

The Paris Commune—2 p. 2  
 The Cotton Industry - p. 3  
 Letter from France - p. 4  
 Literary Page - - - p. 6  
 Readers' Opinions - - p. 7

# Freedom

AN ANARCHIST FORTNIGHTLY

## “STATE SECURITY DEMANDS DENIAL OF JUSTICE”

IN 1937, when the case of the five workmen employed at the Royal Dockyard, Devonport, who were dismissed on the grounds of security, was debated in the House of Commons, the present Prime Minister—then in the Opposition—attacked the Government's justification for its action in these forceful words: “In the main, it is that defence which has been put up through the ages by every tyrant and dictator, namely, necessity. The security of the State demands the denial of justice to these men.”

To-day, Mr. Attlee, as Prime Minister, justifies the dismissal of Communists and Fascists from the Civil Service on the grounds of security and adds that “the procedure must be fair to the individual. It must be fair to the State.” Mr. Attlee was much more honest eleven years ago, when he realised that this was impossible. Either one or the other, but not both!

Since 1937, we have had the example of the Defence Regulations (1939), and particularly of Regulation 18B, which had no pretence of offering justice to the individual. And again, in Palestine thousands of men and women suspected of working for, or being in sympathy with, the Jewish terrorist organisations have been held for years in prison, without trial and without being offered an opportunity of denying the information which led the Government to detain them as suspected persons.

The step taken by the present Government is a quite logical one. Mr. Attlee has declared publicly the Government's intention of carrying out a purge of the Civil Service though this was not necessary, since the Government already possesses dictatorial powers over Civil Servants, described by Mr. Attlee in these terms:

The civil servant holds office at the pleasure of the Crown. He can be dismissed. There is no remedy at law if he is dismissed if his conduct and efficiency do not come up to standard. Further, he has no right to occupy a particular office and to be in a particular Department. Even promotion does not come of right. A man can be transferred from any part of the Civil Service. I put those facts because we might as well be clear what the facts are. Dismissal means forfeiture of pension rights. Pension rights in the Civil Service are not on a contributory basis. They are acquired after a certain amount of service. If someone is dismissed or leaves the Service before those rights have accrued, he has no remedy.

With such powers already in existence, against which, to our knowledge, no voice has been raised in the House, the present outcry, particularly in the reactionary Press is just sheer hypocrisy, and it would be foolish for us to accept this sudden rallying to the defence of the freedom of the individual, as anything but a manoeuvre by those who seek to make political capital out of the Government's present predicament.

The Beaverbrook Press now champions the rights of the “oppressed” minorities. The Daily Express is now eagerly quoted by the Daily Worker (18/3/48):

Yesterday the Daily Express broke the united front of the capitalist Press with a declaration that “Mr. Attlee has altered the British way of life for the worse. . . . Hitherto it has been broadly true that a man may be made to suffer for his actions but never for his beliefs. It is true no longer.”

This statement unquestionably echoes the thought of millions, including vast numbers who voted Labour at the last election. The decision to victimise men and women for no other crime than that of being Communists, or of coming within the

### THE BOOMERANG

IN an article, “What is this Fascist Menace?” published in *Freedom*, 4/10/47, the two following paragraphs have topical interest:

But if now we turn to the practical aspects of legislation against fascist organisations the danger which it presents is so enormous that the good that is claimed for it becomes insignificant (and were it not for the fact that we believe the Communists feel that as a result of the powerful Russian backing they are no longer a minority force in this country and cannot be the victims of the boomerang effects of the kind of political legislation they propose for the fascists, their proposals, if accepted, could prove fatal to their very existence if and when this or another Government chose to use it against them as well).

A law may succeed in banning fascist or anti-Semitic propaganda from street-corner platforms, but it will only drive the propaganda underground, to carry on its work in a far more insidious manner. If only Mr. Pollitt read *Freedom!*

pletely misfired. At the Co-operative Party conference this Easter, though the Communist-inspired resolution, calling for legislation to make it a criminal offence to preach racial hatred and anti-Semitism, was carried by a 2 to 1 majority, the other Communist-inspired resolution calling for the rescinding of the Government Civil Service purge was defeated by a 10 to 1 majority.

The weakness of the Communist case is clearly revealed in the *Daily Worker's* leading article, “The British Gestapo” (18/3/48). The title alone, in view of their unqualified support of (Continued on page 8)

## Trade Unionism The Last Lap

THE Trades Unions, with only one or two exceptions, have never been anything else but wage-bargaining organisations. Avowedly reformist in aim and character, they have never represented any threat to capitalist society, never shown any desire to make any attempt to bring about a revolutionary change in our social system. They have been, at the best, insurance societies negotiating for the workers under capitalism, at the worst—and this increasingly in recent years—machines through which to discipline the workers for the stabilisation of capitalism.

It says much for the agility of the T.U. leaders and little for the militancy of the workers that for so long the unions have managed to combine both these functions. The advent of the Labour Government, however, threw more and more accent on the worst aspect of the unions—the disciplinary side of their activities, and with the steady worsening of Britain's economic condition, the representation of the workers against the employers has taken a completely secondary importance in union function.

