

In this issue:  
The Psychology of War - p. 2  
Speaking & Writing - p. 2  
Inexorable Choice - p. 3

# Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"The people have come to believe that government can procure for them, not merely prosperity, but happiness. . . . We must grow up, we must cultivate ourselves. Our goal must be a world in which every man is his own republic."

—ERIC LINKLATER  
(Private Angelo)

Vol. 13, No. 45

November 8th, 1952

Threepence

## TITO'S MARXIST ORTHODOXY

THE tendency of Marxism to become a new kind of religion with all the ecclesiastical trappings, hierarchy, and dogma, including that of infallibility, is illustrated by the present Congress of the Yugoslav Communist Party. Tito is at great pains to show that Yugoslavia, not Russia, is the home of "true" or orthodox Marxism. In Russia, Marxism-Leninism has been traduced by Stalinism, while the true pure flame is carried on by the party of Marshal Tito—and all the rest of the absurd struggle to occupy the post of Marx's Vicar here on earth. As the *Times* remarks, "It is obvious that the fathers of Communism wrote so extensively that a quotation from their words can always be found to prove any thesis." Does all this convince the faithful? If so, they are to be found inside the Party only, and may serve to justify psychological cravings; but it is hard to believe that the man-in-the-fields cares very much what Marx or Lenin or

anyone else wrote far away from his problems.

Meanwhile, the very phrase "fathers of Communism" is only too apt to describe those modern Aquinas and Augustines whose holy feasts serve to make bright with holy fire the eyes of party secretaries and neophytes taking their first Communist communion.

### Power Alignments

Religious fervour, however, is for the masses: the leaders of the Church, whether of Rome or Belgrade or Moscow, have always had a strictly practical approach to politics. The upshot as regards foreign policy has brought Marshal Tito into line with the Western Democracies rather than with the "People's Democracies" of the East. Four years ago, just after the split with the Cominform, Tito still spoke of the "brotherly Soviet Union whose policy was in the interests of world peace". "Four years of the cold war," writes the *Times*, "have convinced the leaders of Yugoslavia that the state-capital-

ism of present-day Russia is a greater danger to peace than capitalism as it exists in the west." The Pope has become the Anti-Pope, even the Anti-Christ, and it is time indeed for Marx and his only begotten son, Lenin, to find a new Vicar.

### Election Issues

Shortly after Sen. Nixon's first big broadcast, a New York listener sent the following letter to the Republican National Committee:

Gentlemen:

*I have just finished listening to Sen. Nixon's speech, and I have not been so moved since I last saw "Stella Dallas". It is hard to believe that such corn was not carefully contrived; but if not, if the man really is such a simpleton, he certainly should not be running for public office.*

*As I recall, the issue was not whether Nixon loved his wife, his children, and his dear little dog. It was a matter of ethics. And this issue was not discussed honestly. I trust that he lost a lot of votes with this speech.*

*I sincerely hope that Ike will get himself a grown-up running-mate.*

Sincerely,  
CAROLE HALE.

The lady has just gotten an answer and sent the correspondence to us. The reply came on a gaudy postcard carrying a photograph of the Nixon family on one side and this message on the other:

Dear Friend:

*This is just a note to tell you how deeply Pat and I appreciate your expression of confidence after the broadcast last Tuesday.*

*We want you to know we shall do our best never to let you down.*

DICK NIXON.

(From the *New York Post*)

## Bonn's Mission to Madrid

ALL Spain has been buzzing with comment over the recent appointment by the Bonn Government of Prince Adalbert, scion of Bavarian royalty, as Ambassador to Madrid. The astonishment was due in the first place, according to dispatches from a *Worldover Press* correspondent, to the close relationship between Adalbert and the exiled Spanish royal house. The Infanta Paz, one of the sisters of Alfonso XII, married a prince of Bavaria, and one of their children was the present Prince-Ambassador, who is thus a first cousin of the late deposed King Alfonso XIII and second cousin of Alfonso XIII's son Juan, pretender to the Spanish throne.

Why should Chancellor Konrad Adenauer send as a representative of the West German Federal Republic such an ambassador? Some of the reasons are simple and innocent. Prince Adalbert speaks Spanish fluently, and so does his wife, the Princess Augusta of Buttenheim. He is a cultivated man who would naturally do his best for close relations between Germany and the country of his Spanish kinsmen. But there the innocent background fades into something more significant.

Prince Adalbert will occupy a magnificent palace on the luxurious Paseo de la Castellana, and Spanish aristocratic and pro-fascist circles have indicated they expect to make his residence a great rallying centre for the big land-owners, industrialists and monarchists. It happens also that Adalbert was one of a German group which, in the days before the war, gathered at the influential "Centrum" that had so much influence on the Reichstag, and which brought together representatives of the big banks and industries, including the Krupp.

It is not without portent that Prince Adalbert was chosen to represent West Germany at a time when leading German heavy industrialists—such as Schlomann of Duesseldorf and M.A.N. of Nuremberg—have undertaken to rehabilitate the Spanish steel industry, sending essential machinery for the initial stages. And at a time when West German companies are beginning to supply the armament needed by Dictator Franco for the strengthening of his forces.

It is well known in Germany and Spain that the arming of Franco by West Germany is favoured by the Pentagon at Washington and by U.S. officials at Bonn and Madrid. Their reasoning is that this will help get the

German arms industry functioning again, that it will take off some of the pressure by Spain in the negotiations over American bases, and that it may permit Spain to re-arm without making any drain on arms ticketed for NATO countries. "The increasing close relations between German arms manufacturers and Spanish Falangist industrialists," writes a *W.P.* reporter from Spain, "may suit Washington, but how will it go down in France and Great Britain." —*Worldover Press.*

## Military Adventure in Kenya

### Evacuation Eventually—Why Not Now?

THE sensation-mongers of the Press have a godsend in the very name of the Mau Mau of Kenya, conjuring up visions of witchcraft and secret jungle societies beloved of the novelette-reader for whom Fleet Street caters. Foreign-sounding words soon acquire a particular meaning in English and anyone who scrutinised the pulps can soon explain the difference between a submarine (heroic) and a U-boat (sinister) and laugh to scorn the pedant who translates U (*i.e.*, Untersee) boat as exactly meaning submarine. Mau Mau sounds vicious, primeval, the mysterious jungle, and all that, in the context as presented by the journalists, but how absurd it makes the attempts to yoke the same thing to Communism, and the efforts to build up a sort of jungle-Marxism sound much more ridiculous in Africa than they could possibly do in Malaya.

How pathetic this is in conjunction with the efforts of certain papers to build up a vindictive attack on Jomo Kenyatta, and to present the glamorous picture of the "European settler" beset by hostile natives and preserving a stiff English upper lip in the midst of it all. Malaya "Planter's Wife" style. It is rather difficult to believe in it when one knows both Jomo Kenyatta and some of the recent "European settlers", but without doubt some people believe it, and up comes Mau Mau to take the place of the so-called "Stern Gang", or Kenyatta to take the place of Moussadek.

The bitter attacks made by some of the national papers on Jomo Kenyatta are revealing—for instance, the reactions of his English wife appear to vary with which paper one reads—but what is

patently absurd and yet widely believed is the story that he is acting on behalf of Moscow. There is nothing Moscow could do or has done in Kenya. China is not adjacent, as it is in Malaya. No Soviet-dominated countries are near. The Communist Party in South Africa is the nearest geographically, and it is of negligible account. Jomo Kenyatta, furthermore, belonged always to the group of African anti-imperialists whose concern was the African people always, and who fell out with the Communists—who at one time gave them ideological support—simply because they would not toe the Moscow line and direct the African struggle along Moscow paths which dictated imperialism in the popular front and war-time days, and anti-imperialism only in the early "Red Front" and (later) Hitler-alliance days, when it suited their political book.

