tried to interfere with his travelling. Through Colorado and Kansas everything went well.

Then, at the first town in Missouri, the Negro came out with the rest of us to the café, and sat at the counter. The proprietor served everybody else, and pointedly ignored him.

At the second stop, the white waitress in the café recoiled with horror and fetched the manager, who sent the Negro soldier into the kitchen to get his food away from the whites.

At the third stop, the whole thing had been organised thoroughly, and there were separate "white" and "coloured" rooms, very clearly and prominently marked up. The soldier, who had evidently had enough of being insulted, this time tamely followed the arrow and went into the "coloured" section.

Now the fact that impressed me most about this series of incidents was that all the people who had taken part in this deliberate humiliation of another human being were ordinary, working-class or lower-middle-class people, the kind of people who are probably reasonably decent in their behaviour with their family and their friends. They were certainly not monsters of any kind, but normal people—according to the norms of modern American society—acting in a manner which they had taken for granted since childhood and which they would deeply resent anybody else's attempting to change.

Another significant fact was that the prejudice they felt was evidently strong enough to defeat other loyalties of their kind. According to their lights, assuming them to be ordinary Southern Democrats in politics, this Negro soldier was fighting in their interests, and might very well be forced to die in those same interests. But did this make him any more worthy of consideration? Not a bit of it—he was a "nigger" just the same, and whatever he might do or be, the colour of his skin and the shape of his features would determine their attitude towards him.

This is the attitude of the average poor or middle-class white in the South. No doubt it has been fostered by the landlords and the factory owners who gain from the division of the people they exploit. But, whatever its origin may have been, the popular attitude is there, and the white people of the South have as a whole been completely corrupted by the situation. The fear of the Negro's revenge, the feeling that he must be kept in his place, the resentment of economic competition, are all powerful factors which, played on by politicians and by petty little job-holders of every kind, form the whites of the South into a solid reactionary front. The effects of this are clear; not only are the poor people of the South, whites and Negroes alike, far worse off than they are in other parts of the United States or Canada, but the rift between Negro and white has narrowed little, if at all. The skeleton of a totalitarian order exists, with a marked race and a powerful emotion of fear ready to hand for the politician to play on: the example of the late Huey Long, indeed, shows how easily the South can slip towards the pattern of dictatorship. But, like all totalitarian situations, that in the South is supported by the almost universal approval of the population, based on hatred and fear of the man with a different background which these poor white workers (men with really nothing to lose, far worse off than their fellows in New York and San Francisco) regard as dangerous to their well-being.

The presence in a country or part of a country of a race commonly regarded as inferior has, then, a number of results which are detrimental to the very people who hold the prejudice. To summarise them once again:

(1) A precedent in legalised brutality and in disregard of elementary freedoms and rights and of legalised protections is set.

(2) A level of poverty below that of the ordinary workers is set by the presence of a special submerged class—so that there is always a lower step towards which the mass of the people can be thrust in time of economic instability.

(3) A line of division is cut through the very middle of the working-class, depriving them of unity of action and feeling, and preparing that condition favoured of totalitarian régimes in which the people, while united from above, are atomised among themselves into mutually fearful and distrustful individuals and groups.

(4) Political bosses and corrupt party machines flourish in a situation where the appeal to racial prejudice is enough to rally a majority of the white population about them—regardless of the fundamentally reactionary nature of their programme or the parasitic nature of their rule.

In other words, in the Southern States of America there already exists that mass acceptance of injustice and of internal division which is the essential condition for a totalitarian society.

This is an extreme example. But racial hatred, wherever it exists, as a wide-spread popular phenomenon, provides a similar basis for totalitarianism. Nor is it even necessary that actual hatred should exist; the presence of an economically depressed caste, whose existence is tacitly recognised by the workers as a whole, is already a beginning of the situation, it is already a condition which could provide a popular basis for a totalitarian order.

Let us take, then, some European countries where racial hatred does not exist in an overt form. France is a case in point. For many years we have heard the boast that in France there is no colour bar and no distinction between races, and this is in fact culturally true. I doubt if there is any country, except perhaps Brazil, where a Negro will encounter less prejudice on account of his skin. Yet the fact remains that in France again there are certain depressed classes, certain groups of people who, because they are regarded as alien, are kept more or less permanently at the lowest possible economic level. One group consists of the refugee population, and particularly the Spaniards who came into France as a result of Franco's victory. The tales of the concentration camps in which these people were kept,

told most vividly in Koestler's *Scum of the Earth*, are well known. What is perhaps not so familiar to people outside France is that nowadays, owing to the French attitude to the employment of foreigners, the vast majority of Spanish refugees are condemned to accept the worst paid jobs, of the kind which no Frenchman will take, unless he cannot get anything better. A Spanish friend of mine, a textile technician by trade, is not allowed to follow his own profession, has to work as an attendant in the underground archives of an insurance firm, for which he receives 20,000 francs a month (£20); until recently he could find accommodation only in a hotel, where he had to pay 6,000, and then 8,000 francs a month in rent, leaving between 12,000 and 14,000 francs a month on which to feed himself, a wife and child. The majority of Spaniards are in this situation, and do not get the opportunity to be otherwise. Authorities consider that they should always be given the worst-paid employment, and the French workers do not approve the arrangement, since they never hear of them protesting on behalf of the Spaniards. Of course, the many French workers who only get 20,000 francs a month, but the fact that with them it is a matter of life rather than the question of a distinction against a whole social group.

Another group in France is the depressed even further below than the general population is composed of Algerian workers. These, being French citizens, have a free right of entry to France, and, since there is unemployment in North Africa, they are going to France at the rate of 100,000 a year. Nobody will give them any better than the lowest paid work, a very few of them get even that, the regular thing; it is estimated that more than 10% of them ever get any jobs. The rest do casual farming, labouring work, act as peddlars, or in mission for capitalist organisations, and their standard of living, which is perhaps better than they might expect at home, is well below that of even the poorest French people. They live in the worst slums, those which have been abandoned by the local inhabitants, crowd together, often sleeping ten or a dozen on the floor of a single room, in this way they form a depressed class, already several hundred thousands, who are economically and culturally cut off from the rest of the French people, whose condition arouses no evident tests from the French workers and

Continued on p.

