Issued by SYDNEY ANARCHIST GROUP.

A N A R C H I S T

R E V I E W

Anarchism is not a repudiation of social discipline,
but rather an assumption of humanitarian responsibility.
- Sholem Asch.

SEPTEMBER, 1959.

No. 2

ANARCHISM - WHAT IS IT ?

- S.E. Parker

"Yes, I believe in the displacement of this system of injustice by a just one; I believe in the end of starvation, exposure and the crimes caused by them; I believe in the human soul regnant over all laws which man has made, or will make; I believe there is no peace now, and there never will be peace, so long as man rules over man; I believe in the total disintegration and dissolution of the principle and practice of authority; I am an an anarchist and if for this you condemn me, I stand ready to receive your condemnation."

- Voltairine de Cleyre.

ANARCHISM is the denial of authority in human relationships. By authority anarchists mean the possession by a man or group of men of the power to compel others into obedience to his or their will. We regard the existence of such a principle in human relationships as detrimental to the enjoyment of life, as well as serving to protect and perpetuate the rulership and exploitation of human society by a privileged minority. Any man who is subject to the will of another is a slave. Anarchism therefore teaches that the full and free development of the individual - the basic unit of society from our point of view - is only possible in a society in which all domination of man by man has ceased. In other words, a society wherein rulership has been replaced by fellowship. Hence our use of the word anarchy (i.e., without rulers) to describe the free society which we regard as the first requisite for the true development of men.

The principle of authority manifests itself in three main forms today, each of which represents a group of constraints:-

(1) The State - the domination of human behaviour. The state is that collection of coercive institutions - the police, judiciary, armed forces and so on - whereby government - the main concentration of authority in the sense that I have defined it - ensures the enforcement of its will, in the shape of laws, and thus maintains the status quo.

(2) Property - the domination over the means of wealth production. Property is the control by a privileged economic minority of the means of production, by which they are enabled to dictate to the majority, the workers (the property-

less, the non-controllers) the terms on which the workers can use these means to obtain a livelihood. The property system, whether state or private, ensures that its controllers get a preferential share in the distribution of the wealth produced, thus living at the expense of those whom they exploit.

(3) Religion and Psychological Conditioning - this is the function of instilling into people's minds and conditioning their emotions with the concept of obedience to authority as a necessary part of life. It is performed by the church, the schools and, nowadays especially, through the mass media of the cinema, press and radio.

The tendency of these three forms is to coalesce into one body. We find the end-process of this tendency in the modern totalitarian state.

Anarchism is the avowed enemy of the principle and practice of authority. It proposes to substitute for the present system of rule and inequality, a society based on voluntary co-operation, instead of government, and equality through freedom of access to the means of production, instead of property. To achieve this society it is necessary for mankind to bring about a social revolution, abolishing authority and capitalism - the contemporary form of property.

Now this term "social revolution" is still regarded with some distaste even by those who should know better. By it we mean a fundamental change in the relationships between man and man, not the change in appearance, but not in essence, that is reformism. Social revolution means the abolition of the status quo - not its improvement by reform.

Social revolution is a twofold process. It is a growth and an historical act. The growth is the development on the part of individuals of the desire for fundamental social change. The historical act is the point in time when the status quo is overthrown by the masses and the possibility for new social forms is made actual.

The conditions for the success of a social revolution depend therefore upon the extent to which ideas of social change are accepted and implemented during a

revolutionary uprising. It is during such an uprising that the ideas of the anarchists will gain most acceptance. Although the ideal of anarchy may be attractive to many, particularly of the oppressed, they are nevertheless loth to part with the apparently valuable petty privileges and securities their rulers promise to concede to them in exchange for their conformity (in times of so-called prosperity, that is). I consider it futile to expect a widespread acceptance of anarchism so long as the status quo gives an appearance of stability (though in turn its stability obviously depends, to a great extent, upon the support given to it by its subjects and the efficiency with which it justifies its existence to them. It follows that the more who are won to our ideas the less there are to support the status quo, with a consequent lessening of its stability). Only when the support for the status quo is catastrophically weakened by its collapse as the result of its internal contradictions can we expect any mass adherence to our ideas. Until that time we can gain individuals here and there, we may even grow into an appreciable minority, but an ideal so revolutionary and so fundamentally different from other social ideals as anarchy, will only grow and be realised as the result of a long, arduous and often seemingly hopeless struggle, which may include several revolutionary attempts.

