

WAR COMMENTARY

Vol. 1 No. 3 Twopence.
JANUARY 1940

1939 OUR TASK 1940

WE are once more at the beginning of a new year. Let us use this occasion in order to review the past year and make plans for the coming year.

1939 has been a bitter year for all Anarchists. Our movement in Spain suffered a crushing defeat and the survivors of this tragedy languish in Franco's prisons or in Daladier's concentration camps. In France our movement, which had gained so much strength during the past three years has been rendered impotent; our Press suppressed, and our groups dispersed. In Canada many comrades have been arrested and a rigid censorship of all Anarchist publications imposed. We had entertained such great hopes of giving to the world an example of our revolutionary spirit of our creative strength in the organisation of a whole country (Spain) yet once more we are obliged to act as isolated groups

and in some cases illegally.

But the past years have been pregnant with experiences. We have learned that we can rely on very few outside organisations in our struggle both against Totalitarianism and war. We can no longer rely on Parliamentary Socialists, Communists or pacifists as our allies. It may happen that we have a common aim or certain points and that certain steps forward be taken with them but soon they will lag behind either because of opportunism or because of fear. We will avoid the company of those neo-pacifists who only a few months ago were the champions of War for Democracy! We will avoid the company of so-called Socialists who have shown themselves the willing tools of our oppressors. We will avoid the bleating pacifists, always anxious to sign petitions and to march in silent processions, but never ready to ACT! Let those who work with us be consis-

Contents

The Evolution of British Foreign Policy, by F. A. Ridley	3
War and Woolly Women, by Ethel Mannin	5
Trade Unionism and Totalitarianism, by A. Meltzer ..	7
Behind the Slogans	9
Bees From My Bonnet, by Reg Reynolds	10
Social Reconstruction After the War, by Tom Brown ..	12
More Documents on the Spanish Tragedy, by M. L. Berneri	14

tent with their principles and be ready to put them into practice!

* * *

At the present time all our efforts must be directed against the war. But, as our opposition to the war must not be purely theoretical and intellectual, we must aim at destroying the evil that is Capitalism, at its roots. Our struggle, therefore, must be directed along definite channels.

We must carry on the struggle in the factories and workshops against the exploiters by demanding increases in wages, an improvement in working conditions, and a forty hour week, which will mean the weakening of the boss class, and which will also mean one step forward in the struggle against capitalism and consequently against war.

We shall oppose the immediate danger of conscription. This we can do more effectively by co-operating with such organisations as the No-Conscription League.

We must also continue to fight alongside the Colonial workers for their liberation from their foreign oppressors and from their own bourgeois politicians. Up to the present the British workers as a whole have been the *accomplices* of the Colonial exploiters, and have even benefited, indirectly, by the poverty and wretchedness of the native peoples under British domination. It has not been properly understood that their cause is the cause of all workers—our cause—that their liberation would bring about the

weakening of the capitalist class which is just as much *our oppressor*.

In all these tasks our publication, WAR COMMENTARY, will be one of our most valuable weapons. It is therefore essential that it should be widely circulated wherever there are English-speaking workers, and that financial support, to guarantee its regular publication should be the duty of all men and women eager to build up a movement, free from party dictates, opportunism, bureaucracy, weakness, and all the other hundred and one evils that undermine party controlled organisations. All readers should further resolve to introduce new readers either individually or through their group or Trade Union branch. And, a final word; we must stress the fact that it is not enough to just buy and read the paper. We want you to discuss the articles and get in touch with the editors if you have criticisms or constructive suggestions to make.

Let our aim this year be to make WAR COMMENTARY a great paper, fighting for the cause of the international working-class, for their Freedom and for their Emancipation!

SUBSCRIPTION RATES

One Year — 2/0 (post free)

6 Months — 1/3 (post free)

Trial Subscription — 9d. 3 months

All subscriptions in the British Isles should be sent to:

FREEDOM PRESS DISTRIBUTORS,
9, NEWBURY ST., LONDON, E.C.1.

Atrocity Blue Books

"On reflection, however, I doubt it if his appetite for birds that makes the cat with the yellow eyes feel guilty. If you were able to talk to him in his own language and formulate your accusations against him as a bird-eater, he would probably be merely puzzled and look on you as a crank. If you pursued the argument and compelled him to moralize his position, he would, I fancy, explain that the birds were very wicked creatures and that their cruelties to the worms and the insects were more than flesh and blood could stand. He would work himself up into a generous idealisation of himself as the guardian of law and order amid the bloody strife of the cabbage patch—the preserver of the balance of nature. If cats were as clever as we, they would compile an atrocities blue-book about worms."

ROBERT LYND

(Essay on "Cats"; "The Pleasures of Ignorance," essay anthology, 1921).

THE EVOLUTION OF BRITISH FOREIGN POLICY

By
F. A. Ridley

THE German philosopher, Frederick Nietzsche, once summarised his political attitude by stating that he was a "good European." Similarly one can accurately summarise the foreign policy of Great Britain throughout the past four centuries by stating that throughout, England has been the worst of Europeans; in fact, the greatest enemy of any and every attempt to unify Europe. From the time of Queen Elizabeth on, the policy steadily pursued by England in its relationship towards the European continent has been that so trenchantly summarised by an 18th century Whig minister of Foreign Affairs (Lord Carteret): "England is safe only as long as Europe is divided."

A widespread belief still exists that England has, so to speak acquired her paramount position in modern history by accident; in "a fit of absence of mind" as a modern imperialist Historian (Sir John Seely) once expressed it. Nothing could be further from the truth than such a conception. Never, in fact, in all history has there been a parallel example of a small (originally) backward land rising to the status of a world empire by the unflinching pursuit over a period of centuries of a settled and calculated "real-politik," directed to the exclusive policy of insular aggrandisement.

From the time of Queen Elizabeth, at the dawn of English capitalism right down to the present day, the foreign policy of the expanding British Empire has been built up on these fixed and undeviating principles: to keep the European Continent in a permanent state of weakness and division by playing off the weaker European powers against the stronger. Meanwhile Britain, by thus keeping Europe at a distance in a kind of permanent civil war, was free to devote her main war effort, chiefly operated by means of her growing maritime supremacy, to building up a vast colonial empire in all parts of the world, partly by direct conquests and partly by colonial "wars" (in reality, usually little more than massacres) against the extra-European "lesser breeds without the law."

The British Empire and, in ultimate analysis, the whole world position of British capital in the modern world, is the direct result of these

policies euphoniously denominated by their promoters as "The Balance of Power" and "The Freedom of the Seas"—the use of unctuous jargon of this kind is, indeed, a regular part of British diplomacy and itself is a necessary part of its political technique.

The rise of England from a status that was merely insular to one that was genuinely world-wide in character has proceeded through a succession of well-marked periods, each characterised by a violent and prolonged conflict with that great European power, which, at the particular epoch, happened to represent the chief obstacle to British ascendancy. Against the rise of such a power—usually accused of aiming at the "hegemony" of Europe—Britain then exerted her whole strength plus that of all the continental allies that she could cajole, coerce and/or bribe.