The very fact that Jomo Kenyatta in London spoke on all anti-imperialist platforms—even Anarchist—would make him anathema to the Communists, but frankly "Communist" is just a convenient label to pin on anyone nowadays, even in countries like Kenya, the Sudan and other parts of Africa where Stalin is unknown. But what is above all so ridiculous is the certain knowledge the eventually compromise will have to be reached, and whatever they say about Jomo Kenyatta now that he is imprisoned and his followers persecuted, will be retracted in later years just as it was with regard to Jawaharlal Nehru. They heaped the same abuse on Nehru and for that matter George Washington; could they not spare us just this once the personal abuse against a man who appears at a prominent position of the

## COMPLICATIONS

ONE of the things that workers have got to realise is that they mustn't be selfish. They simply must not look at the way things are going for them and think that it is important whether they have enough to make ends meet, or can satisfy their needs, whatever they are. What is much more important is that the complicated wage structures of their industries are not upset.

Workers must take the broad view of things. What really matters is not whether that pair of boots can be repaired this week, but whether the balance of payments for the country as a whole can be improved this year. The wife must be made to realise that besides the necessity of closing the dollar gap, getting a new piece of coconut matting for the scullery is really insignificant. She must go on tripping over that hole in the old piece for a good while longer yet, because the wage structure for the whole industry must not be disturbed.

The Porter Tribunal for the Coal Industry has rejected the miners' pay claim for an increase of 30s. a week, without making any alternative offer, saying that an increase is not justified by the increase in the cost of living, and that if it were granted it would complicate the revision of the wages structure for the whole industry which it recommends the National Coal Board should carry out.

And the National Coal Board would

be very pleased to carry out a revision of wages throughout the whole of the mining industry. At the moment practically every coalfield has its own wage-rate, calculated by its own method, for nearly every job connected with mining. It is a hangover from the old free enterprise days when the miners themselves used to fight their own boss instead of letting a union executive for the whole country negotiate with a boss for the whole country—and sell-out the industry throughout the whole country.

But it will certainly be no easy, or quick matter to iron out all the differences of pay and terms throughout the country's pits. For one thing, conditions vary from coalfield to coalfield—sometimes from pit to pit—so much that what may be a fair price for a job in one mine is quite unfair and unworkable in another. Perhaps the very fact that it will be a long job to straighten up the whole country is the real reason why the Porter Tribunal have put it forward as an excuse for not granting the miners' claim. Don't have a rise now, the Tribunal really says, wait until the Coal Board have worked out a wage structure for the whole country, and then we'll see what we can do. And neither the Tribunal nor the Coal Board nor the unions know how long the revision will take. But the miners must be patient, recognise their responsibility to the nation and wait, still working as hard

Continued on p. 4

## More Collective Punishment in Malaya

GENERAL Templer's methods have once more been applied to punish a Malayan village. A Singapore dispatch dated Nov. 1st, states:

"General Templer has once more imposed severe penalties on an erring Malayan community—this time on Pekan Jabi, a new village three miles north of Singapore.

"For one month from to-day the 1,600 villagers—mostly resettled Chinese squatters—will be confined inside a perimeter wire for 18 hours a day and 12 of these hours will have to be spent inside their cramped wooden houses. Their rice ration will be reduced.

"When their administrative officer, Mr. D. P. Rees, read them the order this morning, the villagers received it in sullen calm.

"The penalties follow a raid on the village last Tuesday by a platoon of the 'Malayan Races' Liberation Army'. They had killed three Malay policemen and seized arms and ammunition without a shot being fired in defence. Collusion from within the village was indicated, but an appeal to villagers for anonymous information produced negligible results."—(*Observer*, 2/11/52.)

There is little point in discussing again the moral objection to this method of securing "co-operation" from Malayan villagers. But certain other points do emerge. First, these people had been "resettled", had already been uprooted from their own village and rehoused in a new compound after sifting and sorting. Yet they do not seem to have learned from this the advantages of colonial democracy. The evidence of "collusion from within the village" may mean that they are convinced of the righteousness of the "bandits": if so, they are being punished for political convictions, for not all can have been active accomplices of the shooting. Much more likely is it that they feel powerless to interfere. Who then would not be sullen at penalties imposed by an administration which knows how to punish but not how to protect—for that is how it must seem to them?

"Realists", "strong-arm men" or believers in white supremacy may be gratified by General Templer's methods, but their moral obliquity can only shock and disgust normal people—in whose name, however, they are done.

Continued on p. 4

# THE PSYCHOLOGY OF WAR

THOSE who read at all in the literature of modern psychology, especially educational psychology, are likely to have wondered, as we have wondered, whether these writers will ever get around to an analysis of Nationalism, or even a critical discussion of the foreign policy of the United States. The major powers often seem to adopt policies and to strike attitudes in relation to other nations which break all the rules that the psychologists declare must be obeyed in order to have good human relations. We ask, therefore, can the educational principles based on modern psychological studies ever be applied in politics, or are we to regard suggestions of this sort as either premature, unpatriotic, or both?

Interestingly enough, two professional psychologists raised this question more than a year ago in the correspondence columns of the April, 1951 *American Psychologist*, organ of the American Psychological Association. The fact that the writers are also pacifists may help to explain their daring although it does not, so far as we can see, diminish the force of their logic. These psychologists, Arthur I. Gladstone and Herbert C. Kelman, of New Haven, Connecticut, set the issue in four general propositions. Noting, to begin with, that the aim of the foreign policy of the United States is, "presumably, the preservation of peace," and that this policy "is based, among other things, on certain assumptions about human behaviour," they start out with a consideration of the Frustration-Aggression relationship:

"It is a truism that aggressive people are frustrated people. To reduce aggressive tendencies you must reduce frustrations. If aggression is met by counter-aggression, the action serves as an additional frustration and increases the aggressive tensions. So the aggression may increase on both sides until one or both opponents are worn out. We know no instances, in history books or in psychological case-books, in which force or the threat of force has frightened the aggressive tendencies out of an individual or group (although the mode of expression may have been somewhat changed). So argue the pacifists. U.S. National policy depends on certain assumptions concerning the effects of threats and force on human behaviour. If these assumptions are wrong, a worldwide catastrophe is likely to occur . . ."

## The Case of Japan

A fairly clear case of national frustration is found in the situation of the Japanese people in, say, 1936, and doubtless before. In that year, the Harvard University Press issued *The Basis of Japanese Foreign Policy*, by Albert E. Hindmarsh, presenting the results of a detailed investigation of Japan's economic problems. Prof. Hindmarsh ended his book with these words:

"Japan's case . . . seems . . . sufficiently real to secure support from the masses of the nation and her intelligent leaders. It is well to know that there is some basis for her claims and that the expansive policies appeal to so many Japanese as the only alternative to starving to death in their own backyards. Only in that realisation can we appreciate the motives and motivating forces of Japanese policy and pretend to know whence it moves. To cry for peace and ignore the actualities of international relations is to court disillusionment and loss of faith in the possibilities

of world order. . . . For the United States, the beginning of wisdom in the determination of our Far Eastern policy lies in an honest appraisal of the realities which Japanese statesmen must face."

