

FAREWELL FAROUK

THE major factor in Egyptian politics has always in recent times been dread of "the street", the realisation that the vast crowd of under-privileged and oppressed fellahen and city-dwellers could one day rise. On each occasion they have risen—whatever the pretext may have been—the Egyptian politicians endeavoured to run in front of the popular demands, thus claiming to have led them and to harness them back into apathy once more. Since the dominance of an authoritarian religion has dulled the positive revolutionary concepts that might otherwise have appeared, the masses have each time been content with the fact that "somebody was taking it up". The most British of all the Egyptian ruling-class, their sons at Eton or Oxford, their daughters at local English colleges, have thus been compelled to take up the slogans of anti-Imperialism, but it has always been well understood that the major aim of ruling-class politics has not been the expulsion of the British but the quietening of the "mob demands" for that.

As we have mentioned in these columns before, the game played by Farouk in proclaiming himself King of Egypt and the Sudan was on these lines. He had to pretend to be against the occupying forces, but nobody would regret more than he the day when they went. Now that the British have been for so many months playing a "hiding game"—their forces withdrawn to the Canal Zone, no longer a visible irritant to the majority of Egyptians, and stationed in a part of Egypt where those employed by British or French (Suez Canal) firms make up a large part of the population, hostility to Farouk becomes more evident. In his complaint that "the British did not stand by him" he really means that when he loudly proclaimed that they should go he did not want them to go. He is now sacrificed by the ruling-class clique that has deposed him to appease the multitude, who undoubtedly will be happy at the abdication of the king.

General Mohamed Neguib who led the Army coup is a soldier long known for his interest in political affairs and even his incursion into Republican circles, and it is very convenient to have proclaimed a baby of a few months old as king. By the time he is able to take any active part, as Farouk did, they will be well accustomed to dealing without him, and there is no doubt at all that Republicanism has at last come out into the open in Egypt. For years the servile press of Cairo and Alexandria could not speak of Farouk without going into swoons. Now that he is deposed, none is so low as to do him honour, and their readers are regaled with stories of his corruption and despotism, which are as true as ever they were.

The abolition of the titles "Bey" and "Pasha" are a symptom of the republicanism represented—in spite of his present-day denials—by the General, and if the latter can reconcile the Army's domination of the new set-up with the Wafd movement of Nahas Pasha—for so long the popular demagogue and the chief opponent of Farouk—he can move forward to the bourgeois capitalist society with military tendencies that is the ideal of Egyptian politicians, whose main aim is to step into the shoes of the English occupying forces, without giving too much to the masses. However, there is always the danger of a sudden spontaneous uprising—possibly without any clear aim, but undoubtedly violent—which will upset all their best laid plans. Hence the Egyptian Army's insistence on "quiet", its patrolling of the streets, and severe penalties for those looting or attacking wealthy foreigners (usually the signal for an outbreak). Hence, too, the go-slow policy of the Army, which preserves the throne in the shape of Ahmed Fuad's pram, and the selection of Aly Maher as Premier, in an attempt to reconcile politicians, soldiers and the crowd—for Maher was known for his anti-British policy during the war and was also pro-Farouk.

The real significance of Farouk's abdication is that by virtue of his being a king he had to associate himself with the old guard of monarchism and strict ecclesiasticism, a rôle he could no more play than the Duke of Windsor. He will do much better in America as a wealthy sybarite, and if he has any sense he will give up playing at having been a king and become a prosperous Californian Democrat.

But the last word does not rest with the Egyptian Army and the future of Egypt remains imponderable as the Sphinx. The last word there and in the other Arab countries remains with the masses who are never consulted but have a habit of rising suddenly and toppling dynasties.

INTERNATIONALIST.

ANARCHIST 'Z' MAN

Our comrade John Bishop, of the London Anarchist Group, was recently granted exemption from military service on the Z reserve. Bishop was six years in the Army during the war, being twice taken prisoner by the Germans. He joined up with the London anarchists two years ago and has been one of our most enthusiastic outdoor sellers of FREEDOM. When called upon to do his Z training he ignored the W.O. forms and then appeared before a tribunal, where he challenged the validity of the law trying to coerce him into uniform again.

The Tribunal were not interested in that; they were merely administering the law, not thinking about it! So they turned our comrade down. On appeal, however, he convinced the Appellate Tribunal of his sincerity and was granted exemption.

John Bishop had no intention of doing his Z training anyway, but it's just as well to get the State to recognise that without any unpleasantness if possible!
P.S.

Civilians Under Martial Law

DURING the war, many war-resisters were prosecuted repeatedly in an attempt to break their spirits, but a recent case shows that it is not only in war-time that the State plays its well known game of "cat and mouse" with those individuals who do not do as it wants.

One day last December, London evening papers carried headlines: "Soldier Was Led Astray by Anarchists", which little piece of sensationalism referred to the refusal of a young man to do his Territorial training, and quoted from his defending (?) officer at his Court Martial.

Roy Bowers was called upon to do his National Service, and joined the Royal Army Medical Corps in May 1949. He performed his duties in exemplary fashion, and was discharged a corporal with excellent record in 1951. Under the Conscriptio laws, he remained under Military jurisdiction and was liable for Territorial training for the next five years.

By the time of his discharge, however, Bowers had begun to realise a thing or two about the relationship between Military training and democracy, about the Army and freedom, and he concluded that the State had had enough of his time and that he no longer believed in it or wanted to serve it. This is known as being got at by anarchists.

Thus it was that when the Army indicated to Bowers that it would like him to report for his T.A. training, he declined to turn up. So in due course an escort arrived at 8 a.m. at his house and he was delivered before a Court Martial, where he told the presiding officer that he had not the slightest intention of continuing to serve the State in any capacity—for which ungrateful attitude his defending officer could only try to find the excuse that he was a young man of high principles but that the anarchists had got at him. The Court Martial found that to be no excuse at all and sentenced him to 112 days detention.

This was on December 6th, and Roy Bowers was in detention until Jan. 11th, when he was released, his sentence having been cut to 56 days on confirmation.

Leaving the shelter of Colchester Military Corrective Establishment, Bowers in due course appeared before a Tribunal as a Conscientious Objector, in May. He has never been officially notified of

the decision of this impartial body, but he has heard through the Central Board for Conscientious Objectors that his case was dismissed.

The War Office, however, must have been notified, for they once again began to serve Bowers with demands to do his Territorial training. Again he refused to go, and in due course the escort paid their early morning visit, he was hauled off to Barracks where he was charged and then released under open arrest before coming up for Court Martial once again.

This procedure can clearly be repeated just as often as the War Office like, until such time as they wear down the resistance of Roy Bowers. Bowers, however, has no intention of being worn down.

This case is the first of its kind. So far there have been only three objectors to Territorial training, and the other two did not carry their resistance into detention. The point where this case differs from that of objectors during the war, however, is that Bowers is already under military law. The potential National Serviceman who refuses to submit to medical examination remains under civilian law and can only be dealt with in a civilian prison. Once they have done their military service, however, they come under the military and remain so for the entire period they are on the reserve. Technically, then, refusal to turn up for training amounts to refusal to obey orders, or desertion, with the well-known consequences in the glass-house.

But these men are civilians. Civilians under martial law. Conscriptio in this country is supposed to be for only two years, but in fact the young man who does his National Service is putting himself under martial law for seven years, to be called upon for military duties any time the authorities think fit—and liable to dire penalties on refusal.

