

Inside: PACIFISM MORALLY WRONG; KRONSTADT LIVES!; MALATESTA MANIFESTO.

# The boycott that worked!

## 1971 CENSUS — ENGLAND

H Form For Private Households



To the Head of the household... April, etc.

If the person was born in England or Wales or Scotland or Northern Ireland tick the appropriate box, or  
If the person was born in another country, write the name of the country (using the name by which it is known today) and the year in which the person first entered the United Kingdom (that is England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland).

**B10** Write the country of birth of:  
a the person's father  
b the person's mother  
This question should be answered even if the person's father or mother is no longer alive. (If country not known, write 'NOT KNOWN') Give the name by which the country is known today.

YES  NO

YES  NO

YES  NO

YES  NO

YES  NO

YES  NO

YES  NO

01	Scotland
02	Wales (incl. Monmouthshire)
03	Northern Ireland

A household includes either one person living alone or a group of persons (who may or may not be related) living at the same address with common household arrangements. Persons visiting temporarily with the household are included.

### Questions of ethnic origin dropped from next census

By Nikki Kneewels

The Government has decided to drop questions relating to ethnic origins from the next census which will be held on April 5, 1981. The only information on the country of birth of each of those who have been registered in the United Kingdom and the Office of Population and Census Statistics, London, will be available to the public under the Freedom of Information Act.

The Secretary for Health, Mr. Clifton Robinson, deputy chairman of the Commission for Racial Equality, said he had been consulted about the issue. He said that the decision to drop the questions was a "welcome" one and would save the special resources of racial origin questions.

The Secretary for Health, Mr. Clifton Robinson, said that the Government would be dropping questions on ethnic origin from the census. He said that the decision was a "welcome" one and would save the special resources of racial origin questions.

Mr. Clifton Robinson said that the Government would be dropping questions on ethnic origin from the census. He said that the decision was a "welcome" one and would save the special resources of racial origin questions.

a tick in example,

by this household

by another household

by this household

also by another household

as only by this household

use also by another household

for use only by this household

for use also by another household

ES — for use only by this household

ES — for use also by another household

NO

# The boycott that worked

Two members of the Freedom Press Collective went to prison in 1972 for refusing to fill up forms for the 1971 Census.

Their objections to that particular census were not based on any sensitivity about admitting whether they had inside toilets or not, nor about how many rooms there were in their 'households'. Their objections were to the existence of the census at all (and, in fact, to the existence of the people perpetrating it.) In particular they objected to the questions inserted in that census relating to the 'ethnic' origins of the population being subjected to the compulsory inquisition.

Our comrades were of course not alone, although few enough went so far as to give up their liberty rather than collaborate with the State's impertinence. Many thousands of solid citizens refused to fill in the form accurately and at one mass demonstration in Trafalgar Square, several hundred Young Liberals publicly burned their Census forms.

To our knowledge none of them were prosecuted, nor were many of the rest of the thousands who preferred not to be counted. Our two comrades, however, were prosecuted, fined and, on refusing to pay their fines, imprisoned... but not for the usual paranoid reasons with which we boost

our own importance but for the simple reason that they lived in a small Suffolk village where acts of disobedience stick out like sore thumbs.

When you're fighting the State, it isn't only who you are that matters, but where you are!

Anyway, there was sufficient objection on more constitutional grounds to the Census in 1971 for the 'responsible authorities' to realise that that there would have been even more today if similar questions were asked again. So this time they carried out a dummy run in the London Borough of Haringey... and, as our cutting on the front page (from the Guardian Thurs. March 20) shows, it came up against a massive popular boycott, especially from the West Indian community.

A response of little over 50% from the entire borough told the bureaucrats that there was not only indifference but hostility to their probes. Interestingly enough, among those 'dismayed' by the result is the Commission for Racial Equality, who feel that local authorities need information of the kind demanded in the Census in order to cope with the special needs of racial minorities. The fact that any school teacher can tell the authority about special needs in his or her school, any housing officer can discover, if the desire is

there, how underprivileged any minority group is... and minority groups always are, so no great detective work is necessary... seems to have escaped CoRE's notice. As also has the fact that central authorities always seem to use information against the people, not for them.

But that, of course, is an anarchist analysis. Just as refusal to co-operate with the State is anarchist action.

The people of Haringey are to be congratulated on having put two fingers up to the Office of Population Censuses, the result of which has been that, not only have the offending 'ethnic' questions been dropped, but the whole Census has been pared to the bone, rather than jeopardise it as a whole. And we hope we are right in saying that many whites in Haringey have refused to co-operate with it in solidarity with their black neighbours.

The 1981 Census is now going to be 'the shortest and simplest for 50 years'.

Good. For anarchists, the less information the State has about us the better, for the State is always the enemy of the people. Our comrades tell us that they are most happy that the boycott they took in 1971 has echoed massively ten years later.

This is a boycott that worked. Direct action-anarchist action-that put the State on the retreat!

## MEXICO

Following the recent sit-ins of the Belgian and Danish embassies in Mexico City, Rafael Aguilar Talamantes, the leader of the Socialist Workers' Party of Mexico - a typical reformist social democratic group - was granted an audience with President Jose Lofez Portillo yesterday.

Talamantes told the president of his party's worries, because in 1979, he said, the SPM had been 'up against a political reality that was frankly brutal, in which local political bosses and rich land holders had obstructed the advance of political reform'. Talamantes accused members of the Institutional Revolutionary (sic) Party - which under three different names has been in power in Mexico for nearly 60 years' - of fraud and terrorising members of his party.

Aguilar Talamantes explained to the president about a petition for the release of 35 members of the SPM, who were being held in jails throughout the country; and particularly repression in Jalisco. In January this year, said Talamantes, Jalisco police had attacked a "socialist" meeting, seriously injuring 20 members.

Talamantes was particularly worried about the repression, because later this year, there will be municipal elections and changes in 13 governorships. And the Socialist Workers' Party planned to field candidates in various constituencies. Indeed, they intend to nominate Cuauhtemoc Cardenas for the governor of Michoacan (Cardenas, son of the late president Lazaro Cardenas, has also been nominated for the same governorship this week by the Institutional Revolutionary Party! ;).

Talamantes reassured President Lofez Portillo, however, that his "socialist" party condemned the

"takeovers" of foreign embassies by groups seeking freedom for "political prisoners". He said that such takeovers and sit-ins were "undoubtedly transnational", and provocative. He told the press that he and other members of his party "could freely talk to the president about obtaining liberty for their jailed comrades without having to involve embassies".

But he did not say whether President Portillo or the "Interior Secretariat" (read political police) would take any notice of the good "socialist" - and release any of the political prisoners or quit terrorising opponents, or alleged opponents, of the PRI.

Maybe we shall see .....

PEN

\*NB. The 'revolution' of 1910 - 1920 was supposed to have destroyed bossism and landlordism - but not quite !

# Kronstadt lives the struggle continues

Fifty-nine years ago, on March 17 1921, the Bolshevik party in Russia, in the form of Trotsky's Red Army, massacred the Kronstadt sailors and workers who called for a 'third revolution' against the new managers - the party, and for independent workers' councils. On March 17th 1980 there was a meeting in Central Hall, Westminster, London, attended by 2,500 left-wingers inside and outside the Labour Party. Billed as The Debate of the Decade, it was rather a series of (attempted) lectures from the platform from various ex-public school types such as Peter Hain (Labour), Paul Foot (SWP), Tariq Ali (IMG) and Wedgewood Benn MP (aspiring future prime minister), along with Stuart Holland (left MP) and Hilary Wainwright (author of Beyond the Fragments, and fast becoming an acceptable 'official' spokesperson for the women's movement). Since it was a 'debate', about 40 London anarchists and autonomists decided to go and contribute our opinions individually and collectively. (Can't imagine how we got so many tickets - free too!) We sat together in the middle downstairs. Naturally, the structure of the meeting was typically authoritarian, with the Leaders on the platform due to drone on for an hour while mere spectators were allowed up to two minutes each afterwards if they filled in a steward's slip and were acceptable enough to be chosen. Such submissiveness, however, never occurred to us, and we started heckling straight away, gaining confidence as time went on. Hain was the chairman - he's going

up in the world, eh! The first speaker (Holland) was so fucking boring we almost fell asleep - just a few shouts like 'What about the workers?' Then it was Daily Mirror columnist Foot, and we decided that since he has the opportunity to air his views to 5 million people every week, we were going to make our views heard. 'Fifty-nine years ago to this day, the Kronstadt workers were massacred by the Bolsheviks - your lot!', accompanied by various chants and songs. Then some people in the balcony joined in with 'Get out of Ireland', and two people stood up behind the platform with a huge banner saying 'Are you with Benn or the H-Block men'. Stewards tried to stop the one shouting, so we shouted 'Let him speak', 'Support the Armagh women too', and 'Troops Out of Britain'. When Benn came on, we drowned him out and stewards stated gathering around us, but couldn't get us because the seats were fixed and we were prepared to defend ourselves physically. Hain moaned that 'there's always a few loonies', and Benn said that there must be Special Branch, CIA & KGB agents present - the same lies to justify the Kronstadt bloodbath. Some of his followers called us fascists too. 'How many jails will you empty, Benn? How many police will you get rid of? Will you stop kids being beaten in schools?' one of us shouted. Also 'Arm the pickets!' Benn in fact barely got a word in, and Hain was unable to bring 'order'. We tried to get revolutionary ideas across about workers' councils, abolishing armies and money and

opposing all Parties, but either the rest of the audience couldn't make out what we were saying, or they were naturally antagonistic. Many chanted 'Out, out, out!' at us, to which we replied 'Sling out the platform!' We barely heckled Hilary Wainwright, who, although arguing for extra-parliamentary activity and collective organisation, tried not to attack the Labour and left parties who are out to recuperate and suppress any autonomous movements.

After 3 speakers from the floor, we decided to leave together. We could have usefully stayed but many of us were bored and frustrated by this oppressive event.