Apparently, one need not be a psychologist to grasp the reality of the Frustration-Aggression relationship. While observations of this sort will doubtless arouse bristling questions and suspicions in some readers, along with angry murmurs about Pearl Harbour, no amount of righteous indignation can alter the facts. Nor the Frustration-Aggression situation. Not even a major war can do very much to alter a situation which arises from basic economic problems.

## "We Will Not Starve Quietly"

For example, turning to the Sept. 10 issue of *U.S. News & World Report*, we find an article, "Free Japan: A U.S. Headache," in which the principal disclosures are that Japan has too many people, too little food, and too few jobs. This island country, which had sixty-

eight million people in 1936, seventy-two million on V-J Day, has eighty-five million people now—and will have an estimated population of ninety-two million in 1960—is in exactly the same difficulties it was in twelve or fifteen years ago, except that the difficulties are greater. As *U.S. News* puts it:

"Officials working with the problem regard it as the most dangerous element in a country that is relied upon by the U.S. as a friendly outpost of Western defences in Asia. Over-population was the pretext of Japan's seizure of Manchuria and for attempts to conquer vast chunks of Asia in the 1930s and 1940s. Now Japan—stripped of its outlying possessions after World War II—is a much smaller country with millions more people.

"Against this background is the recent remark of a Japanese industrialist in Osaka: 'We will not starve quietly.'"

A reader of the *U.S. News* article who is acquainted with the facts in Hindmarsh's book might remark, laconically, "This is where I came in," and do his

best to get away from it all.

The third proposition deals with the therapeutic approach. The argument is that people who resort to violence are psychologically disturbed. No good psychotherapist allows himself to "aggravate" a disturbed patient. So—

"If the 'patient' is a national or political group we may use persuasion, economic sanctions, social ostracism, non-cooperation; in short, the methods of non-violent resistance. To use violence would be to defeat our own purposes. Favourable change requires benign and permissive conditions."

## The War Habit

This presents obvious rhetorical difficulties, with more rumblings about Pearl Harbour to be expected. However, we don't know of many pacifists who claim to offer a panacea which can be applied at the last minute before a war starts, or the first minute after it has started. The pacifist point here, seems to be that peace, if we are ever to have it, is worth a long-term effort in this

direction.

The fourth proposition discusses the danger of habituation to war:

"Training and experience in the techniques of mass murder which comprise modern warfare are bound to have unfortunate effects on the participants. Callousness at bloodshed and violence, stimulation of hate, deterioration through disuse of the habits of peaceful living seem likely to result. . . . The widespread adoption of authoritarian patterns which total war requires in civilian activities as well as in the military organisation is also bound to have unfortunate effects. Habituation to taking orders, suppression (to a large extent) of the practice of free inquiry (because of the dangers of subversive thought and disunity), placing military expediency above all other values, a tremendous increase in control from above with a corresponding reduction in democratic participation in decision-making, are all likely results. In attempting to defeat the opponent through military means the U.S. seems forced to adopt the measures of totalitarianism which it opposes so strongly. Once we build up these habit patterns it will be tremendously difficult to break them and we may find ourselves unable to do so." *Manas* (U.S.A.)

## Speaking and Writing

FOR the industrial commentator who makes no pretence to be an "expert", it is not always easy to find sufficient topical material to make interesting articles from the anarcho-syndicalist point of view.

Like most working-class journals, *FREEDOM* suffers from a shortage of correspondents among industrial workers, and the reason for this is obvious. Even in countries like Britain, with a high degree of literacy, where every working-class child has the opportunity to learn how to read and write, the workers do not develop much as writers. They don't have to; in fact the general attitude is against them doing so. As long as a worker can sign his name on a wages sheet, can write a non-informative letter home from the trenches and can make a cross on a ballot paper, that is about the limit of what is expected from him in the way of penmanship. And that is all that is wanted from him by the powers that be.

As for reading—as long as he can read the instruction sheet on a job and confine himself to westerners or comics off the job, that's about all that is thought to be necessary for him to take his proper place in society. And the less he thinks or reads or writes, the better for those who hold that a worker's proper function is simply to get on with the job and do without question what he is told.

Fortunately—and all working-class progress is due to this—many workers have not been content to remain in this dumb and servile position. But their protest has mostly taken the form, not of words, but of action—which is in keeping with the function they are forced to play in class-divided society.

And when articulate workers have sprung from the ranks—and their name is legion—they have, in the main, been speakers, not writers.

When one thinks of the thousands of working-class orators, for all the political parties, who week after week speak millions of words from platforms at street corners, works-gates, in the parks and on the bomb-sites, one can only be amazed that so little of that eloquence is ever put down on paper. Speakers who can hold forth for hours, defeating hecklers, answering questions coming out of the blue from fifty different ideological directions, so often are completely stumped if they are asked to write 500 words on their own job.

A few Sundays ago, at Hyde Park, I heard one of its best-known speakers admitting that while he loved speaking, he hated writing. One's immediate thought was that it was the sense of power an orator is reputed to have when holding a large crowd under his spell, beating all their arguments and seeing their immediate reactions, that was the reason for his preference. And certainly there is that personal contact between a speaker and his audience that is almost completely lacking for a writer. The difference is rather like that between a film actor and a stage actor; the film actor plays his part "cold", before an audience only of technicians, to be relayed later to his real audience, but the stage actor plays "live", direct to his audience and sensing their reaction.

This is the way the speaker addresses his audience. Speaking is usually much

more emotional than writing, and to be successful the speaker has first to establish a contact with his audience. He, too, senses their reaction and can vary his approach and his argument accordingly.

The writer, however, sits down in the quiet of a room away from those he is addressing. There is no applause—and, of course, no hostility. No cut-and-thrust of argument, no shouting down and ridicule, no witty come-backs that get your audience laughing at your interrupter, no sense of making propaganda to the masses and of influencing people to your point of view—although obviously the well-written argument will often convince where the spoken word will not. There's nothing but a blank sheet of paper lying coldly before you, and you have to marshal your arguments so that they will stand up to being analysed at leisure.

Writing demands a mental discipline that speaking does not, and here I think we are coming nearer to the reason for the reluctance that so many otherwise articulate workers have for putting their thoughts on paper. Writing is something that was dinned into us at school when our natural, youthful rebelliousness was being disciplined out of us. It was something we were forced to do whether we liked it or not. The complications of English grammar were dully explained to us—but were found to have no connection with our everyday speech. We were not encouraged to express ourselves in our "compositions" in our own words, but were made, under

the lash of the teacher's sarcasm, to express ourselves in *his* words—an impossible task.

The inculcation which the working-class child receives as he goes through the sausage-machine of elementary (very elementary!) education is fairly consciously devised to fit him for his station in life. And his station in life is not one where he is encouraged to become an expressive human being. In fact, just the opposite. His place in life is a dull place. From early morning till well into the evening he is either at work, in a servile position, or travelling to and from work in conditions that demand an armour of insensitivity.

The minority who rebel, who become active workers in some organisation which they believe will better their circumstances, are far more likely to use their natural means of communication—speech—than subject themselves to another unnatural discipline which they were pleased to leave behind them when they left school.

There is, of course, another very simple and important reason for workers refusing to commit themselves on paper. Nearly all the prosecutions the State has made against working-class organisations have been clinched and driven home on what they have said *in print*. It is far more difficult to prove a man said something from a platform than to show it in black and white.

That, however, is not a reason for not writing. It is simply a reason for being careful *what* you write! P.S.

## Lessons of the Spanish Revolution—17

# The C.N.T. and the Caballero Government Crisis

THE revolutionary crisis in Catalonia had barely been "resolved" when a political crisis in the Valencia government once more distracted attention from essentials to a struggle between personalities.

