

# Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

The people never give up  
their liberties but under  
some delusion

EDMUND BURKE

Vol. 14, No. 19

May 9th, 1953

Three pence

## THE WAR IN INDO-CHINA

# FALL OF FRANCE IN ASIA

THE Viet-Minh ("Communist") forces in Indo-China have suddenly switched to an offensive against Laos. Grave anxiety exists in Paris H.Q. as to whether the French Army can hold Laos. The French garrisons are confined to a few strongpoints whereas the Viet-Minh are spread over impregnable country and are advancing upon the "holy city" of Luang Prabang. This would be an immense advantage to them. While it is not the capital of Laos (as erroneously stated in some British papers) and having no real strategic value, it is the "town of a hundred pagodas"—an attractive prize to the Viet-Minh, whose "communism" consists largely of adherence to Mao Tse-Tung and the Chinese war-lords but which is far from any "old-fashioned" Marxist beliefs in religion being "the opium of the people".

The constant attempt by the Viet-Minh to control the destinies of Buddhism, and enrol the thousands of bonzes (Buddhist priests) as their adherents by the same means as Stalin enrolled the popes of the Orthodox Church, is an explanation of their life-no-object advance upon unimportant Luang Prabang. The reason for their successes is that Laos depended largely upon Annamese and Tonkinese as working-men. The constant emigration from Tongking and Annam (now Viet-Nam) was halted only by the war. Tongking is the stronghold of the Viet-Minh because it was the province most exploited by French Imperialism and consequently the centre of disaffection, which the "Communists" eagerly exploited. Amongst the town workers of Laos, large numbers fled to Siam but others remained outside the cities, and the approach of their fellow-countrymen is a species of liberation for them. The Laotian peasant himself is largely indifferent as to which of the two foreign forces rules him, and in many cases the change of government can hardly be known to him.

The Laotian Government, moreover, has long been torn by dissensions between the ruling-classes over questions of royal accession, as well as the Parliamentary intrigue, and amongst the only section likely to be pro-French there is no chance whatever of unity. Hence the

### Sacrifices Unlimited

MILITARY men are not renowned for their intellectual ability and capacity for logical thought. The hearty Field-Marshal Montgomery is no exception.

In Montreal last week he declared that Atlantic Pact nations must be prepared to sacrifice for even 100 years in their effort to bring about peace. He went on to say:—

"Nations must be organised to spring into action quickly. The trouble in the world to-day is that from time to time evil men arise and seize power and try to exert their power by force. The world's major problem is how to deal with such threats without interfering with people's ordinary lives, the prosperity of each nation, or economic realities.

"This can be done quite easily if the people of each nation are prepared to make sacrifices for the safety of their nations."

In other words, sacrificing for 100 years is not to be regarded as interfering with people's ordinary lives! If we are all prepared to sacrifice for the whole of our lives in order to maintain the crippling armaments programmes and preserve the safety of our nations from the evil men, this will not interfere with prosperity, or economic reality.

But will life be worth living?

fall of Luang-Prabang may be expected, and even Ventiane, the capital of Laos, on which French hopes depend, may collapse. And with Laos gone, Cambodia, Tongking, Annam may all be lost to France. The only chance otherwise is of large scale American intervention which depends on the outcome in Korea. If peace is settled there, both the Chinese and Americans will turn their attention to Indo-China. Of such is the value of the heralded peace negotiations at Panmunjon!

Ventiane is on the very border of Siam, which is heavily occupied in outlying districts with uniformed Viet-Minh troops, despite the attitude of the Government. During the war Marshal Phibul collaborated with the Japanese, but underwent a remarkable transformation afterwards and emerged as a democratic hero of America. It should likewise be remembered that the "Communists" throughout Asia were in effect pro-Japanese throughout the years of occupation—in Japan itself (despite their proscriptio) as well as in the whole of Asia, except in China where Mao Tse-Tung continued to collaborate with Chiang Kai-Shek against the Japanese. This attitude was due to the position of Japan vis-à-vis Russia. Whereas the Stalinist line changed elsewhere on the invasion of Russia by Germany in 1941, Russia did not declare war on Japan until 1945, and the party line was simply to preserve its existence without resistance.

Thus they have emerged as a strong party, and can in fact only be paralleled by others who also collaborated with the Japanese. French Imperialism was unable to do so, much as it would have liked to do in the Vichy years. However, since the war it has steadily lost

ground. First of all it temporised with Communists such as Ho Chi Minh (leader of the Viet Minh) in the hopes of an alliance. Then it re-imposed the old discredited royal families throughout Indo-China, who rule again in the name of the French Republic—"Vive le roi" has long been an illegal cry in France but has become compulsory in countries like Cambodia! The continued existence of French Imperialism prejudiced nationalist feeling, while the poverty in the midst of incredible plenty is in itself a cause for rebellion. The only sure card the French Government had to play was the tyranny and oppression of the Viet-Minh. But it could not counter this with any progressive aspirations itself. The truth is that both sides are equally retrogressive, and no movement has arisen which is able to oppose both.

There are those who tell us that a "Third Camp" is impracticable, but the "practical" solutions look equally dismal, and moreover neither is really a solution, since whichever one supports can give no guarantee whatever that the tragic jungle war will not drag on with the other side. The nostalgia for a "Third Camp" is, however, seen by the enormous popularity given everywhere to representatives of India, since (whether this is in fact so or not) the majority of people in Indo-China with any ideas on the current situation believe that Nehru stands for a third way—neither one imperialism nor the other. Bitter experience, unfortunately, will teach them that diplomacy is not enough, and a movement for independence means more than neutrality. The prospects for such a movement depend upon the growth of revolutionary feeling, which is not an immediate solution but the only one.

INTERNATIONALIST.

## Bury Corporation to Victimise C.O.'s

ALL employees of Bury (Lancs.) Corporation have been questioned in an inquiry to seek out and dismiss all declared conscientious objectors. A resolution was made in 1940—the first of the worst years of the war—and the Corporation have decided to adhere to it again.

Teachers and local government officers, as well as transport and street cleaning workers, have all been questioned, and already the unions concerned are protesting.

An official of the Bury Branch of the National Union of Teachers said last night:

"This is a witch hunt and contrary to all our principles. We do not support or oppose conscientious objectors but we do believe that people should not be victimised because of their religious be-

liefs. Many of us fought in the war for freedom of thought and speech."

The Bury (Passenger Section) branch of the Transport and General Workers' Union, which has a membership of 340, described the inquiry as "an unwarranted interference with the liberties of individuals," and an official of the union said: "We shall give the strongest backing to any union which decides to fight this resolution."

Members of the Bury Headmasters' Association, who have been asked to check all their school staffs, are angry at the inquiry and it is understood that teachers at several schools have signed petitions of protest which will be sent to the council.