To describe this process in detail is unnecessary: it is being utilised today against Hitler-Germany as formerly against its historic predecessors. An Italian historian of British Foreign policy has, indeed, aptly commented that whenever a British Statesman utters the word "hegemony," "throats are due to be cut on the European continent." The same authority calculates that to prevent this dreaded "hegemony"—usually exaggerated and sometimes actually invented by British diplomacy—no less than twelve wars of continental coalition have been engineered by Britain; the present one, which walks faithfully in the footsteps of its predecessors, being the 13th according to this computation. Our authority adds, that, without British prompting, most of these wars would not have occurred, and none of them would have lasted as long as they did.*

The history of English foreign policy can, in fact, be divided into well-marked periods distinguishable by the predominance of England's antagonism to some specific power in historic succession, and in successive stages in her Imperialist evolution, Britain fought Spain, 16th and 17th centuries, Holland—17th, Monarchical France—17th and 18th centuries,

* Carlo Scarfoglio—"England and the Continent."

Revolutionary France—18th and early 19th centuries, Russia 19th, and Germany 1914-18, and again to-day. Her successive victories over these formidable rivals marked the stages in the rise of the former obscure North Sea island to the status, first of a great, then of a world Power, and finally to that of the wealthiest and most powerful Empire in modern times, if not in all recorded history.

Never in all history has there been seen a parallel foreign policy, pursued so consistently, and with such a steady sequence of victories to its credit, as has been that pursued by the British oligarchy from the era of Elizabeth and Cecil to that of Chamberlain and Halifax. Submerged as it is by floods of hypocrisy intended for "that beast of muddy brain," the people, the evolution of British foreign policy represents a century-old ruthless real-politik, compared to which the ephemeral ruthlessness of a Mussolini or a Hitler fades into insignificance. e.g. It is still customary in "Left" (sic) circles to denounce Fascist Dictators as "aggressors." Granted that they are, what does their "aggression" amount to in comparison with that of the British Empire, which, between the generation of Oliver Cromwell and our own day—that is, rather less than three centuries, has deluged Europe in blood in thirteen major wars, on the average one war every 22 years, not to mention colonial "wars of aggression" without number, say, every 22 weeks! Compared to this record of cold deliberate war-making by the British ruling-class, the Fascist Dictators are amateurs, and the most ruthless barbaric conquerors, a Genghis Khan and a Famerlaine, sink down to mere also-rans in the art of scientific homicide. Thirteen great wars, plus innumerable "punitive expeditions," and all, without exception for Freedom, according to the mythology which masquerades as "English History"! In fact, and in relation to Europe, the ruling class of Great Britain may be defined as a permanent war party.

The present war runs true to tradition. Britain is fighting Hitler for the same reasons that she fought his predecessor, the Hohenzollern regime. (As far back as 1934 the present writer, in his book "Next Year's War" predicted the outbreak of precisely such an Anglo-French-German conflict). None the less, there are signs which indicate that this may be the last of the aggressive wars of the British Foreign Office; the number 13 is traditionally unlucky! For it seems distinctly unlikely that Britain can isolate Germany and thus prevent the war from spreading. There is a growing

probability that this war will ultimately lead to some kind of European unity, let us hope on the basis of a new Socialist International. Such a Union, at least, can now be definitely discerned on the contemporary historic horizon.

The day upon which that United States of Europe comes into existence will also mark the end of an entire historic epoch; of that era that has been increasingly dominated by British Foreign Policy, with its technique of "divide and rule." As part of a Socialist Europe, Britain can then enter upon a new historic phase; one less grandiose, perhaps, than has been her imperialist epoch, but also far less destructive to the higher interests of humanity. The alternative can only be a new "Hundred Years War" or succession of wars, leading ultimately to unthinkable horrors, and eventually, to the enforced return of England, a metropolis forcibly deprived of its world empire, to its former mediaeval status as an obscure island in the North Sea. "That way madness lies," and suffering without equal in human annals. The future of a non-imperialist England can no longer be separated from that of the continent to which she geographically belongs.

MANIFESTO OF THE I.W.W.

"We, the Industrial Workers of the World, in convention assembled, hereby reaffirm our adherence to the principles of industrial unionism, and re-dedicate ourselves to the unflinching, unfaltering prosecution of the struggle for the abolition of wage slavery and the realisation of our ideals in Industrial Democracy.

"With the European war for conquest and exploitation raging and destroying the lives, class-consciousness and unity of the workers, and the ever-growing agitation for preparedness clouding the main issue and delaying the realisation of our ultimate aim with patriotic and therefore, capitalistic aspirations, we openly declare ourselves the determined opponents of all nationalistic sectionalism, or patriotism, and the militarism preached and supported by our one enemy, the capitalistic class. We condemn all wars, and for the prevention of such, we proclaim the anti-militarist propaganda

"We extend assurance of both moral and material support to all the workers who suffer at the hands of the capitalist class for their adhesion to those principles and call on all workers to unite themselves with us, that the reign of the exploiters may cease and that this earth be made fair through the establishment of Industrial Democracy."

War and Woolly Women

The women's silent peace march having been forbidden by the police under the new Emergency Powers Act, it was decided to hold a mass meeting under the same auspices—that is, the Women's Peace Campaign. One of the objects of this meeting was to gain support for an appeal to the Queen to use her 'gracious power' to stop the war and call a world peace conference. The Chairman of the Women's Peace Campaign wrote and asked me if I would be one of the 'notable women' supporting the platform. I refused—for the good socialist reason that I do not support any appeal to royalty, and because I am very tired of woolly women pacifists who go about bleating about the wickedness of bombing babies, and making such 'profound' utterances as to how much better the money spent on munitions would be spent on schools and clinics and so forth. It is time women pacifists got over the pacifist 'facts of life.' There is a terrible ennui in that repetition about bombed babies and wasted money. It is all rather like adult people getting excited about the discovery that kittens come from the mother-cat. When are war-hating women going to wake up to the political significance of war—the socialist realisation that war is an integral part of the capitalist-imperialist system, and that no bigger-and-better League of Nations, no world peace conference, is going to give lasting peace—because it cannot, so long as imperialist interests remain?

Take, for example, the reaffirmation of faith of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom as given in Peace News for the week ending December 15th: 'We recognise that the Governments of the world have persistently refused to use peaceful means for the adjustment of international disputes and for the remedying of injustices . . . In this moment of chaos we believe the essential dignity and sanity of mankind, and we believe that out of the present disorder a new and better world can and will arise. . . . We urge that the Governments of the neutral countries should at this time with patience and with persistence seek avenues for mediation, taking opportunities to open the way to negotiation. And more especially we appeal to the President of the United States of America to call a conference of all neutral countries, having as its aim the putting for-

ward of recommendations to the belligerent countries for the ending of conflict on such terms as will secure a just and durable peace.'

