

# Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"To-day under the guise of worship of the individual, fetishism of the personality, the individuals' real scope is narrowed to tragic smallness . . . Buchenwald and Hiroshima are true statements of what we think about the individual."

—GYORGY KEPES.

## PERSIA ON THE TIGHT ROPE

IT could be said that all events in Persia are to-day reported by the newspapers through oil-coloured spectacles. Very little discussion filters through on such topics as the rise of Persian nationalism, for instance—although that is clearly an important aspect of Persian politics.

The recent events of Dr. Mossadek's dismissal and the return to power have been treated in the same superficial fashion. The *Times*, for example, while voicing subdued pleasure when Dr. Mossadek fell, speculated (as it turned out, correctly) on the weakness and insecurity of his successor, but still appeared to have no other viewpoint than one of British oil interests.

An exception to this general attitude of the press was provided by an editorial in the *Observer* (27.7.52) which looks over the shoulder of the British oil magnate and sees more significant aspects of Persia's rôle in world politics. This article was like a breath of new air in all the newspaper stuff about Persia: yet, even if it served to underline the essential bankruptcy of the prevailing political outlook in a way which has more general significance than the material under discussion.

### Communist Influence in Persia

Briefly, the *Observer's* argument is as follows. The riots in Teheran were "extremely massive and well-organized, and the mobs who went back to the charge after being dispersed by fire showed a discipline and persistence which is provided only by a stiffening of matured street-fighting cadres. There is only one organization in Persia which can be credited with the authorship of this performance: the Communist Tudeh Party."

The conclusion drawn is that "Dr. Mossadek, although outwardly at the height of his power, is in reality in a considerably weaker position than before, for he owes his restoration to office to the newly revealed Communist power of the streets, which he can hardly hope to control."

Now it is the fashion to attribute everything to-day to Communist machinations, and such an analysis should not go without critical evaluation. It seems certain however that the Persian Communists did support Mr. Mossadek. And it does not appear that the street demonstrators had any revolutionary conceptions of the kind that spring spontaneously from populations at certain turning points in history. Hence it is a fair assumption that they were being manipulated by some other organization, and the *Observer* is probably right to identify the Communist Party.

### Alternatives to Communism in Persia

Now, anarchists and people of good will generally are opposed to the setting up of a régime of Communism in Persia, because they hate authoritarian dictatorship, the police State, the denial of justice and of freedom, and the suppression by terrorism or physical means of all opposition, which is marked up in Communism. But they also would oppose any other régime of a dictatorial nature. In brief, anarchists and other humane persons want to see Persia, like anywhere else, free to develop naturally and in freedom and happiness.

Not so the politicians and the 'realists'. The *Observer* goes on to

point the dangers in the present situation. For the Communists, Dr. Mossadek provides a figure behind whom they can prepare, by breaking up potential resistance, for a *coup d'état* in a few months' time. But in envisaging the consequences of this the *Observer's* leader writer has no single word about its undesirability from the point of view of the Persians themselves: he is concerned solely with the balance of power:

"Of all the countries in the world, Persia seems the one most likely to fall under Communist domination in the near future. Moreover, since Persia is contiguous to Russia, Communist domination of Persia would in all probability lead to an immediate penetration of Persia by Russian managers, technicians, and administrators, and to an eventual incorporation of Persia into the zone of Russian military and political power—her transformation into another Poland or Rumania. Nothing could more disastrously upset the world balance of power. Persia under Russian control would outflank both Turkey and Pakistan and make the Indian Ocean an unsafe sea. It is unlikely that such a land-

slide in world power relations could pass without straining the already weakened fabric of world peace to the uttermost.

"It is probably no exaggeration to say that the danger of events leading to a third world war is to-day greater in Persia than in Germany, Yugoslavia, Korea, or Indo-China. In these four places the Great Powers have the measure of the local problems and know where they stand and how far they can and cannot safely go. In Persia, they may be swept off their feet by a sudden onrush of local revolution which they cannot control."

### The Remedy

The remedy, as the *Observer* sees it, is to prevent this happening. "This means preventing a revolutionary situation from developing—in other words, preventing bankruptcy and economic collapse; and strengthening the forces of nationalism—outside and perhaps inside the Communist Party—which are the only emotional and political bulwark inside Persia against the absorption of this vast and important country by Russia."

The writer then goes on to describe the British preoccupation with the oil dispute as "extremely petty" and calls for a reversal of this attitude.

Continued on p. 3

## TELEVISION The Means of Persuasion

THE situation which has arisen over television is very curious. On the one hand, a parliamentary battle as to whether there should be sponsored T.V. or continued monopoly. On the other hand, a rush by people in all walks of life to try and get a set. Television is no longer the rich man's toy, as it was before the war, or the latest middle-class fashion, as it was just after; instead it is becoming almost as ubiquitous as the radio. Family after family competes to buy a set, cutting down on holidays and so on, regarding it as a priority in pleasure and an essential means of enjoyment. Yet if this were the case, why should the politicians be squabbling as to whether the Government or the commercial firms should control the screen? Nobody to-day is so naive as to believe that they are wondering which could give the greatest pleasure to the public, or how the maximum of enjoyment might be obtained for the community at large. There is a bit more meat than that on the bone when those dogs squabble over it.

The sudden hue and cry over television contrasts with the neglect suffered for a long time by motion pictures or radio in their infancy. To-day the ruling-classes are well aware of the tremendous power that lies behind propaganda by persuasion. To those old methods—of which the one is becoming almost as obsolete as the other—Press and Pulpit, is added Radio, Films and now Television, which might be the most potent of all. There is plenty of sugar on the pill—entertainment of one sort or another must be there in order to get the patient to swallow his medicine—but entertainment is the last thing that is in the minds of the politicians when they argue over the future of T.V.

The fact is that they realise the potentialities of this means of moulding public opinion which may yet come to outweigh all the others. Big Business would certainly like the opportunity of reaching the public, both with advertisements—on the American model—and the form of commercial-political advertising we have seen in this country (on the Tate & Lyle cartons, for instance). But Big Business can no longer dominate in this field, for the totalitarian state of the future intends to get the means of persuasion under its own control, and the structure of the B.B.C. has been ideally suited in advance for this type of propaganda. They have only reckoned with their public in not being too blatant about it, but the propaganda for conformity is there all the time; it is a subtle, pervasive form of propaganda we get, sometimes unconscious class propaganda, but it exists nevertheless, in exact proportion to the requirements of the ruling-class, which at the moment does not require it in any greater form than it now gets it.