This is just one indication of the extent to which militarism has invaded our lives. Roy Bowers did his two years service. The State has had its pound of flesh, and like the Z men who are refusing to go back into the Service which claimed them during the war, Bowers thinks that is enough. From the anarchist point of view it is more than enough.
P.S.

Civil Disobedience in South Africa

UP to July 27th about 900 men and women had been arrested in the passive resistance campaign against the pass and curfew laws of Dr. Malan's government.

On the previous day 107 Africans were arrested in Port Elizabeth for passing through the "Europeans only" entrances to two railway stations.

The authorities have seized money in the possession of people who refused to pay fines as an alternative to imprisonment, and have paid the fines from the money seized, so the African National Congress and the South African Indian Congress have urged their supporters not to carry money on them when they intend to break the racial laws, since the success of the campaign will depend on filling the jails so much as to make the laws unenforceable.

On August 2nd, in sentencing 60 of the Africans arrested at Port Elizabeth, the magistrate said, "The time is approaching when I will single out those under 21 years old and give them the stick." Fines of £8 to £10 were imposed with the

alternative of 40 to 50 days imprisonment.

Police in cities throughout South Africa raided the offices and homes of non-European organisations on July 29th. There were no arrests, but documents, membership cards and correspondence were seized.

The pledge which forms the basis for the civil disobedience campaign reads: "We, the oppressed people of South Africa, hereby solemnly pledge ourselves to carry on a relentless struggle to repeal the unjust laws as laid down in the plan of action of the African National Congress, supported by the South African Indian Congress, the Coloured Peoples organisation and other freedom-loving peoples. We shall do all in our power, to the utmost limits of endurance and sacrifice, to carry out the Congress call against the unjust laws which subject our people to political servility, economic misery and social degradation. From this day forward we, as disciplined men and women, dedicate our lives to the struggle for freedom and fundamental rights."

Internationalism and the Olympic Spirit

SINCE the opening of the Olympic Games at Helsinki a few weeks ago, much has been written about "the Olympic spirit" mainly, it must be admitted, in the more classy sort of paper which only has a small circulation. But the "Olympic spirit" is not without significance as a concept. Discussion of it has, in England, been due to two main factors: first that this year for the time time Soviet Russia entered a team of athletes; while Japan and Germany, the defeated nations, were also represented once more. Secondly, the games were witnessed by two public figures in the shape of the Royal Dukes of Edinburgh and of York, whose presence served to recall that their grandfathers had played a large part in founding the games, in their present form, at Athens towards the close of the last century.

Friendship in International Competition

The aim of the founders was to make the comradeship and amity and friendly competition of athletes a factor in international affairs. They sought to make the virtues of fairness, of free competition, and of the team spirit, also play their part in the intercourse of nations, by setting a kind of example.

The games have proved an unqualified success from the point of view of the athletes and the sport-

loving public. But as far as the intentions of the modern founders went, well that is a different story. 1898, when the games were restarted, also happens to be the date from which some historians (following Rosa Luxembourg) mark the beginning of the epoch of the world wars. And certainly international behaviour on the part of the great powers has been less marked by "honour" and "sportsmanship" than perhaps at any previous half-century.

The conception of using games-morality, which has played such an important part in the expensive public schools in the past in moulding the morality of the British upper class, as an instrument for influencing states is itself purely an upper class notion. It shows how remote from reality were the people who could make such an attempt. Yet it is easy to be wise afterwards: fifty years ago there was a steadily increasing international co-operation—in transport, communications and a hundred other complexities of international organisation. Kropotkin noted the trend and considered it an important modern manifestation of mutual aid.

Still Influential

Up till the present there has been only one major intrusion of politics into Olympic Games—in 1936 when

Hitler ostentatiously refused to shake hands with the great American athlete, Jesse Owens, because he was coloured. This year there were fears that the Russian team would provoke incidents, but no—all went smoothly. Philip Noel-Baker, M.P., wrote in the *Observer* (3/8/52): "There have been no politics: and no incidents worth the name . . . Russian athletes, clearly, have not only learned sport: they have learned sportsmanship as well . . ." Edward Crankshaw, by no means an indulgent critic of the Soviet régime, drew attention to the markedly unhysterical tone of the reporting of the games in the Russian Press. The successes of the Russian athletes have "enabled the Soviet Press almost for the first time to take life easily and write about the Soviet achievement in a very reasonable manner, contrasting sharply with the hysterical assertiveness about achievements that are less real . . ." Reading *Pravda*, one has the impression that its correspondents have positively enjoyed a brief holiday in the cold war.

Athlete Politicians

"Brief" is the operative word, for as soon as the games were over, the Finnish Communist Party organised a meeting of 5,000 people, a

Workers' Control and the Free Society

THE slogan "Workers' Control" dates from the beginning of this century but the idea behind it can be traced to those early socialist followers of Robert Owen who made the term Grand National mean to the British workers something more exciting than a fashionable horse-race. What the early pioneers who set up the Grand National Consolidated Trades Union aimed at was the complete supersession of capitalism and its replacement by a system in which industry would be run by voluntary associations of workers. Since that time the ideal of industrial democracy, expressed in one form or another, has been kept alive by the small minority of workers and their middle-class sympathisers who recognised that the real revolution takes place in the workshop. Their message to the workers was much the same as that of Goethe's to the 19th century emigrant in search of liberty: "Here, or nowhere, is your America!" Here, they said in effect, here in the workshop, in the fields and in the mines, we must accomplish the revolution or it will be accomplished nowhere. It will not be won through the ballot box or at the barricades but in the places where we earn our daily bread. The fight for freedom must be won in the workshop if it is to be won at all.

Communist Opportunism

Like many another good idea, however, the idea of workers' control has been taken up by fools, charlatans, opportunists and downright knaves and its true meaning perverted and twisted out of all recognition. It is necessary, therefore, to distinguish the legitimate from the bastard, the true from the false idea of workers' control. The most flagrant idea is to be found in the current Stalinist conception. Cashing in on the workers' disillusionment with nationalisation, the Communist Party has in recent years taken up the slogan of workers' control. They are generally careful, however, to leave the idea as vague as possible. What they are seeking in practice is control of industry by the Communist Party—the self-styled representatives of the working class. Undoubtedly, if the C.P. won power in this country, there would be many changes in industry but the changes would only amount to the substitution of one sort of leadership for another: control would be vested, not in the workers, but in the political bureaucrats of King Street. The most generous interpretation of the Stalinist conception is that workers' control means control of industry by the working class. Workers' control may involve this but it does not mean this: it means something far more revolutionary.

"Profit-sharing"

In certain reformist circles, timorous leeches have been at work draining the idea of all its blood and vitality. To them workers' control signifies no more than the representation of the workers on managerial bodies. Workers' representation on national boards or even on the management boards of individual enterprises, whether publicly or privately owned is, I need hardly say, not workers' control. What is even more important, it is not, as some of its advocates allege, a step towards control. It is in fact only a more modern and more specious form of profit-sharing. Its aim is the aim of all profit-sharing and co-partnership schemes: to fasten more securely the gyves about the wrists of the workers. By participating in management the workers participate in upholding their own slavery. The function of their representatives on management boards is to allay discon-

tent and to compromise their independence. "See here," says the so-called progressive boss to the workers, "you and I are joint-controllers of this enterprise: this order is signed not only by me but also by your elected representatives; to strike against it is to strike against yourselves." And then, when his appeal has been successful, he will turn to his more stupid colleagues and say: "What better way could be found for disciplining the workers than to let them be disciplined by their own leaders."