It follows that there may never be an anarchist revolution in the sense of a single historical act - only revolutionary attempts with more or less libertarian tendencies, which will assume anarchist forms according to the strength, clarity and consistency of the anarchist movement. The anarchist revolution consists of the growth of anarchist ideas and actions, the culmination of which is the achievement of the free society.

The role of the anarchist in a revolutionary situation is therefore to oppose any attempt to fix the revolution into an authoritarian system, no matter what specious pleas of 'revolutionary unity", or 'defence of the revolution" may be made. Our task is to encourage every endeavour towards the elimination of authority from human affairs and to always insist in word and deed upon the autonomy of the individual. Anarchists should seek to constitute always the liberative force in a revolution and not allow them-

selves to follow the treacherous path of compromising their principles by collaboration with authoritarian groupings and institutions, no matter how revolutionary these seem to be. The lessons of Spain and Russia are plain to all who care to see in this respect.

The outlook for the realisation of anarchy in our time appears very remote, to say the least. Perhaps man will never attain it - it is no inevitable result of progress. That men are capable of living in freedom we are convinced, but the free society will only be achieved when they will, desire and struggle to achieve it.

This being the position, if anarchism were merely a theory of an ideal society in the indefinite future, there are some who would think that there is no point in striving after something that may never be reached. But we anarchists are not just believers in some future society who in the meantime aid and abet the system they profess to oppose. We believe that anarchism is a way of life which can be practised (to a greater or lesser extent according to the capacity and courage of the individual) in our present environment, here and now. That we cannot live as complete anarchists as long as authority continues to exist is obvious - if this were so there would be no point in working for a social revolution - but it is equally obvious that even under the constraints imposed by governments and capitalists ways are still open for the carrying out of anarchist acts. We do not have to wait for others for us as individuals to start our revolution. On the contrary, it is the sum total of such 'one-man revolutions' that will constitute the completion of the anarchist revolution.

I have previously defined social revolution as being twofold in character - an historical act and a process of conscious desire and activity for new social forms, the success of any social revolution depending on how far these two characteristics fuse into one.

Given the fact that the only course of action open to us today is on the individual and group level, the possibility of mass action of any purposeful kind to overthrow the status quo being remote, it follows that our task today is the development of ourselves as conscious revolutionary individuals and the winning of those who are still capable of independent

thought to our ideas. By so doing we shall be aiding and intensifying the growth of the anarchist revolution, so that should a time arise when the masses succeed in breaking the physical, mental and emotional bondage imposed upon them by their rulers and by their own acquiescence, we shall have the clarity and strength to influence by our ideas and actions the resulting revolution into a libertarian direction. In this way we can prepare the ground for the ultimate achievement of anarchy.

It is true that we have to submit to many things we hate, that we have to compromise on questions we should prefer not to compromise on, but we can still be free in our personal relationships with our friends and comrades, we can still make love without seeking the permission of church and state, and we can still refuse a "yes" when faced with a fundamental issue such as war. Whenever possible we can live outside rule and exploitation, and when we cannot we can still sow seeds of discontent that one day, perhaps, may blossom into the "liberty and pride and strength of the single soul and the free fraternisation of men". When the day arrives of the free man, the free woman, the free child, we shall have not only realised liberty in our souls, but in the very fabric of our individual and social being.

"The law," says Israel Kalisch in W.L. George's novel of that name, "can do nothing but coerce. The freedom of your deeds lies in the freedom of your soul, but willingness to join together freely and to part freely, to love freely and to die freely ..... Comrade, believe with Nietsche that to build a sanctuary one must overthrow a sanctuary."

We do not have to wait for others for us as individuals to start our revolution..... our task today is the development of ourselves as conscious revolutionary individuals and the winning of those still capable of independent thought to our ideas. - S.E. Parker.

A T H E I S M

- G.H.