BOOK REVIEW

THE PROBLEM OF YOUTH

THE FALSE START, by Jean-Baptiste Rossi. (Secker & Warburg, 9/6d.)

"The implacable 'No!' which surrounds the child who cannot understand, the child who cannot escape, the man who one day will be dead, who walks tirelessly in the indifferent circle of the hours, as his father has walked, as his mother has walked, with all the words, the established words, classified once and for all, and the capital letters, the G for God, the H for Honour, the N for Not, the E for Eternity, the G for Good, the B for Bad. The child in capital letters does not even know that he is not born, does not even grasp the idea that he can be born, does not even know the only capital letter, the capital L for Life."

—JEAN-BAPTISTE ROSSI.

THE FALSE START is the simple and tender story of the struggles of a fourteen-year-old schoolboy and a twenty-eight-year-old nun to realise their love in the face of the hostility and derision of the conventional, the I-know-better-than-you of the authorities, clerical and secular. Whatever may be the personal opinion of its author, it is an undoubtably anarchistic work.

Denis is a pupil at a Jesuit college in France. Claude (Sister Clothilde) is a nun. They meet one day when visiting the same hospital. In spite of the imagined disapproval of the god which both have been taught to revere and to whose service the nun has dedicated her life, they persist in their love. Both have to struggle with themselves. Denis confesses, first to an obnoxious schoolmate, then to a priest at his school. Claude has visions of disgrace to her family and almost succumbs to the entreaties of her Mother Superior to return to the chaste life she formerly led. But both succeed in transcending their pasts. Denis loses his belief in a god. Claude leaves her order and both "start badly, but... start together, so as to reach the end together,

no matter how"—until his parents and the priests force Denis into the prison of a boarding school. And there, with the temporary triumph of authority, the story ends.

Although the publishers speak of the "detachment" of the author, it is not difficult to discern on which side his sympathies lie. He shows us the ragging pupils of the college, and their masters, who are perpetually and indiscriminately handing out detentions; the malicious conventionalities of the inhabitants of the nun's home village; the life-denying smugness of the parents and the death in life of a nun's existence. Against all of this he emphasises the sincerity and purity of the lovers and their right to love.

Considering that the author was sixteen when he wrote this novel, it is an outstanding effort and a considerable and telling work for the freedom of youth, a work which anarchists, in particular, should welcome and appreciate.

S. E. PARKER.

Comment on

ARTISTS AND THE CRITICS

TO suggest, as your contributor did recently (FREEDOM, 15/12/51), that a conspiracy seems to exist amongst the critics for the purpose of discouraging public mention of the paintings of Jankel Adler, seems to indicate that the approbation of the critic is thought to be desirable, and even necessary, for the development and proper appreciation of a painter's work. This, of course, is not so. It does not require much knowledge of the methods of critics and their works to arrive, with very few exceptions, at the conclusion that a good painter is recognised in spite of the critics.

A good painter may be the means whereby any number of journalistic hacks can achieve a good living—witness the thriving industry in junky art books, especially in France—but the reverse is seldom true. In fact, the critics are notorious for their *penchant* in being wise after the event as is tragically evident merely from the reading of *Camille Pissarro's letters to his Son*, in which it is made plain that almost all the painters in the French Impressionist movement had a long and discouraging struggle to obtain some slight recognition during their life-time. A list of painters who subsequently became famous, and who remained scarcely known during their lifetime, could be added to almost indefinitely, so that the plaint that a particular painter is being neglected really has a more general application.

Most creative artists feel the lack of genuine interest in their work at some time during their lives, and it is highly probable that this neglect had a considerable bearing upon the tragic death of Bernard Meninsky who shared the space at the New Burlington Galleries with Jankel Adler. For whatever one may think of Meninsky's later work, and certainly his late paintings are disappointing, the fact remains that there are canvases and drawings which, by any standard, rank very high indeed. Meninsky's best work has a completely direct and uncomplicated appeal as in some of the portraits where it is informed not only by the most consummate drawing and a genuine feeling for the human qualities of the subject, but also by an attitude towards his art completely free from all pretence and artifice.

That representational painting of this quality, together with that utterly different kind of painting of Jankel Adler, should suffer from a more or less similar neglect, not only from the critics

but from the public in general, seems to indicate that the kind of painting is not, as is generally supposed, the primary cause of this lack of interest. A painter's public, even if he is successful, remains small, and those members of it who can afford to buy become scarcer every day. The working painter, whatever the form of painting he may favour, still has to work hard for, in most cases, very meagre returns so that he is more or less driven to show at one of the fashionable West End Galleries, where at least there does exist the probability of a sale and of being noticed. A West End Gallery is small, somewhat exclusive, and is only open during shop hours so that, except for the hurried lunch time glance of the occasional office or shop worker, paintings tend to be seen only by those with leisure and time to spare. This relative isolation is a condition that the Arts Council, who are the organizers of the Adler Meninsky Exhibition are helping to dispel. The show will, after London, travel to the Midlands and perhaps further north, and it is to be expected that thousands of members of the public who otherwise would have had no opportunity of seeing the works of either painter, will now have a chance of doing so.

Finally, it is very likely that the various newspapers of these towns will have something to say about the exhibition, and in spite of fanciful ideas about conspiracies, I hardly think that the critic of the *London Observer* will have nobbled the aspiring young reporter of the *Chorlton-cum-Hardy Gazette*.
London, Dec. 26. ROY SACKMAN.

TWO WORLDS

TWO worlds continue to exist side by side, a world of good health with high living standards and a world of disease, hunger and premature death, Dr. Frank Boudreau, executive director of the Milbank Memorial Fund of New York, said last month.

"It would be folly to imagine that two such different worlds can continue to exist side by side, in peace, for you cannot expect the peoples of this other world to be content forever in their misery."

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

Some of the books reviewed on this page in 1951 . . .