According to the *Manchester Guardian* of 25th April,

"The Town Clerk of Bury refused to comment, but a senior member of the council said: 'The decision to adhere to this resolution was reached almost unanimously'."

On the 30th April, however, the following letter appeared in the same paper:

"Sir.—The news item published recently by the national press on the decision of the Bury Town Council to reaffirm its ban of 1940 on declared conscientious objectors needs a significant correction.

"A 'senior member of the council' is said to have stated that this decision was 'almost unanimous'.

"In fact, the voting figures were 16-14, all Labour members present voting against.—Yours &c.,

J. COOKSON (Councillor)."

This letter casts rather a different light on the matter. If Mr. Cookson's figures for the voting are correct (and he would hardly commit himself, in print, being a councillor, if they were not) it hardly looks like an "almost unanimous" decision, since it had only needed one of the "Ayes" to vote "No" to have made the vote 15-15.

Such voting figures show the weakness of voting as a means of arriving at decisions, anyway, but far more important is the fact that such a controversial measure can be pushed through on such a slender majority.

The fact that the voting was so close however, should give encouragement to all those opposed to the resolution. A little pressure from outside, among the Corporation's employees should be enough to get it rescinded. If the transport workers and teachers, street sweepers and Council clerks, will join forces, they can fight their employers and win.

When, a few years ago, Southend Corporation tried the same thing, public opinion was strong enough to defeat it. The same thing must be done for Bury.

From their own legal viewpoint the Corporation's action is bad. The State recognises conscientious objectors. They are a definite legal category (providing they satisfy a Tribunal, which isn't easy!) and for a local government organisation to set out to victimise this section of society is intolerable.

From the point of view of civil liberties it is even more deplorable. There will be even less point that there is now in pointing the finger of scorn at the totalitarian States, or Senator Joe McCarthy, if measures like Bury Corporation's are allowed to creep in here.

perjury. We always knew that ignorance of the law was no excuse, but now to be ignorant of your neighbour's thoughts is a crime. Guilt by association is in effect an established process of law.

So can you be surprised that ordinary people "hide" behind the Fifth Amendment when hauled before a Congressional Committee for "crimethink", when by merely opening your mouth you may incriminate yourself? If you claim that you cannot remember how many red berries there were on a sprig of holly you bought for a pre-war Xmas, you may well be indicted for perjury on the

Continued on p. 4

## AMERICAN LETTER

# 1984 Is Breathing Down Our Necks

AROUND the campus of an American University you will find several discussion groups which meet once a week or so to give the scholar, student or faculty member, a chance to flex his grey matter in public debate. As long as the topic is fairly innocuous, such as birth control, the world food shortage, or a religious issue, only the familiar races are to be seen—the innocent lovers of polemic; the naive addicts of verbal cut and thrust. Yet attend a talk on academic freedom, or any other issue that might be tainted by the leprous odour of Communism—be it ever so faint—and a new face appears upon the scene. A new face and a new expression. The thin-lipped, unsmiling mask of the professional heresy hunter. The gentleman from the Thought Police is with us.

He sits near the door, trying to make his muscular frame as inconspicuous as possible, and scribbles in a detached way upon his little pad, as if the hand that is so furiously busy collecting evidence does not really belong to him. He contributes nothing to the debate. Nobody knows him—or wants to. He is there solely to listen and to note everything that might conceivably be construed as unorthodox. He is the Hound of State on the scent of what George Orwell labelled "crimethink". He is marking down the aberrant individual who still has the temerity to try thinking for himself.

When the projected Great Purge of the education system gets under way these deviates will find themselves out of a job, and all doors to other academic appointments will be closed to them because their faces do not fit under the New Order. If their views are too eccentric the blowtorch will turn their way and

more than just this insidious economic pressure will be brought to bear on them. They will find themselves behind bars with ample time to contemplate their folly in having thought they were citizens of a democracy that guarantees freedom of speech. Perhaps they will conclude that democracy is a mixed blessing when the common people become victims of mass hysteria induced by reactionary propaganda which uses an imperialistic war to fan the fires of blind hatred.

There are plenty of F.B.I. agents on campus, of course, but not so many that they can be everywhere at once. Such refinement of thought-control can be expected only with time. No doubt, with its lust for efficiency, America will one day develop a system that will surpass even the Russian régime for ruthless precision. With 31 years to go we look like being well on schedule. Until that happy day the Inquisitors have to be satisfied to place their Hounds in only the most strategic places. They enrol as students in the social study courses; economics is a favourite. They attend the lectures with religious regularity, taking their precious notes without needing to draw attention to themselves. They eavesdrop in the drug stores where radicals are known to foregather for their conspiratorial cup of coffee. They will

## LEAGUE AGAINST CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

Public Meeting, ST. PANCRAS TOWN HALL, WEDNESDAY, 13th MAY, 7.15. Speakers: Canon Carpenter, Victor Yates, M.P., F. A. Ridley, A Norwegian speaker, Jean Henderson, Philip Sansom, Robert Copping. Questions and Discussion. All welcome!

be found in any organisation that is suspect of harbouring progressive ideas, such as racial equality or civil rights groups, or anything with "socialist" or "liberal" in its title. Wherever there is a possibility that in the heat of debate on controversial social, political or economic problems a thought-criminal will make a slip in an unguarded moment and reveal himself as a sceptic regarding the ultimate perfection of the American Way of Life, they will be there.

For mark it well, it is no longer just what you may do that will get you into trouble, but what you may think. Owen Lattimore is not arraigned for having committed any overt crime, but because his persecutors claim that he thought differently than he says he thought. He is being indicted for having intentions which he denies having. He is charged with being ignorant, and of having a poor memory for events ten years past. He is charged with having experienced certain emotions.

Specifically, he is charged with perjury for having denied being sympathetic to Communism. If a competent jury discovers that in fact Owen Lattimore did experience such an emotion in 1942 then his goose is cooked. The Thought Police will have nailed him for "crimethink".

Just how the jury is going to establish such a tenuous "fact" remains to be seen. Presumably, they will have to be trained to project their astral bodies back along the fourth dimension and creep inside the prisoner's skull for a sly peek before dashing back to the jury box to denounce him.

Similarly, Owen Lattimore denies knowing that a certain person was a member of the C.P. at the time he dealt with them. Again he is charged with

# Mysticism and Anarchism

THE mystic is a person who stretches all his stirrings "unto the sovereign desirable, and unto the highest willable thing, the which is God". The anarchist is not perhaps so neatly definable, but to take its most recent manifestation, we may say that he stands for the spirit of revolt, symbolised by Prometheus, and that Man is the object of his faith.

