

# Freedom

AN ANARCHIST FORTNIGHTLY

Vol. 9, No. 23

November 13th, 1948

"To the man who possesses nothing it is indifferent, to a certain extent, under what government he is living."  
MONTESQUIEU.

"Men were never made to believe stupidities for any other reason" than to make them submissive."  
VOLTAIRE.

Threepence

## CAN WE SECURE PEACE?

**D**URING the recent war, *Freedom's* predecessor, *War Commentary*, pointed out that capitalist economy has reached the point where it can only maintain itself at all on a war footing. War has become less a struggle between nations than a mode of economy, an end in itself. As early as 1942, *War Commentary* had pointed out that the capitalist class would seek to prolong the war for as long as possible, and that the signal to end it would be the actuality or the threat of revolutionary action on the part of the workers. The course of the war in Italy after 1943 tended to bear out the analysis of *War Commentary*, and the war was in fact spun out for half as long again as its predecessor of 1914.

War has become a necessity for capitalism because the contraction of the world markets have closed all other means for the maintenance of industry. And since profits cannot be secured unless production is proceeding, the whole drive of capitalism itself is now directed towards preparation for war or its actual conduct.

### The Cycle Re-Starts

It is impossible not to recognize that the cycle is starting all over again. In 1911 the then rulers of this country began an armaments programme with the building of dreadnoughts. In 1935, the Baldwin administration initiated a new re-armament programme on the grounds that the only way to prevent war was to be fully prepared—*Si vas pacem, para bellum*—"If you desire peace, prepare for war." Inevitably, the process of history unfolded itself for the n-th time and war preparations became the phoney war, which in turn gave place to the genuine article itself. In 1911, in 1935, in 1948, the preparation for war does not serve the political end of prevention: it is the outcome of the economic necessities of the market economy of capitalism. And it leads inevitably to war itself.

Once this is grasped—and the reiterated cycles of history render it impossible for any but the completely blind or the hopelessly wishful to disregard the underlying process—it becomes apparent that the peoples and their rulers are not faced by a matter of choice at all. We do not choose or reject war, it is not a matter of good or ill will, of pacific humanitarians or warmongers; war to-day is a necessity to the economic system under which most of us groan.

And beyond the economic drive, there is another rather dreadful aspect of the matter. Economic questions provide the need for war, but it is obvious that wars are only made possible by the willingness of workers to fight them, and it is at least theoretically true that wars will cease when men refuse to fight. Unfortunately, it is only too plain that for the majority of people war provides an interest in life, a tangible object to work for, which is lacking in peace time. It is by no means uncommon to find people who are distressed to find themselves compelled to admit that they are happier during war-time than they are between wars. It is the pointless deadlines and impotence of peacetime capitalism that makes war, for all its horrors, a relief. It is this that makes the acceptance of yet another war once again likely.

### Opposition to War alone Insufficient

These two factors, the incorporation of war into the full-time structure of capitalism, and the paradoxical fact that it is more psychologically acceptable than capitalist peace, leads us to some practical conclusions.

Before 1939, there was mobilised a formidable expression of opinion in opposition to war. For example, the peace ballot with more than a million signatories; while the climate of opinion in 1935 made it expedient for the Baldwin administration to fight the general election on a disarmament ticket although it fully intended to

initiate the opposite. Then there was the growth of pacifist bodies, with their impassioned opposition to war and their total ignorance of politics and economics—in a word, of the world in which we live. Finally, there was the formidable demonstration of relief (at the expense of Czechoslovakia) at Munich in 1938, a relief expressed not merely by the populations of Britain and France, but also of Germany.

It is evident enough that war it not deferred because "nobody wants war". It follows therefore that the attempt to mobilise "anti-war" opinion, with all political shades under the umbrella of pacifism will fail once again. But meanwhile, the unfounded and unhistoric optimism of such blanket movements has the effect of deflecting attention from the underlying trend of economics (of war economies we should now say) which remains remorseless so long as it goes unrecognised. Pacifist movement of this kind provide blinkers which effectively prevent a rational attack on the causes of war.

For it is now bitterly plain that war is inseparable from the market economy of capitalism, and that the march towards war can only be halted by the ending of the capitalist mode of economy, by revolutionary action on the part of the peoples of the world.

### Ugly Bedfellows

If pacifism provides blinkers to conceal the true trend of events, still more havoc is caused in the ranks of would-be resisters by the propaganda of the Communists. When one says that war and capitalism are inseparable, one by no means excludes the "Socialist Sixth"

from the process. For the Russian Government is a monopoly capitalist of gigantic proportions, and Russian economy is as dependent on the market considerations which are the core of capitalism as any of the "reactionary imperialists of the West". War is as necessary for the Russian ruling class as for any other.

Meanwhile, however, the present direction of war preparation towards an expected conflict with Russia has turned the Communists of the West (not, needless to say, of the East) into vociferous pacifists. And this carries with it the serious disadvantage that a man is to some extent judged by the company he keeps, so that the government can regard all anti-war activity as "objectively" pro-Russian. And, just as in the years before 1939, many pacifists' horror of war made them almost apologists of Nazism, so the same emotional need turns many to-day into fellow travellers. Nothing could be more disastrous or disillusioning for the anti-war movement than to get itself tied up with the policies of Kremlin-King Street.

### The Endless Vista

It is necessary furthermore to take an even longer view than that of the increasingly close-up one of World War III. For the processes of capitalism are subserved by war, and so far have survived it, have even been rejuvenated by it to some extent. As far as Germany is concerned the Allies seem to have won set and match for good. And Russia may be knocked out of the contracting group of great powers (France being a seceder willy-nilly). But there is still the rivalry between the British and the American Empires. The allies of yesterday have already fallen out. The same thing will happen to the allies of to-day, for after World War III capitalism will still need its increasingly permanent war economy.

(Continued on page 4)

## WHY?

Local authorities have been instructed to suspend demolition of air raid shelters for the time being, said Mr. Chuter Ede, Home Secretary, in the Commons this afternoon.

Certain exceptions were being allowed where necessary in the public interest.

Evening Standard, 4/11/48.

## STEEL A FRAMEWORK FOR FASCISM

**H**ARDLY anybody can have been satisfied with the new Iron and Steel Bill, outside of the Government, the existing managements, and Trade Union officials. Those who, from different points of view, are opposed to nationalisation in principle, can find little in it to change their minds—except for the Conservatives.

The main argument of the Tories against State ownership of steel is now reduced to the rather feeble one that it is nothing but a doctrinaire move, dictated by blind adherence to party policy rather than by economic advantage. But on the face of it—is this argument so far wrong? The fact is that this new Bill is going to make practically no difference at all to the running of the Iron and Steel industries, the sole alteration being the direction in which the profits flow. From now on dividends will go into the coffers of the State instead of into private pockets.

Let us consider what remains the same. Under existing controls, prices (and therefore profits), the sales and products of the industry, have been for years subject to Government direction. A scheme of reconstruction and modernisation, to cost nearly £200,000,000 over a period of five years, has been put in hand and financed by the Government to the extent of 50% of the cost. The industry, under the British Iron and Steel Federation, is one of the most highly monopolised in the country—and will hardly decentralise under State control!