3/2/51	Conditions of Freedom	John Macmurray	6/-
17/2/51	The Good Soldier Schweik	Jaroslav Hasek	2/6
3/3/51	The Face of Spain	Gerard Brenan	15/-
17/3/51	William Godwin, A Study in Liberalism	David Fleisher	12/6
5/5/51	Iron in the Soul	Jean-Paul Sartre	12/6
19/5/51	Marxism, Freedom and the State	Michael Bakunin	5/-
19/5/51	Beyond the Mountains	Kenneth Rexroth	7/6
26/5/51	Memories & Portraits	Ivan Bunin	12/6
2/6/51	The House & The Fort	Charles Humana	9/6
9/6/51	Art & The Evolution of Man	Herbert Read	4/-
16/6/51	The Brigand	Giuseppe Berto	9/6
16/6/51	The Cinema 1951	Roger Manvell	2/6
23/6/51	Lag's Lexicon	Paul Tempest	10/6
7/7/51	The Case of Comrade Tulayev	Victor Serge	12/6
14/7/51	The Broken Root	Arturo Barea	15/-
21/7/51	Heavens on Earth	Mark Holloway	16/-
4/8/51	Land Potential	T. W. Evans	12/6
18/8/51	Men Against the Desert	Ritchie Calder	12/6
18/8/51	East of Home	Sonthe Rama Rau	16/-
25/8/51	Psychoanalysis & Politics	R. E. Money-Kyle	9/-
25/8/51	Race and Psychology	Otto Klineberg	1/6
15/9/51	An Assessment of 20th Century Literature	J. Isaacs	8/6
25/9/51	The Estate of Man	Michael Roberts	15/-
6/10/51	Contemporary British Art	Herbert Read	3/6
13/10/51	The Roots of Prejudice	Arnold Rose	1/6
27/10/51	Human Needs	Michael Graham	15/-
10/11/51	Changing Culture of a Factory	Elliot Jaques	28/-
24/11/51	Racial Myths	Juan Comas	1/6
24/11/51	Race & Culture	Michael Leiras	1/6
24/11/51	And All But He Departed	Alex Comfort	7/6
8/12/51	Literature of the Spanish People	Gerard Brenan	40/-

Obtainable from
27 red lion st. london.
W.C.1

Proudhon, Marx & the Peasant

AS a factor in production, land possessed the eternal distinction of being man's elementary source of living; and socially 'the raw material of the soil' was peculiar in that it could not be fitted into the prevailing doctrine which justified property because it ensured to each the product of his labour and of his abstinence. But while many reformers had shown an interest in the land and some in agriculture, none had taken an interest in the peasant as such—with one exception, Proudhon. His sympathy for the peasant was something unique in the history of socialism, but it is an exception which strikingly proves the rule.

"Proudhon, who in general suspected the constricting effects of large economic units, had economic and philosophical reasons for wishing to see each peasant owner of his farm. But when he speaks of this as the means of 'consummating the marriage of man with nature', his very language reveals how much he was moved by the innate attachment of the countryman born and bred to the soil and to those who tilled it. His agrarian socialism was indeed a socialism for the

peasants. Marx also in his early writings showed occasional startling traces of Utopian influence in idealising freedom in the choice of occupation; as when, for instance, he contrasted the capitalist system of production, in which every man was kept chained to a rigid sphere of activity, with the ideal of a regulated Communist society, in which each man would be able 'to do this to-day and that to-morrow, to hunt in the morning, to fish in the afternoon, to carry on cattle-breeding in the evening,' and so on. But while Marx and his disciples were greatly in Proudhon's debt as critics of existing society, and eagerly used his arguments against the principle of property, they turned them also against the small rural property which Proudhon had idolised. They paid attention to the peasants only because they looked upon them, with a dislike in which the townsman's contempt for all things rural and the economist's disapproval of small-scale production mingled with the bitterness of the revolutionary collectivist against the stubbornly individualistic tiller of the soil."

—Prof. DAVID MITRANY, in his new book, *Marx Against the Peasant* (Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 25/-)

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY
Vol. 13, No. 1 January 5, 1952

Looking Backward and Looking Forward

EVERY year the major newspapers publish on New Year's Eve a review of the past twelve months. Most, of course, are concerned to recall the merely sensational events: but for papers like the *Times* or the *Manchester Guardian* the occasion is one for looking down, as it were, an annual re-taking of contemporary history. They provide in this way a valuable record and summing-up. When one stands back from a particular year and recalls these annual reviews over a period of years, what impresses one chiefly is the position which this recital of contemporary history produces. In the past twenty-five years it is difficult to remember a single year whose exit was not marked by a deep, gloomy gloom.

It is a finding cannot be devoid of significance, especially when the annual reviews—for example, the five years between to-day and the General Strike—amply confirm this sense of futility. Of course it is true that an age appears in different light to contemporaries and to subsequent historians. We are accustomed to regard the age as a happy, carefree, carefree, carefree period: but it did not seem so to those who lived at the time and whose prevailing philosophy was one of gloom. Earlier in the *FREEDOM* drew attention to the B.B.C. lectures by Jack Isaacs on the twentieth century literature, summed-up in the title "The Age of Anxiety".

Our lifetime has increasingly determined the old nineteenth century idea of inevitably increasing progress. The political developments since 1917 have been on a scale of horror so appalling as to have blunted our sense of tragedy. It seems certain that the sadness and futility which the yearly recital of events brings is a true picture of our time.

Terrible and despairing events may be bearable to a philosophy of progress and inevitable increase of happiness for mankind. Disasters can then be regarded as mere birth pangs. But we are now deprived of belief in inevitable progress—many anarchists, like Malatesta, never derived any support from such belief—and are able to see such a philosophy as a mere religion-like consolation for the wrongs of history. As in other fields, the destruction of a religious belief deprives one of comfort and throws responsibility on to each and every individual. It is a painful process but one from which men emerge with their stature enhanced and their minds freed from a clogging inaction. If our world is so appalling, and we cannot comfort ourselves with the illusion that "all will come right in the end," we have reached a point when the question is: What are we going to do about it?