At a cabinet meeting held on May 15 to examine the situation in Catalonia, the two Communist ministers, Jesus Hernandez and Vicente Uribe demanded reprisals against those responsible for the May Day. Caballero agreed, but could not accept the Communists' view that the responsibility lay with the C.N.T.-F.A.I. and P.O.U.M. Whereupon the two Communists rose and withdrew. Caballero replied by declaring that the "Council of Ministers continues". His determination was short lived, for the Communists' gesture was a signal for Prieto, Negrin, Alvarez del Vayo, Giral and Irujo to rise in turn and leave. Only Anastasio de Gracia, and Angel Galarza, loyal socialist friends of Caballero, and his four staunch "anarchist" ministers remained seated!

Following conversations with the President, Caballero was again entrusted with the task of forming of government. Both the C.N.T. and U.G.T. proposed a government based on the working class organisations with representation of all the parties, and led by Caballero. The Communists on the other hand proposed a government "led by a socialist and in which all parties of the Popular Front are included as well as the working-class organisations."

Caballero's solution was to offer three portfolios to the U.G.T. and two to the Socialists. They were all key ministries, comprising the direction and control of the war as well as of the country's economy. To the Communists, Left Republicans, and Republican Union, he allocated two seats each, and to his staunch friends of the C.N.T. a further two ministries: Health and Justice! Both the Communists and the C.N.T. refused to accept these arrangements. The Communists were mainly concerned that the Ministry of War should not be held by the Premier. Caballero could not accept this proposal, and since it was agreed by the Republicans and Socialists that a new government without the representation of the C.P. could not be considered a Popular Front government, it was clear that Caballero would be unable to form a new Cabinet which would be acceptable to the Communists. The C.N.T. objection was stated in a conciliatory, more in-sorrow-than-in-

anger, letter from the Secretary, Mariano Vasquez, in which it was pointed out that the C.N.T. could not accept a position of inferiority with the U.G.T. or of parity with the Communists; nor could they accept the idea that the economy of the country should be concentrated in the hands of one Party.

The crisis was solved with the President calling on Dr. Juan Negrin, a right-wing Socialist and Moscow's man, to form a government from which the U.G.T. and C.N.T. were excluded. Indalecio Prieto, arch enemy of Caballero, was to handle National Defence while Negrin, beside being Premier, was also in control of Economy. A Communist became Minister of Agriculture.

The C.N.T. reaction was a curious one. In a communiqué of May 18, they declared that the Negrin government which was formed without their participation could not count on their collaboration. "At the present moment all that we wish to state to the workers belonging to the C.N.T. is that now more than ever before must they pay attention to the watchwords emanating from the responsible Committees. Only with homogeneity in our actions shall we succeed in defeating the counter-revolution and in avoiding the 'embrace of Vergara'. Comrades! pay attention to the watchwords of the responsible Committees! Let no one play the game of the provocateurs! Serenity! Firmness and Unity! Long live the alliance of the workers' organisations!"

One cannot avoid noting the marked difference in attitude adopted by the leaders of the C.N.T. to the situation during the May Days and that created by the government crisis. In the former case, they were prepared to make every compromise—indeed they ordered the cease-fire among the C.N.T.-F.A.I. workers without even obtaining government acceptance of any of their demands—in the name of unity, and the maintenance of the "anti-fascist front" against Franco. In the government crisis they stubbornly refused to participate or to collaborate with a government which was not led by Largo Caballero. Such an attitude would not appear to us in violent contrast with that adopted during the May Days, if it indicated that the C.N.T.-F.A.I. leadership had learned the lessons of the Barcelona barricades and was attempting to return to its traditional revolutionary position. But this was far from being the case.

In a statement to the Press a few days after the formation of the Negrin government, Mariano Vasquez, National Secretary C.N.T., declared:

"Participation of the C.N.T. in the Government is indispensable if it is intended to work with honour to end the war quickly. The workers' organisations must be represented in the Government. One cannot dispense with the most vital section of the people, which works hardest in the rearguard and has most men at the fronts. The lack of C.N.T. collaboration in the Government means drawing it back (*retrotraerla*) [the C.N.T.] to its former oppositionist position. All our enemies have dashed themselves to pieces (*estrellado*) against the glorious insignia of the C.N.T. Who dares to attempt to hold it back, will be crushed, and the C.N.T. will continue to go forward. It must therefore be taken into account and given the place in the government that is its due."

Ignoring the heroics of this statement, one sees that the idea of being in opposition has become abhorrent to these "anarchists", and their whole propaganda from now on will not be more revolutionary but, on the contrary, will be a daily complaint that the C.N.T. has been excluded from the Government, and an unending lament for the days of Largo Caballero when the government was a *revolutionary* government! We were under the impression that the myth of Revolutionary governments had long ago been disposed of by Anarchists, and that it was an illusion only cherished by Marxists. We still believe this, and it is clear that even some of the leaders of the C.N.T.-F.A.I., in spite of their attitude and utterances, did not in fact believe that there was much to choose between governments. Rather was it that they did not know how to extricate themselves, without loss of prestige, from the web of political bargaining in which they had been caught by the experienced politicians. They had travelled so far in their mental transformation, and in their sense of personal importance and political astuteness that they considered a return to the revolutionary position of the C.N.T.-F.A.I. against all governments was a retrograde step; one for which they would be condemned by history.

What in fact did the C.N.T. do during those months in "opposition"? (1) The appealed to public opinion

## FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

(Hours 9 to 6.30, inc. Saturdays)

### Two New Penguins:

Ten Years Under the Earth  
Norbert Casterot 2/6

The Hittites O. P. Gurney 3/6

### Two New World's Classics:

Selections from Leonardo da Vinci's  
Notebooks (Illustrated) 5/-

Plays and Players: Dramatic Criticism  
of G. Bernard Shaw 5/-

### Two 'Reminders' (as new):

My Country and My People  
Lin Yutang (was 10/6) now 3/-

Warrior Without Weapons  
Marcel Junod (was 12/6) now 3/6

### Just Published:

This England 1952

New Statesman 2/6

Art and Technique Louis Mumford 15/-

Arrow in the Blue Arthur Koestler 18/-

### Second Volume now arrived:

La CNT en la Revolución Española  
José Perets 15/-

### To Print Again:

Civilisation, War & Death  
Sigmund Freud 8/6

Have you had our latest second-hand book list? If you would like it, please send a stamped addressed envelope.

Obtainable from

27, RED LION STREET,  
LONDON, W.C.1

## INEXORABLE CHOICE

WEEKLY papers suffer under the necessity to have a closing day for copy, a last moment of going to press. Whatever happens after this zero hour, however momentous, must remain blandly unknown to its column when it has been common property for many hours to readers of the daily press. So it is with the U.S. Presidential election, that fantastic operation which, like Leap Year, falls every four years. As these lines are being written, the first voters will be casting their choice in America, though FREEDOM will remain ignorant of the result a day or two hence.

It is not sour grapes, however, at the limitations of a going-to-press date, which make anarchists declare that the outcome is of little moment. The issue, like or Adlai, may stir to fever heat some of the electors in the United States, but an on-looker from Britain can hardly fail to see a wider perspective.

Democracy, universal franchise, all the rest of the apparatus of "letting the people choose", may have been developed to find out what a people wants, but such considerations have little relevance to-day in our world. For whatever we may want, it seems reasonably certain that what we shall get is the now familiar pattern of insecurity about a job, unstable buying power of wages, limitations about choice of work imposed by "direction of industry", conscription, and the dormant fear of war. Not even the most naive could believe that any of these questions will be substantially affected by whether it is the General or the Governor who goes to the White House.