Industrial Unionism

Anarchists are not likely to be misled by these two perversions of the idea of workers' control, but there is yet another confusion we have to guard against. Workers' control is not necessarily the same as control by trade unions, whether these are called industrial unions, guilds or even revolutionary syndicates. The basic idea of syndicalism is that the associations formed by the workers to defend their economic interests should become productive associations to carry on all the useful work of society. In other words, the unions from being merely defensive and offensive organisations under capitalism are to become the administrative units of the new society. After the battle has been won, the swords are to be turned into ploughshares and the spears into pruning hooks. By itself, this transformation would not achieve workers' control. If all those employed in coal-mining were included in the N.U.M. and the functions of the National Coal Board transferred to the union head office in Westminster Bridge

Road, the ordinary miner would not necessarily have any more control over his work than he has at present. He might find simply that he was taking orders from Will Lawther and Arthur Horner instead of from Sir Hubert Holdsworth and Ebby Edwards. Everything depends upon the structure of the union. Trade union control, or syndicalism, is only synonymous with workers' control when power within the union is decentralised; when power is so distributed that the workers in every mine, factory and workshop remain supreme; when the union Head Office does not give orders but only accepts orders; when, in fact, the union is only a means for co-ordinating the activities of its constituent parts. Just as workers' control is not the same as control of industry by the whole working class, so it is not simply control of industry by all the workers collectively in any given industry: it is control of the mine by the workers in the mine, control of the factory by the workers in the factory, control of the shop by the workers in the shop. The workers in any enterprise, since they are not self-sufficient, will naturally make arrangements, contracts, and agreements with workers in similar enterprises and with distributive and other associations, but the direction of the flow of such extra-workshop activities must always be from and never towards the workshop. In other words, if control is to be a reality, the workshop must remain an autonomous unit—which is something very different from an independent unit. The workshop is primary, the industrial union, the com-

mune and so on, secondary. Workers' control, in fact, is not just syndicalism: it is bigger than syndicalism, more revolutionary than syndicalism: it is the anarchist idea. And syndicalism is only sound in so far as it aims at workers' control in the sense that I have defined it. From this it follows that syndicalism is not, as some of us would have it, the industrial expression of anarchism. Rather, I would put it this way, anarcho-syndicalism is the anarchist conception of syndicalism and the only form of syndicalism which would in practice ensure the emancipation of the producers. It is because workers' control means above all workers' control of the workshop that we must be sceptical of cut and dried schemes of organisation. To draw up blue prints of the social and industrial institutions of the future society may help us and others to clarify our ideas but it is control not the plan which is important. If we become too organisation-minded, we shall find ourselves quarrelling over how many industrial unions there should be and where and how we shall draw the line between various industries, and we may find ourselves laying the foundations, not of the free society, but of a new state—the industrial state—every whit as oppressive of individual freedom as the old.

To sum up, workers' control is control of production by the actual producers: it is the doctrine that those who do the job, who know the job shall control the job; that you and I in our work at the bench, down the mines, in the fields and in the office and the school shall, in conjunction with our fellow-workers, organise our working lives in the way that we think best. This and only this is workers' control and it our first duty to make this meaning clear and to expose the bogus conceptions that parade under its banner.

Socialist Theory of Nationalisation

So much by way of clarification of the concept itself. Let us now try to assess its significance. The best way to do this is to contrast it with the socialist theory of nationalisation, which derives from Marx and which still dominates most socialist thinking. According to this theory, capitalist society is divided into two main classes: the bourgeoisie which owns the instruments of production and the proletariat which is excluded from ownership of these instruments and which subsists by selling its labour power to the owners. Through their ownership of the instruments of production the bourgeoisie is able to dominate society and to appropriate the surplus value produced by the proletariat. This basic division between the propertied and the propertyless gives rise to a fundamental antagonism which is expressed in the class struggle. With

Continued on p. 4

The Human Sanction

JACQUES discusses the various sources of authority in an industrial undertaking. He particularly stresses the task sanction, hitherto by far the most important, and the democratic sanction, the workers' participation in control, which he considers must be brought in to modify it. Since democracy is a cloak for so many ambiguities, the latter might perhaps better be called the human sanction. (It was incidentally, significant that a strengthening of the human sanction in this particular factory led to a corresponding strengthening of the executive function.) But there should be further study of the nature of this task sanction, to which Western man submits himself with such a fury of

obedience, and which is so indiscriminately available for the manufacture of atom bombs or cheap jewellery, the promotion of a bloody faith or the vicarage garden party. There are signs that the English, at least, are in revolt against it; the East has possibly seldom suffered from it; and this is called laziness. Perhaps it is only an unconscious insistence on the need for the human sanction which might turn the factory from the 'icy tumult', as Simone Weil called it, to a place where the worker may draw other satisfactions than his weekly pay packet.

—C. A. ROLAND, in *World Review*, discussing *The Changing Culture of a Factory*, by Elliott Jaques, (Tavistock Publications, 28/-).

NEW PERIODICALS

THE SYNDICALIST, Vol. I, No. 4, August, 1952, 2d.

THE new issue of *The Syndicalist* contains an analysis of the implications of the Dagenham strikes, the work-tore of the loco shed men of B.R. Western Region, and the unsuccessful wage claim of the USDAW. There are articles on "The Co-partnership Racket," on Syndicalism in France, on mining accidents, and the fourth in the series on Anarcho-Syndicalism, which describe the relationships of "The syndicate and the commune." Contributions from Edinburgh and Glasgow discuss the changing nature of trade unions and the characteristics of the "good union man." *The Syndicalist* costs 2d. monthly, and postal subscribers to FREEDOM can have it sent to them for an additional 2/- on their annual subscription.

★

RESISTANCE, Vol. X, No. 1, July, 1952. (Obtainable from Freedom Bookshop, 6d.)

THE reappearance of this anarchist magazine from New York is very welcome. The principal feature of this issue is *Essays on the War* by David

Wilck. The first of the three essays, "In Quest of the Lesser Disaster," castigates the conformism of the American liberal intelligentsia. The second, on "The American Century" seeks, in a very interesting way, to unravel the mystery of American foreign policy. The third on "The Military Subordination" discusses the "totalitarianisation" of the United States, against the background of modern American history.

Paul Goodman writes on "The Audience of the Kefauver Hearings," A. Geller on "A Liberal Lack of Imagination" (discussing an article on *A Communist and His Ideals* by Diana Trilling, and on *Civil Liberties—A Study in Confusion* by Irving Kristol, which appeared in the American magazines *Partisan Review* and *Commentary*). Michael Greig reviews Marie Louise Berneri's *Journey Through Utopia* and J. Feldman criticises David Riesman's *The Lonely Crowd*.

There are also "Reflections Occasioned by Publication of the Memoirs of Whittaker Chambers" by D.T.W. (who mistakenly describes George Orwell as an ex-Communist), and poems by Howard Griffin, Paul Goodman, and James Boyer May.

