

Anarchists on the March

The Windmills of Whitehall

THE EASTER MARCHES for nuclear disarmament have always displayed a range of confused and clashing ideas, and if last week-end's march was in fact no more diverse in this respect than previous ones, the fact that it was the first march to be held while a Labour Government held office, heightened the disagreements between the various points of view.

It is clear that now the official CND leadership has lost the initiative, its ideas and enthusiasm have evaporated, and its leaders carry on more out of inertia than anything else. The *Guardian's* suggestion that if CND didn't organise a march next year, any of the 'extremist' groups could step in and do so, suggests the possibility that Peggy Duff may yet have to be given a cabinet seat with a special job of controlling dissident elements, and making appeals that 'the nation cannot afford unofficial marches'. During the final rally in Trafalgar Square several Labour MPs and supporters expressed their shock and humiliation at the Labour Government's support for US policies in Vietnam, but none of them, or the CND leadership (including Olive Gibbs and Canon Collins), as much as mentioned the fact that for years they have been urging campaigners to ignore the direct actionists' approach and concentrate on getting the Labour Party back into office.

There is a traditional saying that 'the bosses' crisis is the workers' opportunity', and in the same way the crisis in the nuclear disarmament movement, and the disorientation among the vague left and progressive currents of opinion, present an opportunity for anarchist ideas to make headway. However, just as many crises of capitalism have slipped by because not enough workers were ready and concerned to exploit them for socialism, it seems that anarchist views will not just spread themselves, but need to be argued and propagated as forcefully and as skilfully as we are able.

LABOUR'S LEFT—AGAIN!

On the second day of the march, supporters of *The Week*, a periodical which seems to represent the non-Trotskyist left in the Labour Party, were hard at work with loud speaker vans, special supplements and issues of their newspaper and a meeting in a pub, to argue their policy of working inside the Labour Party, passing resolutions from branch to federation to constituency party and to national conference, demanding that Labour MPs and ministers should put into effect the views of the rank and file. It seems hardly likely that that will produce any results. It is easy to recall the rises and declines of lefts in the Labour Party, from the Socialist League of Stafford Cripps before the war, to the Bevan- (and Wilson-)ites with *Tribune*. It is also tempting to remember a letter from Frank Allaun, MP, to *Peace News* a couple of years ago, during a correspondence between political and non-political CND-ers, in which he urged people to come back into the Labour Party because of the tremendous changes that Harold Wilson's leadership had made. However, if successive generations boring within the Labour Party have had no effect at all, libertarians cannot afford to feel smugly self-satisfied about it, because despite the important influences that anarchist thought has had on subjects like education and attitudes to sex, the effect of anarchism on domestic, economic and industrial questions, and on the range of foreign policies that a government feels itself able to pursue, has been equally negligible.

While it is true that anarchist ideas have not succeeded through not being tried, whereas the parliamentary approach has failed through being tried, that merely leaves us with the problem of getting anarchism across to a large enough section of the people for it to be effective. Two features of the propaganda of ideas during the past few years seem particularly disturbing in this context. Firstly, for a very considerable number of young militants the Communist Party and YCL are still the most attractive organisations. When the first Aldermaston March took place the memory of the Russian tanks in Budapest was fresh in the minds of all politically-conscious people, and that, and the so-called 'revelations' of the 20th Party Congress, had caused a mass exodus from the CP. The present wave of youth haven't known that personally. Nevertheless, it does seem that the blossoming of direct action through the Trafalgar Square sit-downs, when the Committee of 100 was for a short time the most important movement of protest, has left a relatively small residue of interest in libertarian as opposed to authoritarian socialism.

ANARCHIST IDEAS NEEDED

Secondly, while the anarchist movement has succeeded in growing in numerical strength and colourfulness to the extent that no report or even photograph of a mass demonstration can ignore it, the clarity of ideas and vigour with which they are propagated does not seem to have grown in proportion. The importance to a movement such as ours of participation in a wider movement such as CND is clear, but it will only produce good results if our participation is handled thoughtfully. It provides an opportunity for anarchists to call attention to their existence, and in this we have been successful. It gives a chance for distributing general anarchist literature and propaganda, and a number of comrades did this during the march, although it would have been more effective if more had taken part. Most important however is to show that the anarchist attitude to nuclear disarmament is the most relevant and fruitful one, in the context of the problems with which people on the march were concerned. Both *FREEDOM* and *ANARCHY* were full of good articles, and one can feel confident that anyone who was reached by them will have got a good idea of what anarchism is about. The same cannot be said, unfortunately, for some of the group activities of anarchists taking part in the actual march, which seemed to be inspired by a misunderstanding of anarchism.