## Conclusions

We had tried to bring up revolutionary ideas, into a manipulated debate between Left leaders, while the masses were meant to look on reverently. No revolutionary ideas were suggested from the platform at all. Our aim was to change both the content and the form of the meeting, override the platform and start a direct, revolutionary debate with any <sup>ONE</sup> in the hall wishing to take part. The fact that we met with hostility from those present shows how unimaginative, non-revolutionary and manipulative the Left is, and how urgent it is for us to create an independent anarchist movement in industry, in each locality, in all fields of life and on the streets. We have a long, long way to go and have to prepare and extend at once. It is true to say that it is our own confusion and inability to develop a revolutionary strategy that has led to our present ineffectiveness.

N.B. Pluto Press planned to bring out a book and 80 minute L.P. (for £2) of the 'Debate of the Decade', but the debate decayed instead. The record should make for very interesting listening if it ever gets done. Maybe after censorship it'll come out as a 10-minute single. K. Ronstadt.



Let me begin this article by stating that I am a certified gradualist. I feel that, without significant changes in the present social/economic/technical mix of both Western and Eastern societies, anarchy is the work of a century, if not more. Being a gradualist, however, in no way implies that I do not foresee situations where there will be attempts at rather rapid change, at revolution. It is merely that any realist will realise that, even if these attempts don't land us with something far worse than what existed before a la Russia, they will still fall far short of anarchy. Real economic and social changes are the work of gradual accumulations of small changes, as the history of either bourgeois or techno-bureaucratic revolutions should show us.

Having gotten that out of the way, however, I still believe that there will be periods during this evolution towards anarchy in which it will be not only inevitable but also morally desirable that oppressed groups use force, violent force. I would like to develop this idea as a response to "Anarchy and Violence" by J. Rapp (FREEDOM Vol 41 No 4), as Comrade Rapp's article is as good an example as any of the confusion that lies at the base of pacifism.

To deal with the practical aspects first. Rapp devotes very little of his article to 'practical' arguments for pacifism, most likely because he, like most pacifists, is not really interested in practicalities so much as in moral justification. The only 'practical' argument that I could dice out of his essay was the idea that, because violence is used in a revolution, it is likely to perpetuate itself in a vicious cycle. In such a vicious cycle, anarchists, because their ideas handicap them militarily, are almost certain to come out the losers. Looking back on such events as the Spanish Civil War, one can see that this is probably true, from a narrow military viewpoint. On the other hand, the record of passive resistance, when it faced a determined enemy, e.g. Stalin's Russia or Hitler's Germany, rather than 'civilised' imperialists like the British in India, leaves us no illusions that a dreamy pacifism is any better. If one wants to cite history one should cite all the facts relevant to the case at hand. One should also cite them truthfully. The idea that village or tribal communities in ancient times would not defend themselves if capable is simply nonsense. So is the idea that the European religious dissidence

# Why pacifism is morally wrong

of the Middle Ages was always non-violent.

No, there are many different conclusions that one can draw from the failure of past attempts at revolution. 'Revolution', in one sense of the word (not mine) being a violent contest in which one side will come out the winner (or a coalition of sides), it is not stating anything really profound to say that the side with the best army will win. A 'revolution', however, is a complex mixture of events and feelings. It is surely reductionist to isolate one factor, violence, and proclaim it to be the revealed truth of why revolutions fail. Equally important is disorder, for example. Revolutions are extremely confused events. Systems of production break down, and, despite certain people's naive belief in the ability of vast numbers of people to 'muddle through', with nothing more than a religious devotion to the 'idea', people get hungry, cold, frightened, etc. They demand a strong party, a leader, because they see such as the only way that they are going to relieve their immediate pain.

There are other factors, possibly dozens of them, that add up to one conclusion. The chances of anarchy coming into being from a revolution are very slim indeed. This does not mean, however, that anarchists should not participate in revolutions. Going back to the 'realistic' view I outlined at the beginning, it is obvious that anarchists (and the 'masses') should be well armed, as well as their inherent weaknesses let them be, and should participate actively in the direction of the revolution. Just as no revolution is likely to result in anarchy, so no revolution will always and everywhere end up in the same result. There are systems that will allow for continued evolution towards anarchy, in a more or less rapid and orderly fashion, and there are systems that 'freeze' all self initiative of the 'masses' and end up requiring yet another revolution merely to get back to square one.

During a revolution, anarchists, if they 'believe in violence', are in

a position to throw their weight behind one or the other party. If they are large enough they may even be the deciding factor in who wins. The choice is obvious. One throws one's lot in with the side that will likely allow the masses the most opportunity to organise themselves 'after the revolution'. This requires a cold hearted and clear headed calculation, not moral lectures. This calculation was why the Spanish anarchists were right to support the popular front, even if they were very wrong in some of their tactics, like entry into the government. This calculation is why anarchists would be wise to give what little support they can to the Second International 'terceristas' in Nicaragua rather than to either the liberal (read U.S. dominated) or left-wing (read Moscow line communists). This doesn't mean that we don't attempt a balancing act to prevent the social democrats from totally monopolising the political life of the country, but it does mean we have a clear idea of where our physical safety lies.

It also means that we have a clear idea of where the physical safety, economic benefit and range of freedom for the vast majority lies. There is one thing for which I will always be grateful to my mostly unhappy childhood acquaintance with the Catholic Church. This is the lesson that there are sins of omission as well as those of commission. To sit back, with a smug sense of moral superiority, while a ruthless tyranny rides to power is not moral. It is the very height of immorality. It is murder just as surely as if we were manning the guard stations in the death camps. This is the basic dilemma of pacifism, its basic immorality, the worm of evil at the heart of its glittering facade. We are not just responsible for what we do. We are responsible for what we don't do. To argue by analogy: if you have a gun and you see a group of thugs attacking another person on the street, you are responsible for coming to that person's aid. In the real world, this one, groups of thugs don't listen to moral lectures.

They do listen to a weapon pointed their way. You may wish to minimise the use of force. You may merely threaten. Or you may shoot to wound rather than to kill. But, if you refuse to help, if you choose to preserve your moral purity, you are just as responsible for any harm to the victim as any of the thugs.

Charging up to give a moral lecture, sacrificing yourself (and the victim) on the altar of pacifism, doesn't get you out of the moral bind either. The basic evil of pacifism is not that it is cowardly. It is not that it is incapable of making grand romantic gestures. No, the basic evil is that it gives people a moral, a pseudomoral, justification for refusing possible help. Sure revolutionary situations don't tend to lead to anarchy. But they sure as hell will lead to the worst possible event unless anarchists act to push them in libertarian directions.

I would like to go further into Comrade Rapp's rather twisted display of deductive logic, logic that, for example, allows him to claim that Kropotkin is wrong for thinking that killing tyrants is an example of 'his standards of morality (that) exist as an objective truth for all to follow' while, of course, Rapp's advocacy of universal pacifism as an objective truth for all to follow is somehow different. This sort of thinking is typical of the 'magic word' form of sloganeering. It is really tremendously faddish among the more liberal end of the libertarian spectrum. It is a form of doublethink that is hard to recognise for a lot of people. As both an ex-Catholic and an ex-Marxist I find it disgustingly familiar. In the case of a liberal the sleight of hand is thus; any, and I do mean any serious moral stand can be twisted around and 'deduced' into an advocacy of an 'objective' standard of morality. This supposedly proves it wrong, and thought ends right there.

The almost inevitable conclusion of this abandonment of any objective standards is, quite obviously, that one adopts whatever standards happen to 'feel good'. This, unfortunately, is, 9 times out of 10, whatever is fashionable at the moment. This fashion is never subjected to the same rigorous criticism that the unfashionable 'objective standards' are. Fashion doesn't have to be that of the major society, as the 'natural' cult of the past decade should demonstrate. All that is required is enough of a subculture to shield one from the

larger society, and, in the case of pacifism, the remnants of the 'counter'-culture provide this shield quite well.

I am not a rationalist myself. If pressed I would style myself an empiricist. Yet reason does have its limited value, if backed up by real events and objects. To strike at the idea that there are 'objective' standards is to strike at what limited good reason can do us. Any 'objective' standards derived from real facts and (limited) deduction are subject to modification if more facts come in. They are still, however, objective. Rapp would have all idea of 'objectivity' in such matters ruled 'out of order'. Falling into fads is probably the least of our worries should large numbers of people accept such an attitude, or need we rake the ideas of 'Aryan science' or 'proletarian science' over the coals once more?

Obviously not all pacifists resort to such arguments to justify their beliefs. I am also of the belief that Comrade Rapp is fully capable of being able to see both the illogical and dangerous destination of the ideas he is trying to put across without changing his pacifist beliefs one iota. Pacifism is not necessarily connected to such subterfuge, in the same way that it is necessarily connected with the evil of omission. The general moral tone, however, of most Western pacifism (I am really unfamiliar with the Indian variety) is very, very conducive to picking up such methods of justification, probably due to the religious tinge that much of it has. To be quite frank, the general habits of thought, or lack thereof, in the pacifist ranks only scare me less than those of the Marxists and the Catholic Church because of the general lack of effectiveness of pacifists. One is left with the question: if pacifism, because of its inability to make a convincing enough case otherwise, has to resort to 'sloppy thinking',

what is its major effect on non-pacifists? Does it encourage peacefulness or does its effect come more through its method of argument? Does it add one more nail to the coffin of reason and put one more brick on the wall that barbarism is building to enclose us? This is not an argument against pacifism in general, but it is an argument against the 'complex' of ideas that much Western pacifism is associated with.

In conclusion then, pacifism is morally wrong, as well as practically foolish. It is morally wrong in both a general sense and in its present semi-counter-culture incarnation. This conclusion is, ironically enough, particularly valid from an 'evolution 'revolutionary' rather than a 'revolutionary' viewpoint. In this article I haven't had space to go into why 'revolution' is not a viable anarchist alternative. Perhaps in the future. To realize that pacifism, as a principle, is wrong says nothing about what tactics are appropriate at any given time. These have to be determined empirically and not, as the pacifists would have us do, deduced from first principles.