This trend reached its last lap on Wednesday, March 24th, when a special conference of T.U. executive committees agreed to accept the Government's proposal to peg wages. The decision, of course, was no surprise. It was barely news. The T.U.C. had already accepted the proposal in principle from the Cabinet, and the special conference was called just to give the stamp of democracy to one of the biggest sell-outs even British Trade Unionism has produced. Not that there was no opposition at all. The final voting came out at 5,421,000 in favour of the policy, 2,032,000 against, with the big unions—Mineworkers, Transport and General, Municipal and General-supporting, and the smaller, C.P. controlled unions against the policy.

“Liberty without socialism means privilege and injustice.

Socialism without freedom means slavery and brutality.”

BAKUNIN.

### Lip Service—and a Letter

Lip service was also paid to the Government's “firm assurances” stabilise or even reduce prices and profits, and the conference also announced that if the Budget does not tackle this problem it will meet again to reconsider its action.

George Isaacs, Minister of Labour, had rather embarrassed the T.U.C. by, a fortnight before the conference, sending to all wage councils a letter stating that he would have to be satisfied that they had taken the White Paper (The Economic Survey, the “crisis” story) into full account when considering confirmation of wages proposals. This letter, which was withdrawn on the eve of the conference, to be replaced by a fuller document, shows that, whenever the unions submit a claim to arbitration by a wages council, it will almost certainly be rejected, which will let the union out nicely!

The Unions, in fact, are now falling into their pre-destined places. As the industrial wing of the political Labour Party, they are tied to the Government, which in turn, tied to a policy of stabilising capitalism. In a capitalist society it is the worker who always—always—suffers first and benefits last. And the unions, compelled to support the State, have now openly deserted the workers, which is perhaps the best thing that could have happened. For if the workers will now learn the lesson in all this, withdraw their support from reformism and create revolutionary organisations under their own control, we may yet avoid the apparent degradation before us.

## Communists & Censorship

### They Believe in it When Applied to Others

IN view of the Government's proposed purge of Communist and Fascist Civil Servants and the Communist protests this has aroused, we would remind our Communists of the proposals put forward by the C.P. controlled N.C.C.L. and by the fellow-traveller-independent-M.P., D. N. Pritt, K.C., for legislation against so-called Fascists. The extracts given below are taken from an article “Mr. Pritt and Civil Liberties”, published in *Freedom*, 6/4/46.

At the Annual General Meeting of the National Council of Civil Liberties held in London last Saturday, amongst many resolutions passed was one which—to quote the *Manchester Guardian* report—called on the Government to introduce legislation immediately to make the propagation of Fascist doctrines and of racial hatred illegal. In fairness to certain members of the Council it should be stated that there was opposition to this resolution, which nevertheless was passed.

#### What Mr. Pritt Would Do

Mr. D. N. Pritt, M.P., replying for the Executive Committee said that he was convinced that it was not technically impossible to draft a Bill which would have the effect desired by the Council. Now Mr. Pritt—whom reader will remember as a leading light in the People's Convention which disappeared as soon as Russia entered the war on the Allied side, but which previously existed to plug the C.P. anti-war line—debated with Mr. John Maude, Conservative M.P. for Exeter only a few weeks ago on the subject “Can

We Outlaw Fascism?” In this debate Pritt explained the legislation he wanted:

“The first thing I want is legislation that fascist organisations like the B.U.F. and the Imperial Fascist League, and a good many other well-known old organisations and some new ones that are beginning to get known, should be made illegal; it should be made punishable to be a member of them, and, just as we did in 1937 with very much less important organisations, we should legislate to wind them up. . . .

I think that we ought to add, too, quite ordinary moderate criminal punishments on trial for specific offences such as helping to run these illegal organisations, propagating respect or veneration for the fascist leaders, dead or alive, using fascist slogans, and symbols, and, above all, what has been demanded frequently for a good many years in a great many different quarters, including very moderate ones, legislation against anti-Soviet propaganda. And, secondly, I want—and here I think we can fairly say this is outlawing fascism, which I want to do—that—individuals who have been proved to have fascist connections, fascist activities, fascist convictions in either sense of the word, should be barred for a period of several years from any form of political activity, literary activity or publishing activity.” (Our italics.)

As to defining what he meant by Fascism, and whom he proposed should decide which were the Fascist organisations, let us listen to what Mr. Pritt had to say.

“But you did ask me to define fascism. Now I don't believe it is necessary to have a general definition of fascism, but I do agree with you it's necessary in your legislation to have a definition of what you are dealing with. And I think it's quite easy to

define the organisations by the offensive operations they carry on. If an organisation exists to help any of the fascist tricks I was suggesting before, those organisations should be illegal. I think we should go further. I think that we should give the Home Secretary power to schedule fascist organisations. He had far more serious powers in the war; he locked people up on the basis of what he understood to be their beliefs or activities or faiths, and this is just to wind up an organisation. And let's wind it up. If you want me to define fascism as such I will, but I don't think it's very important to the legislation.”