The Government's policy of freezing wages render it hardly likely that workers in the industry will benefit financially from a change-over. Existing managements and individual firms are to remain as they are, even in competition with each other, and they are to be expected to make a profit. In any case, only the 107 larger firms are to be owned by the new national board, all firms producing or rolling less than 20,000 tons of steel or working less than 50,000 tons of iron ore are to be left to "private enterprise". What then, is to change? Only two things will alter. One we have already mentioned—that profits will go to the State instead of to private owners. The second is the more important. It is the degree of control which the State will be able to exercise over the workers in Iron and Steel. The fact that the relative prosperity in recent years in that industry has been due firstly to the restrictive practices of the employers, and secondly, to the world-wide war economy of our time renders the prospects for workers, not only in Iron and Steel, but everywhere, pretty gloomy.

Why? Because if the private owners' restrictive practices are to be replaced by the Government's production drive for export, in a capitalist economy the inevitable result, sooner or later, is overproduction, which means a slump. As

## THE U.S. ELECTIONS

**T**HE defeat of Dewey by Truman in the American Elections came as a surprise to the Press and those who choose to believe it. A close parallel with the British Elections in 1945 exists. The Conservatives believed Churchill to be invincible, the press which has built up the legend of his popularity "voted" him into power—even the Labourites did not categorically deny it—the *Sunday Express* was crowing out loud its thanks to Professor Laski for "the great victory for Churchill's men" before the results were out. In America the other week the Republicans were convinced of a mirage similar to the Churchill myth—that the American people were "American" in the sense used by the anti-un-Americans, and had swallowed the flag-wagging emptiness and political snooping that constituted the Republican's stock-in-trade. The British Conservatives in 1945 and the American Republicans in 1948—businessmen used to getting their own way—overlooked the strength of organised labour and did not know what the workers were thinking because they did not belong to them or speak their language.

Having found they were wrong, the newspapermen ask us somewhat petulantly who was right anyway, or bring out people who knew but didn't say.

### TRUMAN AND LABOUR

**T**HE victory of Truman is due to his bid for Labour support. American Labour is not represented in its own party; at one time it was always Republican, but since the Roosevelt period and the New Deal demagoguery it became generally Democratic. The Republicans became the American Tories, the party

of Big Business. The Democrats became a hotch-pot of Southern feudalists, industrialists, Liberals and fellow-travellers as well as the old Tammany machine, and nobody could tell what it stood for. Roosevelt kept the party together by vigorous contradictions and diplomatic ingenuity, but under Truman, as everybody could see, this collapsed. Wallace walked out with the fellow-travellers; Thurmond walked out with the Dixiecrats; the industrialists and professional politicians walked out when they saw the disintegration of the machine; and Truman was left, not alone, but with the Liberal Northerners. He bid for appeal to the Labour vote, against the Taft-Hartley anti-labour Act, against Wall Street and Big Business (solidly Republican) and the Congress' responsibility for rising prices and intentions of taking off rent control.

Thus, by virtue of the walk-out and disintegration, and by no means due to Truman's personal gifts (which the Press invent to reduce all political analysis to a domestic level) the Democrats became a party with a fairly concrete programme, attacked by the industrialists, pledged to certain specific reforms and appealing to the Labour vote. The Labour leaders moved to Truman's support when the professional politicians of the old school walked out for the same reason as certain middle-class Labour M.P.'s are now walking out. Under the established American tradition, they will now get the plums of the Administration, but moreover they are now fully conscious of their power as never before. While it is true the Democratic Party is far from being social-democratic, in his bid for power Truman invoked that vote. He himself may not realise this fact. In his recorded utterance he has expressed himself "humble before his task", in the manner of politicians not really believing it, and inclines to believe in his own greatness now the publicity boys have discovered it. But all he has done is to call for political action by Labour, which will have this effect; to bring nearer the day of political power for Labour in the U.S.A.

Will this benefit the workers? Certainly not. Their illusions about political action will be dispelled as assuredly as those of the British or Australian workers when Labour is in power. But while the political alternative is Dewey or Eisenhower, or others of the calibre, they are not likely to take any other political road. This may very well be the moment for some opportunist (Walter Reuther has been mentioned) to create an equivalent to the British Labour Party. It is true that the average union boss is somewhat chary of the word "Socialism" (which has not always meant in the U.S.A. what it has in England) but we may discount talk of their "backwardness" as if the British trade union bureaucracy was so very forward. They may talk a little more about "free enterprise" but if they found one of their number dressed up in the fancy breeches of a Lord-in-Waiting they would whisk him off to an expensive psychiatrist. When they realise what Socialism has meant to the British trade union boss they will soon become converted.

### THE INTER-ELECTION MACHINE

**T**HE fact is that in the Parliamentary countries, under the present scheme of things, Labour must eventually come to power. The old days of the machine are over. Tammany Hall can no longer organise the electorate; it must die as surely as the English "rotten borough" system and Eatonswill. And how is the modern political machine to function between elections? The Conservatives and Liberals have tried their hand with boozing-clubs and whist-drives; the British Legion has been a stand-by; but nothing can compare with the trade union machine, which is in trim all the year round and collects dues with a regularity equalled only by the PAYE system. In the present system of Parliamentary democracy, Labour must eventually gain power, and it is increasingly

(Continued on page 3)

P.S.



ESSAYS FROM TULA. By Leo Tolstoy. With an Introduction by Nicolas Berdyaev (Shepard Press, 12/6).

THESE essays were well worth reprinting, but one could wish that a little consideration had been given to their editing. A bundle of pamphlets seems to have been thrown together and sent to the printer without more ado. They appear in no logical or chronological order, and in most cases no information is given about the date of their composition or first publication. One essay is dated May, 1914, four years after Tolstoy's death. As no trouble has been taken with the texts, footnotes which might have been informative in 1900 are reprinted in a misleading manner—for example, on page 95, we are told that Moscow has a very defective system of drainage, which may still be true, though it is not likely that the cesspools are now emptied into barrels every night. On page 83 another footnote informs us that "in Russia . . . the greater part of the agricultural work still is done by peasants working their own land on their own account". It would not have taken an editor half-an-hour to give these footnotes a retrospective sense. A brief preface states that the essays included are either "little known or not easily obtainable in England to-day", but four of the nine essays reprinted appear in the later volumes of the Oxford Press edition and are at any rate easily accessible.

Nevertheless, the volume is very welcome, for some of the essays are otherwise unobtainable and are among the best social criticism ever written by Tolstoy. *The Slavery of our Times*, which was recently re-issued by the Porcupine Press, is included and is welcome in this context since it gives a comprehensive summary in about seventy pages of Tolstoy's political creed. It is the most uncompromising statement he ever made of his anti-governmental position. More interesting, perhaps, to readers of *Freedom* is the next essay, "An Appeal to Social Reformers". I believe this pamphlet was first issued by the Free Age Press, Christchurch, in 1900. In it, Tolstoy clearly defines his views on anarchism. After reviewing the theories of Godwin, Proudhon, Bakunin, Kropotkin, Max Stirner and Tucker, Tolstoy proceeds:

# THE END OF AN AGE

"So that whilst correctly recognising spiritual weapons as the only means of abolishing power, the Anarchist teaching, holding an irreligious materialistic life conception, does not possess this spiritual weapon, and is confined to conjectures and fancies which give the advocates of coercion the possibility of denying its true foundations, owing to the inefficiency of the suggested means of realising this teaching."