In parallel with anarchism and the negation of authority marches the negation of God. Non-belief in a god - atheism - represents one of the principles of anarchy. The acceptance of a god would be a full and unconditional negation of the basic principles of anarchism, of a free human society, of liberty, solidarity, equality, justice, free initiative, and so on.

By his intelligent observation of life and the history of human society the anarchist naturally and logically comes to negate god and the vile systems of beliefs and superstitions, the historic layers of stupidity and ignorance which are called religion.

No other socio-political study has devoted such great importance to the analysis of religion, or the enslavement of man, or so fundamentally analysed all sides of the question of belief in and propitiation of a god as that carried out by anarchists. Godwin, Proudhon, Kropotkin, and Faure particularly penetrate deeply into this eternal proble. And with brilliant clarity M. Bakunin expresses anarchist thinking : "The idea of God", he writes, "draws after itself the destruction of the human mind, and of justice. Religion is the most decisive negation of human liberty, and inevitably leads to the enslavement of human beings, not only theoretically but practically".

Religion debases and corrupts people; it destroys their reasoning power, the principal instrument of human emancipation. It reduces them finally to imbecility - the essential condition of their slavery. Religions dishonour human labour and make it a sign and source of servitude. They kill the ideas and sentiments of human justice, ever tipping the balance to the side of triumphant knaves, privileged objects of divine indulgence. They kill pride and dignity, protecting only the cringing and the servile. They stifle every feeling of human fraternity in the hearts of men and of nations, filling them instead with divine cruelty.

All religions are cruel, all founded on blood, for all

rest principally on the idea of sacrifice, that is, on the perpetual immolation of humanity to the insatiable vengeance of divinity.

Elsewhere Bakunin writes: "Religion is collective madness, which gains strength as it becomes more the traditional madness; it penetrates the social and private beings of the people. It is inserted in the society, and becomes a form of collective soul and thought. Every man from his birth is engulfed in it through things he sees and hears. He is so much nursed with it, so poisoned, and it permeates his very being to such an extent, that no matter how strong his will is he needs a very great effort to free himself. He may never free himself. It is a wicked historical phantom created in the imagination of the first man. This phantom in its many guises havers over the knowledge, progress, and liberty of mankind. It impedes all aspirations towards a true humanitarianism and casts a shadow over life itself."

We can see today, in parallel with the reinforcement of state slavery and the increasing pressures of a standardised conformist society, a relative religious regeneration in both East and West. We can see that religion starts to become (particularly in the tyrannical regimes) a refuge of the despairing, an illusionary consolation of humiliated and frustrated peoples.

It is also obvious that the ancient opiate for the soul remains an immutable and necessary means of indoctrination for authoritarianism, a necessary auxiliary in the continual struggle to keep the people in a state of mental subjection. How else can one explain the official recognition, toleration and even material assistance given to the churches by the state organs of regimes which call themselves socialist.

It may also be that a credulous, easily impressed people is preferable from the point of view of the individuals and parties who represent themselves as socially progressive, and who say they are not religious, yet are very careful not to attack the churches and their gods or the whole parasitical edifice of the religious institutions.

There are Marxists who say that the religious influence will wither and disappear under the impact of technoeconomic changes. Why? There is no historic reason for assum-

ing this, and daily observation would give it the lie. We can fully agree with Bakunin when he says "If God really existed, it would be necessary to abolish him". These gods are powerfully entrenched, and will not just quietly fade away; they must be fought and exposed as evil shams. Modern churches still contain shrines dedicated to the superstitious creations of primitive man - creations now institutionalized into powerful weapons used for his continuing enslavement.

The state needs a mentally enslaved populace, and for this religion is a most useful tool. If we analyse the sermons preached by any denomination we can see plainly that the idea of God and believing in God is a complete negation of man's independence, of his desire for liberty and dignity, for solidarity and equality. Religion reduces man to a creeping, whimpering object, forever praising his insatiable god, forever begging forgiveness, a gutless thing of propitiation and fear. He becomes a creature tottering through life supported by his crutch of meaningless dogma, accepting social injustice, wars and insecurity without a cry of protest because all things are ordained by God. Even love is robbed of its human content and is supposedly a monopoly of gods and churches.