One further quotation from Mr. Pritt. Mr. Maude asked him: “Wouldn't you like to introduce penal laws to punish people who were vilifying existing democratic organizations?”

“PRITT: In a way, yes. As for minorities, I have got no use for minorities who are murderers, felons, treasonable minorities or fascists; they are all to me something that should be got rid of, and if you asked, would I be prepared for legislation of that kind—if I learnt that the effect of the legislation I want was to stop that vilification, I shouldn't worry in the least.”

Mr. Pritt's philosophy of *Freedom* calls for little comment. But we cannot omit to stress that for Mr. Pritt and his Communist friends “Fascism” is a label which covers all those people who, irrespective of their political sympathies for or against Fascism, oppose the régime in Russia. . . .

Mr. Pritt, in 1948, has put his name to a motion “regretting the statement made by the Prime Minister and feels it constitutes a departure from the principles of democracy and civil liberty.”

## MORE DEPORTATIONS IN U.S. WITCH-HUNT

A NEW wave of deportation hysteria sweeps the United States, similar to that following the last war. Between October and December, 1946, there were 21 active political deportation cases, involving aliens in 11 states and 14 different nationalities.

Many of these are related to the anti-Communist drive, and include leaders of the Communist Party. These are Claudia Jones (British West Indian), Dr. John Greenberg (Rumanian), Alexander Bittelman (Russian), secretary of the Jewish Morning Freiheit Association, Joseph Knerly (Hungarian), James Crain (Irish). But anybody who knows the American set-up will realise that under the general heading of “Reds” the F.B.I. will lump all who are not entirely in accord with Big Business, from mild liberals and radicals leftwards.

In the last century, America was a symbol to Europeans of escape from European tyranny. To-day, the desire to go there is probably as great but there are few illusions left about its relative liberty. It is a symbol of escape from Europe and hunger. People in this country who are not down to the level of desperation of Central Europe, may well see from the “alien red” witch-hunt, the sham behind the tinsel of American life to-day.

# THE PARIS COMMUNE

THE FRENCH BOURGEOISIE were not the only would-be leaders who looked with disfavour on the initiative of the workers. Marx and Engels in London may have preached internationalism, but when the French and German militants of the International Working Men's Association sent fraternal greetings and an anti-war message to one another on the eve of the Franco-Prussian war, they merely sneered.

The French internationalists had declared: "Brothers, we protest against the war, we who wish for peace, labour, and liberty. Brothers, do not listen to the hirelings who seek to deceive you as to the real wishes of France." And the German workers had replied: "We too wish for peace, labour, and liberty. We know that on both sides of the Rhine there are brothers with whom we are ready to die for the Universal Republic." These inspiring words have their message as true to-day.

## MARX AND ENGELS ON THE WAR

But Marx and Engels wrote to each other of "the imbeciles of Paris and their ridiculous manifesto"! In their letters they referred to the French workers as "the frogs" like any English public schoolboy.

For Marx desired the victory of Germany. For him, Bismarck's expansionist war which added Alsace and Lorraine to Germany for fifty years, was a war of defence. When his friend Kugelmann suggested that the war had ceased to be a war of defence only, he was severely rebuked by Marx and told that it was only his deplorable ignorance of dialectics which prevented him from seeing that

We are publishing below the second of two articles on the Paris Commune. In the first, printed in the last issue of *Freedom*, the author, by way of introduction, pointed to the fact that unlike 30 years ago, the Commune had become merely a tradition, and accounted for this by the fact that the Russian and Spanish revolutions had robbed it of its uniqueness. He noted with regret and concern that the events of 1917 and 1936 had not received the profound study past generations had devoted to the Paris Commune. Without such a study, it would be impossible to find practical solutions for to-day. The author then proceeded to give a general picture of the Paris Commune and to draw parallels between it and the Russian and Spanish revolutions.

a war of defence was bound to have aggressive features in it.

Marx regarded even international wars solely from the point of view of whether they advanced his particular theories within the socialist movement or not. Here is what he wrote to Engels on 20th July, 1870:

"The French need a thrashing. If the Prussians are victorious, the centralization of state power will be helpful for the centralization of the German working class; furthermore, German predominance will shift the centre of gravity of West European labour movement from France to Germany. And one has only but to compare the movement from 1866 till to-day to see that the German working class is in theory and organization superior to the French. Its dominance over the French on the world stage would mean likewise the dominance of our theory over that of Proudhon."

There speaks the leadership conception, and utterly sectarian at that. No wonder Marx and Engels deplored the seizing of initiative by the French workers. "If one could have any influence at Paris," wrote Engels to his friend, "it would be necessary

to prevent the working folk from budging until the peace." Even when the workers took open revolutionary action, they still opposed them and Marx cried: "Tell the working men of Marseilles to put their heads in a bucket!" How little he understood working class action! For if the insurrections at Marseilles and Lyons and Narbonne had been successful, the Commune might not have been destroyed.

In view of his attitude towards working class initiative, it is not surprising that where Marx's ideas have triumphed, as in the Russia of the Bolsheviks, working class revolutionary initiative has also been crushed out by the most oppressive of all dictatorships.