No two positions could at first sight appear more alien to each other, and even antithetic, especially as it is usually felt that an all-round anarchist should be a professed atheist as well. His atheism in the best of cases is rooted in the conviction so pithily expressed by Bakunin that "one master in heaven is the surest guarantee of a thousand masters on earth". To which the mystic could candidly reply that there are no masters on earth and that He is not God whom one feels and conceives as a master.

Anarchists and mystics move in different spheres. But if mind, like matter, is indestructible, and the law of the conservation of energy on the physical plane has its counterpart in a law of the conservation of spiritual forces or personalities; if there is a Mind inclusive of all minds, a Platonic-like world of actual ideas where Boutroux's "Beyond that is

within" stretches from consciousness to consciousness and permits them to communicate and commune, then the anarchist's thoughts and the mystic's will be found unsuspectedly kindred, and it may be wondered why they never or seldom met in their temporal and contingent surfacing. It will be found that the anarchist is a mystic in politics, and the mystic an anarchist in religion.

If we are to look for anarchist ideas in the past it is in the writings of mystics that we will gather the richest harvest. But the difficulty for the present-day anarchist to think of religion independent of its historical instances and organised churches, explains the sad neglect of the search for affinities between these two forms of the human spirit, and this in spite of the fact that many persons became anarchist primarily because of unassuaged mystical longings. It is Guido Manacorda who first to our knowledge pointed out their close relationship and complementarity. He called his mystically inspired brand of anarchism "positive anarchism", and "negative" all

other brands preaching a direct attack on social institutions. He had to recognize, however, (rather cavalierly, one feels, as it was only in a note to a chapter of his "Mistica Maggiore") that "positive" anarchism had found expression even in such writers who, like Malatesta, were of the "negative" brand. What makes anarchism positive is the impulse and direction of love, while mysticism is negative when by crass or subtle involution it tapers into a quintessence and spiritualisation of hedonism, with no pangs for human suffering, and with social injustice cleverly beghosted or juggled away from the field of awareness.

Perhaps the reason why mysticism and anarchism so seldom achieve articulate fellowship lies in that the mystic's emphasis is on contemplation and the anarchist's on action. The mystic holds that only one thing is necessary, not so much the saving of his soul as contact with ultimate reality, the realization of the oneness of all things in God, of constant "at-onement" until his innermost soul bursts into God. He aims at selflessness

at the absolute and eternal, which for him are not mere abstractions, parturitions of a philosophy of essence, but un-intellectual magnets to his love-charged aloneness, so that he sets at nought all that appears fundamental and ineradicable to primary awareness such things as the existentialists have described as "Vorhandensein", "Existenz" and "Dasein". Consequently also he does not attempt to judge or change the world. The anarchist, on the other hand, judges and condemns, hates as well as loves, wants to regenerate the world of men, so un-God-like, wants to make God visible in a harmony of social living, of correlated subjects, rather than plunge for Him invisible into the night of his soul, into the light of heaven. But unless the anarchist shares with his brother communist the vision of a perfect state of mankind as an assembly of smoothly running digestive pipes, or as a herd of bulls and cows happily ruminating, frolic on and manuring imperishable pastures, he will probably conceive his utopia as a society of mystics engaged in contemplation, throbbing in purity with the infinite rhythms of ultimate reality. It so happens that the mystic is in one sense more individualistic than the anarchist, for he works for fulfilment here and now, he wants the "highest willable thing" for himself before his death, and does not waste his destiny as some anarchists do with inner theatrical gesture and super-Christian sentiment for a dis-

tant generation that will not be or, if it be, cannot ancestrally be robbed of its own destiny.

Not all mystics, it is to be noted, led a retired and contemplative life. Some of them, particularly in the West, were very active, and even, like Catherine of Siena, politically active. A woman addressing other women, Teresa of Avila said that God is to be found among the saucepans in the kitchen ("Dios esta entre los pucheros"), meaning that mysticism and the humblest, most menial work are not incompatible. But mystics who were active and recommended social and economical activity, only seldom and hardly ever with impunity did rebel against the established authority, so that their life and preaching, however meaningful and spiritually satisfying, turned out results that indirectly helped to strengthen the hold on the masses of some group of lurid interests, and to enhance the prestige of some form of tyranny. Of this Gandhi is the most recent and classical example.

We come now to the crux of the problem. Results don't matter to the mystic. "The world is imprisoned in its own activity, except when actions are performed as worship of God. Therefore you must perform every action sacramentally, and be free from all attachments to results". These words are from the Bhagavad-Gita, a book in which the mystical standpoint of non-attachment is pushed to its furthest limits, to include the slaying of one's brethren. It is a terrible book, but it is

Continued on p. 3

## An American Speaks His Mind

THE ugly fact is that our present economy rests in large measure on our rearmament programme. That is why Wall Street is thrown into a panic whenever it fears "peace may break out." The Kremlin talks as if that proves Wall Street is trying to start a war. All the evidence suggests that Wall Street is more afraid of a war than most parts of the country are. But the brokers in Wall Street, whatever their professional defects, know enough to wonder what would happen to our economy if our war preparation

stopped short or even tapered off too sharply. And an economic collapse in this country would spell sorrow not only for America but for most of the world . . .

The government of the United States has awarded itself the leadership of "the free world" . . . The Korean War was our show. It was we who rounded up the votes in the U.N., and it was we who with far greater difficulty rounded up token military forces from fellow-members. Early in the discussions an American orator at Lake Success, whose speech was heard on American radios, suffered an interesting slip of the tongue: he spoke of the United States. It is possible that many American listeners failed to detect the slip for the same psychological reasons that caused the American diplomat to make it. Shortly after the Chinese intervened in Korea, the *New York Times* announced unsmilingly, that as soon as Washington had decided what was to be done, it would be done through the United Nations. The statement doubtless struck many American readers as both accurate and natural . . .

Now that our policy has failed us, we can see clearly enough why: it is purely negative. This is what has left us with that most useless of instruments, a foreign policy that does not appeal to foreigners. It not only does not attract them, it does not even make sense to them. Since it never has made much sense to the American, this is a good time for inventory.

The best way to take stock, since

we admit we are the leaders of the free world, would be to have another look at the free world. We have been staring with such breathless horror at the Kremlin for so long that we have forgotten the two billion men and women on this planet who are neither Russian nor American and who are a little skeptical of both Moscow and Washington.

Let's take our eyes off Russia just long enough to listen to these two billion men and women, or even just look at them. They will be hard for us to see. For America to-day is like a rich suburb surrounded almost entirely by slums, and rich suburbanites always find it hard to put themselves in the place of a man who lives in a slum. Perhaps that is why, when we talk about Asia, we use expressions like "teeming millions"—anonymous, inhuman phrases, phrases that reduce men to statistics, that rob men of their faces. If Asians have no faces, you and I don't have to look in their eyes . . .