Lessons of the Spanish Revolution—4

The Revolution at the Cross-Roads

IF July 19, 1936 is a day in which the revolutionary workers of Spain wrote a chapter in the history of the struggle by the world's oppressed for their liberation, July 20th will, we think, be regarded as the beginning of the betrayal of the workers' aspirations by their representatives. Harsh words, but no words can be too harsh to describe the actions of a group of men who usurp their functions, and in so doing jeopardise the lives and the future of millions of their fellows.

Peirats asks whether the dilemma of social revolution or collaboration had been thoroughly discussed by the Confederation and anarchist militants; whether the consequences of such a decision had been considered and the pros and cons examined. Or again whether the lessons from past experience and from the history of past revolutions had been taken into consideration. All Peirats tells us is that "what is beyond any doubt is that the majority of the influential militants interpreted the situation in the same way. The few dissenting voices among them were lost in thin air; the silence of others was really enigmatic. Between those who protested in vain and those who remained silent through lack of determination, the collaborationist solution paved a way for itself." But what was the opinion of the Organisation, of the men who had spilled their blood in the unequal, yet victorious, struggle in the streets of Barcelona; of those in the Asturias double-crossed by Colonel Aranda and the government who assured everyone he was "loyal"; of those in Valencia who were refused arms by the Government to storm the barracks? They were not consulted, though their actions eloquently expressed better than words their true feelings. "We trusted in the word and in the person of a Catalan democrat" wrote Garcia Oliver, the "influential" member of the C.N.T., of President Companys. And he should have added, "but not in the revolutionary workers of Spain."

On July 20th the Madrid Government and the Generalitat of Catalonia existed in name only. The armed forces, the civil guard and assault guards were either with the mutinous Generals or had joined the people. The armed workers had no interest in bolstering the government which only two days previously had been reshuffled to include right wing elements in order to facilitate a "deal" with the military insurgents. All that nominally remained in the hands of the Central Government was the gold reserve, the second largest in the world, of 2,259 million gold pesetas. No attempt was made by the C.N.T. to seize it. They were repeating the mistakes made by the revolutionaries at the time of the Paris Commune who respected the property of the banks. "From July 20—writes Santillan—we placed improvised guards in Banks, Safe deposits and pawn-

brokers, etc." How obliged the Central Government must have been to the Anarchists for their oversight, or short-sightedness! And how astutely they used the gold to fight the revolutionary forces. For instance the withholding of funds from Catalonia, which was much too revolutionary for their liking, almost paralysed the principal industrial and military centre of Spain. That it also affected the successful prosecution of the armed struggle against Franco mattered little to these men who, as we have already said, had preferred Franco to arming the people. Indeed, during the first seven weeks and before the non-intervention pact came into force, the Giral government failed to purchase any arms abroad though there was ample gold to pay for them.

In those July days, then, there was only one authority in "Republican" Spain: that of the armed workers, most of whom belonged either to the C.N.T. or the U.G.T. In Catalonia the Committee of Anti-Fascist Militias had been formed representing the workers organisations as well as the various political parties. The Government of the Generalitat simply acted as the rubber stamp for the Committee, but, as we shall see, such an astute politician as Companys would not for long tolerate such a situation of inferiority. The initiative, and revolutionary drive however were with the workers. They created the armed columns which were to engage Franco's forces, (four days after the victory in Barcelona the first column, of 10,000 volunteers left for the Saragossa area) and in a matter of days, according to Santillan, more than 150,000 volunteers were available and willing to fight in whichever sector they were most needed. In the industrial areas the workers were taking over the factories and where possible converting them to the production of arms, armoured cars and the other necessities of the struggle. Meanwhile the peasants had taken over the large estates. In the large towns the public services were re-organised under workers' control, and the distribution of food was guaranteed by the workers' organisations.

But as each day passed the gulf between the revolutionary workers and their representatives became greater. And understandably so: for from being their representatives they had virtually formed themselves into an Executive body, responsible to the Committee of Anti-Fascist Militias and not to the members of the C.N.T. We are once more faced with the situation of the revolutionary masses pushing ahead and consolidating their gains while the leadership lags behind paralysed with apprehension at its inability to control the situation, and appealing, cajoling, threatening, and always counselling moderation. In the first manifesto broadcast on July 26, by the Peninsula Committee of the F.A.I., the most extravagant language is used to describe the

struggle "against the fascist hydra" but not a word about the social revolution. On the other hand a most violent and threatening attitude was adopted by the leaders of the C.N.T.—F.A.I. to stamp out the relatively minor wave of looting and the settling of personal scores that took place in those early days of the revolution. Yet considering the magnitude of the social upheaval; the disorganisation of the economy, the breakdown of public services and the total absence of the forces of "law and order", the looting and shooting and the burning of churches were insignificant compared with the deep sense of responsibility and the initiative shown by the workers in re-organising the life of the country, not along the old lines, but inspired by their concepts of social justice and equity. They organised security patrols; relieved the customs officials at the frontier to prevent any rearguard activity by Franco's friends; they controlled the telephone exchanges so as to be in a position to check on any political intrigues between Barcelona and Madrid. In a word, they were showing plain commonsense and foresight in the revolutionary period, whilst their leaders were absorbed in questions of a strategic, diplomatic or political character and losing every time. The tragedy however was that the forces of government, by manoeuvring the political parties into a bloc against the C.N.T. were rapidly gaining ground. Indeed within two months the problem of the duality of power between the Committee of Anti-fascist Militias and the Government of the Generalitat is resolved with the abolition of the former. Having learned nothing from their earlier experience of collaboration in a revolutionary Committee with the political parties, the C.N.T.—F.A.I. leadership, obsessed by the idea that the revolution must wait until the war was won, joined the Government of the Generalitat.

Anarchist Dictatorship or Collaboration & Democracy

THE dilemma of the Anarchist and Confederation dictatorship or Collaboration and democracy existed only for those "influential militants" of the C.N.T.—F.A.I. who, wrongly interpreting their functions as delegates, took upon themselves the task of directing the popular movement. We do not question their integrity and courage as men and as members of long standing in the revolutionary movement in Spain. But as leaders—not in the sense that Durruti or Ascaso were leaders, but as directors who in their wisdom guide the "masses"—

Continued on p. 4

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

Resistance, Vol. 10, No. 1 6d.
A new issue of an American anarchist magazine.

The Conduct of Life Lewis Mumford 21/-

"Mr. Mumford's maturity of thought is shown in his protest against rigorously formulated systems. The effort to whittle down valuable conduct to a single set of consistent principles and ideal ends does not, he argues, do justice to the nature of life, with its paradoxes, its complicated processes, its internal conflicts, its sometimes unresolvable dilemmas."
—Times Literary Supplement.

Second-hand books by Lewis Mumford:
Technics & Civilisation 15/-
Condition of Man 15/-
City Development 4/-
Men Must Act 3/-

From the Waste Land Edward Hyams 12/6
The author's experience in converting three acres of wilderness into a market garden and vineyard.

The British Worker in Retreat 1938-1952 C. H. Norman 6d.
Facts about prices, wages and finance.

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

†La C.N.T. en la Revolucion Española (Toulouse, 1951).

ANARCHIST MOVEMENT & THE WORLD

ANARCHISTS remain, numerically, an insignificant body. To all appearances the anarchist movement, except in Spain, has played little part in shaping history for good or ill. And in this country the size of the anarchist movement has always been quite trifling.