The world of capitalism in the modern State is at once enormously complicated and driven into certain courses by economic imperatives, such as markets, demand for labour, availability or otherwise of raw materials. Individual men and women may seek to control this vast machine, but it is beyond their individual power. There are, indeed, key men holding positions of power with the machinery of capitalism—industrialists, trade union leaders, economists of the Keynes type—men who advise rulers, but who owe their own positions of influence to their understanding of the machinery rather than to any real control over the process. The rulers they advise are equally powerless. Their advisers do not tell them what to do but what, in the circumstances, they must do.

If these men were able to control the machinery of capitalism, one would have to regard them as responsible for its appalling results, and so rate them very wicked men indeed. They may often be very unpleasant people, though just occasionally they are delightful and well-intentioned, but it is absurd to regard them as evil in the old moralistic sense.

Modern States have developed in a certain pattern and they can only work within that pattern. Phrases like "the inexorable laws of history" or of "capitalist development" recognise this fact, even though democratic procedure pretends that it is quite otherwise, pretends that choice exists—even on major issues.

Looked at from this standpoint—which is, after all, scarcely a fantastic or far-fetched one—the issue of Eisenhower or Stevenson becomes a meaningless one in any broad social sense. It may be important to a certain section of American personnel, but to the population at large, or the world at large, well, no.

An American radio commentator on the B.B.C., in an eve of election

broadcast, said in effect that "whoever wins the election, we may rest assured that American policy will remain the same". Of course; but is it reassuring?

Policy to-day flows from the pattern of social and economic life which we call capitalism. But so also do all the limitations and imperatives of our daily lives. The pointlessness, the frustration, the downright ugliness of adult life to-day arise just from this pattern which we can "rest assured" will not change.

Yet, almost everyone to-day is yearning for it to be changed; is either in revolt against it or is resigned to defeat in life. However one expresses it, the phenomenon one tries to describe is the mass unhappiness, the repeated pattern of industrial frustration, the painful attempt to secure fulfilment in life. This is the pattern that neither Ike nor Adlai, nor Stalin or Tito, or Nye or Clem, can change. It is not the president who must be elected, but the whole social way of life that must be changed, changed in a direction that may increase the fulfilment of life that is called happiness. It does not require anarchist theory, or indeed any political propositions, to point this out, for it is something which everyone feels, though not everyone as yet understands it.

## BUDDIES

COLONEL Robert Scott, United States Army Air Force, Commanding Officer of Fuerstendfeldbruck Air Base in West Germany, addressing German newspapermen on October 9th, 1952, said:

"I hope and pray that the moment will soon come when either I or some other American commander will turn this fine Air Base over to some German Wing Commander with the beginning of Germany's new Luftwaffe.

"You saw first that the great threat to civilisation was to the east, with the Communist Soviet Union. I wish that we had had the foresight then in 1945 to understand that.

"I impatiently wait with you for the day when we will stand shoulder to shoulder as friends and brothers to resist the threat of Communism."

## World Birth Control Conference

THE World Conference of the International Planned Parenthood Committee, Bombay, Nov. 24—Dec. 1, has received an extraordinary response. It has been sponsored by over three hundred distinguished persons from many countries, eminent speakers will lecture and a widely representative attendance of Asians, Europeans and Americans has already been indicated.

Prime Minister Nehru's public recognition of the need for family planning (July 1951) and its inclusion in India's first five-year plan aroused the people to a consciousness of the population problem, both from a personal and national point of view. The Government allotted Rs. 5 lakhs a year for contraceptive research and for the dissemination of information on family planning. India was the first government in the world to request aid on these subjects from the World Health Organisation. As a result several clinical research studies were initiated in Delhi State, Mysore State, Madras State and West Bengal by Dr. Abraham Stone, the WHO expert on planned parenthood. Other projects in this field have also been begun.

The Army, last spring, issued directives to open birth control clinics in all regimental centres.

All this activity has given the Indian birth control movement great impetus.

By now, fifty or more family planning centres function in the larger cities, among which are: Aligarh, Ameraoti, Bombay, Calcutta, Dehra Dun, U. P., Madras, Nagpur, Poona and Punjab. At least fourteen municipalities support clinics: Ahmedabad, Bangalore, Berhampur (Orissa), Bombay, Delhi, Hyderabad, Karwar, Lucknow City, Madras, Nasik, Poona, Secunderabad, Sholapur and Surat. Municipal awareness of this vital health measure shows a discernment still politically, though not privately, lacking in the United States. Only seven out of forty-eight states include family planning in U.S. public health programmes.

The *Indian Medical Journal* for May, 1952, devoted its whole issue to family planning. The editorial describes concisely what lies before the dedicated groups engaged in this work. "The task, therefore, of the advocates of Family Planning is doubly difficult. A dual task awaits them. They are required to instruct people on the technique of artificial contraceptives on the one hand and on the other they must be torch bearers to remove the age-old beliefs

of the people and change their fatalistic outlook. It must be borne in mind that so long as Indian people believe that everything in this world is predestined and man is simply a plaything in the hands of Providence, no material advance can be registered."

Actually, birth control propaganda in India began more than twenty years ago. The first Indian clinic established was in Poona. In 1930, the Mysore government issued a revolutionary order to open contraceptive clinics in three hospitals. In the next few years the All-India Women's Conference passed resolutions favouring birth control and both Madras University and the Madras government accepted the proposal to give courses in contraception. Margaret Sanger's visit in 1935-36 greatly widened interest and the Family Planning Society was formed in Bombay, headed by Lady Cowesji Jehangir. A few clinics sprang up but closed when the war made importation of contraceptives impossible. Nevertheless, in 1940, a resolution in the Council of State for the establishment of birth control clinics was adopted. Six years later, the Health Survey and Development Committee recommended provision of contraceptive advice. In the meantime, various women's groups kept agitating, with the result that the Bombay Municipal Corporation decided to establish free family planning clinics. Today, there are fifteen. An innovation in the eight most recent is the free service for voluntary sterilisation of poor couples with large families. Eight additional partly free clinics are run by welfare organisations.

In 1949, the influential Family Planning Association of India (Bombay) was formed under the dynamic leadership of Lady Rama Rau. Its prestige was demonstrated when the Indian Government Planning Commission requested proposals for family planning and invited representation on its health and social welfare advisory panels. The latest ambitious undertaking, that of the World Conference, has required vision, determination and incessant effort.

Other organisations working for family planning are the All-India Women's Conference, the Christa Sova Mandir in Scholapur and the Nagpada Neighbourhood House in Byculla, Bombay.

—International Planned Parenthood Committee: London & N. York.

## 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 :  
*Murxism, 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.
- RUDOLF ROCKER :  
*Nationalism and Culture.* cloth 21s.
- ALEX COMFORT :  
*Delinquency* 6d.  
*Barbarism & Sexual Freedom* paper 2s. 6d., stiff boards 3s. 6d.
- ALEXANDER BERKMAN :  
*ABC of Anarchism.* 1s.
- PETER KROPOTKIN :  
*The State: Its Historic Role.* 1s.  
*The Wage System.* 1d.  
*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 in China.* 2s. 6d.  
*New Life in the Land.* 6d.  
*Railways and Society* 3d.  
*Homes or Hovel?* 6d.  
*What is Anarchism?* 1d.  
*The Basis of Communal Living* 1s.
- 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.

