

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"He who is used to following others will never be able to go forward himself."

MICHEL ANGELO

Vol. 13, No. 46

November 15th, 1952

Threepence

END OF THE "NEW DEAL"

In the thirties Roosevelt led the American Democrats into a new role, one which they had never before assumed, namely that of a liberal reform party. Historically, they were the conservative feudal party, and still tied to their past support of the South and Slavery. The Republicans had been the party which at least ostensibly crusaded against slavery, contained the anti-slavery and non-slavery elements. Above all, however, they were the party of rising capitalism against dominant feudalism, and thus they became the party of Yankee Big Business. For many years they automatically received Negro support in the same way that the British Liberals received Non-Conformist support, and in a like manner received almost automatically the support of political trends in the labour movement.

British immigration and the growth of the organisation of the Catholic Church strengthened the Democrats as a reactionary bloc, but also spread political labour trends between the two parties, so that neither side became in any way representative of organised labour even through its most reactionary representatives. The issues between the two parties became blurred and ill-defined; both began to recruit Big Business support in the North, while although historical tradition kept the Democrats solid in the South, both allowed the occasional idealist to come along and whip up popular support on liberal issues.

The years of prohibition and its devastating effects upon public life, with growing gangsterism and corruption, plus the effects of the depression (which struck America worse than anywhere simply because such a thing had not been experienced before), enhanced the prestige of Roosevelt and the "New Deal" he put through the Democratic Party. This was the signal for many convinced liberals, radicals and socialists to abandon what was not only principle, but sheer commonsense, that had kept them out of the dual party racket, and plunge in with Roosevelt. Such a policy could only be immediately successful: there was nothing quite so glowing as the knowledge of still keeping their early ideals (which they believed were being introduced into reality by F.D.R.) but also getting in on the New Deal bandwagon. With high ideals and low motives, therefore, they inaugurated two decades of Democratic rule which the Republican politicians were driven desperate in trying to break.

WHY WARS ARE POSSIBLE

WARRING is not inherent in the human being; it is an attitude and a behaviour that are part of the individual's social inheritance.

Wars are made possible because the lives of so many individuals in the modern state are so grey and so dull, so complicated and so unsatisfying.

The people are led into war because their leaders have a sufficient knowledge of human society to be able to exploit the group mentality."

—PROF. E. A. CREW, in *Must Man Wage War* (Thrill Books, 1s. 6d.)

The Republican politicians got their opportunity when the liberal elements around Roosevelt fell for the claptrap of World War II. They were caught in a mesh of their own making. They denounced the "Isolationism" of all those who did not want to plunge into the war, but then, what was such talk but a means of belabouring their opponents whom they knew full well were just as militaristic as they. Such a damp squib failed to explode because nobody anywhere really objects to a politician for being "isolationist". Very often in England when one hears of U.S. politicians being isolationist, the wistful wish is expressed that ours could tend a little that way, too—but unfortunately they are only too ready to go in and lose every battle but the last, which would be a much more popular entrance.

When Russia entered the war, all the old memories of what were in many cases only youthful enthusiasms were raked up. No praise was too lavish for Stalin, the Soviet Union could not be held too democratic, the paramount question was aid for the Russian army. It was the golden age for Anglo-American Communists, who had been saying it all along, and whose words were echoed by all on both sides of the Atlantic—even if some of them individually were a little bitter at being edged off the pro-Soviet platforms as being a little too red for the moment.

In this country, a diehard Conservative was Prime Minister. He had a predominantly Conservative Parliament. Leading Conservatives—including the most violently anti-Bolshevik of the past—could not repress their glowing adulation of Stalin and Stalinism. (The odd fact may be remarked that the one Conservative who had always been pro-Stalinist—the Duchess of Atholl—became one of the first anti-Stalinists, while such people as Lords Londonderry, Beaverbrook, Rothermere, ate all their

previous words. Beaverbrook, so late as 1945, told Communist hecklers at Paddington: "Vote for Churchill—Stalin's pal"—an incident which—needless to say, quietened the Stalinoids—was reported glowingly in his own papers.)

But this did not adversely affect the British Conservatives later when the political scene changed and they suddenly realised that Stalin was not so white as he had been painted. Having a reputation for diehard Conservatism was sufficient. Anybody suggesting they were all a bunch of Red traitors would be laughed to scorn. So powerful is this principle rooted in Western political life (that you can do anything provided it is against your political record—i.e., Bevin could bring out troops against the dockers, which the Tories would not dare to do now, but Churchill can yield to Stalin) that Beaverbrook could later suggest Strachey was a traitor—at least his papers linked Fuchs and Strachey in a fanciful attempt to prove a connection because Strachey had also once been a Communist—despite the fact that Beaverbrook had been so violently Stalinist himself so long during the war.

This was not so in America where the Democrats had become regarded as liberals, and the Republicans took a heavy toll of their reputations, honour and careers. Even Roosevelt himself was assailed as having yielded to Stalin's demands. All his henchmen one by one came under fire. Had they been regarded as Tories such charges could not have been made against them and they themselves could have made them (as witness the Beaverbrook incident). Hence the fury with which the Republicans could assail them, and on that wave of fury—not altogether manufactured because of the ingrained belief that you must always act contrary to your tradition—such rabble-rousers as McCarthy and the "Un-American Activities Committee" (closely modelling itself on Bolshevik lines) could come to factual power.

That was how they could bring down the administration Roosevelt left behind him and implicate hosts of other public figures into the bargain. Nevertheless,

Facts Emerging in Kenya

FREEDOM has on more than one occasion voiced the suspicion that the Government were using the Mau Mau as a lurid red herring to cover up the more deep-seated and long-standing causes of discontent in Kenya. Recent reports and the statement of Mr. Lyttelton, the Secretary of State for the Colonies, to the Commons on his return from Nairobi, give support to this view.

It is exceedingly difficult to get first-hand reliable reports about what is going on in any part of the world. In such circumstances, our opinions must be based mainly on what we know of imperialism and colonial administration generally, our knowledge of government and governmental methods, and the previous experience of how to interpret government "hand-outs". This last is derived from a comparison of what governments have said with what subsequently has been shown to be the actual state of affairs at the time, in a large number of historical events in recent years. To this kind of interpretative activity, we have to add, in the case of Kenya, what we know of local conditions in the past, what are the outstanding problems, and what we can learn from reliable non-governmental sources of information.

Exaggerating Mau Mau Outrages

We ventured to suggest that any and every crime in Kenya could be represented in this country as the work of Mau Mau. In this way, public attention could be focused

more on terrorist crime and diverted from social and economic of much greater importance. In the debate following Mr. Lyttelton's statement to Parliament, a Conservative M.P., Mr. Teeling, confirmed that "this country had got a rather wrong impression of what was going on in Kenya." He went on to instance a case in which a white woman reported to be living alone was said to have shot an African attempting to break in. Mr. Teeling said that the *Times* reported that this incident occurred at Nakuru, 100 miles north of Nairobi, and that centralised attempts were being made to start Mau Mau oath-taking ceremonies there. The *Kenya Weekly News* pointed out, in fact, that the District Commissioner at Nakuru declared that there were no recent reports of Mau Mau ceremonies there. The African who was shot was a patient suffering from typhoid fever who had escaped from hospital in a delirium. He was shot while breaking into the house not by the white woman, but by a member of the Home Guard who heard her cries for help. "If a newspaper as responsible as the *Times* found it

SYNDICALIST NOTEBOOK A Union for M.P.s?