It is true that the English anarchist movement of the late nineteenth century contained many outstanding men and women thinkers, many of them collected here by the accidents of political asylum. And it is true that individual anarchists like Godwin, Proudhon, Bakunin and Kropotkin can be shown to have influenced thought. And it is true that anarchist movements have always exerted an influence out of proportion to their size, though (again with the notable exception of Spain) they have not been able to exert decisive influence in crises of history. All these factors make individual anarchists reflect from time to time on the value, the purpose of their activity. Such reflections may come more often to English anarchists who cannot lose themselves in a busy movement, because the movement in Britain is so scattered and so small.

It is perhaps worth considering the activity of individuals in such a nebulous "movement". At all times anarchists have insisted that certain truths, certain lines of action must be acted upon, not because they are expedient or likely to carry much chance of immediate success, but because they are right. Some may flinch at what seems a moralistic, almost a religious way of expressing the fact: but it remains true that anarchism has always been profoundly concerned with principles and has always asserted their primacy over expedient considerations.

When there are only a very few anarchist, their activity must be permeated by such feelings, for if they paused to consider the effect of their activity, to assess their strength, or more realistically, their weaknesses, they might well be discouraged from continuing any activity at all.

All movements, however, must grow from almost nothing, must have a stage of seeming impotence and weakness (cynics might remark that the English movement has never emerged from such a stage). Hence the activity of isolated individuals always carries the possibility of a harvest in the end. Yet such possibilities are rightly put aside as not being the aim of anarchist activity. If the aim were to build up a large movement, the plain indication is to consider principles less important than catering for what people want—such a method is the main stock-in-trade of the political parties.

Expediency before principle may swell the dues box but in the end it destroys the respect accorded to a movement, however adroitly its propaganda is handled. And the very independence of the anarchist movement, though it has kept them small and diminished their political influence, has maintained the respect in which anarchist views are held. This is one of the reasons why it has been said that the anarchists are "the conscience of the left"—which remains true in part even though the Left to-day has dispensed with the need for a conscience! Much truer is it to say that anarchist principles do correspond to something which almost everyone regards as true, so that the

II. The Illusion of Organisation

THE second illusion of which I wish to speak has to do with the anti-war movement itself—what we expect from the movement, and how we think of ourselves and the persons with whom we act. Once again, we are up against an old tradition which has to be abandoned.

In the thirties, when anti-war sentiment was so strong among young people, and especially among students, great things were expected. In fact, the hopes were reasonable. If the young people—the future conscripts, the future dead—made it plain that they did not want to fight, would not the adults have to take notice? And one of the obstacles which slowed down the march to war in America was the vociferous protest among young people in the pre-war years.

Even at that time, when there were grounds for hope, the effects of the emphasis on the mass protest were not all good. Gradually people began to adjust themselves to accept the oncoming war, and when this happened, the pacifist young men were bewildered. They had learned to trust to the "safety of numbers", they were not prepared to stand alone, or with the few who still thought like them. Nowadays, to try to build a movement on hopes for "results" would be disastrous.

The need of the times is not for a "pressure-group" or for a big public show. The need is for what we may call an "underground of abstentionism." Instead of putting our efforts into building national organizations and impressive

Problems of Anti-War Activity - 2

"united fronts", we must strengthen the individual so that he may survive and retain his integrity, so that he may strengthen his comradeship with his fellows.

What strengthens a man? About this, no facile generalizing is possible. Just because it must be the work of a man alone, and his friends, and no one can generalize about it, must we expose the fraudulence of other pretended sources of strength.

III. The Error of Conscientious Objectionism

The third error is the error of COism. I am referring, of course, to the tradition of what is known as the pacifist movement, as a distinct part of the general anti-war movement. According to this tradition, the important thing is to be a conscientious objector. The idea is to persuade people, by word or example, to take this stand. When they do, either all else follows, or nothing else need follow.

We find so much wrong with this whole point of view that I hardly know where to begin.

First of all, it is wrong to take a negative, defensive reaction and make it the centre of all propaganda and action. By contrast, the anarchist idea of the "free man" includes an attitude toward war—we try to abstain in the best ways we can—but we try not to be dominated by the war or the government's demands, we mean to affirm life, to affirm free-

dom, to affirm the potentialities of man.

Along with emphasis on a rigid, negative position, goes the creation of a "false elite". The young pacifist is given to understand that this is the ideal toward which he should strive, and that when he has achieved it he may rest content. Once again, our ideal, however short of it our best efforts will leave us, must be freedom.

Third, when a man takes the CO stand, he is in fact recognizing the State. Often enough, there are good grounds for doing so. Sometimes it is simply the best action of which a man is capable at a particular time. Other times a man may give this recognition to the State only for the sake of doing public battle with it, defying it and challenging it to do its worst. What I am objecting to is not the action—often it is exactly the right action—but the teaching of it as the model to follow.

Again by contrast: the "free man", so far as we can hope to approach this ideal, may be a CO, or he may not be. He takes the step which is the best he can invent at the time. What this step is, he determines; it is not determined for him by the government or by anti-war leaders. If he desires to give battle to the State, he attempts to do so on his own terms.

Another bad feature of COism is that its appeal is to some of the worst parts of us all—the desire to suffer, a desire from which few persons to-day can wholly escape, and which we should certainly not encourage. It is true that the very best choice a man can make,

in such an evil situation, may lead to suffering; it may even be the case invariably. But this is all we should say; we should not go on to say, a man can tell the right way by the fact that it leads to greatest suffering.

Finally, COism is sectarian. It suggests that any other stand on conscription, any other attitude toward the war, is not genuine. It rules out comradeship between those who take the CO stand, those who are lucky enough to work out a different solution, and those whose bad luck or personal failures overcome their real desire to abstain from war.

We might sum up our objections to COism by asking: is it too much to expect allowance to be made for difference of temperament and difference of philosophy?

IV

Let us turn the coin over.

We do not tell people: peace is possible. We tell them plainly: war is rooted in this social system, peace is not possible now. But you are not obliged to engage in this slaughter, no matter what your fellow men do. If you can do nothing more, abstain. If you can, help us work to change the conditions which make war inevitable.

We do not tell people: your safety and strength are in numbers, in a mass. We say to them: the strength of the movement is created by the strength of the individual, and each man can increase his own strength.

We do not tell people, directly or indirectly: be a CO. We say: the step that counts is the step of achieving the will to abstain from the war, to try to be free, to try to work to abolish war. No dogma, and no elite!

DAVID WIECK.

Internationalism and the Olympic Spirit

Continued from p. 1

"Peace Rally" in Helsinki, at which prominent Soviet and satellite athletes spoke. Emil Zatopek, for example, attacked the Americans as war-mongers and denounced the American General Staff in Korea because they didn't even stop the fighting for the period of the games.

Victor Tchoukarine, the champion Olympic gymnast, and a Russian, spoke on the subject of American use of germ warfare.

The *Times* does not report this incident, its Olympian spirit being above taking notice of the political views of middle distance runners... But it is rather more amusing to find that the *Daily Worker* also omitted these exploits of Zatopek and Tchoukarine! Much of the circulation of the *Daily Worker* is said to rest on their racing correspondent "Cayton", and it would scarcely be polite to offend the susceptibilities of British sportsmen!

