

There is little need of eye contact or to be aware of unfolding surroundings. Many drivers absent-mindedly cruise along having surrendered their own judgement to a set of regulations. Thought gets reduced to formula and judgement is replaced by obedience. Roads, overloaded with signs, have replaced the need for human values and common sense.

The cause of most of the trouble lies in the obsessional desire for speed. Vehicles hurtle around the streets only inches from pedestrians. Motor cars are so central to the organisation of society that it's almost sacrilege to imagine a world moving on a different scale of values. After all, why is it necessary to travel from Leeds to Manchester in forty minutes rather than three hours? The faster we go the more our peripheral vision is reduced and the more our attention span is limited. Speed kills more than bodies. It kills off basic respect for others. Road rage – the side effect of congested territory and speed – is merely anger without consequences: those that drive slower than us are dickheads and anyone who overtakes us is a maniac.

Busy car parks ably demonstrate that motorists can manoeuvre between each other in reasonable comfort. Those times when traffic signals fail are moments when drivers exercise caution and eye contact. In all areas of reduced speed and minimal regulation motorists are measurably more alert than they are let loose on the highway. Once the controls are removed people resort to ordinary everyday judgement and are capable of working things out for themselves. Pedestrians on crowded pavements have long established codes of conduct in order to pass between each other. It works successfully because it's all done on a human scale.

The interests of bureaucracy do not lie in the direction of increasing human autonomy. Bureaucratic solutions to organisation always demean the personal responsibility of the individual. The State has no contract with you to engage with duty or civic pride. It treats citizens as recalcitrant adolescents. Accordingly we should not be surprised to find so much anger on our motorised journeys.

We inhabit a world of extreme regulation where progress seems possible only through more regulation. Speeding vehicles are strangling the country. Their emissions threaten

everything. Yet the greater part of the economy is dependent upon the continuing growth of these fearsome machines.

I propose that the quality of everyone's lives can be positively enhanced by the *removal* of restrictions. I look forward to a world where traffic moves around on a human scale of conveyance. A world where giant roundabouts are transformed into allotments or grazing points for zebras. To a time when we abandon the illusion that we need speed and even more speed. To a world where people set about dismantling all the mandatory street furniture that has such a negative impact on our environment.

Anarchists have much to contribute to society by questioning the need for abstract regulations. And so many questions abound. What would be the effect of removing the social control element from education by making all school attendance voluntary? If it were recognised that people were simply free to put what they wished into their own bodies, what would happen to the present corrupt drugs-war? And if all bureaucracy were suddenly dumped from medical practice would health care improve or would it diminish?

We live in desperate times. The value of liberty is continually being devalued by the cosmetic freedoms of the Market State. Weighed down by rules and regulation the hapless citizen probably ticks along at 10% of his or her potential. Little wonder that so many just learn to play the rules of the game and make use of them in order to lead a comfortable life. Creativity can be left to the misfits. And these misfits keep on asking the big questions.

Peter Good

FRIENDS OF TOTAL LIBERTY

The Match! A Journal of Ethical Anarchism; Post office Box 3012, Tucson, Arizona 85702 USA \$2.75 Send cash or stamps only.

Global Tapestry: A journal celebrating Anarchism and poetry £2.40 per issue. Subscription £9.00 UK (cheques payable to DA & R Cunliffe) available from Spring Bank, Longsight Road, Copster Green, Blackburn BB1 9EU

Green Anarchist: Available from 9 Ash Avenue, Galgate, Lancaster. Subscriptions £10 for 5 issues. Make cheques payable to Green Anarchist.

The Voluntaryist: P O Box 1275, Gramling SC 29348 USA. Edited by Carl Watner. \$20.00 for six issues.

Freedom: from Freedom Press, in Angel Alley, 84b Whitechapel High Street, London E1 7QX. 50p per issue,

Imagine: A sceptical journal of philosophy and politics. \$3.50 or subscription \$5.00 from P.O. Box 8145, Reno, NV 89507 USA

Any Time Now: Anarchist decentralist magazine edited by Dick Martin with regular contributions from Larry Gambone. Subscription by donation to ATN, Affinity Place, Argenta, B.C., Canada (V0G 1B0)

The Cunningham Amendment
The Journal of the East Pennine Anarcrisps. Dedicated to revolutionary acts of joy and irreverence in a world increasingly weighed down by sterile bureaucracies. Send donation (suggest £1.00) to 1005 Huddersfield Road, Bradford BD12 8LP West Yorkshire.

The Dandelion (Individualist Anarchist)
Subscriptions are \$9.00 to people outside the USA. Available from Michael Coughlin Post Office Box Number 205, Cornucopia, Wisconsin 54327 USA.

The Individual published by the Society for Individual Freedom 6 Swan Terrace, Hastings TN34 3HT

The Free Press Death Ship published by Violet Jones P O Box 55336, Hayward CA 94545, USA

TOTAL LIBERTY SUBSCRIPTIONS

Subscriptions for *Total Liberty* are available at £8.00 per 4 issues (£5.00 for low-income). *Total Liberty* currently appears twice a year, but aspires to appear on a quarterly basis. *Total Liberty* is a non-profit making venture.

Send cash, stamps or postal orders made payable to J P Simcock to *Total Liberty*, 47 High Street, Belper, Derby DE56 1GF. Some editorials from previous issues of TL are available on the TL website, which is at

http://mysite.freemove.com/total_liberty1
TL can be contacted by email at ain@ziplip.com

Total Liberty

A Journal of Evolutionary Anarchism

Volume 3

Number 4

Spring / Summer 2003

£1.00

CONTENTS

Editorial	Page 2
Defining It by Steve Booth	Page 2
The Origins of Authoritarianism by Larry Gambone	Page 3
Individualist Anarchism v. Communist Anarchism and Libertarianism by Wendy McElroy	Page 6
The Answer Lies in the Soil: Who Owns Britain reviewed by Colin Johnson	Page 11
Terrorism and War & Perpetual War for Perpetual Peace reviewed by Joe Peacott	Page 12
Lost Civilisations of the Stone Age reviewed by Richard Alexander	Page 14
Trafficking with Anarchists by Peter Good	Page 15
Friends of Total Liberty	Page 16
Subscription Details	Page 16



Editorial

In the Spring / Summer 2002 edition of Total Liberty I asked, in the context of discussing the possibility of creating a popular opposition to Government and State, ...“what horrific level of level of death and destruction heaped upon defenceless civilians before we see millions of people on the streets of Western European and American cities?”

I now have an answer. The prospect of an American and British Government war on Iraq has been enough to provoke world-wide demonstrations against the war. Demonstrations which within Britain saw as many as two million people on the streets of London on February 15th 2003.

Increasingly people are becoming aware that Governments, States and

Corporations and their accompanying wars against humanity are themselves the worst crime which we can imagine. We have no illusions that such Leviathans as the American, British or European military, industrial corporate machines can be quickly dismantled, but the strength and size of the world-wide opposition to war, is a hopeful sign that millions of people can see through the propaganda, distortions and lies spun by Governments and Corporations and see the common humanity which links us all. Out of this we hope to see grow a new movement to create *Freedom and Justice* for all. Anarchists have a positive role to play in such a movement, lending support and help where we can, and also providing a different vision to the stale and tired formulas of mainstream politics. A practical vision, supported at the

community level by the experience of the realistic grass roots level projects so many of us are involved in. We are not mere street corner paper sellers, we are not merely disaffected people, the *usual suspects* who go on demonstrations. We are engaged in a movement for change which also includes single issue campaigns as well as voluntary organisations for a wide variety of purposes: cultural events, education, allotment associations, community groups, co-ops, community papers. These are all prime examples of people working in their own streets and neighbourhoods to bring power back to ordinary people and out of the hands of the gangster politicians who create wars.

JPS

DEFINING IT

Steve Booth

‘So the Bird is gone and in the outer world he cooks,
Men like me will always have the Bird in their music, paintings, and books.’

-Ted Joans

One of the foundations of anarchism is the fact that we are explorers, and seek out freedom. When I was eight or so, I went off on my bicycle, exploring the lanes round the Lancashire - Cheshire border where we lived. Later, with my father, we went cycling on tours round England. For me, another aspect of this exploration is jazz. I don't know how it was that I got into jazz music, all the other lads in school were into Genesis, Black Sabbath or that Melanie, but not me, most of that stuff passed me by, and I was listening to Benny Goodman, Charlie Barnett, Glenn Miller, Jack Teagarden, Mugsy Spanier, Eddie Condon, Hoagy Carmichael. I guess at that stage I didn't really know very much about jazz and what I had was just haphazardly encountered. Back then (in the early 1970s) there used to be a radio

programme on Sunday nights, with Peter Clayton, and there was Humphrey Lyttleton sometime in the week, and this was all I really heard of it.

Then I left home and went in the RAF, and there I discovered Bebop, and Charlie Parker. I'm not exactly sure how it was, but I think it was late one Friday night in the Summer of 1977, and we were watching TV in our block at Cosford. It was some incomprehensible black and white French film about bored teenagers who stole jazz records, and there may have been some stuff about Existentialism in there too - something else far away and incomprehensible - and the records they stole, which formed the soundtrack, were Charlie Parker's.