According to religion, god is everything, man is nothing. Everything comes from god, we owe everything to god. The first duty of a believer is to pronounce his own nothingness, to kneel before god and god's earthly representatives (of course) and declare: "I am nothing. I belong to you, god; I obey your command".

What king of liberty could we expect such a man to be, who voluntarily and with humiliation prostrates himself and delivers himself into the hands of a god and his earthly representatives? Can we expect any free initiative from such a man - any feeling of comradeship, solidarity, equality, or justice when such principles are not part of him? He is all god's - his feelings are not of his own being, and he freely acknowledges this. Such a man will never enunciate ideas of social justice; his whole existence is based on monstrous inequality - the recognition of himself as nothing, and god as everything.

From this there follows the creation of a hierarchy, a

a scale of inequality. On this ground the psychology of a slave grows well, fertilized with ignorance, systematically maintained. It becomes very easy to cultivate all kinds of prejudice and keep alive old superstitions - all the behaviour and thought in fact which are desirable to those who command the conduct, deeds and morals of the believers. The clerical shepherds march hand-in-hand with the worldly leaders of human flocks.

The history of christianity is consistent; it has always claimed to be the religion of the oppressed, the insulted, the enslaved and the poor. This religion of love and equality has created inquisitions, led bloody crusades, supported the mighty against the rebellious weak. It claims to be an international and universal religion with the cry that all men of all races are brothers. It claims immeasurably vast numbers of the earth's people as members of its faith. All these things it claims in the mire of hypocricy. Throughout the centuries to this day the christians practise mutual mass-murder, all invoking the name of god, the love of god.

It is clear that religion contradicts the natural feelings and the good principles of human relationships. It is in conflict with human thought, and is rejected by science. How is it to be explained that such a negative and pernicious force has continued to exist for so many thousands of years - because christianity is but a modern version of earlier and more primitive forms of religion? How has it held in clerical slavery - the prerequisite to other forms of slavery - so many untold millions for so long?

The supernatural - the idea of god, the belief in an invisible supernatural being, is a natural idea, as material in origin as any other. It finds its roots in the animal nature of man. This is no doubt an affront to the pious fathers of the church, who would endeavour to give religion a heavenly and divine origin. The religious framework is built on the natural feeling of fear characteristic of all animals and inseparable from the natural instincts of self-preservation and survival. In this sense the concept of religious feeling is not strange. But as an idea cultivated by enlightened man, religion appears as a product of the limited and constricted human intellect.

Consequently, as it survives now it is an essentially

human product. It may be that it is the first and still incomplete manifestation which marks the line between animal and human, because it is accompanied by the need to explain all the surrounding natural phenomena, the first distinctive quality of the human being. A cosmic view of all phenomena, of the ceaseless flux of change and development of all matter, living and dead that envelops all things in its natural entirety, is a concept from materialistic scientific thought, and the fruit of many centuries of struggle against ignorance, many years of study, observation, and empirical research.

Logically, no such concept was available for primitive man, with his limited knowledge geared to the daily struggle for survival. But without doubt early man did feel the existence of this universal solidarity, of which he himself was a part, along with the animals. But with this difference, that although they shared a common, instinctive fear of unexplained natural phenomena, man began the search for an explanation of his surroundings. Intellectually ill equipped to do this, primitive man came to animism and the adoration of the unexplained forces and phenomena.

So was laid the beginning of religion in all its forms, from the primitive to the contemporary. From the time man lifted his head from the swamp of fears and demons, history shows us a picture of ignorance slowly retreating, driven away by the light of a slowly advancing knowledge. Will and consciousness are gradually replacing fear, knowledge replaces ignorance, and religion retreats before reason. He who believes does not know. Science takes the place of religion, and the philosopher buries the idea of god.

Man, destroying fear and ignorance, is advancing towards the realization of his liberty, the culminating point the humanizing of the animal-man so that he may stand without a god, without a master - a free man.

The greatest misfortune of this century is the fear of freedom. Our own incapacity to be free man or to respect the freedom of others makes us deny it under the pretext of protecting it. Freedom does not need to be protected, shel[illegible] these are threats to freedom.

