

- Marx on Bakunin - - p. 2
- Fate of Prisoners in Russia - p. 3
- Syndicalism & History - p. 4

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"Society and government are different in themselves, and have different origins. Society is produced by our wants, and government by our wickedness . . . Society is in every state a blessing; government even in its best state but a necessary evil."
—THOMAS PAINE (1776)

Vol. 13, No. 28

July 12th, 1952

Threepence

FOREIGN COMMENTARY

WITCH-HUNTS & RESISTANCE

NO sooner had the American State Department issued its apology to Professor Owen Lattimore for having withheld his passport on the strength of a "tip" from an informer which turned out to be false (FREEDOM, 5/7/52) than the witch-hunters were once again on his trail. A Senate sub-committee has charged that Professor Lattimore has been "a conscious, articulate instrument of the Soviet conspiracy" and recommended perjury proceedings against him and John Paton Davies, Jr., a State Department official.

A formal report to the Senate by the Senate Internal security sub-committee, both Mr. Lattimore and Mr. Davies testified falsely in its recently conducted inquiry into the Institute of Pacific Relations.

The sub-committee spent more than a year investigating the IPR in a search for Communist influence in United States policy in the Far East. The IPR describes itself as a private research organisation for the study of the Pacific Islands, and published a magazine, *Public Affairs*, of which Prof. Lattimore was editor from 1934-1940.

Mr. Lattimore is now a professor at Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore. He is referred to in an A.P. report as a Far Eastern affairs specialist who has acted as occasional consultant to the State Department.

We think it important to stress that the IPR is a "private research organisation, etc." and Prof. Lattimore is not a government employee, for it leaves no room for those apologists of the present American inquisition who might argue justification for political purges in government departments on security grounds.

The position in America to-day has reached a pitch where a Senate Internal security committee has the powers to investigate private organisations and to subpoena witnesses who are made to state under oath their political associations. Prof. Lattimore was subjected to twelve days' questioning by the sub-committee and swore he had never been a Communist, a Communist sympathiser or a Soviet agent. What a farce all the talk about free elections with secret ballot when in fact the Government has the power to force a person to publicly disclose his political beliefs!

Let us proceed further in our examination of this shabby business. The sub-committee said that throughout its hearings Mr. Lattimore's "connections and association with Communist international organisations" were shown to be pronounced.

As for the IPR, the sub-committee's report said: "The net effect of IPR activities on United States public opinion has been such as to serve international Communist interests and to affect adversely the interests of the United States."

It said that a group of persons operating within and about the IPR, including Mr. Lattimore and career diplomat John Carter Vincent, "exercised substantial influence on United States Far Eastern policy." The report charged that Mr. Lattimore and Mr. Vincent "were influential in bringing about a change in United States policy in 1945 favourable to the Chinese Communists."

To carry on a research organisation on Pacific affairs without having contact with Communists is perhaps a patriotic American way of doing things, but it would seem a very unreliable way of obtaining a complete and objective picture. (For instance, it was reported

last week that Secretary of State Dean Acheson had "an apparently friendly ten-minute chat tonight in Vienna with Russia's High Commissioner to Austria, Lt.-Gen V. P. Sviridov" at a reception given by the American High Commissioner. After the meeting he said, "This was Mr. Donnelly's private party, so I would not want to say what we discussed." Will this be used in years to come by some inquisitorial sub-committee to prove Mr. Acheson's "connections" with Communists, etc.?)

The sub-committee's report is obviously concerned with protecting American public opinion from all views and information which do not conform with American foreign policy. Thus, we have reached the stage where all views that do not fit that pattern are against American interests (as if the present American policy is inevitably, and without any need for discussion, the right policy) and therefore are of comfort to the enemy, Communism. In Russia the people are effectively "protected" from subversive ideas and anti-Russian views by a controlled Press and Radio. If the American sub-committee has its way, such must inevitably be the policy to be adopted to protect American democracy from dangerous ideas.

TO our mind, it is of no importance to the cause of real freedom whether Prof. Lattimore (according to the report) lied on five occasions during his testimony. Supposing he did, then it would mean that Outer Mongolia was in fact an independent country until after the Second World War, that he had associations with Communists knowing them to be such, and that he published articles by Communists. What is important is

that in the world to-day—and not only in the totalitarian countries—there is a fear of freedom: a fear of free, unfettered speech and of a press which puts forward many and conflicting viewpoints, fear of the corrupting effect of contact with people of different views. It is interesting to note that in the eyes of the witch-hunters, contact with a Communist presupposes the indoctrination of the non-Communist with Communist ideas and not the opposite, just as in Russia outside contacts are avoided, for it is presupposed that "capitalist-bourgeois" is bound to corrupt the good Communist.

What person in his senses would give up his freedom for the chains of slavery? It is just because nowhere in the world are the people free that no existing "way of life" commands their loyalty. Those whose "loyalty" cannot be imposed by force or by fear of a worse alternative (viz.: the propaganda of "communism" in the West, "capitalist slavery" in the East) or by religious faith in an after-life of perpetual happiness, are prone to jump from the frying pan of capitalist imperialism into the fire of Stalinist totalitarianism, and vice-versa. But those are not solutions—as the victims invariably discover in the end.

For those individuals who aspire to freedom there is, in our opinion, only one road open: that of resistance. Resistance to indoctrination and conformism; resistance to physical and mental conscription and to attempts at reducing us to irresponsibility. It is a difficult road, but at least it leads in the right direction. The others, in spite of their tempting ice boxes, candies and automobiles, all lead to disaster, as we should all by now have learned only too well.

LIBERTARIAN.

Syndicalist Pyramids

IS there a danger, as a recent correspondent in FREEDOM claimed, that "the syndicalist ideal of one industrial union for each industry would degenerate into monolithic rigidity and a consequent growth of bureaucracy and a new dominant class?"

Let us admit from the start that of course there is that danger. There is always the possibility in any collection of individuals that whatever form of organisation they create among themselves can become monolithic or rigid or authoritarian. It depends entirely upon the individuals concerned.

We all know the phrase "the price of freedom is eternal vigilance" and this applies as much to collections of people as freedom-conscious as anarchists as to anybody else, and in small aggregates as well as in large, control can pass to a minority if the majority allow it.

Can I whisper, without being accused of sabotaging anybody's community scheme, that this could even happen in a small community? Our comrades at Whiteway Colony had to wage a struggle only a few years ago against attempts by a (political-minded) minority to gain control. A progressive school in London had the same trouble from members of the same political group, and in each case, I am glad to say, it was the vigilance of anarchists who were personally concerned that helped to rally the majority against the attempted seizure of control.

We had the example of what happened in Russia, after the people had set up their councils—soviets—which were then infiltrated by the Bolsheviks, when Lenin's appropriation of the Anarchists' slogan "All power to the Soviets" came to mean, after the October counter-revolution, all power to the Bolsheviks. Here was society broken down into small units—no syndicates with pyramids of delegates, even—and still it fell into the

hands of the most bureaucratic class the world has yet seen.

The answer lies, obviously, in the consciousness of the people concerned. In our anarchist movement in this country, an attempt was made a few years ago, for a section to get control, and they used all the vote-canvassing, backstairs intrigue that typifies such activity in the political sphere. They were beaten by determined action by active members—who took a strong stand to preserve the anarchist press.

And unless the rank-and-file in any organisation jealously guard against any attempt at domination, no matter what the structure of that organisation, it can be taken over.