It is necessary to point out that if Marx's ideas are attacked here it is not from any mere partisan spirit. Those who know Marx only through his report to the General Council of the International, called "The Civil War in France", may have formed a different view of his attitude. But the letters quoted above were written at the time of the events, or just before them. The views expressed there would hardly have gone down well with the International after the brutal

massacre of the Communards. Marx's own prestige in the revolutionary movement required that he change his tune a little.

But it is extremely important to recognise how inadequate were Marx's revolutionary ideas, founded as they were on ideas of leadership, proved in the event of an actual working class uprising. It would not be necessary to deal with them, but for the baleful influence they have achieved in socialist theory.

Kropotkin has summed up three major theoretical conceptions of the Commune. First the idea of decentralization, as opposed to the centralized state beloved of the bourgeoisie and the "scientific socialists". This was embodied in the idea of the autonomous commune, freely federated with other autonomous communes. But one must realize that autonomy is not the same as isolation, and this was how the revolutionary government of Paris understood it, for when a neighbouring commune asked for ideas and material help, they refused on the grounds that they would not meddle in other towns' business! Similarly they failed to recognize the need for the revolution to spread, so essential for its success. This primary lesson was not even fully grasped by the Spanish revolution in 1936, but only by a few of its most advanced anarchists theoreticians. More than ever to-day should we declare for an unstinted internationalism embracing the workers of Britain and France, Germany and Russia,

America, Asia, and Africa, without any exclusions whatsoever. The only internationalism which can have any meaning must be thoroughgoing and integral.

## ABOLITION OF PRIVATE PROPERTY

Kropotkin's second point was the idea of abolishing private property altogether. Proudhon had proposed the same measure to the Assembly in 1848, but had been reviled for it even by the so-called socialists like Louis Blanc and Ledru-Rollin. And a few years before the Commune, Bakunin's adherents had succeeded in committing the International to a resolution denouncing the principle of inheritance of private property, despite the fierce opposition of the Marxists (after the Congress, the Marxist tailor, Eccarius, had remarked "Marx will be most displeased"). And in 1871, the scientific socialists advocated a limited collectivism which made only machinery socially owned.

The Commune assuredly recognized the class character of its revolution, for the Council declared: "Workmen, do not deceive yourselves about the import of the struggle. It is the engagement between parasitism and labour, exploitation and production. If you are tired of vegetating in ignorance and wallowing in misery... if at last you want the reign of justice, workmen, be intelligent, rise!"

But despite this, the Commune failed to cut away the economic base of bourgeois power by expropriating the Bank of France and all economic undertakings. Left with his economic powers virtually unimpaired, Thiers was left strong enough to exact his brutal revenge. Yet Proudhon, facing this very Thiers in the Assembly of 1848, had put expropriation of the banks as the first act of the revolution must accomplish, and almost the only one which could not be allowed to wait.

## ABOLITION OF GOVERNMENT

The final lesson was the abolition of government. This also the Commune only dimly grasped. The real heroes of 1871 on the theoretical plane were almost anonymous members of the Central Committee of the National Guard, a body of workers who undertook to frustrate the treacheries of the military and political leaders of the bourgeoisie. It was they who armed Paris, who took all the necessary practical steps, and who proclaimed the Commune in March. That done, however, they wanted to hand over to a revolutionary government, the Council of the Commune.

The Council sought to take the initiative. But surrounded by all the trappings of officialdom and, worse still, cut off from the fructifying contact with the mass of the workers, they lost themselves in trivial details. Nevertheless, though they did nothing themselves, they deprived the workers of the initiative and hence put the brake on revolutionary action. The existence of a government brought the revolution to a standstill.

The devotees of "strong government" attack the members of the Council for their inertia. But their so-called weakness has virtues for us. For example, they reduced some savage court-martial sentences and prevented the execution of the death penalty. "Strong government" men declare that they thereby undermined discipline; for us, it shows that office had not yet brutalized them.

Ultimately, the inertia they threw over revolutionary events made inevitable the development of the semi-dictatorial Committee of Public Safety—a disguised form of police—and paved the way for defeat. Let us not blame them, many of them honest and courageous men; let us instead learn to fight against the misconception of a "revolutionary" government. This idea was still strong enough to play a big part in destroying the Spanish revolution, and early vitiated the apparent success of the Russian revolution. The lesson of the Commune is to seek a revolutionary form which will retain initiative in the place where it properly belongs, in the working masses themselves.

## TRIBUTE TO THE COMMUNARDS

We are celebrating the Commune. Let us never forget the heroic and unknown—the workers, both men and women, of whom Louise Michel stands as the symbol. From them emanated the constructive ideas of the Commune; on them fell the main fury of the vengeance of Versailles. I cannot better conclude than with the great words of Delescluze at the funeral of the first victims of the struggle with Thiers' troops, some of them prisoners who had been massacred in cold blood.

"I will make you no long speeches; these have already cost us too dear... Justice to the families of the victims; justice for the great town which, after five months of siege, betrayed by its Government, still holds in its hands the future of humanity... Let us not weep for our brothers who have fallen heroically, but let us swear to continue their work, and save liberty, the Commune, the Republic!"