SINCE the trade union movement in this country founded its own political party, we suppose it is only fair that members of Parliament should form their own trade union.

Mr. Frank McLeavy, Labour M.P. for Bradford East, has launched an attempt to form an association of M.P.s to watch over their facilities and "working" conditions.

they could not overthrow the Democratic Party altogether, because of Truman's generalship. On the one hand he let the Rooseveltians be thrown to the wolves while the Democratic sleigh ran onwards. He did not attempt to defend the Rooseveltians against these embittered attacks, which were the symptoms of years of Republican frustration. Instead in his Presidential campaigns he restated some of the liberal principles which the Rooseveltians—at bay—no longer dared repeat for fear of being called Bolsheviks. This surprised all spectators who believed Truman could not be re-elected, and mirrored to some extent that reformism could still pay off. Stevenson seems to have tried to rally round the Rooseveltians and some of the Truman Democrats. In this he had not succeeded in the face of growing right-wing attacks from the Republicans.

Under Eisenhower, the Republicans are now back in the saddle. This swing of the political pendulum is inevitable in the political game. We do not profess to see much greater disaster one way or the other. America is committed to the game of imperialistic intervention, and it may well be that in pursuance of the accepted but curious political principle we have outlined—just because of his background Eisenhower may be less likely to plunge into further military adventures than would any politician embodying a more pacific tradition. But what sways the issue is not such possibilities based on individual likelihoods so much as the economic structure of the capitalist system, which stood very little chance of being altered whoever won the Presidential election.

INTERNATIONALIST.

One thing they will not be able to do that the ordinary union claims to do—they will not be able to make claims for higher pay. Why not, we are not quite sure, but since we always think of M.P.s as a race apart anyway, we suppose it's quite natural that their organisation should be different from others, too.

A ticklish point arises here. Should anarcho-syndicalists support this organisation of workers on the job? If M.P.s go on strike for—say—double time for all-night sittings, or danger money for visits to their constituencies, should we support them?

Fortunately for our theoreticians, the situation is unlikely to arise. Mr. McLeavy is already a member of a trade union—the Transport and General Workers' (will the M.P.s affiliate to this? They would feel at home in it!) but we are assured that the new M.P.s' union will be a less militant affair. How any union could be less militant than Deakin's Own would be difficult to imagine!

STATE SECRET

THE owners of any property usually like to know what they are getting for it if it is sold on their behalf by their accredited agents.

Even if they are discredited agents, most owners would still like to have this information, and we are quite sure that the champions of free enterprise, commerce and private ownership—the Conservatives—would consider it very bad business if—say—an estate agent refused to tell a house-owner how much he was selling it for.

But those same Conservatives now expect to be able to sell the "nation's property" without disclosing the figure to the nation. At least, that is what it looks like, in view of one of the clauses in the Bill for steel nationalisation.

This clause would make it a criminal offence to disclose information, true or false, about the sale of the state-owned steel companies. The courts could impose penalties of up to two years' imprisonment or £500 fine or both!

The Tories made a big fuss about the amount paid in compensation when Labour Party was certainly open-handed with our money, but not generous enough for the Tories—friends of the ex-owners.

Now, clearly, the Conservatives want to be able to sell the industry back to the Iron and Steel manufacturers at a "friendly" price, but want the fact of how friendly it is to be kept away from the public.

They need not worry overmuch. Mr. Lincoln Evans, the steel-workers' leader, showed himself at Margate to be a very "sensible" and "realistic" Labour leader. He can be relied upon to co-operate with the Government and to persuade his members to work even harder to make up the difference between the buying price and the selling price.

Nobody will suffer through these financial transactions. Nobody, that is, except the taxpayers in general and the steel workers in particular—and who worries about them? Certainly not the Tories, nor their friend Mr. Lincoln Evans. P.S.

FEWER SCHOOLS

A REDUCTION in the number of new schools being built is reported by the Minister of Education in reply to a question put to her by Mr. Stephen Swinger. The Minister says that building work started on 128 new schools between January 1 and July 31. For 1950 and 1951 the comparable figures were 164 and 424 respectively.

In reply to another question from Mr. Swinger, the Minister says that in January (the latest date for which figures are available) there were 39,026 classes with more than forty pupils, 1,240 with more than fifty pupils, and nineteen with more than sixty pupils on the register.

Continued on p. 4

Manchester Guardian, 16/10/52.

The One True Faith: Recent Studies of Religious & Political Messianism

IN the years since the war, a number of thinkers have been suggesting that extreme beliefs and the actions that spring from them, arise not from the wisdom of the believers but from their deficiencies. A well-known Catholic writer, Monsignor R. A. Knox, in his book *Enthusiasm: A Chapter in the History of Religion* (Oxford, 30s.), examines the extravagances of evangelical religious sects in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. He writes, of course, from the point of view of his own faith. Another book on religious enthusiasm, Mr. George Godwin's *The Great Revivalists* (Thinkers Library, 3s. 6d.), concludes that the great religious revivals "arise from mental and physical causes among adolescents and unbalanced people, especially at times of intense emotional fervour."

RELIGION AND POLITICS

The great revivalist preachers themselves, Mr. Godwin argues, were suffering from diseased minds, and he implies a connection between religions and political hysteria in his comparison of William Booth, founder of the Salvation Army with Adolf Hitler.

"Both early in life became obsessed with one idea. Both became the fanatic of their single dominating idea. Both became dictators. Both developed the power complex. Both detested criticism and refused to believe that any who differed from them could have any merit or virtue. Both built up great organisations. Both had power to sway great throngs without cultural speech or intellectual content of message. Both were impossible at close range. Both ended with delusions of grandeur. One need not press the comparison too far, though the points of resemblance are impressive. Hitler, one may believe had it in him to become a religious fanatic; Booth to found a new social order."

SAVIOURS AND BELIEVERS

Religious evangelism, says Mr. Mark Holloway, "tends to become less and less popular, as the standards of education rise. The truly modern revivalist, therefore, operates in the political field."

Fanaticism in political movements is the subject of Mr. Eric Hoffer's *The True Believer* (Secker & Warburg, 10s. 6d.), which discusses the psychology of mass-movements. Mr. Hoffer devotes a large part of his book to "The Potential Convert," the misfits, the frustrated and the bored, and among his "Factors Promoting Self-Sacrifice" are self-identification with a group, depreciation of the present compared with an idealised past or future, dramatisation, and irrationality. The fanatic whom he finds particularly prone to self-sacrifice is a person with no inner balance, perpetually incomplete and insecure, who clings passionately to any support he comes across who "hungers for the deep assurance which comes from total surrender"—"a homeless hitch-hiker on the highways of the world." Two other books with a bearing on this subject are Mr. R. A. Money-Kyrle's *Psychoanalysis and Politics* (Duckworth, 9s.) with his discussion between the "humanist" and

the "authoritarian" conscience, and Alex Comfort's *Authority and Delinquency in the Modern State* (Routledge, 8s. 6d.)