Can woolliness go much further? So long as there are rival imperialisms there can be no

By ETHEL MANNIN

peaceful adjustments; there must and will always be wars. How can a new and better order arise out of the present conflict—short of world revolution? But world revolution is a phrase which strikes terror to the heart of fully ninety per cent. of pacifists. Certainly the Women's Peace and Freedom league does not stand for world revolution, any more than the Peace Pledge Union, or the Women's Peace Campaign. And do they really believe that the governments of neutral countries can find a means of ending the present conflict 'on such terms as will secure a just and durable peace?' Do they really still pin their faith to another League of Nations, another Kellogg Pact? I am afraid they do—despite the farce of the League of Nations throughout its history, despite the fact that, as John Scanlon points out in his sardonic little new book, *But Who has Won?* "armament firms will agree that in the last twenty years only one thing has stimulated recovery in their business more than a disarmament conference, and that was the signing of the Kellogg Peace Pact." Three weeks after she had signed that pact, renouncing all wars, America ordered fifteen new cruisers—just as Mr. Chamberlain, as soon as he got back from Munich, where it was agreed that England and Germany would 'never again' take up arms against each other, plunged us into an armaments' race unequalled in history. Yet they still go on, these well-meaning, oh-so-earnest, ladies, babbling of peace pacts and world conferences and a 'lasting peace' between governments with rival interests. "Women Must Awaken to Save Humanity!" cries Vera Brittain,? and 'The Freedom for which we are striving today is of far wider significance, (than the feminist struggle of the past) namely, the freedom of all peoples to live in peace and

security,' declares the Woman Chairman of the Women's Peace Campaign. All peoples, lady? Are the Indian masses to live free of the British Raj, and the African peoples free of British and French and Dutch and Belgian and German imperialisms? Are the Arabs to have freedom from the British? Is Eire to have her six counties in a united Ireland finally free of British domination? In whose peace are the oppressed races to live, Lady? An imperialist peace, or the peace of their own independence? What security are they to be offered—the imperialist humbug of the mandate system? Women must work 'for the new social order which alone will make peace a reality,' you say. That's true enough, but do you mean it? Are you really, preaching revolutionary socialism? Or merely, as I suspect a new social order based on the same old capitalist system, an order which the more it changes the more it is the same? It is not women who must awaken to save humanity, ladies, but the international working class movement. Women have their part to play in this, but it cannot be isolated from the revolutionary working-class struggle generally. It is not a feminist issue, but a socialist one.

And it is in this perpetual stopping short this idea of the socialist position that the mass of women pacifists wander off into wooliness. Sending messages to the Queen isn't going to help the anti-war struggle one iota; royalty are the apex of that system which breeds wars. When the Queen of Holland and the King of Belgium rushed round to each other trying to find a solution to the present conflict, do you really imagine for one moment that it is because they are pacifists? Any more than Mr. Chamberlain spoke as a pacifist at Munich. They are all prepared to make wars when it suits their imperialist purpose. No king or queen, no government, no president, wants war if it can be avoided, because war is bad economics; but every member of the ruling classes is prepared to wage war when capitalist-imperialist purpose cannot be served without it. Let's have no illusions about that. They all say they don't want war, didn't want this war; Chamberlain said it, Daladier said it, Hitler said it; and they didn't want it, but they have got it because under the existing regime there is no other way of consolidating imperialist positions and achieving imperialist ends. The British and French Empires have to be protected, along with British and French economic interests, and German imperialism has to ex-

pand, and her economic position made secure. This like all capitalist-imperialist wars, is a trade war, ladies; the issues are markets, and pounds, shillings and pence, and if you really think that these competing nations can sit round a table and come to a lasting agreement not to fly at each other's throats when the economic situation demands it every generation or so, it is time somebody took you all aside and explained to you the basic nature of something called the capitalist system.

Women have a part to play in the anti-war struggle all right, but it must be alongside the men. Even the Daily Telegraph admitted the other day that the success or otherwise of this war rested upon the shoulders of industry—that is to say of the workers, who produce the world's goods, and the munitions of war. Power is in their hands, and it is they who need to awake, not these muddle-headed, well meaning female pacifists. Workers' action can stop this war; without the consent of the workers it cannot possibly go on, since it is they who turn out the food, the munitions—and the man-power that feeds the guns. It is the world's workers who sanction wars and make them possible. It used to be said that war is a thing that were the people wise kings would not play at; today war is a thing that were the workers wise governments could not play at. . . .

They would do better, these woolly women, to stop the sob-stuff about bombed babies, and instead of sending messages to the Queen, cultivate a knowledge of economics, and direct their propaganda to the workers to use their power and bring about the new social order in the only way it can be brought about—through direct action on the part of the international working-class movement.

SELF-CONDEMNATION

"Many of us in the Labour Movement have been denounced for supporting this 'Imperialist War'. It is the world's greatest Imperialist war.

"But it is not of our creation. . . .

"Of course, this is an Imperialist war. But it is not due to Britain and France. It is waged by an Imperialist Germany."

ARTHUR GREENWOOD

("Daily Herald," Nov. 13, 1939)

Trade Unionism & —

DURING the last war the trade unions and labour movement were tied to the chariot wheels of imperialism. While co-operating with the Government for the pursuance of the war, the labour leaders hampered their own rank-and-file in the defence and furthering of the rights of labour.

This war it is different: the trade unions, so far from being tied to the chariot-wheels of Imperialism, or being (as they later became) the fifth wheel, have now become a very necessary wheel. The Government relies on the trade union bureaucrats to organise the masses behind the State, a role being carried out successfully in Germany by the officials of the Nazi Party.

In one totalitarian country—Italy—it has been recognised that union organisation is necessary for employers and workers, with the State on top to see “fair play”—for the employers! Russia has gone the greatest distance in totalitarianism: the total Russian society is part of a magnified Civil Service—every individual is a unit working for the State, fighting for the State, and being organised by the State in almost every detail. Germany has not gone so far in the direction of State capitalism (for in Germany it was first of all necessary to liquidate the private capitalists who had used Hitler to smash the workers, before finding Hitler has used them to attain power), but in Germany the same final tendency is clear, and the results—the suppression of all individual and social freedom, the lowering of conditions to suit the requirements of the State without regard for the worker. No doubt in time Italy will go the way of Germany and Russia: the final victory of totalitarianism, the abolition by the State of the private employer and its complete taking-over of his functions.

State capitalism is worse than private capitalism: the worker can no longer exercise his daily-decreasing freedom of playing off one employer against another (by changing his job, etc.) nor by playing off the State against the employer of vice versa, for State and employer become synonymous terms.

The trade union bureaucrats believe in state socialism: their idea of state socialism appears little different from that of state capitalism: totalitarianism. Through their political organ, the Labour Party, they seek nationalisation of industry: and *nationalisation*

means, essentially, State control—totalitarianism. One does not need coloured shirts to bring Fascism: here are our trade union leaders preparing to introduce that form of industrial serfdom which, when styled “Fascism” or “Bolshevism” drives us to violent opposition.

This is all trade unionism is becoming: part of the organisation of the new industrial serf-

— Totalitarianism

dom. One can understand the trade union officials being anxious to retain their well-paid jobs—one can also understand them anxious to become the industrial barons’ stewards in twentieth-century feudalism: but we cannot understand why the rank-and-file should go on following their leaders, who, clearly enough, have no more connection with the original aims of trade unionism than have the “national socialists” of Germany with socialism, the “national syndicalists” of Italy with syndicalism of any kind, or the Stalinists of Russia with communism.

Possibly one of the important reasons is the conservatism in socialism: people are not prepared to go “out into the wilderness”: they follow the paths hallowed by tradition, even when it is clear that those paths are outworn.

