

# Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

## RISING TENSION IN AFRICA

RACIALISM continues to be the altar on which lives are sacrificed in Africa. The French policy in Morocco—described in the last issue of FREEDOM—consists in the last resort in the defence of European supremacy and such a programme must in its nature fan all the fires of Moroccan nationalism. Reactionaries of the right support the whites against the blacks and browns at all costs, while left wing oppositionists support nationalism as being a "progressive" force against imperialism without considering what a hydra-headed monster nationalism is. (Aggressive nationalism was seen in Nazi Germany, subject-race nationalism in Indian "self-rule"; both of them, on any human view, in their different ways depressing enough). There can be no resolution of such a conflict: it can only raise new and bloody problems, and block the way to positive solutions which contain progress for the populations concerned.

Exactly the same deadlock is being enacted in Central and Southern Africa. The white settlers in Kenya claim to have "overcome" the Mau Mau crisis. But the Kikuyu's land hunger remains the same, the race issue remains the same, with a new bitterness and disillusionment added.

**Nyasaland**  
"Disorders" which began last week in the Cholo district of Nyasaland are spreading. The native popu-

lation has launched a non-co-operation campaign against Central African Federation and additional grievances over the land rights of tenant farmers on the estates of the white settlers have added to the state of tension. African peasants have blocked roads with road blocks and by felling trees, and have also destroyed bridges, presumably to hinder the movements of the police and troops who have been brought in.

The police have used tear gas to disperse crowds and in some cases have opened fire on them, several deaths being reported. The government of Nyasaland has appealed to Southern Rhodesia for police assistance, and reinforcements have been duly flown into the territory from Salisbury. As a result of the state of emergency a police display which was to have taken place at the weekend during the agricultural show at Salisbury has been cancelled.

The *Observer's* correspondent concludes an account of the disturbances in Nyasaland with the ominous remark: "The events of the past few days serve to emphasise how tense race relations have become in what had been Africa's most peaceful colonial territory before federation began two years ago." (our italics).

A correspondent described in FREEDOM a few months ago the attitude of white settlers and of the natives in Nyasaland and showed what Central African Federation meant in terms of the economic subjection of the latter by the former. There can be no doubt at all that a government which disregards the unanimous protest of six million Africans and thrusts through unpopular legislation to suit a few thousands of white settlers is simply provoking violence. They are still apparently banking on the philosophy ridiculed by Hilaire Belloc's rhyme:

"... We have got  
The Maxim gun, and they have  
not!"

Continued on p. 3

## American Aid Strengthens Franco

WITH the passing of the years, and the growing political opportunism that is fostered by the unrelenting West versus East propaganda, the general hostility that existed in the world to Franco's régime has been slowly but surely undermined. This is particularly the case in America where the only qualification for an ally is that he should be opposed to Russia and "Communism".

The *coup d'Etat* in Iran, which among other things is considered as a potential blow at Russian influence in that country, is viewed by America, according to the *New York Herald Tribune's* Washington correspondent, with "undisguised relief". And for his part the new Iranian Prime Minister Major General Zahedi realises that if he is to solve some of the urgent economic problems, and thus prevent a general revolt against his régime in due course, he needs Anglo-American backing. Accordingly one of his first acts has been to order the police to clean-up what "Red influence" exists in the country. Last week, for instance, it was reported that the police burned thousands of captured Communist publications in a vacant lot in the capital. And according to the newspaper *Dad* "Gen. Zahedi's government has decided to widen the anti-Communist drive by firing known Communists from government jobs. Under the Mossadegh régime, Communists infiltrated the Education Ministry, and particularly the Finance, Post, Telegraph and Health Ministries.

The Zahedi dragnet also scooped into jails 16 brewery workers, three spinning mill hands and 15 others as potential sources of trouble for the new chieftain. The number arrested in the roundup so far is estimated at well over 300."

On the other hand General Zahedi has stated that negotiations started by Mossadeq with the Russian government would continue, and the Shah has told newspapermen that Iran was ready to accept help from any nation—even Russia. Such blackmailing tactics obviously pay dividends. And who can but doubt nevertheless that this orgy of book-burning will make of Senator McCarthy and his influential friends, life-long allies of the new régime in Iran?

To return to Franco's Spain. Franco is obviously in a strong bargaining position, and has not yet signed any agreement with the United States, though discussions have been going on now for eighteen months. But it seems that the end is in sight, and the proposed terms deserve to be reported *in extenso* since they once more show how wrong those well-meaning friends of Spain are who advocated that Spain should be assisted in her economic plight. The argument put forward by such people as Gerald Brenan in *The Face of Spain* was that Spain should be included in the Marshall

Aid; that however corrupt the administration might be some, at least, of the food and fertilisers would find their way to those who needed them and the real poverty of the Spanish peasant would at least be relieved.\* But if it is only realised that neither Franco nor the American Government are interested in the condition of the Spanish peasant's belly (if they had been would they have made him wait eighteen months in deciding how to fill it for him?) but in much less personal and human matters, and this is clearly shown by the reported terms of the agreement published in the *New York Times* (August 26):

The spokesman for the State Department indicated that the two governments had come to terms on basic principles, but he added that there were "still some wrinkles to iron out."

The agreement consists of three parts: the use of Spanish military bases by United States forces, United States military aid for Madrid, and, separately, United States economic assistance.

A reported but unconfirmed outline of the forthcoming agreement indicated that United States military aid might reach as much as \$132,000,000, to be spent primarily for improvement of Spanish military equipment.

Additional financial aid, bringing total assistance to something more than \$200,000,000, would be made available for improvement of industrial and transportation equipment essential to the defence effort. In general, the economic aid agreement would follow the lines of standard mutual assistance pacts with other friendly governments.

In return for this help, Spain would make certain military installations available to the United States, although Madrid would retain ownership. (Our italics).

As can readily be seen Franco in providing the American bases will get in return the means for strengthening his military machine. In the process (and this is one of the fantastic aspects of capitalism) work will be provided for some thousands of unemployed Spanish workers, who will therefore be able to fill their bellies with a little more food (probably imported from America). But the net result will be that not only will the plight of the peasant remain unchanged but that Franco will be in a much stronger position to keep down any attempts by the starving masses to overthrow his régime. Thus will American foreign policy have two successes: that of getting a foothold in Spain (through the naval and air bases) and at the same time strengthening the grip of Spanish reactionaries over the rest of the country.

Such is the rôle of "American democracy" in the world to-day. R.

\*These arguments were discussed at length in FREEDOM and will be found reproduced in Vol. 1 of *Selections from Freedom*.

## Electricians Out Again

FOLLOWING last week's strike action by nearly 1,500 electricians at selected works throughout the country, conciliatory measures were taken by the Ministry of Labour to get the two sides together.

The employers' organisation, the National Federation of Electrical Associations, agreed to meet spokesmen for the Electrical Trades Union last Monday to discuss further consideration of the E.T.U.'s wage claim. The E.T.U. agreed for the strikers to start work again on Monday morning as a gesture of good faith.

The employers, however, had no such good faith themselves, and in the discussions on Monday the best they could offer was that they would bring an answer from their members in 14 days' time giving a date for further discussions at National level!