P. Murtagh

## DESIRES

TWO COMRADES from "The Soil of Liberty", Minnesota will be spending 10 days in London in April/May. Could anyone able to put them up please contact FREEDOM.

"Homeless comrade seeks room in central or north London. Can afford up to £16 p.w. Am responsible and quiet. Very desperate - please help! contact Henry c/o Jez 402 7281

NORTH LONDON COMMUNE, attempting to run on anarchist basis seeks new members. 7 St. Pauls Rd. N17, tel 808 9826 (non-smokers, meat eaters)





## THE CUTS

### THE CUTS

It seems that every day the government announces more cuts in public services - hitting health, education, social services, etc. . . In short everything, that is except 'necessities' like the police, army and judiciary which will be needed to suppress our discontent.

However, in our rush to blame Thatcher and the Tories, let's not fall into the trap of assuming that Labour are any better - remember it was Callaghan's Government which started the current cutbacks. So let's not be taken in by Labour's crocodile tears.

We have to fight the cutbacks - we have no choice. We can't afford Harley Street or Eton and in some cases our lives will depend on it. We must go much further than simply fighting the cuts though. Remember that the Welfare State has its beginnings in the state's concern that not enough recruits to the army were suitable as cannon fodder during the Boer War, rather than any concern for working class well-being. Don't think that things have changed much since then either - our needs are only secondary to the State's and employers need for an educated and healthy workforce.

If the Welfare State existed for our benefit rather than the state's, why is it that, for example, pensioners are left to live in poverty and die in squaller? The answer is simply that the old and the chronically-sick are on the scrap heap as far as the state is concerned.

Yes, we must fight the cuts but, for our own sake, we must go much further. We must take over and organise public services ourselves, for our own benefit. We must, at the same time, take control of industry so that we can build a better society. In this way we can do away with the need to go to the state cap-in-hand for unemployment benefit simply by removing the cause of unemployment and the 1001 other social ills that plague us.

Direct Action Movement -  
Manchester Branch 109 Oxford  
Road, Manchester M1 7DU.

## NELPAS/SWP/SWSO

The Eds.,

I am not often given to agreeing with the actions of the SWP, but I would think that NELP Anarchist Society might give more attention to the SWSO argument on support supporting the boycott on the Moscow Olympics. (Your issue March 15th.)

Your own editorial sometime ago pointed out that far from 'deviating from the actions of civilized nation nations' Russia was in fact conforming to those of capitalist nations. The Mexico Olympics were held at the time of a massacre of Mexican protestors, and of universal Western support for the American war in Vietnam.

## GET STUFFED!

The Editor,

G. Minshull must remember if anarchists find it distasteful to get involved with the working class in industry. He must also not mind if, when a crisis occurs and he wants to advise them - they tell him to go and get stuffed. They find it hard to trust their 'leaders' why should they trust outsiders, who despise their way of life.

They may not be romantic enough in their existence, but they are the only thing the capitalists are really scared of - even Geof realises how crucial they are - clever boy!

If Item 4 of 'Paid jobs' is the serious anarchist attitude to Industry then Capitalism has nothing to learn from them, and the working class would rather they stayed in that pub. .

Yours faithfully, D. Hallswood.

### FREEDOM NEEDS TYPISTS

If you can type, you can help us! You don't have to commit yourself to regular appearances, but we do occasionally need people at very short notice for 1 or 2 evenings. If you could work with us on this basis, please get in touch. We're dying to hear from you!! We would also like a (or some) regular typists - get in touch soon. Setting is done on Monday and Thursday evenings - please contact us then on 01-247 9249.

The boycott is an excellent tactic when used at the request of the inhabitants of a country (South African fruit workers, California ditto, Spanish workers in the tourist industry.) If it is to be extended to the international crimes of countries, and if it is done in conjunction with other states, which themselves have committed commensurate crimes, then those who advocate it have to demonstrate:

(a) that it will actually help those in whose support it is supposedly done, and  
(b) that they are not playing the International Real-politik games of rival states.

I don't think NELPAS has shewn either. L. O. Wellington.

## Anarchy & violence

Dear FREEDOM,

One of my reactions to John Rapp's FREEDOM article, "Anarchy and Violence", is to attack his implicit assumption that there are only two sorts of anarchist, 'pacifist' and 'violent'. He underestimates the great variety of positions which people hold as regards violence. One belief is that of people like myself, who will avoid violence whenever possible but who feel that sometimes defensive 'violence' can be the only response to certain outbreaks of extremely aggressive and brutal human violence. If a Hitler comes my way I'll have to fight, as I'm not prepared to tamely allow myself and other people to be lead off to concentration camps (saying "Peace, man"? without putting up armed resistance. As an anarchist one can be against both violence and pacifism.

Paul Durruti Columnist.

## ANSWERS?

Dear Sir,

If the masses are really so stupid, materialistic and easily-led as Jeff Robinson claims (and I am inclined to agree with him) how on earth could an anarchist society ever be set up. let alone work?

Yours faithfully, John L. Broom Stromness.

## Co-ops fair

Plans are afoot for a summer fair this year to celebrate the co-op movement in this country.

In mid-January people from several co-ops met near Leeds to begin organising for the event. At the moment things are still a bit vague, but we intend to hold a co-operative trade fair, to strengthen the links between co-ops, to challenge traditional work and home life, to discuss common principles, differences and difficulties and to show the general public, for the first time, the co-operative movement as a whole.

In the co-op fair's first newsletter, they say "common ownerships and collectives are still a very minor form of organisation and we have yet to develop some unity. Union makes us an effective force towards social change."

The fair will include all co-ops in Britain, and a few from outside. Co-ops engaged in similar activities will design

stalls and exhibitions as a group.

Stalls will include trade items, exhibits, music, acting and cartoons. Also groups are asked to demonstrate their history or their purpose in being a co-op.

The organisers are relying on film, music and theatre collectives to provide a constant element of fun and entertainment.

In order to organise the fair a series of delegate meetings will be held, the intention is to work with no hierarchy, for it to be every co-op fair.

All co-ops, collectives etc., are urged to become involved. The fair is planned for July 13th-20th, at Beechwood near Leeds.

For full details, how to become a delegate, how to help organise the fair, how to attend:

Contact: Co-op Fair,  
Beechwood College,  
Elmete Lane,  
Roundhay,  
Leeds LS8 2LQ.  
Phone 0532 720205

Cliff Harper

## IN BRIEF

As you will have noticed the judiciary has come in for a certain amount of criticism lately. There have been hints of bigotry and bias. Their military wing, the police 'force' has suffered even more abuse, with insinuations of corruption, brutality and murder. One aspect of their work which has led to particular muttering is their insistence on using the provisions of Section IV of the 1824 Vagrancy Act, which is very useful in preventing loitering 'with intention to commit an arrestable offence'. The impartial application of this law, in order to rid the streets of black muggers, has produced a predictable chorus of squeals from pinko do-gooders. This has built up to the extent that the law may have to be dropped.

But never fear. A. J. E. Brennan, Deputy Secretary in the Home Office, has been exercising himself on this matter. His conclusions will be heartening to all respectable citizens. The gap left in police powers will not "necessarily" be "intolerable". The community would have to "reconcile" itself with the gap and Parliament would have to decide if and how it should be filled.

Ayatollah Khomeini, God's representative on Earth, has resurfaced after his hospital confinement. Rested by the break he has condemned, strikes, go-slows and the "unauthorised" expropriation of property. People who resort to the use of guns are categorised as "dictators, who will not let you breathe if they come to power."

### CLOSING THE DOORS

The CIRA library at Geneva is temporarily closed, due to management problems. We can use all your co-operation and support.

Those who have borrowed publications are begged to return them for inventory purposes. No inquiries will be answered except to indicate other specialised centres capable of assisting researchers.

We thank our readers for their understanding and all publishers for their contributions.

The reopening of CIRA will be announced in due course.

The Librarians  
(CIRA is the Centre International De Recherches Sur L'Anarchisme. EDS)

## نافرمانك

We have received a letter from an Iranian anarchist group operating from the same address as the French Anarchist Federation (3, Rue Ternaux, 75011, Paris). This group had planned to publish a magazine in Farsi, called 'Nafarman' ('No authority'). However, there were delays, and in the meantime another paper, using the same name, appeared in Tehran (see FREEDOM, Vol. 40, No. 22). The group in Paris attempted to contact these others, but received no reply. They are angry, as they had previously announced their intention to use the title. Now, their paper has appeared still called 'Nafarman'. It can be distinguished from the other, (if you read Farsi!) as it carries the name of its founder, Ahmad - Reza Ravanbakhsh. The Paris group are suspicious of the Tehran 'Nafarman', considering that its publishers are using the international anarchist movement for their own ends. We'll give more details when we've sorted it out...

There are a couple of other active Iranian groups. The 'Malatesta Group'

operates in Iran. They announce the basis of their programme as:

- 1) Autogestion, that is to say the abolition of capital and the formation of factories and enterprises without owners and without bosses
- 2) Federalism, links to co-ordinate economic, social and cultural activities in order to avoid the appearance of power and leaderships.

The group reject terrorism and consider that mass struggle is the only way to achieve a free society. They have links with the 'Kaveh' group, who work abroad and with the Tehran Libertarian Group, who campaigned against the recent elections.

### APOLOGY AND APPEAL

We apologise for the fact that the typesetting of some items in this week's News Section falls well below our normal standard. This is because our regular typist is on holiday, and at least one of her replacements has the flu! If you can type PLEASE get in touch!

# FREEDOM CONTACTS

**Freedom Press**  
IN ANKEL ALLEY  
84b WHITECHAPEL HIGH ST.  
LONDON E1

## GROUPS

### INLAND

ABERDEEN libertarian group, c/o 163 King Street, Aberdeen.  
ABERYSTWYTH David Fletcher, 59 Cambrian St., Aberystwyth.  
BELFAST anarchist collective, Just Books, 7 Winetavern St., Belfast 1.