It is no accident, nor is it malevolent design on anyone’s part, that the trade unions are out-of-date in structure. In many unions the old craft principle is still retained, a principle dating back to mediaeval times. Some old unions even still carry the old insignia, banners, emblems, watchwords and titles: just as does the Lord Mayor’s Show or the entire parliamentary and titles and judicial bodies.

It may be of regret to antiquaries—it can only be sensible to workers—to say “*Scrap the lot!*” The unions, if they are to achieve that form of society all sincere socialist trade unionists must desire, have to be rebuilt according to the requirements of modern industry. The bosses are organised according to the day and age: so must the workers. Last century’s—even last year’s—methods may not be suitable for today. Habits can grow. Break them!

That is the way to fight capitalism: not, as one trade union official stated, by paying the trade union officials the same salaries as the employers’ representatives!

With the outmoded methods of organisation must go also the officialdom, present and pro-

bable. In any crisis, such as the present war, the workers fall back on their unions. The officials are seen to be actively on the side of the enemy: the ruling class. In national warfare Governments shoot men who desert "under fire": in class warfare it is not too much to suggest that workers should sack officials who betray them!

The only pretext for keeping the officials is: they represent the feelings of the majority. Maybe they do (whenever did an opportunist not happen to coincide with the views of the majority?): but the majority we must convince that their interests are elsewhere—the leadership we oppose pure-and-simply.

It is suggested, then: scrap trade unionism for industrial unionism: scrap the salaried jobs. Then we have an organisation that can fight against capitalism. But how about an organisation that can build socialism? The Labour Party we can hardly hope to rely on. All other parties seem to go the same way. Here again we must rely on our own action: workers' direct action. The organisation we set up for strikes against capitalism we must use for a general strike for socialism and for the control of a free socialist society. By this means: factory committees forming the nucleus of industrial unions—we can organise production, by the workers themselves, and dispense entirely with the need for the State.

Such new unionism will be revolutionary and industrial: it will be syndicalism (the organisation of the working class for strike and control action), and (since it will keep clear of State politics and domination) anarchist. *With such an anarcho-syndicalist movement the workers could combat any decline in their real wages or conditions, could organise for progress in such directions, could prepare for labour's emancipation.*

One question arises: So well arranged is the trade union machinery that sometimes not a majority and almost certainly not a strong minority would get its way on such a vital matter. For industrial unionism means the entire rebuilding of trade union organisation.

One instance alone will show: that of clerks. Clerks generally have the choice of about a dozen unions (this is one of the reasons why so many clerks join none at all!)—general, railway transport, local government, civil service, shop assistant, bank, distributive, etc. Sometimes in one office—if it has trade union members at all—will have all its clerks in different unions. But industrial unionism says: *one industry, one union.* Clerks would join

the industry they worked in (transport, etc.)

Or to take another question: even in a so-called industrial union (such as the A.E.U.) its branches are organised according to where one lives, not according to where one works. Men working at the same factory might all belong to different branches. Industrial unionism says: *one factory, one committee* (or branch).

One is therefore faced with the problem: will we eventually have to leave the trade unions to create these fresh industrial unions? It seems likely. They tell us we will be striking at the tradition of the labour movement: we reply that principle matters more than tradition. The men who co-operate with the Government, its personnel the political descendants of Castlereagh and Sidmouth, have no right to quote Tolpuddle to us! The men who join in T. U.-employer-State committees, the forerunners of totalitarianism, have no right to tell us how trade unionism was once persecuted!

A union leader and a bishop at a ruling class City banquet have both strayed—the former as much from Labour's pioneers suffering Government persecutions, the latter from the early Christian martyrs in the Roman arenas!

The war will call into being some form of mass organisation. The workers will gradually begin to realise that, if they are to resist the demands of totalitarianism, with its brutal consequences,—Fascism at home whether Britain wins or loses the war — they have to build some movement akin to the shop stewards' movement of the last war. Militant workers should be ready to insist on the firm opposition of this movement to the capitalist and labour bosses and to political control, and on the adoption of an independent revolutionary programme. In this way we shall see the building of an anarcho-syndicalist movement, through which means the workers will at last attain emancipation from Capitalism, Totalitarianism, the State and war.

ALBERT MELTZER.

"DAILY WORKER" FORGOT TO PUBLISH THESE GREETINGS!

Hitler's message to Stalin on his 60th birthday reads:

"I beg you to accept my most cordial congratulations. I herewith send you my best wishes for your personal welfare as well as for the happy future of the peoples of our friend, the Soviet Union."

Behind the Slogans

FOR the past few weeks the British public has been entertained to a number of broadcasts explaining the propaganda methods adopted by the Nazi Party in its rise to power and during the past six years. The methods which have been used, the bare faced lies which have been told to the German people, have been exposed by the genuine anti-fascists long ago. During the Spanish War, for instance, all sections of radical opinion pointed to Germany and Italy's armed intervention in that country,

of ruthless force and political materialism to the whole uneasy world. "Blood and iron," she boasted, was the cement of her unity, and almost as openly the little, mean, aggressive statesmen and professors who have guided her destinies to this present conflict have professed cynicism and an utter disregard of any ends but nationally selfish ends, as though it were religion..." (pp. 7-9).

The same phrases are being used today by war apologists, with the only difference that one reads Hitlerism instead of Kaiserism. But what makes the above extracts more interesting is the fact that some 25 years later, the same H. G. Wells wrote:

"I was in control of the propaganda against the German Government by the British Ministry of

"Not At War With the German People"

but at that time Mr. Chamberlain preferred to believe Dr. Goebbels. It was convenient, in the same way as it is convenient nowadays for Mr. Chamberlain and the controlled Press to label as lies everything emanating from Berlin.

However, in view of the fact that the B.B.C. will not broadcast a programme on British propaganda methods, the following extracts should prove useful in gauging the sincerity behind those idealistic and even sentimental declarations made by those in power.

The first is from a book by H. G. Wells published in 1914.*

"We began to fight because our honour and our pledge obliged us; but so soon as we are embarked upon the fighting we have to ask ourselves what is the end at which our fighting aims. We cannot simply put the Germans back over the Belgian border and tell them not to do it again. We find ourselves at war with that huge military empire with which we have been doing our best to keep the peace since first it rose upon the ruins of French Imperialism in 1871. And war is mortal conflict. We have now either to destroy or be destroyed. We have not sought this reckoning, we have done our utmost to avoid it; but now that it has been forced upon us it is imperative that it should be a thorough reckoning. This is a war that touches every man and every home in each of the combatant countries..."

"We are fighting Germany. But we are fighting without any hatred of the German people. We do not intend to destroy either their freedom or their unity. But we have to destroy an evil system of government and the mental and material corruption that has got hold of the German imagination and taken possession of German life. We have to smash the Prussian Imperialism as thoroughly as Germany in 1871 smashed the rotten Imperialism of Napoleon III. And also we have to learn from the failure of that victory to avoid a vindictive triumph.

"This Prussian Imperialism has been for forty years an intolerable nuisance in the earth. Ever since the crushing of the French in 1871 the evil thing has grown and cast its spreading shadow over Europe. Germany has preached a propaganda

Propaganda from Crewe House (in the last war)..."