PEOPLE NOT POLITICIANS

The most obvious case of this was during the public assembly called by the Committee of 100 at the entrance to Downing Street after the CND speeches. It is an axiom of anarchism that directing appeals to politicians is a waste of time, and that social revolution will only be achieved when the anarchist message has been brought home to the workers and farmers, the people who do the vital work in society. Yet on Easter Monday there was the strange spectacle of anarchists urging a violent charge against a police cordon in order to break through to the Prime Minister's residence, while the people to whom their propaganda could have been addressed were drifting off home or listening to Duff & Co. If anything, having scuffles with the police for no purpose at all, and spreading out across a country road for the pleasure of block-

AUTHORITY WAS challenged in the streets by the Anarchists during the Easter March.

The March started quietly enough. In the front were the CND leaders and their political support. Then followed the flags and supporters of the hundred flowers of the dissident Left. Amongst them 20 or 30 Anarchists, marching under the Oxford banner. Then, as the March wound its way through lovely lanes and hostile villages, the Anarchist contingent was beginning to get somewhat bigger. At the end of the lunch break there were 89 of us, starting to march out together. However, behind the LAG banner, there marched one person and a black-and-white dog behind the two people carrying it. It looked as if Arthur Uloth's 'death wish' has finally proved correct, and we have 'melted away'.

By the afternoon, the groups began to arrive. Hayes and Middlesex, Manchester, Merseyside, Bristol, Glasgow, Ilford Libertarians, and London and Bedford SWF. After tea break, the arrival of more experienced campaigners lifted the London Anarchist Group out of its lethargy. The second day was a great improvement. On being told by CND marshals to split into regional groups, we replied that we have no marshals and we intend to look after ourselves. On the road to Ruislip occurred our first trial of strength. A CND medical van was told to turn off the road by the police. The volunteer doctor-driver, bloody-minded as they come, refused to turn to the right. He told the policeman that his job was to look after the marchers and therefore he had to stay on the route. It was a fat lot of good to have first-aid attention miles away from the march. By this time, the Anarchist column arrived on the scene and rallied to the doctor's aid. After shouts of 'Let him through', and 'Police State', and a wait of five minutes, the police capitulated and the car was allowed to go on. The doctor, not an anarchist, later thanked us and said, 'The decision of the police would have disturbed the medical service on the march, the organisation of which was my responsibility. It was fortunate that the Anarchists were around at the time.'

TREACHERY

CND marshals showed their gratitude in a different way. This is what happened according to *The Times* (April 19, p. 6). When the march 'reached the gates of the United States Air Force base at Ruislip... the only sign of a disturbance came when a group of anarchists tried to

ing the local bus is less relevant to nuclear disarmament than voting Labour.

Part of our case, and one which places a real barrier in the way of getting it across to well-meaning progressives, is that to aim for nuclear disarmament, or the end of a particular colonial war, is meaningless in the context of a world of states and power politics. The only way anything can be achieved will be by replacing the destructiveness of governments and the futility of politics by a constructive approach based on taking control of our lives as workers, students, farmers, etc., and organising society by responsible co-operation. We all despise the police, politicians and the respectable unthinking opinions of the mass of the people, and we urge comrades to strike a real blow against them by spreading the anarchist alternative, rather than wasting energy tilting at the windmills of Whitehall.

P.H.

stop in front of the gates, but the police, forewarned by campaign officials, had already moved out into the road, and a shove or two quickly sent the demonstrators on their way' (our italics).

This kind of treachery is again emphasised, when *The Times* reporter goes on to say, 'more significant than any demonstration was the sight of the campaign public relations officer chatting with his opposite number from the USAF headquarters as they watched the marchers pass'.

One would like to know on whose side the CND was—the US Air Force, the police, or the demonstrators. They endangered 180 demonstrators when they led them into a trap of 250 policemen at Ruislip, 'surely the perfect target for demonstrations' according to *The Times*.

During the tea break at Ealing Common, Olive Gibbs, chairman of CND, was booed when she told a YCND rally not to take part in the Downing Street demonstrations organised by the Committee of One Hundred. CND also distributed a hurriedly-composed leaflet to every marcher clearly aimed at the Anarchists and the Committee. (It was succinctly answered the next day in a leaflet by the Committee.)