What your organisation can do is to make it as difficult as possible to begin with, by establishing checks against the growth of a bureaucracy. This, I believe, is one of the important factors in syndicalism, and the principles of no permanent officials, organisers subject to immediate re-call if they do not carry out the wishes of the rank and file, and paid no more than if they had stayed at their work, are to a large extent safeguards against the growth of bureaucracy. Add to this the principle of no centralisation—local autonomy and federation, and the possibility of domination by a minority rather fades away. But it all depends on the maintenance of these principles and their determined defence.

When syndicalists advocate one industrial union, they do so because it is obviously absurd for workers in the same workshop not to get together in the same organisation. Our correspondent wants a multiplicity of free associations. Well, the trade unions present a multiplicity of associations, but they are anything but free. Smallness or variety do not in themselves guarantee freedom, in fact in the TU movement to-day they guarantee slavery, by dividing the slaves. And in fact, by having so many associations, the workers have multiplied the bureaucrats on their backs.

In the railways, for example, there are three main unions and over 50 other craft associations—all with their officials. I know that our correspondent does not envisage quite the same sort of thing, but assuming a multiplicity of free associations, are they to co-operate or remain aloof one from the other? If, as I imagine, they are to co-operate—how? Except through a multiplicity of delegates?

Now, it is feared that the syndicalist system of delegation would lead to pyramids of delegates, each one up the scale more and more remote from the workers on the job. This, of course, can be so if the workers set up a permanent bureaucracy and give them the right to make decisions. But that would simply not be anarcho-syndicalism, it would just be industrial unionism.

The anarcho-syndicalists do believe in free association, and that they should be brought down to the smallest possible units. You can't get down much further than the individual, can you? What we suggest is that workers in each workshop form their own association, under their own immediate control (with no compulsion on any worker to join it if he doesn't want to). Meetings deciding policy, action, etc., should be on the widest basis, and delegation should only be brought in when co-operation with similar free associations is necessary and it is impractical to hold joint mass meetings.

That these associations should link up with each other throughout each industry and with each other in all industries on local, regional and national levels, does not seem to me to create "pyramids" of power. I see no other way in which contact throughout the whole of industry can be maintained, and providing control flows from the association to the delegate and not vice-versa, the growth of bureaucracy is prevented.

Perhaps it can be argued that the whole of industry does not have to be linked up anyway, but I think that argument can only be sustained if we are prepared to dissolve modern industry and return to the simple life. Personally, however, I prefer electric light to rush-light and am all for the mechanisation of the sewers.

In all these arguments, however, our basic proviso must be kept in mind. That whatever system you favour, it should not be regarded as more important than people. The individual should not be crushed by the collective, but the only safeguard in any system lies in the consciousness and vigilance of the people.

The Flogging Judge Speaks

ONCE again, the question of flogging is in the news, and once again the sensational—in the yellow press sense of the word—aspect, the utterly injudicious outlook of the Lord Chief Justice on this matter has brought it all up again.

Lord Goddard urged recently that flogging should not only be re-introduced, but that its scope should be extended to other crimes. He implied that its abolition in 1948 had resulted in more crimes of violence being committed. "The remedy for gangsterism," he declared, "was to bring back corporal punishment, and extend it, not limit it."

As the *Observer* rather acidly remarks: "This argument seems to ignore the elementary rules of evidence, and to show a confusion of *post hoc* with *propter hoc*. It is perfectly true that violent crime is on the increase; but those crimes for which flogging was the punishment have actually decreased since flogging was abolished."

The Facts

The actual facts were given by Mr. George Benson, Chairman of the Howard League for Penal Reform in a letter to the *Times* on July 5th:

"No penalty has been so thoroughly investigated as has flogging. The data, stretching back for nearly a century, was sifted and analysed by a departmental committee appointed in 1937 by Lord Simon when Home Secretary.

"The report of this committee established two things: first, that the arguments most frequently used to defend flogging, that it stamped out garrotting and that Mr. Justice

Justice Day put down robbery with violence by use of the 'cat', were legends without even a substratum of fact, and, secondly, that it was impossible to find any evidence whatsoever to show that it was more effective than ordinary imprisonment. The committee recommended its abolition on the following grounds:—'After examining all the available evidence we have been unable to find any body of facts

OUR FREE PRESS

LAST year, the eight leading paper manufacturers of this country made a total profit of £32,371,441. That is far greater than the combined profits of all the newspapers of this country—far greater. What did the Mills do? They put £12½ million to reserves, raising them to £49 million; they distributed £1,401,000 in dividends.

In 1947, Bowaters, the largest manufacturers of newsprint in this country . . . made £24 million profit, in 1948 £3,800,000, in 1949 £41 million, in 1950 £6 million, and last year £11,130,000.

On the present basis of the cost of paper in this country at £64 per ton the price of pulp is only £47. What else is used in the manufacture of newsprint—coal, labour, transport, some water, some clay and some profit? . . . in 1939 the British newsprint mills were delivering paper into the press rooms of the newspapers for just under £10 a ton and for that they paid the cost of pulp, transport, labour, coal, water, china clay and made a profit. To-day that is not enough. This generous Government gives them £17 a ton for tripperies . . .

What is the result? Every week a newspaper or periodical in this country dies. Fifty have died in the last 12 months . . . reputable newspapers which have represented the point of view of decent folk all over this country . . . These papers have died because they could not sustain the strain that these high newsprint prices were imposing upon them."

—SIR LESLIE PLUMMER, House of Commons, June 23rd.

London Anarchist Group SUMMER SCHOOL, 1952 (August Bank Holiday Weekend)

Those requiring accommodation should apply before the 15th July to enable us to complete arrangements. Accommodation is limited so please contact us as soon as possible.

A complete programme will be circulated in due course, and will also be available at Freedom Press.

If any comrades in the London area have accommodation to offer either in the form of beds, floors, cellars, etc., we shall be grateful if you would contact the Summer School Committee, L.A.G., c/o Freedom Press, 27 Red Lion Street, W.C.1.

MARX ON BAKUNIN

WHEN Marx read Bakunin's book *Anarchism and the State* (1873), he added the following critical notes which are presented here in the form of a "dialogue". Originally published in Russian by the Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute from the original notes of Marx in the possession of the Bolshevik Government, it is here translated from a French version which appeared in 1935 together with other anti-Bakuninist material, and this English version was published by Max Schachtman in the *New Internationalist* for Nov.-Dec. 1951.

The *New Internationalist* point out the above details and therefore state that it is impossible to guarantee complete accuracy—"It is but one of similar texts whose verification must wait other days." It is perhaps sufficient for us to point out that the editing, if any, can at no time have been favourable to Bakunin. Yet we believe that Marx's comments are more detrimental to Marxism than to Bakunin and Anarchism.

Marx's remarks are given in italics; his summary and extracts from Bakunin's work in Roman type, and Marx's comments thereon are contained within brackets. Despite some confused passages, the text is given as in the *New Internationalist*.

BAKUNIN:

Wherever there is a State, then there is inevitably domination and consequently, slavery as well. Domination without slavery, be it hidden or conspicuous, is inconceivable—this is why we are enemies of the State.

MARX:

What is the meaning of the proletariat, raised to the rank of ruling class? It means that the proletariat, instead of struggling in an isolated way against the economically privileged classes, has conquered sufficient strength and organisation to make use of generalised means of violence. But it can make use of only economic means which suppress its own character of wage-earner and, as a consequence, its class character. Furthermore, with its total victory its domination over other classes is finished, since its character as a class would disappear.

