

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"Freedom is something substantial. A man who is ignorant is not free. A man who is a tramp is not free. A man who sees his wife and children starving is not free. A man who must toil twelve hours a day in order to vegetate is not free. A man who is full of cares is not free. A wage-worker, whether labourer or clerk, who, every day for certain hours, must be at the beck and call of a 'master' is not free."

—LAWRENCE GRONLUND.

SIR JOHN IS NOT SO TOUGH

Busmen go back with Concessions

THREE weeks ago Sir John Elliot, Chairman of London Transport made a statement on the bus strike to the effect that the attitude of the Executive would not change however long the bus strike continued. He said: "My attitude is a tough one. I feel that public opinion is behind it. I do not care for surrender—it does not attract me". This statement was made in conjunction with his decision to cut the bus services by 10% "whether the unions like it or not".

We suggested at the time that, for a variety of reasons, Sir John Elliot's 'tough' talk was partly bluff, a view which has been confirmed by the conditions which led to the end of the bus strike.

Last Wednesday, in spite of prophecies on all sides, the majority of garages voted to continue the strike because they were still dissatisfied with London Transport's promise to review the pay of the 14,000 men left out of the Industrial Court's award, and because of notices of cuts in services which had been posted in garages.

By the next day Sir John had agreed to increase the wages of the 14,000 country bus workers by a

sum which "will closely approximate" the Central London crews increase, operative from July 2nd. In addition, he has withdrawn his threat that there will be an immediate cut on the bus services of 10%, but the 4% summer schedule reduction, fixed before the strike began, will stand. The Union has yielded on the demand for the 8/6d. to the Central Busmen to be back-dated to March 12th.

This is a victory for the strikers who held out for seven weeks, but there is no doubt that someone will have to pay the £2 million loss in London Transport receipts during the strike. Some form of fare increase is already planned, and it is unlikely that London Transport will be prepared to reduce its considerable profits.

Under our present economic system the problem of wage demands to meet rising costs in living is inevitable. Public transport is largely used by workers who have to foot the bill by paying higher fares. This, added to the soaring cost of food and other essentials, means that workers in other industries have to, in their turn, demand increases in wages. Prices continue to rise so that profits will still be made—the

result in the end is economic depression and unemployment. We may then have a 'local skirmish' or a full-scale war to solve national economic difficulties, after which the routine begins all over again. Only nowadays H-bombs are making the likelihood of survival after a war, enabling us to re-start our lunatic course over again, very remote. Some people think that annihilation would be better for mankind. They may be right. But, we prefer the rational and humane course, and suggest that we could begin tomorrow to organise society in such a way that the problems we have just touched on could be eliminated or, at least, reduced.

This would mean the abolition of money, the State and the means by which war can be waged. We already know the reactions to these suggestions from workers no less than their leaders. The worker who shows determination in a wages struggle cannot yet see the connection between his wage demands and all the other problems in society. Until he does, and is also prepared to take action to change the structure, then the whole crazy business must continue.

Hungarian Executions

What Happens Next?

THE murder of Imre Nagy, Pal Malater and their two colleagues of the Hungarian uprising has, for once, revolted the Western world. Of itself the judicial execution of these men is an appalling crime, with its background of cold, calculated treachery, but it is also very much more. It is a clear indication of the Soviet Union's attitude towards Yugoslavia, and a grisly warning to the men in Poland who may now assume that Khrushchev has reconsidered his previous line and is now reverting to type—the Stalin type.

It is quite possible that Khrushchev always intended to return to the old policy of terror as soon as he had established himself firmly in power, and that his method of gaining security of tenure was by temporarily instigating a more liberal policy. Conversely it is possible that he is not as secure as appearances indicate, and has been forced to his present actions by the old Stalinists lining up against him.

Either way the outlook for peaceful co-existence has not improved. It cannot be supposed that the Soviet Government expected anything but censure from the West following upon the open admission of the Nagy killing; it must therefore be assumed that it did not care what the reaction was, but was far more interested in the effects created

in Communist countries.

One thing is certain: the U.S.A. and Britain are now in an even stronger position to disbelieve any "suggestions for the furtherance of peaceful co-operation" which may emanate from the Soviet Union. Since the Twentieth Congress it has been difficult for the West to avoid as much world criticism as the Soviet Union on questions of the genuineness of their desire for agreement on disarmament, nuclear tests and other matters. Now the West can point to a further example for distrust—and the United States will find it easier to talk its way out of a summit conference.

Meanwhile we must all await developments which will soon take place and will give us a clue as to the reason for Nagy's death, and more important still, the reason for the publicity surrounding the killing. There are still at least three other men who were in the last Nagy Coalition Government, who's fates are as yet undecided; a lot depends in all probability, upon the actions of Yugoslavia and Poland, but it may be that the Soviet Government no longer cares a hang for anyone's opinions—for the present—and its latest act is simply a proof of this fact. The Soviet leaders have killed before—and will no doubt kill again.

CYPRUS

Britain Stays

AFTER shilly-shallying for years over policies for Cyprus while thousands of people died, or were injured, in a futile struggle for 'independence', the British Government now comes forward with a proposal which it is hoped will be acceptable to both Greek and Turkish Cypriots and which has been described by the *Observer* as "imaginative, fair and designed to meet the real interests of the Cypriot people".

The proposals, through a separate House of Representatives, are designed to give authority to Greek and Turkish Cypriots over communal and internal administration. The basic position of Britain however, remains unaltered, since responsibility for external affairs and internal security and defence is to rest with the Governor, in consultation with the Greek and Turkish Government representatives. The plan, it is suggested, should be given a seven years' trial period. So far, comments from Turkey and Greece have found the plan unacceptable, but, in the mysterious world of political diplomacy this was the reaction which was expected and is interpreted as being a 'good sign'. Sir Hugh Foot, excited by the scheme, commented on the Greek and Turkish reaction in these words: "That's the beauty of it. We never expected them to. This is our plan. We're going ahead with it. And it'll work . . ." It was hoped that neither side would accept the plan too hurriedly pushing one or other into the position of having to oppose! Such are the ways of politics, while the people, manipulated like puppets on strings, kill each other at the direction of their leaders.