Anarchists, at least, should be proof against the next illusion—that of thinking the individual futile and hence sinking one's individuality (and one's responsibility—there's the comfort returned by the back door!) in a party organisation. The idea and ideal of anarchism is not an extravagant one. It is that men can live together in mutual assistance and freedom—a belief shared throughout the ages by many thousands of people who never heard of anarchism. It is the idea which all independent people, and all those whose lives seem admirable to us all, naturally put into practice—that one should act according to one's sense of right, not simply according to the herd or to commands.

LETTER FROM GERMANY POLITICIANS AND MILITARISTS

BETWEEN the two rival blocs of East and West, the German people are caught in a trap. The occupying powers, the victors, placed troops all over the country after the war with the pretext of disarming Germany and exterminating its militarism. These intentions would have been praiseworthy if the victors had not only abolished German militarism but their own also. In this case the question of re-armament would not have arisen for any people in the world, but now, the victors in collaboration with the German Government want to re-arm the people of West Germany, and the Russian Zone is already partly re-armed.

The preparations for this coming re-armament have been the resurrection of all the reactionary forces against which the last war was waged according to the proclamations of the victors during the last war. For the former generals, admirals and officers of Hitler are waiting for this rearmament (except for the neo-Fascists who sympathise with Russia). On the whole, the people are unwilling to re-arm. They are unwilling to re-arm, they are war weary and war wise, and have no interest whatever in the quarrels between the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. The people know by experience that re-armament means war, and the terrible results of war are daily before their eyes. And there are three million people of whom all track has been lost—children, women and men—all that is known of them is that they have been made prisoners by the victors.

The call of the politicians to rally the people for the defence of democracy does not receive much favourable response, although as a whole they do not want a dictatorship. But they have had experiences with the democracies in the last few years, and further, they doubt very much whether this rearmament would produce any good, even from the point of view of military defence, in spite of the heavy burden of taxation which the re-armament would cause.

And this general opinion is confirmed by military leaders like Eisenhower, Juin, and Montgomery. According to them, re-armament will not be any military protection for Western Germany; on the contrary, if war with Russia should come, Germany will certainly be brought into it. And here arises the question. Would the Russian armies treat the German people better if Germany were at war with Russia, or if Germany declared itself a neutral country? Of course, it would be doubtful whether Russia would respect that neutrality. A rigid line of defence along the borders of the Russian Zone of Germany and of the satellite States, is untenable in case of war by the armies of the Western Powers, against the avalanche of the Russian armoured divisions, even with the re-armament of Germany and the reinforcements of the Atlantic Pact States. This is the opinion of the military leaders.

For their general plan consists in a retreat before the avalanche of the Russian armies to the West bank of the Rhine into the line of the French fortresses Metz, Verdun, etc. For this purpose the military depots which were in Germany have been removed to Western France. The main point of this

plan consists in the assumption that the retreating Western armies would be followed by the advancing Russian armies towards the Eastern borders of France, Belgium and Holland, and that in this manner the Russian armies would scatter over Germany and possibly over parts of the adjacent countries between the Alps and Scandinavia.

The militarists suppose that the main battles would be fought here, and Eisenhower expects to annihilate the Russian armies in these territories through continuous air-bombing. It is obvious that by the time these Russian armies had been annihilated, the civilian population would also have been exterminated, if not by bombs then by hunger, or the people would have been sent away to Russia as slave-labourers.

The *United Press* reports that in the case of war the refugees would be assembled in camps under military authority in order not to hinder military operations. Persons who are known or suspected to be opponents of the Western Powers would be imprisoned. All Germans who occupy important positions would be evacuated to safe places. Most likely these are the Germans who are now making propaganda for re-armament. And it can be affirmed with full justification that all the politicians and militarists who made these plans will be in "safe places" if war should break out. Their plans prove that the pretext of a defence of democracy and liberty is at best non-

sense and a fraud. They would cost millions of innocent and non-belligerent human beings their lives, and perhaps wipe out whole nations.

Both sides claim to have an ideological controversy, but that is of course, utter nonsense and only propaganda to screen the real points at issue. We know that without re-armament and the war in Korea, the United States would be in a capitalistic crisis, perhaps the worst slump in its history. Consumption, by comparison with speeded-up production, has reached such a low level that capitalism cannot even exist for a few years without a war to destroy its unsaleable goods. And Russia will become a serious capitalist competitor of every exporting country for the world's markets, as soon as its industry and agriculture have been further developed. That the masses in Russia are hungry and badly clad and housed has nothing to do with what they are able to produce when they are forced by the Bolsheviks. The Russian slave-labour is so cheap that no country in the world, especially the U.S.A., can compete with its cheap production. And that is the deciding factor in world trade . . . and in world wars.

The Russian worker or peasant is without doubt the most exploited worker in the world, but he is intelligent, has great endurance, and in no time can learn how to handle a tool or machine. The German workers noticed that when during the last war there were more

than a million Russian slave-labourers working with them in Germany. It would therefore be fallacious to think that Russia could not in the future, throw on to the world market goods just as well made as those of the other industrial countries like Britain and the United States.

State-capitalism, coupled with a dictatorship and intensified exploitation as in Russia is by far a cheaper mode of production than that of private capitalism, on account of the low wages it pays, or the absence of any wages at all in the concentration camps. It can also count on smooth production with no interference from the workers in the form of strikes, etc., and if a few workers should show themselves refractory, off with them to the concentration camps for life.

It is in harmony with the traditions and the morals of capitalism to stop such a threatening competition in the bud, by razing the workshops of the competitor to the ground in the name of democracy and liberty. Through the bombing of the competitor's workshops, towns and cities the Bolshevik State can be made to totter, the necessary presupposition for a rising of the downtrodden masses in Russia which could have as its consequence the fall of the Bolshevik State. And then Russia would again be open for exploitation by private capitalism and as a buyer for its unsaleable goods.

WILLY FRITZENKOTTER.
(To be concluded.)

Foreign Commentary—in Brief

Protecting Democracy

Washington, Wednesday.—The U.S. State Department has revoked the passport of Mr. William Patterson, executive secretary of the American Civil Rights Congress, who said in Paris that the U.S. is following a policy of genocide (race killing) toward Negroes.—Reuter.