"This spiritual message is simply the one long ago known to men, which has always destroyed power and always given to those who used it complete and inalienable freedom. This weapon is but this, a devout understanding of life, according to which man regards his earthly existence as only a fragmentary manifestation of the complete life, and connecting his life with infinite life, and recognising his highest welfare in the laws of this infinite life, regards the fulfilment of these laws as more binding upon himself than the fulfilment of any human laws whatsoever."

"Only such a religious conception, uniting all men in the same understanding of life, incompatible with subordination to power and participation in it, can truly destroy power."

Elsewhere Tolstoy identifies this vague religiosity with Christianity, but with a Christianity deprived of all ecclesiastical organisations, all ritual and superstition, in short, with the ethics of the Sermon on the Mount. He nowhere, so far as I know, gives a very clear definition of "infinite life", and it is doubtful if he believed in personal survival after death. His positive belief was in the sanctity of human life, and in love:

"It is so simple, so clear. You live; that is, are born, mature, grow old, and then you die. Is it possible that the aim of your life can be in yourself? Certainly not. How then? man asks himself. What then am I? The only answer is: I am something that loves; at first it seems something loving only itself; but one need only live a little to see that to love the self which passes through life and dies, is impossible and purposeless. I feel that I ought to love, and I love myself. But, loving myself, I cannot but feel that the object of my love is unworthy of it; yet not to love is impossible to me. In my love is life. What is to happen? To love others: one's neighbours, friends, and those who love us? At first it seems that this will satisfy the demands of love; but all these people are in the first place imperfect, and, secondly, they change, and, above all, they die. What is one to love? The only answer is: love all, love the source of love, love love, love God. Love, not for the sake of the loved one, nor for oneself, but for love's sake. It is only necessary to understand this, and at once

all the evil human life disappears, and its meaning becomes clear and joyful."

That quotation comes from an address delivered to a group of peasants during the summer of 1907: it is one of the last and the most moving of Tolstoy's declarations of faith. But it would be a mistake to assume from words like these that Tolstoy was unaware of the grim nature of the social struggle that awaited the oppressed masses. He could not believe in "the spread of the unrealisable teaching of socialism, dreadful in its despotism and wonderful in its superficiality"—he anticipated very clearly the inevitable tendency of socialism to develop into totalitarianism. He saw perfectly clearly that the State

was the enemy of Man, and his most forceful pages are directed against this growing danger. Against the State he realised that the only weapon was non-obedience, passive resistance, and he carried his policy in this direction to a fearless and uncompromising extreme. The best expression he ever gave to this revolutionary policy is found in an essay originally published by William Heinemann in 1906, and reprinted here—"The End of the Age". From his clear-sighted vision of the apocalyptic nature of the revolution then revealing itself he derived only one hope of deliverance: the cessation of obedience to governments.

"For this great revulsion to take place

it is only necessary that men should understand that the State, the fatherland, is a fiction, and that life and true liberty are realities; and that therefore it is not life and liberty that should be sacrificed for the artificial combination called the State, but that men ought in the name of true life and liberty to free themselves from the superstition of the State and from its outcome—criminal obedience to men."

Tolstoy's message has not grown out-of-date. In the present "end of an age", when fear and anxiety and collective crime have expanded beyond even Tolstoy's conception of the possibilities, these essays come to us with prophetic force and urgency. He strides like a giant over all the pettifogging economists and politicians and confronts us with his unanswerable accusations, his scorn, and his overwhelming love of life and humanity.

HERBERT READ.

## THE CRITICS WERE HURT

WHEN a subject or theme too great for comprehension is placed before professional critics, the reaction is inevitable . . . their ability to extract the most trivial aspect and use it to damn the overall greatness of the particular work. Which is exactly what happened when British newspaper and radio critics reviewed *Paiza*, the Italian film which deals with the war in that country. The war just passed, that is, "Too Mean to be Great", was one headline and this referred to the substance of the complaint of the others. The "meanness" referred to was the failure to give due credit to the British war effort in Italy together with one or two incidents which wounded the national honour. These so-called objectionable parts took up hardly a minute of the film.

But was the producer at all concerned with military exactitude? Was he, like critics, limited to historical facts in his perception of the human drama? The fruits of his labour show conclusively that neither nations nor armies (impersonal masses) can compare in importance with the individual. Only the joy and tragedies of individuals can have life and form. Therefore his soldier characters are inevitably caught up in their own private worlds while their uniforms suggest a stigma of some remote authority.

Rosellini has contrived to integrate six separate episodes within the general theme of the war in Italy. These episodes follow the path of war from Sicily to the Po. Such has been the sincerity and purposefulness of the creation, however, that the force of human conflict is never sacrificed to the

military struggle. Single incidents are immortalized as when the American negro soldier, enjoying a higher standard of living than he knew at home, finds his past thrown in his face when confronted by the slums of Naples. He has come to this particular neighbourhood to recover his boots which have been stolen by a street urchin. Now,

with the boots once more in his possession, he pauses. The environment holds him in a web, each passing moment affecting him more profoundly, an abstract poverty becoming a detailed hell. He drops the boots and hastens away, a crystal of pure drama enriched by the urchin's expression of bewilderment. An expression symbolizing a lost generation.

IN only one scene has an attempt been made to glorify military heroism and this seems incidental to the conclusion when a child is found sobbing in the early dawn and wandering among the bodies of his dead parents. In the other scenes, Joe from Jersey dies as he shows a girl photos of home, the drunken negro cannot escape from the tormenting thought of home, another soldier in a prostitute's room dreams of the girl who welcomed him to Rome only a few months before. Three American padres visit a monastery where their crude worldliness conflicts with the humility of Franciscan asceticism.

In such settings as these, talk of national honour, fair play and so on

seem like the cries of savages. Rosellini is concerned with eternal truths in the shape of human conflicts seen through the individual. The critics' concern is for a world of their own social conditioning with man subordinated to the imaginary drama of states and societies. The supposed anti-British bias was a feeling widely held in Italy and therefore factually correct, though the film hardly gave it more than a passing mention. The scene where two British officers provide a scrap of buxlesque seems directly descended from the Two Types of Eighth Army fame.

There are touches of greatness in *Paiza* because it never forsakes humanity and, truly reflecting man and his caprices, refrains from a too precise objectivity.

C.H.

## BY THE WAY . . .

While in Leicester I bought a copy of Rucker's "Nationalism and Culture" from Boots. I also saw two copies on sale at the Midland Educational there. I very much agree with the suggestion in "Freedom" that such a work should be found in all public libraries. When I asked for it locally, the librarian insisted on me being supplied through their postal service, so I was supplied from one of the London libraries. However, I do hope that such a book is selling well, as it is certainly packed with information and contains a splendid denunciation of all totalitarianism, as well as a scholarly exposition of anarchist principles. One thing, of course, that one does need in studying it, is a fair amount of spare time, which very few of us have in these days, but I found when I read it first that its qualities were so varied that once I had started I found it hard to lay the book down. Another thing that must have struck many readers was the extraordinary fertility of the author's mind. It is undoubtedly a book which should be read by all interested in liberty and those who do not will miss a treat.

