

WAR COMMENTARY

Vol. 1 No. 8-9 Twopence
JUNE-JULY 1940

I.R.A.

Reaction On The March

AS a result of pressure from France, and from influential British "democrats" with a fascist mentality "Freedom" even in its most limited form has ceased to exist in this country. It has not come as a surprise to us. In the last issue of War Commentary we even suggested what technique the Government would use. As the following extract from that issue shows, we were unfortunately correct in our analysis.

(1) Ex-boasters of Hitler clamour for imprisonment of all Germans, as potential spies, including those who risked their lives fighting Hitler underground while these gentlemen wrote letters to "The Times" in their clubs, saying what good Hitler was doing for Germany.

(2) the demand for dissolution of all communist, fascist "defeatist" and similar organisations (the term similar to include trade unions, Labour Parties and co-ops, opposing the war; I.L.P. N.C.L., Peace Pledge Union, Anarchists, educational and civil liberties bodies).

(3) the creation, gradually, of the power of the executive to dissolve anything they choose.

(4) the strengthening of

the executive power as the dictatorial body controlling the country.

(5) Hitlerism, and not even with the social programme that was used to delude the German people.

Action against Aliens is in full swing, following on the example of France where German Socialists, Liberals and others who have opposed Fascism with actions and not with words, are in concentration camps.

Contents

The Labour Party Goes to War	4
Political Morality	5
Nine Months of War, by George Padmore	7
The Immorality of Power, by Reg Reynolds	10
Farming: Before the 1940 Harvest.....	12
Emma Goldman.....	13
The Roman Catholic Church and the Modern Age (III) by F. A. Ridley	14

The next step is the opposition in England. In Parliament there no longer exists an Opposition. The Speaker informed the House that as far as he was concerned it did not exist. And here again it is interesting to note that the same position exists in France. "Peterborough" of the Telegraph writes: "The Communists having been suppressed, there is now nothing deserving the name of a party in the Chamber that is not pro-Reynaud." (The methods of "suppression" are strangely reminiscent of Mussolini's and Hitler's rise to power!).

Unfortunately for the Government the forces in opposition to the war are increasing, and hence the coming into force of the new Defence Regulations in which a direct attack is made on opinion whether expressed at meetings or in the press. With typical British hypocrisy one is told that of course "there is no attempting to punish people who honestly express minority opinions" but in the same breath it is declared that "the purpose of the regulations is to deal with activity which might constitute a grave mischief to the State," and provide for a maximum sentence of seven years penal servitude for any propaganda calculated to "foment opposition" to the successful prosecution of the war! Further difficulties are put in the path of those expressing minority opinions by the intimidation of their printers, who can be penalised by the confiscation of their printing presses and premises. Thus it is that the Pacifist newspaper, Peace News with a weekly circulation of 30,000 copies is having difficulties in finding a printer. The same will be the case for all the "left" Press very shortly.



Opposition to these new regulations, in view of the present critical political period, will be unable to make itself heard. Yet the suppression of opposition whilst not an apparent discomfort to those men and women supporting the war effort is nevertheless a menace which will undoubtedly greatly expand. As this country, in its internal policy, seems to be following France very closely, one can obtain some idea of the effect of curtailing opinion by examining its effect on even the National Press in that country. In spite of the Entente Cordiale censorship of the British news by the French Press continues. The Manchester Guardian for instance seems somewhat alarmed by the fact that the Norway debate in the House of Commons was falsely reported in several French newspapers. The Petit Parisien for instance had "toned down beyond all recognition the arguments used by Sir Roger Keyes . . . while Mr. Amory's speech is scarcely mentioned at all." Leading articles have on more than one occasion been entirely censored, whilst all opposition papers have been suppressed. The effect of press control can hardly be minimised. Have we not been told in the past by all our "democratic" politicians of the shattering effect press control has had on the German people? Have we not

been told by these same people of the "lies" which appear in the controlled press of Germany and which the German people believe because they have no means of knowing the truth? And yet to-day we have made one step towards that state of affairs in this country. And as each day passes so the ruling class, with its dupes in the Labour Party imposes those very same measures which have marked the rise of Fascism in Germany and against which the self-declared "lovers of liberty" are supposed to be fighting!



"War Commentary" in the seven months of its existence has been struggling to put forward the truth. It is not enough to be opposed to war as are the great majority of Pacifists. And it is not enough to assume that when there will be a majority in favour of peace wars will be abolished. For, as Roosevelt once rather cynically pointed out though there were 90% of the people in favour of peace the remaining 10% contrived to make war possible. And therein lies the problem. We must understand the system which creates wars and find how best to fight it and destroy it. All this talk of "negotiated peace" of "Federal Union" of "calling a conference with Roosevelt" is wasted breath and wishful thinking.

We are not defeatists. Defeatists are those who look upon war as inevitable. Those learned gentlemen who write to the Times about the "laws of human nature," they are the defeatists for they offer no solution to the peoples who live constantly in the shadow of war. We Anarchists offer what we consider the only solution. But unlike the politicians we do not ask you to give us Power, or to represent you in what has been often called London's best Club—The House of Commons. We reject Power and the bureaucracy which it creates as the greatest cancer that has afflicted mankind. The results of Power vested in individuals and political cliques is making itself felt throughout the world by the sacrifice of millions of lives in a struggle which no one can show is in the interests of the people. We instead say that we shall solve the problem only when the peoples of the world will feel the cause of freedom and justice so strongly as to come to realise that they must take their share of the responsibility in the administration of their countries. It is not sufficient to say that the Parliamentary system answers these demands. And eloquent proofs have been pro-

vided by the new Defence Regulations passed in the House in less than three hours and without a division, in which every man, woman and child becomes a pawn in the hands of a powerful ruling body. Was the country consulted? Did the "representatives" of the people consult their respective constituents in order to reflect their opinions in the House?

Everywhere we hear the remark "But this is Fascism." Of course it is, and let it be remembered that once we surrender those few liberties which have been wrested from the State by the workers sacrifice and martyrdom (do you remember the Tolpuddle martyrs, Messrs: Attlee, Bevin and Co.?), it will require all that sacrifice and struggle to regain them.

We Anarchists by reason of our small numbers can do nothing to change the present situation. But we can show the way to the building of the new society (in which "Liberty, Freedom, Equality" will not be just fine words) by our unflinching stand against the war and its causes and by our willingness to sacrifice even our lives for this cause, if necessary. That is our contribution to humanity, to progress and civilization.

POSTSCRIPT

The preceding article had been written for publication at the beginning of June instead of, as is the case, at the end of June. But the facts remain. Only to those already given can be added many more.

In the meantime, Italy has entered the war, the French Army defeated and Spain gets ready to play her role!

The same Mr. Churchill who only a short time ago boasted that he was "the first Englishman to wear a black shirt" and that had he been an Italian his vote would have been given for Mussolini (whilst we were doing everything in our power to make known to the British people the meaning of Fascism) is now the 100% anti-fascist and we, because we do not join in the Government lip service, are accused of being enemy agents!