REVOLUTIONARY MESSIANISM

But the most thorough and formidable of these recent attacks on the fanatic in politics are the work of historians. The first of these is *The Origins of Totalitarian Democracy* by Professor J. L. Talmon. His book traces back political régimes like those of Hitler and Stalin to the eighteenth century idealism which finds its most complete expression in the writings of J.-J. Rousseau. (This view was very ably expressed in a recent broadcast by Mr. Isaiah Berlin.)

Professor Talmon sums up his theme in these terms: "How to reconcile the postulate of a fully integrated social order with individual freedom? The eighteenth century refused to think them incompatible. It was steeped in the deep faith in the equation of liberty with reason and virtue. When the French

Revolution came to disprove the equation, the result was the great schism. Most flinched from the spectre of force, and fell back upon a trial-and-error philosophy. The faith of the others—Jacobins and their descendants—hardened into an exclusive doctrine represented by a vanguard of the enlightened. They justified themselves—as trustees of posterity—in the use of coercion against those who refused to be free and virtuous.

ONE TRUE FAITH

"Revolutionary Messianism grew totalitarian, but claimed to represent the only true democracy. And indeed its totalitarianism was not due to the exaltation of such collective entities as state and race as prior to man. It set out to save man, man as such. Left totalitarianism may in course of time proclaim the party or class to be absolute values. Even so, party membership does not carry with it the type of inescapable determinism with which the organic racial state of right totalitarianism swallows up the individual. A party may demand absolute obedience, but it is after all, a mechanically composed group. You can join it or secede from it. Hence the

appeal of a universal religion peculiar to totalitarian Messianism, but alien to totalitarianism of the right. Furthermore, again unlike totalitarianism of the right, which considers man to be corrupt, unruly and thus in need of a master, left Messianism proclaims man to be good and perfectable. Political Messianism became totalitarian not because it denied the value of human personality, but because it overrated its capacity for readjusting itself to the harmonious social order.

THE NATURAL ORDER

"Helvetius, Holbach, Morelli and others dreamt of a social system in which none would be unhappy but the vicious, none vicious but the fools, that is to say the bad calculators. To their vision they gave the name of the natural order: natural, because it had logic and cohesion. It was to bring into harmony the personal with the general good, and resolve the tension between duty and freedom. The question arises: If such an order was natural, why had it never become a historic reality? The answer is: Because vested interests were at work to prevent it. Then, it may be

Continued on p.

ANNIVERSARY

THE CHICAGO MARTYRS

"Men die, but principles live."

ALBERT R. PARSONS.

LIKE all revolutionary movements, the anarchist movement has its share of adherents who become victims of the State's "justice". One might with some truth contend that we have more than our share, since our ideas represent a threat to the very existence of the State, rather than to those who happen to control it at any given moment. These victims generally fall into two categories: those who consciously strike a blow at the representatives of authority and admit the responsibility for their act when caught, and those who are innocent of any illegal act yet are sacrificed because of their ideas. The Chicago Anarchists of 1887 are an example of the last category and it is the purpose of

this article to briefly outline this famous case of juridical murder. In this country, their martyrdom is no longer regularly commemorated as it once was, but it is salutary at times to remember who they were and why they died, if only to remind ourselves and others what the State is capable of when it feels itself in danger.

The year which preceded their death saw a great upsurge of the labour movement in the United States. Upon the initiative of the National Labour Union a general strike was proclaimed for May 1st in order to force the employers to obey the eight hour law passed in 1878. Prominent in the Chicago agitation for the eight-hour day were the anarchists Albert Parsons, August Spies, Samuel Fielden and George Engel. Though they thought the eight-hour day to be merely reformist, they supported

the movement for it, nevertheless, because they considered it provided a good opportunity for teaching the value of solidarity.

On May 2nd, a meeting was held by twelve hundred workers of the McCormick Reaper Works to protest against incidents of police brutality. The following day a meeting was held near the same works by the Lumber-Shovers' Union. At 4 o'clock scabs were seen to be leaving the factory and part of the crowd began to throw stones at them. The police arrived in large numbers and fired into the crowd, killing six and wounding many others. Indignant socialists and anarchists, when hearing of this, immediately decided to call a protest meeting the following evening (May 4th) in the Chicago Haymarket. It was then that the death warrants of the anarchists were signed.

The protest meeting was quite orderly. Spies spoke and was followed by Parsons. After him came Fielden to close the meeting. The Mayor of Chicago, who had been present since 8.30, went to the police station at ten and informed the captain of police, Bondfield, that the meeting was peaceful and there was no need for interference. Bondfield thought differently, and led a force of 180 men to disperse the meeting. Fielden, who was just about to finish, protested that it was a peaceable meeting and got off the platform. Disregarding his protest, the police advanced to the attack. Before they commenced, however, a bomb was thrown from a side street, killing one policeman and fatally wounding seven others.

Uproar ensued amongst the Chicago capitalists and the order went out for the arrest of Parsons, Spies, Engel, Fielden, Michael Schwab, Adolf Fischer, Louis Lingg, Oscar Neebe, Rudolph Schnaubelt and W. Seliger (who later turned traitor and testified for the prosecution). Parsons went into hiding and Schnaubelt escaped, never to be arrested. The rest were brought to trial on June 21st, 1886. Soon afterwards Parsons voluntarily walked into court in order to stand trial with his comrades, convinced that his innocence would secure him justice—he was mistaken. Ostensibly on trial for murder, the defendants were in fact, as the prosecution later admitted, on trial for being anarchists. By means of a packed and prejudicial jury, Parsons, Lingg, Fielden, Schwab, Engel, Spies and Fischer were sentenced to death, whilst Neebe (who appears to have been neither an anarchist nor even a socialist) received fifteen years imprisonment. In spite of the efforts of the defence for a new trial, the date of execution was set for November 11th, 1887. Fielden and Schwab, after petitioning for mercy, had their sentences commuted to life imprisonment. On Nov. 10th, Lingg whose vigorous speech had scared the wits out of the capitalist press and had ended with the now famous words, "I despise you. I despise your order; your laws; your force-propped authority. Hang me for it!" was killed by an explosion in his cell—whether it was suicide or a deliberate murder is still a matter of speculation.

The four remaining anarchists spent their last night of life quietly and were asleep when the coffin-wagon clattered into the prison yard. At 7 a.m. they were awakened. Calm and collected, they passed the time until their execution with

songs and conversation. Mid-day, the "drum tap", to use Benjamin Tucker's phrase, was sounded. Flinging corpses were all that remained of them, and the hangman went to collect his blood-money.