Retreat from Internationalism

The whole episode illustrates the general retreat from international-

strength of anarchism lies just in this ability to touch the sense of truth in people in general.

To maintain this kind of strength demands absolute adherence to principle and absolute refusal to make expedient concessions—a task much easier for a small and insignificant movement than for a large and potentially, influential one.

Recognition of this fact makes the task of even a small movement easier to grasp. It is to show the practical relevance of the universal truths which anarchists assert to people who feel such things to be true, but who do not regard them as practical politics.

Despite general setbacks in the world situation it can be said that the truths which anarchism teaches are more supported to-day than ever before by researchers in practical fields. To put the matter another way: the world has reached such a pass that it is becoming ever clearer that superficial expedients must give place to the radical kinds of solution so long advocated by the anarchists.

But it still remains for individual anarchists to demonstrate these truths and underline them in every possible way.

ism and also the fact that the nations are not now dominated by the ruling class spirit which motivated the forbears of the Royal Dukes—and so their attitude to the games is also different.

The exacerbation of nationalism is itself illustrated in a minor way in the analysis of the British failure at the games. This is attributed to the fact that although no nation makes a greater fetish of games than the British none takes them so lightly in a national way. It appears that in Britain there are only 65 cinder tracks, whereas in the State of California alone there are over 600! Philip Noel-Baker sadly remarks that "we have only begun to take sport to the people, as the Finns, the Americans, the Russians and the Germans have done."

International Red Cross

IF the spirit of the Olympic Games indicates the decay of the trend towards internationalism which Kropotkin discerned and approved, the present state of the International Red Cross illustrates the same decay—or rather the steady swamping of international co-operation by nationalist rivalry.

At the time when the Russians were boycotting the United Nations, they used the meetings of the International Red Cross as a platform instead. So do the Communist Government of China—for the same reason. Both are unconcerned about the value and the future of the Red Cross.

The Western nations, it is claimed, are anxious not to provoke the Russian bloc into walking out of the Red Cross, whose usefulness, they rightly insist, depends on its being a truly international body. But it seems doubtful if the formal adherence to internationalism at present shown by the Red Cross is quite the same thing.

The Russians will not accept Red Cross investigation of the charges

Salvatore Giuliano, a Sicilian bandit, asked the attorney-general who was prosecuting him: "How can a man who has been forced on an evil path be accused, when the forces of evil were created by the same laws that demand his punishment?"

At the 1948 games it was said that the British entrant for the Marathon, a male nurse at a London hospital, had to do his training in his off-time at night, and went straight back on to duty after the event. It is said that the financing of the British teams is shaky and that many would-be entrants are unable to do so for financial reasons. The American, Russian, German Governments, by contrast, sweep aside all such difficulties: for their athletes it is "all found".

No doubt admirable in some ways (for example, results) there can be no doubt that nationalism and its internal propaganda is at work here, to the virtual extinction of the internationalism aimed at by the Olympic Spirit.

of germ warfare because they claim that the Red Cross would favour America and not be a truly impartial body. This may well be true, for it seems unlikely that the aggressive nationalism, the my country right or wrong kind of patriotism which has eaten into internationalism in so many fields should have left the Red Cross wholly untouched. Nevertheless, if there were true international representation it seems unlikely that minority dissenting reports would be ruled out.

The Russians and Chinese also refuse Red Cross inspection of both North Korean and United Nations prisoners camps. These represent too useful propaganda lines to scotch them prematurely by impartial investigation!

It is to be hoped that under all this wrangling at high levels, the International Red Cross still manages to carry on useful work. FREEDOM has so often had to draw attention to the retreat from internationalism in science (penicillin and mepacrine as wartime secrets; atomic research blanketed by the Official Secrets Acts, etc.) that it is easy to forget how serious a loss this represents. And one cannot fail to be alarmed at the reversal of a trend which represented as recently as Kropotkin's time a hope for the future.

FREEDOM PRESS

- MARIE-LOUISE BERNERI :
Neither East nor West cloth 10s. 6d., paper 7s. 6d.
Workers in Stalin's Russia. 1s.
SELECTIONS FROM FREEDOM
Vol. 1, 1951, *Mankind is One* paper 7s. 6d.
- TONY GIBSON :
Youth for Freedom paper 2s.
- PHILIP SANSON :
Syndicalism—The Workers' Next Step 1s.
- ERRICO MALATESTA :
Anarchy. 6d.
Vote—What For? 1d.
- M. BAKUNIN :
Marxism, Freedom and the State. paper 2s. 6d., cloth 5s.
- HERBERT READ :
Art and the Evolution of Man. 4s.
Existentialism, Marxism and Anarchism. 3s. 6d.
Poetry and Anarchism. cloth 5s., paper 2s. 6d.
The Philosophy of Anarchism. boards 2s. 6d., paper 1s.
The Education of Free Men. 1s.
- ALEX COMFORT :
Delinquency 6d.
Barbarism & Sexual Freedom. paper 2s. 6d., stiff boards 3s. 6d.
- RUDOLF ROCKER :
Nationalism and Culture. cloth 21s.
- ALEXANDER BERKMAN :
ABC of Anarchism. 1s.
- PETER KROPOTKIN :
The State: Its Historic Role. 1s.
The Wage System. 3d.
Revolutionary Government. 3d.
Organised Vengeance Called Justice. 2d.
- JOHN HEWETSON :
Sexual Freedom for the Young 6d.
Ill-Health, Poverty and the State. cloth 2s. 6d., paper 1s.
- GEORGE WOODCOCK :
Anarchy or Chaos. 2s. 6d.
New Life to the Land. 6d.
Railways and Society. 3d.
Homes orhovels? 6d.
What is Anarchism? 1d.
The Basis of Communal Living. 1s.
- WILLIAM GODWIN :
Selections from Political Justice. 3d.
On Law. 1d.
- F. A. RIDLEY :
The Roman Catholic Church and the Modern Age. 2d.
- ★
Marie Louise Berneri Memorial Committee publications :
Marie Louise Berneri, 1918-1949: A Tribute. cloth 5s.
Journey Through Utopia. cloth 16s. (U.S.A. \$2.50)
- ★
K. J. KENAFICK :
Michael Bakunin and Karl Marx. Paper 6s.
- 27, Red Lion Street, London, W.C.1.

THE SEVENTH ANARCHIST SUMMER SCHOOL

THE seventh annual Summer School was held in London over the week-end of August Bank Holiday. To have held it so regularly and with such persistent success is certainly an event in the Anarchist movement! Once again we had the pleasure of welcoming comrades from all over the country—Glasgow, Bradford, Sheffield, Liverpool, Wolverhampton, Birmingham, Bolton, as well as London, being among the many towns and accents represented. In the comfortable premises of the Renaissance Club, very kindly made available by the "New Europe" Group, a series of lectures was held, and during the meantime open-air meetings at our regular pitches in Manette Street and Hyde Park were addressed by a galaxy of our orators, including Mat Kavanagh, Eddie Shaw and Philip Sansom.