It is difficult to say as regards both radio and television which is the greater evil—a State monopoly which does not have to bow to commercial dictates, or a commercial sponsored station which does not have to take the orders of the Civil Service types. "It is curious that nobody ever suggests that commercial television might be run by theatrical interests whose speciality was the various forms of entertainment and culture," I heard someone say the other day. "When one hears about commercial television it is always taken for granted that soap manufacturers know more about what the public wants than the unemployed Army list boys at Broadcasting House. Maybe they do, but one would think that if we have to subsidise somebody to run the show for us, it might at least be somebody who is out to entertain us, rather than sell us toilet or soft soap."

Such a problem, however, cannot really be solved in an authoritarian society, for in order to maintain the modern State all forms of persuasion are necessary—when those forms fail, the armed fist is brought into it, but indoctrination is the first essential in order that the armed fist can be used. For that purpose all forms of entertainment and even culture must be used by the State as a means of influencing public opinion along certain lines. Under the generic term entertainment one includes the Press and Religion, and it can be seen plainly how the latter is used even in the "communist" countries which originally laid claim to breaking from the religious tradition. Sport too comes into it, and no observer of present day life can fail to see how all these are used in order to preserve conformity and try to freeze out the rebel.

In a free society one visualizes that when technicians came together to pool their knowledge and abilities for such things as television and broadcasting stations, they would be far less in the position of the B.B.C. than in that of the present day short-wave amateur. They would work independently of any authority to give something to the community. Actors, musicians and others would be only too willing to give their talents to reach the community. One could not avoid propaganda—obviously in any play such might arise—but it should be given its proper place. There is nothing wrong with propaganda itself—the means of persuading people to hold certain ideas—but what is wrong is the concentrated monopoly of it into the hands of one party or one class, and while we may not yet have the former, we are very much tending to the latter, which ultimately will lead to the same thing.

The answer is not the "maiden aunt" policy of strict impartiality—which, bent a bit but more or less there as between the "leading parties"—is the aim of the B.B.C. It is the complete "freedom of the air" which does not exist, has not yet existed and is not contemplated by any organisation whatsoever. Let the air be as free as the press—at present that is not all the way, but let it move forward with it on an equality. There are no serious difficulties in forming a multiplicity of stations—the commercial people soon build them when they want to. When everyone can speak and be seditious, blasphemous or as generally outrageous as they wish—or (since we are not in a free society) as they can be in print, at least, then we shall have

Continued on p. 3

## Something More Than Circus Interest in the American Elections

NEW YORK, July 17.

FOR the first time in many a year, the political conventions hold something more than circus-interest.

The nomination of Eisenhower is being interpreted by the pro-Eisenhower "experts" as the victory of crude and honest amateurs over "the machine", of underdog over steamroller. The press, generally pro-Eisenhower, finds this theme inexhaustibly interesting. No doubt it is already an established . . . legend. How contrary are the facts! Consider the claims of the Eisenhower people. On the one hand, they want to show that Eisenhower won by appeal to a moral issue, not by crafty politics; so they constantly repeat that Taft was defeated by the "bungling" of his own "steamroller". Yet they also want it to appear that Eisenhower had a legitimate, untainted majority, was the people's choice, and for this purpose they point out that Taft needed the contested southern delegates in order to win.

They cannot have it both ways. If Taft needed the disputed delegations—and he did—then his fight for them was not "steamroller stupidity", it was the midwestern "old guard" fighting for its life against a much more powerful steamroller.

This is the fourth consecutive convention in which the "old guard" mid-west Republicans have been defeated by the alliance led by the chiefs of the New York party. Can this go on *ad infinitum*? Will the New York faction allow the mid-west to regain party control, so that the interesting farce may be repeated in 1956?

The Taft fight for the southern delegates was a god-send to Eisenhower—not, as his partisans wish us to believe, in procuring the nomination—that was already assured—but in at last providing Eisenhower with a mask in which to appear in public—as champion of fair play and morality. It is a poor mask, and the decision to keep him covered up in Europe as long as possible was wise.

His appearances in the U.S. have been unexciting; his sympathizers have begun to point out that there are limits to how far an "I don't know" can be expected to carry a national politician in these times of televised press conferences. Had Taft not staged a last-ditch fight, the nomination would have been a dreary anti-climax, and an exceeding poor omen for November.

Though their chances are still excellent, Republican victory is no longer a sure thing. The election should have come much sooner. The worst of the Korean casualties are—at least temporarily—over; there are not many "Reds" left for Senator McCarthy to unmask, and the store of mink coats may be running low; business is prosperous. And now the Republicans have a candidate identified with the administration's foreign policy. However, "Truman's War" is still hated, and a limitless public gullibility has stood the severe test of McCarthy's gayest "Reds are in the Government" fantasies; these facts should elect Eisenhower. Much depends, of course, on the Democratic convention, not yet in session at this writing.

What must interest us most is, what would Eisenhower's election mean? It is the writer's opinion that Eisenhower cannot fundamentally alter the present drift: namely, the Permanent War Short of War, with all its domestic and foreign implications. This opinion is based on several factors: (1) Eisenhower's army reputation as a "political general", and "administrator", "he'll do what he's told to do but he won't initiate"; in short, a stuffed shirt, a gladhander. (2) The fact

that Eisenhower's ambitions seem to end with being President; he does not—like MacArthur or even Taft—have any known ideals or principles, let alone a drive to put them into effect. Eisenhower could, for example, just as well have run as a Democrat ("too liberal", is his only reported objection); and in such a case we can speak only of ambition, not design or principles. (3) His nomination was engineered by a perfectly orthodox eastern capitalist group, who have nothing to gain from attacks on liberty or extreme State centralization, except such as naturally goes along with the war.

This, of course, must be the image of Eisenhower held by his high backers, who saw in him their only chance to deprive Taft of his political reward and to dominate the political scene. They may misjudge their man, or they may not.

It is taken for granted in these comments, that when times change, and the power-groups require a figure (or figure-head, it does not matter) of force in command of the nation, then the presence of a general in the White House will suit their purposes admirably.

D.T.W.

## Possible Intervention in Egypt

AT the time of going to press (29.7.52), the expulsion of King Farouk has been an entirely bloodless affair. It has indeed been said that there have been more deaths in the struggle to see Eva Peron's bier than in the army's *coup d'état* in Egypt.

In this sense that intervention of the Army under Mohammed Neguib is in every sense a palace revolution in which the Egyptian people have played no part except in the negative sense that they lifted no finger on behalf of Farouk.