On November 14th, thousands of people followed the funeral procession of the dead martyrs; thousands more bareheaded, lined the streets. At the cemetery, four funeral orations were delivered in English and German. The most outstanding were those of Carl Black, the defence counsel, and "German-American Heine," Robert Zel, whose concluding words were:

"We have no cause to grieve for our dead. They died the death of heroes. As the cross became the symbol of love, so will the scaffold in the nineteenth century become the symbol of liberty. But we must mourn our own disgrace, our own irresolution, our own cowardice. Let us turn from these graves with the words of Herwegh in our hearts: 'We have loved long enough; now we are going to hate.'"

EPILOGUE.

The friends and comrades of the dead men stated again and again that not only were the anarchists victims of the vengeance of the State, but that the State transgressed its own laws in order to kill them. And in June, 1893, one of the few honest men ever to be elected to a governorship in the United States, Governor Altgeld of Illinois, unconditionally released Neebe, Schwab and Fielden as being innocent of the crimes for which they were imprisoned. The statement he issued, exonerated not only the survivors, but also the five who had died. Justice had been done at last—the justice of a legalitarian who believed in the honest administration of the law . . . but the injustice of the law itself and the system of domination and exploitation it protects still remained. There can be no true justice until they have been destroyed and the ideal for which the five anarchists of Chicago died becomes the everyday life of men.

S. E. PARKER.

Exhibition

Ceylonese Painting

OPENING at the Imperial Institute Gallery, South Kensington, on November 25th, is an exhibition of Ceylonese painting which should be of great interest to readers of FREEDOM and all those who wish to see art assume a positive and humanistic rôle in society. These paintings are the work of the 43 Group of Ceylon, a body of painters who came together in 1943 in reaction against the deadening influence of the Ceylon Society of Arts, which throughout its existence has been dominated by British academic standards.

While it has benefited greatly from the stylistic developments of contemporary European art, the painting of the 43 Group members remains, in feelings, rooted in the soil of their island and draws its vitality from the imaginative interpretation of the day to day life of the people.

Equally free from propagandist motives or refined escapism, this painting reveals another aspect of resurgence in the East, and must be a stimulating challenge to the Western artist.

This will be an exhibition not to be missed.

Book Review

An History of Anarchism

HISTOIRE DE L'ANARCHIE, by Alain Sergent and Claude Harmel. (Le Portulan, Paris, 870 francs.)

LIBERTARIANS and students of the revolutionary movement have often complained that no reliable history of anarchism exists. Although there was a great need for a book which would deal with the activities and aspirations of the various anarchist groups as well as provide an analysis of the writings of its main theorists.

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

For Teachers Especially . . .

- | | | |
|--|-----------------|------|
| Youth for Freedom | Tony Gibson | 2/- |
| Hearts Not Heads in the School | A. S. Neill | 7/6 |
| The Problem Family | A. S. Neill | 7/6 |
| That Dreadful School | A. S. Neill | 7/6 |
| Talks to Parents and Teachers | Home Library | 7/6 |
| Homar Lane and the Little Commonwealth | E. Bannister | 7/6 |
| The Education of Free Men | Interland Press | 1/- |
| Education for Peace | Interland Press | 7/6 |
| Education Through Art | Interland Press | 25/- |
| Colman and Ideas of the Modern School (1913) | Interland Press | 6d. |
| Branch Street | Media Forum | 2/6 |
| The Likes Of Us | C. V. Holmes | 3/6 |
| A Way of Life for the Handicapped Child | | 5/- |
| Talks to Teachers on Psychology | Interland Press | 4/- |
| Education and Hierarchy | J. M. Gougeon | 1/- |

All books in print rapidly obtained (please state publisher). Out of print books sought for.

Open 9 till 6.30 (5.30 Saturdays)

Obtainable from

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

The difficulties facing any resolute writer were of course very numerous. As anarchists seldom formed permanent organisations and more than once had to work illegally, official records were few and widely scattered. Also, the writings of men like Proudhon and Bakunin had their share of nineteenth century rhetoric and tortuosity, intermixed, it is true, with passages of brilliant insight which raises the authors to the rank of leading social writers of modern times. Many a conscientious historian was thus deterred from devoting his talents to the study of a philosophy so fecund in originality and to a field of action where the tragic meets the comic, and the serious the amusing.

Recently, however, there has been a revival of interest in anarchism. Professor Carr's *Michael Bakunin* and George Woodcock's biographies of Godwin and Kropotkin brought to light much which in the past seemed to be the exclusive property of a few. Among them was the well-known anarchist historian Max Nettlau, who did a great deal of necessary spadework without which no history of the social movement before 1914 can be written.

Making use of his researches and of a great many others, two young French authors, A. Sergent and C. Harmel, have written the first scholarly history of anarchism. The first volume which has 448 pages and was published in Paris in 1949, begins with some of the French thinkers of the eighteenth century Enlightenment and ends with the death of Bakunin, the decline of the Jura Federation and the first number of Kropotkin's newspaper, *Le Révolté*, in 1879. The second volume, yet to be published, will describe Kropotkin's place in the evolution of anarchist thought, the activities of the bomb-throwers, the views of the individualists, the growth of revolutionary syndicalism

before the First World War, Machno and the Russian revolution and the rôle of anarchists during the Civil War in Spain.

There can be no doubt that the first half of their study of anarchism fills an important gap in our knowledge. It explains many a query, unmasks not a few Marxist misinterpretations and shows how far or how little, as the case may be, outside influence affected the movement and its leading personalities. The whole tone of the book is sympathetic to anarchism although the authors never shirk from pointing out various inconsistencies and temporary deviations from the anarchist ideal.

Some of the chapters merit special mention. The one on the French revolution gives a detailed account of the "Enragés" who were the anarchists of the day and had little in common with Babeuf, an early precursor of Generalissimo Stalin. The ones on Proudhon tell us much about a profound thinker and show how baseless some of Marx's accusations were. His influence over the French workers was great, as may be seen from a most interesting chapter on the early days of the First International. His followers there held some very shrewd views on various aspects of anarchism. Equally valuable are the chapters on M. Stirner, the Paris Commune and the little-known libertarians like Bellegarrigue, Coeurderoy and Dejacque who had certain original ideas and fought in the years after 1848 when Bakunin and Proudhon were in prison or in exile.

All this makes *L'Histoire de l'Anarchie* most interesting to the readers of FREEDOM who will be impressed by the authors' knowledge of detail and the depth of their interpretations. As such their book can be warmly recommended to all those who understand French.

L.A.

A PARADOXICAL VENTURE

WITH the rise of the nation-state, the idea has gained general acceptance—mistakenly, we believe—that large-scale administration is superior to individual initiative. Socialists, following Marx, believe without question that large organisations are naturally better, more efficient than small ones. Normally, Conservatives and Liberals support the idea of individualism, but in practice believe in cartels and government control of more and more of social and economic life. Lord Lothian said nearly 25 years ago, "We are all Marxists!" Even in scientific research we hear mostly of "team-work."

Anarchist theory dissents from the worship of mere size and has the Marxist taunts of "petty bourgeois mentality," the "outlook of bookkeepers" and so on as a result. Even anarchists are apt to accept unconsciously the prevailing belief that large-scale organisation is best. The total effect of this analysing creed is to reduce the importance of individual initiative, and so discourage its application.