Repression is being intensified. Besides rounding up a number of Fascist leaders and their stooges, the authorities have started directing their attention to Pacifists, Socialists and Anarchists. A well known pacifist speaker, Frederick Lohr whose article on Political Morality we publish elsewhere in this issue, has been sentenced to three months imprison-

ment on the usual charge. We also learn of the arrest of an old Anarchist comrade whose platform regularly drew large audiences. And whilst the authorities arrest genuine anti-fascists (we make a distinction between these and our part-time anti-fascists who tomorrow if need be will be again singing the praises of Hitler and Mussolini), the dangerous Fascists can continue their work. The truth will out, even if it is too late, as is the case in France where anti-fascists, Communists, political refugees etc. have been imprisoned or left to die in concentration camps. Now we read in the Reynolds News (23/6/40) that "the 100 French Senators and Deputies who assembled in the Athenaeum Theatre in Bordeaux yesterday to affirm their support of the Petain Cabinet are known to have strong Fascist sympathies. They do not represent the French people."

Well, well! And when will the workers cease to be the dupes of politicians?

POLITICAL MORALITY

(continued from page 6)

tives. Change will not come about by reform. The body politic is diseased and decaying and new blood cannot cleanse it. To construct a new world order we need a sound and secure foundation. Only the principles of social and economic justice can provide this foundation, and only men imbued with passionate devotion to truth can build the edifice. Political morality today is bankrupt; it is questionable whether it ever existed, and if the future morality is to govern the conduct of men, we must, without any further loss of time, define our attitude to these principles.

The most effective way of demonstrating our belief in any political morality is by propagating and living according to principles which would contribute towards the creation of an ethical Society, i.e. a happy community. This means the propagation of the ideas of production for use, distribution to need, substitution of Government authority by elevation of individual responsibility. We must become agitators against the acceptance of immoral capitalist values, breed revolt and disgust in the minds of the workers against the existing commercial code. We must harness this spirit of revolt into a political weapon against capitalism and imperialism, an instrument which will be sharp and true because it will be the instinctive expression of an aspiration for a fuller ethic in life.

Frederick Lohr

The Labour Party ● Goes To War

"If we are so weak and so foolish that we are going to be made tools of by this government, and led up the garden path of imperialism . . . we shall deserve our fate."
Mr. Attlee (Brighton 1935)

In the summer of 1914 the Labour Party was passionately for peace; within a few days of the outbreak of war it was howling for blood. After the war when the workers' disillusionment grew, the Labour Party became the party of peace. Now that capitalism again goes to war the Labour Leaders plump for slaughter.

After the war, when peace is again a safe policy the Labour Party will declare for peace and denounce its rivals as war-mongers—until the next war. It is safe to be a pacifist in time of peace.

So the Labour Party conference was a conference of war. Some organisations call conferences to form a policy. Not so the Labour Party, its policy is decided by the Conservative Party. The Party leaders can never make up their minds about anything until the Government decides.

The high spot of the Conference was the speech of Leon Blum the celebrated Popular Fronter and non-interventionist. The speech was in French which very few of the delegates could understand.

The New Statesman (May 18'40) states he was given a polite but lukewarm reception, but as he spoke he aroused great enthusiasm. "He (Blum) actually succeeded in carrying with him a conference which did not understand what he said." There is nothing remarkable in this. Macdonald often did the same.

The Labour Party enters the government as was long expected. Its entry is followed by new powers of repression. The progressive offensive against trade union rights and working conditions the persecution of the P.P.U. (particularly sellers of "Peace News") and the imprisonment without charge of the governments opponents, these are the fruits of "Labour" office holders.

Churchill reserves the two most unpleasant jobs for the Labour Leaders. Attlee announces the suspension of law and demands complete dictatorial powers for the Churchill govern-

ment, Bevin organises industrial conscription. Churchill kills two birds with one stone. He gets the power he seeks and discredits for ever the Labour Party and T.U.C.

It is true Attlee said the government did not intend to use the powers yet. When will they use them? Certainly in the aftermath of war they will be needed tenfold. Mr. Greenwood told a Manchester meeting "The country may have to face an army of 7,000,000 unemployed after the war."

Seven million unemployed and a large army of cripples, a greatly reduced dole and rising inflation! Messrs Churchill Chamberlain and Attlee will need their dictatorial powers.

The Communist Party supplies its usual light relief. Last year the "*Daily Worker*" and the C.P. shouted "Let Attlee, Sinclair and Churchill get together without another minute's delay and express their readiness to form a new Government of the people."

And now that we have a government of Churchill, Attlee and Sinclair? Listen to the "*Daily Worker*" (May 10, 1940) "A pretty Parliamentary game. The "*Daily Herald*" thunders against Chamberlain but is silent about Churchill. What a man to take under the wing of the Labour Party! He has now two Gallipolis to his credit. Perhaps the Labour leaders will help him to carry off a third."

The C.P. always opposes one day what it proposed the day before. **T.B.**

CORRECTIONS

The May issue (Vol 1 No. 7) contained a few mistakes which we wish to correct:

In the article **For the Workers International** Page 1 first line rear: "Two years ago May Day coincided with the bloody repression of the Revolution in Spain . . ." This should have read "Three years ago . . ." referring to the May Days in Catalonia in 1937.

In the article "**Liberty Equality, Fraternity**" The concluding paragraph Page 6 "For the moment, it must be the task of the comrades in England and France . . . to make known the facts . . ." Instead of "France" substitute "America."

Also on Page 6 we refer to E.P. . . as Emergency Precautions Act, instead of Emergency Powers Act.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES

One Year — 2/6 (post free)

6 Months — 1/6 (post free)

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

Political Morality

In 1914 there was considerable parliamentary opposition to War. A large section of public opinion mistrusted the motives actuating the Government of that day. The people then were told that the Government had no imperialist aims, that they fought for no base materialism, but that their war policy was justified by high moral purpose. Subsequent history revealed that the ostensible justification for the war had no relation whatsoever to the real reasons which induced the Government to declare war. The Peace Treaties disclosed the aim of the war effort not as a higher morality, but a grosser materialism.

Last September there was not a great deal of parliamentary opposition to the declaration of war. This was due to the clouding of fundamental issues by an even greater emphasis than before on the moral question. The political Left, nominally in opposition to capitalist Government, permitted their hatred of continental Fascism to blind them completely to the real issues involved. Outside parliament, however, there was again considerable opposition to the Government's war policy. There was again widespread suspicion among the public that it was dictated by the same material considerations as before. Considered in the light of the history of the present Government's term of office, the high moral propaganda used to justify the War is transparently base and hypocritical.

Despite everything written and said to the contrary, all official effort since the last war has been directed towards the maintenance of Power Politics. The apparent willingness in the past to consider the relinquishment of Force and the settlement of European political problems by negotiation, has been mere lip-service to Peace, in order to placate public opinion. When the disposition of Power was overwhelmingly onesided, nothing but talk was contributed towards the cause of peace, and immediately the status quo of Power alignment was threatened, the true nature of political morality manifested itself in re-armament and military alliances. Analysis of the structure of modern capitalist society shows that it could not have been otherwise.

Political power has but one institutional

function, and that is to acquire or maintain control of the production and distribution of wealth.