Is it possible for the entire proletariat to be at the head of the government? (In a trade-union, for example, can the whole union form its executive committee? Will all division of labour cease in the factory, and will the various functions which flow from this division stop? And in Bakunin's edifice from bottom to top, will everything go to the top? Isn't it then true that there won't be anything below? Will all the Commune members simultaneously administer the common interests of the district? Then, there is no more distinction between Commune and district.) There are about 40 million Germans. Will all 40 million, for instance, be members of the government? (Certainly! For the whole thing begins with self-government of the Commune.) The entire people will govern, and there no one will be governed (when a man rules himself, he does not do so according to this principle, for isn't he only himself and no-one else?) Thus, there will be no government, no State, but "if there is a State, there will be rulers and slaves" (this is simply to say, when class domination will have disappeared and when there will no longer be any State in the present political sense).

BAKUNIN:

This dilemma in the theory of the Marxists is easily resolved (by them). By government of the people, they (that is, Bakunin.—K.M.) mean government of

¹This note is obscure. We take Marx to mean that "they, that is the Marxists according to Bakunin's view of them . . ." There is also some obscurity in the preceding paragraph where it seems that Marx is sometimes summarising Bakunin and then answering him.—ED. FREEDOM.

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

- The British Worker in Retreat
1938-1952 C. H. Norman 6d.
Hints on prices, wages and finance.
- First Essay on Population
T. R. Malthus 10/6
A new edition with notes by Dr. James Bonar.
- The Power and the Glory
Graham Greene 3/6
Graham Greene's finest novel, in a new cheap edition.
- England in the 19th Century
David Thomson 2/-
This volume in the Pelican History of England describes the years from the battle of Waterloo to the First World War.
- War on Want
Asso. for World Peace 1/-
A plan for world development.
- The Anarchist Prince
Woodcock & Avekumovic 21/-
This 400-page biography of Kropotkin covers the history of the European and Russian anarchist movement up to Kropotkin's death and contains a detailed account of the early years of FREEDOM.

Obtainable from
**27, RED LION STREET,
LONDON, W.C.1**

great majority of the popular masses by a privileged minority. But this minority, the Marxists say [where], will be made up of workers. Yes, if I may say so, of former workers, but who the moment that they are more than representatives, or have become rulers of the people, cease to be workers.

MARX:

No more than a manufacturer to-day ceases to be a capitalist because of the fact that he becomes a member of the city council.

BAKUNIN:

. . . and from the heights of the State they will look down upon the world of the worker as mean and vulgar; no longer will they represent the people, but themselves and their pretensions as the people's government. He who doubts this is not at all informed about [isn't acquainted with], human nature.

MARX:

If M. Bakunin was au courant, he it only with the situation of a manager even in a workers' co-operative, he would send all his authoritarian nightmares to the devil. He would have had to ask himself, what form can administrative functions assume, based upon a Workers' State, if he wishes to so designate it.

BAKUNIN:

But those elected will be ardently convinced socialists and, besides, scientists. The words: "socialist scientist" [has never been employed; "scientific socialism" employed only in opposition to utopian socialism which tries to inculcate new nonsense into people, instead of limiting its science to understanding of the social movement formed by the people itself; see my work against Proudhon], which are endlessly used in the works and speeches of the Lassallians and Marxists, show by themselves that the so-called Popular State will be nothing else but the highly despotic direction of the popular masses by a new and numerous aristocracy of real or pretended scientists. The people is not erudite. That means it will be entirely absolved of its cares by the government; it will be completely penned up inside the government's stable. What a fine deliverance!

Men have felt this [!] contradiction, and recognising that, despite all its democratic forms, the government of scientists [what a delirium!] would transform it into the heaviest, most hated, most despicable and effective dictatorship in the world, they console

themselves with the idea that this dictatorship will be only transitory and for a short time [no, my dear fellow!], that class domination by the workers over those social strata of the old world which oppose them can last only so long as the economic basis for the existence of classes will not have been destroyed. They say that their only concern and their only goal will be to form and lift up the people [café politicians!] economically as well as politically, to such a degree that all government will soon become unnecessary and the State, having lost all its political character, that is, its character of domination, will transform itself into what is clearly a free organisation. But if their State is truly popular, why destroy it, and if its destruction is necessary for the real deliverance of the people, why do they dare to call it popular?

MARX:

An abstraction made up of Liebknecht's² hobby. The Popular State, which is itself a piece of idiocy directed against the Communist Manifesto, etc. All this simply means that, during the period of the struggle for the overthrow of the old society, since the proletariat still acts according to the basis of this old society and consequently still moves within those political forms more or less belonging to it, it has not yet attained its definitive formation during such a period of struggle and, for its deliverance, it uses methods which are suppressed thereafter. From this, Bakunin concludes that the proletariat should rather do nothing at all; it should await the day of general liquidation, the last judgment.

BAKUNIN:

By means of our polemic against them [which naturally appeared before my book against Proudhon, before the Communist Manifesto, and even before Saint Simon], we have forced them to admit that without freedom or anarchy [Bakunin has only translated Proudhon's and Stirner's anarchy into inept Tartar], that is, the free organisation of the working masses from top to bottom [stupidity!] being reckoned with, their "People's State" [servile] is a yoke which engenders despotism on the one hand, and slavery on the other.

²Wilhelm Liebknecht, the father of Karl Liebknecht, is meant. He was, of course, a Marxist Social Democrat and convinced anti-Bakuninist, even though he here is the butt for Marx's scorn.—Ed.

the people, with the help of a small number of rulers elected by the people.

MARX:

Asinine! This is democratic verbiage, political drivel. An election is a political form, be it that of the smallest Russian commune, or in the artel. The character of an election does not depend upon its designation, but, on the contrary, upon the economic base, upon the economic relations between the electors. As soon as functions will have ceased to be political, (1) governmental functions will no longer exist, (2) the distribution of general functions will have become a matter of profession and will confer no power, (3) elections will have none of their present political character.

BAKUNIN:

Universal suffrage for all the people [such a thing as "all the people" is, in the present sense of the word, fantasmagoric!], where there are peoples' representatives and elected rulers of the State—such is the last word of the Marxists, as well as that of the democratic school. A lie, behind which is hidden the despotism of the ruling minority, so much more dangerous since it appears as the expression of the so-called will of the people.

MARX:

Under collectivized property, the so-called will of the people would disappear, to give way to the real will of the co-operative.

BAKUNIN:

Thus, as result, administration of the

John Brown of Harper's Ferry

ONE of the myths that established the Republican Party in power for many years was the belief that it was the more progressive party; above all, it had "freed the slaves". For years it retained the labour vote and even to this date the reactionary South votes Democrat *en masse*. A fresh myth has arisen about the progressive beliefs of the Democrats; this myth has kept them in power for years. There is no doubt to-day that the Republican backbone is the Yankee businessman, but this was ever the case. Abraham Lincoln's aim in the Civil War was not the abolition of slavery, but the maintenance of the Union, and as he said, if he could have maintained the Union he would have done so, whether it meant the retention of slavery or not.

However, slavery could not be retained because of the persistent attacks on it in the North and the friction between abolitionists and slave-holders, which meant that either the Union split or that slavery went. Lincoln's Presidency may have saved the Union but it did not free the slaves. For that, more credit must go to the abolitionists, Wendell Phillips, Lloyd Garrison and others, who aroused public conscience to the point where it appreciated the odium of slavery. This cause of anti-slavery was perverted to the use of the Republican Party in the Civil War; once hostilities began to "save the Union" the most indifferent Yankee businessman became interested in the lot of the oppressed Negroes of the Southern landowners, just as some of the most unlikely people in England woke up in 1939 to the cause of the persecuted in Hitler Germany—but only as a propaganda weapon to win the war. In the course of the American Civil War propaganda, too, they canonised old John Brown—and the people who had defamed him during his life sang of his "soul going marching-on" long after he was dead.