Nevertheless, social forces in such situations are less stable than in normal times, and it seems certain that when Mr. Eden told the Com-

mons that "in view of the unsettled conditions which inevitably result from events such as have recently taken place in Egypt, we have thought it right to authorise certain movements of British Forces as a precautionary measure"—he had in mind the possibility of popular intervention.

It has often had to be pointed out that when it comes to intervention against the forces of social revolution abroad, the British ruling class have tremendously long experience. In interpreting Eden's statement in this way, we do not mean to imply that the situation in Egypt is at present a revolutionary one: we merely note that the British government takes its precautions.



III

The Militarists' Uprising of July 1936

ON July 11th, 1936, a group of Phalangists seized the broadcasting station of Valencia, and issued the following proclamation: "This is Radio Valencia! The Spanish Phalange has seized the broadcasting station by force of arms. To-morrow the same will happen in broadcasting stations throughout Spain".

The Generals launched their first attack in Morocco six days later. The army, headed by the forces of the Legion occupied the towns, ports, aerodromes, and strategic places in the Protectorate, seizing and killing militant workers and prominent personalities of the Left.

Faced with the accomplished fact, the reactions of the political parties and of the C.N.T. to the situation are particularly interesting. The Socialist and Communist parties issued the following joint note: "The moment is a difficult one. The Government is sure that it possesses sufficient means to crush this criminal attempt."

On the morning of July 19th a large proportion of the soldiers of the Barcelona garrison left their quarters to occupy all the strategic buildings and centres of the city, linking up with other elements involved in the

uprising. Some writers on the Civil War in Spain have attempted to create the impression that both sides were so incompetent that the rising and the popular reaction were somewhat of a farce, and Ruritanian in character.

In Barcelona it was the revolutionary workers of the C.N.T., with small sections of the assault guards and civil guards (implacable enemies of the Anarchists in normal times) which had not gone over to the Militarists who, within twenty-four hours, succeeded in forcing General Godeu and his troops to surrender.

9 Even Prof. Allison Peers, who by implication is not in so many words preferred Franco to the Anarchists and the social-revolution writes in Catalonia Infelix (London, 1937): "At 3.50 a.m. on July 19 the first of the Barcelona garrisons revolted. Leaving the Caserna del Bruc, in the district of Pedralbes, the troops advanced rapidly down the Gran via Diagonal.

10 Pierats points out that in the hand to hand fighting in the streets of Barcelona, the discipline of the military was broken, and the soldiers once in contact with the people were soon influenced by them; many were those who used their arms against their officers.

F.A.I. : Anarchist Federation of Iberia. C.N.T. : Workers' National Confederation. Revolutionary Syndicalist organisation influenced by anarchist ideas, and whose objectives were Libertarian Communism.

U.G.T. : General Union of Workers. Reformist Trade Union movement influenced by social democratic ideas and controlled by the Socialist Party.

hopeless situation for the workers was, thanks to their heroism and initiative as well as their revolutionary enthusiasm, converted into victory. But in other towns valuable time was lost by the indecision of government officials and supporters of the Popular Front as well.

In Valencia the barracks were surrounded by the workers before the troops could occupy strategic positions in the city. This situation lasted a fortnight, the government refusing to arm the people and declaring that the troops imprisoned in the barracks were "loyal".

In Saragossa where the whole garrison joined the uprising, the workers, in spite of their numerical strength (30,000 in the two organisations, U.G.T., C.N.T.) were unable to crush the rebellion. They lacked arms, and in the words of a leading militant of the C.N.T. "we have to recognise that we were very ingenuous. We lost too much time having interviews with the civil governor; we even believed in his promises . . ."

In Asturias, another revolutionary centre of the Peninsula the indecision of the authorities and of the Popular Front created grave complications in the situation there, and only at the cost of many lives was the uprising finally quelled.

But it was the speed with which the Rebels carried out their plan of linking up their two main forces across Andalusia and Extremadura, using as intermediary bases Seville, Cadiz, Algeciras, Jerez, etc., that constituted the key to all their future military successes.

11 Curiously enough the C.N.T. and U.G.T. leaders ordered the return to work to all except the Transport workers. The Valencia proletariat however refused to comply until the barracks had been attacked and the soldiers disarmed.

+ La C.N.T. en la Revolucion Española (Toulouse, 1951).

TOWARDS A RICHER LIFE

THE impotence of the individual's social contribution is an illusion based upon a perspective of the past which distorts the view of the present. The tragedy is the lack of vision and consequent lack of courage to take the consequences of our present place in nature and society.

Most efforts of contemporary men are short-circuited in shortsighted goals. Individual or group purposes are controlled by the scale of smaller out-lived conditions. Present day production of the means of our existence operates in a restricted time-scale and considers mainly the initial, the most palpable results of individual or narrow group interest, and is indifferent to remoter consequences.

by tragic smallness. It is significant that while we pay lip service to individuality, the optimum of individual development, genuine heroes, are missing. Buchenwald and Hiroshima are true statements of what we think about the individual.

The optimum performance in human work is defined by one's ability to find a rhythmical articulation proper to the body, the mind and the task. Efficiency and psychological balance are based on the unique rhythm growing out of unique processes.

If the rhythm is interfered with and forced to obey a measure foreign to its own conditions, the very vitality of change-growth is endangered. To-day we are witnessing a degradation of our health and integrity, growth and hopes.

Work, the very foundation of our existence, is broken into a rhythm foreign to human nature. Just as shortsighted misuse of arable land disregarded the natural rhythm of fertility, and devastated vast territories, mechanization guided by a myopic outlook used up our most important resource, human beings.

Productive man who will restructure contemporary life must retain his unique sense of life—his own nature. Creating

a mechanical world of technology, he must safeguard himself against being dictated to by the equipment he created. Health can be safeguarded only if man recognizes the genuine rhythm in his activities. He can perform his historical task if he is not thwarted by the mechanical tempo of his technical tools, his factories, his offices, his transportation vehicles, leisure, if he retains his ability to sense himself in his natural rhythm of action and repose.

If one can see himself in this vital bondage with nature and society, he will not need to look for gratification in fantasy but will find an outlet for his emotions in his active life, in his work. Self-esteem and courage will be regained if work will both economically and morally, socially and individually achieve a constructive role.

But man's creative sensibility is dulled and misused. Yet it alone can guarantee that the emotional dynamics, political passions and rationally willed goals will not derail and disintegrate into regressive patterns as they tend to-day.