It is impossible to say what the result of this plan will be until we hear more from Greece and Turkey. If accepted by each it is because they no longer consider it expedient to haggle with Britain over their respective claims: Turkish demands for partition and Greek proposals for union.

Last week Turkey was inciting its nationals in Cyprus to riot. Have we now to accept that the Turkish Government has suddenly seen the futility of such a course? Is it not that in fact the leaders were staging a show of strength in order to convince all concerned that they were a force to be reckoned with in any future plans for Cyprus?

While the British authorities were engaged in a struggle with EOKA, Turkey was content to sit and watch Greek Cypriots being killed, imprisoned and beaten with the aid of Turkish Cypriot policemen. But once the Turkish Government got wind of a British compromise deal with Makarios the futile rioting of last week, which ended in a number of brutal deaths, was planned.

And why, we may ask, was this "imaginative" scheme now put forward by Britain, not suggested years ago before the division between Greek and Turkish Cypriots ended in communal violence? For the same reasons which all Governments use when deciding who shall be sacrificed, and when—expediency and power. The recent riots in Cyprus gave the British Government a good reason for flying in thousands of troops and arms. Necessary for law and order, it piously tells the rest of the world, and even Greek Cypriots, who have no reason

ARKANSAS

A Backward Step

LITTLE ROCK is in the news again, following on the decision by Federal Judge Harry Lemley that the Arkansas school board should be granted a delay of two-and-a-half years before having to continue with integration. This in effect reverses the ruling given last year by Judge Davies that the Central High School at Little Rock must immediately start integration in accordance with the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court.

It will be recalled that nine Negro students were admitted to the school, precipitating disorder amongst white segregationists, which was only put down eventually by part of the 101st Airborne Division. This year one student graduated and one was "expelled for throwing food at her tormentors". This, before Judge Lemley's new decision, left seven; these seven are now directed to attend a coloured school which is described as equal in its facilities to the Central High School, despite the agreed concept that separate but equal is of itself unequal and no longer to be tolerated.

Thus the principle established last year of actively complying with the Supreme Court's decision of "integration with all deliberate speed", even though the Governor of the State, with much support from white citizens, was attempting to fabricate a means of avoiding the decision, falls to the ground, and provides the segregationists with a delayed victory.

It is argued that Judge Lemley's order is reasonable in view of local conditions and the likelihood of further violence when the school re-opens in September, though it is even more arguable that the school board has greatly exaggerated this danger just so that the postponement of Negro admission should be made; the evidence submitted to the Court has been generally agreed to be heavily weighted against continuation of integration for a period.

But the main point is something quite different. With Judge Lemley's decision, even supposing it to be "an exercise of equitable discretion and good judgment" (his own words), there lies the sacrifice of a principle. If it was just that school segregation should be enforced a year ago, despite local disorder—it is still just. Furthermore the decision establishes a precedent which could well stand as a flaming beacon for the segregationists to rally round, and it is not hard to visualise a series of similar decisions in favour of postponement being made throughout the Deep South. And so an order made perhaps in good faith, but without sufficient foresight as to its possible consequences, could jeopardise the cause of integration over a vast area of the United States.

Propaganda :

SOME

Anarchist Reflections

IN his letter on the "Problems of Propaganda", printed in last week's *FREEDOM*, our comrade Arthur Uloth suggests that "something is wrong somewhere" when anarchism which "has been preached for over a hundred years in Europe, seems less likely to succeed now than it did fifty years ago". He does not think anarchist propagandists are to blame for not doing enough or that their propaganda is wrongly conceived. But earlier in his letter he suggests that

it would not be unfair to say that the anarchists, like the other "progressives" (hideous expression, but there seems no other comprehensive word) seem to have no other resources than that of reasoned argument, which is quite inadequate to influence people.

"Argument"—"that is our weapon also" writes A. J. P. Taylor in his Campaign Report* in which he attempts to assess the results so far achieved by the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, with its public meetings, its marches, its pamphlets and its leaflets. In his opinion, and from his observations as an active speaker for the Campaign, it has succeeded in its first objective of rallying the converted and giving them "confidence by showing each of them that he is not alone". But so far as the rest of the population is concerned "my own feeling, which may well be wrong, is that our arguments are not yet finding their mark". Apart from the public's

Continued on p.

*New Statesman, June 21, 1958.

REPORT ON THE CO-OPS - 7

(Continued from previous issue)

IN this critical review of the *Co-operative Independent Commission Report* I have discussed only a few of its major recommendations, especially as they are likely to affect the declared social and democratic purposes of the Movement. To recapitulate briefly: the Commission advocates a far-reaching overhaul of the Movement to enable it to meet more effectively the challenge of its main competitors in the retail field, the private multiples. To this end the Movement should concentrate in the next decade or so on capturing an increasing proportion of the retail trade of the country. This will require the investment of some £150 millions in new enterprises and the rationalisation of its productive resources. A new national federal body should be set up which will open a chain of Co-op multiples for the sale of footwear and other dry goods. Under a plan of amalgamation the aim should be to reduce the number of societies from the present 950-odd to an 'ideal number' of 200-300, each society being based on a natural shopping catchment area. Finally, steps should be taken to improve Co-op management. This will involve a new conception of the rôles of the permanent officials and the governing committees respectively. To the officials will fall the job of actually managing the Co-ops, while the elected lay committees will be responsible for policy and the exercise of democratic control.