John Brown was the most militant of all the anti-abolitionists, independent of them all, scornful of the dilatory methods of the legalists, contemptuous of the Republicans whose anti-slavery beliefs could be bought and sold according to political expediency, and impatient of the non-resisters, such as the Quakers, who supported the anti-slavery crusade but took no part to end slavery. His opposition was entirely religious; he

held that slavery was an affront to the "Word of God" and his life-long struggle was based on Christian principles. Coming from an old Puritan family, it was inevitable that he came to be referred to as "the last of the Puritans", that his struggle to end slavery was compared with Cromwell's armies and such contemporary struggles of militant Puritanism. However, in the means which he employed to end slavery, he was not acting as "the last of the Puritans" but as one of the pioneers of modern revolutionary ideas. While he had no acquaintance with such ideas, his actions were in accord with them; and it is significant that whereas Marx could see in the American scene no greater vision than a triumph of Republicanism, with the consequent expanding capitalist development ("as a preliminary to socialism"—what a joke to-day), John Brown without any knowledge of revolutionary theory struck at the root of the matter in his epic fight at Harper's Ferry.

Struggle in Kansas

For many years John Brown had carried on a practically one-man fight with the great resources of the Southern States, as a guerilla leader supported by members of his large family and some others. In 1854 the great compromise of the Northern politicians with the South prohibited slavery for ever in the North but at the same time legalised it in Missouri, which for some time had been a bone of contention between slave-holders and abolitionists. Missouri secured, the State craved Kansas, which was thrown open for settlement and the question of slavery left to a decision by those who should settle there. There was a rush of emigrants to Kansas for both sides. The Northern emigrants were subjected to raids from Missouri, tarred and feathered, their homes burned down, driven away by gangs from the South. John Brown took up the challenge and emigrated to Kansas from his home in Massachusetts, and settled near Osawatimie, primarily to defend the cause of "free socialism" and abolition.

In the fighting that mounted weekly between Free State men and the pro-slavery forces, John Brown became a recognised military figure. He stood out against the quibbles of the politicians. The Republican Party while theoretically

supporting the Free State men, did not want to allow matters to degenerate into a battle in which they said that the Free State men would be overcome. John Brown was denounced as "impractical". They appealed to the ballot box, but elections were overcome by the force of the Southern pro-slavery elements invading the state daily from Missouri.

In this constant battle, John Brown fell out with most of the abolitionists. His biographer and friend, James Redpath, quotes him as "secretly despising the ablest anti-slavery orators"—"Talk is a national institution, but it does no manner of good to the slave."

"He despised the Republican Party . . . Where the Republicans said Hall, Brown shouted Forward to the rescue! He followed neither Garrison nor Seward, Gerritt Smith nor Wendell Phillips."

The Republican Party favoured the non-extension of slavery. Garrison was for its abolition but by legal means, which in the long run meant that the slave-holders would have to agree to it.

Brown entered into a struggle in Kansas that was in fact a private guerrilla war against Missouri. Despite the pleas for calm by Northern politicians, Kansas men were daily being murdered or driven out of the territory. He aimed to save Kansas for "free soil" but at the same time to strike a blow against Southern slavery in the South itself, despite the fact that Kansas was not on the whole with him—the terrorised settlers themselves feared lest invasion be provoked, and all the time this invasion was daily upon them. Finally, there came the battle of Osawatimie, when a small force of Brown's engaged an array of several hundreds of Missourians, and routed them to such an extent that further conquest in Kansas was utterly precluded.

The Negro Insurrection

But the conception of the forces that he was thus engaging was too much for the republican North. From being "impractical" Brown became "mad" and throughout the North he was denounced as a "madman". How could so small a body defeat the South? Most of all were those voices raised because after Osawatimie he turned from the defence to the offence and resolved to strike at the South, preparing his forces for a

"Police Action" In Korea

TWO years ago the United Nations consented to the sending of forces to "repel aggression and set up a united, peaceful and democratic Korea." They acted upon the most cursory investigation, under heavy pressure from a single Power, and upon the instruction of a Security Council whose composition was open to question. The war which has continued ever since has caused more misery and been conducted with more indiscriminate savagery than any previous campaign of similar scale. The Governments concerned began with a cause which was suspect; they have rendered it vile. They have employed methods of war which have resulted in the estimated death of one in five of the population of Korea. They have, from the standpoint of "repelling aggression", effectively won the war against North Korea, and the victory has been thrown away by the deliberate action of General MacArthur. The peaceful and democratic government they championed has revealed itself as a tyranny whose disgusting character not even they themselves have been able to whitewash. The conversion of a limited civil war into an international cockfight has bitterly exacerbated world tensions. The United Nations has been effectively wrecked, and its claims to stand for decency and humanity made a laughing stock.

It has been argued that this is a police action. In what civilised country would the police massacre the population of a city to reassert law and order? It has been argued that once the word "aggression" has been pronounced at the United Nations, all thought is thereby suspended and all human decency abandoned—we can butcher as we like, with napalm, with firing squads, with bombing; the moral responsibility rests on the "aggressors". Even Pilate rather more water than that. It has been said that we cannot abandon Korea to a Communist tyranny. I would as soon see all seriousness what abuses we have for such a tyranny to commit. Killing of three million people? Execution of men, women and children? Torture? Violence against prisoners? Deliberate suppression of inconvenient facts? The tyrants will have their way cut out. Mr. Churchill deplores the public description of Syngman Rhee as "thug and a blackguard" because such statements may have international repercussions. I do not think that it is an excess of plain speaking which has brought us into our present situation. It has been argued that to abandon the war now would be a betrayal of men who have laid down their lives. Because brave men have been led to die in a worthless cause, I see no reason to sacrifice more. We can see with our own eyes the fruits of "collective security" and the struggle for justice, peace and freedom as it is interpreted by the U.N. High Command, and I submit that we defile ourselves by remaining associated with it.

—ALEX COMFORT (in a letter to *The New Statesman*.)

THE SYNDICALIST

THE July issue of THE SYNDICALIST includes articles on Redundancy, the Closed Shop, the Bakery Industry, the Communist capture of the Association of Scientific Workers; "Piffling in Transit"; the Textile Crisis, the Coal Board; and the third in the series on Anarcho-Syndicalism.

THE SYNDICALIST costs 2d. monthly, and postal subscribers to FREEDOM can have it sent to them for an additional 2/- on their annual subscription.

raid on Harper's Ferry. Of course it might be considered "mad" if Brown were really the "last of the Puritans" but not when one thinks of him as a pioneer of modern revolution; for he did not think he could liberate the slaves but that the slaves could liberate themselves.

"In the Canadian Provinces there are thousands of fugitive slaves, the picked men of the Southern States, intelligent and deadly enemies of the South. Five hundred of them, at least, annually visit the Slave States passing from Florida to Harper's Ferry, on heroic errands of mercy and deliverance. They have carried the Underground Railroad and the Underground Telegraph into nearly every Southern State. Here, obviously, is a power of great importance for a war of liberation . . . To conquer the South, a small band only is needed."

Brown therefore called a secret convention of Negro Abolitionists in Chatham (Canada) and made plans to attack Virginia. This time the purpose was not that of the "Underground Railroad"—*extradition in the North*—but that of *emancipation in the South*. He aimed to seize the Arsenal in Harper's Ferry, arm the slaves and to march through Virginia with an army of free blacks. The Negro Insurrection

MARXISM AND ANARCHISM

IN the general struggle for economic justice Marxism hitherto has appeared as the standard-bearer against capitalism and imperialism. Most young people, when critical of capitalist economics and capitalist society, turn to Marxism to seek a theoretical basis for their revolt, for Marx's texts are readily available and his doctrines are expounded by many left-wing intellectuals and denounced by supporters of reaction.