Fraternally,  
Sidmouth, JOHN STEVENS.

★  
Sex and Temperament in Three Primitive Societies Margaret Mead 12/6  
Education After School C. Stimpson 15/-  
Adolescence: It's Social Psychology C. M. Flemming 16/-  
Inquest on an Ally Paul Winterton 12/6  
Successful Living Brian Wolfe 8/6  
The Moment Virginia Woolf 10/6  
Tales from the Arabian Nights 8/6

★  
PUFFIN BOOKS 1/6 each  
Woodworking for Beginners.  
The Clothes We Wear.  
Our Horses.  
The Theatre at Work.  
Mountain and Moorland Birds.  
About a Motor Car.  
English Fashions.  
Dogs.  
Animals of Australia.

★  
We are accepting orders for the KINSEY REPORT on SEXUAL BEHAVIOUR IN THE HUMAN MALE (800 pages, 32/6), copies of which will be available in limited numbers early in December. Reserve your copy NOW!

★  
Postage is not included in above prices, and should be added.

Please send all orders to

**FREEDOM BOOKSHOP**  
27 RED LION STREET  
LONDON - W.C.I.

## The Birth of Serbian Socialism

EIGHTY years ago the whole of the Balkans with the exception of Serbia, Montenegro, Southern Greece and Rumania formed part of the Turkish empire.

In Serbia, the overwhelming majority of the population consisted of peasants who tilled their fields with primitive implements. The towns were inhabited by civil servants, merchants, artisans and by an industrial proletariat composed of about a hundred printers and foundrymen.

Although Serbia was nominally a constitutional monarchy, the country was governed rather ruthlessly by the State bureaucracy. This ruling class thought that Serbia could be a modern European State only if the limited wealth of the nation was appropriated for the creation of a strong army, an efficient police, an enlightened civil service, and a national church.

To achieve this, the bureaucracy kept on increasing land taxes and custom duties. All the manufactured goods were imported at a high price from the Habsburg monarchy, while the peasants sold their products very cheaply. In consequence the impoverishment of the peasantry and of the artisans reached such alarming proportions that the first Serbian socialists could speak of the pauperisation of the whole nation.

The plight of the peasants was also due to the gradual disintegration of the agricultural co-operatives called *Zadrugas* in which several generations of blood relatives lived and worked together. These self-supporting communities based on production for use remained unbreakable so long as they were not compelled to exchange their products for money. But as the Serbian State developed and as new classes emerged in the towns the economic conditions in the countryside changed rapidly. The *Zadrugas* began to break up and Serbia became a land of small holders.

It is therefore not surprising that the Serbian socialist movement assumed a distinctly libertarian character. This natural tendency towards anarchism as opposed to State socialism was further stimulated by some students who during

their studies in Western Europe and Saint Petersburg fell under the influence of Proudhon and of the Russian Nihilists and Populists. Paradoxically enough, the future opponents of the bureaucratic State were recruited from among those who were intended for the civil service after the completion of their studies abroad. The leader of this small group of students was a twenty-two years old journalist, Svetozar Markovic, who, during the seven years of his activity as a socialist (1868-1875), did more than anyone else to spread libertarian ideas in the Balkans.

At the very beginning of their agitation, Markovic saw that socialism propagated by a few students could never have a nation-wide appeal in a country

bankrupt owing to a lack of experienced personnel. In addition, an incident not commonly associated with that type of organisation, made Markovic and his friends the laughing-stock of Belgrade. It seems that the leaders of the tailors co-operative treated the apprentices so badly that one day all the young workers suddenly stopped work and after a heated discussion about payment by results left the workshop. This was the first strike in the history of the Serbian working-class movement.

The future of this small libertarian movement would have been very uncertain but for a series of socialist newspapers like the *Worker*, *Publicity*, *Liberation*, *Work*, and others. One of them, *Worker*, was the first socialist paper not only in

## Bakunin and the Serbs—I

where most of the peasants were illiterate and where nearly all the educated people belonged to the ruling class, i.e., the civil service. This state of affairs forced him to restrict the dissemination of libertarian ideas to the ranks of the educated youth because the students and the schoolboys were the only section of the population capable of understanding Markovic's views and ready to support him. His followers began by holding "literary evenings" in the lecture-rooms of Belgrade University but these meetings came to a sudden end when the Minister of Education discovered that the subject of a talk was "What is Government". Then a few secret societies sprang up but they achieved little owing to the inexperience of their members and the alertness of the police.

Meanwhile Markovic organised a number of producers' and consumers' co-operatives with the intention of using them as "the first school in which the workers will learn to live and work together". Unlike the co-operative movement in Western Europe the Serbian one was, in the absence of a strong proletariat, composed almost entirely of impoverished artisans. After some initial successes all these co-operatives went

Serbia but also in the Balkans and appeared just after the defeat of the Paris Commune. It was mainly through these small newspapers that Markovic expounded his programme which he described as "attacking everything that is old, destroying the old and laying the foundations of a new society".

While many of his contemporaries proposed to reform the Serbian State by merely curtailing the power of the civil service, Markovic demanded an outright abolition of the bureaucratic system. He denounced it in a series of articles as an expensive and oppressive form of administration excluding the people from public affairs and preventing the toilers from achieving their emancipation through parliamentary channels. A social revolution, according to Markovic's point of view, was therefore necessary, although it implied the use of violence which he abhorred. We find a characteristic passage on this subject in one of his early writings: "I do not say that tyranny should not be overthrown by force but I do declare that any such attempt will come to nothing unless the masses are filled with confidence and faith and hope at least to derive some benefit

from the new order. Thus violence may only be used as a negation, for the destruction of the old system, while the organisation of the new society cannot be carried out by force against the will of the majority."

Apart from his numerous writings on the various problems facing the Serbian people, Markovic devoted a great deal of attention to the society of the future. As a resolute opponent of State socialism he was of the opinion that the "Marxist theory offers no positive basis for the solution of the social problem in Serbia." Instead he advocated a union of self-governing communes and a municipal ownership and cultivation of the land, hoping thereby to bring about a libertarian society without the intermediate stage of capitalist economy.

To-day, the present regime at Belgrade insists that thanks to the strength of the new army and the vigilance of the secret police (OZNA) the peoples of Yugoslavia are able to devote all their energies to the building of socialism. At the same time the Communists in spite of their descent from Marx find it impossible to ignore the libertarian tradition of the Serbian people and are therefore claiming Markovic as one of their remote precursors. What Marshall Tito and his suite of 114 ministers seem to forget is that "their precursor" wrote: "I cannot understand those socialists who want to strengthen socialism with the help of bayonets. They expect all members of the society to work and yet they want to keep a non-producing class for the preservation of their system. They are like the liberals who need a dictatorship to strengthen liberty."

(In the next article we shall deal with Bakunin's attempt to form a Serbian Socialist Party.)

I.A.