All highly industrialised nations are perpetually in a state of commercial rivalry for markets. Due to the export of the means of production in the forms of capital and machinery, the markets for the surplus products of industry are steadily shrinking. The continued extension of machine mass-production methods reduces costs, but, lacking an expanding market, causes unemployment, which resulting in reduced home consumption, intensifies the struggle to secure monopolies in foreign markets, and renders exclusive control of the sources of raw materials imperative. The outcome of this competition is an economic war in which the national economy or standard of living is sacrificed in an endeavour to maintain competition abroad. In its efforts to preserve its home markets from foreign penetration, each country erects tariff walls, and those countries which lack "imperial markets," i.e. dumping grounds, are compelled to find ways and means of overcoming the restrictions to their export trade. Tariff walls are scaled by subsidising export trade at the expense of home consumption. A point is reached where costs can only be reduced by depression of wages. The continued depression of the purchasing power of the home market, creating unemployment and distress, compels the introduction of a totalitarian economy, which must be successful in securing export trade by commercial competition, or must resort to war to acquire markets by force. Failure to secure markets by commercial competition leaves but one method open by which profit can be maintained and surplus labour absorbed: a war economy is adopted. The diversion of labour and capital to the stultifying programme of re-armament, whilst giving apparent temporary relief from unemployment, piles up the burden of national debt, still further depresses the potential purchasing power of the people and creates a very understandable fear of aggression in surrounding countries, who each resort in turn to the piling up of more armaments and debt in order to guarantee their security and protect their markets.

Such was the position existing in 1914 and existing in a much more intense form since 1932.

The Armistice of 1918 was not the end of the War, but only one phase of it. The Treaties were framed not with the idea of making peace, but of continuing war. The economic war continued with unabated fury, until another impasse arose from which there appeared no other alternative to war except a revolutionary rearrangement of world-economy; an alternative which, if accepted, would entail a complete repudiation of the principles of profit and privilege on which our society is built, and which for obvious reasons our present rulers would never voluntarily accept.

To-day, as in 1914, Germany is the spearhead of the attack of those countries which challenge the economic supremacy of the British Empire. The nations will line up against each other ostensibly according to their so-called national interests, but really according to the international interests of their competitive economies. The issue must be clearly seen thus. No question of ideological loyalty or political morality is involved, or should be allowed to confuse our analysis. It may be that the totalitarian states will fight together against the western "democracies," but this will signify no harmony of ideas between the various partners. No ideological loyalty unites Russia and Germany, Italy and Japan. Each is out to secure for itself a greater share of world power, and as any acquisition must be at the expense of the "have" nations, these will unite to resist. No ideological sympathy induced capitalist-democratic Britain and France to guarantee the false frontiers of near-Fascist Rumania, Greece and Poland. The so-called Peace Front was erected in an attempt to prevent the expansion of Germany's economic power in Europe. Mr. Butler's cynical interpretation in the House of Commons of the Polish guarantee, was sufficient to indicate this. (It will be remembered that when asked whether the guarantee against aggression given to Poland implied aggression by ANY power, Mr. Butler replied that it was understood, though not stated that GERMAN aggression only was considered.)

If we accept the argument that Wars are fought to decide the right to control natural resources and human labour, then our struggle against War is not merely a question of the

renunciation of War by lethal weapons, but of repudiation of the principles of economy, and of social relationship, which lead directly to War. We must recognize that War is not an event but an institution, a recognised and accepted instrument of Policy, and being so the determination to retain the plunder of the last war will do more to knit together the so-called Peace-Front against aggression, than any pseudo-affinities of ideologies.

Since the recognition of the inefficiency and evil produced by the outbirths of capitalist economic principles, confers upon us the moral responsibility to effect change by the creation of conditions which, by their planned nature, cannot be productive of evil, it follows that we must wholehearted enter into the struggle against War and militarism with honest minds, clear of intellectual casuistry and wishful thinking. In this connection our support is invited for many plausible and well-meaning schemes for the reconstruction of the world (after the war) all of which lay claim to ethic values. The political and economic Federation of "democratic" States is offered as a solution to war. The establishment of a World-State is advanced as the only way to progress and Peace. Money reform providing for further expansion of consumer-power is advocated as the first necessity. Land reform, Parliamentary reform, etc. etc.

We must ask ourselves, by whom and for whose benefit, are these programmes advanced? Federal Union of whom? World-State governed by whom? Do these prospects specifically state the intention to abolish our present property-money values, the use of usury, the private control of production and distribution. Do they advocate destruction of class or authoritative privilege? Do they really set about the repudiation of fundamental principles, or are they efforts to mitigate the effects of Capitalism and War. If they advocate the former then we must ask ourselves, can we honestly expect our present capitalist ruling class to conscientiously destroy itself, and if not, then how will these Utopian schemes be put into operation?

Many of us talked for years of creating Peace by removing the causes of war. If we believe Causes will have to be eradicated, let us not mess about any longer with, attempts to reform effects with palliatives and restora-

(Continued on Page 3, Column 2)

NINE MONTHS OF WAR

Nine months of war ! And what are its effects upon the colonial peoples?

In spite of the ruthless censorship of news from the colonies and the hush-hush policy of the Colonial Office illustrated in its suppression of the West Indies Royal Commission Report, news of repression and terrorism throughout the Colonial Empire is gradually coming to light.

Here are some indisputable facts which we challenge the Secretary of State for Colonies to deny.

FASCISM INVADES SIERRA LEONE

The Emergency Powers Act, passed immediately after the declaration of war by the National Government, with the approval of the Labour Party, ostensibly against Nazi activities in Britain, is now being used by Colonial authorities to tighten the yoke of Imperialism around the necks of the natives.

Thanks to these Defence Regulations, all Colonial Governors have been vested with absolutely dictatorial powers over the lives of more than 60,000,000 people. They can order the arrest and imprisonment without trial of any native whom they consider "undesirable." All fundamental safeguards of the subject, such as habeas corpus, have been abolished "for the duration."

On the very day that the Prime Minister declared the 400,000,000 natives of India and the Colonial Empire belligerents without their consent, Sir Douglas Jardine, Governor of Sierra Leone, West Africa, ordered the arrest and detention in a concentration camp of the well-known African trade union leader, Wallace Johnson.

COLONIAL SECRETARY DEFENDS GOVERNOR'S ACTION

When questioned in Parliament about the Governor's high-handed action, Mr. MacDonald, Colonial Secretary, cynically remarked that "I see no ground to question the Governor's decision." To

which Mr. Paling, Labour M.P. riposter that Johnson's crime was that "he had been agitating for better conditions among the people, miners in particular who are working in the mines (iron ore) for as little as 6d per day."

Since then Johnson has been removed from the internment camp and sent to prison for one year on the charge of having written an article months before the outbreak of war in which he criticised the administration of a British official.