Before Marxism received this wider currency, however, it was by no means the sole and uncontested possessor of the revolutionary ideal. In the nineteenth century, the anarchist conceptions of Bakunin swayed the majority of the First International, the International Working-Men's Association, and Marx could only break that hold by breaking up the International itself. Marxism became a general currency when the Marxists took to parliamentary methods of struggle.

The claim of the Bolsheviks to carry Marxism into effect (as Marxism-Leninism) in Russia, has taken some of the revolutionary glamour of Marx's theories. And at the same time the highly diluted Marxism of the English Labour Party has shown that this doctrine is not incompatible with a kind of governmentalism not basically different from that of the frankly capitalist parties of liberation and conservatism.

It may be therefore that the revolutionary forces will no longer look to Marxism, since its very successes have given point to the criticisms of the Bakuninists. In this way the political failures of Marxism may well join with the trend in progressive social experiments and in science which favours an anarchist and freer conception of social justice.

In this connexion, the comments of Karl Marx on Bakunin's book *Anarchism and the State*, reproduced in this issue of FREEDOM, are especially interesting. Originally published from Stalinist sources as an anti-anarchist broadside in France, it has now been printed in English for the first time in the ex-Trotskyist paper *New Internationalist*. Both in France and America it seems to have been accepted as good polemical material against anarchism.

Nothing could perhaps better illustrate the breadth of the gap which separates Marxism from Anarchism than the fact that the same polemical material can be presented as evidence favouring their points of view by both anarchist and Marxist papers!

Bakunin states plainly that the Marxist idea of government of the people—the dictatorship of the proletariat as it is now usually called—means governmental power in the hands of an elected minority. (This is putting it at its best: in our own time the election has usually been side-stepped by a *coup d'état*, resulting in an actual dictatorship.) But for Marxists, this self-evident criticism is "asinine," "democratic verbiage, political drivel"! Even in the fragmentary form in which Bakunin's thought is presented here (for it should not be forgotten that the editing is Marxist), it is clear that he is seeking a form of society in which men and women, individual men and women, shall be free and shall have a direct part in administering the common affairs of society. Marx, however, cannot conceive of a trade union without an executive committee to rule it. He never proposed any trust in working men, as his letters to Engels at the time of

the Paris Commune showed. (When the workers of Marseilles revolted, Marx derisively told Engels that the French workers had better "put their heads in a bucket".) His "rebuttal" of Bakunin's warning that workers in the government cease to be workers at all, is naive in the extreme to present-day spectators of nationalised boards.

The arguments of Marx epitomise the whole basic difference between his thought and that of the anarchists. Where the latter sought a form of society in which men could work out their own lives, making their own mistakes and learning from them, Marx and his followers have always thought in terms of an élite of leaders whose conceptions and will must be imposed upon the workers. It is a vital distinction and one which the years are throwing into greater and greater prominence.

JOHN BROWN

Continued from p. 2

was the practical answer to slavery. John Brown sensed that a declaration of emancipation would be forever a dead letter in the South and the slave must strike his own blow for freedom. The hysterical abuse of him at the time as a madman was made to avoid like the plague the basic idea of his—no conquest by his own little army but a negro revolution in the South.

Harper's Ferry

A terrible panic seized Virginia when Brown marched into Harper's Ferry. Unfortunately, he had been betrayed by an informer. The South had made preparations; the slaves were kept under surveillance while the forces of both Maryland and Virginia rushed into fight the small band at Harper's Ferry. It was overwhelmed, and with such brutality as one has become more accustomed to in recent years, many of the party were tortured, murdered, mutilated. Brown himself remained alive although many of his sons had perished. He was taken to Charlestown to await trial for treason and insurrection.

As might be expected the North did not stand by him, not even Kansas for whose independence he had fought. Wendell Phillips alone among the politicians did not denounce him as a madman, though thinking him impractical, while Emerson but especially Thoreau spoke on his behalf to protest meetings in the North. Thoreau's Plea for Captain John Brown is a plea for his good name. He knew that the Virginian tiger would not be deprived of its prey.

"Perhaps politicians may prove that only seventeen white men and five negroes were concerned in the late enterprise; but their very anxiety to prove this might suggest to themselves that all is not told. Why do they still dodge the truth? They are so anxious because of a dim consciousness of the fact, which they did not distinctly face, that at least a million of the free inhabitants of the United States would have rejoined if it had succeeded."

While "the momentary charge at Balaclava, in obedience to a blundering command" was praised, the solid, sensible folk of the United States belittled and denounced John Brown. Even those who supported abolition—"Republican editors, obliged to get their sentences ready for the morning edition and accustomed to look at everything by the twilight of politics, express no admiration nor true sorrow even, but call these men 'deluded fanatics'—'mistaken men'—'insane' or 'crazed'. It suggests what a sane set of editors we are blessed with, not mistaken men; who know very well on which side their bread is buttered, at least . . . It was his peculiar doctrine that a man has a perfect right to interfere by force with the slave-holder, in order to rescue the slave. I agree with him. They who are continually shocked by slavery have some right to be shocked by the violent death of the slaveholder but no others. Such will be more shocked by his life than by his death."

The law of the slave South was clear as to the rights of the slaveholders. John Brown (so old and infirm by the wounds of the battle that he had to be carried into court) was sentenced to be hanged. Thoreau's plea was not for Brown's life—which he knew was forfeited to the enemy he had fought—but for his good name. In vain, the comfortable, safe cry was "Madman!" But in good time when Brown was hanged, the politicians wanted to trade on his name. Redpath was approached to write his life as Republican Party propaganda, which he indignantly refused. Finally, during the Civil War, an anonymous street song-hawker wrote the famous "John Brown's Body" and the memory of the pioneer of American Negro revolution was shelved, for "the last of the Puritans" had come into his own, he had "made the gallows glorious like the Cross" they said, but they did not follow his ideas of a Negro Insurrection, and put their faith in the slick Republican politician, Lincoln. A.M.

The Inter-American Student Congress

RIO DE JANEIRO, June 26th.

THE recently held First Inter-American Student Congress at Rio de Janeiro presented several points of melancholy interest, starting with the frantic efforts made by the organising committee, the Brazilian Students Union, to secure the choice of reactionary and Catholic-dominated students' organisations wherever possible: only in a few countries such as Uruguay, Argentina and Mexico (which was not finally represented) were they forced to accept non-subservient associations. In fact, the Inaugural Assembly which was to have been attended by all the ambassadors of the countries represented was cancelled after the Uruguayan delegation, composed of students sympathetic to anarchism, protested against the admission of delegates representing totalitarian régimes responsible for repression of students' political activities. The Uruguayan delegation then withdrew, followed by that of Argentina.

This demonstration created some scandal, and accusations of "communism" were freely hurled at these two delegations, whilst the Brazilian secret police who were already present at every session of the congress began to pay closer attention to Brazilians who allowed themselves to approach the members of these delegations. However, after the Uruguayan and Argentine delegations had proposed to the Congress a resolution demanding a "third position" for Latin America (no connection with Peron's much vaunted "third position") and pointing out the equally reactionary quality of American and Russian imperialism, the "communist label" was withdrawn and replaced by that of "extremist"—a sinister but unexplained stigma.

Having had almost no success in infiltrating their stooges into the various delegations, the Brazilian stalinists kept very quiet about the Congress, preferring to devote their propaganda space to the fourth Brazilian Writers' Congress which was also taking place at the time, and where several comrades had been safely installed.