In this article the term "libertarian" refers to those trends in the international socialist movement which followed the federalist ideas of Bakunin. The Marxist wing of the International increasingly favoured authoritarian forms and centralisation.—Eds.



## AMERICA FEELS THE DRAFT

THE first American victim of the new draft is Ralph E. Cook, divinity student of Portland, Maine. Ralph was given a 2 year term for refusing to register by U.S. Judge John D. Clifford, who declared: "The act of registration is the key-stone of the system devised by Congress." Cook would have been exempt under the law, if he had registered.

Registration Day, August 30th, was marked by Peacemakers' demonstrations in New York City, Columbus and Xenia, Ohio, Philadelphia, Chicago, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Boston and San Juan, Puerto Rico.

In Boston on August 30th, the Rev. Lowell Cantrell was hit by a few tomatoes. He was arrested and acquitted. A few days later he was arrested again and fined 20 dollars for picketing the Cadet Armoury there.

Wallaceists also were at some registration spots with their bright

and shiny petitions to Congress. An A.L.P.-Stalinist sponsored petition for a referendum on the 10 cent subway fare in N.Y.C. was thrown out of court. Definitely illegal. (These petitioners are the same people who asked us to vote for the fare-raiser William O'Dwyer for Mayor. He got in on their votes.)

Major Paul Akst, selective service officer for N.Y.C., estimated that there were some 20,000 eligibles in New York who had not registered. One New Jersey estimate placed their registration 50,000 behind. A national registration of 9,600,000 had been predicted. The actual registration was 8,584,963. Some of this discrepancy is laid to the fact that many of the men in the age group are in the volunteer army and therefore exempt from registering. Some are accounted for by this, but by no means all. The situation is complicated by later registrants, those who register after the deadline—the non-enthusiastic, shall we say? The Government itself is also reluctant to give out any national figures. It all bears watching and investigation.

JACK GALLEG0.

### AT LAST!

THREE thousand miners are now on strike in the Ayrshire coalfield as a protest against damages imposed on 15 local men for taking part in an unofficial stoppage.

News-Chronicle (5/11/48)  
We have been wondering for how long prosecutions for striking were going to be tolerated. We are glad to see these Scottish miners are now taking the only action possible to stop this iniquitous victimisation by the State. All power to their elbows!

## U.S. ELECTIONS

(Continued from page 1)

difficult for a Party based exclusively on Big Business to prevent it.

And trade unionism is a method not of bettering the workers' conditions but (particularly in a Labour-governed country) of disciplining them. The American capitalists, like many British industrialists, may come to see that fact when they grow up out of Old Gloryism, and we may yet see generals and "old families" "representing" the U.S. workers, and trade union leaders in Wall Street.

What of the next stage? The middle-class ideas of Socialism bring the leaders to be a class apart. The technocrats come out on top; the brass plate on the managing director's door is altered and he stays in power as a Government representative. The Labour leaders leave the unions to become officials of one kind or another.

There are two answers. One that of the Communists in Australia, where as the Socialists leave the unions the Communists take their places as the new movement of power. The union bureaucracy becomes a new one, to be domesticated by capitalism or the big bosses of a Stalinist State (as in Czechoslovakia). The other way has been seen by many British workers who lacking tangibility for the idea, have vaguely accepted it without realising its immense possibilities. Namely, the realisation that the political struggle does not lead anywhere and that Parliamentary action must be rejected alongside either free enterprise (capitalism) or nationalisation (the logical conclusion of social democratic reformism), in favour of WORKERS' CONTROL.

## More About the "Citizen of the World"

THE case of Garry Davis who renounced his American citizenship to become "a citizen of the world" continues to create interest and sympathy. The Paris edition of the *New York Herald Tribune* (23/10/48) reported that his position received the support of a prominent group of intellectuals, who at a press conference engaged themselves to share any difficulties which he might meet as a consequence of his future acts.

According to the *Herald Tribune*: "Richard Wright, American novelist now living in Paris, also supported the statement drawn up by the group, who

constituted themselves into a "council of solidarity" around Mr. Davis.

Henry Osborne, British member of Parliament and Secretary of the Parliamentary Commission of the British section of the movement for World Federal Government, attended the press conference.

French members of the new committee to support Mr. Davis include the novelists Albert Camus and Vercors, Emmanuel Mounier, editor of the magazine *Esprit*; critics Maurice Nadeau and Jean Paulhan, painters André Breton and Jean Helion and others.

Mr. Davis has been living in Paris since he was evicted September 17th from the international zone surrounding the Palais de Chaillot, where he had gone in order to bring his case to the attention

of the United Nations."

A few days later, an Associated Press message from Geneva referred to the possibility of an addition to the ranks of world citizens in the person of a Greek, Mr. Henry Polydefkis, a correspondent for a number of newspapers, including the *Socialist Leader* of London. He declared that if the Swiss police insisted on his leaving the country he would "throw himself under the protection of the International Relief Organisation at the U.N. office in Geneva."

Garry Davis seems to be causing a considerable amount of trouble to the authorities just by himself. What would happen if a few million resolute men and women throughout the world did the same thing?

LIBERTARIAN.

## HOMER LANE

THE problem is not one of destroying the energy of mind which is so much needed by society, but of transforming it from vicious behaviour into social service.

The problem of schools is to re-awaken the play instinct (which is a social and co-operative instinct) in school work. Most teachers do not agree with this, and make the child do what he dislikes, as discipline.

These quotations from Homer Lane's *Talks to Parents and Teachers* (recently reprinted by Allen and Unwin, and obtainable from the Freedom Bookshop) at once link his work with John Dewey, whose *Pedagogic Creed* appeared in 1897 in America, where Lane lived the first thirty-five years of his life; and with A. S. Neill who founded Summerhill in 1925, the year of Lane's death. There are also incongruous elements of similarity in Baden Powell's "great game of scouting", which was started in 1908, and—

*Talks to Parents and Teachers*  
Homer Lane 6/-  
*Homer Lane and the Little Commonwealth* E. T. Bazeley 7/6  
The above two books are both available from FREEDOM BOOKSHOP.

condemned though it is by its uniform, segregation of sexes, jingoism, promises to God and the King, Seventh Law of Obedience—whose central appeal is the fire in camping, and the utilisation of the gangster spirit in the patrol system.

Homer Lane had much to say about fire; and in his practice self-government applied more to the child's individual activities than to the organisation of a group, such as a whole school, which should be the affair of adults:

"The mother who believes in self-government allows the child to learn the nature of fire. Let the child be near the fire, and when a hot coal falls out gently move his hand towards it, till the heat becomes unpleasant and gives a burning sensation. Now he is educated, having learned that fire burns when touched. He will never want to touch the fire again; he is self-governing in this matter; he has no fear but an intelligent caution. This is knowledge. And a little link of confidence has been forged between the mother and the child."

In his work at the Little Commonwealth, Lane was mainly concerned in adjusting the 'delinquent's' attitude to authority. His job was to get them to fit into society. Nowadays, the progressive schools are criticised, because, following Lane's methods, they turn out normal pupils who do fit in. They become bomber pilots just as well as pupils from orthodox schools. Is anything being done, it is asked, to atrophy aggressive instincts?