By

George Padmore

He received trial on this occasion. A farce as complete as anything that has ever been played out in a court of justice. Johnson was permitted to see his lawyer only the day before he was taken from the concentration camp to the court. Defence Counsel demanded trial by jury. The judge refused and personally selected three Assessors—two white men and an African Government official—to help him try the defendant. Counsel objected to this procedure, pointing out that the judge himself was associated with the case at an earlier date and that one of the three Assessors was a Frenchman—M. Marterey—who had only very recently become a naturalised British subject and was not well acquainted with the English language. The other European Assessor—Mr. Gibson—was the manager of the firm of Paterson, Zachanis and Co. Ltd., a member of the "Commercial Pool," whose operations had been criticised by Johnson, as inimical to the interests of the native workers and peasants. Mr. Mammoth, the third Assessor, was a Civil Servant, and not eligible to adjudicate in a case in which another Government Officer was involved.

The judge over-ruled all legitimate objections raised by Johnson's counsel, whom he ordered to sit down. Counsel there and then retired from the case and walked out of court, accompanied by other African barristers as a gesture of protest against such Star Chamber procedure. After serving his term of one year, Johnson, if he is still alive, will be taken back to the camp. For he is now in the prison hospital dangerously ill with dysentery contracted during his internment.

The whole purpose behind the persecution of militants like Johnson is to intimidate those who have the courage to take the initiative in organising the downtrodden native masses. The imperialists hope that by arresting and imprisoning such native leaders they will sow terrorism among the workers and thereby frustrate the development of trade unionism in the colonies. For despite the recent legislation legalising trade unionism in the colonies

we must have no illusions. Employers—and even many officials—are hostile to the principle of collective bargaining. Mr. P. de V. Allen, the Principal Labour Officer in Kenya, told the Commission of Inquiry into labour disturbances in that colony in 1932 that he does not favour trade unions for Africans. Instead he proposed the formation of a "Committee of Native workers, with a white chairman."

This from the lips of a labour official who is supposed to be the "trustee and protector" of defenceless natives against vested interests is very revealing. It is obvious that the Africans will have many Tolpuddle martyrs before they achieve their victory.

REPRESSION IN THE WEST INDIES

The well-known West Indian trade unionist, Uriah Butler, whose activities served to bring so forcefully before the British public the wretched conditions of the West Indian workers, has been arrested for opposing the war. Butler has been exiled to Nelson Island, a penal settlement off the mainland of Trinidad.

All political and labour activities have been greatly circumscribed. Public meetings and demonstrations are forbidden. Not more than ten workers can assemble. All opposition to the war is considered "seditious" and punished accordingly. The latest news is that two trade union officials, Alley Denawa and Quintin O'Connor, were arrested and fined £3 or 21 days' imprisonment for addressing a meeting of electrical workers demanding higher pay to meet the increased cost of living. Both men were also placed under a bond of £10 each to refrain from further labour activities. The judge threatened to send them to jail without the option of a fine next time!

In Jamaica the situation has become so intolerable that even newspapers are not allowed to refer to political events in India. Nor are they permitted to publish news dealing with strikes and other forms of industrial unrest in other parts of the world. Information about wage increases granted to British workers to meet the rising cost of living is strictly forbidden. It is feared that such news might incite the Negroes to similar demands upon the Government and private employers. The Governor has also forbidden meetings of the Ethiopian Society, a body working on behalf of Abyssinian refugees and the restoration of Abyssinia's freedom.

Such is the restriction of the Colonial Press, that in Dominica, a native editor has been forbidden by the Local Authorities to print Ministry of Information "hand-outs" passed by the British Censor!

THE FOOD PROBLEM

Everywhere the cost of living has gone up enormously. In some islands more than 150 per cent! To appreciate what this means two factors must be kept in mind: (1) The overwhelming majority of West Indians are landless and therefore unable to provide their own food. (2) Wages are very low. The average wage of plantation labourers—for most of the people work on the land—is about 1/6d per day. Artisan and skilled workers receive be-

tween 2/- and 4/- per day. In Trinidad—the only island with an oil industry—there are a few skilled mechanics receiving £3 per week, but they are few and far between.

On the other hand, the price of manufactured goods and staple foods are as high as in Britain. Paradoxical as it may seem, these tropical colonies, although chiefly agricultural, import most of their food. The people live on tinned goods!

Here are some statistics to show the rise in prices in Trinidad. Beef has increased from an average of 9d per lb. to 10½d—27%; condensed milk, 3½d per small tin to 7d—100%; butter from 1/6d to 2/- per lb.—30%; potatoes from 2d to 2½d per lb.—25%; corn from 2d to 2½d per lb.—25%; and split peas, used largely among the very poor as a substitute for meat have increased from 2d to 6d per lb., that is, 200%.

Recently the death was reported of several natives who had died from arsenic poisoning caused by inferior grade sugar imported into Trinidad from Demerara!

In Bermuda prices are even higher. According to the Government Food Supply Control Board, the minimum prices are: chilled beef, 1/3d per lb; butter 2/- per lb; coffee 1/6d per lb; flour 2½d lb; condensed milk 7d per tin; potatoes 3½d per lb; rice 3d per lb; sugar 3½d per lb; and tea 2/9d lb.

Is it any wonder that colonial government reports assert that the overwhelming majority of natives are suffering from malnutrition. Only the workers and God know how these workers even manage to exist!

In contrast there are others who are doing well enough out of the war. They are the sugar kings and oil barons—the merchant princes who have a monopoly over imported food and are well represented on committees presumably controlling the retail prices of foodstuffs. There is control, of course. Not, however, upon the European wholesale dealers, but of the small shopkeepers, largely East Indians and Chinese.

Just a brief glance at the 1939 profits of some British companies with West Indian interests tell the story. Tate and Lyle (sugar refiners), £1,319,788—dividend 13½%; Trinidad Leaseholds (oil), £580,464—15%; Apex Trinidad Oilfields, Ltd., £175,858—30%; and Trinidad Petroleum Development, Ltd., £181,074—15% dividend.

MONOPOLIES SQUEEZE AFRICAN FARMERS

The war has given a knock-out blow to the native cocoa farmers of West Africa. During the last war natives received as much as £60 a ton for their crops, but this time it is the European trading monopolies who are skimming the cream.

Shortly after the outbreak of war the Imperial Government bought up the entire cocoa crop for 1939-40 at the price of £16/16- per ton at Accra, which is below the cost of production. In 1913 cocoa was fetching about £40 a ton in Accra, and by 1919 had risen to £120 per ton.

The cocoa is marketed by a special board set up in conjunction with the Ministry of Food, under the Chairmanship of Mr. John Cadbury, a Director of Cadbury Brothers, Ltd., the biggest cocoa and chocolate manufacturers in Britain. In this way

the chocolate manufacturers obtain their cocoa supplies for very little above the fixed price the producers receive from the Government. After satisfying the Home country's needs, the special Marketing Board sells the remainder of the African crop in neutral markets—in particular, the United States—at the most competitive price. With the proceeds the British Government is able to acquire the dollars necessary for financing its purchases of aeroplanes and other war materials.

The situation, however, has been so exploited in the interests of the British buyers that the biggest American combine (\$3,000,000) Rockwood and Co., are threatening to seek their cocoa supplies elsewhere. The whole business is a complete swindle. The fixed price control of the Government ties down the native, provides fat profits for the British chocolate manufacturers, and is helping to pay for the war—of course, at the expense of the native.