This of course was quite unacceptable for the electricians. Another fourteen days' work would see the two big exhibitions—the Radio Show at Olympia and the Marine Engineering at Earls Court—well open and under way, and would give the employers time to organise their labour so that all urgent work was cleared up, and they could be prepared for a stoppage of almost indefinite length. Electrical contractors are able to stand off their workers whenever a particular job has been finished—and in 14 days quite a lot of "sparks" would have found themselves out of a job.

So the E.T.U. has taken the only possible course—immediate strike action again—and on a bigger scale than before. At mass meetings at Earls Court and Olympia, all workers were called out. This means not only workers on the contracting side employed by the N.F.E.A., but also engineers and maintenance men, so far not affected, have joined the strike. At the time of writing—

"Nothing is so bad as consistency

The politicians are the most prominent victims of the doctrine of consistency."

—LORD BEAVERBROOK, ("Success")

Tuesday morning—Olympia and Earls Court are at a complete standstill as far as electrical work is concerned.

And throughout the country, all those who were out last week—at the oil installations, the atomic station at Aldermaston and elsewhere—are being called out again.

Now it looks as if the gloves are really off, and a long-drawn-out battle may follow. The E.T.U.'s action however, may divide the employers, for firms outside the N.F.E.A. are now being affected and may bring pressure on the contractors to settle the electricians' grievances in the interests of the industry as a whole.

This is that rarity—an official strike. The E.T.U. is of course Communist-led and we shall be interested to see how this strike develops.

## When Black is White THE LAW (is an Ass)

DURBAN, Aug. 23 (A.P.).—A local magistrate ruled yesterday that a Durban man is both a white man and a coloured man, while his wife, who has been registered for 20 years as a white voter, is a coloured woman.

The case was one in which the man was charged under the Group Areas act with having occupied premises in a district set aside for white people. The magistrate said the act was "most intricate" and it was possible for a person to be classified as belonging to one race group under one section and to another race group under another section.

The man before the court was obviously white, he said, and were it not for a certain section of the act he would have been discharged.

The section in question dealt with his wife, the magistrate said, and she fell within the coloured group, so her husband must therefore be said to be in that group.

He imposed a nominal fine of £1. An appeal is to be lodged.

## DEAR READER...

WE hope our readers will not think it out of place if our editorial column this week deals with the problems facing us as a publishing group. It is the first time this year that we have used our space to talk about our administrative problems, and it is perhaps an opportune moment since at this time of the year a large number of subscriptions are due for renewal. Several hundred readers will have received renewal notices this week, and it is not an exaggeration to say that the future regular weekly publication of FREEDOM is dependent on these notices receiving prompt attention.

The publication and distribution of minority journals such as FREEDOM becomes ever more difficult because of increasing production costs and the limited demand which does not make it "worthwhile" for the trade distributors to handle such journals. Such difficulties have in the past been overcome by enthusiasts in the progressive movements who have undertaken the distribution by selling at meetings and on the streets. It appears that among the present generation there are fewer pioneers than in the pre-Welfare State days, and FREEDOM in common with other minority journals has been made to feel the effect of this new attitude. Our work has also suffered by post-war emigration; in Glasgow, for instance, an active, lively group has been reduced to one or two stalwarts who do what they can to propagate anarchist

Continued on p. 3

## "Progress Report" on the Great Witch-hunt LAWYERS NOW. WHO'S NEXT ?

AMERICAN progressives who were among the initial supporters of the political witch-hunt are now becoming a little worried by the power of this thought-control machine. And well might they, for the real danger is not vested in McCarthy and his Committees alone. After all there must be ways and means of removing them. What is the real danger is that the McCarthy mentality should spread throughout the population and result in private witch-hunts. And this is what in effect is happening in America to-day.

One example is provided by the decision of the American Bar Association to "clean its ranks of Communists". The report which was unanimously accepted by the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association last week stated that Communist party membership was incompatible with membership in the bar and that "the hour of accounting" by these attorneys has been too long delayed.

In adopting the report, the House of Delegates, which is the policy-making body of the Bar Association, did not even debate the issue. The report was by a special Committee to Study Communist Tactics, Strategy and Objectives, headed by former Senator Herbert R. O'Connor, Democrat of Maryland and one-time chairman of the Senate Crime Investigating Committee.

The committee was established in February as the result of a resolution, adopted at the mid-winter meeting of the House of Delegates in Chicago, that noted that some lawyers, "relatively few in number," had been members of the Communist party cells.

The resolution called on the Attorney General to take action to determine the fitness of Communist lawyers to practice before the Federal bar and for local associations to attack the problem at the state levels.

The committee said that it had compiled a list of lawyers who had been identified under oath as members of the Communist party and who had invoked their constitutional rights against possible self-incrimination to questions concerning Communist membership or attachment.

The report said that lawyers under the shadow of Communist connections should be permitted to return before Congressional committees and "give frank testimony." What was sought by this procedure, said the report, "is not punishment for past deeds or mistakes, but a determination of present fitness and worth to be a member of an honorable and a responsible profession."

Mr. O'Connor's committee said that it had concluded, as a result of its study, that "no one who is presently a Communist is fit or should be permitted to be a member of any bar of this country." The report added that "it should now be obvious that membership in the Communist party is incompatible and inconsistent with membership at the bar."

Read in conjunction with what we know of the present witch-hunt mentality the following suggestions made by the committee take on a sinister meaning:

At the same time the committee said that some lay witnesses might have refused to testify before Congressional committees "on the advice of attorneys

Continued on p. 4

TO-DAY the term 'Grand National' signifies to the average worker nothing more than a fashionable horse-race but a 120 years ago it stood for something more impressive: the Grand National Consolidated Trades Union—the first-ever One Big Union with the avowed object of wresting control of the instruments of production from the hands of the capitalists and placing them under the control of the producers. In his latest book—a revised version of a study first published in the International Review for Social History, 1939.—Professor Cole retells, in more detail and with more accuracy than previous historians, the exciting story of the British workers' first attempt at a full-scale assault on the citadels of industrial capitalism.

The story begins at Manchester in 1818 when, under the leadership of the Spinners' Union, an attempt was made to organise a General Union of Trades—the Philanthropic Society. This organisation was still-born but it inspired John Doherty, the most influential trade unionist of his day, to further attempts along the same lines, in 1826 and again in 1830 when he launched the National

\* Attempts at General Union, 1818-1834. Macmillan, 16s.

Association for the Protection of Labour. As the name of the latter shows, the objects of these first general unions were reformist: to prevent wage reductions and to secure 'to the industrious workman a just and adequate remuneration for his labour'. The general union, in short, was just a bigger and better trade union. But, the education of the workers once begun, it could not be halted at that point. If a general union could win reforms, could it not also achieve a revolution? Using the general expropriatory strike, or, as he called it, the Grand National Holiday, could not a general union smash the capitalist system once and for all and establish in its place a system of mutual co-operation in which the workers themselves owned and controlled the new machines? So, at least, many workers, men and women, asked themselves and determined to find the answer.