By this time our part of the march had grown to 750 and at the anarchist bookstall there was a brisk demand for literature and an incredible insistence on badges. When we tried to sell literature instead, one YCND girl, her bosom bedecked by badges, looked at this paper and asked, 'FREEDOM? What's that?' On the last lap of the second day we spread across the road—some wit shouted to us, 'Accidents cause people'. On the last day our section was well over a thousand. When we arrived at Kensington Gore, we again spread right across the road in a solid mass. Yet when I looked back there were still anarchist flags visible by the kerb of the road some three hundred yards away.

At the meeting in Hyde Park we decided to ask for a speaker at Trafalgar Square to represent libertarian opinion. Peter Cadogan agreed to speak, but Peggy Duff, OM, Olive Gibbs, OM, and Mrs. Anne Kerr, MP, refused our request, even though Cadogan was only to give a brief outline of what we would have said ourselves.

Now came the most difficult portion of the march: The whole of the available police force was allotted to our section. This was done at the request of CND, according to the police inspector, which is a pretty stupid way for a peace organisation to behave. We assured Peggy Duff that we also believed in non-violence—this she queried. We can in fact point out that throughout the three days' demonstration whatever police provocation there was, on the CND's insistence, only one man was arrested out of the anarchist contingent (and he for quite a different reason), i.e. one person out of 1,500. It is a clear indication that if anyone was using violence, it was not the anarchists. Otherwise one would be sure that the police would have made hundreds of arrests.

NO SOLIDARITY

Progress was very slow from Hyde Park as we were surrounded completely by police. There were two large vans in front of us and two large vans at the back of the anarchist column. Every time the back was cut off, the front of the anarchists had to stop to wait until our comrades caught up. The delay was unavoidable but we could not possibly risk being separated under such

hostile conditions. The crunch came opposite Westminster Abbey, where 500 police surrounded us completely, linking hands and crushing inwards. Compare this with the *Daily Telegraph* (April 20, front page): 'As the crush increased several demonstrators used the staffs of their red and black banners as battering rams, and others were hurled against parked cars'. This is inaccurate (naturally, for the *Telegraph*). The banners are held with bamboo sticks, very light. We were using our heads, not our fists. It was the police trying to provoke us into fighting. We did not co-operate. One comrade's arm was reported broken, and a baby was held up high by anxious hands in the middle of the melee. Eyes averted, other groups passing by did not protest. I managed to slip through and appealed for solidarity. Solidarity! There was none from the Quakers, none from the Communist Party groups but it came at last, from a group of young CND boys, and especially from Young Socialists who stopped at last and shouted, 'Let them through. Let them through'. Thank you, those young people—you have shown us there is hope in the world yet. You averted a most vicious attack by the police who were only anxious to provoke us into violence. Even some of the younger Communists came to us afterwards and apologised to us for the lack of solidarity on the part of their, or anybody's, comrades.

TRAFALGAR SQUARE

I shall never forget Wynford Hicks, with his arms outstretched like a man on a cross, begging the people to help the anarchists, and how the stony-faced bureaucrats walked on.

When we finally got through, with the help of these Young Socialists and YCND boys, Whitehall was soon ringing to the cry of 'Anarchy in—Governments out'. We linked hands and marched towards Trafalgar Square which was reached first by our comrades of the SWF. The police regrouped once more and tried to stop us but our shouts of 'Let them through' were answered by the great crowd shout at Nelson's Column and the police were demoralised and gave up. There was a tremendous burst of cheering from the spectators. The meeting at Trafalgar Square gave the speakers a very poor reception. There was hardly any applause, not because the sentiments expressed were wrong, but because the speakers were so evidently insincere. They included Lord Brockway, Sydney Silverman, MP, and Mrs. Kerr, MP, who talked about her Christian conscience. As the *Guardian* said (April 20, front page) 'the gathering... came nearest to discovering its soul when Peter O'Toole read a poem by Adrian Mitchell with a refrain of "Tell me lies about Vietnam"... art was more moving than politics.'

No wonder a heckler shouted, 'Why tell us—why don't you tell Wilson?' It would be instructive to receive further details from some of those who participated on the March, also reports of provincial press, TV coverage and reactions from abroad. Lack of space for the moment precludes us with dealing now with the demonstration at Downing Street; the Spies for Peace leaflet; and other aspects of the March. To be continued... and I mean this.

JOHN RETY.

P.S. Visit our comrades in Hyde Park who are holding a 10-day fast and continuous public meeting protesting about Vietnam.

Don't Rock the Boat!