It is not by accident that at the same time when a new barbarism made a farce out of the human and a counterfeit of nature through man-created environment—during the progressive devaluation of the meaning of scale, organization, and twisting human rhythm into mechanical monotony—the most sensitive protested vehemently.

The last eighty years' history of vital arts shows a continuous effort to reclaim lost sensibilities. For those who can see this evolution, late nineteenth century and twentieth century art is a rich storehouse of inspiring knowledge. Step by step the revolutionary leaders of visual arts focused their creative efforts upon formulating those aspects of vision so badly lacking: scale, structure and rhythm.

Above all architecture, courageously led, found a symbol and palpable reality in the healthy structuring of space. Today its best leaders are searching with convincing honesty and tenacity for an organization of our physical environment again truly shaped on the human scale.

William Morris, who in spite of his

apparent anachronisms saw many things clearer in the last century than many of us see to-day, said "Anything that is made by man and has form must either be a work of art, or destructive to art." He understood clearly that everything man makes is the foundation of what we call art. Art for him is "the expression of pleasure in the labour of production" and he considered this "joy in labour" as not only the birthright of labour, but the foundation for a richer life.

—FROM AN ARTICLE ON "SCALE, STRUCTURE AND RHYTHM", BY PROF. GYORGY KEPES, IN Transformation, (U.S.A.)

Potentialities of British Farming

THE LAND OF BRITAIN by Laurence Easterbrook. (News Chronicle "Background to the News" Series, 1s. 6d.)

MR. EASTERBROOK in 40 illustrated pages gives a very interesting potted history of farming in this country. He describes first the mediaeval agricultural system, then the golden age of the great improvers. Robert Bakewell, Amos Cruickshank, "Turnip" Townshend and Coke of Norfolk, then the collapse of 1879, the short-lived prosperity of the first World War, after which "undreamt of depths were to be plumbed" by British agriculture.

"In 1929, North America had a record harvest which, under our wonderful system of world economics, was destined to bankrupt many of her own farmers, bring added disaster to our own, and pave the way to the industrial depression of the 1930s, induced largely by the fact that the agricultural section of the world (about two in three of its population) had become too impoverished to buy Britain's goods.

His next section gives an account of the agricultural changes brought about by the outbreak of war in 1939. "When war broke out we were producing less than one-third of the food we consumed. Yet our livestock population was an all-time record. We were achieving this balancing feat by importing between 7 and 8 million tons of animal feeding stuffs annually . . ."

AMONG animals of the same species and among human being the natural tendency is mutual aid. Self-reliance and federalism, the sovereignty of each group, and the construction of the larger composite social body from the small and simple group were the leading ideas as recently as the eleventh century. Since that time the conception has changed. The votaries of Roman law and centralized authority succeeded in paralyzing this ancient Greek idea which had given to families, clans, villages and towns their local autonomy.

From that time it has been taught from university, pulpit and court bench that the salvation of society must be sought in a strongly centralized state under semi-divine authority. Centralized government has come more and more into power, and local autonomy has decayed. The absorption of social functions by the state favoured the development of a narrow, irresponsible individualism. As the obligations to the state increased, the citizens were more and more relieved of their obligations to each other.

The citizen now pays taxes, and the rite absolves him vicariously from his ancient responsibility to do things for himself. As a result there arises the theory that man can and must seek his own happiness in a disregard of the needs of others. Justice and the consideration for others may be left to the state. The new law tends to leave the citizen free from the old and natural human obligations. They have become the business of the state.

It is against this centralization of authority that we need to be warned. We need not be opposed to organization, but the organization which we approve should be the natural and voluntary grouping of energies to secure results beneficial to the individual. Society might wisely seek for a non-authoritarian organization of common interests which would abolish the existing antagonism between individuals and classes. Release from the restraints of authority might thus be attained.

The state is a compulsory organization of the people into a body politic, pretending to secure the prevalence of justice by self-imposed government. As a matter of fact, the state was created as an organization in which the dominant forces in society protected themselves against the suppressed forces. The state developed as an institution for the protection of privilege. Its perpetuation depends upon force. A state without repressive laws, police, soldiers and jails is not conceivable; a people who can get along without these instruments need no state. When we go back far enough we find that states and governments started not so much as movements of the people, but rather as the efforts of a privileged class—chiefs, kings, lords—to have their privileges, which were got by force of arms, legalized and made secure.

—J. B. WARBUSSE, Co-operative Decentralisation.

"By 1944 we had increased our arable acreage from under 12 million to nearly 19 million, almost exactly reversing the figures for permanent grass and arable land."

Then Mr. Easterbrook turns to the "Changed World" of to-day. "The war ended. The longed-for day arrived. We found to our surprise and dismay that in almost every way, except in terms of horror and physical danger, we were worse rather than better off. Potential bankruptcy, even possible hunger threatened us when the sound of the bugles of victory had hardly died away. We were just beginning to realise that it is impossible to spend five years' effort and the savings of a lifetime on destruction without having to face an unpleasant bill for the damage."

"At the present time," says Mr. Easterbrook in his final section on Our Own Food, "we are producing just under half of all the food we eat. We are doing that from just over 31 million acres of crops and grass in the United Kingdom and we have in addition some 17 million acres of rough grazings. So, at most, we have less than an acre per head of the population. On the face of it we have little hope of being self-supporting. In the past sixty years we have lost one agricultural acre in every seven for such purposes as housing schemes, roads, playing fields, military training grounds, aerodromes and so on . . . We are still parting with 55,000 acres of farm land annually for non-agricultural purposes."

But here he comes to his most important point. " . . . Let us look at our own country. What do we see? We see almost everywhere land that could be

Continued on p. 3

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

- The Human Group George C. Homens 25/-
By taking the small group to be a microcosm of our society, the author gives the theory of social behaviour, describing several groups from a street corner gang in an American city to a similar group in a south-sea island.
The Flower Garden E. R. James 3/6
This 400-page Penguin book is designed "to show people of average ability the easiest way of beautifying their gardens, and, incidentally, their homes, by the application of common sense".
Marx Against the Pécant David Mitrany 25/-
A book of the first importance, one of those rare books which starts new thinking.
A. J. P. TAYLOR.
The Revolutionary Movement in France John Plamenatz 16/-
A perceptive and scholarly history.
The Land of Britain Laurence Easterbrook 1/6
Interesting pamphlet on the past and future of farming in this country.
The Industrial Worker 3d.
Weekly organ of the American I.W.W.
Obtainable from
27, RED LION STREET, LONDON, W.C.1



## PERSONALITY IN HISTORY

THE more doctrinaire type of Marxists (and usually the more reformist) take the view that the individual is of no importance in the movement of historical events. Where leaders occur they regard them as "mere" embodiments of class forces and so, ultimately, of the basic economic structures and stresses. It is not difficult to find support for such a point of view, especially if the arguments are directed against the opposite "great man" theory of history put forward by Carlyle.