"The work I did was done in absolute good faith, and the gist of the business is that we, who lent ourselves to propaganda, were made fools of and ultimately let down by the traditional tricks of the Foreign Office.

"We were kept in the dark about all sorts of secret entanglements to which these gentry had committed the country, and we were allowed to hold out hopes to the German people of a liberal post-war settlement our masters had no intention of making. We were tricked, and through us the German liberals were cheated."†

As Wells further explains, the liberal propaganda was simply used to weaken the resistance of the German liberals behind the Kaiser, while the Northcliffe "hymn of hate" was directed at the British public. The pious platitudes to the German people ("We are fighting Kaiserism, not you!") were ignored at Versailles, but the "Daily Mail" policies were carried out.

As Wells admits (despite his implied support of the present war, which conflicts with his determination not to be fooled again) the gentlemen of the British Foreign Office and the Quai d'Orsay are of no different calibre to their predecessors, "little, purblind, mean chaps."

The democratic sentimentalists are going to be fooled again, and so (if they do really listen to the Chamberlain propaganda) are their colleagues in Germany. The people who will get their own way are not the Attlees but the Milnes, not those hoping to "defend democracy and destroy Hitlerism" but those determined to destroy Germany for imperialist reasons. This means: no chances of Hitler being overthrown from within (at least by the democrats) and certainly no lasting peace.

* "The War That Will End War," by H. G. Wells. Published by Frank & Cecil Palmer, 1914.

† "In Search of Hot Water" (Penguin Series, 1939).

Reg Reynolds

● SOME BEES FROM MY BONNET

OR, if you prefer, some bats from my belfry. I want to discuss a number of things which have no particular relation to each other except in the labyrinth of my cerebellum.

First of all, there is an addendum to my article on India last month. When I mentioned the claims put forward by the Muslim League to represent the Indian Moslems my attention had not been drawn to the following interesting summary of the position, which appeared in a letter in the "New Statesman" of November 18th, signed "A. Gupta":

"In your last issue you comment that Mr. Jinnah does not speak for all Muslims. That is quite true. The Muslim League in the last elections secured only 108 out of 482 seats reserved by the Act of 1935 for Mahomedans only. In the North-West Frontier Province, which is predominantly Muslim, the League has not been able to secure a single seat in the legislature. In the Punjab Assembly there is one Muslim League member.

The Muslim League professes to represent all the 80 million Muslims of India. The Government and the "Times" take this claim for granted in spite of the above facts, presumably because it suits them. On the other hand, Congress spokesmen claim that numerically the Indian National Congress has more Muslim members within the party than the Muslim League. In most of the provincial legislatures at least some Muslim members are with the Congress. In the Frontier Province, the majority party, though Muslim, is the Congress Party. The votes on recent resolutions in the Congress Provinces show that the Congress is attracting more and more Muslims on its side. If so, is it too much to say with Gandhi, that the Congress is "an all inclusive body," and that it is, without a rival, representative of the masses of Indian irrespective of class or creed?"

The writer might have added that, as one went further down in the social scale, the unenfranchised masses (72% of the adult population) are even less inclined to support the Muslim League and its communal policy—they are all either supporters of Congress or well to the left of it (in the Kisan Movement, for instance, which is a militant peasant organisation, or in the organised labour movements). Thus the Moslem Minority organisation, of which so much use is made by the opponents

of Indian freedom, dwindles into relative insignificance but for the wealthier Moslems.



THE "New Statesman" was not so hospitable to a letter of mine on an equally topical issue. Mr. Norman Leys, having written in its columns that "it is simply untrue that our pot is as black as Germany's kettle," mentioned torture specifically as one of the crimes of which British Imperialism was not guilty. In my letter, which the "New Statesman" evidently thought it unwise to publish, I replied:

"Balancing evils is even more difficult (and futile) than balancing different types of armaments—a favourite pastime once at Geneva. But there are continual allegations of barbarities that reach us from various parts of the Empire. Admittedly, I should find it as hard to prove (in this country) the numerous allegations of torture in the Indian jails during 1930-32 as it would be to prove, before a Nazi court, the brutalities of German concentration camps. In each case "official" evidence would be solidly against me and I should have to rely upon that of prisoners and those who had examined them after release. The same applied to the recent allegations from Palestine and Sierra Leone, though not long ago an ex-policeman (British) admitted in a book, with apparent pride, that he had endeavoured to extort information from an Arab by torture. (See "Palestine Policeman" by Roper Courtney, Jenkins 1939.)

"Our Government has only just "revealed" facts about Germany that it has known for years. Such sensitiveness to the feelings of a foreign power is not, I imagine, less acute where our own affairs are concerned. Enquiries have repeatedly been demanded into allegations of brutality in the places I have mentioned, and elsewhere in the Empire; but since the Hunter Commission gave us its appalling findings with regard to Amritsar, we have not been treated to further investigations of this sort. Which is all the more strange, because a British Commission would hardly be biased against those who appointed it."



THE actual quotation from "Palestine Policeman"—a book completely hostile to Arab nationalism—is as follows:

"There was a fellow I caught myself one night. I was sitting in my accustomed spot in the garden cafe when I became aware that there was a man dodging from one bush to another... Our prisoner was a Palestine Arab... Obviously we had got an important messenger. But we could not make him talk. I knocked him about. I beat a tattoo on the soles of his feet with a rubber truncheon. He wept. He writhed. He moaned. But he would not utter a word."

Not torture, of course: just rough play. The trouble is, it's very seldom we get such things naively admitted like that—still less the in-

initely worse things with which the police and military have been charged in Palestine—and elsewhere.

I was talking the other day to a man who was in an administrative position in Palestine. He got himself into trouble through his efforts to bring some of the criminals to book. He had countless stories, complete with details and documentary evidence, of torture and murder by the police and military, of “framed” charges and other attempts—mostly successful—to pervert the course of “justice.” He spoke of the courts as places where no Arab would think of expecting justice.

This man had no “back-ground” by which to explain all this. He just felt outraged and bewildered. He had gained nothing and lost much by his insistence on what he believed to be “British” standards of decency and integrity. His sincerity was beyond question. Then we talked of politics in other parts of the world, and it was clear that in his own muddled way he was veering towards fascism! (Ah, says the reader, that explains everything! But he is wrong.) I asked him what drew him to fascism and he said: “They seem to be the only people who take any interest in this frightful racket. Do any of the socialist parties stand for a fair deal to the Arabs?”

I was silent. I had nothing to say.



THAT is the worst tragedy of Palestine. The Glasgow paper “Solidarity” (mid-October) reported John McGovern as saying in an anti-war speech that the British Imperialists “have burned down cottages in Ireland, in India, in Egypt and in South Africa.”

Evidently he considered that a crime. But he said nothing about the destruction of thousands of Arab homes in Palestine. On the contrary, he told the House of Commons (Hansard, November 24th, 1938):

“If there was one thing about which I should agree with the military, it is in blowing up such villages, which would be a godsend to the Arabs, for whom other habitations could be found. They are steeped in filth.”