GOVERNMENT MINISTERS are rather alarmed at the pending wage increases. The Postmaster General has attempted to justify the very recent postmen's award. It is understood that Jim Callaghan is satisfied but other Ministers are not convinced that the award is within the 'guiding light' of 3-3½%. Rank and file postmen are not satisfied either, they consider they are still 10% behind wages in comparable jobs in other industries. Ron Smith UPW Gen. Secretary may be due for a skirmish at the UPW Annual Conference next month. Tony Wedgwood Benn might have baffled Ron Smith and Jim Callaghan with science, but Joe Soap pounding the streets each day is not so easily deceived.

Fifty thousand engineering clerks are not in the mood for conjuring tricks, they want an all round increase of 15/- for all members. Negotiations at national level are finished unless the employers make the approach. 'Direct Action' in various forms will be considered in terms of individual companies, the only rub

being that such plans of action must be submitted to the EC for their approval. The employers have offered the old three year trick but the clerks are not standing for that one. At long last the so-called 'White Collar' workers are having a go, and it is up to the production workers in each firm to give their active support, not just pass resolutions of solidarity, waste paper baskets are more than full already.

Also arising from the Clerical Workers' Conference came the disturbing news that the Iron and Steel Trades' Confederation have pressurised the management at Stewarts Lloyds Newport office into preventing the CAWU from securing negotiating rights. According to CAWU President, David Currie, the IS Trades' Confederation have threatened to stop work if negotiating rights are granted. Rank and file steelmen should tell the Confed to 'get to hell', the rank and file are the people who decide whether to withdraw their labour or not. It would certainly shake the Confed if it called for a stoppage on this issue and the

steelmen replied 'get notted'. The Engineering Employers don't wish to rock George Brown's boat; they have just offered DATA a 3-3½% increase. They wish to keep in line with the Government's Incomes and Prices Policy. This patriotism 'cuts you to the quick'. But comrades in the immortal words of George Brown 'My people will understand'. Sorry George mate members of DATA do not understand and have no intention of understanding a wage freeze. They are banning overtime and stopping work on April 27. Anyway Mr. Brown, the employers respect your patriotic motives.

BILL CHRISTOPHER.

Freedom For Workers' Control

APRIL 24 1965 Vol. 26 No. 13

EXHIBITION WORKERS ON THEIR OWN

THE DISPUTE in the exhibition industry, now in its fourth week, has entered a new stage. From the start the overtime ban has been used, not only to try to get an hourly rate of 10s. for craftsmen and 9s. 6d. for labourers but also to show dissatisfaction with the union-employers' agreement which only gave workers an extra 6d. per hour, and brought the alignment of unions and management out into the open.

Because the ban is holding up the opening of the large engineering exhibition at Olympia and Earls Court, employers have sacked stewards in an effort to break their rank and file organisation and force the men to return to 'normal working'. This has happened at the firm of City Display to the carpenters' stewards, who are members of the Amalgamated Society of Woodworkers. The first thing the men did here was to get in touch with their union, but they drew a blank for the union did not want to know, so the men decided to withdraw their labour. Soon after this the union officials put in an appearance, not at the request of the members, but at that of the management.

CHANGE OF LEADERSHIP

We, not only as rank and file members

of unions but also as Anarcho-Syndicalists, are often told that we have to work for a change of union leadership. This has just happened in the ASW. Recently elections were held for a new London District Secretary, two of the district organisers being nominated for the position. One was Jack Rusca, a member of the Communist Party and the other, Jack Jones of the Labour Party.

After some argy-bargy over election addresses, in which a minor rule was broken by Rusca, he was finally elected. A great victory for the 'Left' you might think, but the workers at City Display soon had this illusion shattered for when they asked Mr. Rusca what he was going to do about the victimisation of the stewards he told them to get back to 'normal working', which includes the working of overtime.

The Communists often create the impression that their Party leads in the struggle for higher wages and better conditions, but here we have a case of a CP member gaining power as head of the London District, but still carrying on the policies of his predecessor. Obviously now that he has obtained power, he has become part of the constitutional struc-

ture of the union. As such, he and the union are a party to agreements with the employers and part of the Joint Council agreement is that a reasonable amount of overtime shall be worked if necessary.

When the exhibition workers started a ban on overtime they put themselves outside the agreements and the constitution. If he has assisted the men in dispute, Rusca would have broken the constitution and been at odds with the executive council, so to expect support from him and the union is a complete waste of time.