I have argued that these proposals are likely on balance to improve the efficiency of the Movement. The Commission may be unduly optimistic in believing that, at this stage, the Co-ops can muscle-in on territory already held by the private multiples, but there remains plenty of scope for the Co-ops contributing to the euthanasia of the small shopkeepers who, collectively, still pre-

dominate in the distributive sector of the economy. It may be, also, that the Commission over-estimates the advantages to be derived from radical amalgamation, while ignoring the disadvantages and possible alternatives. Taken all in all, however, if the Report were adopted *in toto* one might reasonably expect some improvement in the economic efficiency of the Movement. My major criticism is that this would almost certainly be bought at the expense of other aspects of the Movement. It involves, for example, a tacit abandonment of the ideal of a Co-operative Commonwealth. This is not very serious, since the ideal is now so vague as to be practically meaningless. More important, economic efficiency is likely to be bought at the expense of what has hitherto been regarded as Co-operative Democracy. Despite the Commission's avowed disclaimer, its proposals will weaken the element of 'lay democracy' and will accelerate the clearly evident tendency towards 'the managerial revolution' in the Co-ops. From being essentially a movement of the urban working class, it will become increasingly a movement of the urban middle class, and a movement effectively controlled by its managerial élite. To may way of thinking all this is too high a price to pay. I have no wish to preserve much of the *status quo* in the Co-ops but I would prefer a solution to their problems which would be more in harmony with the old ideals of the Co-op pioneers and less in keeping with the outlook of a (detached)

Isaac Wolfson or a fashionable 'new socialist'.

It ought to be said that there is nothing very new in the proposals of the Commission. The ideas that have gone into the making of the Report have been canvassed pretty thoroughly in the Movement during the past few years. The idea of a chain of Co-op multiples, for example, is the brain-child of a University lecturer in economics, Dr. Sidney Pollard. What the Commission has done is to collect together the ideas it fancied and weld them into a general plan of re-organisation. If action is the aim, this is not an unimportant achievement. The Report has cost a few thousand pounds to produce but Co-operators like most men, are more prone to listen to advice they have paid for than the advice they get gratuitously.

Having paid its money, is the Co-op Movement likely to take the choice offered it? It is perhaps too early yet to say.

The Report was only formally 'received' at the recent Co-op Congress and the restricted debate on it nearly fizzled out at once stage of the proceedings. A special Congress, however, is to be held in the autumn at which the real decision will be made and, meanwhile, sectional conferences will be held throughout the country to discuss the recommendations. Initial reactions are difficult to judge. The C.W.S. which, if the Commission has its way, will be quite radically transformed, has so far made no comment. The Co-op Union too

has passed no judgment and has barred its officials from advocating anything other than the official line, whatever that may be. The Co-op Press, however, while remaining 'neutral' is clearly sympathetic. There have been one or two asinine comments from Co-op leaders hostile to the Report, but most of the top managers in the Movement are favourably disposed—as well they might be.

The real decisions on acceptance or rejection will undoubtedly be made in the board-rooms of the 950 retail societies. A clue to present opinion in this quarter is provided by an article in the Co-op journal, *Agenda*, reporting the responses of a cross-section of 'societies' to a questionnaire concerning the Commission's major proposals. There is almost unanimous opinion in favour of the rationalisation of production. On the question of a national chain of Co-op multiples, the majority is decidedly against. Societies are about equally divided over amalgamation but the large societies and, hence, the overwhelming voting strength at Congress, are in favour. And on the management question there is a small majority in favour of the Commission's proposals, opinion varying markedly depending upon whether the respondent was the chief official or the president of the society. These answers, of course, are in the nature of a first poll only. Opinions within board-rooms still remain to be thrashed out and may change as the discussion on the Report gets under way. But at the moment it looks doubtful whether some of the major recommendations will be accepted, let alone the Report in its entirety.

There will be a strong tendency, my cynical self suspects, for societies to accept those recommendations which do not apply to them and to reject those that do—on the well-known principle that 'it's 'im, not me, what's at fault'.

In any case, even if some of the more important recommendations are accepted by the next Congress, there remains the problem of implementing resolutions. The principle of local autonomy for each society still obtains and no Congress resolution is likely to alter that. The majority might attempt various forms of moral persuasion on 'recalcitrant' societies but in the last resort each society can 'go it alone'. To press too hard may lead to a splintering of the Movement.

The problem of re-organising the Co-op Movement is similar in some ways to that of re-organising local government. In many respects this country is still operating with a 19th century system of local government. But every proposal for reform has so far failed because the various local authorities involved cannot agree among themselves. However, there is an essential difference. A strong central government, willing to grasp the nettle, can decide in the end to ignore the 'vested interests' that stand in the way of local government reform. In the Co-op Movement, there is no such central government: reform cannot be imposed from without, it must come by the route of persuasion.

It is at this point one can see why so many Fabian-type socialists despair of the Co-ops. Neat and tidy plans of rationalisation cannot be implemented by legislative fiat in

Continued on p. 3

Philip Holgate's London Anarchist Group Lecture on ANARCHIST IDEAS TODAY

WHATEVER virtues the theme "What can anarchists do?" may have it can certainly not claim any originality in the title. Nevertheless I feel that a discussion under this heading can be very important to us, and that I am justified in using the period of the London Anarchist Group's Sunday evening lecture for this purpose. During the five years during which I have been associated with the anarchist movement in Britain there has been a tremendous amount of very frank self-criticism directed against the ideas which are traditionally associated with anarchism. The fury and ruthlessness with which anarchists are by tradition credited with in their attacks on tyrannous and oppressive institutions such as the Church and the State has been turned and directed against the movement itself and some of its most cherished theories.

If yet another example is needed to illustrate the workings of the dialectical process which is so often scorned by libertarians it is that in the course of their search to extend libertarian theory to the new fields which have been opened by psychologists and sociologists, and to make use of their discoveries to enrich our theories in turn, many anarchists have been led towards ideas which have cut away at some of the very foundations of other aspects of anarchism. This has no doubt led many people who once regarded themselves as anarchists to feel that it no longer holds water as a complete theory, and go their ways, thinking and acting in a manner which has much in common with anarchism, and willingly owning their debt to it, but no longer needing or desiring to link their thoughts to a comprehensive anti-authoritarian root.

It has also led to a flurry of attempts to revise and redefine anarchism. This disintegration of the theory of anarchism has been paralleled by a numerical diminution in the effective strength of the movement, and I don't think it an exaggeration to say that we present, as a movement, a pretty poor show to anyone who inquires as to the possibility of putting our plans into practice.