AN ANARCHIST LOOKS AT THE LABOUR MOVEMENT.

- N.R.

(The Anarchist Review welcomes this contribution from one who has many years experience of the workers' struggle to his credit as a member of the I.W.W.)

"This is a free country" is quite a commonly used expression among the politically confused workers. The question straight-away arises: "What is freedom?"

When the alarm clock jolts a worker out of his bed in the mornings, he must know that he does not leave his bed of his own free will. When he reaches his place of employment he must punch the bundy clock, which is another check upon his liberty. When he arrives at the work-bench or machine, it is impressed upon his mind that he must work in order to feed himself and his family.

Yes, he can leave his job if he so desires, but he is driven by grim necessity to find another master. He is regimented, controlled, externally disciplined. In fact, he is economically conscripted.

While this system of private ownership of the means of life exists, we are slaves to the master class. Under capitalism we can never be free men. We are in the grip of a relentless system which drives us on and exploits our labour-power for profit.

While one class in society can hold the power of life and death over another class, there can be no real freedom. Both Church and State combine to control our minds and bodies. Superstition and force can have no place in a free society.

There are in Australia several organisations which claim to believe in freedom. Let us have a look at these.

The Australian Labor Party is well known to all. Its record over the past fifty years has been most lamentable, and a great disappointment to thousands of workers. Many have left it in disgust.

There was a time when the Labor Party had a majority in the Federal Parliament, and was in control of the Government

in five States. Surely this should have been the time when "the great Labor Party" could have proved itself to consist of men of character and determination, and been truly representative of the working-class; but to the great amazement of the horny-handed sons of toil they proved themselves to be no better than bourgeois politicians.

Every time the trade union movement demands some action from their political representatives they are palmed off, frustrated, and told: "Give us a chance. Don't embarrass the Government." Never yet has the Labor Party supported a trade union whose members were on strike. But a Labor government has covered itself with ignominy by gaoling strikers. When labor politicians take the oath of allegiance to the Crown, and swear to carry out faithfully "law and order and good government", then the workers' hopes of radical reforms disappear. The politicians are obedient servants to the class state.

Parliament has been the road to emancipation for many labor politicians, and consequently they are not going to do anything that will jeopardise their parasitical lives. They become professional politicians, and will fight like hell to hold their seats at the Parliamentary pie counter. Parliament has always been a happy hunting ground for go-getters, crooks, grafters, and egotistical bounders who are there only for their own personal aggrandizement. Of course, this is the very nature of Parliament, and it would be very foolish of us who understand the real functions of the Government to expect anything else. "He who would be free himself must strike the blow".

The Communist Party is one of the greatest frauds ever inflicted upon the working-class. Throughout all history there has never been another organisation guilty of so much misrepresentation, hypocrisy, deceit, and lies. The very name is a lie. It is not a communist party! It is chiefly concerned with popularising the foreign policy of the Kremlin. It is a conspiritorial organisation working for the overthrow of all democratic institutions and the establishment of a ruthless dictatorship, with the liquidation of all opposition. It is a monolithic party, whose policy must not be questioned. Many Party officials have been murdered for daring to differ from the dictator. The Stalinist purges were a blood-lusting massacre which only a megalomaniac could con-

template. These inhuman atrocities are still justified today by Communist officials.

The Communist platform speakers are propagandists without honour, and present an alluring picture to tickle the ears of their listeners; but never once do they mention the ultimate objective of the Communist Party. It is not what the communist speakers say, but what they leave unsaid where the danger lies. They are frauds and false pretenders. This certainly is one organisation of which the workers should beware. Democrats and dictators must for ever remain implacable enemies. Free men bow down to no-one.

The Trotskyists, of course, are no better. If Trotsky had gained control in Russia he would have been just as big and bloody a monster as Stalin. Power lusting despots can have no place amongst libertarians. No god, no master, is our slogan.

The Socialist Party is pitiful. Quite decent and honest fellows no doubt, but all their socialist propaganda is wasted effort. "We can do nothing," they say, "until we have a majority of socialists in Parliament." Then they will legally and constitutionally legislate for socialism. It all sounds so nice and easy, doesn't it?