The opening lecture was given by Albert Meltzer. Speaking on "Contemporary Anarchism," he outlined the attitudes and immediate aims of the Anarchist Movement, making the point that Anarchism to-day could not be considered an insignificant sect, and that in fact it was the undefined aim of a very large number of people who might not always recognise that fact. He cited humorously the instance of a man who told him—"I've got no time for Anarchism—I'm too busy with my unofficial strike committee and group-building our own house!" What was that but Anarchism? A large number of trends—the libertarian movement in education, self-building, unofficial workers' action, ideas of workers' control—were in fact anarchistic, and it was our job to give definition and a linked, positive aim to these ideas.

Eddie Shaw, speaking on "Propaganda in an Industrial Area," put forward the objections and prejudices encountered by the open-air speaker, and how you could overcome them effectively by the conscious-egoist case. As long as you kept them laughing, they would not be coming out with the bicycle chains. They would soon learn that it was in their own interests to combine and overcome the way in which they were being oppressed, once you let them know they were the mugs being used for the bosses' interests, and were not as smart as they imagined.

On the Sunday, John Hewetson dealt with the "Integration of Anarchist Ideas," outlining the social and personal impact of anarchism upon the personality. The Marxist, in ignoring the necessity of these problems, was having a harmful effect upon the working-class movement. It was significant to note how, despite the emphasis placed upon economics alone by Marx, in his personal life and that of his daughters conventional bourgeois morality was dominant—as witness Marx's attitude to Engel's "mistress" and the suicide of Eleanor Marx-Aveling.

Geoffrey Ostergaard gave a very full and concise lecture on "Workers' Control," the text of which is to be reproduced in FREEDOM. Finally, Tony Gibson, dealing with "Revolution and Happiness" outlined the struggle both for workers' control and for personal liberty, and the relationship of sexual emancipation to that of social emancipation.

The subjects raised in discussion have and will be dealt with very fully in these columns, and once more the Summer School has been

very effective in bringing a study of the problems of our movement before those who are in turn actively bringing forward those ideas to the public. In the course of its existence, the Summer School has been able to bring our militants together to clarify the attitudes which they are expounding in print and by the spoken word, as well as providing a convivial get-together for comrades who so seldom get the opportunity of meeting.

THE DOUBLE-THINK OF MR. MOOREHEAD

His principal contention is that these three men exhibited an almost pathological arrogance in setting up their own private consciences above the conscience and judgment of "society." "[Fuchs] was basically a man who would always refer to his own conscience first and society afterwards. There is no place for such men in an ordered community. They belong where Fuchs now is, sewing mailbags in Stafford Gaol." Seldom can an honest but confused man have been so successfully hoist on his enemies' petard, for this is a piece of straight Fascist or Communist morality.

—The Observer, 20/7/52, reviewing "The Traitors: The Double Life of Fuchs, Pontecorvo and Nunn May", by Alan Moorehead.

SPEAKING in February to the Manchester and Salford Trades Council, Dr. Brian, then Chairman of the Executive of the Association of Scientific Workers gave Mancunians a much more authoritative—and much more alarming—assessment of their chances in the next war than the government's recent Civil Defence appeals, (the callousness of which has provoked this reminiscence). He said:

"Five years ago, on August 6th, 1945, a uranium bomb was dropped on Hiroshima. This was equal to 20,000 tons of high explosive. A plutonium bomb was dropped on Nagasaki three days later—this was more powerful still; between 75,000 and 100,000 people were killed. Half of this number was killed by fire, another quarter by heat flash. The other quarter was killed by radioactivity, which did not affect them until some time afterwards. Ten thousand died off through destruction of blood corpuscles.

"With one bomb on an average British city, 50,000 people could be killed. Deep shelters could offer some protection but only providing we had a timely warning system. [Our emphasis].

"To-day the nuclear bombs that are being made in the U.S.A. are much more powerful than those dropped in 1945. A hydrogen bomb, according to estimates, could kill a million people in a city like Manchester."

Since the Manchester conurbation has a population of four million, eight such bombs would entirely destroy its inhabi-

itants, one-tenth of the population of England. This computation assumes unexpected inefficiencies in this gas-chamber technique of removing one's enemies, such as the inconvenient thinning out of the housing density towards the periphery of the conurbation.

It is interesting to note that in an earlier assault of rulers on ruled, the St. Peter's Fields massacre, known as Peterloo, eleven people were killed and 400 wounded. The resulting wave of horror throughout the country was responsible for much of the middle-class support for the Reform Bill. To-day the prospect of ten thousand Peterloos within three kilometres of the same spot causes only a flicker of interest. If anything this is more alarming than the actual prospect of destruction, for it seems that what is vital to society has already been destroyed. Manchester ERG.

KEEPING UP WITH THE TIMES

THERE used to be a story told in Wick when I was a boy of an English traveller who was caught there in a great snow storm and marooned for three whole days in a temperance hotel.

The wires were down, the harbour was frozen, the railroad was twenty feet deep in snow, and the outlook generally was as black as the landscape was white.

At the end of the second day the traveller met a fisherman and asked him how long he thought the storm would last. The fisherman ejected a stream of tobacco juice which burned a black hole in the snow, and replied, "About a week."

"A week!" the Englishman cried. "Do you mean to say that the people in Wick won't know for a whole week what's going on in London?"

"Aye! That's the way of it," said the fisherman, hitting the same spot with another jet of black juice, "but then, ye see, sir, the fowk in London are no better off, for they won't know what's going on in Wick."

—IAN MACKAY in Tribune.

Workers' Control and the Free Society Continued from p. 2

the development of industry, work becomes increasingly social in character but individual appropriation of the product of industry by the capitalist remains in force, thereby creating a conflict between the socialised character of production and private property relations. At a certain stage of social evolution, private ownership of the instruments of production becomes a fetter on the social productive forces. This is recognised by the capitalists themselves who seek to unify the ownership of the instruments of production in the form of joint stock companies, combines and trusts, and, even, in a few selected cases, by state ownership itself. But with this development of large-scale organisation, the superfluity of the bourgeois class becomes increasingly evident—the capitalist no longer manages his own enterprise but hires managers to do it for him. The social functions of the entrepreneur are thus, more and more, performed by salaried employees while the capitalist is revealed as a purely parasitic element. The logical culmination of this process is the complete collective ownership of the instruments of production which is effected by the proletariat when it captures political power. Collective or state ownership and control of the means of production, distribution and exchange is thus regarded by the socialists as the form of property relations appropriate to the

social character of the productive process.

Ownership and Control

The most important point to notice about this theory of nationalisation is that the ownership of the means of production is regarded as the most important factor. Their relationship to the ownership of the means of production defines the two classes of society; the end of the process is a change in the form of ownership; and the implication is that when the state owns the means of production, classes will necessarily be abolished. The Marxists, it is true, unlike the reformist socialists, recognise that limited amount of state ownership of industry is compatible with capitalism, and indeed serves the interests of capitalism so long as the capitalists control the state. But from this they deduce only that the state must be controlled by the political party of the proletariat and must own all the means of production. The whole theory of socialism, in fact, revolves round the question of ownership; and the assumption is that when the capitalists are ousted from ownership and their property transferred to the state, the fundamental problem has been solved. Hence, the popular conception of socialism as a system under which capitalist private property rights in the instruments of production have been abolished.