Partly this charge is explained by the limitations in Lane's own acceptance of society as he found it. Striking examples are that the "citizens" were paid wages, in Little Commonwealth currency, for their work, out of which they had to pay for their own food, clothing and amusements. The slacker, if he was unable to pay for his own expenses was supported from the public treasury, the funds of which were raised by taxation. Lane proudly explained how the citizens instituted not only a form of parliamentary procedure, under which rules were enacted, but also judicial procedure. In view of his contempt for both money and the judiciary—and the troubles he had with both in his own life—it is odd that he allowed these systems in his school. On the other hand, in claiming that one got in closer touch with the spirit of the Commonwealth at the 'Citizens' Court than at any other function of the community, he pointed out the difference between it and adult Courts which are "legal institutions rather than the mouth-piece of a public code of morality."

Partly the present-day criticism of the progressive schools is made by those who hold a strong emotional hatred of authority. Lane saw that a self-determined

more than one needs to rebel against the human tail. Both are unnecessary and die out through lack of dependence on them.

With regard to aggression, although Lane held that this instinct need not survive childhood, he assumed that a phase of it is inevitable: as part of the recapitulation of human development. To-day this is open to question. Is it not possible to let children find sufficient means of self-assertion, and to indoctrinate them with ideals of co-operation so that they shall adhere to a morality of mutual aid? Teachers should know more about what this means from day to day in school. Must every child be expected to learn an aggressive technique of defence against aggression from other children?

ANTHONY WEAVER.

"Freedom" aims at publishing every month a commentary on questions related to education. Contributions on this subject from readers would be welcomed and will be passed on to Tony Weaver for comment.

Alex Comfort:  
BARBARISM AND SEXUAL FREEDOM  
Boards 3/6. Paper 2/6  
Alexander Berkman:  
A.B.C. OF ANARCHISM 1/-  
George Woodcock:  
ANARCHY OR CHAOS 2/6, Cloth 4/6  
NEW LIFE TO THE LAND 6d.  
RAILWAYS AND SOCIETY 3d.  
HOMES OR HOVELS? 6d.  
ANARCHISM AND MORALITY 2d.  
WHAT IS ANARCHISM? 1d.  
THE BASIS OF COMMUNAL LIVING 1/-  
Rudolf Rocker:  
NATIONALISM & CULTURE 21/-

C. Berneri:  
KROPOTKIN—HIS FEDERALIST IDEAS 2d.  
Errico Malatesta:  
ANARCHY 3d.  
VOTE WHAT FOR? 1d.  
M. L. Berneri:  
WORKERS IN STALIN'S RUSSIA 1/-  
F. A. Ridley:  
THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH AND THE MODERN AGE 2d.  
Gaston Level:  
COLLECTIVES IN SPAIN 1d.  
Charles Duff:  
A HANDBOOK ON HANGING 2/-

## FREEDOM PRESS 27, Red Lion Street, London, W.C.1.

Herbert Read:  
POETRY AND ANARCHISM Cloth 5/-  
Paper 2/6  
THE PHILOSOPHY OF ANARCHISM  
Boards 2/6, Paper 1/-  
THE EDUCATION OF FREE MEN 1/-  
John Hewston:  
ITALY AFTER MUSSOLINI 6d.  
ILL-HEALTH, POVERTY AND THE STATE Cloth 2/6, Paper 1/-  
MUTUAL AID & SOCIAL EVOLUTION 1/-  
Peter Kropotkin:  
THE STATE: ITS HISTORIC ROLE 1/-  
THE 'WAGE' SYSTEM 3d.  
REVOLUTIONARY GOVERNMENT 3d.  
SELECTIONS FROM HIS WRITINGS (Chosen by Herbert Read) Cloth 8/6

John Olday:  
THE MARCH TO DEATH  
THE LIFE WE LIVE, THE DEATH WE DIE 2/6  
A. Ciliga:  
THE KRONSTADT REVOLT 2d.  
Icarus:  
THE WILHELMSHAVEN REVOLT 6d.  
"Equity":  
THE STRUGGLE IN THE FACTORY 3d.  
McCartney:  
THE FRENCH COOKS SYNDICATE 3d.  
William Godwin:  
SELECTIONS FROM POLITICAL JUSTICE 3d.  
ON LAW 1d.  
P. J. Proudhon:  
GENERAL IDEA OF THE REVOLUTION IN THE 19TH CENTURY Cloth 5/-

## THROUGH THE PRESS

### SOCIALLY USEFUL—AT LAST

I paid a flying visit to the Empire Paper Mills at Greenhithe. Amidst the wonders of the production of modern newsprint I watched a machine churning up £1 notes.

There were stacks of them, soiled and rejected by the banks, being fed into the pulping machines. Just one tiny bundle would have solved many of my problems. There was nothing doing. Treasury officials stood by to see that not one escaped destruction.

"Never mind," I said bravely to the foreman. "It is heartening to know that maybe next week my column will be printed on ex-£1 notes."

"You said it," he answered. "But it happens that the whole of this lot is being pulped up for toilet rolls."

Reynolds News, 17/10/48.

### THE LAW

The Wastepaper Recovery Association to-day issued this warning:

If you burn paper or cardboard in your Guy Fawkes bonfire you will render yourself liable to a fine of £100.

### GREATEST ORDEAL

Viscount Montgomery, who was speaking at a meeting of the Outward Bound Trust, offered to pay for a boy to take a month's course at the Trust's sea school at Aberdovey.

"I would like the committee to choose a boy from an unsatisfactory environment," he said.

"I would like to see the boy before he goes and I would like to see him when he leaves school and is on his way home. I feel that it is impossible for a boy to go back to his old environment without being an influence for good."

The chairman, Mr. Spencer Summers: "We shall do our best to give the boy sufficient courage to call on the Field-Marshal."

News-Chronicle, 26/10/48.

### AMERICANA

Californians studied the results of the Moss Stores Panty Poll. Moss had introduced two new women's panties, one embroidered with "Dewey-Warren", the other with "Truman-Barkley". Results of the Poll to date (by sales): Dewey-Warren, 8 to 5.



(Continued from page 1)

It was announced recently that the Control of Engagement Order which came into force in October last year and was due to end by January 1st next, is likely to be extended for another 12 months—at least.

This extension has been recommended by the National Joint Advisory Council, on which are represented managements of nationalised industries, private employers and the T.U.C., and it is the task of this Council to investigate and discuss further all "impediments to production", and all of the so-called restrictive practices which the wicked workers are said to be maintaining.

Needless to say, the most restrictive practice of all, conscripting young men just as they begin to be useful in industry, will not be criticised. The only question relevant to that to be discussed will be the position of workers in key industries who are in either the Emergency Reserves or the Territorials—a possible interference with their work which must be catered for somehow "in the national interest".

It will be remembered that originally the Control of Engagement Order was brought in to deal with the "Spivs" and "Drones" and was a singularly inept piece of legislation to deal with such slippery customers. But the important thing is that it is now on the books and liable to stay there for use against anyone and enables the State to keep you just where it wants you.

## LAUNDRY WORKERS' PAY CLAIM REJECTED

A DEMAND for a pay rise of 10s. weekly by 135,000 laundry workers has been turned down by the industry's wages council—for the reason that it would mean a bigger laundry bill for the customer.