If such a miracle were to happen, and the Socialists won a majority in Parliament, how far do they think they could get? Surely they are not so simple as to believe that the combined forces of Capitalism would tamely hand over without a fight! And these Socialists, not being made up of the tough, raw material of the industrial class-war fighters they would, in order to avoid a term behind bars, become tame cat socialists, and faithfully carry out the administration of the Capitalist state. In answer to the rising indignation of the workers who voted for them, they would most likely use the old cry of the Labor governments of the past: "Give us time. Don't embarrass the government."

No parliament, no matter how radical or socialist it may be, could ever achieve any socialist legislation unless it had a strong, active determined, industrial organisation, prepared to use its industrial might in support of such a government. But the industrial unionists might well ask: "Why should we waste our energy inssupporting a government which can let us down, when we have our own big fight on our hands in the indust-

rial arena. The class-war never will be settled in Parliament. Its battle-ground is at the point of production, where wealth is produced and profits are made." Industrial democracy can only be won by the organised industrial workers. It will never be given to them by politicians.

The Trade Union Movement of Australia is more conservative in its outlook than revolutionary. The union officials are job conscious, and are more interested in holding down their well-paid, comfortable jobs than fighting the everyday struggle of their members. Some union officials are just seat-warmers or office boys, and become quite alarmed if some member suggests direct action. Some become bush lawyers, and spend most of their working time in the Arbitration Court. Some become bureaucrats, and others develop into dictators. Most of them believe in class collaboration, and would rather have a nice heart-to-heart talk with the boss than educate the members of their union for workers' control of industry. None of them ever wants to go back to working in industry, and they have no scruples about what they will do in order to keep their position in the union.

If the Trade Union Movement is ever to become a real, live, fighting force in the industrial life of the workers, it must cleanse its ranks of the hangers-on. The class-war is real and brutal, and must be fought to the bitter end. Only then can we enjoy peace, freedom and happiness in a world of plenty.

Anarchists are realists and men of action, not mere dreamers. They are materialists, and want no truck with those who wish to reform a decaying system, and preach morality to the master class.

We advocate international industrial organisation with workers' committees in every sphere of industrial activity, such committees to be based on revolutionary syndicalism.

It is the historic mission of the working class to do away with capitalism. Those engaged in production must organise, not only for the day-to-day struggle against the master class, but in order to carry on production successfully when capitalism is overthrown. By organising thus, we are forming the structure of the new society within the shell of the old. A free society, with voluntary co-operation and every worker enjoying individual liberty is our objective.

HOW I CAME TO THE ANARCHIST POINT OF VIEW.

- K.E.

Reviewing the development of my ideas, I see myself in the past as a Spiritualist, a Tolstoiist, a Socialist, and now as an Anarchist. I feel that it is relevant here to look at these ideas again.

At no stage have I been a blind fanatic, but always searching for truth - the living truth. In the early stage of my search, as a Spiritualist, I was possessed by religious mysticism. From that I evolved to Tolstoiism.

Tolstoiism may be regarded as a kind of spiritualism, but with a firm belief in human goodness. It attacks all political evils, but retains the idea of a god. For this reason a Tolstoiist always remains divided in his mind between the physical and spiritual universes. As a Tolstoiist my mind was restless. Observing life as a whole, I came to have doubts about this philosophy.

I perceived that Tolstoiism satisfies the human emotions as a religion does, but gives no satisfaction to the reasoning mind. Looking for answers to the problems of materialism and spiritualism, I turned to Socialism.

The socialist idea so inspired me, that I devoted all my thought and activity to it. I found many answers to my personal philosophic problems, and freed myself from the mystical approach to life's problems.

It should be said that it took me a long time to accept the socialist idea, because Socialism aims at establishing a classless society, but by two different methods.

Those who are informed about socialism know that there is an authoritarian and an anti-authoritarian socialism. The authoritarian seeks to establish a classless society by seizing the existing institutions of today's society, and it also preserves the idea of political leadership.