American Record

The Christmas death-roll from accidents of all kinds in the United States to-day reached 779, exceeding by eighteen the previous record for the four-day holiday of 1936. Deaths from traffic accidents numbered 531 and from fires 107.—Reuter.

There's Money in Oil

The Standard Oil Co of New Jersey last month distributed a year-end dividend of \$91,000,000 (£31,000,000) to its 250,000 shareholders.

The Real Price of Coal

An explosion in the mine at West Frankfurt, Illinois, last month resulted in 119 men being buried, beyond hope of rescue. Mr. John L. Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers, is reported to be "really mad about this disaster." For the past four years he has been campaigning to give much greater power to Government mine inspectors. A Bill to this end, giving inspectors the right to close a mine on suspicion of a safety hazard, was defeated by Congress last year.

Curious Morality

By a majority of some twenty votes, the Italian Senate decided recently not to ask the Government to close all casinos and gaming houses in Italy. There was no party whip over the matter, and opinions were almost equally divided, except that Ligurian and Venetian senators were in favour of keeping on the big casinos at San Remo and on the Lido, which are paying concerns.

Recently, the Italian Government forced the little republic of San Marino to close its casino on the ground that San Marino had promised by treaty not to enter the field of Italian Government monopolies, that it was competing with the Venice casino and that it was making the local peasants gamble. In the brief debate that took place the Government wriggled out of the dilemma with a motion pigeon-holing the whole matter "until the question of casinos is regulated internationally." This was carried by a small majority; it seemed to imply a vision of some future European legislation in such matters.

Spending £50 millions a year

Major-General W. F. Hasted is shortly to go to the Persian Gulf to act as special adviser to the Sheikh of Kuwait, whose income has been calculated to be about £1,000,000 a week since the conclusion of a new agreement with the British-American controlled Kuwait Oil Company.

It is thought that General Hasted will help the Sheikh and the Municipal Council, over which the Sheikh presides once a week, to decide how best to spend the money.

With a population of only half a million, Kuwait should with its income from oil become the most prosperous country in the world. But one wonders how much of this £50 million a year will reach the population.

Death of a Salesman—New Version

The *United Press* reports that: the death of a Korean hero has given new life to his poverty-stricken family. The \$10,000 government insurance policy Raymond Gilmore made out to

his parents has enabled them to buy "the only home we ever owned," his work-worn mother said.

"Raymond was a good boy who just never had a chance in life," said Mrs. Charlie Gilmore, 42. "He would be happy to know we have this place."

She pointed to the white frame combination home, café and grocery store the family bought with \$4,500. The rest of the cash will go to buy Raymond's five brothers and two sisters clothing, food and other things he often echoed.

"Now we can live like humans," his mother said.

Raymond's father was a miner, but he has been confined to a wheel chair for ten years with a back injury.

When Raymond was 16 he quit school because he did not like the jokes school-mates made about his tattered clothing.

More Men and Money for Indo-China

The French Budget estimates for the war in Indo-China represent approximately ten per cent. of the total Budget, and are up by two-thirds on last year's estimates. And there is a widespread fear that actual expenditure will turn out to be even higher.

There are 173,000 Frenchmen fighting in the French formations in Indo-China, and another 20,000 are serving as the backbone of the associated Vietnamese army.

So much for this "minor war" which was going to last a few months, and which has now been going on for years.

WAITING FOR THE DAY

The American Bible Society has nearly one million Russian Bibles stored in its warehouses ready for shipment in anticipation that some day the iron curtain will lift.

Peace News, 14/9/51.

No doubt the Foreign Languages Publishing House in Moscow has a million copies of the works of J. V. Stalin, also in anticipation of "the day"!

SLAVE MARKET IN JAPAN

A DISPATCH of the American Associated Press reveals that slavery in Japan actually is increasing.

Many of the slaves are young girls, whose poverty-stricken parents sell them to houses of prostitution.

This is admitted by the Japanese Government Labour Ministry. The Ministry says that in the year ending June 30th, slaves numbering 1,579 were sold. This was double the figure for the preceding 12 months.

Of the slaves sold, 674 were under 18. Boy slaves numbered 100 and girls, 574. The Associated Press dispatch declares: "Most of the slaves sold were children of poverty-stricken families. Most of the girls went into houses of prostitution."

Although the dispatch was printed September 22nd in the *Washington Evening Star*, the news of Japanese slavery was suppressed by most capitalist papers. The facts have not yet been widely circulated.

Japanese poverty will increase as the result of rearmament, and heavy taxes

already have lowered workers' living standards. Hugh H. Smythe reports in an article in the American magazine, *The Nation*.

Smythe says: "Before the Korean war the living standard, always pitifully low, had recovered to 75 per cent. of the 1930-34 level, but since then prices have risen almost 50 per cent., and the Government has shown neither the ability to cope with inflation nor the inclination to strengthen the social security system. The price of rice rose 18.46 per cent. and of electricity 31 per cent. in August."

Smythe, the guest lecturer in sociology at Yamaguchi National University in Japan, reports that Japanese women are still believed inferior—marriages are arranged with little consideration for the women's wishes. This feudal attitude toward women undoubtedly causes the reactionary government to tolerate compulsory prostitution of little girls.

JOHN LEEB.

Popular Basis of Totalitarianism

Continued from p. 2

thus be regarded as having their tacit approval.

In Germany a similar situation exists with the refugee population of exiles from Czechoslovakia and other Slav countries which exported their population of German descent after the war. These people are often resented by the native Germans as competitors for food, for housing and for work; they form an under-privileged minority who are allowed only a disadvantageous share in these things, and thus, by practising and countenancing discrimination and un-solidarity, the German people are preparing within their midst a group which is already being used by neo-Nazi groups as a springboard for their activities.

To act in such a way may demand the shedding of all kinds of comforting illusions. But when at this season one looks with despair at the preceding twelve months and the vista of preceding years, it is also with a tremendous sense of relief that one shakes off all those ideas and prohibitions and illusions, the acceptance of which means acquiescence in the appalling world of the twentieth century. If one looks forward to a better world there is a kind of comfort in the realisation that one has to work for it. In a meaningless world, such work gives meaning to life.