BIRMINGHAM anarchist/anarcha-feminists meet Sundays. Contact Alison at Peace Centre, 18 Moore St., Ringway, Birmingham 4 (tel. 021 643 0996)  
BRIGHTON Libertarian Socialist group, c/o Students Union, Palmer House, Univ. of Sussex, Palmer, Brighton.

BRISTOL City: 4 British Road, Bristol BS3 3BW.  
Students: Libertarian Society. Students Union, Queen's Road, Bristol.

CAMBRIDGE anarchists, Box A, 41 Fitzroy St., Cambridge.  
CANTERBURY Alternative Research group, Wally Barnes, Eliot College, University of Kent, Canterbury.

CARDIFF write c/o One-O-Eight Bookshop, 108 Salisbury Road.  
COVENTRY: John England, Students Union, Univ. of Warwick, Coventry.

DERBY. Contact Andrew Huckerby 49 Westleigh Avenue, Derby SE3 3BY (tel. 368678).

DUBLIN. A.B.C. Collective, 7 Ballsbridge Ave., Dublin, Fire.

EAST ANGLIAN Libertarians, Martyn Everett, 11 Gibson Gardens, Saffron Walden, Essex.

EDINBURGH anarchists meet 8 pm Mondays at First of May Bookshop, 45 Niddry St., Edinburgh.  
EXETER anarchist collective c/o Community Assn., Devonshire House, Stocker Rd., Exeter.

GLASGOW anarchist group: John Cooper, 34 Raithburn Avenue, Castlemilk, Glasgow G45.

HASTINGS anarchist group c/o Solstice, 127 Bohemia Rd., St. Leonards on Sea, Sussex (tel. 0424 429537).

HULL Libertarian Collective, 23 Auckland Ave., Hull, West Humberside.

LEAMINGTON & Warwick c/o 42 Bath St., Leamington Spa.

LAMPETER, Anarchist Group, c/o Adrian James, S.D. U.C., Lampeter, Dyfed, SA48 TED, Wales

LEEDS. Dave Brown, 30 Park Row, Knaresborough (near Harrogate), N. Yorkshire.

LEICESTER, Blackthorn Books, 74 Highcross St. Leic. tel. 21896 and Libertarian Education, 6 Beaconsfield Rd. Leic. tel 552085

LONDON ANARCHIST FEMINISTS, Box 33, Rising Free, 182 Upper St. London N1

### LONDON

Anarchy Collective. 37a Grosvenor Ave., N.5 (tel. 359 4794 before 7 pm).

Freedom Collective, 84B Whitechapel High St. (Angel Alley) E.1. (tel. 247 9249).

Hackney anarchists: Contact Dave on 249 7042.

Kingston anarchists, 13 Denmark Rd., Kingston-upon-Thames (549 2564).

London Workers' Group, Box W, 182 Upper St., N.1 (249 7042) meetings Tuesdays 8pm at Metropolitan pub, 75 Farringdon Rd. Love V. Power, Box 779, Peace News London Office, 5 Caledonian Road, N.1.

West London anarchists, 7 Penard Road, W.12.

MALVERN & WORCESTER area, Jock Spence, Birchwood Hall, Storrage, Malvern, Worcs.

MID-SUSSEX & South Coast anarchists, c/o Resources Centre, North Rd., Brighton, E. Sussex.

NORWICH anarchists, c/o Free-wheel Community Books, 56 St. Benedicts St., Norwich.

NOTTINGHAM c/o Mushroom, 10 Heathcote St. (tel. 582506) or 15 Scotholme Av., Hyson Green (tel. 708302).

OLDHAM. Nigel Broadbent, 14 Westminster Rd., Failsworth, Manchester

OXFORD anarchist group c/o Danny Simpson, Exeter College. Anarchist Workers group ditto. Anarcho-Feminists c/o Teresa Thornhill, 34 Divinity Rd.

Solidarity c/o 34 Cowley Rd. Paisley (College) anarchist group, c/o Students Union, Hunter St. Paisley, Renfrewshire.

READING anarchists c/o Ms. Shevek, Clubs Office, Student Union, Whiteknights, Reading.

RHONDDA & Midglamorgan. Henning Andersen, 'Smiths Arms', Treherbert, Midglamorgan, Wales.

SHEFFIELD anarchists: c/o 4 Havelock Square, Sheffield S10 2FQ.

Libertarian Society: PO Box 168, Sheffield S11 8SE.

SWANSEA: Don Williams, 24 Derwyn, Dunvant, Swansea.

SWINDON area: Mike, Groundswell Farm, Upper Stratton, Swindon.

WESTON-super-Mare: Martyn Redman, Flat 5, 23 Milton Road.

## NATIONAL

MIDLANDS Federation: groups include Birmingham, Coventry, Derby, Leamington/Warwick, Leicester, Nottingham, Sheffield.

NORTH EAST Anarchist Federation. Secretariat HLC 23 Auckland Avenue, Hull.

THAMES VALLEY anarchist federation - contact Oxford or Reading group.

DIRECT ACTION Movement, Sec. 28 Lucknow Drive, Sutton-in-Ashfield, Notts. Manchester DAM Group Box 20, 161/ Corn Exchange Buildings, Hanging Ditch, Manchester M 3BN Groups in London & Leeds also.

SOLIDARITY libertarian communist organisation (publ. 'Solidarity for Social Revolution') c/o 123 Latham Rd., London E6 Groups & mems. in many towns.

ANARCHIST COMMUNIST Association of class struggle anarchists (publ. 'Bread and Roses'), Box 2, 136 Kingsland High St., London E8.

## MEETINGS

DAM PUBLIC MEETING Thurs. 3 April, 8pm. STAR & GARTER Fairfield St. MANCHESTER. 'Whats Wrong With The TU's', Jim Petty, v. pres. Burnley Trades Coun.

WOMEN AND PRISONS On SAT. APRIL 12th. at Conway Hall, Red Lion Square, WC1, there will be a day of activities, discussion and information on this topic. Areas we hope to cover are the present situation of women in British goals, international perspectives, alternatives groups now active and what we can do in the present towards the complete abolition of prisons.

LIVERPOOL: Liberty Hall mtgs in the Everyman Bistro, Hope St. every Sunday 8 pm. March 30. The 1980 Spit & Polish Girls Show. 'alternative view of the army by all-woman cast'. (non-members 70p). April 6. Benefit for Merseyside Anti-Nuclear Action Gp. Bar & disco to 11.30 (£1.50 waged, £1 unwaged).

April 20. 1984 Coming on Time? Duncan Campbell discusses the sinister side of new microelectronics technology.

OXFORD: Anarchist/libertarian conference late June. Oxford anarchist group would like conference to be structured according to the priorities of the groups & orgs. attending. So please send suggestions, ideas for workshops, commitment to write discussion papers to: Mark Leopold or Tony, 77c St. Clements, Oxford. Timetable and further details will follow response.

### LONDON

April 13 Discussion on anarchism at Marchmont Community Centre, 62 Marchmont St. WC1 2 pm (Org. by Libertarian Alliance - 'for Life, Liberty and Property')



# Malatesta's Anarchist Programme

*The next congress of the UAI (Federation of Italian Anarchists) will be taking the opportunity to reaffirm its belief in, and dedication to the realisation of, 'Malatesta's Anarchist Programme' first adopted by the congress in 1920. It has been reprinted in the March 9th, issue of Umanita Nova (Italian anarchist weekly) and we too feel it worth restating. Eds.*

## 1. AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

We believe that most of the ills that afflict mankind stem from a bad social organisation; and that Man could destroy them if he wished and knew how.

Present society is the result of age-long struggles of man against man. Not understanding the advantages that could accrue for all by cooperation and solidarity; seeing in every other man (with the possible exception of those closest to them by blood ties) a competitor and an enemy, each one of them sought to secure for himself, the greatest number of advantages possible without giving a thought to the interests of others.

In such a struggle, obviously the strongest or more fortunate were bound to win, and in one way or another subject and oppress the losers.

So long as Man was unable to produce more than was strictly needed to keep alive, the conquerors could do no more than put to flight or massacre their victims, and seize the food they had gathered.

Then when with the discovery of grazing and agriculture a man could produce more than what he needed to live, the conquerors found it more profitable to reduce the conquered to a state of slavery, and put them to work for their advantage.

Later, the conquerors realised that it was more convenient, more profitable and certain to exploit the labour of others by other means: to retain for themselves the exclusive right to the land and working implements, and set free the disinherited who, finding themselves without the means of life, were obliged to have recourse to the landowners and work for them, on their terms.

Thus, step by step through a most complicated series of struggles of every description, of invasions, wars, rebellions,

repressions, concessions won by struggle, associations of the oppressed united for defence, and of the conquerors for attack, we have arrived at the present state of society, in which some have inherited the land and all social wealth, while the mass of the people, disinherited in all respects, is exploited and oppressed by a small possessing class.

From all this stems the misery in which most workers live today, and which in turn creates the evils such as ignorance, crime, prostitution, diseases due to malnutrition, mental depression and premature death. From all this arises a special class (government) which, provided with the necessary means of repression, exists to legalise and protect the owning class from the demands of the workers; and then it uses the powers at its disposal to create privileges for itself and to subject, if it can, the owning class itself as well. From this the creation of another privileged class (the clergy), which by a series of fables about the will of God, and about an after-life etc., seeks to persuade the oppressed to accept oppression meekly, and (just as the government does), as well as serving the interest of the owning class, serves its own. From this the creation of an official science which, in all those matters serving the interests of the ruling class, is the negation of true science. From this the patriotic spirit, race hatred, wars and armed peace, sometimes more disastrous than wars themselves. From this the transformation of love into torment or sordid commerce. From this hatred, more or less disguised, rivalry, suspicion among all men, insecurity and universal fear.