## Lessons of the Spanish Revolution - 16

Continued on p. 2

to right the wrong of their "exclusion" from the Government. (2) They renewed their efforts to reach agreement with the U.G.T. for an alliance. (3) To this end they spared not efforts in attempting to rehabilitate Largo Caballero, so decisively outmanoeuvred by the Right wing socialists (Prieto and Negrin) in the struggle for power. And Caballero naturally reciprocated once he was ousted from power and politically isolated!

The period of "opposition" was launched by a series of four vast meetings, broadcast throughout Spain, at which each of the ex-Ministers gave an account of his activities in the government. We have already referred to the speech made by Garcia Oliver on that occasion. Even more revealing, however, was the speech delivered by Federica Montseny, a prominent member of the C.N.T.-F.A.I. and still to-day an influential figure in the M.L.E. (Spanish Libertarian Movement) in exile. Having played a leading rôle in ending the street fighting during the May Days in Barcelona, her reflections on her actions are of particular interest.

"I remained a week in Catalonia, a week of continuous work—she said—seeking the solution to all the problems, and with the orientation of the comrades of my organisation. We were successful in our efforts. The matter was satisfactorily solved. It was a lesson and an experience for everybody—or rather, it should have been. And when I returned to Valencia, satisfied and convinced that we could put a feather in our caps both nationally and internationally in so far as the workers' organisations and the Government had demonstrated that they had absolute control over the masses, and that the Government, never as then had such prestige, in having managed to solve a problem of tremendous importance without shedding blood—I was saying, when I returned to Valencia joyfully convinced that I was returning victorious along a path covered with laurels, we found that the crisis was planned for the very day of our arrival." (Our italics.) But this is not all! Later, the speaker dealt with the participation of the C.N.T. in the Government.

"I, as an anarchist who rejected the State, conceded it a little credit and confidence, in order to achieve a revolution from above. . . . And those who should have been grateful to us, because we abandoned the street and violence and accepted responsibility within a government, bound by a legislation made by others, did not rest until they obtained that we, the revolutionaries of the street, should return to the street. And now this is the problem. The C.N.T. is back in the street. Those people do not realise the terrible responsibility they bear for having made us return to the street without the responsibility of government; an organisation and a powerful movement which have lost none of their vigour or effectiveness, but which, on the contrary, have been strengthened by acquiring a discipline and

a co-ordination which they previously did not possess. . . . Federica Montseny's conclusions were that the participation of the workers' organisation in the Government was "the most fundamental Revolution made in the political and economic fields". The entry of the C.N.T. "with a sense of responsibility, with a useful activity, with a task already realised without arguments, opens up a new future in the world for all the working-class organisations". The speaker was trying to show that since the workers made the revolution, both in destroying the foundations of the existing order and in building the new society, they therefore had a right to be included as a class in the task of government. Just as Garcia Oliver before her, Federica Montseny puts forward outworn reformist ideas as if they were revolutionary discoveries!

In a newspaper article on this subject,\* Juan Lopez, the C.N.T.'s ex-Minister of Commerce, maintained that the collaboration of the C.N.T. had not resulted in any internal disintegration of the Confederation. He believed the contrary had been the result. "Our influence among the workers is decisive. The sense of confederal discipline has developed immensely, and the moral and organic unity of the C.N.T. is not surpassed by any organisation or party." To measure the health of an organisation in terms of "discipline" and "organic unity" is dangerous, misleading and unconvincing. All politicians and trade union leaders dream of discipline for the masses. The C.N.T. leaders proved to be no exception. In case it may be said that we have misinterpreted Juan Lopez, we will quote from a further article published a month later.† "Each one of us must be disposed towards the inflexible view of the internal discipline of our movement. That there must be for the libertarian movement in this period of war and of rapid transition, a real single command. That is to say, a single voice and a single front. Local problems, regional crises, absolutely everything must be resolved by the direct intervention of the supreme organs of our movement. Contradictory positions must be discarded and, since we are joined by a single ideal, we must defend one interest."

Juan Lopez was not alone in proposing and desiring this dictatorship within the C.N.T. Some months earlier, on March 28, 1937, the National Committee called a conference of all the Confederal and Anarchist Press which was held in the Casa C.N.T.-F.A.I. in Barcelona. "Its principle objective—writes Peirats‡—was the subordination of all the organs of expression of anarcho-syndicalism to the directives of the National Committees. Certain dissonances had to be suppressed, such as the freedom to criticise by certain periodicals, which had raised themselves to the position of being repositories

of principles and snipers at the weaknesses of the Committees and the Confederal ministers. The result of this conference was the most effective answer to the ill-founded illusions of those who believed in a chimerical confederal discipline." Though the Conference agreed with most of the projects put forward, the suggestion that the libertarian press should virtually become the mouthpiece of the committees was only accepted by a majority vote, "a hollow victory if one takes into account that at the end of the conference the minority reiterated its decision to disregard the vote."

The C.N.T. as a movement did not suffer by the policy of collaboration and centralisation in the same way as have so many other working-class organisations in similar circumstances, simply because to a very large degree the leaders were unable to impose their decisions on the rank and file militants. The swiftness with which they mobilised their forces in Barcelona during the May Days, and the difficulty which the "influential militants" had in persuading them to abandon the barricades is surely proof of this. But there can be no escaping the fact that the defeat forced on them during the May Days was followed by a noticeable demoralisation among the revolutionary workers. The organised armed attacks on the collectives in Aragon, costly and useless military campaigns carried out for political considerations only, serious shortages of food and raw materials, the growing number of refugees as Franco occupied more towns and villages, could not but have a serious effect on morale.

It is true that during this period the C.N.T. was not in the Government, and there are those apologists of collaboration who put forward the view that the attacks on the workers' position following the May Days could not have taken place if there had been C.N.T. Ministers in the Negrin Government.‡ But, to our mind, to maintain such an attitude, is to close one's eyes to the realities. Above all, it is to ignore the all-important fact that the Caballero Government had at least one victory to its credit; that of re-establishing the authority of government, which during the first two months of the struggle was non-existent. In this task Caballero was greatly assisted by the influential members of the C.N.T.-F.A.I. in his Cabinet and by the growing bureaucracy in all departments of public life, in which members of the C.N.T.-F.A.I. played an important rôle.

And just as the provocation during the May Days was carried out in spite of four C.N.T. Ministers being in the Catalan Government, so would similar acts against the revolutionary workers have been committed whether the C.N.T. was in the Valencia Government or not. As Federica Montseny so succinctly put it: "in politics we were absolutely ingenuous."

(To be continued)

V.R.

\* *Fragua Social* (Valencia, 9/6/37).  
† *Fragua Social* (Valencia, 10/7/37).  
‡ José Peirats; *La C.N.T. en la Revolución Española*, Vol. 2 (Toulouse, 1952).

36 This view is put forward in violent terms by Horacio Prieto, formerly National Secretary of the C.N.T. in an article on *La Política Libertaria (Material de Discusion)*, Brighton, February 15, 1946.

GROUP MARRIAGE etc. . . .

Replies to criticisms of Messrs. Casey and H.R.L., which appeared in FREEDOM for 11th October.

HERE we go again. Just because I do not burble about the "Joys of Spring" tra-la. Mr. Casey implies that I must be a heartless monster. In desperation I can only refer him to Russell's talk on "Reason and Passion" which appeared in the *Listener* a few weeks back. While I do not regard all that he says as the gospel, he nevertheless establishes his main point in his usual lucid style. Reason and emotion, far from being incompatible, are in fact complementary.