Nevertheless, such a situation in which the anarchist movement in Britain finds itself has positive potentialities as well as negative realities. The theoretical shake-up has ensured that no unique idea or tendency has such an ascendancy as to crush others, or to push its rivals outside the bounds of anarchist respectability. The state of flux of the personal composition of the movement means that no group or individual can exert a stranglehold on it, and produce the disastrous consequences which have occurred in some countries. There are no public expressions of anarchist propaganda which so dominate the scene that anyone needs to feel compulsion to contribute to them. We are therefore in a position from which we could build up right from the beginning if we wished to, taking with us exactly as much as we like from the anarchism of the past and from what exists to-day.

I think that the process of disintegration has gone so far that I think it is time we started a re-synthesis of our ideas, and I hope to make a contribution to that to-night. At the worst, what I say will just be one

more attempt to look again at anarchism and present a different view of it. At the best, I hope that it may stimulate a movement towards rethinking our ideas not only in a critical destructive way, but with some idea of building up a solid structure on what is left. Since I think that even a move in that direction would be of interest to those who stand on the brink of the movement I am quite happy to be saying this at a public meeting and not at some internal discussion.

* * *

FIRST of all I would like to analyse as well as I can the reasons why anarchist theory does not seem so solid and coherent as it did years ago, or in fact does to-day in some parts of the world. Although I have used words such as 'disintegration' to describe this change, I certainly do not regard it as a bad thing, but rather as a sign of health and vitality in anarchism which makes it possible to produce such destructive self-criticism and I hope to survive it. Anarchists have always regarded political parties as being their enemies, and as being something to warn people against. This opposition to politics has been in part based on the conclusion that the type of organisation which is needed to successfully contest elections and achieve power in the political field was inimicable to the achievement of freedom in society. Perhaps more however, and this point of view is sympathetic to the one which blames the oppressed for their position rather than the oppressors, we have seen that the personal qualities which are brought to the fore and developed by political activity such as counting heads of membership, laying down and following party lines, are those appropriate to an authoritarian social order and not to a free one.

The typical party member is required to accept his place in the party whatever it be, and to play a rôle cast for him. This may be a boring and submissive rôle such as collecting subscriptions or canvassing for members. In a more subtle way a party member is expected to think the thoughts laid down for him. Here of course I am defining the hard ideal and not suggesting that actual people fit exactly into this description. He is expected, when involved in political discussion, to respond to any stimulus with the reply "Well Labour's policy is this . . ." or "The Communist Party takes the following line . . ." Needless to say this is anathema to anarchist minds. The trouble starts when we begin looking at ourselves in a mirror and start wondering whether we are really different from the political person.

It may be that in spite of rejecting and keeping clear of the outward forms of the authoritarian political parties, anarchists are just as susceptible to the spirit which pervades them. This point could be driven home by inviting you to consider a caricature of what one might call the politically spirited anarchist. He devotes all his energy and every waking minute to the cause, but more important, and more typically, he has the answer to every possible question or objection to anarchism on his lips waiting to be hurled at the first sign of an opponent. He is ready to state the anarchist interpretation of any piece of news from home or abroad without a moment's hesitation. Of course this caricature doesn't exist and probably never has done,

but at the same time I think that few of us would declare that we haven't at some times of our anarchist lives had at least some of the above characteristics lurking furtively in the background of our minds.

Well, we have to keep quiet about them now, because the atmosphere is full of psychological theories to show that in addition to having to admit a certain unpleasant truth in Lenin's remark that many formulations of the ideal anarchist society was a state in which everything was called by different names, and agreeing that anarchist organisations generally degenerate into political type organisations in fact, we now find ourselves faced with the final blow, that perhaps even the individual anarchist is not very much different in his attitude to the individual political person. When someone who has perhaps in pursuance of his libertarian ideas read up a bit of psychology, and made use of psychological arguments, is brought face to face with the charge that his anarchism is really a means of escaping from his personal problems, and that his visions of a free society are rather unworthy projections of his inner fantasies, it takes rather a tough mind to carry on being an anarchist.

Another factor that has contributed to a weakening of anarchism is that it has become more obvious that the hopes of anarchists of former days, that a radical transformation of society by means of anarchist agitation was at least a possibility worth fighting for, had no real basis. For many revolutionaries in the past, and even for some to-day there is a real possibility that their ideal society will be realised within their lifetime and so their revolutionary activity is very clearly in their own interests. Acting in one's own interests plays a large part in the theories of Max Stirner, the German anarchist whose ideas exercised an influence in the British Anarchist Movement a short time ago. They assert that everything a person does is an expression of his egotistic self-interest, and that the commendable, intelligent person examines his actions in this light and tries to see how he can further those interests in as rational and successful a manner as possible. Taking that at its face value would mean that no-one, except those most prone to illusion, would be anarchists.

Interpreting ones "interests" in a narrowly hedonistic sense, it is impossible that the activities of the anarchist propagandist, or even the life of someone who really tries to live according to an anti-totalitarian view of life, in an authoritarian society could produce worthwhile results under an egotistic scale of values. I am not saying that this applies directly to the professing Stirnerites within the anarchist movement, but I would in passing give the opinion that for everyone who has really got some benefit from Stirnerism, two or three have just ended up by being made so muddle-headed as to be unable to do anything either for themselves or for the movement, and have lapsed into a kind of aggressive apathy which chiefly involves pouring scorn on their former comrades who remain in the anarchist movement. Of course not everyone does interpret 'conscious' self-interest in a narrowly hedonistic sense, but when you start modifying that it takes a lot of the force out of Stirner.

(To be continued)

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

OPEN DAILY

(Open 10 a.m.—6.30 p.m., 5 p.m. Sets:)

New Books . . .

The Adventurers Jules Romains 15/-
The Love Man Gwyn Thomas 13/6
Granite and Rainbow
Virginia Woolf 18/-
Social Class and Mental Illness
A. B. Hollingshead and F.C. Redlich £3
Men Who Fought for Freedom
Egon Larsen 15/-

Cheap Reprints . . .

Love in the South Seas
Bengt Danielsson 2/6
Sweet Thursday John Steinbeck 2/6
The Wayward Bus John Steinbeck 2/-
To a God Unknown
John Steinbeck 2/6
The Pastures of Heaven
John Steinbeck 2/-

Second-Hand . . .