History always shows that the presence or the creation of minorities who are inferior from and distinct from the rest of the population, always acts in favour of reactionary politicians, and provides a powerful element in their popular basis. The Negro situation in America, the Arab situation in France, the situation of the refugees in Germany, so long as they are countenanced by the ordinary people of those countries, are urgent dangers to the liberty of all. Even in England, the attitude of the trade unions and their members to the employment of foreign labour is a warning sign of the same tendency, the tendency towards division within the ranks of the exploited.

The spread of totalitarianism in the world may be beyond our powers to control, but certainly the only thing that can halt it is solidarity among its potential victims, and where the workers in any country discriminate against other workers because of their different origin, or while they even stand indifferently by when such discrimination occurs, they are preparing unwittingly no doubt, the conditions in which a totalitarian order may begin. All the great totalitarian movements went into power because at the beginning they had wide mass support, and the basis for that support, and for their subsequent success, lay in the creation of division between their subjects by the existence or creation of "inferior" races or groups. And for this reason no man who humiliates a Negro, or connives at economic discrimination against a foreign worker, should be very surprised when Big Brother's hand descends upon his shoulder.

GEORGE WOODCOCK.

I HAVE been reading the controversy around Mr. Green's statements (Nov. 17th) concerning the purpose of marriage with great interest because of the opposite ways of thinking shown by the writers.

I believe that an analysis of a present condition may often do more harm than good, since its conclusions may be rigidly imposed on an always changing future, and since the more we revere the analyst the less we bother with the burnt porridge that may have flavoured his divine message after any particular breakfast. All the same, I wish some competent person would undertake an analysis of the ideas of anarchists to-day.

Now, the trademark of the authoritarian is his trust in formulae. "Inevitable," "necessity," "correct" are his favourite words. His Church is established. Dogmas issued. Official opinions can be referred to on all matters of human life past, present and future: for to obtain "correct" knowledge the authoritarian goes not to the source, the experience, but to an interpretation of the source. Not to the Bible, for instance, but to the quotable opinions on the Bible according to Pope Pius, K. Marx, or the editor of the Rationalist Annual. He adopts other people's reactions to facts in place of the absent original and intuitive reactions of his own.

I believe the libertarian mind is to be discerned by its freedom from prejudice and by its ability to reach a conclusion without reference to precedent or books. Such a person may not be ready with reasons but there is about his thinking a greater clarity, a quite different "correctness" from that of the Marxist. Most of us, I feel, contain both these types, and the authoritarian element is not wholly absent from most anarchists.

In Mr. Green's article there was no single comment on anyone who has accepted or rejected marriage, which I take to mean a contract between a man and a woman, whether or not it is written and whether or not it is registered. He left the impression of having a greater interest in constructing a theoretical chain of historical events,

than in finding out "The Purpose" (if any) in the case of specific people, their ideas on what marriage is and what it entails. An intelligence test floating around his laboratory will not yield anything importantly true; it may enable him to generalise. "Man is not by nature monogamous, polygamous, etc." but I remember that many crimes are committed in the name of Man. Men are less impressive; they are only people. So, when Mr. Green assures me that the "primitive side of Man's nature is both self-centred and bone idle," I smell the oil of a computer and cannot take his conclusions very seriously.

In contrast, the reply of Mr. Casey (Dec. 1st) reveals more serious dealing and a dislike of hoodwinking. When he concludes, "My whole belief in human nature . . . rejects Mr. Green's logical theory," I sense an anarchist flavour and find myself in sympathy with him. It is unfair of Mr. Green in his later letter to reproach Mr. Casey

for not reading Margaret Mead.

I do not feel that Mr. Casey rejects Mr. Green's premise: a man has no moral right to demand the services of a particular woman, in fact, we surely agree that the "ideal of free love" cannot imply demanding anything at all. Mr. Green's free society "includes free love". Will this love, in his estimation, permit us to remain "monogamous" (should we find continual delight with another person), or would we be wise to make sporadic forays into polygamy and thus avoid detection as a counter-revolutionary, and in a "conflict-ridden, narrow state"?

Most monogamy, most marriage, is I fear, compulsive. That is no grounds for asserting the same for all marriages. Mr. Green's logical reasoning has led him to a false conclusion: fact about a man or woman cannot be induced from theory.

London.

JOHN BERESFORD.

IN his letter (FREEDOM, 24/11/51)

Mr. W. Knapp thinks I isolate myself in an ivory tower, but I am trying to be intensely practical. I can very well visualise that violence would be organised by capitalists and politicians if the workers took over the means of production, especially food and clothes. I consider that the violence of the capitalists and politicians could only be fought down in the economic field, i.e., by preventing them from getting hold of the prime necessities of life—and not by organising counter-violence on the military model. I think Kropotkin said somewhere that unless the food problem is solved, every resolution will fail and reaction will set in and triumph.

After all, the capitalists and politicians are, and will always be, a minority, and they can be defeated if they cannot recruit men with the help of food and clothes. They do not fight themselves, but buy up starvelings. If they don't control the means of life they will not be able to recruit anyone to fight and

die for them. If in order to meet violence, counter-violence is organised on a military basis, it will become the nucleus of a State machine, living at the expense of the producers. This embryo State can be taken over by some to be used against all others. For a whole people cannot be armed, but only a minority.

The anarchists want no State because they want no violence. The line of action by anarchists should therefore be to avoid the organisation of violence—not to compromise with it in any form for expediency sake. Expediency is another name for opportunism which is not compatible with anarchism.

I consider that we must have more discussion on the main issues instead of side issues for the clarification of our ideas. Mr. Knapp probably considers such discussion as "merely the rationalisation of intellectuals isolated from reality"—so let us not think of discussion because that would be rationalisation and intellectualism.

It seems safest not to discuss cause discussion would bring out differences among anarchists, keeping quiet on essential issues will not bring unity, for as soon as a crisis arose the anarchists themselves would disagree and fight in groups against each other. If we disagree let us disagree and try to agree on essential (not simply forms), so that we can act in unison when we must.