If I do not indulge in Rousseauvian ecstasies about the noble savage, but prefer to examine the matter logically, it is because I have learnt to mistrust purely emotional appeals. As Hitler, Mussolini, et al have recently shown, the emotional appeal divorced from reason is a highly inflammable balm.

I must allow, however, that brother Milward has caught me on one foot as far as the creative artist is concerned. What is unique about this rare avis, of course, is the very fact that he can and does produce something beyond what he has learned. However, even Leonardo da Vinci spent his earlier years acquiring techniques, and Newton without mathematical education could never have produced his Principia. No, I'll agree that without the "divine spark" progress is by definition impossible.

As to Milward's belief in a non-technological Utopia, I must earnestly ask him if he is prepared to forgo such advantages as modern methods of communication—the radio, books and newspapers, cars, trains, ships and aeroplanes? Is he also willing to die in Malthusian glory while the witch-doctor with his bats' wing and horse-leather supplants the modern (technological) medical specialist with his penicillin and X-ray apparatus?

To accept scientific knowledge is not to reject human values. Huxley's *Brave New World* merely illustrates the disastrous results of making this assumption.

Now to H.R.L.'s contention that I am unscientific in denying "the language of the blood". Yes, comrade, I have read enough on heredity to know what a modern biologist considers a transmissible characteristic, and the weight of the evidence is all on the other foot. If Comrade L. wishes me to accept his

mystique he will have to do more than just quote the opinions of the somewhat rhapsodic sociologists of the Peckham experiment (admirable as that enterprise was in many respects). A mother's milk may or may not be adequate to the biological needs of her child—it depends upon what she has been eating and on her general level of health. These are the factors that are of paramount importance, not blood relationship. In point of fact, it was precisely these factors which were so carefully controlled in the Peckham experiment. If Comrade L. knows of any other relevant scientific data I should be pleased to hear of it.

Indiana, Oct. 30. BOB GREEN.

I READ with great interest the article by Bob Green on "Group Marriage," etc., and the letters of Milward Casey and "H.R.L."

I must confess I found myself agreeing intellectually with all that Bob Green said and failed to detect any suggestion (as made by Milward Casey) that he advocated "freedom in love without the emotions". Surely freedom in love does not discount selectivity and with selectivity comes attraction of mind as well as body? I am sure that the article was not as coldly rational as Casey read it. The only snag is: how can we so train our emotions to exceed complete freedom to the beloved. Is it not as much a desire to be needed that creates possessiveness as the need to possess? Can one say this is learned—or may it not be an innate need of individuals? Is it necessary for us to evolve out of this to have a free society? Would not Bob Green, with his concern for humanity, agree?

As for the children. Of course they should live freely in a free society, my intellect tells me. But do we not find that the social misfits are those who have been proved to have too little sense of belonging in childhood. Can this be given in a "House for Children" or only by parents? No woman has more consciously disciplined herself against possessiveness of her children than I have—but I still get a tremendous thrill out of saying "my children" and they out of belonging. Is it conditioning and would they be better if free from all family ties?

I think the encroachment of the infant on the freedom of the young mother is

a much more devastating thing—and is certainly only necessitated by economic circumstances. This could be adjusted by society long before we reach Utopia; we could be doing it now as the first step towards freeing children from the emotional ties created by the mother because she has so few other interests. I would like to throw out to "H.R.L." the challenge that he may be still exaggerating the need of children for parents, because he wants to close his eyes to the greater need of the parents for the children.

To Casey I would say that it appears a fact that adopted children can be as much loved as the most loved children of natural parents.

Stroud, Oct. 19. JOSÉ HALLAM.

AFRICAN AFFAIRS

I DON'T think your article of 18th inst. goes to the root of the matter. The record of the behaviour of the White (so-called Christian) races in Africa has been disgraceful.

As a young man, I was familiar with Sir Roger Casement's disclosures about the Belgian Royal Domain in the Congo. Trader Horn's tirade against French treatment of the Melagassie in Madagascar, the Boer's ill-treatment of the Kaffirs in S. Africa, not to mention our own steady extermination of backward races like the Pygmies and the Bushmen. The White races have indeed much to answer for.

It must be some 20 years ago I first read Professor Lips' admirable study of African Art, called *The Savage His Back*, in which it is made clear the native of Africa holds the white man in hatred, ridicule and contempt.

I prophesy we shall all be turned out of Africa before the end of the century.

Petworth, Oct. 21. R. G. ABBOTT.

THE CONDUCT OF LIFE

I READ with interest George Woodcock's review of the last volume of the Lewis Mumford tetralogy *The Conduct of Life*. In this book—based upon the belief held also by Kropotkin that there are certain ethical values implicit in the human condition—I disagree that Mumford shows a tendency to lapse into "moralism". Indeed, elsewhere in the book, Mumford himself warns against the dangers of becoming "goody-good", and writes: "People whose life is confined to obeying the prescribed rules for conduct tend to be little the very purposes for which ethics exists; that is a life more abundant and significant."

To descend to details, I must oppose Woodcock's contention that Mumford indulges in any kind of "tirade" against the use of tobacco. In the passage in question Mumford wrote: "In Western countries one of the prime marks of an organic change in our culture . . . would probably be the drastic reduction of the now compulsive habits of smoking and drinking." (Note he uses the word "reduction" and not "elimination".) He goes on to point out that the fact that even in a time of world-wide famine no one dared to suggest even a partial turnover of tobacco land to food growing, illustrates how close to *rigor mortis* our civilisation has come. This is in keeping with one of the main themes of the book, which is that there is a need for a simplification in all spheres of contemporary life, if the capacity for direct and creative action is to be regained.

Doubtless certain people will feel that the discussion of such obvious ethics smacks of "authoritarianism", even although the breaking of any compulsive habit must obviously be voluntary to achieve any lasting benefit. The current craze for "giving up smoking" demonstrates the hysterical point that most people have reached, and how little, in our present centralised civilisation, they have retained the ability either to organise their own lives, or to retain a sense of proportion when they make the attempt.

In their defence of "freedom" I find

that many anarchists tend to throw common sense out of the window. Even in an anarchist society there would surely be a certain pressure to conform to accepted behaviour patterns in order to ensure a minimum social cohesion and a going culture. In other words, while one would respect a man's right to go to the devil as he pleased, one would not need to respect the man himself for doing so.

New York, U.S.A.

K.I.

SINCE I have had occasion to be critical in the past, I feel it only right that I should also let you know when I think your efforts are especially praiseworthy. In FREEDOM for 4/10/52 your front-page article "Expectations at Morecambe" and your leader "What is Democracy" are really excellent. They are not vague, generalised, sour condemnations, but a clear, explicit analysis of just how representation becomes misrepresentation. I would like to see the gist of these articles embodied in a cheap leaflet which I would be pleased to distribute locally.

I must thank you for your intention to put a stop to mere abuse of correspondents by critics who disagree.

I am also rather interested in your statement, in your reply to P. L. Lewis (18/10/52), that "a social revolution which could be achieved . . . without violence, is the one which has the greatest chance of a successful outcome." I know you go on to qualify this statement, but it does seem that you have conceded that anarchism can be discussed apart from insurrection, and that the pacifist anarchist is not quite the pariah he sometimes appears to be in your columns.

Stockport, 23/10/52.

J.R.H.

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

The present series of indoor discussion-lectures will continue at the premises of the British Drama League, 9 Fitzroy Square, London, W.1 (off Warren Street, Tottenham Court Road).

The meetings will be held on TUESDAYS at 7.30 p.m.