Nevertheless, it is an arid kind of explanation and few find it entirely acceptable. It is unquestionably true that men like Cromwell, Robespierre, Lenin and Hitler were carried to prominence by certain class movements in history: but can one truthfully say that they embody the movements they represent? Cromwell, indeed, over the centuries which dim the details of personality may appear the embodiment of the puritan middle class. But Robespierre, Lenin and Hitler were together too peculiar as individuals to be regarded in any too precise a sense as faithfully representing a particular historical trend.

Can one say that their very individual peculiarities affected the movements they represented? Did Robespierre's fanaticism make a different thing of the Jacobin movement? If it did then the doctrinaire materialism of the Marxists is plainly inadequate and wrong.

By all accounts Lenin was a strange man. He does not seem to have had any striking vices, nor did he display obvious asceticisms like Hitler's alleged teetotalism. But there is that strange conversation with Klara Zetkin about sex in which Lenin seems to ask for advice with the detached curiosity of someone for whom the questions were quite remote—a sort of beetle-collector's approach. This incident is part of a rather inhuman side to Lenin's character which, allied to—and reinforcing—a certain ruthlessness in logical argument, does seem to have affected the Bolshevik outlook in general. When at his death Lenin became, as it were, canonized, the psychological effect of adoration may well have hardened these personal tendencies in the movement.

Hitler provides an example of a dictator almost completely devoid of general characteristics, and, what is also extraordinary, one who made no attempt to invent any for propaganda purposes.

It has always seemed quite false to say that Hitler embodied the ideal of the German people. But it seems clear that he did crystallize certain hidden psychological strivings and give them expression. With a movement as violent as Nazism it also seems likely that the personal colour given it by its leader did more than bring to the surface these unconscious psychological struggles in post-war Germany: they almost certainly encouraged and accentuated them. And what is perhaps more relevant to the general question of the rôle of individuals in history, the dictators of this century have profoundly modified the economic forces and relations of which they are naively supposed to be the mere expression.

When this is said it still has to be remembered that but for the post 1918 economic turmoil in Germany, and the frustration of individual Germans, Hitler might have remained an obscure Schickelgruber. The point is that when brought to

power his individual qualities asserted themselves as historical forces in their own right.

These reflections have a topical origin. The death of Eva Peron and her colourful eruption on the stage of South American politics inevitably prompts such reflections. Here again it seems certain that her own psychological peculiarities exerted a considerable effect on the social and economic history of Argentina. There seems general agreement that the vast social relief organization which she created would never have come into being if instead of snubbing her, the society ladies had invited her to be president of the existing Catholic relief scheme.

It is unfortunate (in some ways) that modern psychological conceptions cannot be brought to bear on the analysis of the motives of the living and the recently dead. Alex Comfort has suggested that politicians' behaviour patterns do in fact indicate certain kinds of psychological motivation which are gratified by power. But at the moment there cannot easily be any detailed analysis of interior biography, fascinating and illuminating though such a study would be.

Certainly there is a contrast between these individuals who do move history and men and women of more generous life and broader outlook. Eva Peron and Lenin seem small figures, as *individuals*, compared with, say, Kropotkin and Mary Wollstonecraft. It seems likely that individuals who embody powerful forces, whether economic or unconscious psychological ones, express only a partial aspect of human striving, and represent humanity under conditions of extreme stress.

Looking at history it is difficult to feel that where personal characteristics of leading protagonists have been important factors they have been factors for good. And at the most they only express *particular* (usually not very respectable) psychological strivings of the mass. Clearly the mass of people cannot satisfactorily live vicariously through figures like Hitler or Lenin or Eva Peron. And in fact the more fully integrated citizens of such régimes are quite independent of such vicarious psychological gratifications. It is plain that where the mass of people were content and integrated and achieved fulfilment in life, the rôle of the "leader" or the Cinderella in diamonds and furs would be unnecessary and so unfilled. In such a situation, it would not be "the individual", but *every individual in society* who would affect history by taking a conscious part in it.

In the end therefore the discussion on the rôle of the individual in history can be seen as one with a limited application to a particular epoch of history—the epoch of the rulers. When that epoch passes and mankind emerges into the sunlight such discussion will seem unreal indeed.

## DEFENDING THE FREE WORLD

IN the House of Commons on July 22nd, Mr. Tom Driberg asked the Secretary for War what was his policy in regard to the posting to Korea, Malaya, or Western Germany of avowed Communists who had registered as conscientious objectors on political grounds but had been refused exemption from National Service.

Mr. A. H. Head: There is no specific policy on this matter. Each case is considered on its merits.

Mr. Driberg: Is it not evident that it would be rather absurd to post to Korea a man who is legally entitled to believe that the other side in Korea is the right side?

Mr. Head: If I gave an undertaking that I would post no Communist to Korea, it might result in a recruiting drive for the Communist party. (Laughter).

All very amusing of course, but doesn't it illustrate how the defence of "the free world" and so on, depends on sending people to fight who wouldn't want to go of their own free will, and that the people who send them know it.

# Problems of Anti-War Activity

The following is based in a talk given at a conference of the War Resisters League in New Jersey, June 29, 1952.

AS anarchists, we are very much concerned with anti-war activity. We believe that anyone who sincerely wants to abolish war, and who looks at the facts with open eyes, will come to see that we can't abolish war unless we make the basic social changes which anarchists propose.

But we don't believe that any and all means are good just as long as they build up a movement against war. We're not interested in motion just for the sake of seeing something move. Since we believe that a libertarian revolution of society is necessary to put an end to war, we believe that the activities, slogans and propaganda of a movement against war must be judged in more than one way. They must be judged first by whether they do really encourage people to oppose war and build a movement dedicated to abolishing war. But they must be judged also by whether they help people to recognize the need for profound social changes in order to achieve the pacifist aim.

When we say, "there must be a revolution," we mean that war is caused by the kind of social organization we live under, and by the ideas, fears and prejudices which this social organization arouses in people. We speak of the evils of the present forms of industrialism, of "atomized" social structure. By this we mean that the man who makes his daily peace, morning, noon and night, with this way of life, does not have much energy left to oppose the political and economic rulers who think of war as a natural part of what they call "foreign policy". When a man accepts this way of life day after day, his anger mounts, and in the end he is almost glad to have a chance to vent his fury on a foreign enemy.