We want to change radically such a state of affairs. And since all these ills have their origin in the struggle between men, in the seeking after well-being through one's own efforts and for oneself and against everybody, we want to make amends, replacing hatred by love, competition by solidarity, the individual search for personal well-being by the fraternal cooperation for the well-being of all, oppression and imposition by liberty, the religious and pseudo-scientific lie by truth.

\* Il Programma Anarchico was drafted by Malatesta and adopted by the Unione Anarchica Italiana at its Congress in Bologna (1920)

Therefore:

1. Abolition of private property in land, in raw materials and the instruments of labour, so that no one shall have the means of living by the exploitation of the labour of others, and that everybody, being assured of the means to produce and to live, shall be truly independent and in a position to unite freely among themselves for a common objective and according to their personal sympathies.
  2. Abolition of government and of every power which makes the law and imposes it on others: therefore abolition of monarchies, republics, parliaments, armies, police forces, magistratures and any institution whatsoever endowed with coercive powers.
  3. Organisation of social life by means of free association and federations of producers and consumers, created and modified according to the wishes of their members, guided by science and experience, and free from any kind of imposition which does not spring from natural needs, to which everyone, convinced by a feeling of overriding necessity, voluntarily submits.
  4. The means of life, for development and well-being, will be guaranteed to children and all who are prevented from providing for themselves.
  5. War on religions and all lies, even if they shelter under the cloak of science. Scientific instruction for all to advanced level.
  6. War on rivalries and patriotic prejudices. Abolition of frontiers; brotherhood among all peoples.
  7. Reconstruction of the family, as will emerge from the practice of love, freed from every legal tie, from every economic and physical oppression, from every religious prejudice.
- This is our ideal.

## 2. WAYS AND MEANS

We have outlined under a number of headings our objectives and the ideal for which we struggle.

But it is not enough to desire something; if one really wants it adequate means must be used to secure it. And these means are not arbitrary, but instead cannot but be conditioned by the ends we aspire to and by the circumstances in which the struggle takes place, for if we ignore the choice of means we would achieve other ends, possibly diametrically opposed to those we aspire to, and this would be the obvious and inevitable consequence of our choice of means. Whoever sets out on the highroad and takes a wrong turning does not go where he intends to go but where the road leads him.

It is therefore necessary to state what are the means which in our opinion lead to our desired ends, and which we propose to adopt.

Our ideal is not one which depends for its success on the individual considered in isolation. The question is of changing the way of life of society as a whole; of establishing among men relationships based on love and solidarity; of achieving the full material, moral and intellectual development not for isolated individuals, or members of one class or of a particular political party, but for all mankind—and this is not something that can be imposed by force, but must emerge through the enlightened consciences of each one of us and be achieved with the free consent of all.

Our first task therefore must be to persuade people.

We must make people aware of the misfortunes they suffer and of their chances to destroy them. We must awaken sympathy in everybody for the misfortunes of others and a warm desire for the good of all people.

To those who are cold and hungry we will demonstrate how possible and easy it could be to assure to everybody their material needs. To those who are oppressed and despised we shall show how it is possible to live happily in a world of people who are free and equal; to those who are tormented by hatred and bitterness we will point to the road that leads to peace and human warmth that comes through learning to love one's fellow beings.

And when we will have succeeded in arousing the sentiment of rebellion in the minds of men against the avoidable and unjust evils from which we suffer in society today, and in

getting them to understand how they are caused and how it depends on human will to rid ourselves of them; and when we will have created a lively and strong desire in men to transform society for the good of all, then those who are convinced, will by their own efforts as well as by the example of those already convinced, unite and want to as well as be able to act for their common ideals.

As we have already pointed out, it would be ridiculous and contrary to our objectives to seek to impose freedom, love among men and the radical development of human faculties, by means of force. One must therefore rely on the free will of others, and all we can do is to provoke the development and the expression of the will of the people. But it would be equally absurd and contrary to our aims to admit that those who do not share our views should prevent us from expressing our will, so long as it does not deny them the same freedom.

Freedom for all, therefore, to propagate and to experiment with their ideas, with no other limitation than that which arises naturally from the equal liberty of everybody.

But to this are opposed—and with brute force—those who benefit from existing privileges and who today dominate and control all social life.

In their hands they have all the means of production; and thus they suppress not only the possibility of free experimentation in new ways of communal living, and the right of workers to live freely by their own efforts, but also the right to life itself; and they oblige whoever is not a boss to have to allow himself to be exploited and oppressed if he does not wish to die of hunger.

They have police forces, a judiciary, and armies created for the express purpose of defending their privileges; and they persecute, imprison and massacre those who would want to abolish those privileges and who claim the means of life and liberty for everyone.

Jealous of their present and immediate interests, corrupted by the spirit of domination, fearful of the future, they, the privileged class, are, generally speaking incapable of a generous gesture; are equally incapable of a wider concept of their interests. And it would be foolish to hope that they should freely give up property and power and adapt themselves to living as equals and with those who today they keep in subjection.

Leaving aside the lessons of history (which demonstrates that never has a privileged class divested itself of all or some of its privileges, and never has a government abandoned its power unless obliged to do so by force or the fear of force), there is enough contemporary evidence to convince anyone that the bourgeoisie and governments intend to use armed force to defend themselves, not only against complete expropriation, but equally against the smallest popular demands, and are always ready to engage in the most atrocious persecutions and the bloodiest massacres.

For those people who want to emancipate themselves, only one course is open: that of opposing force with force.

It follows from what we have said that we have to work to awaken in the oppressed the conscious desire for a radical social transformation, and to persuade them that by uniting they have the strength to win; we must propagate our ideal and prepare the required material and moral forces to overcome those of the enemy, and to organise the new society, and when we will have the strength needed we must, by taking advantage of favourable circumstances as they arise, or which we can ourselves create, to make the social revolution, using force to destroy the government and to expropriate the owners of wealth, and by putting in common the means of life and production, and by preventing the setting up of new governments which would impose their will and to hamper the reorganisation of society by the people themselves.

All this is however less simple than it might appear at first sight. We have to deal with people as they are in society today, in the most miserable moral and material condition; and we would be deluding ourselves in thinking that propaganda is enough to raise them to that level of intellectual

development which is needed to put our ideas into effect.

Between man and his social environment there is a reciprocal action. Men make society what it is and society makes men what they are, and the result is therefore a kind of vicious circle. To transform society men must be changed, and to transform men, society must be changed.

Poverty brutalises man, and to abolish poverty men must have a social conscience and determination. Slavery teaches men to be slaves, and to free oneself from slavery there is a need for men who aspire to liberty. Ignorance has the effect of making men unaware of the causes of their misfortunes as well as the means of overcoming them, and to do away with ignorance people must have the time and the means to educate themselves.

Governments accustom people to submit to the Law and to believe that Law is essential to society; and to abolish government men must be convinced of the uselessness and the harmfulness of government.

How does one escape from this vicious circle?

Fortunately existing society has not been created by the inspired will of a dominating class, which has succeeded in reducing all its subjects to passive and unconscious instruments of its interests. It is the result of a thousand internecine struggles, of a thousand human and natural factors acting indifferently, without directive criteria; and thus there are no clear-cut divisions either between individuals or between classes.

Innumerable are the variations in material conditions; innumerable are the degrees of moral and intellectual development; and not always—we would almost say very rarely, does the place of any individual in society correspond with his abilities and his aspirations. Very often individuals accustomed to conditions of comfort fall on hard times and others, through exceptionally favourable circumstances succeed in raising themselves above the conditions into which they were born. A large proportion of the working class has already succeeded either in emerging from a state of abject poverty, or was never in such a situation; no worker to speak of, finds himself in a state of complete social unawareness, of complete acquiescence to the conditions imposed on him by the bosses. And the same institutions, such as have been produced by history, contain organic contradictions and are like the germs of death, which as they develop result in the dissolution of institutions and the need for transformation.

From this the possibility of progress—but not the possibility of bringing all men to the necessary level to want, and to achieve, anarchy, by means of propaganda, without a previous gradual transformation of the environment.

Progress must advance contemporaneously and along parallel lines between men and their environment. We must take advantage of all the means, all the possibilities and the opportunities that the present environment allows us to act on our fellow men and to develop their consciences and their demands; we must use all advance in human consciences to induce them to claim and to impose those major social transformations which are possible and which effectively serve to open the way to further advances later.

We must not wait to achieve anarchy, in the meantime limiting ourselves to simple propaganda. Were we to do so we would soon exhaust our field of action; that is, we would have converted all those who in the existing environment are susceptible to understand and accept our ideas, and our subsequent propaganda would fall on sterile ground; or if environmental transformations brought out new popular groupings capable of receiving new ideas, this would happen without our participation, and thus would prejudice our ideas.

We must seek to get all the people, or different sections of the people, to make demands, and impose itself and take for itself all the improvements and freedoms that it desires as and when it reaches the state of wanting them, and the power to demand them; and in always propagating all aspects of our programme, and always struggling for its complete realisation, we must push the people to want always more and to increase its pressures, until it has achieved complete emancipation.

### 3. THE ECONOMIC STRUGGLE

The oppression which today impinges most directly on the workers and which is the main cause of the moral and material frustrations under which they labour, is economic oppression, that is the exploitation to which bosses and business men subject them, thanks to their monopoly of all the most important means of production and distribution.

To destroy radically this oppression without any danger of it re-emerging, all people must be convinced of their right to the means of production, and be prepared to exercise this basic right by expropriating the land owners, the industrialists and financiers, and putting all social wealth at the disposal of the people.

But can this expropriation be put into effect today? Can we today pass directly, without intermediate steps, from the hell in which the workers now find themselves to the paradise of common property?

Facts demonstrate what the workers are capable of today.