On the other hand, anti-authoritarian socialism, which is now called Anarchism, aims at establishing a classless society through the various workers' organisations, and it rejects the principle of political leadership.

The difference therefore is very great. The two versions are contradictory. Authoritarian socialism, by preserving the idea of political leadership is preserving the evil germ of power, from which all the diseases of our present society are derived. It teaches the workers to invest all their confidence in their leaders, and they wait for the leaders to carry out the tremendous task of transforming the present society into a classless one. As their first task in the class struggle, the workers are directed to vote, and in the election booth they give away their responsibility.

The anti-authoritarian socialism, or Anarchism, aims to establish a classless society through the destruction of the principle of political leadership; instead there is individual responsibility within the workers' organisations.

The main aim of Anarchism is that the toiling people may have confidence in themselves; that they realise that the task of achieving a classless, harmonious society is the task of the workers themselves.

To an Anarchist it is clear that no politician is capable of contributing to the struggle for a new society. Once a man becomes a politician, he enters the camp of different minded people - no longer is he at one with the worker. The economic, political and psychological factors which then enter are overwhelming, and he ceases to be a worker; and there is no cure for the power disease.

Anarchism is the rejection of authority, and the investing of all power into the various workers' organisations. In these organisations the individual - each individual - is an active worker, very conscious of his responsibilities to the community as a whole.

Anarchism proves that a free society is possible, and can be established by free men. By free men I mean men free from all kinds of prejudice, superstition, ignorance, intolerance, vanity, and from the urge for political power. Such men are understanding people; they are capable of understanding human nature, and they respect every individual as an equal partner in society. The starting point for the achieving of an Anarchist society is man, healthy and full of vitality, with a clear mind.

Man has to liberate himself from the mental and physical

burden imposed on him by the existing institutions - and the Anarchist philosophy says that he can. When a man feels inner freedom, he feels the desire and the capability to do something good for others. He feels an urge to help others help themselves. He is active in helping others to become free, because he knows that his freedom depends on the freedom of others. He realizes that "no man is an island", and that human happiness is impossible in isolation and loneliness, that it can never be built on the unhappiness of others.

These personal qualities are very essential to every free man, for from them derives an inexhaustable fund of courage and initiative. All beautifying features are innate in man. Their origin is not divine.

Anarchist ethics supply us with rich material to show that man is capable of being the happiest creature on earth, without seeking divine aid. A healthy mind needs no mystery, only a sick one needs this support or hiding place.

I have left the other philosophies behind me, because none of them begins with free men. Not one of them trusts the individual's self-guidance. They all introduce some external power to direct his life.

To me it seems that Anarchist philosophy is the only philosophy which treats man as a human being. The Anarchist idea is an idea of integrity. It meets human aspirations, and is as broad as life itself. No other philosophy offers a better solution to social problems. That we have not yet achieved an anarchist relationship in society is because our society is diseased with the power germ. It is our task to eradicate this.

Anarchism offers a solution to the problems of political and economic justice, depending on cooperation rather than power and force. Anarchism frees man from heavenly and earthly gods. It offers him his own strength, that he may live his life fearlessly and with dignity.

"Want of liberty, by strengthening law and decorum, stupefies conscience". - Emerson.

A N A R C H I S T M O R A L I T Y.

- J.M.

The anarchist philosophy is based upon man's inherent instinct towards mutual aid.

The idea of a natural law of mutual aid was first expressed scientifically by Darwin in his "The Descent of Man". The concept was further developed by Professor Kesslor, a dean of St. Petersburg University. At a Russian Scientific Congress in 1880, Kesslor presented a paper on the law of mutual aid. He died a year later and after his death Peter Kropotkin became familiar with his work and further developed the theory of the law of mutual aid.

This natural law is the foundation of human morality. We should not confuse this law with love or with sympathy, for when human ethics are based on love and sympathy alone they have invariably contributed to a shallow, narrow comprehension of the moral feeling as a whole.