I am therefore unable to agree with those who think we do not require a plan or blueprint. We concretise anarchism. Obedience with our fear of discussion and not to disagree before the process there will be disunity afterwards leading to chaos and violence among anarchists themselves.

Bombay. M. P. T. ACHARYA

Italian Factory Seizures

YOUR reader, T.T., in his letter on the seizure of factories in Italy by workers threatened with dismissal (FREEDOM, 15/12/51), seemed to quote with approval the cutting from the *Socialist Standard*. He thinks their comments are "valid and much to the point", but ignores the real argument, which is a dig at Syndicalism.

Of the three "lessons" which the S.S. points out for socialists, the first and third are, of course, nothing new for anarchists or syndicalists. We have always known that workers could run the factories by themselves more efficiently than anybody else, and we have always shown how State-ownership does not alter the position of the workers.

The second point is the one on which I would like to argue with the Socialists. The S.S. quotes with approval the W.F.T.U. point of view that "there was no point in cherishing the illusion of stable and lasting working-class management in a capitalist régime". Who thought there was? I know of no point of view which puts forward that illusion.

"Industrial action alone," says the S.S., "cannot permanently put the workers in control of the factories," and this experiment "would have ended immediately had the Government decided to employ resolutely the coercive forces at its disposal."

They play the trick of pointing to small-scale action by workers and use the obvious weakness of the position of those workers to pretend that the working-class as a whole could not establish workers' control (forgetting that the very coercive forces of the State are manned and supported by workers) through the very channels in which the workers are all-important.

One does not expect a limited action with a limited aim within capitalist society to achieve a classless society. It

is therefore pointless to claim that if it does not, full-scale action with the aim of achieving a classless society, will fail.

The analogy with Russia is a false one. After the February Revolution the workers had the control and the economic power, but for reasons too complicated to go into here, they allowed the Bolsheviks to claim power. The latter played upon the people's fear of a return of the Czar, spoke in the name of the Revolution, and the people had not enough conscious political experience to see where the Bolsheviks would lead them.

After all, the Revolution in Russia was crushed, not by the old State, but by the new. And in their faith in political action, it is interesting to see how the Stalinists and the S.P.G.B. agree. They are all Marxists and the real threat to a libertarian revolution always comes, not from the Right but from the Left.

London.

P.M.

Communities

HAVING general appreciation, I cannot let Mark Holloway's references to the Gloucester Land Scheme (in his first article on "Communities in Relation to Society") pass without comment. One is sorry he was sadly disappointed upon his visit, which accounts for his slightly contemptuous description which, unfortunately, ignores the effort and achievement of the land group in question.

The Land Scheme was started in 1939, by some over-sanguine and inexperienced folk, to provide work and living for the increasing numbers of conscientious objectors, then getting exemption from military service on condition that they worked on the land. The area available and planted the first season was thirty acres and it was hoped to sustain some thirty men. These hopes were disappointed as were the results from the crops in the very first year, and the personnel dispersed.

The Scheme was then restarted in 1940, by a more radical group of about eight persons, with acreage reduced to 6½ acres, but with an acquired debt of some £200. Generally, the primary aim was the preservation of freedom and close community was accepted as best meeting the existing circumstances. Starting thus from scratch, a natural method of living and working together in truth and trust was determined, and though living conditions were primitive in some respects, life was often glorious—and its contrary. The work was hard and the responsibilities of freedom rarely shirked. The food, too, was good, as was the general health. The Gloucester Land Scheme was wound up shortly after the hostilities ended, free from debt and the cash in hand, some £200, donated to the youngest members and social service ventures. During the years it was in existence the scheme afforded much real help and encouragement to people engaging in anti-war activities and was in every respect an education to those having taken part in the effort.

W. Stroud, Glos. S. L. ROBINSON.

AFRICAN AFFAIRS

Continued from p. 1

THE *New Statesman* (22/11/51) quotes reactions in the South African press to the settlement of the Tshekedi Khama affair (see FREEDOM, 15/12/51) as follows:

"The British Government's decision to allow Tshekedi to return to the Bamangwato Reserve," comments *The Rand Daily Mail*, "while maintaining the five-year ban on Seretse, represents a great victory not only for Tshekedi but also for the South African—that is, of course, the White South African—point of view." Anyone who thinks that this dispute is now satisfactorily regulated might do well to ponder on these enlightened comments by one of South Africa's biggest newspapers—and a paper, incidentally, which is generally identified with gold-mining interests. "Most people," the paper continues, "are well enough aware that Seretse was ejected because he offended against the segregation policy of White South Africa, and the British Government's decision really means that Britain now aligns herself with White South Africa on the question of segregation." Such an alignment, no doubt, cuts clean across the expressed wishes of the Bamangwato people. "But who are the Bamangwato," concludes *The Rand Daily Mail* ironically, "to have wishes? Let them know their place."

THE EFFIGY OF JUSTICE

THE bewigged and robed figure of "Justice" from the Lion & Unicorn Pavilion at the South Bank Exhibition is to be exhibited at the Van Riebeeck Exhibition at Capetown next spring. "This exhibition," says the *Architect's Journal*, "will be for White folks only. Come to think of it, perhaps it's more important for them to see it than the others. After all, they have to administer justice, and they might as well learn to recognise it even if it's only an effigy."

The problem of publishing to-day

EVERY week one can read somewhere or other of book publishers and newspaper and periodical publishers complaining of the growing difficulties they have to face in their businesses. And from the consumers' point of view this concern is reflected in increased prices of books (it has been announced that the price of books may be increased by 50% this year), in higher priced or smaller periodicals, and as far as newspapers are concerned there is the likelihood of a further increase, so that the 1d. newspaper may soon cost 2d.

Generally speaking, the objective of the commercial publisher is to give the public the kind of paper the public wants. As soon as sales fall off, "experts" are put on the job to find out why sales are dropping and the proprietors then tell the Editor what he has to do. And in the case of one of the largest periodical publishers in this country it has meant sacking all his Editors, and the transformation of the journals in question, with the consequent loss of many readers but also with the faith in the "experts" view that the change will show a net gain in new readers, and thereby increased revenue from sales, advertising and therefore higher profits.