I am delighted that Communist propaganda forces the rest of us to remember the hungry billion every time we try to think of something more pleasant. Of course it would be even more thrilling if we remembered them out of love of our neighbours. But it is something to remember them at all, even if only from fear the Communists will stir them to revolt and end by making them their military allies in a power struggle against America.

—STRINGFELLOW BARR:  
*Citizens of the World*,  
(Doubleday & Co., New York).

## FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

OPEN DAILY

(OPEN 9—6.30; 5.30 SATURDAYS)

### Reprints . . .

Selections from Leonardo da Vinci 5/-

### Second-Hand . . .

The Sexual Revolution

Wilhelm Reich 10/-

The Paradox of Oscar Wilde

George Woodcock 7/6

The Face of Spain

Gerald Brenan 10/-

Parents Revolt. (A Study of the Declining Birth-Rate in Acquisitive Societies)

Richard & K. Titmuss 2/6

A Home of Their Own

K. E. Barlow 3/-

Green-Belt Cities. F. J. Osborne 3/-

### New Pamphlet . . .

The Crown and the Cash (A criticism of the Coronation)

Emrys Hughes 6d.

New issue of The Syndicalist

(April) 2d.

Postage extra on all items.

Obtainable from

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

## KROPOTKIN, MARX AND

Peter Kropotkin and Karl Marx are both nineteenth-century political philosophers in whose ideas people are still interested. Does it make sense to interest ourselves in these ideas in the Atomic Age? Can they be of any conceivable use in our political thinking after the interposition of many new and modern social philosophies? In the light of my two dominant personal biases, anarchism and Deweyism, I shall attempt to treat these questions as dispassionately as is practicable.

The important thing for us moderns to ask about Kropotkin is, How about his famous instincts? Logically prior to Kropotkin's assertion of the existence of co-operative instincts, is the question of the existence of instincts, and prior to that, of course, is the question of existence. What does it mean to say that instincts exist? Is it different than saying that anything-in-general exists? What would it mean to deny Kropotkin's thesis, to say that instincts don't exist? (1) How would these three things be done? (2) What implications would that have?

From the standpoint of Dewey's philosophy, Marxism shares with anarchism the opprobrium of ontologism and—consequently—outdatedness. Accordingly, I shall consider Marxism from the same point-of-view as outlined above for anarchism, but in somewhat less detail, due to the obviousness of its relation to Dewey's ideas. Finally, I hope to come up with some basis for an alternative political philosophy which would accord with the truly radical philosophy of Dewey.

To narrow the area of prejudgment as much as possible, I shall not consider anarchism and Marxism as mutually exclusive. Bakunin was, after all,—despite his personal difficulties with Marx—the most Marxist of all the anarchists. And Lenin, according to Max Nomad, was little more than

a Bakunin in Marxist trappings.<sup>1</sup> Certainly there was much interaction between the two schools of thought; their divergence perhaps became decisive following the publication of Lenin's *State and Revolution* in August, 1917.

### II

Montagu F. Ashley-Montagu, after earning his living from his watered-down versions of Kropotkin's ideas for years, has at last seen fit to acknowledge his debt to his victim. His latest book, *Darwin, competition and Co-operation*,<sup>2</sup> is dedicated "To The Memory of Peter Kropotkin, 1842-1921. Author of *Mutual Aid*." For whatever it might be worth, Ashley-Montagu has this to say about Kropotkin's current importance:

Kropotkin's book [*Mutual Aid: A Factor of Evolution*] is now a classic—which means that few people read it and that it is probably out of print. Yet no book in the whole realm of evolutionary theory is more readable or more important, for it is *Mutual Aid* which provided the first thoroughly documented demonstration of the importance of co-operation as a factor in evolution. Kropotkin's book, one may be sure, is destined for a revival, and the influence it has already had is likely to increase many-fold with the years. Since the publication in book form of *Mutual Aid* an increasing number of books and studies have been published along similar lines.<sup>3</sup>

My prejudices are such that I am not able to consider such bourgeois reformists as Ashley-Montagu and Warder Allee as exponents of Kropotkin's philosophy. How it is possible to deduce apologetics for capitalism from that

thoroughly revolutionary philosophy is beyond my ken! However, science, like the working class, has no fatherland; experimental evidence both for and against Kropotkin's propositions (Allee has found both) must stand on its own feet, without reference to its implications. Allee himself habitually makes a sharp distinction between "The Biological Evidence" for Kropotkin's theories and "Some Implications" of it.<sup>4</sup>

On the other hand, the theories should perhaps be referred to as a "Kropotkin-type" philosophy, because Kropotkin's own writings leave vast areas undeveloped. For example, he was influenced by Darwin and Kessler before him, and complemented by Allee and Read after his death. Accordingly, I shall from time to time use the symbol, "Kropotkin," to stand for the whole of co-operative-evolutionary philosophy, excluding the reformist attempts to distort its application to politics.

Kropotkin's era was one of boundless optimism, the exaltation of science, atheism and rationalism. Speaking in his *Memoirs* of his student days (1859-61), he said: "It was a time of scientific revival, and the current which carried minds towards natural science was irresistible."<sup>5</sup> He remarked with approval:

. . . the thinkers of the eighteenth century did not change their method when they passed from the stars and physical bodies to the world of chemical reactions, or from the physical and chemical world

<sup>4</sup> E.g. in Warder C. Allee, "Where Angels Fear to Tread: A Contribution from General Sociology to Human Ethics," *Science*, XCVII (June, 1943) 517-525.

<sup>5</sup> (Prince) Peter Alekseyevich Kropotkin, *Memoirs of a Revolutionist* (Boston and New York, Houghton Mifflin, 1909), p. 10.

<sup>1</sup> Max Nomad, *pseud.*, *Apostles of Revolution* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1939) *passim*, particularly pp. 208-210. Nomad's real name is Max Podolsky.

<sup>2</sup> (New York: Henry Schuman, 1952).

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 42-43.

## WHY THE TRUTH ANYWAY?

FIFTY years ago, at the turn of the century, Max Nordau wrote a book entitled "Conventional Lies of Our Civilization". In it he attacked one established institution after another — marriage, government, business dealings, the family, and so on—showing how each was founded on assumptions and propositions which were clearly not true but which were nevertheless accepted as if they were. These were the "conventional" lies.

Enough has lingered of the fierce iconoclasm of that period to make the word "convention" nowadays imply, often enough, a half truth. But in general the attack on nineteenth century morality has had only a negative effect. Our civilization is still founded on conventional lies, but with this difference. They are almost desperate because there is hardly any belief in them left. Who, to-day, "believes in" government, or marriage, or propaganda, in the sense that they accept these institutions as, in general, and allowing for imperfections, sound bases for social life?