Our task is the moral and material preparation of the people for this essential expropriation; and to attempt it again and again, every time a revolutionary upheaval offers us the chance to, until the final triumph. But in what way can we prepare the people? In what way must one prepare the conditions which make possible not only the material fact of expropriation, but the utilisation to everybody's advantage of the common wealth?

We have already said that spoken and written propaganda alone cannot win over to our ideas the mass of the people. A practical education is needed, which must be alternately cause and effect in a gradual transformation of the environment. Parallel with the workers developing a sense of rebellion against the injustices and useless sufferings of which they are the victims, and the desire to better their conditions, they must be united and mutually dependent in the struggle to achieve their demands.

And we as anarchists and workers, must incite and encourage them to struggle, and join them in their struggle.

But are these improvements possible in a capitalist regime? Are they useful from the point of view of a future complete emancipation of the workers?

Whatever may be the practical results of the struggle for immediate gains, the greatest value lies in the struggle itself. For thereby workers learn that the bosses interests are opposed to theirs and that they cannot improve their conditions, and much less emancipate themselves, except by uniting and becoming stronger than the bosses. If they succeed in getting what they demand, they will be better off: they will earn more, work fewer hours and will have more time and energy to reflect on the things that matter to them, and will immediately make greater demands and have greater needs. If they do not succeed they will be led to study the causes of their failure and recognise the need for closer unity and greater activity and they will in the end understand that to make their victory secure and definitive, it is necessary to destroy capitalism. The revolutionary cause, the cause of the moral elevation and emancipation of the workers must benefit by the fact that workers unite and struggle for their interests.

But, once again, can the workers succeed in really improving their conditions in the present state of society?

This depends on the confluence of a great number of circumstances.

In spite of what some say, there exists no natural law (law of wages) which determines what part of a worker's labour should go to him; or if one wants to formulate a law, it could not be but that: wages cannot normally be less than what is needed to maintain life, nor can they normally rise such that no profit margin is left to the boss.

It is clear that in the first case workers would die, and therefore would stop drawing any wages, and in the second the bosses would stop employing labour and so would pay no more wages. But between these two impossible extremes there is an infinite scale of degrees ranging from the miserable conditions of many land workers to the almost respectable conditions of skilled workers in the large cities.

Wages, hours and other conditions of employment are

the result of the struggle between bosses and workers. The former try to give the workers as little as possible and get them to work themselves to the bone; the latter try, or should try to work as little, and earn as much, as possible. Where workers accept any conditions, or even being discontented, do not know how to put up effective resistance to the bosses demands, they are soon reduced to bestial conditions of life. Where, instead, they have ideas as to how human beings should live and know how to join forces, and through refusal to work or the latent and open threat of rebellion, to win the bosses respect, in such cases, they are treated in a relatively decent way. One can therefore say that within certain limits, the wages he gets are what the worker (not as an individual, of course, but as a class) demands.

Through struggle, by resistance against the bosses, therefore, workers can up to a certain point, prevent a worsening of their conditions as well as obtaining real improvement. And the history of the workers' movement has already demonstrated this truth.

One must not however exaggerate the importance of this struggle between workers and bosses conducted exclusively in the economic field. Bosses can give in, and often they do in face of forcefully expressed demands so long as the demands are not too great; but if workers were to make demands (and it is imperative that they should) which would absorb all the bosses profits and be in effect an indirect form of expropriation, it is certain that the bosses would appeal to the government and would seek to use force to oblige the workers to remain in their state of wage slavery.

And even before, long before workers can expect to receive the full product of their labour, the economic struggle becomes impotent as a means of producing the improvements in living standards.

Workers produce everything and without them life would be impossible; therefore it would seem that by refusing to work they could demand whatever they wanted. But the union of all workers, even in one particular trade, and in one country is difficult to achieve, and opposing the union of workers are the bosses organisations. Workers live from day to day, and if they do not work they soon find themselves without food; whereas the bosses, because they have money, have access to all the goods in stock and can therefore sit back and wait until hunger reduces their employees to a more amenable frame of mind. The invention or the introduction of new machinery makes workers redundant and adds to the large army of unemployed, who are driven by hunger to sell their labour at any price. Immigration immediately creates problems in the countries where better working conditions exist, for the hordes of hungry workers, willy nilly, offer the bosses an opportunity to depress wages all round. And all these facts, which necessarily derive from the capitalist system, conspire in counteracting and often destroying advances made in working class consciousness and solidarity. And in every case the overriding fact remains that production under capitalism is organised by each capitalist for his personal profit and not, as would be natural, to satisfy the needs of the workers in the best possible way. Hence the chaos, the waste of human effort, the organised scarcity of goods, useless and harmful occupations, unemployment, abandoned land, under-use of plant and so on, all evils which cannot be avoided except by depriving the capitalists of the means of production and, it follows, the organisation of production.

Soon then, those workers who want to free themselves, or even only to effectively improve their conditions, will be faced with the need to defend themselves from the government, with the need to attack the government, which by legalising the right to property and protecting it with brute force, constitutes a barrier to human progress, which must be beaten down with force if one does not wish to remain indefinitely under present conditions or even worse.

From the economic struggle one must pass to the political struggle, that is to the struggle against government; and instead of opposing the capitalist millions with the workers' few pennies scraped together with difficulty, one must oppose the rifles and guns which defend property with the more effective

means that the people will be able to find to defeat force by force.

#### 4. THE POLITICAL STRUGGLE

By the political struggle we mean the struggle against government. Government is the *ensemble* of all those individuals who hold the reins of power, however acquired, to make the law and to impose it on the governed, that is the public.

Government is the consequence of the spirit of domination and violence with which some men have imposed themselves on other, and is at the same time the creature as well as the creator of privilege and its natural defender.

It is wrongly said that today government performs the function of defender of capitalism but that once capitalism is abolished it would become the representative and administrator of the general interest. In the first place capitalism will not be destroyed until the workers, having rid themselves of government, take possession of all social wealth and themselves organise production and consumption in the interests of everybody without waiting for the initiative to come from government which, however willing to comply, would be incapable of doing so.

But there is a further question: if capitalism were to be destroyed and a government were to be left in office, the government, through the concession of all kinds of privileges, would create capitalism anew for, being unable to please everybody it would need an economically powerful class to support it in return for the legal and material protection it would receive.

Consequently privilege cannot be abolished and freedom and equality established firmly and definitely without abolishing government—not this or that government but the very institution of government.

As in all questions of general interest, and especially this one, the consent of the people as a whole is needed, and therefore we must strain every nerve to persuade the people that government is useless as well as harmful, and that we can live better lives without government.

But, as we have repeated more than once, propaganda alone is impotent to convince everybody—and if we were to want to limit ourselves to preaching against government, and in the meantime waiting supinely for the day when the public will be convinced of the possibility and value of radically destroying every kind of government, then that day would never come.

While preaching against every kind of government, and demanding complete freedom, we must support all struggles for partial freedom, because we are convinced that one learns through struggle, and that once one begins to enjoy a little freedom one ends by wanting it all. We must always be with the people, and when we do not succeed in getting them to demand a lot we must still seek to get them to want something; and we must make every effort to get them to understand that however much or little they may demand should be obtained by their own efforts and that they should despise and detest whoever is part of, or aspires to, government.

Since government today has the power, through the legal system, to regulate daily life and to broaden or restrict the liberty of the citizen, and because we are still unable to tear this power from its grasp, we must seek to reduce its power and oblige governments to use it in the least harmful ways possible. But this we must do always remaining outside, and against, government, putting pressure on it through agitation in the streets, by threatening to take by force what we demand. Never must we accept any kind of legislative position, be it national or local, for in so doing we will neutralise the effectiveness of our activity as well as betraying the future of our cause.

The struggle against government in the last analysis, is physical, material.

Governments make the law. They must therefore dispose of the material forces (police and army) to impose the law, for otherwise only those who wanted to would obey it, and it would no longer be the law, but a simple series of suggestions which all would be free to accept or reject. Governments

have this power, however, and use it through the law, to strengthen their power, as well as to serve the interests of the ruling classes, by oppressing and exploiting the workers.

The only limit to the oppression of government is the power with which the people show themselves capable of opposing it. Conflict may be open or latent; but it always exists since the government does not pay attention to discontent and popular resistance except when it is faced with the danger of insurrection.

When the people meekly submit to the law, or their protests are feeble and confined to words, the government studies its own interests and ignores the needs of the people; when the protests are lively, insistent, threatening, the government, depending on whether it is more or less understanding, gives way or resorts to repression. But one always comes back to insurrection, for if the government does not give way, the people will end by rebelling; and if the government does give way, then the people gain confidence in themselves and make ever increasing demands, until such time as the incompatibility between freedom and authority becomes clear and the violent struggle is engaged.

It is therefore necessary to be prepared, morally and materially, so that when this does happen the people will emerge victorious.

A successful insurrection is the most potent factor in the emancipation of the people, for once the yoke has been shaken off, the people are free to provide themselves with those institutions which they think best, and the time lag between passing the law and the degree of civilisation which the mass of the population has attained, is breached in one leap. The insurrection determines the revolution, that is, the speedy emergence of the latent forces built up during the "evolutionary" period.

Everything depends on what the people are capable of wanting.

In past insurrections unaware of the real reasons for their misfortunes, they have always wanted very little, and have obtained very little.

What will they want in the next insurrection?

The answer, in part, depends on our propaganda and what efforts we put into it.

We shall have to push the people to expropriate the bosses and put all goods in common and organise their daily lives themselves, through freely constituted associations, without waiting for orders from outside and refusing to nominate or recognise any government or constituted body in whatever guise (constituent, dictatorship, etc.) even in a provisional capacity, which ascribes to itself the right to lay down the law and impose with force its will on others.

And if the mass of the population will not respond to our appeal we must—in the name of the right we have to be free even if others wish to remain slaves and because of the force of example—put into effect as many of our ideas as we can, refuse to recognise the new government and keep alive resistance and seek that those localities where our ideas are received with sympathy should constitute themselves into anarchist communities, rejecting all governmental interference and establishing free agreements with other communities which want to live their own lives.