C.W.

J.H.

# The Oldest Paper of the Left!

Some interest was caused by the publication on this page in our last issue, of a quotation from an article by Peter Kropotkin in *Freedom* for March 1890, and it has evidently been a surprise for some of our readers to learn that ours is the oldest of the papers of the Left in this country.

We intend to make a regular feature of "Flashbacks" to early issues of *Freedom* which have interest and relevance at the present day. And it may interest our newer readers to learn something of the history of *Freedom* Press.

When Kropotkin came to England after his release from prison following the Lyons trial, he was invited to join the "English Anarchist Circle", a group which had gathered round Benjamin Tucker's follower, Henry Seymour, who had already founded an active journal, *The Anarchist*, in March 1885, to express their libertarian ideals and aims. At a conference held at the house of Serge Kravchinsky (better known as "Stepniak") it was agreed that the paper would henceforth be issued under the joint direction of Kropotkin, Tchaikovsky, Dr. Merlino, Dr. Gibson, Mrs. C. M. Wilson and Henry Seymour.

## "FREEDOM"—Oct., 1886

After a short time, however, fundamental differences of principle caused a majority portion to break away and found a new journal whose first number appeared in October 1886 and bore the title "*Freedom: a Journal of Anarchist-Socialism*, founded by Mrs. C. M. Wilson and Peter Kropotkin." In 1893 the sub-title was changed to "Anarchist-Communism".

Police prosecutions in 1894 caused suspension of publication until May 1895, but the general editorship remained the same until the late thirties, when it was taken over by Alfred Marsh, while the composition and technical side was done by Tom Cantwell, another member of the

group. In this work he was to an increasing extent assisted by Tom Keell, a professional compositor on a well-established weekly. The spreading distrust and impatience with parliamentarism and political socialism (the policy of the S.D.F., the Fabians, etc.) attracted many to the anarchist-communist teachings of Kropotkin, and in 1895 elements of the old Socialist League, of the "Commonweal" group and Independents had joined hands in the preparation of the London International Conference of the following year. Following on the revelations of the tortures undergone by the Spanish Anarchists in the castle of Montjuich in Barcelona in 1896-97, libertarian enthusiasm increased still further, and *Freedom* became the organ round which such activities centred.

When Cantwell died, Tom Keell, on Marsh's invitation gave up an excellent permanent job to become compositor, manager, and eventually the effective editor (and contributor) of a precarious anarchist monthly. Under Tom Keell the paper was very well printed and edited, and he, too, was responsible for the pamphlet and book publishing activity. The *Freedom Pamphlets* were excellently turned out reprints and original matter in a period of much poorly produced and cheaply printed "socialist" matter.

## 1914-18 WAR RECORD

The War of 1914, however, produced a schism in the group. Kropotkin (for a time), Turner, Wess, Tcherkesoff, and others favoured the Allied cause, but Keell remained consistently anti-war, refused to be considered a paid servant of the pro-war section, and with a growing inclination towards Malatesta's ideas, printed the latter's articles on war throughout 1914-16. For the publication and circulation of anti-war and anti-conscription material, both Keell and his companion Lilian Wolfe, who manages *Freedom* Bookshop, served terms of imprisonment.

Shortly after the first World War, the death of W. C. Owen deprived *Freedom* Press of another staunch supporter, and libertarian ideas were also affected by the post-war depression and disillusionment. Publication

## FLASHBACK—I

"It is the Strike and not the Ballot Box which terrorises the exploiter and makes him see the shadow cast before by the coming Revolution."

Here, in England, there are many amongst the exploiting classes who see dimly the danger ahead, and the capitalist press (and more especially that portion which circulates exclusively amongst the capitalist class, such as the trade journals) contains many articles just now urging the most drastic measures against their slaves who dare to rebel against their will and feebly ask for a higher wage or a shorter working week. The interference of the State is loudly demanded to put down these troublesome strikes and labour unions. The strong arm of the law is to be invoked not for, but against the worker. "We have too much liberty," one trade journal of the "highest class" shrieks in terrified tones; and indeed we shall not be surprised if the workers speedily have to guard against attempts upon such feeble rights of combination and free action as they possess.

There is perhaps no safer rule of thumb for the worker than to do that which his enemy most denounces and to avoid that which his enemy least objects to. To be a State Socialist, to advocate legislative restriction and to pass resolutions at mass or other meetings is sneered at generally and sometimes faintly praised by the capitalist press, but hold an unemployed meeting or two in Trafalgar Square, organise a strike, or initiate a no-rent campaign, and the enemy unmasks himself and characterises the workers, who do these dreadful but practical things, with being Anarchists, enemies of society, disturbers of the public order. Long screeds are written, showing the terrible loss entailed on the community by this action, the selfishness of the strikers, the awful suffering of their families (which is never thought of under other circumstances) and so on.

—"FREEDOM", April, 1890.



Letter from **France****THE HOLY ALLIANCE**

"You must be ready. You will fight. I do not want to know who amongst you will be the dead and who will be the victors. I only want to see fighters here." This speech in Mussolini's best style was delivered by André Malraux, the novelist turned political adviser to General de Gaulle, when he was addressing the "defence groups" of the R.P.F. (the Gaullist Party).