I discovered you could go into pubs and listen to jazz - one I went to was the Royal Oak at Bishops Wood (not far from the Boscobel Oak that King Charles II hid in) and this was trad jazz. Trad and pubs, trad and drinking pints of beer on long hot summer evenings seem to go together. Yet it always seemed to me that Charlie Parker must be the centre of what jazz really is, the

core of it. It isn't something that you can easily describe or explain in words. There's this black man, Bird, and he plays the alto saxophone, and he was only 35 when he died. He is one of those sort of people who so profoundly affected the world around them that history is divided into before and after, rather like before Hiroshima and after Hiroshima, or before the internet and after, before steam trains, before printing, after 11th September ...

The thing that really hits you when you hear Parker playing for the first time is the sheer speed of him. The music they play is called 'Bebop' and it is like a secret language. The Bebop musicians took jazz standards like 'How High The Moon' and lifted or altered their harmonic structures, rhythms, and chord changes. Then they wrote complex new melody lines to replace the old, and renamed the tunes - Anthropology, Ornithology, Groovin High. The cracking thing about this is you can listen to the early Bebop records and it is obvious that when they race through the statement of the theme at the beginning

of the record, they can't wait to get through it to begin to tear it all down again and rebuild it differently. Parker stops soloing and Dizzy Gillespie comes in right behind him with hardly a fag paper between their sounds. There is a passionate enthusiasm to it all, just the kind of thing we need in our own activities now, if we are to succeed.

Bebop was born between shows, with bored swing era musicians tired of all the riffs (musical patterns played over and over again). They played in after hours clubs like Mintons, and Clark Monroe's Uptown House in Harlem. You can get lo-fi records made from the wire spool tape recordings of these jam sessions, with people like the guitarist Charlie Christian on them. At the time, (during the latter half of WW2) the American Federation of Musicians (AFM) union was in dispute over recording royalties, and there was a recording ban, which meant that very little of the early Bebop got recorded. Dinah Washington has a record protesting against this, I think called 'Recording Date Blues'.

Records exist made from radio shows where Bop musicians play to raise money for war bonds. At the end of the show they play the '52nd Street Theme', while the announcer tries to encourage listeners to buy war bonds or something, and it is clear the musicians themselves are at war with the philistine, and are trying to blow him away. He thanks the president of the AFM, James C Petrillo, for permission to record the show, but at the end concedes defeat with 'If you can still hear me, this is the Mutual Broadcasting System' while Bird and Diz chase each other with their exuberant flurries of notes away to the fade.

Relations between the musicians and disc jockeys were not always like that, Lester Young wrote 'Jumping With Symphony Sid' dedicated to a popular radio show presenter. With Parker there is this sense that something mysterious is going on, that the frontiers of the possible are being pushed back. There is a similar sense of the unique with Billie Holiday, instantly recognizable from the cracked timbre of her voice. If Parker is the archetypal jazz musician, Billie is the voice of jazz.

While I was writing this, Janey and I were talking it over, and we got out the book about Billie, and looked up how she came to record the 'Strange Fruit' protest song against the lynching of black people in the southern part of the United States. An unknown poet called Lewis Allen wrote it, a small specialist label tied to a New York record shop, Milt Gabler's 'Commodore' courageously recorded it. To do this at that time (1939) must have been extremely difficult. There was and only ever could be one Lady Day.

What exactly are they doing though? How do we define 'it'? This remains the puzzle. You can hear it, you can sense it, but you can't really explain it in words, only experience it. A woman once reportedly asked Fats Waller to define swing, and he said 'Lady, if you gotta ask, you ain't got it...' There are moments of breakthrough, for example Bird's break on 'Night in Tunisia' - impossibly hot and fast, soaring high above everything else; but you can listen to records by Lennie Tristano, where the thing has cooled down, and you can sort of hear what it is. Tristano was blind, and did not make many records, but it is

the interplay between his piano, the saxophone of Lee Konitz, and the guitar of Billy Bauer. It is not exactly telepathy, more to do with the fact these musicians have obviously played together often, and know what the other one is going to play. It is about the structure of the thing, and the way they dovetail together. Sometimes Tristano plays a fast descending run, and Bauer hits a chord right in the middle of it. Sometimes it is a melody line which passes from one instrument to another. Sometimes it is the way a musical statement is repeated, altered or replied to. Often, with Tristano, it is contrapuntal - the way they play two melody lines which sometimes go together, sometimes clash, where one line goes up, the other one down, and the way they weave together like tapestry.

Coming back to myself though, and discovering all this incredible stuff out there, I sometimes think how it was back then, as a teenager, buying the records in the Parrot record shop in Ipswich. The past is inaccessible, a door that is no longer open to us. Why is it that people go down one road rather than another? I think we are basically explorers, and we seek new areas of knowledge, try to push back the frontiers. But I don't think I've even come close to explaining what 'it' is. There are a few lines by Eliot which are interesting [Little Gidding]

'We shall not cease from exploration
And the end of all our exploring
Will be to arrive where we started
And know the place for the first time.'

THE ORIGINS OF AUTHORITARIANISM

Larry Gambone

Libertarians have long discussed the origins of authoritarianism and how it manifests in the personality as an emotional disease. Some have attempted to explain the authoritarian personality by showing how authority arose through the development of the state and hierarchy. Others have sought the root cause in the rise of organised religion. While these explanations might be valuable in

understanding the development of authority per se, they do not adequately explain how authoritarianism replicates itself in the individual. Religious and governmental brainwashing does not explain the existence of the authoritarian personality among non-believers or where the state is weak.

Wilhelm Reich found a probable cause in sexual repression, and this was a major step forward. Reich showed how

the extreme sexual repression practiced in Germany in the late 19th and early 20th Century created a basis for the rise of Nazism. He also noted this repression existed in all other Western nations, giving rise to dysfunctional personalities. But this is only a partial explanation. Contemporary Western society is vastly less sexually repressive than it was in Reich's day, yet the authoritarian personality persists. It does so to a lesser

degree than previously, but it has not declined to the same extent as has sexual repression. It is not uncommon to find people who are liberal sexually, yet authoritarian in other attitudes. As well, psychologists see the roots of our emotional and psychological problems stemming from our earliest childhood. Since sexuality really blossoms forth at puberty, there has to be a further, deeper explanation for the authoritarian personality disorder than just sexual repression.

Freud came close to an explanation very early in his career when he discovered incest to be the cause of hysteria suffered by his female patients. This attack on the Victorian paterfamilias almost cost him his job, so he retracted and invented a metaphorical incest – the Oedipus Complex. This was also a form of “blaming the victim”. Rather than the father desiring the child, it was the child (filthy, wicked creature!) who had the incestuous desires.

Throughout the 20th Century ever greater evidence accrued among child psychologists, educators and social reformers, that verbal and emotional abuse and corporal punishment had negative effects upon the emotional, social and intellectual development of children. They began to advocate a humane approach to child rearing. The pieces of the puzzle were coming together, but it would have to wait until the 1980's before someone saw the whole picture.

Alice Miller, a Swiss psychologist, wrote *THE DRAMA OF THE GIFTED CHILD* in 1979 and caused a revolution in the thinking about children, the family and the authoritarian personality. The key to understanding our lives is to understand the “conflictual experiences” of early childhood that remain hidden and repressed. Childhood is in a certain sense the longest period of our lives, as we carry what was done to us by our parents with us throughout our lives. The root cause of the authoritarian personality must lie in early childhood.

While physical brutality, the order of the day 100 years ago, has declined, emotional abuse is still general. Parents are not even aware they are damaging their child. All small children are narcissistic and cannot be expected to act like adults. They must experience the full range of their emotions, within the bounds of their personal safety.

Repression of these emotions leads to emotional ill health later in life. Parents force the child to act in ways beneficial to the adult, to be a “convenient child”. This accommodation to parental needs creates a “false self” as the child “...develops in such a way that he reveals only what is expected of him... (engendering) a partial killing of potential when all that was alive and spontaneous (was) cut off.” (1) What is needed is a “healthy narcissism” – a sense of self-worth rooted in the free expression of the child's emotions. The



feelings and emotions of children and adolescents are extremely powerful, which is why “they cannot be repressed without serious consequences”, for “the stronger the prisoner, the thicker the walls have to be.” (2) (Miller also likens the average family to a concentration camp.) This repression of emotions, this denial of the true self she calls the “narcissistic wound” and the “...greatest of narcissistic wounds (is) not to have been loved just as one truly was...” by one's parents. (3)

The primary need allowing a child to grow up in emotional health is for her to be respected “as the person she really is at any time.” (4) A child raised in an atmosphere of respect and tolerance creates individuation. This healthy narcissism leads to a healthy self-feeling and thus self esteem. A child raised in repression, on the other hand, has a “...concealed inner chamber ... in which the props of his childhood drama are to be found. These props may be his secret delusion, a secret perversion,... or the unmastered aspects of his childhood suffering.” (5)

The parent's own narcissistic wound causes them to in turn wound their child. A mother, who was never respected as the child she was by her mother, will in turn attempt to force this respect from her child. Thus the cycle of repression is passed on from generation to generation. As Miller states, “...how inconceivable it is to really love others (not merely to need them) if one cannot love oneself as one really is. And how could a person do that if from the very beginning she has no chance to experience her true feelings and learn to know herself?” (6)

Children are always difficult for narcissistically wounded parents. “Often a child's very gifts, (intensity of feeling, intelligence, quickness, ability to be critical) will confront his parents with conflicts (long) kept at bay with rules and regulations. The rules and regulations must be rescued at the cost of the child's development...proud parents may destroy what is best in their child as a result of their own distress.” (7) Thus, the ubiquitous emphasis on “rules and regulations” is not necessarily rooted in a real need, but in parental neurosis.