The position at the time of writing is that although the workers at City Display can elect new stewards, the management will not recognise them for they have broken the agreement. But the thing is, and this is where the exhibition workers are in a strong position, that as long as they can keep the ban on overtime going (the men at City Display are now back on this tactic) they are hurting the employers. Sooner or later an offer will have to be made by the employers to the men in dispute, who are the ones really affected by agreements, instead of doing a deal with the union bureaucracy.

P.T.

Gunter on the Warpath

SINCE THE LABOUR Party came to power we have heard and read many speeches urging industry to export more. Mr. Brown's incomes policy is part of the scheme of things to keep wages down so that 'our' goods are more competitive in the world markets.

It is ironical that Mr. Ray Gunter, Minister of Labour, should bring matters of economy into his speech, when addressing the annual conference of the Co-operative Party at Blackpool. He is concerned that the number of unofficial strikes is causing loss in output, 'valuable exports are delayed to the annoyance of the foreign customer. But perhaps even worse is the standards of conduct that are sometimes displayed. After all, collective bargaining in a free society must depend upon the honouring of the pledged word'.

The thing is, a 'pledged word' can only be of value between equals. One could say that it is made between the unions and managements, but the agreements concern a third party which is the men on the shop floor. The only power they have to alter anything that goes against their interests is strike action.

URGENCY IS LOST

Mr. Gunter says 'in far too many cases, agreements are broken with impunity, lines of procedure commonly agreed are overthrown at a moment's notice'. Since it only serves the interests of the management to go through the long drawn-out procedure laid down in the joint agreements, it is no wonder that they are broken. When procedure is followed, the urgency of the thing is lost. People soon forget and some other dispute crops up and the first dispute, which might have been won if immediate action had been taken, is lost.

The Minister, in his speech, is clever enough not to put all the blame on the workers, saving a little for managements whose attitudes often 'irritate men sometimes beyond endurance'. But we must not let this upset us, a 'higher standard of discipline and conduct' is what is 'required from our people'.

Very nice of Mr. Gunter, I'm sure! Grin and bear it! It will all be worked out in procedure, just let your union carry on and decide what is best for you. Meanwhile, keep working.

P.T.

LETTER

ANARCHIST WORKERS' CONTROL?

Dear Brothers,
Our Federation is dismayed that after so long a history of anarchism and its opposition to authoritarianism (whether Marxist or otherwise) letters such as that of Peter Cadogan (27/3/65) should be thought relevant.

That 'worker control' or Anarcho-Syndicalism could be confounded with 'control' in an authoritarian sense shows a complete ignorance of social development and, indeed, of sociology itself. In this latter field Marx the social scientist made outstanding contributions. His analysis of society was not merely original but it revolutionised social thought itself. If anarchists such as Bakunin quarrelled with him it was not on the basis of his diagnosis but, rather, in respect of his remedy, viz. political and worker-government action. In this context worker-control, of course, means individual freedom in a society where men must work together, where all individuals share in the control of their lives while recognising that mutual dependence is best defined as mutual aid on the basis of personal liberty, material equality and social fraternity.

Far from it being high time for libertarians to transcend their 'Marxist hangovers', it is 100 years overdue for the Peter Cadogans to stop believing in the 'you never had it so good' capitalism of an outdated system of society and to realise that the real choice today is between a society where the State and the Government are the determiners of our lives on the one hand or whether

people can by mutual agreements, in a society from which material inequality is removed, determine their own lives.

No anarchist champions Marx but Peter Cadogan finds it necessary to adopt Marx as his straw man. Paradoxically, while no anarchist would have the slightest difficulty in demolishing Marx as far as Marx claims to have the remedies to a situation which all admit he defined admirably, poor Peter Cadogan finds even his straw man too substantial to knock down. He produces no diagnosis of society, less still does he attempt remedies. If such ineffectual outpourings still carry any weight, then your articles on Anarcho-Syndicalism were never more justified. And if Peter Cadogan took the trouble of reading Malatesta and Berkman as a prelude to Bakunin and Kropotkin he might divert his talents into fruitful fields.

As an information item I would add that the New Zealand Federation of Anarchists is now established. The two main groups are the Victoria University of Wellington Anarchist Association and the Auckland Anarchist Group. I might state that overseas anarchists are always welcome here. In Auckland our home address is 69 Clarence Street, Ponsonby, where room is always held for visitors. So far only comrades from Australia and other parts of New Zealand have availed of this open house.

Auckland, New Zealand
W. G. LANGFORD.
(Co-ordinating Secretary
N.Z. Federation of Anarchists.)