The early 1830's were hectic days. The agricultural labourers were in revolt, marching forth to destroy the hated threshing machines and to burn

# THE GRAND NATIONAL

the ricks of unpopular farmers and landowners. The agitation for political reform, the results of which in 1832 were to be such a bitter disappointment to the working class radicals, was reaching its peak. The eight hours day movement was gaining momentum under the impact of the idea of simply refusing to work any longer than eight hours. In the trade union world itself, the repeal of the Combination Laws, which Francis Place engineered in 1824, had acted as a great fillip. The trade unions were still hedged in by many legal restrictions but, at least, the mere fact of combination was no longer a crime. Trade unions, previously disguised as Friendly Societies, came out in the open and many new unions were formed in all trades. Co-operative Societies were springing up everywhere and by 1932 numbered a round 500: co-operative societies which were not merely grocery stores but shops started by workers with the object of accumulating enough capital to establish a communist community, or 'Union' workshops in which craftsmen, with the same ultimate object in view, manufactured their products for exchange in the Labour Bazaars.

The inspirer of the co-operatives, both productive and distributive, was Robert Owen, one of the first of the great capitalist manufacturers but one who denounced capitalism as the source of the workers' miseries and who taught that labour was the origin and measure of all value. It was Owen who attended the Builders' 'Parliament', the national conference of the Operative Builders' Union, in 1833 and persuaded the dele-

gates to transform the Union into a Grand National Guild for the purpose of taking over the entire building industry of the country. Encouraged by the reception which the building workers had given him, Owen proceeded next to a national congress of trade union and co-operative societies held in October of the same year. To this congress he outlined a more ambitious plan, the formation of a Grand National Moral Union of the Productive Classes of Great Britain and Ireland to which all workers' organisations, trade union, co-operative and propagandist, were urged to affiliate. The plan was readily endorsed and arrangements made for a further conference at which formal rules were to be adopted. This second conference, a purely trade union body of which Owen was not at first a member, met in February, 1834, adopted a constitution and declared itself to be the Grand National Consolidated Trades Union.

RULE XLVI of the constitution underlined the revolutionary objective of the new body: "That although the design of the Union is, in the first instance, to raise the wages of the workmen, or prevent any further reduction therein, and to diminish the hours of labour, the great and ultimate object of it must be to establish the paramount rights of Industry and Humanity, by instituting such measures as shall effectually prevent the ignorant, idle, and useless part of Society from having that undue control over the fruits of our toil, which, through the agency of a vicious money system, they at present possess; and that, consequently, the Unionists should lose no opportunity

of mutually encouraging and assisting each other in bringing about A DIFFERENT ORDER OF THINGS, in which the really useful and intelligent part of society only shall have the direction of its affairs, and in which well-directed industry and virtue shall meet their just distinction and reward, and vicious idleness its merited contempt and destitution." As the first practical steps towards this new object, the conference proposed a general scheme of co-operative production. Workers were to be settled on the land, Union shops were to be established for the employment of strikers, and each Lodge was to have its own workshop.

A period of intense activity followed the formation of 'the Grand National'; as the union came to be popularly called. Many new unions were formed and a large number of existing societies at once affiliated to the new organisation. In a short time over half a million members were enrolled under its banner and an equal number were organised in other unions, notably the Builders' (which had not affiliated) and the secret 'Yorkshire Trades Union'. The new industrial proletariat was marshalling itself for a full-scale attack on the capitalist system.

But the attack never came. Before the organisation could be built up and before it had thought out a clear-cut policy of action, the employers, aided by the Government, struck back. The counter-attack had begun before the G.N.C.T.U. had formally come into being. At Derby, where there was a big trade union following, the employers in November 1833, staged a lock-out and insisted that all Union men should sign the notorious 'document' renouncing their membership of any union. One of the first acts of the G.N. was to institute a shilling levy in aid of the Derby

Continued on p. 3

## Freedom & Free Speech

IT is the fond boast of many people in this country that in no other nation in the world is so much freedom enjoyed by the individual. When pressed for an explanation of what this freedom is they usually say that it is freedom of speech, of the written word, of political assembly and so on.

Now, anarchists would be the last to deny the relative value of such concessions—for that is what they are—on the part of the government. Nor do we derogate the struggles waged by our forefathers to obtain these 'rights'. They certainly make our propaganda easier than if we were living under a completely totalitarian régime. But, whilst we give full recognition to these things, we do not fail to point that 'civil liberties' such as these, are limited by the laws of slander, blasphemy and sedition\*, and that during time of war they can be abrogated when the views expressed are considered to menace the safety of the State or its running of the war.

When such suppressions of legal rights take place, liberals, progressives and their ilk are dismayed and often engage in numerous paper protests at our "disappearing liberties". Anarchists are not surprised. We know that our boasted liberties are regarded as mere safety valves by a shrewd ruling class. We know this because to us real freedom is freedom of conduct, i.e. the right of each individual to govern his or her own life. Any free society must have this right as its basis and without it people are slaves who must submit to masters, democratic or otherwise.

It is this basic principle of individual sovereignty which fundamentally differentiates anarchism from all other philosophies. Those who do not believe in the principle of liberty can only realise their ideals by forcibly imposing them on any who disagree with them. They are authoritarians and the methods they use are those of authority, of the submission of the individual to the will of others. The authoritarians want to force people into the structure of their ideal society;

the anarchists want to abolish the obstacles to human freedom, thus creating the conditions for the construction of a new society by means of voluntary co-operation.

Viewing the question of free speech, the freedom of the press and so forth in this manner leads one to the conclusion that it is not necessarily a contradiction of the authority principle for governments to allow varying degrees of such civil liberties at certain times in history. Indeed, considering the slave-like acquiescence of the mass of the people to-day there are some grounds for the suggestion that the granting of these 'rights' at the present time is a sign of the strength of authority rather than of its weakness. It is true that these legal rights were won for us by the struggles of our predecessors, but the modern state has come to recognise the value of granting at least a semblance of free speech to its subjects as a means of syphoning off discontent or political rebellion. (Even in Russia one is allowed to criticise one's superiors—for not driving the workers to greater production!)

A struggle to retain or extend the limited amount of free speech we are allowed bears the same relation to the struggle for basic freedom as do the demands for increased wages to the abolition of the wages system. It is an action of relative value within the framework of the *status quo*, but it should never be confused with, or take the place of, revolutionary direct action for the free society.

The 'freedom' boasted of by the press and its believers is merely a number of civil liberties granted by the government to its subjects. These consist of certain areas of partial autonomy within the structure of the legal system, the government always retaining ultimate control. Anarchists recognise the necessity to defend these "freedoms" when they are threatened since they are better than nothing. Our primary purpose, however, is the struggle for real freedom, the basic freedom of an ungoverned humanity. This freedom cannot be obtained by legislative enactments, constitutions, bills of rights or anything which is by the grace of government.

It can only come from within each individual man and woman, from their will to be masters of themselves and servants of none. S. E. PARKER.