The iconoclasts of fifty years ago may have thought that in stripping the mask of lies from one institution after another they were advancing or even establishing the cause of truth. Belief has indeed decayed, but belief and the spirit of enquiry do not seem to be complementary opposites. As the gigantic issue of advertising testifies. After 1918 one might have thought that war propaganda could never be so shamelessly mendacious again, and the lesson was rammed home by the anti-war novels of the late twenties. Yet in 1939 the same process began all over again and even succeeded in getting over the change of sides accomplished by the Russian government in 1941. It was childishly easy for an opposition paper like *War Commentary* (FREEDOM's predecessor) to detect and point out the lies and deceptions, to mention the unpalatable truths.

Easy—yes. But such a proceeding has remarkably little effect. In youth we are all taught that the truth is something to be desired, though the grown-ups also present to the clear eyes of childhood many object lessons in how to appear to believe in all the conventional lies. One finds therefore that the idea that truth is desirable is very much

a conventional lie, heavily overlain by the idea that there are "convenient" and "inconvenient" moments for it.

The *Observer* is publishing an account of the North Korean prisoner of war camps by their reporter, Philip Deane, who was captured early on in the war and has now been released. The account is simple and does not appear unduly embellished, nor does it use emotional methods. But a correspondent writes to the editor asking "what possible object can be served by Mr. Philip Deane's account . . . 'at a moment when all civilization is praying for peace.'"

The same thing recurs whenever FREEDOM has anything to say about Marshal Tito. There were no objections to describing his régime as it is when he was firmly in the Cominform camp. But it is obvious that some readers feel that there is something out of place in retaining the same view now that he has broken with Moscow. It does not seem likely that there is much point in arguing with this attitude. Either the truth is important, or it is subservient to the demands of occasion. The one view holds that conventional lies be exposed for what they are, the other that they have their uses and that life would be very awkward without them.

Nor is it a matter solely of politics. An attitude towards the truth is of profound effect on individual lives, and no doubt underlies and conditions an individual's attitude towards public matters. There can be no doubt that an intransigent attitude (it is delightfully described by Kropotkin in his account of the nihilists in his *Memoirs of a Revolutionary*) can make for much awkwardness in life. But those who possess this attitude undoubtedly feel more awkward and uncomfortable when they deviate from the truth or contrive to avoid facing it. (It begs the question to raise such queries as what is "truth" anyway? Though legitimate enquiries, they are too often mere fancy dress for the "inconvenient" line of argument).

A letter from America in this issue raises the growing sense of truth versus personal safety that has been a feature of the dictatorships. What is required is a parallel understanding that the emasculation of truth has an emasculating effect on an individual's life: in short, that the sacrificing of a truth-upholding attitude is the sacrifice of something basic to life itself. It is certainly as true as it ever was that personal relationships cannot attain to any depth without attitudes of mutual truthfulness.

## Mysticism & Anarchism

Continued from p. 2

consequent, thorough and unequivocal in its facing of truth. If all is God, as for the mystic it must be, then there is no evil or evil also, as we understand it, is God. Krishna, the incarnated Godhead of the Bhagavad-Gita, reveals himself as "the waster of the peoples, ready for the hour that ripens to their ruin". The anarchist Proudhon, in a famous passage, reached the same conclusion: "Dieu, c'est le mal". But he didn't reach the same depth. Like Comte and Feuerbach, he thought of God in terms of religions, as though God and evil could pass away by inaugurating the religion of man, or a myth like that of Lucifer or Prometheus, like Bakunin's anti-theologism, could take the place of ultimate reality.

The deity who in the Bhagavad-Gita

overcomes Prince Arjuna's reluctance to shed blood and tells him to fight, is not, as it would be so simple and comforting to believe, a theological projection of the *raison d'Etat* or that Prussian monster sanctioning all crimes and all *faits accomplis* which loomed sinisterly behind a whole century of Hegelian thinking. But, rather, it is a voice such as many anarchists, and pacifist anarchists at that, heard in the days that caught them in the maelstrom of the Spanish revolution; a voice which told them to fight and to fight bravely, yet not for hate, nor for promotion of any interest, not for a love of battle and not even to save their life, but because of Necessity. Now this Necessity was brought about, not last among other things, by the revolutionary thinking, organising and agitation of those anarchists themselves. They were asked to live their destiny to the full, to reap the fruit of their life, and not to belie their being in the hour of decision. Had their life and their anarchism been different the same voice might have asked them not to fight, but meet that kind of martyrdom that was Giordano Bruno's or Jesus Christ's. True anarchism and true mysticism are to be recognized by the manly way in which they face evil, although they may both appear at first as a way of escaping it, of declining responsibility for it on the cosmic and political planes respectively.

The main danger of mysticism or, rather, of mystical literature, is that it offers the temptation of gracefully forfeiting one's destiny, by seemingly rising above all mankind but in reality being "all belapped in foul stinking pride". It gives the illusion of seeing things *sub specie aeternitatis*, and by asserting that all that is must be, it induces that "weariness and listlessness of any good occupation, bodily or ghostly, the which is called Sloth", and lets evil be. Mystical literature, as nowadays generally presented and absorbed, only serves to spread the great fallacy that mysticism is possible with little or no effort, no self-discipline or asceticism. In this hurrying world one would reap the fruits of mysticism with none of its sowing and tilling. He who thunders and carps at social parasites is more often than not

a parasite of the spirit. And there is wanton greed in spiritual matters as there is for worldly and fleshy things. A passage from "The Cloud of Unknowing" from which we have been repeatedly quoting may serve as both a corrective to this natural greed and a bracing of the will to manly deeds. "In the lower part of active life a man is without himself and beneath himself. In the higher part of active life and the lower part of contemplative, a man is within himself and even with himself. But in the higher part of contemplative life, a man is above himself and under his God". The anarchist with mystic inclinations would be well on the way of achieving his destiny if he reaches and is able to maintain himself in the higher part of active life and the lower part of the contemplative. His mysticism need not go any further; it must not and cannot jump to the highest stage if the second is not firmly acquired, if he is still in some or many respects a man beneath and without himself.

As for detachment in general, and in particular from results, the mystic's position is not one of indifference. It is a position of acceptance, quite a different thing, for even in defeat—as Jasper rightly emphasised in a civilization where success is considered the sole measure of values—even in defeat can a man fulfil his destiny. No doubt there are anarchists who believe that, with or without revolution, the anarchist dispensation may come to-morrow, but I would say the majority of them hold fast to anarchism as an ideal, independent of its immediate or even possible realization. In this they are not prompted by aesthetic reasons, because the anarchist ideal is the most beautiful of all, nor even by moral reasons, because this ideal is supremely right, but for mystical reasons, for "raisons du coeur que la raison n'entend pas" as Pascal might have said, because of love and not because of knowing, because anarchism is a form of mysticism, "a stirring unto the sovereign desirable, and unto the highest willable thing, the which is God", even when anarchism is professedly atheist. If he were to know his mind the anarchist would say with the philosopher Renssi: "I am an atheist out of religion".