A very similar situation obtains in respect of other raw materials. The fixed price paid natives for palm oil is £7 per ton as compared with £13/8/4 in 1937. This commodity, used for manufacturing margarine is under the control of Mr. H. Davis, Oil and Fat Controller in the Ministry of Food. Mr. Davis was formerly a director of Lever Bros. and Unilever, which, through their subsidiary, United Africa Company, dominate the trade and commerce of West Africa. Incidentally, Mr. Knight of the United Africa Company, is Director of Oils and Fats, while Mr. J. P. van den Bergh, of Van den Bergh and Jurgens, another subsidiary, is a Director of Margarine in the Ministry of Food, and Mr. C. L. Salter, another representative of the last Company, is Director of Imported Oils and Fats.

The low prices paid the natives for their crops means decreased purchasing power, which in turn means decrease in revenue. And since the colonial governments depend to a large extent upon customs duties to finance their administrations, any fall in this respect immediately has an adverse effect upon the social services.

Several Governors have already introduced new taxation measures. For example, the export duty on cocoa has been raised by the Gold Coast Government by 18/8 to 42/- per ton, which inflicts additional hardship upon the native farmers.

In Nigeria a new Income Bill was passed in March 1940, making Africans with £500 income liable to a tax of £7/6/8 while Europeans with a similar income are liable for only £2/10/0.

In E. & S. Africa the conditions of the natives are even worse than those in West Africa. The majority of the blacks in these parts of the continent are landless proletarians, working for wages on plantations and in mines. Wages are shamefully low and direct taxation inordinately high. The average income of a Kenya native is about £3 per annum, of which he pays an average of 12/- poll tax. In the South African Union poll tax is £1.

The ruthless exploitation of cheap labour is reaping tremendous profits for the mining companies. In 1929 the Rand Mines Ltd. declared a net profit of £1,042,200 and 160 per cent. dividend. Randfontein Estates Gold Mining Co. Ltd., £1,319,913 profit; while the West Rand Consolidated Mines, Ltd., announced a net profit of £1,443,030.

The chief cause of discontent among the natives is low wages and high taxation.

BRITISH TROOPS KILL AFRICAN STRIKERS

This cause operated behind the recent strike of native workers in the copper mines of Northern Rhodesia, during the course of which 19 Africans were killed and about 90 wounded.

This massacre of defenceless natives has blown sky-high all the official propaganda about happy, prosperous Africans subscribing to buy warships and aeroplanes "to fight Hitler." The Negroes asked for bread, but their masters gave them hot lead!

Official apologists will doubtless soon be describing the strike as the work of Nazi agents. For whenever colonial peoples revolt against the intolerable conditions imposed upon them by their so-called democratic, peace-loving British "trustees," the blame is never placed where it should be, but is attributed to the machinations of the wicked dictator enemy of the moment.

Drastic official censorship has almost completely repressed the news of this strike, but truth like murder will out, with due embarrassment to those who pose as lily white upholders of the rights of the backward peoples of the world.

Copper is an essential raw product for war materials, and in consequence of the demand the mining companies of Northern Rhodesia have been speeding up production. Output and profits have risen vastly, but the wages of the native miners have remained stationary. On the other hand, taxation and the cost of living have increased.

Thus on March 16th miners employed at the Mutulira concessions demanded a 25 per cent. wage increase with a further 5 per cent. to meet the cost of living rise. The strike committee also demanded a reduction in overtime, adequate housing for all employees, an eight-hour bank-to-bank shift and establishment of the closed-shop principle. In addition the natives wanted an investigation into silicosis, a disease common among the Africans in the Copper Belt.

The local management refused to negotiate with the workers' representatives on the grounds that "it was inopportune for the natives to make demands upon the company at a time when they had to strain every nerve to furnish the Imperial Government with copper for war purposes."

The Company officials endeavoured to carry on operations with blackleg labour, and clashes occurred between the workers and the strike-breakers. Police reinforcements were brought to the mines and tear-gas bombs were turned on the strikers. This intimidation failed in its desired effect, and the aid of the Southern Rhodesian Prime Minister was sought. European troops were rushed from Bulawayo to Nkana, the scene of the strike, where shooting took place. Martial law was proclaimed, and the strikers were driven back to work at the point of bayonets.

This is the second time within five years that native miners in Northern Rhodesia have been killed by British troops in the struggle for improved conditions.

(Continued on Page 16, column 2)

Reg Reynolds on

*"Power, like a desolating pestilence,
Pollutes whate'er it touches: and obedience.*

*Bane of all genius, freedom, virtue,
truth,*

*Makes slaves of men, and of the human
frame*

A mechanized automaton."



Thus Shelley, our greatest anarchist poet. This problem of Power and of our attitude towards it seems to me by far the most important of all those that face us. It is, indeed, central to all other problems of our social life and our answer to the many questions raised—or rather, forced upon us—by our social environment

might fall to a federal committee of Syndicates could be described as tantamount to state authority. Nobody who has seriously studied the problem of social organisation under anarchism can doubt that such federal committees would have to exist—up to and including world committees dealing with problems which concerned everyone. These problems would include the fair distribution of rare minerals (such as radium) forethought in maintaining adequate world supplies of other commodities, the avoidance of waste through over-lapping, the provision of reserves for local shortages (crop failures etc.) and so on. If I were asked how I differentiate between the responsibilities of such organisations and the state authority that I wish to abolish I should say primarily by three points of contrast. Firstly, the authority of a syndicate or its executive or of a federation of syndicates is limited to a cer-

The Immorality of Power

must depend upon what answer we have given to this first and fundamental question—"What is your attitude to Power?"

By Power as I am now considering it—spelt with a capital P.—I do not mean merely force or energy, either physical or mental. I am using it in the restricted sense in which Shelley obviously used it, of the absolute authority exercised by one human being over another or of one group of individuals over another group. I am not even concerned here with the limited authority exercised for a fixed period of time (by consent) when a chairman regulates the discussions of a meeting or a committee makes arrangements on behalf of an organisation. Chairmen, committees, editors and even "captains" (on ships) are probably indispensable to modern social organisation, so long as meetings are conducted on the basis that only one person shall speak at a time and decisions have to be made at which it is not possible for all concerned to be invariably convened. Decentralisation reduces such delegated responsibility to a minimum but does not completely obviate it—the result is that less is delegated and that there is closer supervision of the delegate.

It is difficult to define the precise limits of the term "Power" in the sense I am giving to it—as difficult, but no more so, as it would be to say at what point the responsibilities that

tain province of life—it does not, like state authority, stretch out in a limitless series of demands. Secondly, the authority of such organisations is, in the main, authority over *things* rather than over *people*. And thirdly whereas the state begins with the assumption that its authority is indisputable and graciously delegates some of this authority to—say—an urban district council, the syndicates start from the other end. In a federation of syndicates the federation only possesses the strictly limited authority delegated to it, and that (it may be) subject to time limits. Thus the syndicalist organisation is not only limited functionally; but the "higher" centres of organisation possess less of this limited authority than the lower. For a syndicate or federation of syndicates to over-step itself and "legislate" in the sense that the state legislates, on all and sundry matter, would be as unthinkable as the idea that the British Medical Association should attempt to tax cyclists.