\*Arthur G. Keech, Inspector in Charge of Training, Kent County Constabulary, gives the following equivocal definition of free speech in his booklet "Public Order" (Jordan & Sons Ltd., 1952): "One of the most jealously guarded of the rights of the individual is that of free speech. Every British subject knows that he can say what he wishes, where he likes, without fear of persecution, though (and here is the rub—S.E.P.) it must be kept in mind that the laws of slander, blasphemy and sedition must be observed. In general slander affects the individual, blasphemy the Christian religion, and sedition the Queen and Government; and the right of free speech may be defined as the right to say things which, however radical and controversial, are of a general nature and not in themselves directly harmful to the State." (p. 16).

In other words, one may say what one likes, so long as what one says is not interpreted as directly 'harmful' (i.e. likely to lead to action) to the State. Complete freedom of speech, derivative freedom that it is, is impossible as long as government exists. Only under anarchy will men be completely free to speak their minds.

[NOTE. Bernard Shaw's *Fabian Tract*, *The Impossibilities of Anarchism*, 1893, is well known to students. Less well known however, is the fact that Shaw had previously been associated with the anarchists. A friend of Charlotte Wilson, who collaborated with Kropotkin in founding *Freedom*, Shaw belonged to the anarchist wing of the Fabian Society—before it became a 'respectable' and constitutional body in 1887. The article reprinted below was first published in the opening number of Henry Seymour's paper, *The Anarchist*, March 1885, under the title: 'What's in a name? How

an anarchist might put it.' Seymour was an anarchist of the individualist school, as apparently was Shaw also, judging from the eulogistic reference to 'the great Scotchman', Adam Smith. After Shaw had abandoned anarchism, the article was reprinted in leaflet form under its present title and distributed at meetings where Shaw was lecturing against anarchism. Apart from its historical interest, the first part of the article deals with a question often raised by comrades who find the label 'anarchist' a little too shocking and embarrassing.—G.N.O.]

## ANARCHISM versus STATE SOCIALISM by G.B.S.

GIVE a dog a bad name and hang him. Give a man a bad name—anarchist, for example—and hang him by all means. Anarchist is a very bad name indeed. The comfortable landlord or capitalist cries to the collectivist, "What you propose would land you, not in Utopia, as you expect, but in anarchy." The collectivist retorts, "What have we at present but anarchy everywhere?" But the capitalist knows better than that. He points to the omnipresent "iron laws", which on other occasions the collectivist himself has often pointed out, and presses for instances of anarchy. The collectivist thus hard put to it, retracts his generalization, but maintains that thought there is a system and socialization in production, there is anarchy in exchange. By which, as it presently appears, he means that exchange is controlled by a few private persons; that it is a monopoly; that, in short, what he is complaining of is not anarchy at all, but despotism. But he does not cease to use the word anarchy, nor will he admit that he has misapplied it; for the collectivists believe in the infallibility of their pope, Karl Marx; and he said some hard things once for anarchism, as indeed he did, in the exuberance of his talent for hard hitting about every "ism" that was not unquestioning Marxism. And so from both camps mud is thrown on the name of anarchist. Then, it will be asked, why offend people's sensibilities with it? Why not drop it? Simply because our enemies know better than to let us drop it. They will take care to keep it fastened tightly upon us; and if we disown it, and yet, when challenged home, cannot deny it, will it not appear that we are ashamed of it; and will not our shame justly condemn us unheard?

No: we must live down calumny as many men, from primitive christians to quakers, and from quakers to socialists, have lived it down before us upon less occasion. What socialists have done in England, anarchists may do: for England is the fatherland of *laissez-faire*; and *laissez-faire*, in spite of all the stumblings it has brought upon itself by persistently holding its candle to the devil instead of to its own footsteps, is the torch-bearer of anarchism. It is easy for the collectivist to declare that Adam Smith, with his inveterate mistrust of all government, and his conviction that people can manage their own business better than any authority can manage it for them, was half a fool, and half a creature of the mercantile classes; but the greatest work on political economy of the eighteenth century is not proof of the author's folly; nor is their much evidence of servility either in his comparison of a merchant with a common soldier, greatly to the advantage of the latter, or in the contemptuous allusions to "furious and disappointed monopolists", and the like terms, with which his economics are interspersed. Adam Smith could hardly have anticipated that his

lessons would be held up to odium by professed champions of liberty because the oppressors of mankind were clever enough to be the first to profit by them. But the time has come for English socialists to consider whether the great Scotchman was really such a fool as some collectivists seem to take him for.

The compromise of liberals and conservatives on the Franchise was really a coalition brought about by the pressure of the growing democracy on two parties, whose differences had long ceased to exist except as factious habits. The monopolist is at least face to face with the socialist; and it must presently appear to all Englishmen that instead of two sorts of monopolists—whig and tory—opposing one sort of socialist; there are really two sorts of socialists—anarchist and collectivist—confronting one solid body of monopolists. The collectivists would drive the money changers from Westminster only to replace them with a central administration, committee of public safety, or what not. Instead of "Victoria, by the grace of God", they would give us "the Superintendent of such and such an Industry, by the authority of the Democratic Federation", or whatever body we are to make our master under the new dispensation. "Master" is certainly an ugly word for a "popular government", the members of which are but trustees for the people. "Trustees" is good; but is not a father better than a body of trustees? Shall the English nation be orphaned? The Russians have a father in the Tzar: why should not we have a Tzar? What objection would be open to that that does not apply to a popular government just as strongly?—nay, more so; for should either misbehave it is easier to remove one man than six hundred and seventy. Or is there freedom in a multitude of masters, as there is said to be wisdom in a multitude of counsellors (a remark made long before the British House of Commons devoted its energies to proving the contrary)?

The sole valid protest against Tzardom, individual or collective, is that of the anarchist, who would call no man master. Slavery is the complement of authority, and must disappear with it. If the slaves indeed make the master, then the workers are slaves by choice, and to emancipate them is tyranny. But if, as we believe, it is the master that makes the slave, we shall never get rid of slavery until we have got rid of authority. In favour of authority, from its simple enforcement by the rod in the nursery, to its complex organisation in "the minor stage of siege", there is much to be said on every ground except that of experience. Were there twice as much, it is the mission of the anarchist to obstruct its coming and to hasten its banishment; to mistrust its expediency, however specious the instance; and to maintain incessant protest against all its forms throughout the world.

## FREEDOM BOOKSHOP OPEN DAILY

OPEN 10 a.m. to 6.30; 5.0 SATURDAYS

### New Books . . .

Robert Owen of New Lanark  
Margaret Cole 12/6  
The Deprived and the Privileged:  
Personal Development in English  
Society B. M. Spinley 18/-  
The Political Element in the  
Development of Economic Theory  
Gunnar Myrdal 25/-  
The Truman Era Irving Stone 12/6  
Ravens and Prophets  
George Woodcock 15/-

### Reminders . . .

Black Liberator  
(Toussaint Louverture)  
Stephen Alexis 5/-  
The Peasants' Revolt 1381  
Philip Lindsay & Reg Groves 6/-  
The Challenge of Our Time  
Koestler, Forster, etc. 2/-  
Little Reviews Anthology 1946 2/-  
Publications . . .  
Libertarian, No. 6 3d.  
Resistance, August 1953 6d.  
Prometheus, No. 2 6d.