McGovern must have known perfectly well that there was no more question of “other habitations” than there was in the case of Ireland, India, Egypt and South Africa. Did not the “News-Chronicle” even describe the old and the sick being carried out onto the bare hill-side? Yet this was a blessing, while it was a curse elsewhere! Except, apparently,

in Glasgow—for, when I attacked McGovern publicly about his Palestine speeches (at the I.L.P. Conference, Easter, 1939), he said he would like to do the same with the slums of Glasgow... I wonder how the people who lived in them would appreciate being kicked out into the road...

And it is not to be wondered at if the Arabs and many of their friends turn to fascism when this sort of thing is the best that our “socialists” can offer them. “Filth” is McGovern’s favourite word when talking about Arabs, and almost his only criticism of the Government so far have been by way of demanding further measures of repression. Yet he speaks for the most “left” party that has a voice in Parliament!



ANOTHER quick-change artist is Harry Pollitt. I wonder how many of the Faithful who read his “Declaration” in the “Daily Worker” of November 23rd realised its full implications:

“My hatred of Fascism had developed for five years’ intensive anti-Fascist propaganda, which led to a position where I did not see in time the true role of British imperialism, and saw only German Fascism as the main enemy of the British working-class movement.”

First, of course, there is the interesting assumption that “the British working-class movement” was all that mattered; India and the colonies didn’t matter a damn. But what a lovely confession from the Big Medicine Man! “My own ju-ju was too strong for me.” No doubt he had the antidote; so had his panel patients of the Communist Party. But had all those others who listened to this dope for four years? Could they recover so quickly (if “recover” is the right word)? And there is not a single note of apology to those who were defamed, slandered and assassinated because they diagnosed the situation better and denounced Pollitt’s Poison before the war began.



THAT is enough for one number, though there are other things I should have liked to discuss. I noticed, for example, in an unexpected place (the “City Notes” of the “Scottish Daily Express,” December 8th) a reference to the fact that the West African Negro farmers were being paid 18/- a cwt. for cocoa that was selling

(Continued at foot of next column)

Social Reconstruction After the War

It is quite impossible for anyone to outline the war strategy and plans of the Allies, for Chamberlain and Daladier have no plan. Politically they live from hand to mouth; they are twin Macawbers "waiting for something to turn up."

True Downing Street has decided to have a revolution in Germany, but it is to be "a revolution of the right" says Duff Cooper, a revolution to restore to full power the officer caste, the Junkers and the Kaiser, (nasty minded readers will recall that the last war was fought against these people to overthrow Prussian militarism and "hang the Kaiser").

It is not for the British Conservative Party to order the shape and size of future revolutions. It may well be that the war will end by a rising of the war-weary and hungry peoples of Germany, France and Britain. Will it then be possible for Duff Canutes to successfully command the tide of revolt to halt its progress ere it overflows their spats?

But while Anarchists and Revolutionary Socialists speak of ending war by revolution it is necessary for them to understand just what that revolution must be.

The German revolution of 1918 found the Spartacists and Independent Socialists unprepared. After floundering about awhile the Independants settled down to helping the Social Democrats into power. The Social Democrats acted as the caretakers of the state power and handed it in working order to Hitler (asking only for their pensions). The workers had looked to the revolution for bread, it gave them a constitution, then the counter-revolution succeeded.

To be successful a revolution must be social

SOME BEES FROM MY BONNET

(Continued from previous page)

in London at 31/6. The export tax had risen to 1/- per cwt. and the City Editor remarked that "the native gets no benefit from that rise" (in prices) "while his so-called guaranteed price is being made illusory by higher export duties." This is all under government control—the stranglehold of the capitalist firms was bad enough for the Negro farmers without the Government playing an active hand in this way.

And so we begin 1940, and democracy is being fought for—like hell it is.

and economic. Constitutions and laws do not fill hungry bellies, nor do parliamentary speeches grow food or build houses. The new society will be built by the workers taking and holding the means of production, the factories, the mines and the land. Political, state control means the attempted regulation of industry by the politicians, lawyers, Whitehall bureaucrats and policemen.

The futility of political revolution is shown by Russia. The chaos of Russian industry is demonstrated by the constant execution of leading bureaucrats for "sabotage". An ex-bolshevik general Victor Serge tells us how after weeks of absence of fresh vegetables in Leningrad a few heads of the vegetables trust are shot, but the next morning Leningrad is still without fresh vegetables.

The Co-operative Movement has recently given some startling examples of the disaster of political interference in industry. In a free pamphlet "Chaos on the Home Front" they show why we are short of essential commodities.

Scunthorpe Co-operative Society had a very successful creamery "we had had a certain amount of good fresh butter in stock and on September 22, the Food Minister requisitioned it.. The butter was kept there for a considerable time." "Immediately they took it over they increased the price by ten shillings a cwt., or £10 a ton. We were then allowed to draw our own butter out of our own cooling chamber and pay the Food Ministry the increased price of 10/- a cwt."

The society had some butter they needed but not allowed to touch, they wrote a letter to the Ministry saying the butter was going bad and needed turning. The reply told them to send the butter to London, from there it went to South Wales. Was it fresh? The customers were.

"You used to get good sized prunes for 6d. per lb. The Ministry requisitioned the whole lot and sold them back to grocers at a price which means that the retailer cannot sell the big ones for less than 8½d., or the small ones."

"Ministry of Food officials in allocating Burnley's food supplies wanted a datum period, covering a normal pre-war week. Believe it or not, but in their datum they included "wakes week" when most of Burnley was away! And they were very peeved when Burnley grumbled that supplies sufficient for "wakes week" wouldn't suffice for an ordinary week. The case is not exceptional."

"But the outstanding example of official muddle was fish. On the outbreak of war the Ministry at once abandoned the East Coast ports and set up a fish distribution centre at Oxford, with a chain of branch centres. The scheme did not work, supplies failed to reach the places where they were wanted. Much fish went bad because of the length of time taken in unpacking it and repacking it."

In most parts of London fish just disappeared, then

the Ministry confessed its failure and abandoned the scheme, and since then fish may once again be sold, bought and eaten.

It is obvious that the state cannot solve the social problem. The state came into existence as, and remains, an institution to protect private property and keep the slaves in subjection. The workers' problem being economic require an economic form of organisation. Socialism is not a political institution but an economic method; it is not the government of men by a special class of men, but the administration of things.

Anarcho-syndicalists alone have evolved and expounded the means of socialism, the framework of the new society. They call on the workers to assemble at their places of employment, breaking down all barriers of craft, age and sex, to elect committees of their best workmates, to link those committees in each industry and every locality and federate all industries into a national whole. To build revolutionary industrial unions. "By organising industrially we are building the new society within the shell of the old."

Syndicalism uses the mighty weapon of the stay-in strike. Instead of walking out of the factory and slowly starving to death or wandering about the streets to be batoned, the workers seize the means of production. How overwhelmingly successful this can be was seen in Italy in 1920 and France in 1936. The stay-in strike must be developed until the workers gain sufficient class-consciousness to lock-out the master class.

Wars, civil or international cannot be fought without economic means, without the arms, food and transport the workers produce and handle first. Syndicalism gives us not only the means of gaining our liberty, but of erecting the framework of the new society.*

In July 1936 the Spanish workers took over and ran, railways, tramways, buses, taxis and tubes, the telephone system, the wood and textile industries, the hotels, cafes and theatres. The peasants took possession of the land and formed collective farms. Every industry had its successful examples of workers control. Working with a backward economy and in the midst of a terrible war, our comrades yet were able to increase production, to modernise plant and even reduce prices.