The Gaullist Party is methodically building its fascist façade and Malraux's style brings a note of adventure to the rational construction of the movement. But while the attraction of power makes itself increasingly felt, the R.P.F. is abandoning many of its original slogans and ideas. De Gaulle no longer denounces Germany as the "hereditary" enemy, and abandons his claim of making France again a first-rate Power. He no longer demands that the French should control the Ruhr and guard the Rhine.

Recent international events have obliged the General to reconsider his policy. The Conference of the Sixteen and the Brussels Pact have decided the rôle which France could hope to play in international politics: that of a simple partner in the Western bloc, first or last line of defence against the Soviet advance.

**Australia****RACE HATRED**

IN the last issue of *Freedom* reference was made in "Though the Press" columns to the statement by Mr. Arthur Calwell (Australian Immigration Minister) that Australian soldiers and citizens were forbidden to bring any Japanese wives or children of such marriages into Australia. Australians could live with Japanese in Japan but Mr. Calwell could not allow Japanese to enter Australia "while any relatives remain of Australian dead in Pacific battlefields". The excuse is, of course, nonsense, since relatives remain in Australia of those who died at the hands of Germans and Italians and yet no such exclusion law relates to them. The law is directly aimed at Japanese.

Why? We can soon answer that question by asking whether the most consistent enemies of Japan could enter the holy shores of Australia. What is Mr. Calwell's reactions to Chinese immigration to Australia?

Not only cannot Chinese come in, but the *Daily Telegraph* (22/3/48) reports that Mr. Calwell "has ordered 600 Chinese war-time refugees of both sexes, now living in Australia, to leave the country. They are the remainder of the 3,000 evacuees from Hongkong, Singapore, Indonesia, and the New Guinea islands." Surely it cannot be "gross public indecency" to allow these Chinese refugees from Japanese imperialism to remain?

In the case of the refugees from Hongkong, it may be noted that these are British citizens. However, while immigration authorities search for British immigrants to Australia which they cry out is under-developed and needs manpower, Chinese cannot be allowed.

It is clear that the pretext of the war with Japan hardly convinces even those who make it—the whole point is that the doctrine of white supremacy, as upheld by Mr. Calwell, demands that Chinese and Japanese should be kept out of Australia. They want immigrants, but they want to be assured of their racial precedents.

Precisely the same thing happens in South Africa, where the authorities tighten the screw on Indian immigrants and residents; and would dearly like to keep out the Africans themselves! In yet another "great free Dominion", Canada, the questionnaire for immigrants insists on knowing the racial origins so far back as it can. And immigrants who fall into one of the "lesser breeds without the law" are just not admitted.

The theories of Dr. Rosenberg and the Nazis—classifying mankind into superior and inferior races—was admitted to be unadulterated nonsense. This is generally admitted. Then why is it practised in the Dominions? And how can those who oppose discrimination according to race, colour, religion or nationality, uphold the pretence that the Dominions represent a form of freedom?

In these circumstances de Gaulle can no longer put forward an expansionist imperialist policy and is obliged to concentrate his efforts on home affairs. Unfortunately for him he has failed to gain, in spite of all his efforts, a working class following. The Government, on the other hand, remains in the hands of the old, Christian and Socialist Parties. He can no longer hope to seize power in a swift and spectacular way and must turn his attention to less glamorous schemes.

One could, of course, trace a parallel with pre-fascist Italy and with the Weimar Republic and conclude that the Gaullist Party would be able to eliminate the remnants of parliamentary democracy. But the situation is not so simple. In the first place, Washington has its hands full with Greece, Italy, Germany and Palestine and it is not inclined to launch a new adventure in France.

While Malraux makes inspiring speeches, de Gaulle negotiates with the third force, that of parliament and the bourgeoisie. The holy alliance is now possible and is further imposed by the growing pressure of the United States. In this alliance de Gaulle would contribute his prestige and his shock troops (which in Marseilles, for example, are recruited in the same milieu where Doriot and Sabiani used to assemble theirs). The parties now in power would provide the administrative machinery, the confidence of the foreign powers, and the support of a section of the working class.

What characterises fascism is the voluntary participation of part of the workers to the actions of a party, or movement, whose aim is to destroy freedom. In this respect, the Gaullist movement has not succeeded in gaining a working class support. But an alliance between the Social-Christians and the Gaullists could count on the Christian trade unions.

The government has already begun to put into practice some features of de Gaulle's programme, such as the deportation of foreign political elements. Up to now only Poles, Russians, Hungarians and Yugoslavs have been expelled but it is not unlikely that the same measures will be applied to Spaniards and Italians.

On the other hand, all the unions, except those controlled by the Communists, are being pressed to agree to the lowering of prices. And finally, the government is helping the Christian unions and the trade unions belonging to the *Force Ouvrière* to obtain posts in the organs of economic collaboration which have been, up to now, almost exclusively in the hands of the Communists.