Obtainable from

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

## DEAR READER . . .

Continued from p. 1

ideas, but it is a far cry from the activity of a few years ago—thanks to the pioneering activities of such men as the late Frank Leech—when nearly 1000 copies of our journal were being sold at meetings, at factory gates and on the streets, every fortnight.

WE who edit and publish FREEDOM have no financial interest in the success of our journal, in so far as we are in no way dependent on its continued publication for our livings—which are earned in activities unconnected with this publishing venture. But as propagandists—in the best sense of the word, we think—we are naturally anxious that FREEDOM should reach an ever larger public. And since we cannot escape the hard facts that continued publication depends on our ability to “pay our way”, a steady increase in our circulation means that not only are we reaching more people with the anarchist viewpoint, but also that our financial difficulties are being progressively eased. At present a loss of nearly £15 (\$45) is incurred on each issue of FREEDOM, that is, at the rate of £780 (\$2,300) a year, or probably less than the price of a medium sized bomb of the kind that have been used in Korea by the thousand. Relatively speaking, therefore, the cost of FREEDOM is a mere bagatelle. For our group however, it represents an insuperable problem, but we imagined that among our readers there were a sufficient number who would share with us this burden, and make light work of this “sterling (or dollar!) gap” by their contributions to our *Special Appeal* and/or by introducing new readers to FREEDOM.

A glance at our *Special Appeal* is not encouraging. And if one analyses the total of £261 we had received by August 11 one finds that £170 has been contributed by groups and individuals in the San Francisco-Los Angeles areas, £30 from readers in the remaining States of America, and the balance of £60 represents the extent to which our readers in this country have indicated their willingness to share with us the burden of maintaining the only anarchist weekly in the English language! Inured as we have to be to the disappointments and setbacks that are the lot of anarchist propagandists, perhaps we shall be excused for wilting at the sight of these cold figures!

THAT our general optimism is not easily shaken however, is shown we think by the issuing last month of three major FREEDOM PRESS publications, which have cost more than £500 (\$1,500) to produce. Where did we get the money to do this? We didn't! We are relying entirely on the normal business credit extended to us by printers, typesetters, paper suppliers, etc., AND our ability to raise enough money from the sale of these books during the next two months with which at least to appease our creditors. How many readers have, and will, encourage our optimism by obtaining copies of these publications for themselves and also ensuring that every public library in the country has them on their shelves by applying for them the next time they visit their local library? And let it not be forgotten that the best form of advertising books is by talking about them to one's friends and acquaintances.

FREEDOM is both criticised and praised. We hope that our readers will be heartened in the knowledge that the Editors are amongst the severest critics of

FREEDOM, for we would wish to produce a better paper. Our difficulty at present is that some of us write too much and have too little time to read and think, while too many of our contributors think and read too much and write too infrequently! The Editors have no particular desire to monopolise the columns of FREEDOM but will be obliged to do so so long as our contributors do not realise the discipline that is required of all concerned with the publication of a weekly journal. This is especially true in the case of FREEDOM which is, we believe, the only weekly journal written, produced and distributed without any paid staff.

WE would like to think that there are many among our readers who will, in fact, view what we have written about our financial and other problems as a challenge as to the efficacy of voluntary co-operation. No one is economically bound to write for FREEDOM, nor financially interested in editing or distributing it. FREEDOM PRESS publications are brought out without any financial backing or with the knowledge that there is a guaranteed market for them. They must make their way on their own merits and through the voluntary efforts of those who believe that the ideas expressed deserve to be more widely known.

The challenge is then: are there a sufficient number of men and women in the English speaking world who are prepared to find the time and make small financial sacrifices so that the work being done at present may continue and develop, and in so doing prove that voluntary co-operation is possible even in our very unco-operative world?

\*We await your reply.

## FREEDOM PRESS

- E. A. GUTKIND :**  
*The Expanding Environment* 8s. 6d.
- V. RICHARDS :**  
*Lessons of the Spanish Revolution* 6s.
- 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.  
*Vol. 2, 1952, Postscript to Posterity* paper 7s. 6d.
- TONY GIBSON :**  
*Youth for Freedom* paper 2s.  
*Food Production and Population* 6d.  
*Who will do the Dirty Work?* 2d.
- PHILIP SANSOM :**  
*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.
- RUDOLF ROCKER :**  
*Nationalism and Culture* cloth 21s.
- ALEX COMFORT :**  
*Delinquency* 6d.  
*Barbarism & Sexual Freedom* boards 3s. 6d.
- PETER KROPOTKIN :**  
*The State: Its Historic Role* 1s.  
*The Wage System* 3d.  
*Revolutionary Government* 3d.  
*Organised Vengeance Called Justice* 2d.
- ALEXANDER BERKMAN :**  
*ABC of Anarchism* 1s.
- 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.
- F. A. RIDLEY :**  
*The Roman Catholic Church and the Modern Age* 2d.

27, Red Lion Street, London, W.C.1.

## An Appeal from South Africa

Meanwhile Dr. Malan's electoral victory is showing that his race policy of *Apartheid*—absolute racial segregation with absolute white supremacy—is to be ruthlessly pursued. How dangerous this policy is is shown in the following letter which Father Trevor Huddleston, the Provincial Superior of the Anglican Community of the Resurrection in South Africa, has sent to the *Observer*, and which we reprint in full:

"SIR,—Recently in the House of Assembly, the Minister of Justice (Mr. C. R. Swart) held up a photograph of Sir Stafford Cripps's daughter with her bridegroom, an African, and said, 'It is disgusting'. He then proceeded to introduce his Bill. A few months ago, a photograph appeared in nearly all the S. African newspapers of this same Mr. Swart, smiling broadly, and holding in his hand a villainous-looking 'cat-o'-nine-tails' to illustrate his determination as Minister of Justice to make whipping compulsory for certain cases. I want to suggest that these two incidents illustrate very clearly the kind of situation in which Christians are involved in South Africa. And I want to suggest further that it is now time for the Christian conscience to bestir itself and for the Christian voice to be heard all over the world.

"Let me be quite frank. Until recently, Christian bodies working in South Africa told England that they preferred to fight their own battle and that any protest from Christians elsewhere would only increase their difficulties. It would be construed as 'interference' and every Church (except the Dutch Reformed) would be branded as 'foreign', 'uitlander', etc.

"There was something in that argument once—at a time when it was possible to hope that the Government might be influenced to better courses either through fear or favour. But that time is over.

"Let us make no mistake about it. Since their overwhelming success in the April election there has been a note of such implacability: of such fierce determination to pursue their Native policy without let or hindrance, that, humanly speaking, I see no possibility of influencing the Government on racial issues. If it were simply a matter of a change in 'atmosphere' one might be more hopeful. But the change is based very largely on the quite open viciousness of legislation passed during the last few months. It is based, too, on the utterly flabby, expediency-ridden attitude of the official Opposition in Parliament and on the apathy and indifference to-day of the vast majority of Europeans. Because most of the recent legislation has been

directed at the non-European and at those who dare to support him in his aspirations, White South Africa prefers not to think too seriously of its own future; it dare not do so, for if it did its case, its privilege, its wealth would crumble away.