Kropotkin illustrates this point with admirable simplicity: "It is not love of my neighbour, whom I often do not know at all, which induces me to seize a pail of water and rush toward his house when I see it is on fire; it is a far greater even though more vague feeling or instinct of human solidarity and sociability which moves me". He goes on to say: "Love, sympathy and self-sacrifice certainly play an immense part in the development of our moral feelings, but it is not love and not even sympathy upon which society is based in mankind. It is the consciousness - be it only at a stage of instinct - of human solidarity. It is the unconscious recognition of the force that is borrowed by each man from the practice of mutual aid, of the close dependency of everyone's happiness upon the happiness of all - and of the sense of justice or equity which brings the individual to consider the rights of every other individual as equal to his own. Upon this broad and necessary foundation the still higher moral feelings are developed."

Let us see what Kropotkin means when he cites justice, equality, individual rights, not as moral fulfillment, but simply a foundation upon which the still higher moral feelings are developed. He can only mean the assumption of an individual moral responsibility toward the well-being of every individual in the universe - and the freedom to exercise this res-

ponsibility. Can you possibly conceive of a world in which every person is assuming an effective responsibilty for your well-being, and you for theirs? This application of a definite natural law is the morality of anarchy.

We know it cannot be achieved so long as there is capitalism, because of the corruption inherent in capitalism. We know it can not be achieved so long as there is government because of the corruption inherent therein.

Therefore, we advocate a system in which there is no capitalism, no government, and no money. Anarcho-syndicalism is the structure through which such a society can be developed and maintained.

Yet, anarcho-syndicalism cannot function without a moral revolution. The revolution in morality cannot come until millions of people commit themselves to the assumption of individual moral responsibilty, to the struggle for a society in which they will find the freedom to exercise such an effective moral responsibility.

So, in effect, there can be no anarchist society without individual moral responsibility. Until there is an anarchist society, there can be a partially effective but not a totally effective individual morality.

Let me say in conclusion that they who seriously commit themselves to the anarchist cause and strive to live by anarchist principles are working towards the highest degree of moral evolution.

"We are suffering from an excess of rules, of barriers, of signposts, of interference, both subtle and violent. From the time we are born we are poured in the mould of the eternal conventionalisms. The phantoms of fear, warnings, threats and punishments are with us to the grave. All of the political constitutions, statutes and codes of laws have been tried....We have lost our spontaneity, frankness, sincerity and nobility. Man, the first animal to stand upright on his feet has forgotten how to look his fellow man in the eye. Fascism and Communism are finishing this destructive process. We must be anarchists to be free."

- I.A.F.

SYDNEY ANARCHIST GROUP

An affiliate of the International Working Men's Association.

AIMS AND PRINCIPLES.

THE SYDNEY ANARCHIST GROUP seeks to establish a free society, which will render impossible the growth of a privileged class and the exploitation of man by man. The S.A.G. therefore advocates common ownership and workers' control of the land, industry, and all means of production and distribution, on the basis of voluntary co-operation. In such a society the wage system, finance and money shall be abolished and goods produced and distributed not for profit, but according to human needs.

CLASS STUGGLE. The interests of the working class and the ruling class are directly opposed. The S.A.G. is based upon the inevitable day-to-day struggle of the workers against those who own and control the means of production and distribution, and will continue that struggle until common ownership and workers' control are achieved.

DIRECT ACTION. Victory in the fight against class domination can only be achieved by the direct action of the workers themselves. The S.A.G. rejects all parliamentary and similar activities as deflecting the workers from the class struggle into paths of class collaboration.

THE STATE. The State in all its forms is the enemy of the workers and can not exist within a classless society. The S.A.G. does not, therefore, hope to use the State to achieve the emancipation of the working class; it does not seek to obtain seats in the Cabinet or Parliament. Nor does it desire to build a new state on the ruins of the old. Any attempt, by an allegedly working class party to create a new State can only result in a new ruling class.

ORGANISATION. To achieve these aims, the workers must organise. They must replace the hundreds of craft and general trade unions by syndicalist industrial unions. As an immediate step to that end, the S.A.G. aids the formation of workers' committees in factories, mines, offices, shipyards, mills, and other places of work, and their development into industrial unions, federated to an all-national Federation of Labour.

INTERNATIONALISM. The S.A.G. stands firm for international working class solidarity.