That is how commercial publishing works. After all, its objective is to make a profit by entertaining. The pur-

pose in publishing FREEDOM is neither for profit nor entertainment. Without wishing to appear pompous, we would define our purpose in publishing FREEDOM as: our contribution to laying the foundations of a happier and more equitable society based on a sense of mutual respect and tolerance among men, and in which no man will have the power to exploit another man's labour or to coerce him physically or mentally. Such a society would be free from wars, man-made famines and political crises . . . and the wage system!

We offer this potted definition of our purpose simply to develop what we have to say in connection with the problems of publishing and not in order to lay down a hard and fast definition of anarchism. Because we have such a purpose as defined above it is quite clear that the problems we have to face in publishing FREEDOM are dissimilar in every respect from those of a commercial publisher. He finds that his sales are dropping. His answer is to change his "line", or it may be to engage an advertising expert to "put his paper across"; or it may even be solved by engaging a popular short story writer to join his contributors. None of these channels is open to FREEDOM. How then do we suggest that FREEDOM is to survive and Freedom Press publications to be published in a world in which the

chances of survival become increasingly difficult particularly for the small publishers?

AS publishers of FREEDOM we have at all times aimed at making our journal self-supporting, this being, to our minds, a more certain method for survival than dependence on financial support which can be as precarious as the economic fortunes and sympathies of those who offer it. We do not intend this unkindly, but it is a reflection which many years of experience in publishing FREEDOM and its predecessors have more than confirmed. And, in fact, the income derived from the sales of FREEDOM at present only falls short of the cost of production by £10 (\$28) each issue, and an increase of 1,500 copies in our weekly circulation would therefore make FREEDOM financially self-supporting. This is an objective which we, as incorrigible optimists, have always thought a not impossible one. Yet during 1951 our postal subscribers' lists have shown a net gain of only 300 new readers, and through the newspapers and the few enthusiasts who sell FREEDOM at meetings and outdoors, increases in sales have fluctuated between nil (wet and cold weeks) and as many as a thousand copies (during election week).

(To be concluded)

FREEDOM PRESS

- TONY GIBSON : *Youth for Freedom* paper 2s.
- PHILIP SANSON : *Syndicalism—The Workers' Next Step* 1s.
- ERRICO MALATESTA : *Anarchy. Vote—What For?* 6d. 1d.
- M. BAKUNIN : *Marxism, Freedom and the State.* paper 2s. 6d., cloth 5s.
- HERBERT READ : *Art and the Evolution of Man.* 4s. *Existentialism, Marxism and Anarchism.* 3s. 6d. *Poetry and Anarchism.* cloth 5s., paper 2s. 6d. *The Philosophy of Anarchism.* boards 2s. 6d., paper 1s.
- The Education of Free Men.* 1s.
- ALEX COMFORT : *Delinquency* 6d. *Barbarism & Sexual Freedom.* paper 2s. 6d., stiff boards 3s. 6d.
- RUDOLF ROCKER : *Nationalism and Culture.* cloth 21s.
- ALEXANDER BERKMAN : *ABC of Anarchism.* 1s.
- PETER KROPOTKIN : *The State: Its Historic Role.* 1s. *The Wage System.* 3d. *Revolutionary Government.* 3d. *Organised Vengeance Called Justice.* 2d.
- JOHN HEWETSON : *Sexual Freedom for the Young* 6d. *Ill-Health, Poverty and the State.* cloth 2s. 6d., paper 1s.
- M. L. BERNERI : *Workers in Stalin's Russia.* 1s.
- GEORGE WOODCOCK : *Anarchy or Chaos.* 2s. 6d. *New Life to the Land.* 6d. *Railways and Society.* 3d. *Homes orhovels?* 6d. *What is Anarchism?* 1d. *The Basis of Communal Living.* 1s.
- WILLIAM GODWIN : *Selections from Political Justice.* 3d. *On Law.* 1d.
- F. A. RIDLEY : *The Roman Catholic Church and the Modern Age.* 2d.
- ★ Marie Louise Berneri Memorial Committee publications : *Marie Louise Berneri, 1918-1949: A Tribute.* cloth 5s. *Journey Through Utopia.* cloth 16s. (U.S.A. \$2.50)
- ★ K. J. KENAFICK : *Michael Bakunin and Karl Marx.* Paper 6s.

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

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

- LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP OPEN AIR MEETINGS
 - HYDE PARK Every Sunday at 3.30 p.m.
 - TOWER HILL Every Friday at 12.45 p.m.
 - MANETTE STREET (by Foyle's, Charing Cross Road) Every Saturday at 4.30 p.m.
- INDOOR MEETINGS
 - at the PORCUPINE, Charing Cross Rd. (next Leicester Sq. Underground Station) Every Sunday at 7.30 p.m.
 - JAN. 6—Arthur Uloth on ANARCHISM
 - NORTH-EAST LONDON DISCUSSION MEETINGS IN EAST HAM at 7.30
 - JAN. 9—SOCIAL EVENING
 - JAN. 23—S. E. Parker on VOLTAIRINE DE CLEYRE
 - Enquiries c/o Freedom Press
- LIVERPOOL DISCUSSION MEETINGS at 101 Upper Parliament Street, Liverpool, 8 Every Sunday at 8 p.m.
- GLASGOW INDOOR MEETINGS at Central Halls, Bath Street Every Sunday at 7 p.m. With John Gaffney, Frank Leech, Jimmy Raeside, Eddie Shaw

FREEDOM

The Anarchist Weekly
 Postal Subscription Rates
 12 months 17/- (U.S.A. \$3.00)
 6 months 8/6 (U.S.A. \$1.50)
 3 months 4/6 (U.S.A. \$0.75)
 Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies
 12 months 27/- (U.S.A. \$4.50)
 6 months 13/6 (U.S.A. \$2.25)
 Cheques, P.O.'s and Money Orders should be made out to FREEDOM PRESS, crossed a/c Payee, and addressed to the publishers.
 FREEDOM PRESS
 27 Red Lion Street
 London, W.C.1 England
 Tel.: Chancery 8364