Bottled up inside us from early childhood is the anger we felt and still feel as a result of emotional repression. This is known as Narcissistic Rage and while it ought to be directed toward the authors of the repression, usually it is not. One forgives one's parents, romanticizes one's upbringing and when the rage surfaces it will be directed at our children, spouse or the “Other” - Jews, ethnic groups, women, capitalists, poor people, and any scapegoat you choose to name. Here is the root cause of bullies and the sadists. Having contempt for the smaller and weaker is a compensation for the feelings of helplessness that one had as a child and still has. Miller points out how all the terrible despots, such as Hitler, Stalin, Mao, suffered from severe abuse as children. Their monstrous crimes were compensations for their exceedingly low self esteem. So too, with criminals such as serial killers and serial rapists.

In order to compensate for the poor self-concept engendered by the narcissistic wound, the abused individual creates grandiose fantasies. These fantasies will be way out of line with what the person could accomplish even with a high amount of self-esteem. Grandiosity alternates with depression

as these schemes either come to naught or lead to disaster. Rage and grandiosity can lead people to enlist in authoritarian political and religious cults. The cult has a ready made explanation for one's unhappiness and anger – it's all the fault of Satan or the capitalists. The abused person's weak self-concept is inflated by being “saved” and thinking the rest of humanity will burn in Hell. Or they might pretend they are revolutionaries armed with The Truth who in no time will transform the world into an Earthly Paradise.

We must guard against these cults and their false salvation. It is “necessary today for the individual to find his support within himself, if he is not to become the victim of various interests and ideologies.” We have a need to “constantly build up new illusions and denials” to avoid the painful reality of our lives. (8) Youth often rebel and adopt ideas contrary to those of their parents. However, there is little satisfaction to be found in those new ideals, “since this attempt is not rooted in awareness of true needs and feelings, (the rebel) accepts and conforms to the new ideals in a similar way ...in relation to his parents. The rebel denies his true self in order to be accepted.” (9) Thus we have an explanation for the often extreme authoritarianism found among our would-be liberators, including some supposed anarchists. Their politics is ultimately rooted in past repression and not “the love of humanity.”

Authoritarianism is rooted in the repression of the small child. This is the key element in building an authoritarian personality. The repressed child, later as an adult, passes this repression on to her child. This same adult repressed child, unaware of the roots of her suffering, is now open to authoritarian ideas and movements. Hence, sexual repression, racism and sexism will be part of this personality disorder. Such people will respond positively to demands of authority. Rather than reacting with scepticism, they will eagerly embrace wars, “witch hunts” and totalitarian mass movements. Someone used to denying “one's truth” as well as suppressing innate curiosity and criticism, will be open to propaganda and never question those “above” them.

Raising future generations of children in emotionally healthy environments will

weaken the hold that illegitimate authority has over the populace. People with authoritarian personalities will find themselves increasingly marginalised. Those who seek to dominate others will be ridiculed as Neanderthals. To a certain extent this has already happened. Most middle class people in North America born after 1940 were raised on the works of Doctor Spock and other humanistic child psychologists. These are the people that refused to fight in Viet Nam and they and their children are struggling to stop the latest criminal madness, Gulf War II. These same generations have fought against racism, sexism and environmental destruction. They regard the government, the media, corporations and all the other self-styled authorities with distrust. These are signs of mental health.

But these changes are not enough. We need a massive effort to eradicate the idea that it is rightful to repress a child's emotions and undermine its self-concept. However, we do not wish to add to the powers of the state. Rather than instituting new laws and bureaucracies, the Proudhonian notion of contract could be used. In all countries of the developed world, there are various forms of co-operative and state-provided health care. It would be a simple matter to insist that would-be parents, providing they want to use the ‘free’ health care services for birthing, take an in-depth parenting course. This course would teach them non-repressive means of child rearing and provide them with reference material. To make the matter even more serious, they would sign a contract with their unborn child stipulating that they must provide the child with a nurturing, non-repressive, self-esteem building environment. Failure to do so would be breach of contract and the child could then demand compensation from its parents.

A second aspect would be to encourage schools to teach an elementary psychology course – which might be worked into the curriculum in Sex Ed., or in the sort of course that used to be called ‘Citizenship’ or ‘Guidance.’ (Such a course would also be good to counter bullying.) There, among other things, they would learn the dangers of abuse and how to recognize it. When they started having

offspring of their own, they would already have some notion of healthy child rearing practices.

We must eradicate the notion that punishment is desirable as a corrective means and revenge is justified. While many people now question the need to punish children, most still regard it as righteous when applied to adult deviates. “Justice” usually boils down to revenge – calls to “make them suffer for what they did!” Such attitudes only barbarise society and maintain a level of authoritarianism and repression that allows for the abuse of children. People must come to realize the root cause of adult deviation lies in the repression endured when young. We must learn from Native People with their concept of reconciliation rather than punishment. We must seek to heal, rather than destroy. Finally, we need to promote true individualism. Society will not return to the collectivism found in the Middle Ages or in tribal communities. Liberation is not to be found in drowning oneself in cults, ideologies or consumerism. WE HAVE THE RIGHT TO BE WHO WE REALLY ARE.

FOOTNOTES

1. Miller, Alice, *THE DRAMA OF THE GIFTED CHILD*, Basic Books, 1990, p. 12
2. *ibid*, p. 54
3. *ibid*, p.85
4. *ibid*, p. 7
5. *Ibid*, p.25
6. *ibid* Introduction p. xix
7. *Ibid*, p.97
8. *ibid*, p.101
9. *Ibid*, p.60

Quote...unquote

Anarchism in all its guises is an assertion of human dignity and responsibility. It is not a programme for political change but an act of social self-determination.

Colin Ward

Individualist Anarchism v. Communist Anarchism and Libertarianism

Wendy McElroy

I considered entitling this "Individualist Anarchism, Nowhere at Home" but I realized in time that alienation as a political theory has been done already by Karl Marx. If I had used that title, however, the point I would have been making is that the two movements which seem to be natural homes of individualist anarchism -- libertarianism (for which it used to be a synonym) and the anarchist tradition (of which it is a subset) -- are now uncomfortable places. This wasn't always true.

For example, although the Workingman's International (that touchstone of 19th century radical chic) is usually associated with Marxism, the First International consisted largely of Bakuninists (communist anarchists) and individualist anarchists. In other words, individualist anarchism as a radical political philosophy was taken seriously back then by other anarchists; it had credentials behind its name. This credibility came basically from two things. First, it came from the almost herculean efforts of libertarian figures such as Benjamin Tucker, who were not only active in labour organisation but who were also responsible for the input of new, dynamic theory into anarchism, for example by translating the works of Max Stirner. In short, individualist anarchism had life and motion.

Secondly and, I think, more significantly, the credibility came from points of theory which individualist anarchism used to share with communist anarchism. Over the last century, however, the theory of individualist anarchism has changed dramatically and it has drifted far away from the other schools of anarchism: by which I mean communist anarchism, anarcho-syndicalism, and Christian anarchism.

The main school I will be contrasting with individualism is communist anarchism -- the theory of which I'll go into shortly. But I want to take a minute to comment on the syndicalist and Christian anarchism since I won't be

discussing them in any detail. Anarcho-syndicalism is theoretically close to communist anarchism even though, historically, there has been hostility between them. The hostility is largely the result of the anarcho-syndicalist belief that change should come through a reorganisation of labour into a loose federation of collectively owned and operated factories whereas communist anarchists advocated other means. In other words, they both wanted an anarchistic worker's society, but they disagreed on how it was possible to get there. The most popular example of an American anarcho-syndicalist organisation is the early I.W.W. [Industrial Workers of the World], also known as the Wobblies.

Christian anarchism, as a movement, is usually attributed to Leo Tolstoy and its name is fairly self-explanatory. Christian anarchism does not recognize the right to use violence for any purpose. It is a type of pacifism and its rejection of the use of force in self defense is the most significant difference it has with individualist anarchism. Generally speaking, however, Christian and individualist anarchism get along quite well and Tolstoy's work used to be advertised for sale in Benjamin Tucker's *Liberty*, the main forum of individualist anarchism in the late 19th Century.

As I mentioned before, in the days of Tucker individualist anarchism and libertarianism used to be synonymous. The schism occurred because the meaning of libertarianism has undergone separate changes which have taken it in a different direction so that the goals and strategy of libertarianism are often antagonistic to individualist anarchism.

These are the two points around which my speech revolves and to which I will return: changes within the theory of individualist anarchism that have alienated it from other forms of the philosophy; and, changes within libertarianism that have made it antagonistic to individualist anarchism.

But, first, I want to give you some background on individualist anarchism so you have the inestimable benefit of knowing what I am talking about.