"The Suppression of Communism Act, the Group Areas Act, the Criminal Law Amendment Act, the Public Safety Act and the Bill now being pushed through Parliament to control Native labour and to destroy any attempt at Native trade unionism—all these measures and the host of regulations recently promulgated—have the same fearful effects.

They stifle freedom of speech: they affect very greatly the freedom of the Press: they make freedom of movement not only difficult but dangerous for the non-European leader—they are, in effect, the instruments of a police State and they induce the same agonies of fear, frustration and bewilderment.

"What, then, is the Christian to do about it?

"Within South Africa he must, of course, make his voice heard as long as he is able to do so. He may, like Mr. Patrick Duncan, believe that actions speak louder than words and protest by some courageous act of defiance. Or he may still believe that by accepting the present situation patiently he will do more good than by any other method.

"I myself would be prepared to accept this last attitude as lying within the Christian sphere of activity if it were a matter affecting myself or the European group only.

"But in South Africa the whip now falls on Black shoulders, not on White. And in my opinion the only possible choice for Christians is *identification* with the African people: a sharing in their sufferings so far as this is possible—and a determination to do all in one's power to make known what is unjust and to strive against it.

"Within South Africa, in spite of every effort that can be made, there is, humanly speaking, no hope of influencing the present Government. Dr. Malan and all his Ministers have made it clear again and again that their policy is one of *White supremacy*. This is not misrepresentation: this is simple fact. Every piece of legislation, every regulation, every action is directed to that end.

"The iniquitous Western Areas scheme whereby some 60,000 non-Europeans are to be removed from their homes, to lose freehold rights they have enjoyed for 50 years, and to be rehoused twice as far from their employment—this is an outward expression of the doctrine upon which South African policy is built. 'White supremacy—now and always'.

"Can a Christian ever accept such a pagan and vicious idea? It is a simple enough issue, really.

"But we, in South Africa, cannot now fight this evil alone. We need the support of Christendom. We need the support of everyone who believes in the dignity of man. We need the support of every honest and sane person who sees in the issues now being fought out in South Africa issues which are of vital import to the peace of the world.

"In Germany the Churches believed too long in the possibility of compromise with nationalism and racialism. And Christians in England were too late in realising their own responsibility. Let us not make the same mistake with regard to Africa. Let us show the Government of the Union of South Africa that at least in the sight of Christians its policy is a matter of deep and profound concern and of present condemnation. I cannot say it too strongly. Time is very short. It is not only possible, but on the natural level probable, that the Christian Church may be facing her last opportunity of retaining the love and loyalty of her African people—for the gulf widens every day.

"May I say it in all seriousness? For God's sake, wake up!"

Such a letter gains in importance when it is remembered that the Church through its Missionaries have played a very active part in building up imperialism and have been in the past very inactive against racial intolerance.

### Governmental Provocation

At the same time what kind of effect is such an appeal likely to have on a British population which accepts and seemingly endorses their own government's policy of unlimited counter-violence in Malaya and Kenya, and has shown itself indifferent to the protests of Africans against Central African Federation?

At the back of it all is the basic demand that the black millions shall bow to the "supremacy" of the white settlers and their colonial governments. From such an attitude can only spring the twin evils of nationalism and violence, each of them with a legacy of years, even centuries, of antagonism. Anarchists are utterly opposed to this kind of violence with its unproductive objectives and its bitterness. They see only too clearly the evils of nationalism with its empty content and future of frustration. In both these products of racial intolerance they see simply the obstruction to that free co-operation, *between equals*, which should be the keystone on which progress in Africa must rest.

## THE GRAND NATIONAL Continued from p. 2

men, to be employed partly as strike pay and partly in aid of co-operative production. But the funds of the Union were insufficient to cope with this and the strikes and lock-outs which had been and were being declared in a number of other large towns. Too many demands were being made on the new body and the result was a defeat of the men all along the line. Town after town capitulated—Derby after four months of bitter struggle—and the workers were forced to return to work on the employers' terms. A Leeds Union leader drew the correct moral from these defeats: "No more separate strikes and no more tinkling with little hammers on their chains—the big hammer, a universal strike, must fetch a blow, and then the chain will be broken from their necks and trampled under their feet."

Meanwhile the new "Reform Government" had delivered another swinging blow at the workers. It resisted the clamour of the employers for the re-enactment of the Combination Laws; instead, as an example to other Unionists, it prosecuted a group of agricultural workers at Tolpuddle, in Dorset, led by George Loveless, who had formed a Friendly Society which was intended as a branch of the Grand National. Their 'crime' was not the formation of a union, for that was now legal, nor had they had the temerity to come out on strike or even to ask for higher wages. Their 'crime' was the administration of unlawful oaths, under an act originally passed after the Nore mutiny in 1797. For this they were sentenced to 7 years transportation. A few more names had been written on the scroll of working class martyrs.

To add to its troubles, the Grand National was torn by the internal dissensions of its leaders. Owen, who had joined it after the sentence on the Tolpuddle labourers, was opposed to the policy of militant industrial action advocated by James Morrison and J. E. Smith in their papers, *The Pioneer* and *The Crisis*. Both Smith and Morrison deprecated sectional strikes which were frittering away the union's strength and instead urged greater unity and organisation in preparation for a really telling blow by means of a revolutionary general strike. Owen, on the other hand, with his excessive optimism, hoped that the employers as well as the workers would peacefully collaborate in introducing his co-operative scheme; the social revolution was to be a bloodless and painless affair. He succeeded in ousting Morrison and Smith from the leadership of the movement and the Executive of the Grand National deferred to his views. Owen took the lead at the National Conference called in June 1834 at which co-operative production was again hailed as the panacea, but by this time the Grand National was in the process of dissolution. To complete its downfall, the Treasurer, James Hall, absconded with what remained of the central funds. "Thus," says Cole, "the attempt of the workers, partly inspired by Robert Owen's teaching and partly by the anti-capitalist economists such as William Thompson and Thomas Hodgskin, but mostly by sheer hunger and revolt against the competition of the new machines and the intolerable discipline of the new factory system, to create a 'General Union of All Trades', and make of it an instrument of sudden and complete emancipa-

tion, ran its course and ended in defeat".

After 1835 Owen reverted to his original idea of building the 'new moral world' outside the confines of the old, through a system of communist communities. Other working class leaders, despairing of industrial action, turned towards political action and sought to rally the workers under the purely political programme of Chartism. When both Owenite Socialism and Chartism had in their turn been defeated, other leaders set to work to build up, painfully and carefully, co-operative societies on the Rochdale model. The trade unions themselves, after licking their wounds, abandoned the idea of emancipating the workers from the wage system and instead sought merely to defend working class interests within the capitalist system.

The Grand National was, without doubt, a great failure. In its meteoric career, lasting less than a year, it was never really national and it was at no time consolidated. The working classes, it may be judged, were too weak, in this period of rising industrial capitalism, to do much more than kick against the pricks of the new age of machine production. "That they achieved what they did, and not that they were beaten, is remarkable," says Cole. And what they did still remains to-day an inspiration to all those who believe it is yet possible to bring about "a different state of things" in which the workers will control and direct their own affairs. The century old lessons of the failure of those workers who created the Grand National have not yet been learned by their descendants. The light of this first great failure of the British workers is still needed to illuminate the future.