Yet, despite the materialist conception of history, the economic determinism of the Marxists, the theory of progress, first in thought and then in action, has been the history of initiatives either of individuals or of minorities. And if one trains one's eyes to peer through the fog of organisation worship, or around the blinkers of Marxism, it is possible to discern that this process is still going on.

A rather strange example—politically, very strange—of the influence of individual initiative is to be found in the recently founded South African monthly newspaper *The Drum*. Appearing for the first time 18 months ago, this paper set out to be a mouthpiece for the non-white populations of South Africa and the British administered Rhodesias, Nyasaland and the Protectorates of South Africa. Believing in racial equality it employs a mainly non-white staff, and set out to represent the African viewpoint, and is said to have very largely achieved that aim.

This it succeeded in doing by publishing a series of unbiased and devastating exposures of conditions in various industrial and farming undertakings in which Africans are employed. Of these exposures the most sensational was one on "Bethal To-day" and is described as follows:

"Bethal is a farming district some 100 miles east of Johannesburg. It had for long been suspected of brutal ill-treatment of 'native' labourers. The Government, however, after appointing an inspector, had assured the public that conditions were now quite satisfactory. *Drum* sent a photographer and reporter to have a look.

"The findings were spectacular. By a variety of ruses, and at considerable risk from furious farmers, the African reporter succeeded in getting inside the 'compounds', where labourers were kept at night behind barbed wire, sleeping in hovels on concrete shelves: he saw the private 'hospitals' where sick labourers under contract were treated by ignorant orderlies in conditions of extreme filth and squalor:

Studies of Political & Religious Messianism

Continued from p. 2

asked, what is the warrant of its imminent realisation? The answer was that the eighteenth-century philosophy had for the first time in history fathomed the 'source and origin of all evils and crime'—the belief in the badness of man—and made the momentous discovery that man was nothing but the creature of education and laws. Legislators and teachers had it thus in their power to attune all hearts and interests to the harmony inherent in society as in nature.

"The totalitarian implications of this line of thought are apparent. If you fix your vision on the type of man as he was meant to be and bound to become, you feel no qualms in treating the actual man as incomplete, unreal, still as it were a child. You feel free to disregard his actual wishes as you presume to know his real ultimate will better than he himself knows it. You will impose your own will on him, and will deny that you are using violence, but claim to be resorting to strong medicine. The very idea of a state of perfect social integration—which satisfies all needs and secures all freedoms as an attainable, imminent achievement—is an invitation to a government to declare that it has already turned the ideal into reality. . . ."

SALVATION AND LIBERTY

He concludes, "At the present moment, with the growth of the welfare state, the division of the world is not into capitalism and social-security—achieving communism, but between those who have an empirical approach to politics and those who hold fast to the belief in some ultimate, logical, exclusively valid social order. This faith answers a deep-seated spiritual need. It is perhaps a symptom of weakness to face the harsh fact that life is a perpetual never-resolved crisis. The curse upon political Messianism is to be born out of the noblest impulses of man, and to degenerate into a weapon of tyranny, self-deception and hypocrisy. It came into being by a combination of the two

he saw the "bossboys" riding on horseback, armed with sjamboks (long, brutal whips) to goad on the potato-pickers: and he saw the farm gaols, which farmers build and pay for themselves, on the agreement that the Government keeps them filled with prisoners from the town prisons to work on the farms."

This paper is naturally regarded with considerable hostility by the Malan Government. Yet the government controls all paper supplies and, under the anti-communist laws, can close down almost any newspaper as subversive. Why does it yet not fold up *The Drum*?

The answer is probably to be sought in the fact that the founder and backer of the paper is one Jim Bailey, the millionaire son of the late Sir Abe Bailey, who also controls the *Rand Daily Mail*. Such backing is altogether too powerful and too much dug into the ranks of the industrial oligarchy to be lightly suppressed by the government.

Movements of progress know how uncertain is such backing: yet *The Drum's* exposures have had immediate repercussions. Following the articles on "Bethal To-day", with their accusing photographs, the Native Labour Department rashly sent out an inspector, the British Government demanded a full explanation and sent a representative who toured the whole area with the African reporter who had secured the original material. In the event, the barbed wire was removed, compounds were rebuilt, contracts revised and farmers reprimanded.

In Johannesburg, Sir Abe Bailey's son is regarded as eccentric, yet this man's eccentricity and his energy in giving it expression, has already made considerable effect on White-African relations. Initiative has paid dividends even if it has in this case brought some strange bed-fellows into the progressive camp.

instincts most deeply embedded in human nature, the yearning for salvation and the love of freedom. History has demonstrated the incompatibility of a salvationist, all-solving political creed with liberty."

THE UNATTAINABLE IDEAL

The other book is Dr. K. R. Popper's *The Open Society and its Enemies* (Routledge and Kegan Paul, 2 volumes, 42s.) which has recently been reprinted. This book is so long and massive that the best way to summarise the argument is to quote from Mr. William Clark's broadcast discussion of it:

"In essence what he has to say is that for practical purposes the ideal state is not only unattainable, but it is a will of the wisp which leads free men into the cage of the closed society. There is no such thing as the perfect state; the best is only the open society in which constant change and experiment attempt by a slow process of trial and error to make life happier and more worthwhile for the individual.

"Popper's attack on the idealists who put their trust in some perfect state is so violent and lengthy that it has received far more attention than the more important constructive part of the book. Yet there is a serious and clear purpose behind his attack on Plato, as the father of right-wing dictatorship, and on Marx, as the father of left-wing dictatorships. Plato taught his disciples that there was an ideal state, and that in the establishment of that state the rights and freedom of individuals would have to be temporarily sacrificed, but that in the end all would benefit because all would be ruled by wise men. Not necessarily Plato, but his disciples, have interpreted this to mean that there are certain natural rulers, or leaders, who should control the state, and that it is expedient that not only one man, but many, should perish for the people, as embodied in the state. In brief, man is made for the state, and

not the state for man. That belief, whether Platonic or not, is a morally wicked and politically disastrous doctrine.

HISTORICAL DETERMINISM

"Marx, on the other hand, believed that the state would wither away. But this was based on faith in the inevitable course of history, not on the efforts of individuals. Marx believed that the dialectic of history would grind to a stop as soon as it had produced the proletarian revolution. As a political philosopher, Marx for all his insight, made two colossal mistakes; he believed in the inevitability of a certain pattern in history, and he thought that perfection and so an end to the historic process lay around the corner. He has been proved wrong both by the fact that the uncontrolled capitalism which he saw as leading inevitably to revolution, has completely altered its nature without revolution, and by the history of Russia after the proletarian revolution where the dialectic ferment has continued to create new classes of exploiter and exploited. Both these errors stem from a single cause: Marx, like Plato's disciples, underestimated the individual. He thought that the processes of history were beyond human control; he did not believe that man was master of his fate.