Right at the start of the congress, the element of farce began to intrude itself,

when the credentials of the sole delegate from Ecuador were questioned, it having been discovered that he was sponsored not by a specific student association but by an organisation devoted to Catholic propaganda among students. After the protest of the Argentine delegates had been accepted, the U.S. delegation made the delightful compromise proposal that the Ecuador delegate should be permitted a half-vote instead of a full one in the proceedings of the Congress! The majority of the delegates being Catholic (as had been carefully arranged by the organisers) the proposal was accepted. An even more disreputable development occurred a little later, when one of the Peruvian representatives reported that he had been informed that the Brazilian Students Union had cabled to Lima demanding his extradition as a communist. This the B.S.U. denied point-blank until they were confronted, after an official investigation had been carried out, with a photo-copy of the telegram in question, with the signature of the Unions' president clearly visible!

The Congress generally proceeded in the intelligent and democratic spirit outlined above, the only encouraging feature being the consistently revolutionary stand of the Uruguayan and Argentine delegations: Uruguay presented a report on the attitude of Uruguayan students to constitutional reform in their country, and on their struggle to combat both capitalist exploitation and stalinist infiltration. A copy of a student manifesto, addressed to the workers on May 1st, was attached to the report.

Later on, the Argentine delegation made an important and successful appeal against the decision of a special commission that religious teaching in universities should be supported by the Congress. The speech of the delegate proved so unanswerable in logic and argument that the majority of delegates was won over to withhold support from the commission's report. So the last faint remnant of a desire for freedom still existing in Latin American educational institutions was eventually upheld by the students' representatives.

The other achievements of the Uruguay-Argentine delegations in col-

laboration were the addressing of a message to the government of Bolivia protesting against the death penalty imposed on militants of the Libertarian and now illegal Federación Agraria Departamental de Bolivia, and a resolution repudiating Franco's dictatorship in Spain in the name of student organisations of the hemisphere. Apart from these efforts, the value of the Congress appears to have been nil and one wonders if the next one (to be held in Cuba) has any chance of being less stacked with reactionary stooges at the beck and call of dictatorial régimes, not to mention the naive do-gooders, cooing good will, from the U.S.A. and Canada. At the moment it seems unlikely. S.W.T.

Argentina

In spite of the Peron fascist dictatorship, the illegal Anarchist Federation of Argentina held its 3rd Congress on the 22-24 December last. Various important resolutions were discussed and passed by the congress, and it is satisfactory to note that, despite the repressive activity of the Peronist régime, the clandestine anarchist press continues to thrive, including *La Obra*, *La Protesta*, *Accion Libertaria*, *Reconstruir* and the Yiddish-language *Des Fraire Wart*.

Cuba

The Libertarian Association of Cuba is perhaps unique among anarchist groups in that it is using the radio to propagate libertarian ideas, with a cultural programme entitled the "Libertarian Hour". This is in addition to their regular publication *El Libertario*.

Fate of Prisoners in Russia

THE propaganda division of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) have published a report on the fate of prisoners-of-war in the Soviet Union since 1941.

"The report says that the total number of prisoners taken by the Soviet Union was approximately seven million; probably about one-seventh of them were civilians. Rather fewer than one-half of the total have been repatriated; the others are dead and missing. Among the missing, a small number are undoubtedly alive. According to the Japanese Government probably one-third of the missing Japanese prisoners, estimated at between 340,000 and 370,000, are still alive. According to German sources, at least 200,000, or even 250,000, German prisoners are alive in the Soviet Union. The French, Italian, Dutch, and Spanish Governments have the names of their nationals who are known to be alive.

"Most of the missing have undoubtedly died in the Soviet Union. The percentage of dead is at least 40 per cent. of the total, or 8 per cent. a year from the end of hostilities in 1945 to the end of repatriation in the spring of 1950. The figure of 40 per cent. dead is a higher percentage than of the dead

in the German and Soviet armed forces during the Second World War, although Germany and the Soviet Union suffered the greatest losses of all combatants.

SLOW STARVATION

"Eight per cent. a year is 40 times the normal death rate in peace-time in civilised nations for the age groups 20 to 30, to which most of the prisoners belonged. 'There is one conclusion only,' the report states, 'that, whatever the mode of death—in this case mainly slow starvation and cold—prisoners in Soviet hands were exterminated. Soviet prisoners-of-war camps have been the ante-room to the cemetery. To previous massacres another was added in the years 1945 to 1950.'—(*Times*, 28/6/52.)

Allowing for propaganda exaggeration which, however, hardly seems necessary, this report is of great importance as indicating the sheer magnitude of the Soviet reversion to more-than-Tsarist, more-than-Nazi disregard for individual rights.

"The report gives evidence to show that the repatriation of prisoners was slowed down and stopped, partly because of the prisoners' unfavourable reports of conditions in the Soviet Union. In some camps, conversion to Communism was a condition of repatriation. A communication by the secretary-general of the Japanese Communist Party, laid before the Japanese Upper House in 1949, asked the Soviet authorities to repatriate only those prisoners who gave guarantees of having become loyal Communists, but suggested that with each batch there should be a certain number of non-Communists in order not to give away the plan of using repatriation for the diffusion of Communism.

"Repatriated German prisoners in September, 1946, gave evidence that they had been put to work for 12 to 14 hours a day at the hardest manual labour, on a poor diet, and in the worst of climates. An issue of the *Irkutsk Pravda* in December, 1946, told of two million western axis prisoners and 800,000 Japanese working in central Siberia, mostly on the construction of the new trans-Siberian railway, in a region where the winter temperatures vary between 30 and 50 degrees below zero.

"Since 1950, the possibility that prisoners remained in Soviet hands has been used by the Soviet Government as a kind of blackmail. For instance, a Japanese woman, known for her Communist sympathies, announced that 182,000 Japanese prisoners would be returned if Japan concluded a separate peace treaty with Russia."—(*Ibid.*)

THE COUNTRY THAT IS KNOWN BY ITS PRISONS

IT is ironic that the one country in the world which goes to the furthest lengths to prevent the West from knowing about its internal affairs, so as to disguise the blemishes that mar the face of its national life, should be the country about whose seamier domestic arrangements the Western public are best informed. Instead of the few experts who could answer questions about the penal system of the French Republic or the judicial arrangements of the Italians, thousands of ordinary members of the British and American reading public could successfully pass an examination requiring fairly detailed knowledge of how the Russians sentence and imprison their political malefactors and ordinary felons. Gentle maiden ladies for whom Brixton is only a name on an omnibus and Dartmoor a breed of pony could rattle off the prison routine of Moscow's Lubyanka and the geography of the labour camps in the Arctic Circle.

—*Time Literary Supplement*, 16/5/52.

FREEDOM PRESS

MARIE-LOUISE BERNERI :

Neither East nor West cloth 10s. 6d., paper 7s. 6d.

Workers in Stalin's Russia. 1s.

SELECTIONS FROM FREEDOM

Vol. 1, 1951, *Mankind is One* paper 7s. 6d.

TONY GIBSON :

Youth for Freedom paper 2s.

PHILIP SANSONO :

Syndicalism—The Workers' Next Step 1s.

ERRICO MALATESTA :

Anarchy. 6d.

Vote—What For? 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.

GEORGE WOODCOCK :

Anarchy or Chaos. 2s. 6d.

New Life to the Land. 6d.

Railways and Society. 3d.

Homes or Hovels? 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.

Syndicalism and History

THE letter about syndicalism in FREEDOM for 5/7/52 from P.H. sets out to demolish a point of view which nobody has advocated in this paper. It has not been suggested that industrial unionism is a "panacea", nor that *The Miners' Next Step* was an anarchist document (though it was surely in fact the most important statement in this country of syndicalist aims and methods of its period).