This apparent digression does to some extent clarify the meaning I attach to "Power." The difference between an organisation having limited functional authority, progressively more limited as one reaches its higher centres, and an organisation of unlimited authority is the difference between power with a small "p" and Power with a large one—Power in the abstract

—Power to do what you like with the lives of others to make your own rules and break them and then rule yourself in order again.

That is Power.

On this subject I have recently been writing various places and have incurred considerable measure of misrepresentation. Two articles criticism from Marxists, with the usual good measure of misrepresentation. Two articles of mine on Power which appeared in *Peace News* drew a kind of blind broadside from a writer in the *Socialist Vanguard* based upon a series of quite fantastic misquotations. The incident is worth noting as an example, in a small way, of the corruption against which we have to fight, because (if we are to unmask Power Lust as the main source of that corruption) we shall find our enemies not only among our present rulers but among their would-be successors, not merely among the oppressors of today but among those who aspire to be the tyrants of tomorrow.

The socialist defence of Power, as put forward by this writer (Ruth Hall) consisted almost entirely in arranging a kind of Aunt Sally, supposed to represent our case, and then knocking it down. When I wrote and protested the identification of my views with expressions and sentiments that I had never put forward, Miss Hall replied, more in grief than in anger, that it was a pity I had spent space in refuting "alleged" misrepresentations instead of discussing the "essential problem." Yet this very controversy showed that part of the "essential problem" is how to present our case without having it distorted beyond recognition; and this takes us back once more to the problems of Power and social ethics. The fact is that the corruption of Power extends right down to the petty tyranny of little editors of "Left" periodicals. If there is to be freedom (with some ethical standards) applied to social life clearly it is here that we must begin—in the dealings of "comrades" with one another. The conduct of the *Socialist Vanguard* was all too typical of what one has learnt to expect—my original protest was published, followed by a "reply" from Ruth Hall even more outrageous in its mendacity than her previous article. Then the matter was regarded as closed and a further protest from myself refused publication.

As it was Miss Hall's principal argument that

my objections to Power were "pacifist" objections, I take this opportunity of repeating that the case against Power as I see it has nothing whatsoever to do with pacifism, except that every pacifist is logically bound to subscribe to it. And I claim the right to have my case judged by what I have said—by the arguments *actually advanced* and not by the irrelevant remarks that I am "prone to pacifist thinking" because I was once secretary of the No More War Movement! (Such was Miss Hall's explanation of her misquotations). My case against this "socialist" critic (since the "Socialist" editor denies me the right to reply in his paper) is that the desire to "be one's own master" is a common desire and a natural one. In a later article I hope to give a clearer conception of what I understand by freedom; but for the time being—since most of us, however academic, have some practical conception of what we mean by the term—I would make it clear that in my opinion ethics are as much concerned with freedom as with one's right to food and clothes. In fact, without freedom there is no material security, so that right to be without a master is bound up with the right to eat and live. Ruth Hall, who gives us the gratuitous information that she is a "psychologist," finds this objection to having a master "childish." Since it is a living necessity, bound up with our material needs as well as the sense of justice, we may confidently hope that a large section of mankind will always preserve this childish dislike of slavery in any disguise.

GOVERNMENTAL AUTHORITY

Power not only corrupts—it is *itself corrupt*, an anti-social and unethical conception. Even the surgeon who operates on my unconscious body has no arbitrary right to do what he pleases with it; and the highest functionary in the social organism should have his authority similarly limited both in extent and duration. My critic in the *Socialist Vanguard* proposed to obviate the corruptions of bureaucracy by relying on an apostolic succession of benevolent despots—a delightful *reductio ad absurdum* of Marxist theories of dictatorship! The Catholic Church, with more consistency, postulated infallibility as an attribute of absolute authority; and it is especially necessary in appointing a successor to a benevolent despot; for a single mistake might produce a dynasty of Neros and Caligulas.

FARMING : BEFORE THE 1940 HARVEST

(From a Correspondent)

Agriculture, from the aspect of a nation at war, has many disturbing features. Perhaps, though, it would be truer to say that the war has brought into prominence chronic ills which have beset farming during the past twenty years.

When Kropotkin wrote that cultivation in England need only be practiced on the same scale as in Lombardy or Flanders in order to sustain a population of 80 million, he naturally could not consider the disuse and the neglect of our contemporary period. Another objection which might be pleaded against his plan is that what applies to two provinces cannot with equal strength apply to a whole nation.

The problem confronting the authorities today is how to redress the wrongs of the last twenty years. Can they be remedied, or has the rot gone too deep? I shall try to answer this question in the small space which this article allots me. That land which is irretrievable to the farming community consists of the thousands of acres converted into building property. Added to this, several millions of acres have been put out of commission since 1914. Since 1930 alone £225,000,000 in capital have been removed from the land.

GOVERNMENT ASSISTANCE

Government assistance in the past few years has taken the form of setting up a Milk Marketing Board, a Pig Marketing Board, and

THE IMMORALITY OF POWER (Cont.)

Such problems can be left to those who are concerned with the organisation of a slave society. To those who claim the right to judge for themselves whether the society in which they live is "good" or "bad," there can be no arbiter but the people; and the more this right and this responsibility are realised by the masses, the less authority governments will exert. In the past there has been much discussion as to whether democracy is conducive to "good" government. The real answer is that true democracy is not conducive to any government at all. It is the negation of government.

a Potato Marketing Board. The first of these operates in such a way as to satisfy most farmers because it gives them a steady market for their milk. On the other hand, the large dairies profit enormously — one of the members of this board being the owner of the United Dairies. Last year, the final coup was almost forcibly given to the small dairy when a law just missed being passed which insisted upon the pasteurisation of all milk. It is for my reader to decide whether this law was designed for humanitarian or financial ends. The Potato Marketing Board established many restrictions — now removed because of war exigencies — on the sale of potatoes. A potato, for instance, had to be so large and no larger in order to be sold to the market. This prohibition was intended to eliminate some of the crop from the market, and also to prevent too great a yield per acre. Prices, in this way, were kept up.

SKILLED LABOUR FOR AGRICULTURE

So far, the most noteworthy scheme initiated has been the offer to pay £2 for the tilling of every acre of land which has been in grass for at least seven years. Many of the benefits that might accrue from this plan are nullified by putting skilled farm workers into the army. The Agriculture Wages Bill has the duplex purpose of preventing men from leaving the land and inducing others to return to it. Thus while 35/- and 38/- a week were before paid to the male adult farm labourer, a new law decrees the payment of £2.8.0 a week. Many very small farmers whose places are run by their families and themselves will be forced to close down if their sons are conscripted for it is impossible to make, all told, a profit of £2.8.0 a week. Therefore, while farming is excluded from the list of reserved occupations, the augmentation of wages can only be partially effective. The Land Army and unskilled boys just leaving school are taking the place of skilled workers. Mr. Macdougall, an eminent authority on agriculture, has emphasized the need not only for skilled labour, but also for 20,000 tractors, 5,000 disc harrows, and an immense quantity of harvesting tackle for the fulfilment of the government's programme.