I will try to express the anarchist idea of social revolution in terms of certain abstract phrases. The key idea is the "free man". By this we mean, the man whose Self expands, and who learns fraternal solidarity. Concretely: there cannot be a free society, and war cannot be abolished, until individual men and women are able to act independently, are not cowed by force or the threat of

force, are aware of what they want and need as human beings, and are unashamed and unafraid to work and act in friendly, comradely cooperation.

It is the most important lesson of the long revolutionary experience of anarchists that the strength of a movement is the strength of the individuals who compose it, that the success of a libertarian movement depends on the libertarians themselves. Using the short-hand of abstraction, we may say that anarchists are concerned with whether anti-war activity encourages men to be free, with whether it opens their eyes to the need for freedom.

What I want to do now is to draw attention to three basic errors, or

illusions, which have hampered and crippled movements against war. I am not going to set out the details of the damage these mistakes have done. But numerous examples could be cited from the anti-war movements of the 1930s, and present experience easily provides others.

I call these three errors The Illusion of Isolationism, The Illusion of Organisation (or, of the Mass Movement), and The Error of Conscientious Objectivism.

## 1. THE ILLUSION OF ISOLATIONISM

Back in the thirties, the heart of the movement against war was the idea of isolationism. It's true,

Continued on p. 4

## Potentialities of British Farming

Continued from p. 2

growing food, and especially meat, pulling less than half its weight, or pulling nothing at all. Millions of acres in Scotland, hundreds of thousands in Wales, Yorkshire and the Border counties. Almost the whole of the 90-mile stretch of the South Downs only wants water (a comparatively simple engineering operation) to be brought into a scheme that could carry thousands of head of cattle and also of sheep, gradeable straight off the grass. In the whole of the eastern half of Leicestershire, in parts of Warwick and Northampton, in great stretches of Derbyshire, it is the same story, and it can be continued into Somerset, Devon and Cornwall. Millions of acres of wasted land, not much of it of the best quality, but nearly all of it easily farmable and far from being in the lowest category in what they would classify as farmable land in other European countries."

"Some of our most progressive farmers are already showing what can be done. Take the Henderson brothers in Oxfordshire who took on one of the poorest farms on the Cotswolds in semi-derelet condition. With straightforward farming, not by selling bulls at vast profits or intensive market-gardening, they have achieved an output of £100 per acre compared with Britain's average of £25. We have farmers, not on exceptional land, who expect to grow 25 cwt. of wheat to the acre instead of the average of 19... We have plenty of good dairy farmers who would be ashamed to have a cow averaging less than 750 gallons of milk, although the national average is under 600."

To what extent can we increase our food production? "No man can say," answers Mr. Easterbrook, "How do you estimate the increase of four, five or even ten times production when production is now nothing? Those who have seen unused land brought into use again, and turned over to inspired farming methods, so that more grass means more live-

stock, more livestock means more dung, more dung brings better crops, giving more feed for still more stock, will understand how impossible it is to calculate the increased production that good farming can give.

"At present we are producing less than half our food. It would seem a modest guess to say that this production could be raised to 75 per cent. in twelve years if we really bent our minds and our resources to it. Farming is a long-term business. Three years must elapse before anything done to-day can add a single pennyworth of beef to the shopping basket. The time to start is now."

## 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 SANSOM :  
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 Rôle. 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 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.

## Persia on the Tight Rope

Continued from p. 1

What it all comes to is that Britain's rôle is still envisaged as the balance of power. A hundred years after the Crimean War, the problem is still to prevent Russia gaining an outlet to the Indian Ocean. The above quotations make it clear that the British would be expected to intervene if a revolutionary situation developed. Those who are hypnotized by the Russian danger would oppose the revolution even if it were not Communist dominated for fear that it might be. They would never conceive of strengthening the revolution against Communist attempts at control—that is against the Communist counter-revolution.

Meanwhile the British politicians even when they are as "far sighted" as the *Observer* would like them to be, cannot see beyond the perpetuation of a balance of power policy (the Cold War is no more than the old business in modern dress).

What this means is that, if necessary, local fascism will be supported in Persia if it is anti-Russian. For the expediencies of the political balance will always take precedence over progressive needs or revolutionary conceptions so long as the realists dominate policies. If one presses the analysis further it is not difficult to see that such an attitude

finally defeats itself by playing into the hands of Russian Communism.

If we have stressed the *Observer's* point of view it is only because in this instance it has voiced the attitude of "statesmanship". And it is to be hoped that we have exposed in some degree the threadbare and disastrous nature of that outlook, however seemingly balanced and sane. It is an attitude that excludes the revolutionary power of the peoples of the world as the real bulwark against Russian fascism—and also against Anglo-American obscurantist reaction.

## TELEVISION

Continued from p. 1

a freedom of the air comparable to that of the press.

But it is just because an authoritarian State must have the means of persuasive compulsion in its hands that they want instead of the freedom of the air, the control of the air by State bureaucrats, or by commercial firms (which the Conservatives view as more generally conformistic than the former). The ironic part of it, however, is that while they quarrel over who shall use television to whose advantage, people rush to put themselves into long-standing commitments in order that they might themselves be used to better advantage. But then, from time immemorial they always had to keep the Church. A.M.



## LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

IF comrade Parker had devoted the same earnest concentration to my pamphlet as he does to the classics of 1908, he would have noted that I use the phrase "control from the bottom up" not only on the page (37) from which he quotes it, but also much earlier, on page 17, where I say:

"... the syndicalist movement should always recognise the autonomy of its smallest unit, and that control must always flow from the bottom up, not from the top down. In fact, of course, there is no feeling of 'top' or 'bottom' in libertarian movements. As I discussed in the last chapter, there is no room in the syndicates for permanent officials, and thus there is no sense of 'working your way up' in the organisation."

And in the previous chapter I close my section headed "No Permanent Officials" by saying:

"Don't just hope your organisers will not be led astray; make sure your form of organisation does not allow them to be. Don't trust your leaders—don't have any!"

S. E. Parker, however, is not satisfied with "checks" against bureaucracy, he wants an organisation which is qualitatively different from any which is liable to fall under the control of a power-hungry minority. Frankly I am at a loss here. I quite simply cannot conceive any form of association which could not be controlled from the centre or from above if the members allowed it to be. And it is precisely this cardinal point in my argument that S.E.P. chooses to ignore.