Southampton, GIOVANNI BALDELLI.  
27th April, 1953.

## 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.

*Food Production and Population* 6d.

*Who will do the Dirty Work?* 2d.

### PHILIP SANSON :

*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.

### 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.* 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.

### F. A. RIDLEY :

*The Roman Catholic Church and the Modern Age.* 2d.

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

## Deakin's Usual Warning

THE Conference season is once again under way and all the old resolutions are being polished up to look like new.

No attempt to sound a new note, however, is being made by Arthur Deakin, leader of the world's biggest union, the Transport and General Workers, with 1,300,000 members. He is content to utter the warning and admonition that has dropped from his lips with such monotonous regularity for so long—"Go easy on wage claims".

In his union journal, *The Record*, Mr. Deakin says Labour may not like Mr. Butler's Budget, and that wage moves will depend on its effects.

But, he writes, we should not pursue policies "which will react to our disadvantage, merely because we dislike the Budget proposals or the colour of the Government."

Few of the workers at present strug-

gling to make ends meet, however, do make wage claims *merely* because they dislike the Budget. They make the claims because it is a struggle to make ends meet, but Deakin, with his inflated salary (plus all the extras) has no such struggle and has neither the imagination nor the sympathy with his own members to put himself in their place.

Wage claims are being proposed by the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions (3s. in the £), but in view of the collapse of their claim for a £2 increase last year—finally settled at 7/6d.—no great hopes can be entertained there.

The distributive workers are after another 15s. Present minimum wage for a male shop assistant in £5 19s. 6d. in London—so any workers not paid well over the minimum already are certainly in need of a substantial raise.

But Deakin says we must be careful.

## DEWEY - I

to the life of plants and animals, to Man and to the development of economical and political forms of human society, and finally, to the evolution of the moral sense, the religions, and so on . . . And consequently they endeavoured to explain the whole of the universe and all its phenomena in the same way, as naturalists.<sup>6</sup>

He was a thorough believer in what Dewey calls an "archetypal antecedent reality" and in a mechanistic universal causation:

We can already read the book of Nature, which comprises that of the development of both inorganic and organic life and of mankind, without resorting to a Creator, or to a mystical vital force, or to an immortal soul; and without consulting the trilogy of Hegel, or hiding our ignorance behind any metaphysical symbols whatever, endowed with a real existence by the writer. *Mechanical* phenomena, becoming more and more complicated as we pass from physics to the facts of life, are sufficient to explain Nature and all the intellectual and social organic life on our planet.<sup>7</sup>

\* It would have been better to say "kinetic", but this expression is less known.<sup>8</sup>

He also believed in the existence of natural laws and was a thoroughgoing reductionist:

the naturalist . . . continues his patient study of the phenomena of life, of intelligence, and of emotions and passions, in order to prove that they may all be reduced to physical and chemical phenomena. He endeavours to discover their natural laws.<sup>9</sup>

He felt that the "inductive-deductive method" of the time was the only possible method for the study of the social sciences:

But there is one point on which without doubt Anarchism is absolutely in the right. It is when it considers the study of the social institutions as a chapter of natural science; when it parts for ever with metaphysics; and when it takes for its method of reasoning the

method that has served to build up all modern science and natural philosophy . . . to verify our conclusions is only possible by the scientific inductive-deductive method, on which every science is built, and by means of which every scientific conception of the Universe has been developed.<sup>10</sup>

This is all thoroughly objectionable from a Deweyan point-of-view. There is no denying it, Kropotkin is hopelessly nineteenth-century. But a careful reading of *Modern Science and Anarchism*—his principal work on methodology—will reveal that he isn't quite as hopeless as the foregoing quotations indicate.

### III

Anarchism cannot be judged solely in terms of its methodological conceptions, or even of the experimental results of its exponents. This philosophy is grounded primarily in mass action, not in scientific results of experiments designed to establish propositions stemming from observations of that mass action. The first words of this book, for example, contain two important qualifications:

Anarchy does not draw its origin from any scientific researches, or from any system of philosophy . . . We must not forget either that scientific men are but ordinary men, and that the majority of them belong to the leisured class, and consequently share the prejudices of this class; most of them are even in the pay of the State. It is, therefore, quite evident that Anarchy does not come from universities. Like Socialism in general, and like all other social movements, Anarchism originated among the people, and it will preserve its vitality and creative force so long only as it remains a movement of the people.<sup>11</sup>

Is this faith in grass-roots action justified? Kropotkin meets some of the accusations against him of "Utopianism" and at the same time hits upon something very close to Dewey's "growth" in his "vitality" (for which concept Kropotkin himself was indebted to J. M. Guyau):

The question put by Anarchism might be expressed in the following

way: "Which social forms best guarantee in such and such societies, and in humanity at large, the greatest sum of happiness, and therefore the greatest sum of vitality?" . . . The desire to help [my emphasis here—R.J.D.H.] evolution in this direction determines the social, scientific, and artistic activity of the Anarchist. And this activity, in its turn, precisely on account of its falling in with the development of society in this direction, becomes a source of increased vitality, vigour, sense of oneness with mankind and its best vital forces.<sup>12</sup>

In the *Encyclopedia Britannica* article he also addresses himself to the question of utopianism. Speaking of himself, he says: "It was Kropotkin's aim to prove that communism—at least partial—has more chances of being established than collectivism."<sup>13</sup> Again:

Taken in its usual current sense, therefore, the word "Utopia" ought to be limited to those conceptions only which are based on merely theoretical reasonings as to what is *desirable* from the writer's point of view, but not on what is *already developing* in human agglomerations . . . it cannot be applied to a conception of society which is based, as Anarchism is, on an analysis of *tendencies of an evolution that is already going on in society*, and on *inductions* therefrom as to the future—those tendencies which have been, as we saw, from thousands of years the mainspring for the growth of sociable habits and customs, known in science under the name of Customary Law, and which affirm themselves more and more definitely in modern society.<sup>14</sup>

This brings us face to face with the controversial theory of instincts, to which I will proceed as soon as note is taken of one more qualification, indicative of the "modernizations" in Kropotkin's philosophy: ". . . the *conditional* character of all so-called natural 'laws'. In fact, every natural law always means this:—'If such and such conditions are at work, the result will be this and that.'<sup>15</sup>

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 41.

<sup>13</sup> Entry, "Anarchism," *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 1 (Chicago, London, Ontario: Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., 1952) 877.

<sup>14</sup> *Modern Science and Anarchism*, *op. cit.*, p. 46.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 77.