"That is the real argument against perfectionism in politics—that it is bound to ignore the individual, either by making him a puppet in the hands of forces beyond his control, as Marx did, or by making him a wheel in a machine, and exalting the importance of that machine, which is what Plato and his followers did. On the other hand the basis for a philosophy of political moderation is the assumption that the welfare of the individual (not of the state nor the community but of the individual) is the prime object of politics.

"The primacy of the individual does not mean anarchy, it does not mean that the state disappears; it does mean that the state is regarded as the instrument by which the individual improves his lot. The state is made for man and not man for the state. Therefore an essential principle of political moderation must be that the government of the state is removable by simple non-violent means, if it fails to carry out its duty to the individuals who comprise the state.

THE MIDDLE WAY

"The second foundation stone of this philosophy of moderation is a belief that reason rather than revelation should prevail in politics. This assumption,

which can be debated, has the advantage of being implicit, though often ignored, in the whole theory of democracy.

"If we accept these two assumptions and act on them, certain practical conclusions in politics follow. If we accept the power of reason, it is clear that man is master of his fate and not just bound on the wheel of history. This is a heresy, a sort of political Pelagianism, for all those who believe in perfectionism; for them a perfect state has been revealed by Plato, or Adam Smith, or Marx or Lenin, and the duty of man is to stride forward, or be swept forward, in the direction they have charted as fast as possible and as directly as possible. Any inconveniences to the individual by the way such as unemployment or forced labour will be amply repaid by the heavenly bliss of the ultimate perfect state.

"For the advocates of the middle way there is no simple well-marked path; the middle way can only be traced by the proper use of reason in the scientific methods of trial and error. Popper's phrase for this is 'piecemeal social engineering', a phrase reminiscent of what the Duke of Wellington once denounced as 'all this damned tinkering'. That is how 'social engineering' must appear to many people—just tinkering. It is not a glamorous programme; it does not promise heaven on earth, not even on the instalment plan; it does not even guarantee results. The 'open society', to use Popper's name for it, is not a perfect society, it is not even in the last stages of becoming perfect. Utopia is not around the corner; but it does have the merit of being open, that is of being capable of change and adaptation, and so of progress. It cannot promise inevitable progress; there is no short cut to perfection, neither by way of an all-wise leader who demands only that we surrender our wills to him, nor by way of the stream of history which will sweep us onwards and upwards if we only relax and float with the tide. The 'open society' can only promise limited progress as fast as reasonable men can carry it. The responsibility for change lies not on history nor on nature, but on the individual!."

The books which we have mentioned above, on religious fanaticism and its modern equivalent political Messianism have discussed it from the point of view of orthodox religion, of rationalism, of psychology and of political history. Doctor Popper's "Open Society" as interpreted by Mr. Clark makes a positive philosophy from the rejection of Messianism. How far the "open society" equates with anarchism will be discussed in the next issue of FREEDOM.

COMMENT

Martha is so Reasonable

IT is easy to be objective and sweetly reasonable about things which do not directly concern you. Always so unruffled and calm are those writers in women's papers who give advice to "Seventeen", "Worried Spinster" and the other girls in all sorts of trouble who want to know what to do for the best.

These writers, who always have homely names like Martha or Jane, which are calculated to inspire confidence (they are never called Deidre or Fifi) are never lost for the sensible thing to do. They can show, by good, solid, sensible argument, that Mum was right all the time, that "He" must be given up immediately ("He" is clearly a bad influence and up to no good) or, if it is too late, if "Worried Spinster" will only send a stamped addressed envelope, good, calm, sensible Martha will send her the address of an organisation which exists just to help girls in her sort of trouble.

And Martha and Jane are always so darned objective about it all. Although they know full well that carrying out their advice is going to hurt an awful lot just now, "Seventeen" will see how right they were in a few years time, when she is securely hitched to a nice dull respectable bore who couldn't have a bad influence on a mouse—or a good influence, for that matter. After all, Mum has had more experience of the world than "Seventeen" (has she?) and clearly is only concerned with what is good for "Seventeen" (is she?) and Jane thinks that the married man who wants to take "Seventeen" to the Ballet is only Pressing Upon Young Girls when he

spins that yarn about his wife not sharing his cultural interests. (It used to be etchings, remember?)

Above all, "Seventeen" must not make herself cheap. Although "He" is asking her to prove her love for him, if "He" is any sort of a gentleman, he will respect her all the more for refusing to yield to her own passion. For it's not only his passion which worries "Seventeen"; she is bewildered and frightened at that feeling that came over her that evening in the front porch. (Thank goodness Mumsie called her in when she did, it being half past nine and her cocoa ready to take up to bed!) But Martha and Jane know how to deal with that. "Seventeen" should join a Tennis Club or go for nice long healthy rambles with a Youth Club, being all jolly together—all together.

"Seventeen" must wait, and that pouting-faced young solicitor's clerk next door, who wrote to her every fortnight all the time he was doing his National Service, is quite prepared to wait too—all the seven years it's going to be before he is earning enough to get married so they can build up a nice little home of their own, and maybe have children that "Seventeen" can bring up properly, just like Mumsie has brought her up—to know what's right and what's wrong.

And if, any time, you are a wee bit puzzled over what is the right thing to do, there, always in the background, just waiting to be asked, is Martha, or Jane, who always know the sensible thing to do. But sometimes I wish they would give the column to Deidre, or Fifi, just for one glorious week!

"EIGHTEEN."

FREEDOM PRESS

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

them a certain measure of public support, on what general discontents does it maintain its appeal? (In asking this question one should beware of the assumption, fostered (as we have seen by the Government, that Mau Mau enjoys widespread support.)

No part of Mr. Lyttelton's speech received such immediate criticism. The *Observer* reported much criticism in Kenya itself: "We believe that Mau Mau is a child of economic pressure, particularly land hunger," said Mr. Whycliffe Awori, a member of the Legislative Council. It seems clear that the *Observer* shares this criticism for it taxes the Minister with being "over bold" in denying the economic roots. Even the semi-official *Times* wrote in its first leader that "Mr. Lyttelton perhaps dismissed too hastily the economic impulse behind Mau Mau."

Evidently this line of talk is unacceptable to informed opinion. Yet it is the basis of governmental action and propaganda.

Police Repression

From the beginning of the present Kenya crisis, the Government has used the Mau Mau scare as a cover for police repression on a very large scale. Mr. Fenner Brockway, for long a friend of colonial peoples, in his visit to Kenya which ended this week, has been embarrassed by

an armed escort. He and his companion, Mr. Hale, another Labour M.P., sought to refuse the armed escort provided. They foresaw that it would effectively prevent any close contact with Africans. They feared also that Africans discussing the present situation with them would also come into conflict thereby with the laws forbidding assemblies of more than a very few persons, and they therefore did not feel free—because of the escort—to conduct such discussions.

In a farewell statement, Mr. Brockway said: "The armed escort which has accompanied us into the reserves has deterred free expression of opinion, and we have been deeply concerned at the number of arrests that have been made of persons who have been in contact or communication with us."