In 1833, the American libertarian Josiah Warren began publishing *The Peaceful Revolutionist* which was perhaps the first anarchist periodical and certainly the first individualist anarchist one. Warren didn't call himself an anarchist; in fact, no one used that word very much, except as a term of opprobrium to hurl at an opponent, until Pierre-Joseph Proudhon applied it to himself and made it "honourable." Nevertheless, it is clear that Warren was an anarchist. He called for a voluntary society organised around the individual as the basic unit. His approach was expressed in a report he wrote of the libertarian community, *Utopia*, in the May 1848 issue of *The Peaceful Revolutionist*. Warren wrote: "Throughout the whole of our operations . . . everything has been conducted so nearly upon the Individual basis that not one meeting for legislation has taken place. No Organisation, no indefinite delegated power, no "Constitutions," no "laws" or "bye [sic] laws," "rules" or "regulations" but such as each individual makes for himself and his own business." Now, the two key ideas in Warren's philosophy which became the two key concepts of individualist anarchism for over a century were the Sovereignty of the Individual, and Cost is the Limit of Price or the labour theory of value.

Sovereignty of the Individual is fairly self-descriptive and more commonly goes under the label of self-ownership which was the term used by the anti-slavery crusader and libertarian William Lloyd Garrison, a contemporary of Warren. Sovereignty of the Individual or self-ownership refers to the moral claim that every human being has to his or her own body. As Warren expressed it in his book, *Practical Details*:

... "Society must be so converted as to preserve the SOVEREIGNTY OF

EVERY INDIVIDUAL inviolate. That it must avoid all combinations and connections of persons and interests, and all other arrangements which will not leave every individual at all times at liberty to dispose of his or her person, and time, and property in any manner in which his or her feelings or judgment may dictate, WITHOUT INVOLVING THE PERSONS OR INTERESTS OF OTHERS..."

Now, self-ownership is still fairly common in libertarianism, although, as electoral politics prevails, the principle's popularity seems to be on the decline. Individualist anarchism opposes -- as libertarianism used to -- the very idea of anyone holding a position of unjust (that is, undelegated) power over someone else's life. It opposes anyone holding political office. There is a great tension between saying on one hand "your peaceful actions are sacrosanct and no one else's business", while on the other hand attempting to place someone in a position of unjust power over those activities. And the concept which is being stretched out of shape by this tension is self-ownership, Sovereignty of the Individual.

The second mainstay of 19th century individualist anarchism was Cost the Limit of Price, a version of the labour theory of value. This theory states that value results from labour and can come from nowhere else. If I work to produce something and sell it for \$1.00, it is assumed that I have received the full, just value of my labour. However, if an entrepreneur who paid me \$1.00 turns around and sells the product for \$1.50, the question arises: where did the extra 50 cents, the extra value come from? Since all values under my theory comes from labour and since I provided all the labour that went into the product, the extra 50 cents of value obviously represents my labour which the entrepreneur (read capitalist) stole by giving me less than the full value of what my labour produced. In other words, profit is theft. Or as Sam Konkin put it so well in his last S.L.L. talk, the labour theory of value recognizes no distinction between profit and plunder. As another example, imagine that \$1.00 is the just reward of my labour and I lend that dollar to you on the condition that I receive back \$1.10 at the end of a year. Where did the 10 cents come from? Certainly not from my labour since I have already been paid in full. The 10

cents must result from your labour which I am stealing through interest. All profit was theft. Not metaphorically, but literally theft and the fact that people willingly paid interest and willingly sold their labour to capitalists did not mitigate the fact that a theft had occurred.

Now, the labour theory of value, which derives from Adam Smith, was an extraordinarily popular theory in 19th century radical movements, including libertarian ones. There were exceptions, for example the Classical Liberals in England and the Loco Focos in 18th Century America but, if you are dealing with American libertarianism in the 19th Century, you will find that the movement accepted the labour theory of value almost as completely as the modern movement accepts the free market.



This acceptance of Cost the Limit of Price was a strong tie between individualist anarchism and the other forms of anarchism. Communist anarchism and anarcho-syndicalism, especially, viewed capitalism as institutionalized force. From beginning to end, capitalism was profit which was theft committed against the workers; that's where you get the propaganda posters of capitalists as bloated parasites sucking the blood of the labourers. They sought to destroy such profit taking by force.

Individualist anarchists approached the situation differently. Although they agreed that profit was theft, their primary commitment was to a voluntary society and to the right of contract. In fact, Benjamin Tucker described the

ideal society as "society by contract." In essence, they came to the conclusion that if you wanted to invite people to steal from you by contracting to pay interest or rent, it was your business. They might try to show you the error of your ways, but the bottom line was that everyone had the right to make a foolish, self-destructive contract and that no one had the right to interfere in that voluntary process. So, although there was theoretical agreement on the labour theory of value between individualist anarchists and their communist cousins, the added element of respect for contract within individualist anarchism led to radically different practical consequences. For example, whereas communist anarchists would put a gun to the head of landlords, individualists would leaflet all the tenants. And both would attack the State, because they believed that destroying the State would virtually eliminate such practices as charging interest. But, again, the individualists embraced non-violence as a political strategy.

So, what is the real difference here? Is it merely that individualist anarchists are nice people who won't use force to implement their theories whereas communist anarchists are evil? I think the real distinction is less ad hominem and more theoretically significant, and that is, they each define aggression in fundamentally different ways. To the individualist anarchist, aggression is defined with reference to property titles. For example, if a man snatches a dollar I earned from my hand, it is theft for two reasons: first, it is my dollar, I have title to it; and second, he has taken it without my consent. If, however, the man snatches a dollar I had previously stolen from him out of my hand, it is not theft for two reasons: it is not my dollar because he has title to it; it is his property and, therefore, my consent is unnecessary. So, the definition of aggression within individualist anarchism rests on two concepts: title and consent. Whose property is it and does the owner agree to what is going on?

Although the most important present disagreement between individualist and communist anarchism is the definition of property, I don't think this was the most significant point in the 19th Century. Since they both accepted the labour theory of value and condemned capitalism, the most important disagreement was in how they

approached consent. With individualist anarchism consent was a fairly straightforward matter. You agreed or you didn't, you said "yes" or "no." And, so long as you are saying "yes," it is in principle impossible to aggress against you. Not so with communist anarchism. Communist anarchism contains the notion of economic coercion; that is, even if a worker consents to a certain wage, consents to have a portion of his labour stolen by the capitalist, the consent doesn't count because it was obtained through duress. The economic situation created by the capitalist is the equivalent of a gun pointed at the head of the worker: the capitalist says: work on my terms or starve. Allow me to steal from you or let your children go hungry. And the consent, the freedom venerated by the individualist anarchist is dismissed as a fraud. As the sort of freedom that says to the beggar and to the millionaire that they are both free to sleep under a bridge in the driving rain. In short, the communist anarchist does not recognize the possibility of such things as interest or rent existing under contract; by definition, they are acts of force and cannot be otherwise. Using force against those who charge interest or rent was, therefore, nothing more than self-defense.

This notion of economic coercion has dramatic implications for another key difference between these forms of anarchism: namely, how they define "justice" a not insignificant concept. Now, very briefly, an important difference is that communist anarchism approaches justice as an end state; by which I mean, it provides a specific picture of what constitutes a just society. It would be a society without a State or any capitalist practices in which the means of production are collectively owned and every worker receives the full reward of his labour. In other words, justice resides not only in the absence of institutionalized force (the State) but in the establishment of a specific economic arrangement.

In contrast, the individualist anarchist approach to justice is means oriented. It provides no end product, no particular social arrangement which constitutes justice, but says only "anything that's peaceful is just." Under individualist anarchism, you could have communist communities existing beside capitalist ones and, so long as membership was voluntary, the arrangement in each

would be just. So, again, to the communist anarchist justice is an end state (a specific economic system); to the individualist anarchist, it is means oriented (anything that's peaceful) with no hard vision of what would result. They differ as well on the concept of class. Since communist anarchism fundamentally opposes capitalism, often considered to be inextricably a part of the State, it defines class in economic terms, in relation to ownership of the means of production. You are a capitalist or you are a worker. If you are a capitalist, you live off the sweat and blood of the worker regardless of whether or not you know it or whether you are simply the thoughtless, apolitical wife of a banker. You are part of the capitalist class. Since individualist anarchism fundamentally opposes only one thing -- aggression and the State as institutionalized aggression -- it defines class in political rather than economic terms. It defines class in terms of one's relationship to the State. You are a member of the economic class which lives through voluntary exchange or you are a member of the political class which lives off theft and tribute from the economic class. This is the basis of the classic libertarian distinction made by Franz Oppenheimer between the political and the economic means.