Black Power Richard Wright 17/6
New Road No. 4
Silone, Kafka, Lorca etc. 3/-
Psychotic Art Francis Reitman 6/-
Youth and Tomorrow
Olaf Stapledon 2/6
Rise and Influence of Rationalism
in Europe W.E.H. Lecky 7/6
The Russian Enigma Anton Ciliga 7/6
Selected Works of Tom Paine 5/6
Selected Work of Tom Paine 5/6
The Fields at Evening
Ethel Mannin 4/-
Under a Glass Bell Anias Nin 3/6
A New Holy Alliance
Emil Ludwig 2/6
Film and the Future
Andrew Buchanan 3/6
A Point of Order Gwyn Thomas 3/-
Ploughman's Folly
Edward H. Faulkner 2/6
Some Back Numbers "Politics"
Magazine, each 2/-

We can supply ANY book required, including text-books. Please supply publisher's name if possible, but if not, we can find it. Scarce and out-of-print books searched for—and frequently found!

Postage free on all items

Obtainable from

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

PROPAGANDA

Continued from p. 1
blind faith in science producing the antidote to H-bomb destruction and the fatal ill-effects of radiation, Professor Taylor suggests that an important failing in the Campaign is that it is too prone to hedge in its objectives of unilateral disarmament with such qualifying remarks as "if necessary", and to refer to "first steps" when it should be insisting that nothing less than unilateral abandonment "here and now" is the only possible solution.

BUT where Arthur Uloth's "reasoned argument" and Prof. Taylor's "persistent argument" as a means to an end part company, is revealed when the Professor, in the last paragraph of his report declares "But we must never forget that ultimately we have to convert the Labour Party, just as the Anti-Corn-Law League converted Sir Robert Peel". In other words whereas the anarchist seeks the medium of argument to liberate man, the socialist (or should we say the social democrat?) merely asks to convert the public from one opinion to another on specific subjects of policy, believing that this mass opinion will then be able to put pressure on the "progressive" party, which for Prof. Taylor is the Labour Party, to adopt them if and when they take over the reins of government.

Even if we agree that in theory it is possible for these processes to operate in the Labour Party (though, in practise the Party conference is dominated by the dead hand of the Trades Unions' block votes) how will public pressure influence a Tory government whose policies, in any case, are not even determined at the Tory Party's annual conference?

Clearly, public opinion, even when enlightened by argument can do little in an authoritarian society to implement its will simply by relying on the validity, the rightness, the realism or the justice of its demands. We think it the height of political naiveté to imagine that even Labour politicians are open to persuasion by moral argument. It may be true—as Prof. Taylor suggests—that "most people have not grasped the extent of the devastation that nuclear warfare will cause", but can this be said of the politicians, and in particular, politicians as politically "worldly" as Mr. Bevan or Mr. Strachey?

THE fact is that politicians would no more be able to engage in "diplomacy" and government if they allowed themselves to be influenced by moral considerations, the consequences of H-warfare, or even civil war, than a motorist would be able to drive a car if he were permanently haunted by the fear of death at every cross-road. Indeed life itself is a risk, and if we allowed our minds to be influenced by the complexity of the human organism, or its vulnerability to disease and unbalance, surely no reasonable person would accept to live! We accept the risk and forget about it. Similarly politicians however much they may hope to achieve their ends by persuasion, recognise that in the final analysis authority must have the backing of force. For these men the urge to dominate, to be in the public eye, is as strong as the urge to live is in man in general. Both accept the hazards involved. If more people realised that political leaders in pursuit of their ambition for power, are prepared to sacrifice the simple pleasures of life, deny themselves leisure and relaxation, and voluntarily* accept all the

occupational risks to health, liberty and even to life that this may entail, far from entrusting their lives to them, would take the view than an individual, so consumed with a lust for power that he is prepared to sacrifice his life to its attainment, is not the kind of person in whom to entrust the life and liberty of others.

IT is not so much the single-mindedness of politicians which is pathological as the ends to which their single-mindedness is directed. The world has benefited by the single-mindedness of a Beethoven and a Toscanini. That of a Lenin and a Hitler has caused it untold misery. The public apathy to which we anarchists are continually referring; the public cynicism to which Prof. Taylor refers

(We slip into treating those who disagree with us as men of good will; whereas good will is merely another name for inaction. We encounter another obstacle. The essence of the Campaign is that a moral challenge can be stronger than nuclear weapons. People no longer believe this. They once thought that faith could move mountains. Now they doubt whether it can move molehills.)

these are factors with which we have to contend and overcome. But it is no use lulling ourselves into believing that we, the conscious socialists and anarchists have no responsibility for the existing state of affairs. When Arthur Uloth writes

Criticisms aimed at FREEDOM as a paper, and at the anarchist movement as a whole, are often due to a feeling of real frustration. One asks oneself, "Why does nothing ever happen? Perhaps the others are not doing enough? Perhaps I am not doing enough?" One generally tends to blame other people, because one usually feels oneself to be doing the best one can (one understands one's own difficulties better than an outsider, or at least one is more aware of their extent). In reality however, no one is to blame.

like the ostrich, he is burying his head in the sand. Of course we are to blame! The anarchist and "progressive" movements get nowhere simply because we want to eat our cake and have it; because on the one hand we preach with Bakunin that we cannot be free so long as any of our fellow men are unfree, while on the other we act as if it were possible to find "solutions" for ourselves, islands of anarchy surrounded by oceans of misery and conflict! We act as if the unenlightened, apathetic masses should be attracted to us as moths are by a bright light. And we sit back, hoping to lure them with our "Trad Jazz" and our free love like shareholders waiting for their dividends. And some of us are surprised when no one turns up!