# WAGE-EARNING

THE animal body is often described in biology text-books as a factory or a machine, and more often still in books on economics do we find labour described and treated as a commodity. Yet the animal body choosing the modes and purposes of its movements, repairing and reproducing itself is a very strange kind of machine, and an even stranger kind of commodity is the worker who differs in nothing from his buyer, and holds within himself the power of refusing to be bought.

For the sake of his specialism and to reach neat conclusions, the economist needs to abstract the productive function which characterizes a man as a worker, and study it as a fluctuating quantity, 'labour', in conjunction with other quantities such as cost of production, price of an article, etc. But then the capitalist and the State, who apply the findings of the economist to practical purposes, try to the best of their abilities to make those men called workers behave and reckon themselves as mere carriers of that disincarnate power-quality, labour, which is indispensable to all exploiters' calculations.

Marx tried to account for the phenomenon of exploitation on purely economic grounds, but however attractive his attempt might have been in calling for unqualified condemnation of the capitalist system, it was far from cogent and successful. On the other hand, solutions to the problem of wages based on the principle of fair retribution cannot escape the dilemma of being the less ethical the more they are economical, and vice versa. What is worse, they cannot extend justice without extending control, and lead finally to the identification of justice with the decisions of the controlling power.

The concept of exploitation, and its bearing on the problem and system of wages, ought then to be studied in the initial circumstances that transform a man into a unit of labour, degrading him into a usable thing, while recognizing to another the right of using him as a thing. It is in terms of lost human dignity and freedom, and not of cheating, robbery or unfair advantage, that exploitation has to be defined.

In other civilizations a man who was used for the production of goods that satisfied the needs and increased the wealth of another was called a slave. A great volatilization and transmogrification of original values must have taken place for a man in the same situation nowadays to be called a free citizen. Comparisons between the slaves of antiquity and the wage-earners of to-day, insisting on legal and material conditions or trying to access the difference according to a common standard of happiness, usually miss the fundamental issue that makes both the slave and the wage-earner a means to an alien end.

## The Great Witch-hunt Continued from p. 1

who were more concerned with aiding the Communist party than protecting the basic, personal interests of the witnesses."

The committee suggested that state and local bar associations "can and should render a distinct public service" by furnishing, on request, a panel of lawyers that such witnesses or any former member of the Communist party might consult and from whom he could receive confidential, dependable counsel and guidance. This would be based "solely upon the proper interests of the client," the report said.

It is significant that in the pre-war totalitarian states lawyers to be allowed to practise had to be faithful stooges of the Fascisti or the Nazi party; the same is true of the Iron Curtain countries today, and with justification it is pointed out that trials conducted under such conditions are a mockery even of so-called "democratic justice". It seems to us that on the whole the law can be argued more favourably for the defence by a lawyer hostile to the laws defended by the prosecution than one who himself is infected by the witch-hunt spirit. It is useless to speak of the impartiality of the law when the legal representative of the government—the Attorney General—is asked to determine which lawyers are fit to plead for the defence!

Particularly important is it that in political trials the defence should be in the hands of lawyers sympathetic to the defence, for in such cases the function of the defence is two-fold: of arguing the case in its legal implications but also since the jury is composed of human beings and not legal experts, of winning the sympathy of the jury for the ideas and integrity of the defence. Many examples come to mind. In Italy in the pre-fascist days there were a number of

Free societies, and even serf populations forming a society within a society, never made work a condition of membership and freedom. They seem to have acted on the tacit assumption that society is responsible for the well-being of each individual born under its pall. We had to wait for the disruption of societies to the benefit of a centralized state to see the breaking-down of this universal assumption. Along with it came the triumph of beliefs in impersonal forces, which meant the end of practically all the responsibilities that are the moral index of a society's freedom.

Of course, full membership in a society meant dependence of the individual upon the customs and life-patterns giving it its particular form. Usually also, the greater the difficulties and dangers in which a society moved or was formed initially the more rigid and elaborate were its bonds of customs and taboos. But dependence is not a negation of freedom, except when society and individual are contrasted. It is a matter of political theory and historical fact that whenever the rights of the individual have been affirmed to break some social dependence the gain has been mostly on the part of a third party, namely the State, as the book by Nisbet I have recently reviewed sufficiently illustrates.

Before capitalism started in any particular area, people living in that area possessed both means of subsistence and the particular freedom embodied in the customs of the society of which they were members. There were cases in which compulsion was exerted as when a feudal lord decided to turn capitalist, but in general it is out of free choice that a peasant became a wage-earner or sent or sold his children to a factory.

It is customary to lay all the responsibility for the appalling man-degrading and man-killing features of the industrial revolution entirely at the doors of the capitalist class. But it is well to remember that most members of this class did not partake, in spite of superficial ap-

pearances, in the christian and humanist culture still nominally prevailing. If there is a moral point at issue part of the blame must fall on the wage-earners themselves. It was the same profit-motive and the same idea that money meant power and could buy all kinds of satisfaction which led both the capitalist to pay wages and the worker to earn them.

In Europe it is clear that at the rise of capitalism the centralization of political power and the predatory nature of most institutions had left hardly any of those advantages to be enjoyed by being a member of a society. But in Asia, if not in Africa where physical compulsion had generally to be resorted to, well-integrated societies were disrupted by the coming of capitalism because capitalism meant power of an unprecedented kind, and by introducing a new form of power it also introduced a new form of freedom; that freedom which by many people in the West is believed to be the only possible and worth having.

This freedom is that of the unattached and atom-like individual, a system of desires to be managed and satisfied by

his buying power or by contracts with other individuals. It should rather be called independence as it is the opposite of the other type of freedom enjoyed by homogenous, corporate and custom-bound societies. These societies are usually fixed or grow like trees. The social conglomerate based on capitalism, instead, knows no growth but endless accretion. It is in a state of continual non-repetitive change usually referred to as progress; by the production and investment of increasing capital it opens ever new possibilities which tend to devalue all previous achievements.

The question is not whether capitalism was avoidable or not. The fact is that it was not avoided, and that where it was not acceptable it had the power to impose itself by force. It lives and develops by buying human labour, and seems almost invariably to find conditions in which men are ready to sell their productive power in order to achieve independence from restrictions of societies not able any longer to offer them adequate advantages and protection. All sorts of men become wage-earners in order to acquire the buying

power on which the new type of freedom (the so-called freedom of opportunities) depends. Capitalism, on the other hand, would soon die a natural death as soon as men refused to become wage-earners.

The most pacific population may turn bellicose when threatened by the aggressive power of another. It may turn aggressive in turn, but that does not mean that aggression is better than peace. So the fact that many societies broke their original structure in order to admit capitalism when capitalism knocked at their door does not prove that capitalism was a better system. Yet in Europe, in spite of all the nostalgia for the 'ancien régime', it can be safely assumed that dearth of material and meaningful content in the freedom of the family or society to which a man belonged decided him to become a wage earner. He sacrificed his freedom in the hope of a greater gain, under the lure of a greater freedom. But as soon as all forms of society had practically disappeared to make room for the capitalist conglomerate no choice was possible any longer. Wage-earning, which first appeared as a condition of freedom, was then revealed as the substance of slavery.