*Let the doubters read of the splendid achievements of our comrades of the C.N.T. in the Spanish Revolution. The best short account of this is in the Freedom Press twopenny pamphlet "Social Reconstruction in Spain," a pamphlet highly recommended by the "New Leader" and "Peace News."

It was all drowned in a welter of blood by the intervention of Hitler and Mussolini, the "non-intervention" of Chamberlain and Blum and the treachery of Stalin, but the example will live as the Commune of Paris is still remembered. The path our Spanish comrades hewed will be travelled by millions more.

War springs from the social soil, it cannot be abolished except if the social problem be solved. The workers have the means of emancipation in their hands every working day; they have but to free their minds of the witch doctors magic of the State, that parasitic growth which has developed with its special function of war until the two threaten to destroy mankind unless mankind destroys them.

Anarcho-syndicalists will go on with the struggle against war and for bread and freedom until the old regime is destroyed and all mankind is free. "We are building the new society within the shell of the old."

TOM BROWN.

"Freedom" of the Press

FRANCE.

The Daily Telegraph reports that:

A white Christmas was celebrated by the Paris papers. I was looking yesterday at a number of French dailies, representing all shades of opinion. Their leading articles were alike in showing large spaces of black.

M. Wladimir d'Ormesson's article in the "Figaño," a Conservative paper, contained only his name at the bottom of 12 inches of white space. Pertinax in "L'Ordre" had written more. His signature stood over 22 inches of white

The leading article in M. Leon Blum's paper, the Socialist "Populaire," covered two columns—25 inches of space. It contained the writer's signature, "XX" and one word, "Censuré."

Incidentally, articles by the Socialist leader himself have recently suffered the same fate.

ULSTER.

From the same newspaper:

Sir Dawson Bates, the Ulster Home Secretary, it was officially announced in London yesterday, has under the Civil Authorities Special Powers Act, prohibited the circulation of certain small newspapers from Jan. 1 next to Dec. 31, 1940.

The banned periodicals include the "Republic," the "Republican Congress," "Wolfe Tone Weekly," "Irish Freedom," and the "Sentry."

CANADA.

From the Italian paper *l'Adunata dei Refrattari* we learn that several publications have been banned in Canada. These include I.W.M.A. Press Service (Stockholm), *Nouvel Age* (Paris), *Technocracy* (New York), *Le Reveil Anarchiste* (Geneva), *Labour Monthly* (London), *l'Adunata dei Refrattari* (Newark, N.J.), *Christian Reminders on War* (pamphlet published in Seattle), etc. . . .

More Documents on the Spanish Tragedy

AFTER a long delay, we can at last welcome a few books on the Spanish Revolution written by Spaniards. The need for such books has been very great during the past three years, for the only books that had been published came from the pens of visitors to Spain; there have been many interesting accounts by journalists and some brilliant studies by sociologists, but none have probed sufficiently deeply into the life and struggle of the different anti-fascist sectors. The result is that the war and the revolution in Spain, both complex problems, are poorly understood outside Spain. Above all, the events of the last weeks of the war are unknown, save for the confused reports issued by the Press agencies and the calumnies published by the Communist Press.

For this reason, Colonel Casado's book, "The Last Days Of Madrid," is particularly welcome. It throws some light on events, difficult to understand and above all to evaluate. It is an interesting book (in spite of its lack of literary pretensions) because of the great number of documents and facts it contains. The object of this review is not to discuss the opinions expressed by the author but to give a resumé of the facts.

The coup d'état carried out by Casado took place early in March 1939, when the Negrin Government, which had previously sought refuge in France after the fall of Catalonia, returned to Madrid to give instructions

"The Last Days of Madrid," by Colonel Casado. Published by Peter Davies, 1939, 8/6.

"La Traición de Stalin," by J. García Pradas. Published by Cultura Proletaria, New York, 1939, 75c.

"De Companys a Indelacio Prieto," Documentación sobre las Industrias de Guerra en Cataluña. Published by Ediciones del Servicio de Propaganda Española, Buenos Aires, 1939, 40c.

"Negrin y Prieto culpables de Alta Traición." Published as above, 20c.

for unconditional resistance to the Nationalists. Casado refused to obey the orders of Negrin, for he considered that continued resistance was just sheer suicide. But the antagonism which existed between Casado and Negrin (that is to say, the Communists) did not arise solely as a result of their divergent opinions as to the method of ending the war. For a long time Casado had been able to observe the treacherous manoeuvres of the Communists. He had realised that their aim was not to defeat Fascism but to establish their own domination in Spain. With much cunning they appropriated for themselves the most important positions in the army, which they used to further their own political ends. Their tactics consisted in boycotting, by refusing to hand over 'planes and tanks, all organised action by military men who were not Communist and to launch hopeless offensives in order to increase the prestige of communist leaders. It was in this way that they used their influence to prevent the action against Merida, which would have been a triumph for the Republican Army, and carried out the action against Brunete which was a complete disaster. In spite of the fact that their political influence was never very great they succeeded by degrees in controlling practically the whole army:

"... More than sixty per cent of the Commands of the first units of the People's Army were given to the Communist Party... This percentage of Commands in the People's Army was held by the Communists throughout the whole campaign and even rose higher during the last months, when it reached the exorbitant figure of seventy per cent."

Those men who did not allow themselves to be carried away by flattery and all kinds of promises (promotion in the army, money, etc.) made to them by the Communists, lost their posi-

tions, their liberty and often their lives.

It was after two years of this kind of policy and after the loss of Catalonia, which the Government had done nothing in order to avoid, that Negrin returned to Madrid to impose "unconditional resistance" to Franco. What attitude did he meet with? The military command completely opposed the continuation of a struggle which they knew beforehand was doomed to failure; the Navy decided to leave Spanish waters if peace were not rapidly negotiated; the masses, worn out and without any spirit of resistance, due to the bombardments and the famine; the syndical organisations, Anarchist and Socialist (C.N.T. and U.G.T.) ready to revolt against that Government which had made them suffer all kinds of humiliations and which had succeeded in ousting them from the control of the struggle.

Negrin had little hopes of making himself heard because of his unpopularity, besides the fact that his plans for resistance had no solid foundations. Madrid lacked food. It was impossible to obtain arms, and those they had were wholly inadequate: ten tanks and forty aeroplanes! And whilst Negrin was promising arms what were his agents doing abroad? They were giving orders to sell all goods destined for Spain. Those goods which could not be sold were distributed in the concentration camps in the south of France. If the Communists had intended to continue the struggle would they not have tried to send supplies as rapidly as possible to Madrid?