The Holy Alliance is taking shape with the more or less open complicity of all parties with the exception of the Communists. Its success depends not on the Communists who by their violence, their demagoguery, their somer-

**THE NEW MASTER RACE**

I'm afraid a lot of our married families in Germany are a very poor advertisement for our way of living. It often seems to me that they cause more trouble to us occupying forces than the Germans themselves.

Here are three things the Germans note, not in our favour. Wives walking the streets with cigarettes dangling from their mouths—they don't need a smoke, it's just swank. (2) Supercilious attitude of wives toward German domestics—most of whom have forgotten more about housework than the wives will ever know. (3) The snobbishness of the British children—whatever may be said of adult Germans, their children are completely natural, friendly and unspoiled.—SGT. MAJOR, Bournemouth.

Letter in *The Leader*, 20/3/48.

saults and their dictatorial methods antagonise the workers, but on the energy with which the organisations which have remained faithful to a libertarian socialist ideal, will react, and the audacity with which they will propose and impose progressive solutions against the decadence of the bourgeoisie.

The capitalists are conscious of the ineluctable defeat which threatens them and many industrialists are trying to devise reforms which will lead to a *modus vivendi* between owners and producers. In the Christian movement we see progress being made in the ideas of workers' communities in industry as well as in agriculture. And the reformists favour a greater bureaucracy and technocracy in the control of production.

The bourgeoisie is moribund and waits for an heir. The question is to know whether its place will be taken by the organisations which have remained faithful to true socialism and which will preserve the liberty of the individual while at the same time putting a rationally organised economy at the disposal of all.

S. PARANE.

**Foreign Commentary****Are We Helpless?**

THERE are some readers who in the past have written to say that we publish too many anti-Communist articles, and that *Freedom's* space could be better used. Actually the space given to this subject is an indication of the important rôle so-called Communism is playing in European and world politics to-day.

From the point of view of the Left, Stalinism, to give present-day Communism its real title, represents a greater danger than Capitalism, for, whereas the latter is known for what it is, Stalinism pretends to be what it is not. The great danger of Stalinism is its pretensions of being anti-capitalist, anti-imperialist and for the working classes wherever they may be. Nothing could be farther from the truth, and it is the duty of the genuine Left to warn the workers of the Stalinist myth to prevent them from leaping from the frying pan of capitalist imperialism into the fire of Stalinist despotism.

★

Whereas the immorality of capitalist imperialism has been in the past an incentive for the building up of working class organisations based on a noble conception of human values (*viz.*, that the means are as important as the ends) the growth of Stalinism (which is the inevitable development of the totalitarian ideas propounded by Lenin) has almost completely destroyed all moral values in the Left in their struggle for Power. There is a kind of double faced morality in the Left to-day. One set of values are applied to criticise "bourgeois capitalist society" and the very same values are discarded to justify the iniquities of Stalinist dictatorship.

★

It is not so long ago that the Left were exposing the horrors of German Concentration Camps and the savage suppression of all anti-Nazis in Germany. We joined in this campaign, and since 1939 the Left has been exposing the horrors of Franco's Spain, its prisons filled with suffocation and its firing squads making new victims daily.

But that equally gruesome things are happening in the world to-day in the name of the working class seems not to concern large sections of the working class movements. It is all passed over with the comforting assurance that those who are being liquidated are Fascists. And this

**Revolution in Russia?**

SOME unconfirmed reports say that the Americans and their satellites have the idea of distributing propaganda in Russia. For instance, the *News of the World* (21/3/48) states that the Americans "are toying with the idea of bringing to the Russian people concrete evidence of their firmness by distributing pamphlets in the industrial areas of Russia. Already the possibilities of a department for propaganda in 'enemy' territory are being worked out, but the position is still in the exploratory stage." In such matters, the *News of the World* is usually flying a kite rather than having concrete facts, but it remains true that many official sources are considering how they could carry out propaganda against Stalin as they did against Hitler, when the last war to end war was on.

It is certainly a tough nut to crack, because they have previously thought of Russia as a revolutionary country rather than as one in which a revolution might again occur. But only the blind dupes of propaganda will persist in believing Russia to be a revolutionary country. The people who are behind the slogans know better. Just as revolution against Hitler might have helped Western Imperialism, so might revolution against Stalin.

Or, if not revolution, then at any rate sabotage and industrial unrest. Stalin will play it with his Fifth Column, who will disguise themselves in the West as being "anti-war" (when in reality they will be merely "pro-the-other-side"). Can it be done in Russia?

Of course, the brilliant people who haunt the B.B.C. and like forward areas of psychological warfare, are not going to go into industrial areas of the enemy and give out illegal pamphlets themselves. They will issue directives and give

general encouragement. What is wanted is a revolutionary opposition inside Russia.

**What Happened to the Opposition**

But to what extent does this exist outside prison? In the prison camps of Russia, the revolutionary movement has flourished in discussions between political prisoners. Outside the prison camps no open discussion exists. It was the same in Germany, but in Germany the last open non-Nazi meetings were in 1933—six years before the war. In Russia, the last open non-Bolshevik meeting was the gathering of Anarchists released for Kropotkin's funeral in 1921.