<sup>6</sup> Kropotkin, *Modern Science and Anarchism* (London: Freedom Press, 1912) p. 9.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 16.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 38.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 39.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 92-93.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 1.

# THE WHITE RULERS OF KENYA

RECENT newsreel pictures of Kenya have revealed a remarkable situation, the more so in that they were evidently intended to give an impression of a hard-pressed white minority. First of all, we were shown whites walking about on their various occasions carrying revolvers tucked in their belts. A fashionable crowd was seen on the racecourse, with revolvers alongside binoculars, pistols were tucked in ladies' handbags as they looked in shop windows. Rifles were carried in cars. The military dominated Nairobi, but the civilian white population gave the appearance of a township in the Wild West.

But we then saw natives frisked for arms by askaris, and one picture showed them lining up, as the askari conducting the investigation contemptuously threw something from the African's pocket on to the ground before passing him on. We then saw some dreary housing and were told this was where the Africans lived—"but only the lucky ones". The candid camera then took us to the terrible mud huts in which Africans lived in squalor while the invader lived in luxury. Bulldozers were shown destroying one such district altogether—smashing down the houses while the villagers looked on sullenly. There was no attempt to say that anything would take the place of these slums. The Africans, suspected of Mau Mau activities, were simply turned out of their homes and had to seek shelter as best they could in other overcrowded slums.

One remembers that the Kenya African made a gallant attempt at bringing himself up to the level of his enemies so far as education is concerned. The attempts of Jomo Kenyatta and others now in prison or exile were devoted to building an independent educational system, and this above all has earned the hatred of the Christian gentlemen who have not been contented until the independent schools have been destroyed so that the African is faced with the old alternative of mission schools or nothing: Imperialist-Christian dogma or illiteracy, "mission boy" or bushman.

The systematic destruction of homes as well as schools could hardly have other than violent consequences. Centuries of Christian teaching have not made the whites any more liable to turn the other cheek than anyone else, and it could not be expected that their villainy would not be learned "and it will go hard but I shall better it." In these circumstances it is surprising that African resistance has not been more than it has been, but the terror now caused in Kenya has stampeded the panic-stricken European minority into calling for fantastic measures.

We read daily of calls for violent action by white members of the Council—even the suggestion that Mr. Odede should be taken out and lynched. Such outrages do not receive condemnation—like the carrying of guns by Europeans, it is all considered normal. But the moment the African hits back the cry goes up about Mau Mau "murder oaths" which are the same speeches reshaped. I find it hard to agree with those, even some other writers in FREEDOM, who find it possible to condemn the Mau Mau "unequivocally": for do we ourselves, as people of European stock, not

in fact know that in their dealings with "natives" the white races do not understand any other language? There is always a minority and sometimes even a majority, with sympathy towards the aspirations of other peoples; but in the long run the status quo comes to be respected if there is no sensational resistance to it. Even the most radical would hardly try to deny, as it were, the existence of America and Australia, where the indigenous population has been wiped out; in a few years, the status quo has been accepted in Israel, and the dispossession of Arabs forgotten; even those most in sympathy with the Negro in South Africa think of him as an "oppressed minority", analogous with the Negro in the Southern U.S.A., as if he merely merited tolerant treatment and did not in fact constitute the overwhelming majority.

The Kikuyu, like other Africans, have refused to accept this concept and resisted not merely the oppression of the European but also the reverse of the medal, overtures for toleration. As

Thomas Paine said, Tolerance and Intolerance are not opposites, but are complementary, and the right to confer the one implies the right to threaten the other. We see this plainly in Central Africa, where the inducement to join a Federation is conditional on the threat of apartheid within the Union of South Africa.

One modern parrot-cry the Kenya whites cannot claim. The resistance to domination in Kenya has nothing whatever to do with Stalinism. The Communist Party has no roots there, and there is no adjacent country where it has any strength with which to conquer such a movement. No similarity can be made with Malaya, and when the settlers call for a "strong General" with overriding powers to pacify Kenya—as if it were another Malaya, a pawn in the cold war—we know that such are the people who would call for a "strong General" to settle matters in Great Britain, too, if people here also got tired of supporting a parasitic class.

INTERNATIONALIST.

## LETTERS TO THE EDITORS

I WOULD like to thank our Chicago reader, R.J.D.H., for his letter in last week's FREEDOM pointing out the incompleteness of the Engels quotation "Universal suffrage is an index of the maturity of the working class."

I quoted that, in the course of my debate with the Socialists, straight out of their pamphlet on their principles and policy, where it appears without the remainder of the sentence. The lifting out of context, therefore, was not my work but that of the S.P.G.B., and it is not surprising that they left out the words our reader quotes for they are very concerned to show that the suffrage is not only a gauge of maturity, but is in fact the only weapon by which the working class is going to emancipate itself and destroy capitalism.

Lenin's quotation from Marx, that in "capitalist democracy . . . the oppressed were allowed, once every few years, to decide which particular representatives of the oppressing class should be in parliament to represent and oppress them" did not prevent him (Lenin) from getting into parliament and doing the oppressing himself when he had the chance.

## AUSTRALIAN STORY

THIS week, exactly 183 years after Captain Cook brought the white man's civilisation to Australia: Twenty aborigines were fined at Katharine, Northern Territory for contravening the regulation forbidding them to approach within one mile of the township after dark or at any time during holidays, and Sundays.

They were born within the prohibited area, which was their ancestors' happy hunting ground long before Cook's arrival.

—News Chronicle, 4/5/53.

Why should we imagine that any other Marxist party, on achieving political power, should turn out any different from the Bolsheviks?

One of the fundamental differences between Lenin and the Anarchists however, is that the Anarchists recognise that whoever has the reins of government must be oppressive through the very nature of government, which is itself repressive; while Lenin, in common with all socialists, believe that the machinery of government is only repressive because it is now used by capitalists and that in the hands of socialists (their kind of socialist) it could become the means of emancipation.

London.

P.S.

## On Wastepaper baskets and other things

Next time the editors of FREEDOM see fit to shed their periodic crocodile tears over the supposed lack of readers letters they might recall to mind their unseemly attack on Cavan McCarthy's letter, and also their apparently well-used wastepaper basket they so gleefully mention.

I think anyone reading your "Tito" editorial might have been excused for thinking they had picked up the Catholic Herald by mistake. One need not approve of Tito's regime to ask for a more objective treatment of it than this editorial gave.

[Our correspondent is mistaken when he writes that we shed "crocodile tears" over the "supposed lack of readers letters". (Perhaps he uses the term "crocodile tears" without realising its true meaning

## TRANSCENDING THE STATE

"PLEADING 'immunity from being coerced by the laws and orders of the National Government into participation' in military affairs, a 23-year-old Nebraska farmer has taken action to have the Supreme Court of the United States declare our Korean campaign unconstitutional.