The claim would have established a minimum of £5 for men and 70s. for women, wages which are still considerably below the national average.

This is the second claim of this kind to be rejected this year, but the reason why we mention it is because not enough attention is drawn to the very heavy tax which the Government maintains on all laundry work.

Undoubtedly it is the middle-class who use the laundries most, and as long as a tax of 7d. in the shilling is added to all laundry bills, there is little likelihood of working-class housewives being able to

afford the service—and, ironically, they are usually those who would benefit most from being able to send out their washing, since so many go out to work themselves.

But if the increased wages the laundry workers demand would mean an increase in prices, surely that could be offset by abolishing this tax? The employers, however, are not likely to think of that, since the increase would come out of their profits, and to appear to be protecting the customer is a wonderful way of getting sympathy should the workers take further action.

## GOODBYE, Mr. BROWN

THAT stormy petrel of the Evening Standard and the Civil Service Clerical Association, with his job as Member of Parliament a mere sideline, Mr. W. J. Brown, has decided to bow to the storm created by the members of his Association and get out—but on his own terms.

Mr. Brown was the creator of the Civil Service Clerical Association when 38 years ago, he organised a small group of boy messengers. He has come a long way since then and has played his many parts with great astuteness and—what's the word?—business acumen. But the C.S.C.A. is one of the party-infiltrated unions, and has for its secretary none other than Mr. L. C. White, member of the Editorial Board of the Daily Worker. So naturally the fur has been flying at all the annual conferences for the past few years, for Mr. White is not secretary for nothing, and there is a large body of Communists in the Association—though how many of them will remain Communists in the face of the Civil Service purge remains to be seen—and Mr. Brown is now, naturally, very anti-Communist.

At last Mr. Brown decided to go, and the debate at this year's annual conference at Prestatyn centred only around the

details of his going. And on that insignificant detail of pension, Mr. Brown has once more done quite well for himself thank you. He has fixed himself up with £1,390 a year for life after he retires at the age of 55 next year and, good boss that he is, he fought nobly for a pension for his secretary (30 years in the job) and she gets £325 per year—less than a quarter of Mr. Brown, but of course, he was the brains, wasn't he?

Let us look at W. J. Brown's financial position now. £1,390 per year pension, £1,000 a year as an M.P., at least £1,000 per year for his weekly articles in the Evening Standard, in which he spends his time making no constructive proposals but plays the opportunistic game for all its worth, and the total is probably brought up to £4,000 a year with other articles in weekly magazines. What investments he may have we don't know, but he has certainly feathered his nest very comfortably and—as we have pointed out before—as an independent M.P., owes no loyalties to any party or group and so can fly whither the wind bloweth.

Another trade union boss has made the grade.

## SOCIALIST—1948

Socialist Lord Westwood is to be chairman of new building firm, Duncan Cameron (London) Ltd., nominal capital £10,000, offices in London and Edinburgh.

Westwood, 66, lives in Newcastle, comes to London every week. He is an extra-trade union official who for two years was Lord-in-waiting to the King.

Now he is Socialists' ace director. The Directory of Directors lists 23 boards on which he sits. They range from the Government's Finance Corporation for Industry to Newcastle Football Club.

Evening Standard, 4/11/48.

## THINK AGAIN, WORKERS!

A MINOR rumpus is taking place at the moment at one of the London factories of the Metal Box Company (at Acton)—whose directors recently indignantly denied that their company constituted a monopoly in the tin-can-making industry. They only control 40% of the industry, they declared, and that's not a monopoly, is it? Their work, by the way, is not limited to tin cans as such, but includes practically everything which can be classed as a "container".

But the present rumpus is of rather a different nature—and it leads us to be rather critical of the workers in the factory, who are protesting because they have to clock-in every morning, while the office staff do not, and can come in late without being penalised. So what do they suggest? Believe it or not, they are demanding that the office staff clock-in too!

Now, nobody is more sensitive than us to the artificial privileges which office staffs in general enjoy over workers at the bench. By and large, they are unproductive and unnecessary, and the "white-collar-job" snobbery is deplorable. But it is no progress to extend a tyranny to another grade of worker when one feels it oppressive. It may reflect a certain class-consciousness, but is a very narrow-minded and petty attitude. "We have to do it, why shouldn't they?"

The point is, of course, that no factory could impose clocking-in on its workers if they had the guts to oppose it, and the thing for our fellow-workers to do is to effect the abolition of clocking-in at their factory altogether.

What we desire is levelling-up, not levelling-down!

Thus the immediate needs of our troubled time demands that we reject the preventive methods which have never worked in the past; the ending of war requires the ending of capitalism. And if sceptics say that that will not end war, because human nature requires it, we can only retort that in the past human nature only required it every fifty or so years, and didn't demand it as a permanent feature of life.

The immediate needs require us to destroy war by folding up capitalism. And so also does the endless vista of war with America, and perhaps afterwards war with a new great power (for was not Russia "knocked-out" at the Crimea?) of the East, all for the sake of a mode of economy which creates misery and poverty as well as war.

## Let Us Be Practical

With this deadly future in front of us it behoves us to be practical. And that means ignoring the repeated advice of the practical men who urged us on against the Kaiser, the Fuhrer, and soon the Politburo. Ignoring all those who tell us about seeking peace by preparing for war, all those who tell us that revolutionary ideas are visionary and pernicious Utopian wool-gathering. Our backs are to the wall, and we can no longer close our eyes and apply interim remedies which are no remedies at all. It is absolutely necessary to grasp that the struggle against war is the struggle against capitalism itself; that system by which goods are only produced if there is a market for them, or if there is no market, then rearmament and war itself must supply the impetus to production.

That is the sober truth. The revolutionary struggle against war may be difficult, may be a long-term struggle; but it is the only one that offers any prospect of success, any widening outlook for mankind.

## Meetings and Announcements

### UNION OF ANARCHIST GROUPS: CENTRAL LONDON

Every Sunday at 7.30 p.m.  
At 8, Endsleigh Gardens, W.C.1.

NOVEMBER 14th Philip Sansom  
"The State"  
NOVEMBER 21st Alex Comfort  
"Can We Modify Human Conduct?"  
NOVEMBER 28th F. A. Ridley  
"The Conflict of European Ideologies"

### NORTH EAST LONDON

The next meeting of the NELAG will be held at Wanstead House (two minutes from Wanstead Tube Station) at 7.30 p.m.

NOV. 16th Marjorie Mitchell  
"The Family"  
NOV. 30th F. A. Ridley  
"The Political Background of the Third World War"  
Comrades interested cordially invited.

### GLASGOW ANARCHIST GROUP

Indoor Meetings,  
CENTRAL HALLS, Bath Street,  
every Sunday at 7 p.m.,  
Frank Leech, Willy Carlyle, John Gaffney,  
Eddie Shaw.

### BIRMINGHAM

Discussion-Lectures are held on alternate Sundays in Dick Sheppard House, 36, Holloway Head, at 7 p.m.