When the Anarchists were liquidated by the Bolshevik dictatorship, there were few protests outside Russia. The Right stood by the Tsarists and welcomed the suppression of anti-Tsarists by the Bolsheviks; the Left stood by the Communist apologies for the Soviet.

There was a widespread movement of opposition to Stalin in the working-class movement, but its only source of practical support could come from abroad. What has happened to the exiled movement for which the imperialists will soon be looking? In thirty years it is worn out and exhausted just as is the entire pre-Stalin generation of revolutionaries within Russia. This is due in part to the Ogpu and its relentless search for its opponents; in part to the Fascist liquidators; and in a part, too, to the "democratic powers" who made it impossible for them to live. Driven from country to country, forbidden to work, deprived of passports, forced to dependency, living always in despair, drove many good

(Continued on page 5)

**BUCHENWALD CONCENTRATION CAMP**

We have all heard of the Buchenwald Camp and the horrors perpetrated there in the name of racial purity. Buchenwald has not been razed to the ground. It is even occupied by human beings. Listen to what the correspondent of the Swedish Socialist daily *Arbetet de Malmö* wrote of this camp, situated in the Russian zone, and which he visited in February: "To-day the Nazi regime of terror has been liquidated but the concentration camp of Buchenwald still exists. It is surrounded by barbed wire and boarded up to a height of about 10 feet. At the entrance to the camp is a large picture of Stalin. During the night the whole camp is floodlit, and one hears the barking of hunting dogs. In Buchenwald there are still, of course, some Nazi prisoners but they represent an insignificant minority. The majority of the internees are anti-Nazis, mostly Socialists. According to estimates, 12,000 anti-Nazis or thereabouts are at present interned in this concentration camp, and the general opinion is that the vast majority of the prisoners have never been tried. They have been interned without being charged and without being sentenced.

"There are also women in the camp. Their heads have been shorn like the men and they wear men's clothes. Conversation between men and women internees is strictly prohibited.

"The physical and moral condition of the prisoners is terrible beyond description. Suicides and attempted suicides are the order of the day.

"In cases where prisoners have succeeded in escaping, it is not beyond the Russian guards to just arrest any man in the street and put him in the camp in the place of the escapee, so that the numbers will agree with those at the control office. In this way 17 persons have already disappeared in the vicinity of the Buchenwald camp."

**BULGARIAN ANARCHIST PRISONERS**

The *International Working-Man's Association* (I.W.M.A.) announce in their latest Press bulletin having received a report from Bulgaria which gives detailed information on some of the anarchists who are interned in the Communist concentration camps in that country. A list of 25 names of comrades and details of their past records is given. We quote two typical examples: "Guerguie Dimitroff Kurtoff, Karamiayloff, journalist, former editor of *Rabotnicheska Misl*. He spent many years in fascist prisons.

For the second time in six months he has been interned at Cuciyán for the crime of sending articles to the foreign anarchist Press."

"Vassil Todoroff Jordanoff, 44, printing worker, anarchist militant. For many years he lived either illegally or abroad. He was twice tried, by the democrats and fascists respectively. Released from prison on September 9th, 1945, he has been in the camp of Cuciyán-Pernique, for the past nine months, for having spread anarcho-syndicalist ideas among the workers of Sofia."

**THE PRISONERS OF KARAGANDA**

We have already written under the heading "Spain's Forgotten Men" (*Freedom*, 7/2/48), of the Spanish Seamen who are interned in Russia. Their case, and that of a number of Spanish airmen who were sent to Russia by the Republican Government to be trained by the Russians, and who have been held prisoners ever since, have been vigorously taken up by all sections of the Spanish Press in France, with the exception, of course, of the Communists who, true to form, have declared that the interned Spaniards are "Fascists".

The French Socialist paper *Le Populaire* has taken up the case of the Karaganda internees, and in a recent issue quoted by the I.W.M.A. Press Service, reports that there are about 900 prisoners in the Karaganda camp, of whom the majority are Jews. The daily food rations of these prisoners consists of 600 grammes (21 ozs.) of bread, 10 gr. ( $\frac{1}{2}$  oz.) margarine, 17 gr. ( $\frac{1}{3}$  oz.) sugar for lunch and for supper, as well as a vegetable soup which is so bad that it is almost impossible to swallow.

★

These are the three cases we promised readers. They contain all the injustices which the Communists loudly condemned in their anti-German propaganda. And now they are being perpetrated by the Communists to the slogan of "for the benefit of the working class everywhere".

The answer to all this is not an "atomic crusade" against Russia. Wars create many more problems than they solve; that, with the recent crusade against the "Nazi beast" still fresh in our minds, cannot surely be disputed. The solution is to be found in developing our sense of individual responsibility. This idea is brought out in a Manifesto by a number of French left-wing Socialists and journalists, reprinted in *Politics* (Winter 1948) and we will conclude with two sentences from this lengthy Manifesto, and leave it to our readers to work out the problem for themselves.

"Man is most vulnerable when he is convinced of his own helplessness."  
"War can be avoided. But only if we men of France and of Europe do not consider ourselves innocent victims."

LIBERTARIAN.