While ignoring these details, all the anti-fascist sectors in Spain suspected that the Communist policy of continuing the struggle was a manoeuvre to hide a projected coup d'état which would have made it possible for them to flee. These suspicions were confirmed when Negrin promoted Modesto to rank as General, besides three other Communists as military commandants in the most important centres of Murcia, Cartagena and Alicante. Casado, who foresaw his possible arrest (as

did also Mlaja) decided to act and carried out his coup d'état on March 4th, in order to form the Defence Council which was to have as its aim the negotiation of an "honourable peace" with the enemy. The term "honourable peace" is somewhat surprising, for in the conditions existing in the Centre, that is, in the impossibility of imposing their conditions, how could they expect an "honourable peace" at the hands of an enemy which had shown such brutality throughout the war? Colonel Casado and some of his followers, however, hoped that the enemy would have freed themselves of their foreign masters, in the same way as the Republicans had eliminated the Russian agents, in order to negotiate. They thought that Franco was anxious to avoid a massacre which would have made the work of reconstruction in Spain an even greater task, and that he was prepared to give the Republicans time to organise the evacuation.

These hopes were crushed, however, on the one hand by the Communist uprising and on the other by the breaking off of negotiations by Franco. In fact, immediately after the formation of the Defence Council came the Communist revolt, which rapidly extended to most of the armed forces. On March 5th the Communist forces abandoned the front and advanced on Madrid. Then followed a bloody battle between Communists on the one side and Socialists and Anarchists on the other which lasted several days. The hatred which had accumulated over so many long months was released with a vengeance, though all too late to save Spain.

After having succeeded in suppressing the Communist revolt the Council started negotiations but without succeeding in obtaining the necessary respite required to organise the evacuation. In spite of this, Casado gained the impression, from his conversations with Franco's representatives, that a neutral zone at Alicante would be respected.†

The difficulties of the evacuation

were further aggravated by the abandonment of the fronts and the premature sailing of the Fleet. However, the most compromised people were able to reach Alicante, where the International Committee of Co-ordination had undertaken the evacuation, but in vain did they wait in the port for the Committee's ships to take them on board. Owing to France's refusal to offer any guarantee none could be saved. That "democracy" refused these men, for whom prison or the firing squad awaited, the chance of escape which Franco had granted! Negrin, for his part, made sure of not sending the ships which he had at his disposal to Alicante, proving once more his hatred for those who were not his dupes.

Another book dealing with the same events has been written by José García Pradas, ex-editor of the Madrid newspaper 'C.N.T.' "La Traición de Stalin," like Casado's book, is written by one who took an active part in the events. His book completes

Casado's, for it deals more particularly with the attitude of the Syndicalist organisations and the working-class parties, and also gives a vivid picture of the atmosphere surrounding these tragic events.

* * *

Also in Spanish have been published two pamphlets of vital importance, containing documents which expose beyond any doubt the nefarious activity of the Communists in the War Industries (De Companys a Indalecio Prieto, Documentación sobre las Industrias de Guerra en Cataluña) and in the arms deals outside Spain (Negrin y Prieto, Culpables de Alta Traición). The latter explains why Spain lacked arms in spite of her large gold reserve. With that gold it was possible to buy up arms in many countries, as for instance, U.S.A., France, Czechoslovakia. But the Commissions whose task it was to buy the arms were made up of agents of Negrin, men without scruples who squandered the money, refused to take advantage of favourable opportunities to buy arms or aeroplanes and

Historic Documents of the Spanish Struggle

R. ROCKER — The Tragedy of Spain, 7d. (postage 1d.).

GASTON LEVAL — Social Reconstruction in Spain, 1936-1938, 2d. (postage 1d.).

— Three Years of Struggle in Spain (Manifesto of C.N.T.-F.A.I.), 1d. (postage 3d.).

SPAIN AND THE WORLD, Nos. 1-47 (1936-1938). — and **REVOLT!** Nos. 1-6. Complete file, the equivalent of a book of 1,000 pages, containing documents, manifestos, and articles of historic importance.

Only a few sets left 10/6 post free.

COLONEL CASADO — The Last Days of Madrid 8/6 (postage 6d.).

CAMILLO BERNERI — Mussolini à la conquête des Balears, 1/6d. (postage 3d.).

GARCIA PRADAS — La Traición de Stalin, 4/- (post. 3d.).

Orders and remittance should be sent to:

FREEDOM PRESS,
9 NEWBURY STREET, LONDON, E.C.1.

† Casado spoke in Valencia of a promise received, but no promise was made; Franco refused to sign any kind of document.

(Continued from page 15)

even went so far as to sell to Franco the arms destined for the Republicans. Negrin was an impassive witness to all this for he too, received his share of the booty and also because it was necessary that the great lie that "Russia alone can supply us with the arms we need. We must submit to her dictates in order to receive her help" should not be proved false. This lie, which permitted all kinds of concessions to be made, was without a doubt one of the contributing factors of the defeat of Revolutionary Spain.

We cannot recommend too strongly these publications to our readers. We regret that lack of space does not permit long quotations and critical discussion as we should have desired. But for all anarchists the Spanish Revolution must be a subject for continual study in the same way as Russia should be for all sincere Communists. It is only by seeking the causes of our defeats that we can prepare and organise for future victories.

M. L. BERNERI.

AMERICAN WORKERS OPPOSE WAR

Practically every worker in these United States is fervently hoping the United States stays out of the senseless, bloody war now raging in Europe. Many have been lulled into a false sense of security because the general sentiment of the people in the United States is against war. Public sentiment means nothing. It alone will never prevent war. For a verification of this statement we have only to look at the events leading to U.S. participation in the last war.

The people in the U.S. did not want to enter the last war. In fact they re-elected President Wilson on the slogan, "He kept us out of war." Yet, less than a year later we were sending our finest youth across the pond into the blood-soaked trenches of France to "save the world for democracy" and to fight a "war to end all war."

We don't want war to-day but already we are talking about "saving the world for democracy" and "crushing Hitlerism." Shades of 1917!

It is now generally known how the industrialists and financiers manipulated trade to make profits during the war.

Sentiment will not stop it from happening again. Only organisation will. If wars are a growth of the profit system then the profit system must be abolished. The salvation of the entire world lies in a class-conscious working-class organised

W. JOKINEN.

(From "One Big Union Bulletin", Chicago)

The receipt of a specimen copy of **WAR COMMENTARY** is an invitation to subscribe.

Between Ourselves

IN spite of the good response to our appeal in these columns last month for agents and new readers, we are not satisfied by a long way! This is the third issue of **WAR COMMENTARY**, comrades, and we urge you to "push" this issue even more than the last one. We are referring especially to several London comrades who have been conspicuous by their complete absence of activity! Will they respond this month and do their "bit"?

We have received several letters from comrades and friends welcoming the printed **WAR COMMENTARY** and stressing the need for such a publication. We, for our part, have every intention of appearing regularly once a month, but a lot depends on our readers if we will manage to do so. Production costs and postage are more than we can hope to recover by sales alone. Besides this there is the rent to pay every week! Therefore if we are to continue our work we must somehow meet the deficit incurred each issue. We appeal therefore for contributions, large and small, for the Press Fund. In this connection we would mention that several readers promised regular contributions to **REVOLT!** We hope they will do likewise for **WAR COMMENTARY** and that other readers will follow suit.

All correspondence and moneys should be addressed to:

FREEDOM PRESS DISTRIBUTORS

9, Newbury Street, London, E.C.1.

To avoid the possibility of letters being mislaid will correspondents please not address letters to individuals at the above address.

Published by Freedom Press Distributors, 9 Newbury Street, London, E.C.1, and printed by The Narod Press (T.U.), 129/131 Cavell St., London, E.1.