"Stanley Dale Sydow of Burt County, Neb., was convicted in the Federal Court of Omaha last October of violating the draft law. Sentenced to three years' imprisonment and denied bail, he elected, while confined to jail, not to start serving his sentence but to contest his conviction. Sydow's attorney is Fyke Farmer of Nashville, an active champion of world government and an opponent of war. Besides pressing an appeal from his client's conviction with the United States Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals in St. Louis, Mr. Farmer has filed a motion for permission to apply for a writ of habeas corpus from the Supreme Court.

"In his petition, which the Supreme Court would consider if it grants his motion, Mr. Farmer attacks the Korean action as a crime against peace. His client, he says, has 'international duties which transcend the national obligations of obedience imposed by the individual state'."

—New York Times, 7/12/52.

R. F. FENIX.

## A Letter of Bakunin to His Brother Paul

Paris, 29 March, 1845.

... I am the same as before—a confirmed enemy of the existing state of affairs, with this difference only, that I have finally conquered the metaphysics and philosophy in myself and have thrown myself entirely, with all my soul, into the practical world, the world of the real act. Believe me, friend, life is beautiful; now I have a complete right to say that, because I have stopped making a great thing out of looking at it through theoretical constructions and of not knowing it except in fantasy, because I have actually experienced much of its bitterness, have suffered much and have many times fallen into despair.

I am in love, Paul, I am passionately in love: I do not know if I am able to be loved as I would desire to be loved, but I do not give up hope—I know at least that she has much tender feeling towards me;—I ought to want to merit the love of her whom I love, loving her reverently, that is passionately;—she is subject to the most terrible and infamous subjection;—I must free her, fighting her oppressors and kindling in her heart the feeling of her own dignity—inciting in her the love and need for freedom, the instincts of rebellion and independence—making her remind herself again of the feeling of her strength and her rights.

To love is to desire the freedom, the complete independence of the other;—the first act of true love is the complete emancipation of the object that is loved;—one cannot truly love unless one is perfectly free, independent, not only of others but even and above all of the one you love and who is in love with you.

There, that is my profession of political, social and religious faith,—that is my deepest feeling, not only about my activities and my political leanings, but

also to the extent that I am able in my particular and individual existence;—because the time in which these two kinds of action could be separated is very distant from us;—now man wants freedom in all the meanings and applications of that word, or he doesn't want it at all. To wish, in loving, the dependence of the person whom one loves, is to love an object and to be unhuman, because nothing distinguishes a human being from an object more than liberty; and if love also implied dependence, it would be the most dangerous and infamous thing in the world, because it would then be a never-ending source of slavery and brutalisation to humanity.

All that frees men, all that makes them return to their own selves, arouses in them the principle of their original and really independent activity, all that gives them the strength to be themselves—that is true—all the rest is false, freedom killing, absurd. To emancipate man—that is the only legitimate and beneficial use of one's forces. Under all the religious and philosophical dogmas—there is nothing but lies; the truth is not a theory but a fact, it is life itself—it is the community of free and independent men—it is the holy unity of love that bursts forth from the mysterious and infinite depths of individual liberty . . .

(For more information on this letter see M. Nettlau: "New Russian investigations on the life of M. Bakunin" in the Supplement of "La Protesta", Buenos Aires, 6 Sept. 1926).

from "El Matrimonio y el Amor" (pp. 49-51) Cuadernos de Educacion Sexual. Translated by J.G.

## MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

### LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

OPEN AIR MEETINGS  
Weather Permitting  
HYDE PARK  
Sundays at 3.30 p.m.

### INDOOR MEETINGS

At 9, Fitzroy Square, Warren Street, London, W.1.  
MAY 12—Tony Gibson on IDEALISM.  
The meetings will be held on TUESDAYS at 7.30 p.m.

### NORTH-EAST LONDON

DISCUSSION MEETINGS IN EAST HAM  
MAY 20—Jack Robinson. "THE MORE VIOLENCE, THE LESS REVOLUTION".  
Alternate Wednesdays at 7.30 p.m.

### LIVERPOOL

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

### GLASGOW

OUTDOOR MEETINGS from now until further notice at MAXWELL STREET. Sundays at 7 p.m.  
With John Gaffney, Frank Carlin Jane Strachan, Eddie Shaw,

### MANCHESTER LIBERTARIAN GROUP

Meetings at LAND O' CAKES HOTEL, Gt. Ancoats Street, (by Daily Express) at 7 p.m. on 2nd & 4th Sundays in every month. May 10, 24 June 14, 28, etc.  
Enquiries to: J. Pinkerton, 12 Alt Road, Ashton-Under-Lyne, Lancs.

## 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

## American Letter

Continued from p. 1

grounds that you really do remember but are just being plain ornery and subversive. While, if it can be proven that you harbour red corpuscles in your bloodstream your antecedents and connections are in grave doubt. Only an Enemy of the People could be so perfidious.

It is disconcerting, but hardly surprising, that before anyone makes even a mildly liberal remark in a public discussion he is obliged to exorcise himself with the formula "Of course, I am not a Communist, but . . ." It is the frightened liberal's Ave Maria—the first bead on his rosary. With it he hopes to keep the Hounds at bay till the dawn of a brighter day.

In the meantime, McCarthy, that rabble-rousing psychopath, holds the field with his elect gang of character assassins. It is he who dictates the line of attack, directs the assault on each successive bastion of personal freedom and civil liberty, chooses the heads which will roll under the fascist axe of this poisonous clique. The arch-enemy of democracy in his own country, he is the Cominform's most valuable Comrade abroad. America has lost more friends and made more enemies because of the lunatic antics of this tool of the Catholic conspiracy than the C.P. could ever have hoped to have influenced left to its own

devices.

It is very puzzling that a system of political thought as patently absurd and evil as Stalinism, and so obviously inferior to the American Way of Life should attract sufficient support to become significant. We are obliged to conclude that this support derives its impetus from the existence of social injustice. It is regrettable that the malcontents who join the C.P. are less critical in their choice of an ally than in their appraisal of an economic system. This discrepancy is understandable when we remember that for the American the American system is ever-present, while the Russian system is inaccessible. To the sane individual, the rational way to fight Stalinism would be to alleviate the social evils that provide the energy behind all reform movements.

As it is, the McCarthy onslaught has produced the grotesque result of identifying every liberal, progressive, libertarian and humanitarian ideal with the Russian brand of State Capitalism.

George Orwell must be rotating rapidly in his grave as he adds to the three slogans of "War is Peace", "Freedom is Slavery" and "Ignorance is Strength", another three: "Humanity is Brutality", "Truth is Falsehood" and "Reaction is Progress".