Prof. Taylor for his part refers to another cleavage in our audiences which it is even more urgent to overcome. The Campaign is a movement of eggheads for eggheads. We get a few trade union leaders, themselves crypto-eggheads. We get no industrial workers. He largely blames the Labour Party which "has done us great harm, and done it deliberately". As comrade Uloth writes, "one generally tends to blame other people...". If the Campaign remains a movement of "egg-heads" may it not be the fault of the egg-heads who seek to build up a mass public opinion to manipulate it politically instead of stating unequivocally that unilateral dis-

*It is important to stress the voluntary nature of the risk. After all, a miner or professional soldier (rank and file) takes on the job, and the risks, without dreams of power. It's a job. One does not embark on a political career in the same spirit! In any case someone who can be a successful politician could easily find a job as a lawyer, a school-teacher... or a house-painter!

†We might appear to be overstating our case if one thinks of Churchill as a typical example. But compared with a Hitler, a Lenin or a Mussolini, Churchill is an amateur, born with a political spoon in his mouth. Even as a brick-layer he was only an amateur! Nevertheless, even Churchill the amateur military strategist had little respect for the lives of others when it came to pursuing a policy, whether in Gallipoli or at Potsdam.

THE UNWRITTEN HANDBOOK

PROFESSOR C. N. PARKINSON, the author of *Parkinson's Law* which was received rather coolly in these columns recently, and of *The Evolution of Political Thought*, which has been received rather coolly everywhere else, addressed the National Liberal Club in London last week, and, in the language of the *Daily Telegraph*, took his audience on a brisk gallop over some rare hunting country:

"Above all he wants political decentralisation. The burdens must be lightened. Home Rule for Scotland would be a start. Then federal government. Only national and international matters should remain with Westminster. Provincial legislatures would deal with the rest.

"Let Lancashire have nationalisation and the Thames Valley eschew it. Give the North a Health Service and let the South pay for medicine. You could move house to suit your tastes."

By this time, says the *Telegraph's* reporter, "the Professor's audience looked fairly stunned". I wasn't stunned (after all, the Liberals will say anything these days), but I was intrigued, not only because of the bearing of his views on the discussion in last week's FREEDOM on the relation between federalism and decentralisation, but also because his conception of a pluralist system of decentralised public services echoes what was said about the feasibility of breaking up the Post Office, (*The Myth of the Post Office*, FREEDOM 31/8/57), where in illustrating the conclusion that there is no essential connection between centralised government and the running of nationwide, in fact of internationalised public services, a picture was drawn of "Ideological rivalry between say, the worker-controlled Lancashire Post Office, the municipal one in Manchester, and the private enterprise one in Cheshire".

I don't suppose the Liberals took Professor Parkinson's remarks seriously. Not because I equate decentralisation with anarchism except in the sense that anarchy is the ultimate decentralisation, but because if we think of anarchism as apocalyptic utopianism, we must recognise the decentralist attitude as its prerequisite. Kropotkin declared in *Modern Science and Anarchism* that man will be compelled to find new forms of organisation for the social functions which the State now fulfils through the bureaucracy and that "as long as this is not done nothing will be done".

Continually you meet people who heartily agree with anarchist arguments but declare sadly that in the complex conditions of modern society, anarchy would never work. When they say that the whole historical trend of the last hundred years has been towards ever more government they are right, it is in their assumption that this must go on indefinitely, that it is some inevitable law of history, that they are wrong. But who can blame them for thinking as they do?

FOR the brains, like the military ironmongery, are sold to the big battalions. In the last few years an immense amount of study, research, investigation, tabulation, statistical analysis, and Ph.D. mongering has been done on the growth of government; while a pathetic quantity of amateur journalism, after-dinner flippancy and wishful thinking has gone into the search for those "new forms of organisation for the social functions which the State now fulfils through the bureaucracy".

armament is only possible when workers engaged on the production of these weapons will be prepared to stop producing them. This means giving up lucrative jobs, and looking for employment elsewhere. "Argument" plus economic sacrifice... for the workers. And the "egg-heads"? What material sacrifices are they offering to the cause of freedom from nuclear obliteration and burial under moral molehills?

People do respond to example. When we direct our appeal to their heads from our heads, is it surprising that their response is "so what?" When heart and head combine then we have no doubt that something will happen.

BUT let us be quite clear about three things:

- (1) that no politician has a heart
- (2) that "as ye sow so shall ye reap"
- (3) that argument without example is a lamp without the current.

PEOPLE AND IDEAS

The last nine months have seen the publication of

The Growth of Public Employment in Great Britain by M. Abramovitz & V. Eliasberg (National Bureau of Economic Research, Princeton University Press).

The Organisation of British Central Government 1914-1956, ed. by D. N. Chester (Study Group of the Royal Institute of Public Administration, Allen & Unwin).

Central Administration in Britain by W. J. MacKenzie & J. W. Grove (Longmans).

The Growth of Government (Political and Economic Planning).

Between them they have 1,128 pages, cost £4 14s. 6d., and weigh 4lb. 2 ozs. It is sad to think of the tiny percentage of all this thought, scholarship, and sheer weight of learning, that has gone in the same period to the elaboration of the alternatives to government, and the news that during these nine months Kropotkin's *Conquest of Bread* has been published in Polish in Warsaw, Bakunin's *Selected Works* in Yiddish in Buenos Aires, and Kropotkin's *Anarchism; Its Philosophy and Ideal* in Hebrew in Jerusalem, would be rather more welcome if we thought that they would be accompanied by an exposition of anarchism written in the twentieth century and in terms of the twentieth century. And not only in those cities and those languages.

To my mind the most striking feature of the unwritten handbook of twentieth century anarchism is not in its rejection of the insights of the classical anarchist thinkers, Godwin, Proudhon, Bakunin, Kropotkin, but its widening and deepening of them. But it is selective, it rejects perfectionism, utopian fantasy, conspiratorial romanticism, revolutionary optimism; it draws from the classical anarchists their most valid, not their most questionable ideas. And it adds to them the subtler contribution of later (and neglected because untranslated) thinkers like Landauer and Malatesta. It also adds the evidence provided in this century by the social sciences, by psychology and anthropology, and by technical change.