So, returning to the use of violence. These conflicting concepts of justice and class are key and contributed heavily to the different historical paths taken by communist and individualist anarchism. Ponder for a moment, who is more likely to use violence - a man who is committed to peaceful means whatever those means may bring, or a man who is committed to a specific form of society with no moral commitment to any specific strategy, short of not using the State? As you might suspect, communist anarchists have been far more willing to use violence to implement their form of justice than have individualist anarchists. For one thing, the communist anarchist ideal can be implemented through violence. You can enforce a specific economic arrangement on people. But you cannot use force to create and maintain a society without force. Anarchism, in general, has received bad PR with regard to violence and the bomb throwing demented anarchist is as much a cultural caricature as the dumb blonde. Unfortunately, as with most caricatures, there is some grain of truth

in the picture. And, unfortunately, critics have made no attempt to distinguish the truth, to distinguish one form of anarchism from another to ascertain who is the guilty party. Overwhelmingly, the violence attributed to anarchists came either from communist anarchism or from the State's attempt to discredit the anarchist tradition. It is ironic that one of the charges that used to be brought against individualist anarchism in the 19th Century was that it was too peaceful; an anarchist community would have no defense against those willing to use violence to conquer it. Needless to say, this view of anarchism changed drastically and it is possible to point to several events which were pivotal in changing this attitude.

One of these events was the Russian Revolution, or rather the period preceding the Revolution during which several communist anarchist groups openly and repeatedly committed violence as a strategy against capitalists and the State. Part of this strategy included throwing bombs into crowded restaurants on the assumption that only capitalists could afford to eat in that restaurant and all members of the capitalist class were deadly enemies. Although Russian anarchists did not originate the idea of "propaganda by deed," they became famous for using that method. And even though Russia was also the home of Christian anarchism and although the violence committed by communist anarchists was minuscule compared to the violence committed by the State or by the non-anarchist revolutionaries who followed, the Russian Revolution helped to cement the association between anarchism and violence.

In America, the Haymarket incident and the assassination of President McKinley had a similar effect. The Haymarket incident occurred in 1886, in Chicago which was a stronghold of communist anarchism. A group of anarchists, most prominently Albert Parsons, held an open door labour meeting; as it began to break up police converged on the peaceful crowd. A bomb was thrown at the police who opened fire on the crowd. Seven demonstrably innocent men were arrested and tried: one committed suicide, four were hanged, two were subsequently pardoned. I don't have time to go into the Haymarket incident other than to point out three things:

first, the men involved in the Haymarket affair were communist anarchists who openly advocated violence, which is not to say they were guilty of any crime or to reduce their status as anarchist martyrs. Second, the Haymarket incident and the public furor that followed it changed the public perception of anarchism by associating it firmly with violence.

Third, individualist anarchists did not enthusiastically support the Haymarket martyrs. For example, although Benjamin Tucker condemned the State and recognized it as the true villain of the event, he criticized the Haymarket Seven for consciously promoting violence and he was reluctant to raise them to the status of anarchist heroes. In the July 31, 1886 issue of Liberty, he wrote: "It is because peaceful agitation and passive resistance are weapons more deadly to tyranny than any others that I uphold them ... brute force strengthens tyranny... war and authority are companions; peace and liberty are companions... The Chicago Communists I look upon as brave and earnest men and women. That does not prevent them from being equally mistaken." This reluctance on the part of individualist anarchists, whose stronghold was Boston, outraged other anarchists who began to refer to anyone who criticized the Haymarket martyrs as 'a Boston anarchist' regardless of where the critic lived. (Tucker's Liberty was published from Boston.)

The assassination of President McKinley in 1901 by a self-professed anarchist who claimed to have been inspired by hearing Emma Goldman speak almost destroyed the anarchist movement. The deportations and hideous laws that followed were the most obvious repercussions. But perhaps as importantly, it absolutely cemented the association between violence and anarchism, all forms of anarchism. The movement declined sharply past the turn of the century. And individualist anarchism virtually died in 1908 when the offices of Tucker's Liberty and bookstore burnt to the ground.

So, if those were the days when communist and individualist anarchism had a lot in common, what constitutes a real difference of opinion? A real difference is contained in the changes individualist anarchism went through in the 1950s. What happened? In my opinion, the most significant changes

can be analysed by referring to one man, Murray Rothbard. Rothbard and the circle of scholars who met in his parlour in the 1950s -- e.g. Leonardiggio, Ralph Raico, and Ron Hamowy -- did something astounding. Rothbard took three traditions, three themes which were considered antagonistic to each other and wove them together to produce the philosophy that dominates modern individualist anarchism.

The first tradition was Austrian economics. As a specialist in economic theory, Rothbard became an admirer of Ludwig Von Mises and adopted Austrian economics, a radical and sophisticated defense of the laissez-faire capitalism.

The second tradition was individualist anarchism. Now remember, Tucker attacked capitalism as theft and he was considered a moderate on the question, as anarchists go. The genius of Rothbard lay in taking the value of individualist anarchism namely, the theoretical roots of "self-ownership" and its radical civil liberties, while discarding its excess baggage namely, the labour theory of value. He replaced this economic theory with a defense of the free market. The result was something entirely new under the sun: an anarchist movement that championed capitalism. It is difficult to even come up with a parallel to give you a sense of how incredible a hybrid capitalism and anarchism make. If you can imagine someone proving that not only are Freudianism and Behaviorism both correct but that both are and always have been compatible, you might get the flavour of it all.

For better or worse, this moral and sophisticated defense of capitalism has greatly distanced individualist anarchism from the general anarchist movement which still considers capitalism to be an evil on the level of, if identical with, the State. And when you talk to communist anarchists, if they don't get immediately hostile, they are likely to express total bewilderment at this bizarre combination of beliefs.

The third tradition Rothbard and his circle incorporated into this system was isolationism, Old Right foreign policy. And by incorporating it into a system of economics and civil liberties, he created the synthesis that dominates the theory of individualist anarchism as it exists today.

Rothbard is also often credited with modern libertarianism, which I consider

to be a movement separate from individualist anarchism: that is, I believe they have distinct and often antagonistic goals and strategies. When Tucker referred to himself as a libertarian, it meant individualist anarchist, but words have lives of their own and meanings change. As Murray once said to me when I commented on his many strategic alliances: "It's a fast moving world, sweetie." The word liberal once referred to an individualist who defended the free market; now, it means almost the opposite and libertarians need to use the term "classical liberal" if they want to be clear. Similarly, the word "libertarian" has changed due to the fairly successful efforts of the Libertarian Party to associate libertarianism with political goals and the political means, both of which are anathema to individualist anarchist theory.

The integrating theme behind individualist anarchism was the primacy of the individual and the commitment to rid society of all but defensive force. And the kind of force they most loudly opposed was political activity, i.e., voting and electoral politics. They considered any participation in electoral politics to be a violation of libertarian principles. In Tucker's words: "If Liberty has a weak-kneed friend who is contemplating a violation of his anarchist principles by voting just for once, may these golden words from John Morley's 'Compromise' recall him to his better self: 'A principle, if it be sound, represents one of the larger expediences. To abandon that for the sake of some seeming expediency of the hour is to sacrifice the greater good for the less on no more creditable ground than that the less is nearer.'"

On the issue of holding political office, Lysander Spooner was one of the clearest of the individualist anarchists. In A Letter to Thomas Bayard, he framed his objection to the holding of political office, irrespective of who the particular holder may be. By what right, Spooner asked, can one person occupy a position of power over another's life? What circumstance would make this a proper situation? If you have the natural right to protect your life and property and if you delegate this right to another person, then his position is contractual and thereby in accord with libertarian principles.

But what does this delegation entail? It means, according to Spooner, that you possess the right which is being delegated; that the delegation was explicit and not merely assumed, for a contract may not be assumed; and, that you can withdraw your delegation and reclaim the exercise of your natural rights, for to say that you cannot withdraw your delegation is to say that you have given away not the exercise of a particular right but your entire liberty. In Spooner's words: "No man can delegate, or give away his own natural right to liberty or to give to another, any right of arbitrary dominion over himself, for that would be giving himself away as a slave. And this no one can do. Any contract to do so is necessarily an absurd one and has no validity."

Voltairine de Cleyre expressed a similar view in a lecture delivered before the Boston Secular Society in 1890 and subsequently reprinted in Liberty. "I go to the White House" de Cleyre stated, "I say 'President Harrison, are you the government?' 'No, madam, I am its representative.' 'Well, then, where is the principal? Who is the government?' 'The people of the United States.' 'The whole people?' 'The whole people.' 'You, then, are the representative of the people of the United States. May I see your certificate of authorisation?'"

De Cleyre went on to define what she meant by authorisation and why she morally opposed political office and the process of voting. "A body of voters cannot give into your charge any rights but their own. By no possible jugglery of logic can they delegate the exercise of any function which they themselves do not control. If any individual on earth has a right to delegate his powers to whomsoever he chooses, then every other individual has an equal right; and if each has an equal right, then none can choose an agent for another, without the other's consent. Therefore, if the power of government resides in the whole people and out of that whole all but one elected you as their agent, you would still have no authority whatever to act for that one."

To drive my point into the ground...The individualist anarchists overwhelmingly believed that voting and the holding of political office were direct violations of libertarian morality. This issue was debated only twice in Liberty. The first instance occurred when Henry Appleton attempted to infiltrate and use

the Knights of Labour to achieve certain labour goals through that organisation's participation in politics. Appleton accepted political activity as compromise. He wrote: "Tucker has yet to learn that compromise is a true scientific principle under Anarchism." He then proceeded to defend compromise against the rigid "plumb-line" approach of Tucker. Tucker's harsh reply was entitled "Plumb-line or Corkscrew?" Although Appleton's integrity was never questioned, the ensuing dispute was so bitter that Appleton, hitherto Liberty's most frequent contributor, chose to disappear from its pages.