The government answers this indictment of its slipshod methods by relying disproportionately on small allotment holders. Many of these are amateurs and whether the government will be able to find adequate supplies from such a source remains to be seen.

THE PLOUGHING UP SCHEME

The ploughing-up scheme will eventually have an adverse effect on the very small farmer. Because of his reduced acreage in pasture and the need to supply most of his animals' food-stuffs himself, he may be compelled to dispose of a portion of his herd. Before long, not even state subsidies will be able to prevent a rise in the price of dairy produce. Farming, being put on an industrial footing, will soon suffer the injurious effects of a consolidation of capital so that small farms will disappear and large farms become larger still.

The farmer, to date, has had to suffer most by the improvised change-over from peace to war conditions. Last year's harvest fetched peace-time prices, while the cost of seed and fodder were at war levels. Almost all profits was cancelled out. Pig meal, for instance, went up from 7/6 to 18/-, while a two hundredweight sack of seed corn increased from 17/- to over 30/-.

To-day, we are in a transitional period. While over two million acres of land have been put back into cultivation, it is questionable whether there will be a pro rata increase in fodder and human edibles. Probably next year, the diminution in live stock may be reflected in a dearth of manure for this vast acreage. There will then be the prospect of less crops per acre (and an increasing impoverishment of the soil), so that 2½ millions of acres now cultivated will be equivalent in productive power to much less.

BATTLESHIPS BEFORE RESERVOIRS

Research stations in England and Experimental Farms in America are studying the possibilities of Hydroponics or Tank Farming. But, no appreciable progress has been made toward adapting these experiments on a large scale. None the less, England, being a land composed mostly of small hills, could go far towards immunizing herself from the vicissitudes of the weather by the construction of reservoirs. Even on flat land, reservoirs could be built for purposes of irrigation, the water being pumped through conduits. In our present primitive treatment of weather, we are

Emma Goldman

Emma Goldman's death at the age of 70, robs the International Anarchist movement of an indefatigable militant, who for fifty years had devoted all her energies and intelligence for the furthering of the ideals of Anarchism.

It is impossible, in the limited space available, to give even an outline of our comrade's activity in the movement (her autobiography, *Living My Life*, runs to a thousand pages), but the fact that the last three years of Emma Goldman's life were spent in making known to the British and Canadian workers the great achievements of the Spanish workers, gives an idea of what must have been her activity during those fifty eventful years.

In remembering Emma Goldman with affection and esteem (in spite of small differences which at times made it difficult to work together) we recognise in her, the militant, the tireless orator and comrade who did more than her share in forwarding the ideas of freedom and peace: ANARCHISM.

War Commentary.

at the mercy of any drouth-and to-day a serious drouth would lead very probably to a famine. Battleships cost more than a score of reservoirs. But then, under Capitalism, we must expect more deference to be shown unto Mars than unto Ceres.

"This war is, in one of its minor objectives, a war to make the world safe for the gold standard"—Oscar Hobson ("News Chronicle").

CATHOLIC CHURCH AND MODERN AGE

III (Continued from the previous issue)

THE POLICY OF "CATHOLIC ACTION"

In what, especially, consists the epoch-making character of Leo the 13th's social encyclicals, and the policy of "Catholic Action"—to give it the name by which the Church to-day designates its social policy? Broadly, and when construed against the widest historical perspectives, one must affirm that, for the Papacy, it signified in the first place the acceptance of the Capitalist world as the starting point of its public policy; it had finally definitively abandoned its former connection with the vanished world of mediaeval times, which the Popes of the Restoration era had vainly sought to restore. Secondly, by offering its services as mediator between capital and labour, it put forward its claim to survive as the third great power in modern society; as a power independent alike of the two classes whose social conflicts made up the new era.

Last, but the reverse of least, the Papacy appealed directly to the masses, advertised its own claims as a more efficacious protector of the working class than were the socialists, whose materialistic philosophy of history it denounced, and whose revolutionary plans it repudiated, as superfluous and suicidal. In fact, Leo the 13th adopted officially the ideas of Lammenais of alliance between the Papacy and the masses. Not for the first time in its history the Roman Catholic Church condemned the innovator and then, when time had proved their value, adopted his ideas. The essence of the new Catholic social policy as conceived by Leo the 13th, and as practised to-day by his successor, was that *it seeks to exercise a balance of power in European society*. It defends the propertied classes against destruction by exploitation. As the "rejoicing third" in modern class society, the Papacy takes its place in European society. It no longer acts as a mere "bailiff's broker" for the ruling classes; unlike the earlier Popes, it also recognises that the masses exist and also have rights to defend. Such are the essential principles of mo-

dern Catholic social politics. The Roman Church contrary to many peoples opinions has no hostility to collectivism as such, provided, of course, that it respects the "rights" of the Church. After all, economic individualism was a protestant, not a Catholic doctrine.

By

F. A. RIDLEY

Author of "*The Papacy and Fascism*," "*The Jesuits*," "*Julian the Apostate*," etc.

POPE PIUS 11th

The successors of Leo the 13th, in particular, the late Pope Pius 11th,—a very able politician who, future historians may even compare to Leo, whose "best disciple" he proved himself to be—have continued this policy of holding the political and economic balance between the great conflicting classes of modern society, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. In his encyclical "quadragesimo Anno" (May 15th, 1931—i.e. "in the 40th year" after the "Rerum Novarum" of May 15th, 1891) Pius the 11th modernised in a lucid and comprehensive manner the social doctrines of Leo the 13th. Nor did practice fail to keep step with theory during the dynamic administration of this remarkable Pope. The interest manifested by the late Head of the Church towards "Catholic Action"—i.e. the building up of mass following for ecclesiastical policy—is generally known. The present Pope Pius the 12th may be expected to carry on this policy unchanged. For as secretary of state under Pius the 11th Eugenio Pacelli (Pius the 12th) was himself largely responsible for its operation.

A cataclysmic event, however, separates the reign and policy of the reigning Pope from that of his great predecessor, the author of "rerum novarum". The World-War of 1914-18 and the present war have, as is now clear, in retrospect, an epochal significance far beyond their military character; they mark the definitive passage of capitalist civilisation.

from its meridian to its decay; the commencement of "The Decline and Fall" of our "modern" civilisation which arose in the era of the Renaissance and the Reformation. Oswald Spengler the characteristic philosopher of "The Decline of Europe," has clearly demonstrated this basic cultural characteristic of our era in his "Decline of the West." The "infallible" Papacy knows its European history at least, as well as its "faith and morals!" It has seen the West "decline" before, and its present symptoms are accordingly familiar to the ancient Pontiff of the "Eternal City." The present policy of the Vatican cannot be understood apart from this fundamental change in the contemporary zeitgeist.

One of the most acute critics of the Roman Court, the liberal historian Luigi Farini, has delivered this pregnant and far-seeing axiom on the permanent policy of the Popes (c.f. "The Roman State" p.4-vol 1 (1850): "It is the peculiar nature of the Roman Court that it can acquiesce upon occasion, but never bends in mind before either violence or adverse fortune, and never forgets her claims through length of time." In the light of this revealing dictum it will be found illuminating to consider the present policy pursued by the Papacy amid the contemporary crisis of our dying civilisation.