The Government therefore succeeded in hampering these two men from finding out the real grievances of Africans: they made it dangerous to communicate with them and so have no doubt made Africans chary of seeking any contacts with sympathetic Europeans; and have finally used the occasion to make several arrests.

In their final statement, Brockway and Hale declared: "We leave Kenya with hearts saddened by the undoubted resort to violence of some sections of the population—saddened, too, by the system of wholesale arrests and detentions,

Police Figures

The Assistant Commissioner of Police has issued a report on Mau Mau outrages. We have seen that the Government has sought to make the most of these. The official report states that the number of murders attributed to Mau Mau during the past five months is 37—of which 34 were in August, September and October—i.e., since the repression began. The report says

MAKING WALES FIT TO LIVE IN

At last week's annual general meeting of the Council for the Preservation of Rural Wales, Alderman H. T. Edwards declared that "it would cost £14 million to £16 million to make rural Wales fit to live in. He said that only 7 per cent. of the houses in rural districts as a whole had piped water, and 46 per cent. had shared water-closets.

NO JOBS FOR THESE SCHOOL LEAVERS

A BOY or girl leaving school in the North-East Essex coastal area only stands a fifty-fifty chance of getting a job.

In his annual report, Youth Employment Officer Mr. G. R. H. Harding said the problem of unemployment was now three times as bad as last year.

—*Evening News*, 29/10/52.

that hundreds of cases of house-burning have occurred also, and many cattle maimed.

Without seeking to minimise the gravity of these cases, it is legitimate to consider them a small actuality compared with the lurid accounts which have filled the press for many weeks.

They also seem small besides the official figures for repression. "Figures for those in custody, excluding Nairobi, are now as follows: Convicted by the courts, 2,100; remanded for prison custody, 501; in police custody, 869. These figures do not include those arrested under the original operation." (*Times*, 8/11/52, our italics.) The same account describes the severity of the sentences meted out:

"At Fort Hall, four Kikuyu have been ordered to be lashed, in addition to imprisonment, for assaulting an African whom they suspected of giving information to the police about a Mau Mau meeting. Three of the men were sentenced to two years' hard labour, with 24 lashes, and the fourth to one year, with six lashes. For administering a Mau Mau oath in the Fort Hall district six Kikuyu were to-day sentenced to seven years' hard labour and two others to three years for attending a ceremony."

One is impelled to ask whether the lash, proved ineffective as a deterrent in this country, is any more effective in Africa? Or whether it advances the prestige of the Europeans.

Lessons of the Spanish Revolution—18

THE ANARCHIST FEDERATION (F.A.I.) & THE POLITICAL STRUGGLE

IN so far as the present study is an attempt to draw the lessons from the Spanish Revolution, we do not propose to deal with the last eighteen months in the same detail as we have the first year of struggle, for obvious reasons. By July 1937 the State and the institutions of government had once more reasserted themselves; the armed struggle against Franco, once controlled by the government and professional militarists and fought as a war of fronts, could no longer be turned into victory (the whole Northern fronts had collapsed, and in the south, Malaga had been lost); and the workers' organisations were being torn by the struggle between personalities and by a growing centralisation. The much vaunted word "Unity" had become synonymous with blind acceptance by the workers of instructions from the "supreme organisms" whether of the State or of their own organisations. The U.G.T. was split by the political struggle going on for its control between the Communists and the Right and Left wings of the Socialist Party. The C.N.T. was floundering in the mire of compromise. The Committees, and the syndicalist bureaucracy in the Economic Councils, in the military commands, in the security forces, in the municipalities and every other state institution, were completely isolated from the aspirations of the revolutionary masses, and, in the name of unity and the victory over Franco, were throwing overboard principles and the revolutionary conquests of the workers one by one. As we have already stated, the "May Days" in Barcelona could have been the signal for calling a halt; instead, the actions of the leadership made them a confirmation that the revolution had been defeated.

And as if to seal this defeat came the Plenum of the F.A.I. (Anarchist Federation of Iberia) held in Valencia at the beginning of July 1937, at which it was proposed to reorganise the F.A.I. in a way that would make it possible to greatly increase its membership and its "influence". But it was clear from previous statements—if their actions were not sufficient evidence—that this reorganisation of the F.A.I. was not an attempt to safeguard the revolution but to stake some claim on what might be left of the revolution after the "exigencies of the war" and the politicians had done their best to enslave it. In a Circular issued by the Peninsular Committee of the F.A.I. in October 1936, participation by anarchists in "organisms of an official nature" is justified on the grounds that the situation demanded it. The Committee goes on to deal with the future role of the C.N.T. which in the economic reconstruction of the country will be obliged to collaborate with all sections of the "anti-fascist bloc", a task which cannot be assumed by one sector of the community, but which demands a "single organism in which are concentrated the common interests" of Industry and Agriculture. This view is justified on the grounds that "if we introduce discord in the economic field, and break up the efforts which are being made to bring this [reconstruction] about, we shall create a chaotic situation." "For these reasons and in anticipating future developments, we must foresee the disappearance, in certain circumstances, of the Syndicate as we know it at present; and the fusion of our organisation of struggle with similar ones, belonging to other tendencies, on other occasions."

Now the idea behind the F.A.I. plan becomes clear. In a few sentences this is what they say. Since the Syndicates will be interested exclusively in economic questions, and will only be able to have a professional influence on the activities to which they have been assigned, it will be necessary for an external force to exist which will direct this economic robot towards those ends "to which humanity aspires". This external force is the Specific Organisation (*Organizacion Especifica*). And we need hardly add that for this task the F.A.I. considered itself the ideal choice! This is the

first step for the conversion of the F.A.I. to the rôle of the political party. The second step is to tighten up their form of organisation. The F.A.I. founded in 1926 at a conference held in Valencia had as the basis of its organisation the "affinity group". The groups were federated in Local, Comarcal and Regional Federations. The union of all the Federations, including the Portuguese federation, constituted the Iberian Anarchist Federation (F.A.I.), represented by the Peninsular Committee.

At the Plenum of Regional Committees held in Valencia in July 1937, it was declared that "The affinity group has been, for more than fifty years, the most effective organism for propaganda, for contacts and anarchist activity. With the new organisation that is demanded of the F.A.I., the organic mission of the affinity group has been annulled. It is the intention of the Plenum that the affinity groups must be respected, but that by reason of the decisions taken by the F.A.I. they will not be able to participate organically in the F.A.I. as affinity groups."

The new bases of organisation of the F.A.I. were to be the geographical groups, by districts and suburbs. These are joined in local, comarcal, provincial and regional Federations. The Regionals make up the F.A.I. Applications for membership are examined by a Commission attached to every district and suburban groups, and local federation. So far as the reorganised F.A.I. was concerned admission with full rights was granted to (a) Militants who already belonged to the F.A.I.; (b) all those who belonged to syndical, cultural and other organisations related to anarchism, before January 1st, 1936. Others, who did not comply with these conditions but whose references were satisfactory, would be granted conditional membership, not being allowed to hold any post in the organisation during the first six months.