We shall have to, above all, oppose with every means the re-establishment of the police and the armed forces, and use any opportunity to incite workers in non anarchist localities to take advantage of the absence of repressive forces to implement the most far reaching demands that we can induce them to make.

And however things may go, to continue the struggle against the possessing class and the rulers without respite, having always in mind the complete economic, political and moral emancipation of all mankind.

5. CONCLUSION

What we want, therefore, is the complete destruction of the domination and exploitation of man by man; we want men united as brothers by a conscious and desired solidarity, all cooperating voluntarily for the well-being of all; we want society to be constituted for the purpose of supplying everybody with the means for achieving the maximum well-being, the maximum possible moral and spiritual development; we want bread, freedom, love, and science for everybody.

And in order to achieve these all important ends, it is necessary in our opinion that the means of production should be at the disposal of everybody and that no man, or groups of men, should be in a position to oblige others to submit to their will or to exercise their influence other than through the power of reason and by example.

Therefore: expropriation of landowners and capitalists for the benefit of all; and abolition of government.

And while waiting for the day when this can be achieved: the propagation of our ideas; unceasing struggle, violent or non-violent depending on the circumstances, against government and against the boss class to conquer as much freedom and well-being as we can for the benefit of everybody.

Reprinted from  
'Malatesta -- Life and Ideas',  
compiled, edited and translated by  
Vernon Richards. Freedom Press £2.

*June 9/12*

**MALATESTA RELEASE COMMITTEE.**

**A MARCH**

will take place from  
**Mile End Waste**  
TO GREAT  
**PROTEST MEETING**  
AT  
**TRAFALGAR SQUARE.**

**SPEAKERS:**  
BEN TILLET, CUNNINGHAM-GRAHAM,  
GUY BOWMAN, MRS. TOM MANN & others.

A Band will be in attendance.  
Trade Unions invited to bring banners.  
All workers should attend here (Mile End Waste) at 1.45 p.m. on Sunday Next.  
Watch "Daily Herald" for further particulars.  
"Workers Friend" Priests, 105, Jubilee Street, Mile End, E.

---

**MALATESTA: A MASS MEETING**  
to demand the immediate  
**RELEASE OF MALATESTA**  
AT 4 P.M.

Will be held in **TRAFALGAR SQUARE TO-MORROW**

**WEST PLINTH:**  
A. COLE, GUY BOWMAN, W. E. FARRER, EDG. BOWEN,  
C. H. QUINN, GUY BOWMAN, MRS. TOM MANN,  
GUY BOWMAN, MRS. TOM MANN, MRS. TOM MANN.

**EAST PLINTH:**  
W. E. FARRER, EDG. BOWEN,  
GUY BOWMAN, MRS. TOM MANN, MRS. TOM MANN.

**PROCESSIONS START:**  
1.15 P.M. Mile End; 2.15 P.M. Mile End; 3.15 P.M. Mile End.

**BANDS AND BANNERS WILL ACCOMPANY MASS PROCESSION.**

*D. Herald*  
*June 9/12*

# Book Reviews

## ANARCHY COMICS

SOME time ago I wrote in *FREEDOM* about the first issue of *Anarchy Comics*. Well, you can stop holding your breath for the second issue is about to hit the streets - just as soon as our custom and excise scum let it out of the London docks.

It's got 34 pages, bursting with wit, savage satire, violence, beauty and art. It's international, artists from Hollywood, Holland, Germany, France, San Francisco and Camberwell Green (that's in South London, where I live, if you can call it living) having contributed to show the world that not only do anarchists have a sound theoretical perspective on stuff but also that they can draw pictures!

Naturally enough, the editor of *Anarchy Comics*, Jay Kinney, has given himself and his writer, Paul Maurides, more pages than any other artist - 11 pages in fact - but that's the sort of thing you get to do when you're an editor. But, sour grapes aside, their 8-page strip which, as far as I can decipher, is titled 'Kultur Dokuments', is quite brilliant.

In all, there are 10 strips, Steve Stiles on the Wobblies, Sharon Rudahc on 'Peculiar Institutions', the aforementioned 'Kultur Dokuments', a collaboration between me and Bert Brecht (he dead dow) called 'The Bulk Freighter', which, though I say so myself, is pretty good, if not the 'best' thing in the whole sordid mess. Next comes a striking 5-page biography of great proletarian hero Buenaventura Durruti, which has got everything a good comic strip should have, written and drawn by Spain.

Then there's a wierd one, by Peter Pontiac, called 'Romantic Anarchy'; he's from Holland. I don't like this strip at all, see what you think. Let's just call it a personal statement and leave it there. That's followed by a very witty little thing by Jay Kinney (the editor) which goes under the name of 'Radical Reflections', laugh! I nearly wet myself.

Then there's 'The Yipples at the Exchange', yet another chapter in 'Liberty through the Ages' by the French pair, Epistolier and Trublin. They did the strip on 'Kronstadt' in *Anarchy Comix 1*. This new strip isn't up to the standard of the 'Kronstadt' strip but it's still better than a slap in the face with a wet fish.

## RADICAL WALKING

*Freedom to Roam*, by Howard Hill, pb. Moorland

HOWARD HILL is a veteran of the struggles to secure and maintain access 'without let or hindrance' to the commons, moors and mountains of Britain. His book, *The Freedom to Roam*, details the history of this struggle from the Gentlemen's Clubs of the 19th century through the working class ramblers clubs, associations and federations up to the contemporary campaigns. He takes the story back to its economic and social origins and in doing so raises important points about the use of land, the effects of industrialisation, the quality of life and about the struggles of the ramblers to reassert and retain the traditional commoners' rights of 'air and exercise'.

Hill begins with the effects of the industrial revolution which, in creating vast conurbations and slums, cut off the working population from all contact with its roots in the countryside, and forced them to work in the miserable conditions of the factories. A very early form of revolt against this life was shown by poets such as Keats and Wordsworth, but as Hill points out, '... Unlike the literary figures of the eighteenth

After that comes a quite wonderful series of panels by Melinda Gebbie - lovely fluid drawings around quotes from Emma Goldman, very beautiful. Again, Jay Kinney quips away (he's the editor) on the last page on the subject of 'commodity fetishism', a topic that Jay has obviously given a great deal of thought to, for make no mistake, behind Jay's little jokes and gags there are some real serious points to be made!

I cannot leave *Anarchy Comics 2* without a word on the back cover. An hilarious portrait of Chairman Mao (he dead now) by Paul Maurides. It's also available as a poster in full colour, large format for \$3.50 post paid, from the same address as *Anarchy Comics*. Last Gasp, P.O. Box 212, Berkeley, California, 94701 USA.

*Anarchy Comics 2*, 75 p. is available from radical bookshops or from *Hassle Free Distribution*, Unit 6, Kensal Town Works, Kensal Road, W.10, London (postage extra). Or from 'Last Gasp' for \$1.25.

CLIFF HARPER

## Toward a Humour International

PAUL BUHLE of the magazine *Cultural Correspondence* and Jay Kinney, editor of *Anarchy Comics*, have issued a call to 'radical and progressive humorists' throughout the world to 'coalesce and know each other better, exchange jokes and cartoons and inspiration', and to 'make our humour as universal as the promise of the human spirit'.

Buhle and Kinney point out in their call that "true humour, reckless and untrammelled, is the enemy of every boss and bureaucrat, every exploiter and opponent of freedom across the world". They go on to say that graffiti, gags about one's supervisor, foreman or cop, bitter jibes about politicians and the rich are permitted in jests but would be denied or suppressed as political information.

Their appeal for people to add their names to the call, which will be published in the spring/summer issue of *Cultural Correspondence*.

As the activities and giggles of the 'International Humor Movement' unfold, we will bring you views via these pages. The system that makes our jobs a joke, makes our jokes a job!

CLIFF HARPER

and nineteenth centuries, the working class could neither desert the towns to live in the countryside nor spend weeks walking through it ..."

The working classes had often only their Sunday off in which to enjoy the countryside and to refresh themselves before facing another week's exploitation and life in the overcrowded town. Moreover, the expansion of the towns and the enclosures continually reduced access to such open spaces as were nearby.

The earliest rambling clubs were the Gentlemen's Clubs of the 1840s. These were the first to meet the opposition of gamekeepers and landowners. These clubs owed something to the Whig tradition but comprised 'respectable' citizens - industrialists and professional people. As they were relatively few in number and of the upper end of the social scale, they were more able to circumvent the opposition of gamekeepers than some of their lowlier successors. Hill quotes an example of one such confrontation where the gentlemanly ramblers threw off the unwelcome attention of a gamekeeper by chanting a legal formula: "... We hereby give you notice that we do not, nor doth any of us, claim any right of way or other easement into or over these lands and we tend you this shilling by way of amends ..."

However, the first real fight for access by ordinary people to the ancient rights of 'air and exercise' occurred on the very doorstep of London. This movement began in the 1840s to prevent further encroachments on common land, specifically to prevent sales of the commons to speculative builders. The

Commons and Open Spaces Preservation Society was formed in 1865 but as Hill notes it was a popular protest resulting from the jailing of three labourers for exercising commoners' rights in Epping Forest that led to the victory of the society. On 10 November 1879 5 - 6000 people turned out to perform their right to lop trees. This 'direct action' led to the restoration of 3000 acres of land and the declaration by Queen Victoria in 1882 that the forest was to be open to the public 'without let or hindrance'. In 1886 the Forest Ramblers Club was formed to walk, Hill quotes, "through Epping Forest and report obstructions we have seen".

The enclosers of Epping Forest were not the only threat; the upland moors and wastes of the north, particularly the Peak district, the Pennines and Scotland, saw much land taken over and used for grouse shooting and deer forests. The landowners denied access, closed footpaths and rights of way. From 1845 the Rights of Way Society operated to stop illegal closures of footpaths. 1847 saw the 'Battle of Glen Tilt' - a clash between an Edinburgh professor and the Duke of Atholl's Keepers. The society was victorious in the resulting legal dispute.