It is mainly reactionary writers that contrast the capitalist dispensation with societies of the past to the advantage of the latter. Refusing the communist and other State solutions, some anarchists have looked for guidance and inspiration in small so-called primitive societies. It must, however, be realized that the Locke-Bentham-Godwin conception of freedom is not compatible with the culture-pattern of these societies. If wage-earning has to be abolished, social dependence would have to take its place together with a cultural pattern in which many assumptions and habits begotten by the capitalist experience will find no place. The problem of an anarchist culture is more imperative than that of anarchist revolution. With a fairly clear idea of what an anarchist society is going to be like people may feel ready for action. Although we are perhaps enjoying a precarious respite between two cataclysms, the thought of revolution ought not to be entertained in the mood of "après moi le déluge".

GIOVANNI BALDELLI

## COMMUNITY

E. Nehms will be pleased to know that our letter in FREEDOM and a similar letter in *Peace News* have resulted in several replies and constructive suggestions. Until we have a more positive idea of capital available and persons willing we cannot formulate any definite plans. We are suggesting however that a Freedom Community Group be formed to explore possibilities.

Obviously such a community would have to be in marginal areas where land is cheap. Where production for use rather than profit is the purpose, marginal land can be adequate for the type of agriculture suitable for a community group. Where capital is limited, labour power can be substituted in building homesteads, farm buildings and workshops. In agriculture, labour is the

largest single cost of production and where profit is the prime aim of production the efforts to reduce this cost make for high capital outlay and an emphasis on arable farming. This can be avoided by a judicious choice of machinery and carrying a large amount of stocks.

We do not suggest for a moment that the formation of a community on the line suggested will not come up against snags and difficulties both from the practical and emotional point of view. All achievement requires effort and the social climate will result in some compromise but these difficulties are not insuperable given application, honesty and concern for truth.

Colchester

ALAN ALBON.

JOAN ALBON.

## REFORM & REVOLUTION—3

IN many ways, the political climate of to-day does not seem to favour the Anarchist point of view. Centralist, Statist and totalitarian creeds in various forms are dominating social and political thought—all of them dangling their reformist bait for the poor fish to snap up.

But the very success of the reformists will really be to the Anarchists' benefit, for there is nothing like the achievement of a political goal to show the shallowness of it. While the Labour Party was struggling for power there was a fervency and enthusiasm among its supporters which began to evaporate very soon after

the party's policy began to be put into effect.

Reforms do not—cannot—alter the fundamental relationships in capitalist society. They can slightly alter the distribution of the wealth produced by the workers but they cannot change the relationship between the executive and the producer. Reforms can iron out the worst features of an unjust social system but they cannot remove the injustice.

This has been made manifest by the Labour Party's six years of power. The nationalisation of Britain's basic industries has led to a redistribution of the profits. But the worker is still an underdog and those who do the least work get the most out of it, just as they did under private ownership. And the consumer still has to pay for the upkeep of hordes of middlemen between him and the producer just as he did under free enterprise.

All that has happened is that a new class is now seated squarely on the back of the productive worker in the place of the old one and this fact has not been lost on the productive worker. His growing disillusionment can only lead him in one positive direction—workers' control along syndicalist lines.

### To Go Forward

So that although popular support has swung away from Anarchism and Syndicalism, it can be seen that the time is nearing when one can confidently expect a swing back. For after all, what alternative is there?

Now this swing back to revolutionary thought among the workers will not bring a desire to go back from reformism to reaction, but to go forward towards more social advances. We cannot imagine that workers will want to reaffirm the principles of private ownership, for example, however much the T.U.C. may point to the virtues of a "mixed" economy.

Many doubts are now being expressed by trade union leaders about the advisability of much more nationalisation. "The interests of the nation", they say, demand that certain industries remain in private hands completely, some come under a measure of public control, while others are completely nationalised. No longer any talk about the dignity of labour, no questioning of the profit motive at all—in fact, no hope of any radical change in the economic system.

This is all right for the trade union leaders. Most of them have already effected a radical change in their economic status. They are already emancipated from the worries and want that afflict their members. But for the rank

and file the inequalities and injustices of capitalism are still live issues—that have to be fought.

And they can only be fought by the methods of anarcho-syndicalism. Since the reformist goals are seen to be uninspired, and trade union and political methods inadequate, revolutionary ideas as to aims and methods will begin to have special significance.

### Our Alternative

But in order to be effective, the workers must see their significance. It is not enough merely to say "I told you so" to a worker disillusioned with reformism. We have to show that our ideas on working class struggle will bear fruit in time to benefit him. We have to present a living alternative with a recognisable relationship to present circumstances.

Now if we are purist, like some socialists, and blandly maintain that since we are opposed to the wages system, for example, we should not agitate or take part in struggles for wage increases, we shall enjoy the moral satisfaction of being theoretically right, but shall hardly attract any militant workers to our ranks.

As an Anarchist, I am interested in seeing the growth of an influential Anarchist movement as a necessary means towards an Anarchist society. This society will be achieved by a movement which is not only aware of the sort of society it wants, but has evolved the means to get it. Our ideas may be thrashed out in discussion circles, but the actual physical means of revolutionary struggle have to be worked out in practice.

Now what are we to practice on? Obviously only on the achievement of limited aims to begin with, for if we cannot hold out hope of winning small issues, we are not going to be taken seriously in our big talk about the social revolution.

Therefore, as I see it, the necessity for Anarchists to-day is not only to take their stand on their principles, to affirm the necessity for a completely free society, to constantly demonstrate the sanity of Anarchy, but also to show that we are not content to sit and wait for Anarchy to come through wishing for it.

We are not Marxists believing that the historical process will take care of everything for us—we are Anarchists believing that men can mould their environment if they are so determined. And we believe we know the means to achieve the environment we desire. Anarchism is not only something to fight for; it is something to fight with.

P.S.

(To be continued)

## MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

### LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

#### OPEN AIR MEETINGS

Weather Permitting  
HYDE PARK  
Sundays at 3.30 p.m.

#### TOWER HILL

Tuesdays at 12.30 p.m.

#### INDOOR MEETINGS

Watch this column for announcement of new meetings in September.

### NORTH-EAST LONDON DISCUSSION MEETINGS IN EAST HAM

Alternate Wednesdays at 7.30 p.m.

### N. LONDON

ANYONE INTERESTED IN FORMING A DISCUSSION GROUP IN THE WEST LONDON AREA, PLEASE CONTACT:

S. E. PARKER,  
79 WARWICK AVENUE,  
LONDON, W.9.

### BRADFORD

OPEN-AIR MEETINGS  
Broadway Car Park,  
Sundays, 8.30 p.m.

### GLASGOW

OUTDOOR MEETINGS  
from now until further notice at  
MAXWELL STREET,  
Sundays at 7 p.m.  
With John Gaffney, & others

## 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 8344