Victor Yarros also locked horns with Tucker. In one of his many articles for Liberty, Yarros opposed voting on strategic rather than on moral grounds. He wrote: "A friend and reader of Liberty recently put this query to me: When some practical, immediate good can be accomplished by the election of a particular man or the victory of a particular party, is it not the part of wisdom and propriety . . . to aid and abet such election?"

Yarros replied: "The real question is whether the immediate and practical good which, by our hypothesis, can be secured is not overbalanced by indirect and remote injury to the essential aims and purpose of Anarchism. Answer this question in the negative, and all reasons for boycotting politics vanish . . . Anarchists have no religious or moral objection to voting and party warfare." Tucker responded: "For my part, when I say that I would use the ballot if I thought thereby I could best help the cause of freedom, I make the declaration in precisely the same sense . . . as when I declare . . . that I would dynamite if I thought that thereby I could best help the cause of freedom."

Although he didn't disappear from Liberty as Appleton did, Yarros backed down from the issue. The point here is that 19th century Individualist anarchism /libertarianism was overwhelmingly anti-political. One of Liberty's themes was "power corrupts" and one of its regular columns, "The Beauty of Government," was devoted to this theme. If libertarianism of the late nineteenth century stood for any one social principle it was opposition to the political solution (a form of force) to social problems.

Unfortunately, perhaps because it was such a basic aspect of individualist anarchism, the anti-political position has often been assumed as self-evident rather than worked out in hard detail. And if individualist anarchism has contributed to its own decline, it has been in this respect. Individualist anarchists have naively assumed that, because libertarians flatly condemned the political means, the State and politicians, this condemnation meant that libertarians had some fundamental objection to electoral politics itself. A mistaken assumption. More and more, libertarianism has become identified with the Libertarian Party. More and more, the goal of libertarianism has changed from dismantling the State to joining the State and replacing the face behind the desk of power as though it were the particular face and not the desk -- the position of unjust power itself -- that was the enemy. But to an individualist anarchist, the enemy is anyone who assumes political power and anyone who aspires to it. And the onus of proof is not on the anarchist to explain why he objects to someone fighting for vast power over his life, it is on the politician and the libertarian who supports him to explain how such power is justified.

Nevertheless, whoever logically carries the burden of proof, it has become necessary for individualist anarchism to develop a comprehensive defense of anti-political theory in order to counter the grotesque spectacle of anarchists running for President. Fortunately, there is wonderful work being done to fill in the gaps of anarchist theory in which political weeds have grown. The Voluntarist has been running a series of articles entitled the Ethics of Voting by George H. Smith in which Smith breaks new ground by delineating an institutional analysis of the State. Because anarchism is more than just a commitment to non-aggression; it is the principled rejection of the State.

It is commonly assumed that individualist anarchism and libertarianism are two points along the same road, that we are fellow travellers and, frankly, I feel tremendous goodwill toward many of the people within the LP. But this goodwill does not affect the fact that they and I are on fundamentally different and antagonistic paths. And anarchists who are working within the Party in order to smash the State are

fooling themselves. They are donating their time, money, and sanction to the political process with the stated goal of creating yet another politician. Only this time it is a "good politician" -- their politician. And where have we heard this before?

As libertarianism becomes increasingly political, it will become increasingly hostile to individualist anarchism, because anarchism poses as great a threat to the political ambitions of the LP as it does to the conventional defenders of government. I have no intention of amending the slogan "Smash the State" to read "Smash the State Except for the LP." And if the LP is ever successful they will quickly turn on the anarchists, turn on their supposed fellow travellers. The anarchists will then learn from political libertarians the same lesson that the Russian anarchists learned from the Bolsheviks -- we are fellow travellers no more.

Reprinted in Total Liberty by permission of the author, originally printed in Issue 12, The New Libertarian 1984

BOOK REVIEWS

The Answer Lies in the Soil

Who Owns Britain: The Hidden Facts Behind Land Ownership in the UK and Ireland, by Kevin Cahill, published by Canongate, Edinburgh, 2001, pb 2002. £16.99, pb, 450 pages, 265 x 180mm

Despite the comprehensive elegance of Kropotkin's title, "Fields, Factories and Workshops Tomorrow", by and large anarchists remain urbanites of cities, towns and suburbs today. With the possible exception of the interests of anarcho-primitivists, who seek re-integration with nature in pursuit of sustainability and the future, questions concerning the land do not seem to arise much in our discussions or publications.

Confronted by an ever-widening array of possible global catastrophes, most people prefer to perpetuate the problems by burying themselves in the trivia of normality. Oil supplies will be

noticeably in decline within the next decade even if America hasn't cornered all supplies, and we should be thinking about going back to fundamentals. The present picture of a post-scarcity world will progressively retreat to its American heartland. Tory Blair's efforts to add Britain to the off-shore States of the Union will be unlikely to postpone the great die-back for long.

Looked at rationally, the anarcho-primitivists have the correct approach. However, anarchist opposition and initiation is splintered into many shards, each bright and attractive in the right light, but all failing to create a coherent whole. End game scenarios, even if considered unlikely, can serve to illuminate the fundamental realities of power. In this context, *Who Owns Britain* should certainly be of interest. By tracing the nature of land ownership, the author traces the survival of the lately quiet, but still alive and well, British Establishment.



The Establishment, with its roots firmly planted in 1066, is mainly those families who by various means accumulate land. With a tradition of strategic marriage, breeding, and purchase, they retain their positions of privilege to this day. What is also revealed in this book is a consistent tendency for members of land owning families to branch out into professions which serve to consolidate their land-owning and Establishment positions. The law, the military and banking are favoured occupations for sons of aristocrats. For our land-owners are mainly aristocrats, whose favourite haunt, until recently, was the House of Lords from where they could control the legal processes.

With citizen Elizabeth Windsor at their head, our aristocracy 'owns' vast areas of the country. This is why they like to think of it as their country -- unless someone has to die to defend it, when it suddenly becomes ours for the duration. The question of property ownership is one which anarchists have never, as far as I am aware, satisfactorily resolved. It was John Locke (1632-1704), the philosopher who did so much to break the tradition of the divine right(s) of monarchs and establish the framework for individual rights, who left us the present mess. He was personally compromised on the question of property. Locke had an aristocratic sponsor and even benefited from slave labour, yet he got us as far as the right to life, to liberty, to property and the right to rebel against unjust rulers and laws. The tangle of the last two, which tend to lock each other up, requires resolution.

Queen Victoria started the current royalist land accumulation. When she got the Queen position she only had around 27,000 acres. So, by judicious use of the house keeping we gave her, together with the hundred year tax-break her family and follow-ons enjoyed, Lizzie 2 managed to bump this up to at least 75,000 acres. This does not include the 'grey' area of Crown Lands which run to 24 MILLION acres. Of course, land does change ownership, some aristos and large owners go down in the acreage rating, and others like the Co-op come up, but nothing shakes the royal grasp -- except to grab more.

Observers of the recent political / economic scene are probably aware of two anomalies. First, the fact that during the British foot and mouth fiasco when farmers were, as usual, driven to the wall and on their knees, very little land came up for sale. Better for owners and tenants to stick together. (A form of mutual aid?) And independents were probably in hock to banks. More land lock. Second, the Landed Gentry, apart from the matter of hunting, are very quiet. No word on 'their' British sovereignty sliding off to Brussels. Strange, until you realise that, as well as getting every imaginable tax advantage domestically, the Common Agricultural Policy also pumps millions their way *via* their tenants. The EU also has a bit of law which says property cannot be removed unless the owner is amply compensated, and that probably tips them silently towards Brussels.

Who Owns Britain draws many historical threads together, and the interest in each is not lost because they often meet at the same crossroads; rather this tends to emphasise the enormity of the great British land-grab. We are all encouraged to believe that we live in small crowded islands, and our everyday experience tends to reinforce this belief. Urban and suburban townscapes tend to be tightly packed and this is reflected by the facts in the book. The average dwelling sits in 0.18 acres (say, 20 x 45 yards) and in total, homes for 59 million people occupy less than 10% of the land area. By contrast, 189,000 families control around 75% of the land. Britain is only 'crowded' because so few have so much.

Next time you are travelling, particularly in winter daytime, look for all the space. A couple of examples. The train from Peterborough to Doncaster and on to York rolls on through mile after mile of open farmland. Hardly any farms, just thousands of acres. Unlike, for example, West Wales with its tradition of smallish family holdings where each can see at least one neighbour from their farmhouse. Or try driving from tight-packed Stroud in Gloucestershire towards Cirencester. Like many British roads, this one is bordered by woodland. If the leaves are off the trees you will see, on both sides, again for mile after mile, open farmland that stretches to the horizon. True, Charlie boy and sister Annie have their backyards here (1,100 and 1,263 acres respectively). There may not be many farmhouses, but the highly mechanised tenants (intended) are there, working the land, paying their rents, and knowing their place.