NOV. 21st S. E. Parker  
"The Chicago Martyrs"

### LIVERPOOL

Public Meeting at Cooper's Hall, Shaw Street, 7.30 p.m., Sunday, November 28th. Questions and Answers.

### THIRD ANNUAL

### C.O.'s REUNION DINNER

VICTORIA HOUSE RESTAURANT

December 4, at 7 p.m.

(Stewarts)

191, VICTORIA STREET, S.W.1.

Tickets 12s. 6d. from Rex Whittaker,

76, Mount Nod Road, S.W.16.

BRING YOUR FRIENDS

# WHO WANTS AN ARMY?

for the Territorial Army. The present-day conscripts are to serve compulsorily in the T.A. for some years after their nominal release; while Shinwell and Montgomery, pastmasters in the art of personal publicity, have launched a publicity campaign for the voluntary Territorial scheme.

The whole set-up of the T.A. is completely divorced from the traditions and sentiments of the British workers. In view of the patriotic flag-wagging sentiments about British traditions that inevitably always go with militarism, these views (once the monopoly of the Tories, but unfortunately no longer exclusive to them) are usually in this country associated with scorn for the working people who compose the great majority of the population. The Tories to-day go round telling the world that England is the greatest, etc., etc., and in the same breath that the English workers are lazy and degenerate. Jingoism here was always as illogical; Rudyard Kipling, the herald of modern Imperialism, who wrote with such fervour of Britain, despised the "flannelled fools at the wickets, muddled oafs at the goals" who preferred sport to military adventure. Mr. Warbey, the Socialist M.P. for Luton, doubtless felt the same way the other Saturday when the 25,000 crowd at the Luton-Tottenham match shouted him down with jeers, rattles and slow clapping when he tried to utilise the interval for a Territorial address. Kipling once said of them, they were "Idle—in spite of your boasting" (the boasting was his) "And what is your boasting worth, if ye grudge a year of service to the lordliest life on earth?" And it is perfectly true that all the Imperialist boasts, which have passed from the palsied hands of the Tories to

the Socialist Imperialists, are worth nothing even if, under the influence of constant propaganda, they were repeated by the people who nevertheless resist and grudge "a year of service" to military swashbuckling.

The spare-time soldiers in the old days as Mr. Bevin himself points out, were often confined to bank-clerks and shop-assistants, more or less forced to join it by economic pressure, and who had the constant fear that if by inattention to their duties they were dismissed from the Terriers, they would almost certainly be dismissed from their jobs. And in addition to them there were, of course, the "keen" soldiers, but there were no unwilling conscripts in the sense that the National Service men will be. The War Office has shut the public's eyes to the biggest problem, that of discipline. The break-down of military discipline in many places, especially between the big intake of 1944, and the present, which was accelerated as the release programme took away the N.C.O.'s, has had a serious effect on the Army's plans everywhere; and they have never fully revealed how far the inability to maintain rigid "peace-time Army" discipline has affected their operations in many post-war campaigns. Against this they have had the detention barracks, manned by the provost corps. How are they going to deal with the youngsters who grew up in the war-time era and served in the Army in the post-war period, as part-time soldiers? How far will or can military discipline be applied? By courts-martial or police court summonses? By detention or imprisonment? What about the minor offences? Can they confine a civilian to barracks? How can they act against malingering, indifference, absence, ribaldry, inattention, and everything else that the full-time National Service Army has its work cut out to cope with? And how will this discipline affect the great mass of volunteers? They, at any rate, have no doubts on the matter at all; they do not exist.

It is fashionable for the Tories to sneer at the Socialist conversion to the need for the T.A. and to refer to their opposition to it in the past as "a proof of their sentimental pacifism". The labour movement did not oppose the T.A. out of pacifist motives, although undoubtedly pacifists in it opposed it for those reasons, but even pro-war socialists were always against it, because of its perpetuation of the military system in peace-time. "Realism" has triumphed, and the labour movement is converted to being one of the two main capitalist parties, but the old arguments are still valid.

The workers know it. Most of them have seen sprigs of the aristocracy in their officers' uniforms, talking in the modulated accents of a language said to be also English, making fools of themselves in five continents. They will not submit to their superiority in civilian life, guaranteed by peace-time soldiering. In the Army the old traditions still run; but even forty years ago England was

growing out of touching its cap to the squire, and whatever the gentlemen who write letters to the Times justifying the officer selection system may think, the fact remains that one can walk into any Territorial drill hall (and, naturally, walk out again quicker) and find that the unit has well above its full complement of officers, but hardly any men, giving a curiously "Polish Army" effect.

What will the Government do, if the military chiefs insist they must have a strong T.A.? When the volunteers were not forthcoming for the Army, they accelerated conscription. They may therefore adopt the plan so often put forward by the gentlemen who denounce controls and regimentation for their businesses, and advocate them for the working population instead: namely, by a conscript Territorial force. What will stop the Government? Not the noisy protests of the agents of its cold-war rival, the "Communists" who so viligantly denounce the evils of every Imperialism bar Stalin's, whose position is identical with that of the fascists in 1939. And apart from these pro-the-other-siders, how few and small and pitiful in numbers are the anti-war elements! Who else will oppose the recruiting campaign which every responsible Party upholds? Ask Mr. W. N. Warbey, a sadder and, we hope, a wiser man. He knows.

A.M.

## SHADES OF SCHWEIK

Mr. Harold Sturge, the magistrate, expressed astonishment at Old Street to-day after hearing about a man with one eye who was conscripted into a RA anti-aircraft searchlight battery in 1940, and discharged after nine months because of "defective eyesight."

Mr. Liddle, Probation Officer: "He tells me he removed his artificial eye when he went for his medical examination; but they passed him."

The Magistrate: Perhaps the doctor never looked up.

News-Chronicle, 29/10/48.

## Special Appeal

### 7th LIST

Oct. 23rd—Nov. 4th.

London: E.B. 6/-; Llanelli: L.W. 2/6;  
Anlaby: D.R.\* 3/-; Anon\* 2/6; Blotchley:  
W.S. 1/6; Dedham: W.M. 5/-; Castle  
Douglas: J. & M.A.\* 5/-; Hawthorne, N.J.:  
C.F. 19/9; London: D.C.M. 1/-; London:  
G.B. 10/-; Argyle: per F.L. £1; Llanelli:  
L.W. 2/6; Cambridge: Anon 5/-; London:  
D.B. 5/-; Long Eaton: W.W. 2/-; New  
Earswick: H.A.A. 3/9; Dunstable: L.B. 1/6;  
China: L.C.B. £1/2/6; London: R.D.\* 5/-;  
London: L.G.W.\* 5/-; London: T. & E.E.  
5/-; Altrincham: M.A. 16/6; Castleton: J.R.  
10/-.

£8 0 0

Previously Acknowledged £256 16 2

### SPECIAL APPEAL FUND

TOTAL TO DATE £264 16 2

\*After initials indicates contributors to the 5/- a month scheme proposed by a London reader.

## FREEDOM Anarchist Fortnightly Price 3d.

Postal Subscription Rates  
6 months 4/6 (U.S.A. \$1).  
12 months 8/6 (U.S.A. \$2).  
Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies  
6 months 7/6 (\$1.50).  
12 months 15/- (\$3).

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.