The most important development in the struggle for access and one into which Hill goes at some length, was the growth of working people's rambling clubs. These clubs and societies were formed in most industrial towns, and organisations such as the Sheffield Clarrion Ramblers and the British Workers Sports Federation formed the basis for the access campaigns and Mass Trespasses of the period 1900 - 1938. There were numerous other socialist and workers' rambling organisations and groups involved in these campaigns.

These rambling groups flourished in the industrialised regions of Lancashire, Yorkshire and Nottinghamshire, areas bordering directly on the Peak district. The mass trespass campaign grew out of the continued refusal of landowners of this region, both of the grousemoor and water works variety, to allow large scale access. A series of parliamentary bills between 1884 and 1938 failed to pass the House of Commons and apart from scarce 'permit' holders few were allowed on the moors.

Naturally a great many ramblers ignored such legal niceties and walked on the moors visiting clashes with gamekeepers. It is the story of the struggle to gain legal rights of access to various sites in the Peak district which is the most important section of Hill's book.

He unfolds the classic tale of a campaign - the advocates of direct action by mass trespass on the one hand and the advocates of 'moderation' and 'negotiation' on the other, facing a uniformly hostile attitude from landowners. It was the campaign of mass trespassing which created wide public support for 'access'. By the 1930s the 'rambling craze' led 10,000 people to the Peak district every weekend. The rambling clubs grew significantly and began pressurising for access, setting up committees for the purpose.

Since 1926 there had been annual ramblers demonstrations at the Winnets Pass, Castleton, Derbyshire and in 1926 10,000 attended. The two most significant events were the trespasses on Kinder Scout and Abbey Brook in 1932. As a result of the first, organised by the British Workers Sports Federation, six people were arrested. At their trial in Derby five were found guilty of 'riotously assembling to disturb the

public' and imprisoned. Such a 'miscarriage' aroused much popular indignation, but even such popular support did not prevent people within the ramblers' movement such as Chubb from trying to achieve by parliamentary action that which the ramblers were already taking by direct action.

Chubb, the secretary of the Commons, Open Spaces and Footpaths Preservation Society, did not approve or support the mass trespasses. He sided with the view that such action was irresponsible and wrong when negotiation was under way. Chubb supported the Creech Jones access bill of 1938 - so eager were he and Jones to see the bill on the statute book that they allowed its total emasculation and even the inclusion of the 'trespass clause: the bill threatened to make ramblers into 'criminals'.

The second world war put a stop to immediate developments and the second bill, passed in 1949, was an improvement with the creation of national parks. Both bills had sought 'access agreements'. The first (1938) made the ramblers foot the cost, which they couldn't afford, short of bankruptcy. The second bill (1949) shifted this to local authorities, and the rates. However, in terms of access 'without let or hindrance' even the act of 1949 was a failure. Only one third of the Peak district is open; the vast majority of Britain's upland is open by suffrage and not by right. And this position is still a precarious one.

Demonstration and direct action aided the gaining of access in other areas, notably the Forest of Bowland, which Hill considers part of a continuing fight. There are trends within the rambling movement which are worthy of more consideration than Hill gives them. In his chapter on the future of the dangers of over-use, the erosion of paths on moors and mountains, but he does not seem to see the social consequences of the hill walking/climbing tourist industry which, while it may bring valuable money and employment to regions such as North Wales and the Lakes, has also brought second home ownership and the desertion of villages. The sport itself is increasingly commercialised, the admirable attempts on Everest becoming little more than advertising stunts for the equipment firms. The sport is being 'used' to an ever greater degree by organisations such as the scouts/guides, police cadets, churches, the Duke of Edinburgh award scheme, which all seek to assimilate youth to their own warped ideologies. This is a perversion of an otherwise liberating and pleasant pastime.

Nevertheless the majority of those involved in the sport rely on self organisation and mutual aid in the form of rambling clubs, federations and climbing clubs. Mutual aid stretches to great lengths in the activities of the volunteers who form the mountain rescue teams which have saved so many lives in Britain's wild country.

Ramblers and climbers are still prepared to defy laws and trespass to secure 'access'. Even last year saw attempts to prevent access to the Roaches escarpment in Derbyshire. Direct action survives in other forms; it was two climbers who recently scaled Nelson's column to put an anti-apartheid banner on top. The direct action tradition of the mass trespassers of the 1930s - well illustrated by this book - is not dead.

JON SIMCOCK



# Step forwards or sideways

## A CRITIQUE OF THE ANARCHIST MANIFESTO 'A REAL MOTION OF CENSURE' OF MARCH 1st.\*

IT is implicit that any successful political creed that seeks to gain general acceptance must be seen to represent something more than a philosophy of life or politics. Winning arguments with individuals and screaming 's---ash the state!' are not enough to form a small and strong foundation upon which to build an anarchic society. We, as anarchists, must seek to develop issues on every level of society, to demonstrate that anarchism is the only philosophy that will allow people to develop their full potential in harmony with the rest of life on our planet. Furthermore, as the keepers of what we believe to be the only hope for humankind we must be scrupulously honest and not dodge any facet of life that other philosophies believe they have a monopoly on. As such, the 'anarchist manifesto' as I have dubbed it was a brave, if naive attempt to ignite the fuse of the anarchist movement, but one that is doomed to failure.

A banner about which we can group ourselves must fulfill at least three criteria: an analysis of our beliefs, a demonstration of the failures of the state authoritarian philosophies and a determined and forceful development of issues upon which we can campaign. Anything less will not be coherent and therefore will not be identified with anarchism. Such was the 'anarchist manifesto of March 1st'; it only shook hands with the latter of these three basic tenets, raising unconnected and underdeveloped issues, playing with the 'what' and never asking 'why!'. For too long anarchy has been for the hearts of men and women and for the minds of intellectuals. Now is the time to unleash that potent force, the reasoned 'why' of the working men and women of the world. When humankind starts asking 'why' then and only then shall we be able to dismantle the state and build a real future.

### In the Beginning

Our starting point, therefore, must be to ask 'why' as often as possible and secondly to criticise any answer we are given. The tertiary stage must be to provide our own answers.

### CREDO ANARCHY

Central to the anarchist theme are the beliefs that the state is inherently wrong and that all men and women should be free and equal. A constant correlation between liberty and wellbeing of all men and women is commitment to these basic tenets. Everything else in the anarchist philosophy stems from these ideas.

An extrapolation from this must conclude that anything the state does is wrong. What about the welfare state? The welfare state is a tranquilliser that dulls the anger of those casualties of the state's avariciousness. If they really cared all those producing the non essential garbage that is rammed down our throats, all those trapped in the numbing routine of the distribution and exchange system and all those discarded like the wrapper from your Cadbury's Dairy Polysaturate would be free to produce enough for themselves and their dependents, and having 'conquered bread' they would be at liberty to enjoy life.

Any 'manifesto' must be based around this central idea that the state is wrong, but please don't fall into the trap of accepting it; FIND OUT! If it is possible develop your own ideas by arguing points with Marxists and capitalists alike. If they come up with a point you cannot answer, concede it for the time being and rationalise it later. Come up with an answer and then if they knock that down, do it again. That is the only way you will identify your own purpose and that is the only use for this kind of debate.

## THE STATE AS AN ASSEMBLY LINE CONTROL COMPUTER

The essential part of any control system is the software development. This is done by the programmer, and it would not stretch my analogy to say that the programmes of the state are the manipulators of capital. It is their demands that are catered for in both capitalist and state capitalist or authoritarian socialist societies. The fact that capitalist societies have a more sophisticated system that disguises where the real power lies, than do Marxist societies, is irrelevant. They both produce surpluses of non-essentials to cater for fictitious demands.

The central processing units are the parts of the computer which examines these demands and produces the right kind of signals to activate the peripherals which do the actual work on the automated assembly line. The governmental system is the central processing unit and the laws and regulations are the signals. We are the peripherals.

The basic difference between the Marxists and the capitalists is that the former wish to sack the programmers and put their own people in charge - the computer stays. I say, melt the bloody thing down and let us get on with producing what we need.

The failures of the statist theories lie in their very natures; they all want to hand an albatross around our necks. The state costs us sweat and is designed specifically to benefit those who control it. We must ask, why is the state in existence? It does us no good. What does the state give us that we could not get ourselves with less toil? Nothing, must be the clear and resounding cry.

### TOWARDS A CONCERTED EFFORT (Or how to blow the whistle on the state)

We must realise that in reality there are three kinds of people on this earth: anarchists; those who have not yet been converted to anarchism; and those who must be allowed to live out their lives in peace without being allowed to pollute society.

The first and second categories will one day merge and form a new world; the third must be told, You have done wrong, but we shall never seek retribution. But I jump too far ahead. Firstly we must seek to bring about this state of affairs.

To the committed anarchist I will be brief, for my appeal is not to you but through you. I ask you only to live like anarchists: do whatever you can to disrupt the state, and enjoy yourselves. If human beings have a purpose it must be to enjoy themselves. The anarchist, however, does not do it at the expense of others.

To campaign we must start at both the top and the bottom. Examine the inroads of the state on your locality and set up workshops to campaign against them. Seek to abandon the committee mentality and encourage total participation. On a wider level we must always be flexible in our approach and rigid in our goal. The issues mentioned on March 1 are good issues upon which to start campaigns, but it must be emphasised that we are different. We are anarchists.

Many anarchists believe that eventually we must undergo some process of sacrifice that is equal to our commitment. This is wrong. We must say: No way are my brothers and sisters or myself going to suffer. Stick two fingers up at authority and enjoy yourselves.

MARTIN GAUFAU

\* The reference is to the editorial, 'A Real Motion of Censure' in the March 1st, issue of FREEDOM. This was not, of course, intended as a manifesto, or it would have included points that Martin raises here. Eds.