ANARCHO-SYNDICALISM THE WORKERS' 10 NEXT STEP

DEFENCE OF THE REVOLUTION

ANARCHO-SYNDICALISTS do not make a virtue of necessity, and they recognise that the means are governed by the ends in view. With this in mind, we have to consider now the Anarcho-Syndicalist attitude to violence, for the argument is often put forward that Anarchists and Syndicalists must be pacifists, since it is inconsistent to denounce the State for its violence if you are prepared to resort to violence yourself.

Now, no reasonable person believes that the use of force solves any argument, and Anarchists do not 'believe in' violence, any more than the society they want to see is one where everybody rushes around killing because there is no longer a police force to restrain them. We denounce the State because it organises violence, makes permanent institutions of its violent organisations and forces its citizens to be violent at its command.

We do not advocate violence as something we approve of for its own sake, but we do claim the right to resist violence by anybody else. Even in a Court of Law, the plea of 'Self Defence' is recognised as a valid defence against charges of murder or manslaughter. Has the citizen, then, no right to defend himself against the State, if the State uses armed force against him?

Theoretically, the Social Revolution could be achieved peaceably and bloodlessly. The workers could take over the means of production, and politely inform the employers, the police, the lawyers and the prison officers, the Civil Service and the Armed Forces that their services were no longer required in those capacities and that they could come and do some useful work for a change. And, theoretically, they could all accept it.

But, alas, this remains—theory. The history of the 20th century alone shows us that reaction knows a thing or two better than that. If a little tampering with the Constitution does not do the trick, then there could be a march on Rome, a burning of the Reichstag, a Franco uprising—a seizure of power one way or another. Either way it eventually comes to the same thing: a direct struggle between the people and the State.

Where the people have the advantage is in the fact that the State can only function through their acquiescence. The forces of the State, after all, are manned by workers in uniform. No longer does a regular army of mercenaries blindly serve authority. The conscript armies of to-day are unwilling soldiers, already with a grievance against the State which unwarrantably interferes with their lives. Although revolutionaries are accused of disaffecting the troops, it is seldom that affection exists in the first place!

Supposing, then, that workers began taking over industry on a large scale. A social general strike was turning into a social revolution. Obviously, the Government would take action to defend the employers' interests and to maintain their position by force. (Remember that in the 1926 British

General Strike, warships appeared on the Clyde, the Thames, the Humber and the Tyne. The army encamped in Hyde Park—ostensibly to distribute milk but obviously ready for a grimmer task.)

What is the first line of defence of the revolutionary workers? Clearly one of propaganda to the workers in uniform. Anti-militarism is one of the most important features of the Syndicalist case, for one of the most important functions of the armed forces is counter-revolution, activity in which the morale of the 'other ranks' is already likely to be at a low ebb, for they cannot lose their identity with their own people. Is the soldier lightly to shoot down workers who may include his own father, or brother? Is he to be deaf to arguments about conditions which affect him when he is in 'civvy street'.

But, of course, many fighting men will remain true to the colours, and against whatever action they can take, the workers have two lines of defence. The first is that, if they are in occupation of the factories, those factories will suffer if violence is used against them. Now every employer will hesitate—and the State is just another employer in this sense—to sanction the destruction of his property, even if he seems to be losing it. He would rather take the chance of pulling a political or financial trick after the trouble is over (as has been done so often) and perhaps get back in control that way. It's up to the workers to see that he doesn't.

The second defensive measure is the setting up of workers' militias. These differ fundamentally from the official army of the State in that there is no intention of making them a permanent institution, and in the fact of their decentralised control.

Workers' militias are formed by workers who take up arms to defend their revolutionary gains. They consist of volunteers only, any form of conscription being in contradiction to the aim of Anarcho-Syndicalists. The conscious worker-in-arms has only two aims: to prevent the means of production falling back into the hands of the ruling class, and to get back to his constructive life as soon as possible, organising with his fellows a new basis for production and distribution.

It must be admitted that workers fighting organisations can have only a negative function; to prevent the re-establishment of a government. Immediately a new authority is born, the revolution is lost. The final defence of the social revolution lies not in fighting and violence, necessary as it may be, for this is only a transitory spasm—the death-rattle of the old society. The revolution will be best defended by the abolition of the means of violence, destroying completely the power structure in society, so that man can no longer dominate man. Let the constructive revolution create such a society that no man would be fool enough to want it changed. The free society will be best defended by—freedom.

P.S.

(To be continued)