In the quote with which he starts his letter, I admit the danger of pyramids "if the workers set up a permanent bureaucracy and give it the right to make decisions". And in the same article (FREEDOM 12/7/52) I wrote: "The answer lies, obviously, in the consciousness of the people concerned."

S.E.P. makes a plea for a more humanistic, rather than mechanistic, approach to industry, but in fact his attitude to organisation is mechanistic (and Marxist) rather than humanistic (and anarchist) since he believes the organisation must

## PYRAMIDS

be qualitatively different from one capable of corruption, but I maintain that your people must be qualitatively such as to ensure that their organisation cannot be corrupted. In other words it is the workers concerned who matter much more than the structure of the organisation. Nevertheless your organisation should be such as to reduce to an absolute minimum the dangers of which S.E.P. is (rightly) afraid. And I have been to some pains in my exposition of anarcho-syndicalism as I see it, to show how this can be done.

Comrade Parker believes that "the Bolsheviks were able to achieve their domination of the revolution, not because the other revolutionary elements were any less conscious, but because the Soviet system was capable of being used for the achievement of power." It is interesting to note, however, that the

S. E. PARKER (FREEDOM, July 26th) reads like a very gloomy fellow over worried by the "grave danger of authoritarianism developing" in industry within a free society.

In any form of society, until such times as people have become reasonable enough not to get any pleasure out of having power over others, there will be those who will attempt to rule their fellows. This however, is a risk that will have to be taken.

There is really little to be gained by too much theorising over which form of society is least likely to become authoritarian; only the practical application of the principles of anarcho-syndicalism will prove its worth or otherwise. If it fails, as it may do, then some other form of organisation will have to be worked out. In the meantime we go on propagating anarchism, and it seems fairly reasonable that for the purposes of spreading our ideas we should have some outline of the formation a free society is likely to take. Since it is our experience at most of our public meetings that it is the organisation

Bolsheviks did not rely upon the machinery of the Soviet system to maintain their domination, but very quickly began popping into prison all the other revolutionary elements, breaking up their organisations and destroying their presses.

Surely it is because the anarchists and the other revolutionary elements were less conscious than they should have been, that they collaborated with the Bolsheviks in the first place? And the Bolsheviks—very much more conscious, it would seem—very soon used the power the anarchists helped them to attain to crush the anarchists before they did wake up to what was going on.

Would it be unfair for me to conclude by passing from the defence of anarcho-syndicalism to ask S. E. Parker just what, after all, is his alternative? Will he please expound his qualitatively different system of free association? That is if he can see well enough in his unlit cave to chip out his message on the solid rock. P.S.

of industry that worries people who otherwise sympathise with our ideas, we must be prepared to deal with industry as it exists as well as how it should be organised in a free society. It is all very well for S. E. Parker to say that if he had to choose between a cave and a modern factory he would have a cave (although I presume he would still benefit from the products of a factory) but for most people such a choice does not exist. In any case most anarchists including P.S. always maintain that there would be a radical alteration in the structure of industry eliminating the inhuman aspects which capitalism has produced.

The important thing is that anarchists and syndicalists should remain uncorrupted by the inhuman structures that grow up around them, remembering that it is people who nevertheless are responsible for maintaining as well as building them. We must persuade people to change their ideas, if we can do this the dangers of authoritarian organisations developing will be minimised. R.M.

## Problems of Anti-War Activity

Continued from p. 3

people were disgusted with war and sick of war, and they were scared to death of it. But the heart of the big movements against war, the Idea that gave those people hope, was the idea that peace was possible, here and now. They actually thought that war was just plain foolish; they used phrases like, "it's a silly way to settle international disputes." War was a fantastic error—something atavistic, as people used to say; it came about because people were caught up in a hysteria; the only sane people who favoured war or enjoyed war were the power-boys who stood to make some kind of profit from it. If you were really, genuinely patriotic, you believed in peace.

After these years and years of war, such naive pacifist ideas are no longer widespread. But still there are those who cannot break old habits of thought and propaganda. And the busy Communists and Communist sympathizers give proof that it is still possible to rally some people to action on this basis.

It would be the most serious sort of mistake to encourage the idea that if only Stalin, Churchill and Truman would get together and talk it over there could be peace. Or to encourage the illusion that "Russia is really a peace-loving nation".

It would be a serious mistake, if only for the reason that we would allow people to dismiss us as "fellow travellers", and we would actually be spreading the kind of propaganda

that the Communists want to see spread. But this is not the worst of it.

We would not only be playing the C.P. game, we would be playing an even more dangerous game, the game of the "plausible lie". The facts, as we know them, are that there can be no peace among Russia, China and the U.S., and no real peace anywhere, so long as these Nations are organized as States—so long as they are organized for efficient war-making, so long as the deep-going social revolution remains in the future. A Nation may be peace-loving, no State—anywhere—can be.

To promote the hope for peace—now, means either to blind ourselves to the facts of the matter, or to deliberately hoodwink people for the sake of setting them in motion. We would have begun by adopting the creed and the methods of the very social system which we condemn.

We would be building a movement which would vanish little by little—as happened before World War II—with every step toward "hotter" war. And we would be leading people away from the truth they must discover—the need for social revolution, for abolition of the power-institutions, if we to create a decent, truly free society and abolish war.

(To be concluded)

## 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 8.0 p.m.

## NORTH-EAST LONDON

DISCUSSION MEETINGS  
IN EAST HAM  
Alternate Wednesdays  
at 7.30

## AUGUST 6—BRAINS TRUST

## 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.

## ARMAGGEDON AND ALL THAT

I WAS very interested in the article by P.S. in your July 19th issue, titled: "In the Shell of the Old". As he says, "anarchists have always maintained that the organisms for this new society must grow within the shell of the old". It is however, rather unusual for a syndicalist to quote as an example of this historic process the modern ideas of industrial management, (if of course it is quite false to say that "They (the workers) were in fact introducing the system themselves") so ably expounded by Peter Drucker, Gordon Ratterey Taylor, and quite a crop of similar writers.

But what, I should like to know, has become of the messianic class, which is to deliver us from all social evils by miraculous revolution, the social general strike. What about the cataclysmic armageddon which will require no "blue-prints", no "transition" period, no evolutionary adaption. What in fact has happened to the Syndicalist-cum-Marxist mythology of "destruction as creation" which P.S., and others, so objected to being criticised. It is not without significance that no one has yet explicitly come forward to make out a case for this adolescent revolutionism, but have preferred to pose as "bluff realists" chaffing me for my "Pacifism". In other

words they have chosen to dodge the issue. I still maintain that this Syndicalist mythos is a weakness to the Anarchist movement, and believe the whole question demands re-consideration.