Fundamental Error

This assumption that ownership is all-important is the cardinal error of socialism. And the consequence of this error is that socialists have been and for the most part still are bemused by the mere outward legalistic forms of property: they have mistaken the shadow for the substance. While recognising that the power of domination exercised by the ruling class derives from its relationship to the instruments of production, they have misunderstood this relationship. They have confused ownership with control, or rather, they have failed to distinguish the two. They have not seen that private property relations are not essential for the maintenance of class rule, that a ruling class—although not the capitalist ruling class—can exist even where all property is state-owned—so long as the ruling class controls the means of production. For what matters is not ownership but control. Ownership in fact is an empty, meaningless concept unless control goes with it. When you are looking for the boss in any place, the real "owner", you must find, not the man with the title deeds in his pocket, but the man who has the last word about what shall and shall not be done.

—GEOFFREY OSTERGAARD.

[This is part of a lecture given to the Anarchist Summer School, and will be continued in our next issue.]

Lessons of the Spanish Revolution Continued from p. 2

they suffered from the diseases of leadership: caution, fear of the uncontrolled masses, remoteness from the aspirations of these masses and a messianic feeling that all wisdom and initiative flows from above and that all the masses need do is carry out unquestioningly the instructions of these supermen. Santillan for instance, wants us to believe that the Committee of the Anti-Fascist Militias, a group composed of representatives of all the political parties and the U.G.T and C.N.T., and in which he played a prominent part, was responsible for establishing revolutionary order in the rearguard, the organisation of the armed militias, and the training of specialists; victualling and clothing, economic organisation, legislative and judicial action; "the Committee of Militias—he writes—was all this, and attended to all this, the transformation of civilian industries to war requirements, propaganda, relations with the Madrid Government, help to all the centres of struggle, the cultivation of all available land, hygiene, guarding the coasts and frontiers, a thousand tasks of all kinds . . ." and so on until he reaches a point where he writes: "It was needful to strengthen and support it so that it might the better fulfil its task, since salvation depended on its strength . . ." (our italics). Is it surprising that with such a mentality—and we must insist that it smacks of that contempt which all politicians have for the toiling masses—the C.N.T.—F.A.I. leaders should have continued to participate in, and thereby strengthen, the State institutions, and be completely blinded to the real revolutionary potentialities of the working people?

★

"Either Libertarian Communism, which means the anarchist dictatorship or democracy, which means collaboration" was the way Garcia Oliver and the "most influential militants" interpreted the "realities of the moment". We shall be more bold than Peirats who writes: "We shall not examine here the correctness of that appreciation". None of the foreign anarchists who criticised the course taken by the C.N.T.—F.A.I. ever suggested that the Spanish revolutionaries should impose by force the social revolution on the population. Assuming the moment was not ripe for such a complete social transformation, does it follow that the only alternative

was collaboration with political parties which, when they had power, had always persecuted the C.N.T.—F.A.I.? In that case why had the C.N.T.—F.A.I. never collaborated with them in past struggles when the chances of establishing libertarian communism had been much more doubtful than on July 19? We can already hear the answer: "Because this time Spain was fighting international fascism, and we had first to win the war and then proceed to the social revolution. And to win the war it was necessary to collaborate with all the parties opposed to Franco."

This argument contains, in our opinion, two fundamental mistakes, which many of the leaders of the C.N.T.—F.A.I. have since recognised, but for which there can be no excuse, since they were not mistakes of judgment but the deliberate abandonment of the principles of the C.N.T. Firstly, that an armed struggle against fascism or any other form of reaction, could be waged more successfully within the framework of the State and by subordinating all else, including the transformation of the economic and social structure of the country to winning the war. Secondly, that it was essential, and possible, to collaborate with political parties—that is with politicians—honestly and sincerely, and at a time when all power was in the hands of the two workers' organisations.

It was, for instance, abundantly clear from the beginning that the Communists who were such a small minority in Spain (and non-existent in Catalonia) would use the breathing space that collaboration allowed to worm their way into the Socialist ranks, by political alliances, and by playing on the politicians' fears of the threat to any future political hegemony represented by a thoroughgoing social revolution. To this end the Communists from the outset abandoned all revolutionary slogans and declared themselves the champions of "democracy".

The first mistake, it should be remembered, was made in the early days of the struggle, when an ill-armed people were halting a carefully prepared military operation carried out by a trained and well equipped army,

which no one imagined could be resisted, not even some of the "influential members" of the C.N.T.—F.A.I. And these same workers showed their determination by volunteering in large numbers for the armed columns setting out to liberate the occupied areas. All the initiative—and we have said this before and will repeat it again and again—was in the hands of the workers. The politicians instead were like generals without armies floundering in a desert of futility. Collaboration with them could not by any stretch of the imagination strengthen the resistance to Franco. On the contrary, it was clear that collaboration with the political parties meant the re-creation of governmental institutions and the transferring of initiative from the armed workers to a central body with executive powers. By removing the initiative from the workers, the responsibility for the conduct of the struggle and its objectives were also transferred to a governing hierarchy, and this could not have other than an adverse effect on the morale of the revolutionary fighters. The slogan of the C.N.T.—F.A.I. leadership "the war first the revolution after" was the greatest blunder that could have been made, and was fully exploited by the politicians to their advantage. Santillan realised the enormity of the mistake only when it was too late: "We knew that it was not possible to triumph in the revolution if we were not victorious in the war, and we sacrificed everything for the war. We even sacrificed the revolution without noticing that that sacrifice also implied the sacrifice of the objectives of the war" (in *Por que perdimos la Guerra*).

"The Social Revolution or democracy", "The anarchist dictatorship or democratic government" were the alternatives only for revolutionaries who had lost faith with their people and in the rightness of the basic principles of the C.N.T.—F.A.I. Guided by these and supported by the impressive achievements of the revolutionary workers in arms we have the temerity to attempt the formulation of a refutation of these "alternatives" and a defence of the validity of anarchist principles in their application to the practical problems of the Spanish situation in 1936. V.R.

(To be continued.)

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP OPEN AIR MEETINGS

Weather Permitting
HYDE PARK
Every Sunday at 4.30 p.m.
MANETTE STREET
(by Foyle's, Charing Cross Road)
Every Saturday at 6.0 p.m.

NORTH-EAST LONDON

DISCUSSION MEETINGS
IN EAST HAM
Alternate Wednesdays
at 7.30
AUG. 20—Discussion
FUTURE GROUP ACTIVITY

WEST LONDON

Enquiries to—
C. Brasnett, 79 Warwick Ave., W.9

LIVERPOOL

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

GLASGOW

OUTDOOR MEETINGS
at
MAXWELL STREET
Every Sunday at 7 p.m.
With John Gaffney, Frank Leech,
Jane Strachan, Eddie Shaw
Frank Carlin

LEEDS

Anyone interested in forming a group in Leeds, please contact Freedom Press in first instance.

COVENTRY

Anyone interested in forming a group in Coventry, please write Freedom Press.

FREEDOM

The Anarchist Weekly

Postal Subscription Rates
12 months 17/- (U.S.A. \$3.00)
6 months 8/6 (U.S.A. \$1.50)
3 months 4/6 (U.S.A. \$0.75)

Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies
12 months 27/- (U.S.A. \$4.50)
6 months 13/6 (U.S.A. \$2.25)

Cheques, P.O.'s and Money Orders should be made out to FREEDOM PRESS, crossed a/c Payee, and addressed to the publishers.

FREEDOM PRESS
27 Red Lion Street
London, W.C.1 England
Tel.: Chancery 8364