The Papacy pursues to-day two concurrent policies; a long far-sighted one, and a short make-shift temporary one. The former is motivated, undoubtedly by one fundamental consideration which is never absent from the mind of the oldest European dynasty: *the tenacious political memory of the Vatican has never forgotten that it has ruled Europe before.* Now that capitalism is in its death rattle and mankind awaits the coup de grace of Western civilisation in a proximate world cataclysm, the Papacy foresees a time when a new Dark Age may supervene, as it supervened before, after the Fall of Rome. In the 5th century the sceptre of Europe was vacant; Rome tamed the barbarians and plucked a millennial sceptre over Europe from its ruins. What was done once, can be done twice! Particularly by an institution which still repudiates evolution and adheres to the scholastic dogma of the "fiity of species." We have not forgotten the considered judgement of Farini

that the Papacy "never forgets her claim through length of time," and, as time goes, the "totalitarian" theocracy of the mediaeval Popes is still quite recent. The Papacy, conceiving itself as "the pilgrim of eternity," "sub specie eternitatis," has always taken but little account of time! "What has been, will be" the Popes echo the refrain of "Kohleth." ("The Preacher." — cf. "Ecclesiastes" Ch. 1). What has been once, that also can come again; the days of Canossa can still recur.

Such is the long term of the Papacy; Rome, which has survived ancient and mediaeval, may also survive modern Europe—"semper eadem"—and rule again on the "ruins of empires" as she ruled before. But the day for so grandiose an assertion of "The City of God" has not yet come; the abyss before Europe is proximate, but is not yet actual. Rome to-day requires a short term policy for the present era of Capitalism. It is this policy that the Rome of Pius the 11th pursues to-day.

The nature of this policy can be summarised thus; it is to keep the throne of Western civilisation vacant, so that when the hour of dissolution strikes, Rome can mount to power. Two rivals to-day threaten this ascension. *Revolutionary Socialism would destroy the Church in the name of the Future. Tribal paganism, Fascist Caesarism, would destroy it in the name of the Past.* Hitler represents Nero "the beast drunk with the blood of the Saints;" the pagan world and state on whose ruins Christianity arose. The Social Revolution, even more dangerously represents a world in which there is "ni Dieu ni maitre," and where consequently the Vatican becomes merely a museum, and the Pope only a relic of a pre-historic time.

The Papacy recognises these dangers only too well, and sets itself strenuously to combat them. At all costs the capitalist inheritance must not fall either to Communism or to Fascism; to the irreconcilable foes of the Church. Hence, it seeks to play off one against the other. When the Leninist International preached social revolution, the Pope backed Mussolini and Hitler. When, conversely, Hitler paganises Germany and the Stalinist International "defends religious freedom" and, for this end, "holds out its hand" to the Catholic Church, the representatives of the Vatican cautiously returned the proffered salute. At all costs, the dying Liberal Capitalism,

the erstwhile ruler of Europe since the French Revolution, must not leave a successor strong enough to exclude the Roman Court from the succession. At all costs the road to power must be kept clear for the Triple Crown to enter upon its inheritance.

The Papacy is to-day waiting; it is waiting for chaos, for barbarism, for a Europe from which its present day rivals have gone. It waits for an age of chaos, an age of misery, knowing by long experience that "opposites are identical" and that ages of misery can, yet again, become "ages of faith." A new Middle Age presents itself to the Papacy, which does not know the transforming power of the World Revolution. The revolutionary movements of our time will do well not to dismiss the Papacy as their "liberal" predecessors of "The Age of Enlightenment," but too often did, as a senile corpse too weary even to die!

They will find it incumbent to recognise Rome as still a hopeful claimant for universal power. To the success of the World Revolution a renewed Dark Age now presents itself as the sole realistic alternative at the rate at which we see a moribund civilisation now heading for the abyss. Its limited historical perspectives forbade antiquity to be renewed by revolution. To-day such a revolutionary renewal is possible, but is far from being automatically certain. Without its victorious consummation history may yet again repeat itself, and a new theocracy emerge from the scattered debris of our secular world. The revolutionary thought of our epoch grounded in an accurate perception of history, must never make the mistake of regarding the Church of Rome as a mere sect or doctrine like any other. Contrarily, it was never more necessary than now to regard it as what it is in its inner-most essence, a crafty and dangerous claimant for universal

power, as "the ghost of the Roman Empire" waiting amid the ruins of the dying bourgeois world for its hour of universal dominion to return.

NINE MONTHS OF WAR (Cont. from Page 9)

The British South Africa Company, founded by Cecil Rhodes, and used as the chief instrument of his imperialist policies, had a monopoly of the mineral rights in Northern Rhodesia, one of the greatest copper producing countries in the world. The minerals are exploited by Anglo-American financial interests, and in return for the right to mine copper, the three operating companies—the Roan Antelope, the Rhokana and the Mufulira—pay to the directors of the South Africa Company about £500,000 annually. Thus, without lifting a finger, the shareholders of the Rhodes concern get a substantial rake-off every year.

This illustrates vividly the parasitic character of imperialism. Completely divorced from active production, all that British rentiers associated with the South Africa Company have to do is to clip their coupons.

The profits the mining companies are making are colossal. In 1937 the Roan Antelope made £2,078,207 and paid 80 per cent dividend and a bonus of 20 per cent; the Rhokana Corporation, of which Sir Auckland Geddes is Chairman, made £2,319,883 in profits and paid a dividend of 62½ per cent. The smallest company, the Mufulira, in the same year netted £775,401 and paid a dividend of 150 per cent.

The total value of copper for 1938 was £8,201,000 distributed as follows:

Dividends—£3,100,000.

Wages paid to 1,800 white employees—£1,250,000.

Income Tax paid in Northern Rhodesia, £600,000.

Paid to the British Treasury as ordinary company tax (the companies are registered in London) and National Defence Contribution—£600,000.

Balance assigned to other costs, including royalties—£2,160,000.

Production for 1939 was valued at £11,511,376, of which blister copper accounted for £7,977,565, electrolytic copper for £1,466,806 and cobalt alloy for £1,482,149.

Gold figures speak for themselves, and it is pretty evident where the wealth of the colonies goes. Certainly not in the pockets of the people whose lands have been wrested from them, and whose labour is incidental in realising the wealth monopolised by a few capitalists who hold the destinies of the black and white workers in their hands.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND THE MODERN AGE

by F. A. Ridley

which has been published in instalments in "War Commentary" will shortly be available in pamphlet form price 1d. (postage 1d.) from Freedom Press Distributors, 9 Newbury St., London, E.C.1.

EDITORIAL NOTE!

We apologise to all our readers for the non-appearance of "War Commentary" during June, due to "causes beyond our control"! We will, however, make every endeavour to appear regularly in future. Funds, to help us continue our work should be sent to Freedom Press Distributors, 9 Newbury Street, London, E.C.1.

Published by Freedom Press Distributors, 9 Newbury St., London, E.C.1, and printed by C. A. Brock and Co. Ltd., 463 Harrow Rd., London, W.10.