Also, when travelling, notice how often the farm land stops and the housing forms little bubbles of development off the road. This is another way those who have land get most for it. Keeping building land in short supply keeps the price sky high, so if it must be sold it gets top money. And so there is a *de facto* collusion between land owners and local authorities (even if they are not one and the same or closely connected). Worse, everyone who buys a house helps maintain the system and its excesses – if more land became available, the bottom of the market would drop, so mortgaged homeowners become part of the land lock.

So who does own Britain? It has been an incredibly difficult task to even approach an answer to this question. If it were not for one of those quirks of history in 1872, when the uncoordinated land tax body, the clerks of every parish in the land, could answer this question for their parishes, and the whole picture was put together, we would have no tangible answer today. For since the 'mistake' of the return of 1872, the establishment has tried to bury or lose that information. What Kevin Cahill has made in this exhaustive volume is a magnificent attempt to bring the information up to date and into the light. To do this he has had to wade through untold obfuscation, obscurity, and as much fog as could be generated.

Wait a minute, you may ask, what about the Land Registry? Doesn't that tell you who owns what and where? And doesn't everyone who buys a house have to pay to register it with them? *Answers:* What about it? No. Yes. The Land Registry is like the minuscule visible tip of an iceberg. Despite centuries of apparently accelerating reform from the own-it-all-divinely-righted Monarch to the present 'property owning democracy', no one (with the possible exception of the aforementioned Monarch) has absolute title or rights to the land they think they own, even if it is only 0.18 of an acre with a dwelling on it. And this is the rotten core of the land rip-off. The best the Land Registry will allow is that you, possibly along with unnamed others, have an 'interest' in your plot. Sufficient worm holes can be traced through all the reforming legislation to get right back to where it all started, with the Monarchy! (Of course the State, in its many guises, also has interests which it may from time to time express.) What a surprise.

Apart from the primal injustice of the land grabbers (I wonder how many like me have lost relatives fighting for their privileges?), I believe we cannot be free without space to fulfil life options. Kropotkin's communities of networks of fields, factories and workshops could come back into focus, given space. Perhaps it wouldn't work, but we won't find out without access to the land from where all freedom ultimately grows. I have no suggestions for action. Perhaps our Editor could ask Mugabe for an opinion. Failing that, we could look at Ireland where land reform has been achieved, or to Scotland where it is once

more coming on to the political agenda. There must be some way to unlock this most unjust shackle on the freedom of all.

Who Owns Britain answers the question as best it can county by county, so at least you could become knowledgeable about, if not familiar with, your local excessively landed person. Direct action? Get the book into as many libraries as possible, even if you can't run to a copy, while we consider the next step.

Colin Johnson

Howard Zinn's *Terrorism and War & Gore Vidal's Perpetual War for Perpetual Peace* reviewed by Joe Peacott

After the attacks on the World Trade Centre and Pentagon in September 2001, there was much discussion everywhere about why anyone would launch such a brutal assault on United States residents and institutions. Here in America, many seemed stunned that people in other parts of the world held the US government in such contempt and wondered about the reasons for this hatred. In this setting of shock and confusion, the government and the establishment news media put all their efforts into offering analysis of the attacks that provided no real insight into the motivations of the hijackers and simply served to rally support here for the very kind of political and military interventions elsewhere in the world that provoked the disaster in the first place.

If someone relied solely on the mainstream newspapers and television networks for information, they would come away with the impression that those who destroyed the twin towers in New York were motivated simply by an irrational, religiously-based hatred of all Americans and the American way of life. And one would have learned that the threat to us all was so extreme and immediate that any counter-measures, including the murder of innocent Afghan non-combatants, the torture of prisoners of war, and a witch hunt against US residents from Muslim countries were justified. But, when looking at the real facts, it becomes clear that the circumstances that goaded the

hijackers into taking their murderous action, as well as the best means of obviating further bloodshed both in the US and the rest of the world, are quite different from those put forward by the government and its allies in the news media.

Anarchists and others who are in the habit of questioning authority and forming their own ideas about how the world works were not, of course ever taken in by the official line. But, in our ongoing efforts to challenge this received wisdom in our discussions with other folks, it can be difficult to overcome the pervasive influence of the government and its cheerleaders in the news industry on the formation of most people's opinions. Two books published last year, however may prove helpful by providing alternative views of the American government's foreign policy and international meddling in a format that is accessible to regular people.

In *Terrorism and War*, a book distilled from interviews and public talks, Howard Zinn makes a well-argued and readable case that the American government's imperial adventures are responsible for creating the environment that produced those who brought down the World Trade Centre. As a 1997 Defense Science Board report quoted in this book points out, "Historical data show a strong correlation between U.S. involvement in international situations and an increase in terrorist attacks against the United States." While government hacks and TV news anchor people would have us believe that the fundamentalist killers begrudge Americans our (limited) freedoms, Zinn provides ample evidence that the government's enemies are generally unconcerned about how the US government and Americans conduct themselves at home. In fact, many people like Osama bin Laden, Saddam Hussein, and Manuel Noriega (a graduate, by the way, of the US government's own terrorist training school at Fort Benning) were more than happy to ally themselves with the US in the past, when life within the US was hardly different from what it is today. What turned these former friends into enemies were shifts in American foreign policy and US military interventions in other countries.

Zinn goes on to challenge the prevailing myth that US foreign policy is

based on some sort of morals or ethics and shows that it has always served the pragmatic, and often cynical, ends of those in power. From Jefferson's opposition to the revolution in Haiti, to the wars with Mexico and Spain, to the invasions of Grenada, Panama, and Haiti, to the current American alliance with the loathsome governments of Saudi Arabia and Pakistan, US diplomacy and military might have often opposed movements for freedom and supported tyrants and terrorists. And, as Zinn amply demonstrates, Democrats as well as Republicans are happy to throw bombs around and give aid and comfort to dictators.

But, while Zinn ably traces the various international entanglements, alliances, and subsequent rifts that led to the current crisis, where this book is strongest is in its critique of the government's response to the September attacks. He sees it for what it is: more terror that will again provoke terror in response. He traces the development of warfare and demonstrates that the killing of civilians is part and parcel of any modern military operation, whether the fire bombing of Tokyo, the destruction of a bridge full of non-combatants in Serbia, or the murder of a wedding party in Afghanistan. And for him, this means that there is no such thing as a just war. As Zinn says, "If the deaths of civilians are inevitable in bombing, as Donald Rumsfeld acknowledged, it is not an accident. The people prosecuting this war [in Afghanistan] are committing murder. They are engaging in terrorism."

If war is not the answer, what is? Zinn proposes a number of alternative responses to the terror attacks of September 11 that will not simply breed more death, anger, and war. He proposes, in the spirit of Eugene Debs, that the whole apparatus of "military preparedness" be dismantled, that the government end its support for the various nasty police states it supports around the globe, and that it close its homegrown terrorist training camp, the former School of the Americas. While such measures will not immediately bring about world peace, they would surely make the United States and the rest of the world significantly safer for most people.

Of course, none of this could happen without a movement against war, and Zinn documents the long history of such

movements in response to the wars of the last century and a half, a history largely ignored or misrepresented by the government and news media. But, in order for such a movement to grow powerful enough to bring about change, Americans have to develop the same kind of empathy for the victims of US and allied military terror around the world as they generally had for the victims in Manhattan. This happened in the movement against the US war in Viet Nam and can happen again.

While Zinn is no anarchist, using the word "we" when referring to the government (as in "We are terrorizing Afghanistan"), and arguing that the government should do good things with "its" money instead of waging war, he does have a healthy distrust of the state, quoting *IF Stone* to the effect that "...all you have to remember is two words: governments lie." He also goes to some length to demonstrate, as he did in his *A People's History of the United States*, that popular movements, not government initiatives, have always been the motor for beneficial social change.

Zinn is a good speaker and most of this book is taken from talks and conversations. The discussions flow easily, the language is simple, sources are adequately documented, and the arguments are well put. While many readers of this review may be familiar with most of the information contained in this short work, having it all collected in one place is useful, and, if passed on or recommended to a friend unconvinced of the folly of war, this book could serve to open a fruitful discussion.

Gore Vidal's *Perpetual War for Perpetual Peace* covers much of the same ground as Zinn's book in a number of essays that he had been unable to get published in the United States press, including *The Nation* and *Vanity Fair*, journals to which he was a regular contributor. But what makes this book different and important is that, in addition to his analysis of American imperialism (supplemented by an extensive table listing US military adventures since 1948) and its connection with anti-US attacks, he recounts for the reader the strikingly similar circumstances surrounding the bombing of the federal building in Oklahoma City in 1995. He makes a convincing case that this terror attack, like that in New York in 2001, was carried out by someone who felt driven

to respond to the murderous behavior of the United States government in the only way he believed would be effective: fighting fire with fire.