These were the conditions for joining the new F.A.I. but what of the declaration of principles? Bearing in mind that the intention was to increase the membership "in the shortest possible time" it is not surprising that the document contains no statement of principles, unless the following paragraph is to be taken as such:

"As anarchists, we are the enemies of dictatorships, whether of races or of parties; we are enemies of the totalitarian form of government and believe that the future direction of our people will be the resultant of the joint action of all sections of the community which agree on the creation of a society without class privileges, in which the organisms of work, administration and communal living are the principal factors for providing Spain, by means of federal norms, with the outlets which will give satisfaction to its different regions" (our italics).

For an organisation which declares its opposition to the "totalitarian form" of government but not to government itself, one cannot expect any reference to opposition to the State. More so when one reads elsewhere in this document "... The F.A.I. without disregarding, but instead conceding the greatest importance to the war; without renouncing its final objectives, proposes to impel the Revolution in all the popular organisms in which its action may be effective in affirming in a progressive direction the culmination of the revolution that is being carried out." And later, "We advocate the total subsists and we are making every effort to encourage all organisms which contribute to this end. Nevertheless, we believe that, in contrast with our attitude of opposition in the past, it is the duty of all anarchists to take part in those public institutions which can serve to secure and impel the new state of affairs" (our italics).

Members of the F.A.I. who hold public offices "are required to give an account to the Committees of their mission and activities, maintaining close contact with them for the purpose of following at all times their

"inspiraciones"* in every specific case. Any member of the F.A.I. designated for a public office, whatever its nature, can be disauthorised or removed from office as soon as such action is deemed necessary by the competent bodies of the organisation."

The foregoing is a clear statement of the intentions to be recognised by the government as one of the parties to the affairs of government. For to be able to nominate members to hold "public office" the F.A.I. would have to be recognised by the government as one of the partys forming the "anti-fascist bloc". They were fully aware of the implications of their actions from an anarchist point of view, but were undeterred and meetings were held in the principal cities of Spain to launch this monster in the name of anarchism.

In a statement to the International Anarchist movement,† the F.A.I. asked for understanding of their actions and respect for decisions taken only after "free and passionate discussion". (No mention, however, is made of the fact that those comrades of the F.A.I. serving at the fronts, and there were many, had no say in these deliberations.‡) "For instance, the new structure of the F.A.I. in which a form of public activity is accepted, as well as special aspects of political activity, such as the participation of the F.A.I. in all the organisms created by the Revolution and in all places where our presence is necessary to accelerate activity and to influence the masses and the combatants—has been the subject of many violent discussions, without such action being in itself a fundamental modification of our tactics and our principles but simply and solely a circumstantial adaptation to the necessities of the war and the new problems created by the Revolution."

Nevertheless, opposition to the reorganisation of the F.A.I. in Spain was considerable, particularly in Catalonia, where at a Regional Plenum of Groups, a number of delegates withdrew. Two months later, in an article published in *Solidaridad Obrera* (October 12, 1937) Gilabert, Secretary of the Local Federation of Anarchist groups in Barcelona again referred to the "large minority" (*minoria considerable*) in opposition, adding that "the differences reached such a point that some groups threatened to provoke a split". A committee was nominated with a view to finding a solution, which consisted in agreeing that the large opposition should be free to continue as affinity groups, "but that their resolutions of an organic nature will be taken into account in relation to the numbers they represent". This proposal, however, had to be put to a Peninsular Congress for ratification.

The plan to boost the membership of the F.A.I. by broadening its basis seems not to have met with the success hoped for. Before July 1936, the members of the F.A.I. were estimated at 30,000. And according to Santillan§ by the end of 1937 the figure stood at 154,000. But what had been gained in quantity had been lost in revolutionary content. And the urge to create the mass movement had been effected at the expense of individual values and anarchist principles.

(To be continued)

V.R.

* *Inspiracion*—inspiration, or in the less euphemistic language of the professional politicians: *orders, directives!*

† *Federacion Anarquista Iberica al Movimiento Internacional*, published in the *Informacion Bulletin of the C.N.T.-F.A.I.* (Spanish Edition, Barcelona, Sept. 20, 1937, No. 367.)

‡ *¡ Por que perdimos la Guerra* (Buenos Aires, 1939).

§ A. Hdezono in his series of articles on the *Movimiento Libertario* *Spagnolo* (*Florida*, Naples, Vol. 6, No. 7, 30th June, 1952): "It is true to say that in that period, the best militants of the libertarian organisations were to be found among the combatants, and that on their return they found themselves faced with the 'fait accompli'. In reality they could not see the significance of these tactical transformations in their true light, overwhelmed and somewhat 'impressed' as they were by the tremendous responsibilities of the hour, totally absorbed by the fever that gripped everyone before certain concrete achievements of that revolution which they had dreamed of for so many years."

Playing up Mau Mau, instituting police repression, insisting on the colour bar: these are the answers of the administration to the Kenya crisis. Reforms are promised, but must await the report of the Royal Commission, only now being appointed, which is unlikely to reach Kenya before the new year, and which—according to Mr. Lyttelton's own words—can scarcely report for another year.

Basic Requirements

The basic problems remain: land hunger, the poverty of the African, the colour bar, and the draining of wealth from the country. These problems require revolutionary changes in property relations and in the administration of social and economic life. The land and industries should be in the hands of the populations—equally, whether African, Indian or European. Administration should be also in the hands of all the population through local communes. And the aim of administration should be first, all the satisfaction of the needs of the local population. Only where these have been adequately satisfied should wealth be exported. The latter principle seems elementary morality: yet in Kenya to-day, in every colonial territory, it is the profits of the large companies and offices overseas which take precedence over the needs, the necessities of the native population.

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP OPEN AIR MEETINGS

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

INDOOR MEETINGS

The present series of indoor discussion-lectures will continue at the premises of the British Drama League, 9 Fitzroy Square, London, W.1 (off Warren Street, Tottenham Court Road).

The meetings will be held on TUESDAYS at 7.30 p.m.

NOV. 18—E. V. Swart on
PASSIVE RESISTANCE in S. AFRICA

NOV. 25—Jack Rice on
THE RAILWAYMEN'S MUTUAL AID SOCIETY

NORTH-EAST LONDON

DISCUSSION MEETINGS
IN EAST HAM
Alternate Wednesdays
at 7.30 p.m.

NOV.—26—Edgar Priddy on
REBELS & REVOLUTIONARIES

LIVERPOOL

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

GLASGOW

INDOOR MEETINGS
at
CENTRAL HALLS, 25 Bath Street
Every Sunday at 7 p.m.
With John Gaffney, Frank Leach,
Jane Strachan, Eddie Shaw,
Frank Carlin
NOV. 10—Geoffrey Ostergaard on
SYNDICALISM

FREEDOM

The Anarchist Weekly
Postal Subscription Rates :
12 months 17/- (U.S.A. \$3.00)
6 months 8/6 (U.S.A. \$1.50)
3 months 4/6 (U.S.A. \$0.75)
Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies
12 months 27/- (U.S.A. \$4.50)
6 months 13/6 (U.S.A. \$2.25)

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

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