I doubt very much the historical truth of our correspondent's remarks that "The so-called syndicalism of the pre-1914 decade was partly a press stunt, encouraged by the Parliamentary Labour Party to unnerve the government of the day into political concessions, and partly a demonstration of emotional frustration, which was to find a much more satisfactory outlet in the subsequent war."

The statements by members of the Parliamentary Labour Party of the time scarcely encourage this view. Nor does G. D. H. Cole, who in his *Short History of the British Working Class Movement* (Vol. III, p. 70) says:

"A new idea sprang up, and won wide acceptance, of using Trade Unionism not merely as a means of defending wages and conditions, but as an offensive weapon in a war upon capitalist society. Names and ideas were imported from abroad to convey the new meanings which were struggling for coherent expression. Syndicalism and Industrial Unionism, and later Guild Socialism, became the gospels of the day among the young trade unionists and socialists. While the Labour Party in Parliament was shaping its course in close alliance with the Liberalism of Lloyd George, Labour in the country appeared to be worshipping new gods, and bent on the creation of a new society by 'direct action'."

Prof. Cole's next sentence suggests

an answer to our correspondent's second point. Cole says: "All this is, of course, an intellectualisation of what really happened. The underlying movement was a mass movement of sheer reaction against the failure of either orthodox trade unionism or moderate parliamentarianism to secure any improvement in the working-class standard of life. The theorists, working-class and middle-class alike, who sought to give this movement form and direction and to interpret its vague strivings into a new social gospel, never really captured the great mass of the working-class."

From this observation (which I am sure is correct) we can see that the syndicalism of the years leading up to the first world war was a demonstration not of emotional frustration but of bread-and-butter frustration, and even if we accept Georges Sorel's view of syndicalism as a heroic myth, the striving for which keeps the working-class movement 'virile', in the same way as the effort to scale an unclimbable mountain keeps the mountaineers on their toes, then the myth which replaced it, was not the patriotic myth but the Russian myth. For the sections of the industrial workers which had been most affected by syndicalist ideas were those which in the first world war years were the most militant and recalcitrant in the wartime strikes and not those who found "an emotional outlet" in dying for king and country. Anyway, it is surely only a tiny proportion of workers, whether they are syndicalists or orthodox trade unionists who find their emotional outlets in myths, whether they are revolutionary, patriotic or religious. The great majority of people find their emotional outlets in much more mundane and probably more rewarding things. A man in a mining village told Mr. John Newsom that he supported the Labour Party because he wanted a

society where he didn't have to carry his bedridden father a hundred yards to the privy. I cannot think of a better reason if only the Labour Party had fulfilled its programme. But his socialism was hardly an emotional outlet, nor was the syndicalism of 60,000 Glasgow workers and Welsh miners before the first world war.

The origin and varieties of syndicalist tendencies in the working-class movement in this country, its debt to the localism of the French revolutionary syndicates "largely under semi-anarchist inspiration," and to the centralism of the American I.W.W.'s "One Big Union," have been fully described in Cole's *The World of Labour* and his *Short History*; and there is a large number of books of the period explaining or re-proving or attacking syndicalism,* and the existence of all these books, to say nothing of the propaganda of the syndicalists themselves should enable us to discover the "indefinite meaning" that the term had, a meaning probably clearer than that of the words socialism or anarchism. It should also help us see which aspects of the syndicalist movement were libertarian and which authoritarian.

In the foreword to Philip Sansom's *Syndicalism—The Workers' Next Step*, we said: "There is nothing new about the idea of workers' control, or the industrial theory of syndicalism which advocates it. (The word itself comes from the French word for trade-unionism. *Anarcho-syndicalism*, though an awkward word is simply a convenient label for the idea of workers' control coupled with the idea of anarchism which means the absence of authority.)" I don't think that this is a misuse of the term, and since we must call our industrial viewpoint something, and cannot merely describe it as anarchism, since there are non-syndicalist anarchists, I see no reason why we should curtail our use of the word.

C.W.

*Sir Arthur Clay: *Syndicalism and Labour*; Philip Snowden: *Socialism and Syndicalism*; J. H. Horley: *Syndicalism*; J. Ramsey MacDonald: *Syndicalism*; A. D. Lewis: *Syndicalism and the General Strike*; S. & B. Webb: *Syndicalism*; A. W. Kirkaldy: *Economics and Syndicalism*. (All published shortly before the 1914 war.)

The Flogging Judge

Continued from p. 1

anti-social behaviour has causes, and is not in the 20th century to be explained in terms of "wickedness" and such-like biblical hangovers, hardly needs stressing.

Degradation of the floggers

There remains the effect of flogging on the society that uses it. To see a judge order a barbarous punishment is an unlovely spectacle: but what of the man who administers the flogging? . . . the doctor who examines the victim and pronounces his fitness to continue with the strokes, the Governor and the Chaplain who are obligatory spectators? Who can deny the degrading effect of such spectacles?

And the society which tolerates such things is also self-debased. We should press for the abolition of the last inconsistent remnants of flogging (e.g., for prisoners who assault prison officers). And we should insist that those who recommend such barbarities are all of a piece with those who favour lynching, and with the Nazi type of mentality.

U.S. FOUND YIELDING TO HATE HYSTERIA

A REPORT published recently by an American body, the Anti-Defamation League, on racial and religious bigotry, declares that Americans "find themselves accepting hysterical unproved denunciations with less and less repugnance."

The league noted "an alarming increase in violence and hoodlumism attributable to racial and religious tensions," listing the anti-Negro riots in Cicero, Ill., gang assaults upon Jews in Boston, and the unsolved fatal bombing of a Negro leader and his wife in Florida. The league's study, based on material from its twenty-five regional offices throughout the country, said the increased violence and hoodlumism was "disturbing evidence of promoted lawlessness that has not stopped even at murder."

or will we be told that the men did not know they had done wrong?"

The question of workers' representatives joining with employers in asking for more severe suspensions had been discussed jointly by the trade unions in the docks industry. There is little record of trade union representatives on the appeals tribunals or through other channels asking in the past for action against men for alleged infringements of the working rules in the docks.

—*South London Press*, 17/6/52.

ALTERNATIVE TO INCREASED WORK

Increased Efficiency Save Coal

IT was recently stated by the British Electricity Authority that "in the three years up to 1951 improved efficiency in power stations had secured a saving of about 2,000,000 tons of coal, in spite of the deterioration in the quality of coal."

"For the calendar year 1951 the overall average thermal efficiency of the Authority's steam power stations was 21.79 per cent., compared with 21.53 per cent. for 1950. This represented a saving of 400,000 tons of coal and an economy of over £1,000,000."

Capitalist economy in "normal" times does not encourage thrift in the utilisation of its products for "spending is better than mending". But hard times and shortages show what can be done in this direction.

When governments demand harder work as the way out of the current crisis, it is well to remember that a similar increase in output is possible by greater efficiency and less waste.

SKELETON IN THE CUPBOARD?

For a fortnight the skull of Cuthbert Mayne, a priest martyred in 1577, lay in the private chapel of Cardinal Griffin, Archbishop of Westminster, while he was recuperating from illness.

"My subsequent improvement in health," said the cardinal yesterday, "has done much to confirm my faith in the heavenly power of this great martyr."

—*News Chronicle*, 23/6/52.

T. & G.W.U. OFFICIALS DEMAND HEAVIER PENALTIES FOR DOCKERS

THE Transport and General Workers' Union, one of the two unions in the docks, is being challenged by Dick Barrett, general secretary of the rival National Amalgamated Stevedores' and Dockers' Union, to show what action will be taken by the union against two T.G.W.U. men who, Mr. Barrett alleges, sided with the employers in seeking heavier punishments for dock workers who break dock rules.