Timothy McVeigh, who took the fall for the OKC bombing, was no racist right-winger as he has been portrayed in the press. In fact, as Vidal points out, what turned him from a loyal American soldier into someone who hated the federal government were the brutality he witnessed during the first US war against Iraq and the incineration of 82 peaceable residents (of various skin colours) in Waco in 1993, the "largest massacre of Americans by American Feds since 1890 and the fireworks at Wounded Knee." These two events, as well as other abuses of people's lives and freedoms by the federal government, so outraged McVeigh that he believed a military type strike against the American state, regardless of the number of innocents killed, was justified and necessary. As McVeigh wrote in a letter reproduced here, "Bombing the Murrah Federal Building was morally and strategically equivalent to the U.S. hitting a government building in Serbia, Iraq, or other nations. Based on observations of the policies of my own government, I viewed this action as an acceptable option. From this perspective what occurred in Oklahoma City was no different than what Americans rain on the heads of others all the time..."

Vidal makes the point that just as foreign meddling by the US government brought down the wrath of al Qaeda members on innocents in New York, this imperialist intervention as well as domestic state-sponsored terrorism provoked McVeigh (and his associates) into murdering innocents in OKC. And both events have been used to increase the police powers of the feds here at home, more successfully by Bush than by Clinton, but not through lack of trying on the part of the latter. These new restrictions on the freedoms of United States residents and visitors, however, while wider in scope and implemented over a shorter period of time, are not really different in character from those that have been gradually, but inexorably imposed on us over the last few decades. These earlier attacks on liberty, documented by Vidal in his essay "Shredding the Bill of Rights," were justified largely by the "war on drugs," while the new ones are part of the "war on terror," but they are all part of the

war on individual freedom that is waged daily by those who would control us.

Vidal, like Zinn, is not an anarchist, but also has a libertarian streak, which frequently comes out in his writings. He recognizes that "...the people at large are not represented in government while corporations are, lavishly." Benjamin Tucker, the anarchist individualist, once described himself as an "unterrified Jeffersonian," but it seems to me this label would apply much better to Vidal. His writing style is somewhat disjointed, but he is witty, entertaining, and nasty, after the style of Oscar Wilde. While this book would be worthwhile reading for non-anarchists in the same way as *Terrorism and War, Perpetual War for Perpetual Peace* could also open the eyes of many libertarians to the true circumstances surrounding the events in Oklahoma City in 1995. But in either case, the time spent reading this short book will be well-spent.

**Richard Rudgley's
"Lost Civilisations of the
Stone Age"
Reviewed by Richard
Alexander**

To those familiar with Richard Rudgley's oeuvre, especially his publications concerning psychoactive substances, the title may produce feelings of extreme misgivings, fearing the author has ingested too many "substances" and gone off in search of Atlantis, Lemuria or Mu.

Fear not, as this is a respectable piece of work, which attempts to synthesize what is currently claimed to be known about pre-historic societies. In particular he examines the evidence for language, writing, numbers, pottery, surgery, mining, art, symbolism, food processing, fire and so on. In short all the hallmarks for what one might describe as the foundations of civilisation.

Now, anyone who has immersed themselves in the murky waters of anarchist, flavoured "primitivism", will immediately see the relevance of Rudgley's text especially as he attempts to track down the earliest examples (by agreed dating and one has to take on board all manner of caveats over the problems involved in dating materials)

of the above and then discusses what the implications might mean for our more general understanding of the societies, including structure, beliefs, hierarchies, division of labour, trade and so forth.

Space precludes an in-depth look at the text; this is a short review, nothing more, but the implications for our understanding of pre-historic civilisations will be helped if I look at a couple of instances covered by the book.

One area is mining technology. Prehistoric mining was for a number of substances, including flint, chert and ochre. Now one isn't here claiming that it was necessarily widespread (evidence is at best patchy, and the societies that did the mining may have been isolated instances) or continuous. However, to take a relatively late example, in Norfolk, England, there is a site known, since Anglo-Saxon times, as Grime's Graves, which has over 350 pits, which, when excavated were revealed to be prehistoric mine workings. The earliest date appears to be about 1800 BCE and mining then continued until the early bronze age. The scale of the enterprise and the longevity (over 1000 years) and the finds, indicate that here, at least, there was established a substantial division of labour, technology, trade and social continuity. It is evident that the flints here were mined for "export" (or else the surrounding area would be full of broken fragments of flint!) and that such activity was sufficiently rewarding for it to be conducted through many generations. It also suggests considerable sophistication as the pits were dug several metres deep, bypassing layers of "inferior" flints to get to the better quality material deeper down. Not that these were the earliest known mines in Europe as others in Belgium predated them and when it comes to ancient mine working the oldest known ones globally are in the Nile valley, where chert mines some 30,000 years old have been discovered. Evidently mining and all that one associates with it is much older than one may have originally realised.

Another aspect of the primitivist case is that pre-civilisation societies (a movable feast - whenever contrary evidence is produced the time and location of these societies moves with them) are assumed to have been non-hierarchical. It is generally agreed that evidence for social structure is often simply not available for pre-literate societies, all one can do is examine the

physical evidence and draw inferences from it. However, Rudgley draws very interesting conclusions from the evidence of certain grave goods, in particular those found near the city of Vladimir in Russia (it's about 115 miles northeast of Moscow). The graves have been dated back to about 25,000 years ago and contained the bodies of three people, one older adult and two children together with an amazing assemblage of grave goods. It is evident they had been buried with some sort of ceremonial headwear and these, between the three of them, contained over 10,000 beads and similar objects, with the children having the majority of them. Now we can assume that the children did not create these beads themselves. It has been estimated that each bead would have taken between 45 minutes and an hour to make each - and that they were too young to have "earned" them. In effect each child was buried with about 3,500 labour hours worth of goods (and as far as is known these graves are unique in this respect). Clearly we have here evidence of an accumulation of "wealth" associated with a particular family, which presumably means this was a hierarchical society where a few amassed "wealth" from the labour of the many. It may also have been the result of trading with many other groups. (The dating is also interesting - I haven't got any data regarding ice ages to hand; one wonders how the area was affected by ice sheets during this period, given that the last main ice age ended about 10,000 years ago.) Whatever, what these burials suggest is that we have prima facie evidence for a hierarchical society, and one that not only honoured these people in life, but also in death (or else the grave goods would have been recycled as has happened in other societies.)

One could (and hopefully others will) carry on at much greater length analysing the evidence of this book. Suffice to say that it is well written and presented, well documented with 16 pages of source material (much of it of very recent vintage). (Here one can contrast Rudgley's text with a book such as John Zerzan's latest book of essays and occasional pieces "Running on Emptiness". Whilst one cannot be but impressed by Zerzan's breadth of reading and his ability to handle philosophical and anthropological arguments, it is evident from his sources that in his book, he isn't dealing with the

archaeological record in any depth at all. Rather a shortcoming when dealing, at times, with notions of the pre-historic.)

My only quibble, and it is really as much my problem as one with the text, is that I kept getting lost in the technical terminology. I would have appreciated - perhaps on the rear end flap of the dust jacket - a list of the dates to which terms such as Acheulian and Magdalenian actually referred to, and also for some sort of reference showing how the major (and minor) Ice Ages fitted in with the overall dating schema. I mention this as there is speculation regarding just how far human social and technological development occurred as a result of



climatic changes, not to mention how much evidence was totally destroyed during the last ice age both by the glaciers and the flooding subsequent to the melting of the ice as the ice age ended. (A topic dear to the heart of Graham Hancock whose book "Underworld" may be worth investigating (unlike many of his earlier tomes) - more at a later date if I ever finish reading his 800 page epic!)

"Lost Civilisations of the Stone Age" (which are inexplicably merely singular on the spine of the dust jacket) is thoroughly recommended to all those who wish to find out more about our "pre-history" (paradox?) Copies can be found quite cheap - the original hardback cost was £17.99, but I picked up a copy in a discount / remaindered bookshop for a mere £4.99 and the paperback is available at £3.99 if you can find a copy. (My local bookshop sold out very quickly, but hopefully they'll be getting more in stock.)

Pub by Century, 1998. hbk, xi, 308pp, illus. ISBN : 0 7126 77585. Original price £17.99, reduced to £4.99 at remaindered / discount bookshops.

Trafficking With Anarchists

It was one of those half-flippant news items - the kind newscasters read with a raised eyebrow and just a hint of trivia - that triggered my curiosity. Someone, somewhere in Denmark had removed all the road signs and markings at the busy cross-roads of a well known accident spot. As a regular driver on England's congested roads I couldn't imagine a more unlikely experiment. Surely taking away the traffic lights and the STOP signs would result in instant carnage? But no, the news said that motorists began to drive with care and consequently the accident rate fell away sharply.

So I investigated the experiment more closely. Not only had the experiment taken place but also it proved to be attracting interest in several North European countries. In the Dutch town of Oosterwolde a busy intersection had been redesigned with paving and plantings. The concept worked from a human scale rather than by current assumptions where the needs of traffic seem to trump every other value. Vehicles passing through Oosterwolde still use the junction but the area is deemed more a social space instead of the previous bureaucratic organisation of white lines and signals.

Traffic management is an activity riddled in regulation. The problems of road transport have traditionally been approached by piling on one control on top of another. After a corpse-mangled century of growing congestion there are now so many laws it is almost impossible to avoid becoming a criminal. Yet no matter how many new commands are imposed motorists continue to maim and destroy each other. Still, to advocate the removal of regulations seems a strange road to go down.

The problem lies in the way motorists have shifted their own personal responsibility onto traffic signals and mandatory sign posting. Vehicles are driven on the basis of territory occupied.