TUES., NOV. 11—S. E. Parker on ANARCHISTS & ASSASSINS

NORTH-EAST LONDON

DISCUSSION MEETINGS IN EAST HAM  
Alternate Wednesdays at 7.30 p.m.  
NOV. 12—Julian Pilling "FOLK LORE"

LIVERPOOL

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

GLASGOW

INDOOR MEETINGS at CENTRAL HALLS, 25 Bath Street  
Every Sunday at 7 p.m.  
With John Gaffney, Frank Leech, Jane Strachan, Eddie Shaw, Frank Carlin  
NOV. 16—Geoffrey Ostergaard on SYNDICALISM

Complications Continued from p. 1

as they can to produce more coal for export, while the cost of living leaves their present income far behind.

To throw in a sop to take the miners' minds off the real issue, the Porter Tribunal suggested that the industry's National Joint Negotiating Committee should consider the working of the "five-shift bonus" system and also the age at which miners should be entitled to draw the adult's wage rate.

The "five-shift bonus" system has long been a thorn in the miners' flesh. It has meant that for every full five-shift week that a miner works, he receives as a bonus a full-shift's pay. But if, for any reason, he is compelled to miss one shift in a week, he loses that bonus, so that a day's illness means for a miner the loss of two days' pay—the day he is ill and the bonus he doesn't get.

The miner is not entitled to receive full adult's pay until he is 23 years old. It may be remembered that the trouble with the Italian miners last summer started with the resentment by young haulage hands of under 23 of the fact that they were being paid less than Italians who were over 23. We said at the time that instead of attacking the Italians the youngsters would have been better engaged in fighting to get the age at which they ranked as adults brought down. Now it seems the Porter Tribunal has recognised the anomaly and thinks it should be altered.

But these two latter considerations are obviously put forward to cover up the fact that the main wage claim has been completely turned down. And what is the union's reaction?

"We are more than disappointed,"

Special Appeal

October 16th to 31st :

Cardiff: H.L.D. 1/6; Philadelphia: A.C. 14/-; Brooklyn: P.N. 7/-; Moline: E.R.J. 4/-; Brighton: A.S. 5/-; Bromley, Mrs. O.D. 2/-; London: K.L. 3/-; Anon\* 2/6; London: Anon\* 4/9; Stockton on Tees: R.H.M. 1/6; London: W.E.D.\* 10/-; Los Angeles: "Men" Group £5/6/7; Llenelly: E.G.R. 3/-.

Total	8 4 10
Previously acknowledged	459 16 3
1952 TOTAL TO DATE	£468 1 1

GIFTS OF BOOKS: Nottingham: K.N.; London: S.E.P.; London: C.W.

\* Readers who have undertaken to send regular monthly contributions.

said Sir William Lawther, the mine-workers' president, but "We're obliged to accept the decision because it is binding on both parties."

How easy it is, for Sir William to be so sportin' and magnanimous. It is not his salary that is being pinned down to an uncomfortably low level. He doesn't have to continue to go down the pit, with the hopes of an improvement in his conditions dashed to the ground. Sir Will has improved his conditions, a long time ago, when he left the dark pit behind him and got the men who still go down into the darkness to pay him more than they earn themselves. For him life's economic problems have been considerably simplified, but for the men who actually do the work, they remain complicated, and always will as long as the crazy money system continues to torment us.

For one of the arguments put forward by the Porter Tribunal is that an increase all round for the miners would result in an increase of 5s. per ton for coal, which would lead to still further rises in the prices of all manufactured goods. This is undoubtedly so, but what is the alternative? That miners and other producers of primary goods shall be kept at a lower standard of living—without regard for their needs—simply because all other products stem from theirs?

This is what has happened in the past; it is the only way the profit-wages-money systems can even attempt to balance the un-balanceable. It is strictly up to the miners, however, whether they allow it to happen to them again. And if in defending themselves they spell chaos for British industry as it is at present organised—then so much the worse for the present form of organisation. If it cannot provide a stable standard of living for its primary workers, then it deserves to collapse, and the workers will put something saner and more satisfying in its place. P.S.

CONVICTS FOR 1s. 6d.

SOUTH African farmers subscribe money to build a prison near their farms so the Government can fill it with convicts for labour, it was alleged at Geneva yesterday.

Mr. C. W. W. Greenidge, secretary of the British Anti-Slavery Society told the U.N. Committee on Forced Labour: "One such prison is at Leslie, Eastern Transvaal. Prisoners are hired out to local farmers at 1s. 6d. a day. They are taken to their work in steel cages".

News Chronicle, 17/10/52.

Kenya Adventure Continued from p. 1

were not the miserable refugees from Stalin-controlled Europe, escaping from racial persecution via hellships to Cyprus concentration camps. No, the refugees from Britain were of a much different category. They were lords, ladies and gentlemen, escaping from high income tax, via luxury liners to the swell hide-outs of the Bahamas."

Out they went, complaining about "lack of opportunity", the high rate of taxation, frustration to businessmen, etc., etc., in England, all crying out—as did the group of businessmen I spoke of (who had been fined for selling adulterated food). Farms in Kenya and castles in the Bahamas according to taste, but it is in Kenya the reckoning is to-day and maybe it will be in the Bahamas to-morrow.

As I said, to us national distinctions mean nothing, the world is one, let them go wherever they choose and the farther away the better. "But these people are not going out to live on their own labour. They go out there to live on the sweated labour of the coloured people. If the coloured workers rise to defend themselves from exploitation, the aristocrat exiles expect us to go out and defend them, just as they expect us to defend them from any attack from outside wherever it may come. . . . The whisky-boozers of Singapore and the English Rajah of Sarawak expected British arms to be used to defend them against the Japanese. In the same way the white nabobs of India expected British arms to be used for years to defend them against the Indians." And now the East African "pioneers", the businessmen who went out and invested their money in Kenya, expect us to defend them from the Kikuyu African. The Kikuyu is not bitterly nationalistic and he would perhaps agree with the last remark in the article referred to: "The lords and ladies who left these shores with repugnance should go, not with all the goods they have taken and not worked for, but with nothing save the hands they had to work with in order to earn their living. Perhaps they

would not then be so anxious to flock to compete with the superior intelligence of the coloured man."

The soldiers who are being flown to Kenya are not people who invested their money in East African farms because they were dissatisfied with post-war conditions in England. They are the mugs now known as "brave Tommies", formerly "lazy British workers", who were subjected to post-war austerity in order that it might be possible to send military reinforcements on such occasions as this. They should not be subjected to the risk of death for nothing, nor should the Kikuyu be subjected to military rule. There will be no more "colonization" such as decimated the Red Indian or the Polynesian, least of all in Africa where the Negro has the bitter warning of South Africa ever before him. The Army is all for such adventures as the present—if they haven't one place they want another, and apparently from the Press the only concern the War Office has expressed is that too many military commitments at once will deplete them of crack regiments for the Coronation!—but public opinion can and must make itself felt against this senseless adventure, for the sake of which the life tribute is demanded of youth—if not death itself, then at least two years of service—as well as restrictions imposed on everyone. Russia will not be a ha'penny better off if we leave Kenya altogether. It can no more enter Kenya than it can enter Switzerland, without embroiling other countries, but in any case all the arguments against leaving Kenya are equally applicable to Palestine, India, Pakistan, Burma, and Persia. But there we have a fait accompli!

The arguments against Kenya independence may also be held against Gold Coast independence, but let us face the truth of it, that what is delaying that recognition is solely a concern for those investments which will eventually have to be abandoned.

INTERNATIONALIST.