A number of men have recently been suspended by a local board of the Dock Labour Board.

This followed the union-employers' call for heavier penalties which Mr. Barrett alleges. The union men were, in calling for heavier penalties, against their union policy and identical to proposals already turned down by the union, he says.

"In the past few years we have seen men disciplined for allegedly opposing T.G.W.U. policy, even to the extent of being expelled from their union. Some have been of the so-called left wing," Mr. Barrett told the *South London Press*.

"Lately there have been sent to a local board of the National Dock Labour Board three letters asking the right to impose a more severe suspension."

Mr. Barrett gave to the *South London Press* names of two men who, he said, had joined with the employers in making these requests. These two men are workers' representatives on the tribunals and are T.G.W.U. members.

Mr. Barrett added: "These requests (from the appeals tribunals) were against the policy of the T.G.W.U. and the proposals put to the local board were identical with the proposals that had been rejected by the union on behalf of the registered port workers."

"Now will we see any action being taken by the Union against these men

"No, Indeed, no Politics at all"

THE last 14 months tell the story of General MacArthur and his "fading away."

San Francisco, Calif., April 18, 1951: "I have no political aspirations whatsoever. I do not intend to run for any political office and I hope that my name will never be used in a political way."

Washington, D.C., April 19, 1951: "I do not stand here (before Congress) as advocate for any partisan cause."

Cleveland, Ohio, Sept. 7, 1951: "There are those of us who, from neither partisan affiliation nor with political purpose . . ."

Tacoma, Wash., Nov. 15, 1951: "When I left New York, a friend said, 'Oh, politics?' and I answered, 'No, Americanism.'"

New York, N.Y., March 12, 1952: "No, indeed, no politics at all."

Lansing, Mich., May 15, 1952: "There is no politics in me, nor none intended in what I say."

Pierre, S.D., June 2, 1953 (telegram to former Governor of South Dakota): "Would deeply appreciate any help you can give Sen. Tati."

Chicago, Ill., June 10th: Gen Douglas MacArthur was named the keynote speaker for the Republican National Convention.

New York, N.Y., June 11, 1952: "I accept with a real sense of grateful appreciation."

—From the *Milwaukee Journal*.

Ex-Servicemanship

WHEN one happens to have grown up between the two wars, one is inclined to be a bit bored to the teeth of the Great Sacrifice They Made propaganda. "They died that you might live," and when all was said and done, you could have lived just the same, even if the political complexion of the times had been a little different. The curious post-1918 and now post-1945 "ex-serviceman's politics" is a direct consequence of this type of propaganda. In the past, left bodies fought against it—most of them regarded such bodies as fascist—but this is far from the case to-day. Apart from one Labour M.P.'s welcome exposures, the British Legion is regarded by politicians as sacrosanct.

The basic assumption that an ex-serviceman is a high priority on everything is rather difficult to analyse, because it is based entirely on emotion. So far as the disabled are concerned, one notices that those who talk most of the "disabled ex-serviceman" tend to minimise the needs of civilian disabled, whether they happen in the past to have been "ex-servicemen" or not. In the long run, disablement is the window-dressing of the official associations: they exist to look after such interests, but if standards of living were raised to such an extent that the organisation was unnecessary, the latter would disappear.

The truth is that having sacrificed health or limbs for "the country"—that is to say, a particular political course the State may now have modified or altered entirely—disabled veterans are still made the pawns of the patriotic humbug, for the hard core of the idea of ex-servicemen's associations is not so much building up large funds from the public of which they hand out small sums to individual cases, but

A Reader Writes GROUNDS FOR DIVORCE

MAY I ask if anarchists are really concerned about the "effectiveness in public life of those who occupy prominent positions"? In the article entitled "Grounds for Divorce" in last week's issue, you express concern that the "social stigma" attached to divorce for adultery weighs particularly on the sensitive and those in responsible or prominent positions.

As far as the sensitive are concerned, I fancy there can hardly be any aspect of authoritarian society that does not weigh upon them pretty heavily, and marriage itself must be a very heavy burden indeed. And it is, I suggest, the main function of the Royal Commission on Divorce and Marriage to find ways and means of making marriage work. It will, of course, not be able to escape findings that show up the whole degrading business, but I am willing to bet that the final Report will make clear that the authoritarian position is still the same, in essence, as it ever was.

As far, however, as the prominent persons are concerned, I can only say that the more ineffective they become, the better I shall like it, and if they are hoist by their own petard, i.e., if their own stupid system works against them—it serves them right!

London.

T.K.

Special Appeal

June 21st to July 7th:

Wakefield: A.F. 3/-; Fulham: W.E.D. 5/-; Glasgow: A.M.C.D.* 4/-; Cambridge: C.E.D.* 5/-; London: F.E.D.* 5/-; Anon* 1/8; Edinburgh: T.O.M.* 5/-; Hull: R.G. 12/-; London: V.T. £1.

Total . . . 3 0 8

Previously acknowledged . . . 348 16 4

1952 TOTAL TO DATE . . . £351 17 0

GIFT OF BOOKS: C.W.

* Readers who have undertaken to send regular monthly contributions.

HAVE YOU RENEWED YOUR SUB. TO FREEDOM?

keeping alive the phoney wartime sugaring that helped to sweeten the pill of sacrifice for nothing.

As if the official bodies doing out sentiment by the bucketful and charity by the thimbleful were not enough, along come the newest inter-war atrocities in the form of the semi- and total political ex-servicemen's bodies, keeping up the false notions of the last war, so hideously disproved by events. One can well understand the Stalinoids wanting us to remember the days when Holy Joe was the ikon of all orthodox British homes, and to keep up the "Remember Stalingrad" wail once echoed by the Conservative Party.

Hence they are building up their "ex-service groups" on exactly the same lines as post-1918 fascism.

In some circles, their campaign against rearming Germany, and especially Japan, is bound to have some superficial success. They will find later, however, a complete about-face when the harsh reality of imperialism force "patriots" to accept the Allies chosen for the phoney by the State, for nothing is phoney as the ephemeral spirit of ex-servicemanship, and whatever success is obtained in gaining support in terms of voting power soon disappears with the first of popular patriotism blown from the national press.

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

OPEN AIR MEETINGS

Weather Permitting
HYDE PARK
Every Sunday at 4.30 p.m.
MANETTE STREET
(by Foyle's, Charing Cross Road)
Every Saturday at 6.0 p.m.

INDOOR MEETINGS

at the
CLASSIC RESTAURANT,
Baker Street, W.1
(near Classic Cinema)
MEETINGS SUSPENDED

NORTH-EAST LONDON

DISCUSSION MEETINGS

IN EAST HAM
Alternate Wednesdays
at 7.30
JULY 23—Open Discussion
ANARCHISM & PACIFISM

WEST LONDON

Enquiries to—
C. Brasnett, 79 Warwick Ave., W.9

LIVERPOOL

DISCUSSION MEETINGS at
101 Upper Parliament Street,
Liverpool, 8
Every Sunday at 8 p.m.

GLASGOW

OUTDOOR MEETINGS

at
MAXWELL STREET
Every Sunday at 7 p.m.
With John Gaffney, Frank Leech,
Jane Strachan, Eddie Shaw
Frank Carlin

LEEDS

Anyone interested in forming a group in Leeds, please contact Freedom Press in first instance.

COVENTRY

Anyone interested in forming a group in Coventry, please write Freedom Press.

SAN FRANCISCO

FREEDOM readers are invited to support a Spanish Protest meeting to be held in San Francisco, at the Hall in 827 Broadway on July 19th.

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