It is still an anarchism of present and permanent protest—how could it be anything else in our present peril? But it is one which recognises that the conflict between authority and liberty is a permanent aspect of the human condition and not something that can be resolved by a vaguely specified social revolution. It recognises that the choice between libertarian and authoritarian solutions occurs every day and in every way, and the extent to which we choose, or accept, or are fobbed off with, or lack the imagination and inventiveness to discover alternatives to, the authoritarian solutions to small problems is the extent to which we are their powerless victims in big affairs. We are powerless to change the course of events over the nuclear arms race, imperialism and so on, pre-

cisely because we have surrendered our power over everything else. Or, more accurately, I think that the unwritten handbook would interpret it in terms of the power-vacuum. The vacuum created by the organisational requirements of a society in a period of rapid population growth and industrialisation at a time when unrestricted exploitation had to yield to a growing extent to the demands of the exploited, has been filled by the State, because of the weakness, inadequacy or incompleteness of libertarian alternatives. Thus the State, in its rôle as a form of social organisation rather than in its basic function as an instrument of internal and external coercion, is not so much the villain of the piece as the result of the inadequacy of the other answers to social needs.

This is the implication of Gustav Landauer's profound contribution to anarchist thought:

"The State is a condition, a certain relationship between human beings, a mode of human behaviour; we destroy it behaving differently."

THE unwritten handbook, using the immense amount of study that has been made, in the last twenty years, on social groups of all kinds, examines these "other relationships". What has gone wrong with them? it asks. Why has the trade union movement got bogged down in the morass of reformist politics, demanding nothing more than better wages and conditions? Why has the producer co-operative movement failed to expand? Why has consumer co-operation, after such ambitious aspirations, become little more than a dowdy elder sister of the chain stores? Why did the Friendly Societies and the voluntary hospital system fail to provide the comprehensive health service, which the cumbersome and expensive machinery of the NHS had to be initiated to supply? Was the last word in the organisation of public education said by the Act of 1870, on which all subsequent elaborations have been based? Is nationalisation the only alternative to private capitalism in industrial organisation? Why is the local government system a byword for bumbledom and petty officialdom, and how does this affect anarchist notions of local autonomy?

It is because they attempt to examine some of these questions that some of the series that appear in FREEDOM, for instance, Geoffrey Ostergaard's study of "The Tradition of Workers' Control" and Gaston Gerard's current authoritative examination of the Independent Commission's report on the Co-operative Movement, are of such value for people who want to hammer out a social as well as an individual conception of anarchism, which is something more than slogans and shibboleths and which takes into account the actual experiences of industrial societies in this century. They are notes for the unwritten handbook. C.W.

Co-ops Conclusion

the Co-op Movement. The standard techniques of political socialism simply do not apply. The principle of local autonomy is clearly a major obstacle in the path of any central dictator, benevolent or otherwise. Equally clearly, the principle acts as a conservative force in the technical sense; it tends towards the maintenance of the *status quo*. In a libertarian society a force of this kind is obviously desirable. It is arguable whether it is desirable in a movement such as the Co-operative which has to meet the competition of its rivals in order to survive.

Too slow a rate of innovation may be fatal. The fact remains that, relatively, the Co-ops are not making headway; they are marking time, and, unless changes happen soon, they may find themselves actually slipping.

The 'Co-ops' find themselves, therefore, faced with the old dilemma. How many of one's principles should one be prepared to sacrifice in order to survive? Is it possible to survive at all without imitating the principles of one's opponents? And, if one imitates them, what exactly has survived? It past history is any guide, the Co-op Movement generally chooses 'survival' rather than 'principles'—but usually only after a considerable time-lag. Its constitution based on 'open membership', provides the means by which the Movement in the long run adapts itself to changing circumstances; in the world as it is only a closed oligarchy can remain 'pure'. For the Co-op Movement, however, it looks as though time is now running out. Without radical changes, this century may see the eclipse of the Co-op Movement as we know it to-day. With radical changes, such as envisaged in the Report, the Co-op Movement will survive but only in a very different form.

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT! WEEK 25

Deficit on Freedom	£500
Contributions received	£325
DEFICIT	£175
June 13 to June 19	
Merriott: M.A.W. 7/6; London: E.P. £1/0/0; Rockfeller Centre: D.A. £1/0/0; Dovercourt: L.C.W. 10/-; Preston: R.S.M. 5/-; Glasgow: T.D. 6/-; Merriott: M.A.W. 5/-	
Total	3 14 6
Previously acknowledged	321 10 7
1958 TOTAL TO DATE	£328 5 1

GIFTS OF BOOKS: London: C.F.; London: Anon; London: Anon.

*Indicates regular contributor.

GASTON GERARD.

Perennial Problem

S.F.'s witty letter in FREEDOM (7/6/58) deserves a better reply than it has yet received from either the editors or the 'Reader' who rallied to their defence (14/6/58). Whether or not one agrees with S.F.'s conception of the paper's function or his judgment on the general standard of performance of its contributors, his letter raises an important organisational problem. It is a problem which all organisations face but which presents special difficulties for anarchists.

The problem is one of finding new blood. However rich in corpuscles the blood of the founders or present leaders of an organisation may be, it is inevitable that sooner or later it begins to turn to water. Unless a transfusion takes place the result is likely to be debilitating, at least in appearance. Objectively, perhaps, the activities of the organisation may appear sound, even better than in the past—since skill and experience count for something—but they lack the spark of crude vitality.

As an example of what I mean let me cite our contemporary, the *New Statesman*. The N.S. is probably still the best of the political weeklies with anything like a mass circulation. But for years now it has suffered from a kind of spiritual clap. I get the impression—and I am not alone in this—that the same old horses are leaping the same old fences; polished performances all, but lacking in vigour. Compare it with the *Spectator* which a few years back came under new management. I dislike the teddy-boy politics of the *Spectator* more than I dislike the spinsterish whippers of the *New Statesman* but I have to admit that the *Spectator* has got something which the N.S. hasn't: it's well and truly alive. The N.S. had a halfhearted face-lift recently but I have little doubt that it won't really begin to sparkle again until dear old Kingsley Martin is pensioned off and a new editor collects together another set of boys.