Stockport. JAMES R. HOWES.

## P.S. Replies :

Mr. Howes obviously knows more about the factory I wrote about than the comrade of ours who had actually worked in it. It seems to me, however, that whoever has expounded a theory, somebody has to put it into operation, and in the case I quoted, so I was informed, it happened to be the workers who gradually introduced a form of functional group as the basis for operation.

But Mr. Howes undoubtedly has read all about it, as he has also read (not in FREEDOM) all about syndicalism-cum-marxism, the messianic class, the cataclysmic armageddon and the lord knows what (now he'll accuse me of believing in God), but complains that we dodge the issue in not making this hotch-potch of his over-heated imagination more clear to him. Far from objecting to this being criticised I am sure I should criti-

cise it myself—if I only knew what on earth it all meant.

The biggest weakness to the Anarchist movement is having people connected with it who don't know what they are talking about.

## The Power of the Individual

DEAR SIR,

There appeared lately in a Sunday paper an article by a well-known writer. It contained these words: "The more dangerous the world appears to be, the more invulnerable must individualism be." For individualism read "anarchism", the anarchism which, in your summary of its tenets, claims that a "social revolution can only be brought about by the direct action of those who wish it". Add to this the statement in your issue of July 19: "If they i.e. English anarchists (what an apparent contradiction in terms!) succeed in lifting anarchist revolutionary aspirations out of the cold field of broad generalisations . . . they

## Lessons of the Spanish Revolution

as a centre for warehousing, disposition, distribution and the re-organisation of forces in its struggle against the heroic Spanish people . . . Well can it be said that Morocco has placed the Republic in mortal peril?<sup>12</sup> Peirats passes over in silence the question of Morocco. Yet the question that immediately comes to mind is: what was the attitude of the C.N.F.—F.A.I. to Morocco both before and after the uprising? By their actions, it is clear that the C.N.T. had no revolutionary programme which could have transformed Morocco from an enemy to an ally of the popular movement, and at no time did the leaders take notice of those Anarchist comrades in their midst, such as Camillo Berneri, who urged that the Spanish anarchists should send agitators to N. Africa and conduct a large scale propaganda campaign among the Arabs in favour of autonomy. This negative attitude of the C.N.T. to Moroccan independence will be discussed later at greater length.

## The Revolution at the Cross-roads

BECAUSE the C.N.T. in Catalonia was numerically the strongest section of the organisation in Spain; because Catalonia was the first region to liquidate the military uprising, and last, but not least, because in Catalonia the C.N.T. represented the overwhelming majority both in the victorious battle of the streets in Barcelona and amongst the organised workers, its appraisal of the situation on the morrow of victory was bound to have far reaching consequences throughout the country (including, we would suggest, the areas under

Franco's domination).

Luis Companys, President of the Generalitat<sup>13</sup> summoned the C.N.T.—F.A.I. to his office in the Presidency as soon as the uprising had been defeated in Catalonia. The delegation included Santillan and Garcia Oliver, both influential members of the organisations and both, later, Ministers in the Generalitat and Central Government respectively. Garcia Oliver has put on record the interview that took place and which, because of its historic importance, and as the key to all that followed so far as the revolutionary movement is concerned, must be reproduced in extenso:

"Companys received us standing up and was visibly moved by the occasion. He shook hands, and would have embraced us, but for the fact that his personal dignity, deeply affected by what he had to say to us, prevented him from so doing. The introductions were brief. We sat down, each of us with his rifle between his legs. In substance what Companys told us was this: 'First of all, I have to say to you that the C.N.T. and the F.A.I. have never been treated as they deserved by reason of their real importance. You have always been harshly persecuted, and I, with much sorrow, but forced by political realities, I, who before was with you, afterwards found myself obliged to oppose you and persecute you. To-day you are the masters of the city and of Catalonia because you alone have defeated the fascist militarists, and I hope that you will not take offence if at this moment I remind you that you did not lack the help of the few or many loyal members of my party and of the guards and mozos . . . He paused for a moment and continued slowly: 'But the truth is that, persecuted until the day before yesterday, to-day you have defeated the military and the fascists. I cannot then, knowing what and who you are, speak to you other than with sincerity. You have won, and everything is in your hands; if you do not need me nor wish me to remain as President of Catalonia, tell me now, and I

will become one soldier more in the struggle against fascism. If, on the other hand, you believe that in this position, which only as a dead man would I have left if the fascists had triumphed, I, with the men of my party, my name and my prestige, can be of use in this struggle, which has ended so well to-day in the city [Barcelona] but which will end we know not how in the rest of Spain, you can count on me and on my loyalty as a man and as a politician who is convinced that to-day a whole past of shame is dead and who desires sincerely that Catalonia should place herself at the head of the most progressive countries in social matters'."

On this masterpiece of political oratory and cunning Garcia Oliver comments:

"The C.N.T. and the F.A.I. decided on collaboration and democracy, renouncing revolutionary totalitarianism which would lead to the strangulation of the revolution by the anarchist and confederal dictatorship. We had confidence in the word and in the person of a catalan democrat and retained and supported Companys as President of the Generalitat. The C.N.T.—F.A.I. accepted the Committee of Militias and established a proportional representation of forces to give it integrity, and though not equitable—equal representation with the C.N.T. and the triumphant anarchists was given to the U.G.T. and Socialist Party both minority organisations in Catalonia—was intended as a sacrifice with the view to leading the dictatorial parties along a path of loyal collaboration which could not be upset by suicidal competition."

Would that the C.N.T.—F.A.I. representatives had accepted Companys' offer "to become one soldier more in the struggle!"

V.R.

(To be continued)

<sup>12</sup> Quoted by Peirats pp.162-63. Santillan's version of the interview is substantially the same so far as the conclusions are concerned, but he does not quote any of Companys' remarks.

<sup>12</sup> Carlos de Barañan in an article *Ayer, hoy y siempre: Marruecos* published in the magazine *Timon* (Editor D. A. Santillan) No. 2, Barcelona July 1938.

<sup>13</sup> To avoid confusion for some readers it should be explained that there were two governments in Spain: the Central Government with its seat in Madrid, later to be transferred to Valencia, and the Generalitat which was the government of the Autonomous province of Catalonia. Under the Franco régime Catalan autonomy was abolished.

**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