Many organisations, recognising the general problem, have institutionalised means of solving it to some extent. They introduce compulsory retiring ages or procedures whereby elected officers are required to stand down for a period before seeking re-election. These means do not commend themselves very much to anarchists: they savour too much of bureaucracy. Anarchist organisations also often suffer from the fact that work in them offers for most people very little reward, either material or psychic in nature. There is, therefore, rarely a surplus of talent pressing its take-over bid as there is in organisations offering high monetary or prestige rewards.

This in itself might not be too serious a drawback were there not further difficulties still. One of the most important of these is that anarchist organisations must inevitably be to some extent oligarchic in character if they are to remain anarchist. A feature of a democratic organisation is that membership is open to all who subscribe to its principles and, in practice, too close a scrutiny of a potential member's principles is not made. With open membership it becomes possible, therefore, for new men and new ideas to make themselves felt over a period of time. But democracy is often paid for by the sacrifice of the original principles: the organisation is eventually transformed into something which its founders would scarcely recognise. The Co-op Movement is a good case in point.

Anarchists have long appreciated all this. To prevent the subversion of anarchist organisations they have adopted the functional principle which in practice means that the organisation consists of a closed group of activists. In its internal arrangements the group may be, and usually is, democratic to the ultimate degree, working according to the unanimity principle. But in its relationship to outsiders, including those who might consider themselves to be in some sense 'members' of the amorphous anarchist movement, the group presents the appearance of an oligarchy.

The anarchist functional group, of course, rarely maintains the same membership over any lengthy period of time: even anarchists are mortal! Original members drop out for one reason or another—the unanimity principle no doubt sometimes contributing to intra-group tensions. New members are brought in but only by the oligarchic method of co-option. Doubtless some or most of these new recruits 'choose themselves' in the sense that their outside activities have made them the most likely candidates. But there is, of course, no guarantee that this procedure will result in the best available recruits being obtained.

Oligarchy is to be commended in certain circumstances but it suffers from a number of inherent defects. Anarchist oligarchy is no exception. One of these defects is that it tends to generate a feeling of apathy on the part of the outsiders. The division between 'we' and 'they' begins to manifest itself very rapidly. This division cannot be bridged by name-calling between the parties. It is no use the outsiders muttering about the authoritarian tendencies of the insiders and it is no use the insiders mut-

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS

tering about the lack of responsibility of the outsiders. The tension between the two sets of people is inherent in this type of organisation.

The matter is further complicated by anarchist ideology with its anti-authoritarian bias and its assumption that individual spontaneity exists and is highly commendable. Spontaneity undoubtedly exists, especially among anarchists, but I am not sure that it can be relied upon to produce the desired results in a tiny movement such as ours. As an outsider who has been around and about the movement for over ten years, I know that plenty of scope exists for people willing to do their bit. I believe that, in the last few years especially, I have spontaneously contributed a bit. Rather more has been contributed because I have been prompted by the editors. Looking back I feel that I might have contributed even more if some means existed, other than sporadic editorial appeals, to prompt my spontaneous instincts. I was around and about the movement for some years before, in some form or another, I found a niche as an occasional contributor to FREEDOM and lecturer at anarchist groups. I am sure that there may well have been others 'round and about' who did not succeed in finding a niche and have consequently moved on. Had they found it, and been helped to find it by the insiders, they might still be with us today.

To return to the original point of this letter, I think it may well be true that FREEDOM at this particular stage in its life is in need of a blood transfusion. I do not know whether the new blood exists. I hope, however, that S.F., in true anarchist fashion, will set about gathering round himself the half-dozen or so 'responsible' people capable of running the paper for a few months. Since the editors have assured him that the stable door is ever open and that they are panting for the green pastures, we may assume that the harness is theirs for the asking, provided agreement can be reached on a definition of 'responsible'. It may be that the institutionalisation of a three months' holiday for tired anarchist editors every three years is the answer to one of FREEDOM's perennial problems.

GEOFFREY OSTERGAARD.

London, June 18.

P.S.—I am not a candidate for high office.

A Suggestion for S.F.

I HAVE read with interest the correspondence columns of FREEDOM over the last few weeks, and am glad to note that the letter from S.F. has at least produced reactions from readers as well as the editors. This is a sign, however slight, that there are readers of FREEDOM who are sufficiently interested to put pen to paper. Whether they are "for" or "against" is not the essential point.

If I may circumnavigate most of the arguments which have been put forward in the correspondence (in the main they are personal expressions of opinion), and return to the suggestion put forward in S.F.'s original letter; he wrote:

"Now it is my suggestion that these honoured ladies and gentlemen (the editors) should be retired for a few months . . . (and) should invite a dozen people in London whom they feel are responsible enough to run a paper for a few months, not all of the dozen need to be active participants, but if half of this number agree to assist, then the

object will be achieved. This should . . . be interpreted as . . . an extra shoulder temporarily lent to lift a heavy load. Perhaps one of the present Editors would assist in a technical advisory capacity. . . ."

There is of course nothing specifically wrong with this idea—except that it might not work. I therefore have an alternative suggestion, based entirely on S.F.'s but modified, so that if all does not go well there would be no last minute calamity of any kind.

1. S.F. should be the one to invite a dozen people in London whom he feels are responsible and inclined to help.

2. He should invite them to write articles (on current news as well as "theoretical" material) which they could submit to him.

3. He could edit the articles and then discuss the situation *vis-à-vis* FREEDOM with an Editor (or Editors) who would be glad to have his contributions and at

the same time give any advice or criticism where possible.

Thus what might be termed a gradualist approach to the problem could be made. S.F. and his co-operators would produce as much suitable material as they could, and the present Editors the rest. (For it would be annoying to the readers if there were blank spaces in the paper). The more S.F. produced, the smaller the number of articles which would be "barely readable" (to quote S.F.).

The regular contributors would have a rest from the task of writing so much material themselves, S.F. and friends would gain experience and skill over a period, FREEDOM would benefit from additional (fresh) writers, and the readers would benefit all round.

Perhaps S.F. would care to contact me first—I for one look forward to having some of the "heavy load" lifted from my shoulders. H.F.W.

... and an answer from him

PITY indeed that Boxer and Clover should have misinterpreted the spirit of my letter. So far as my agricultural knowledge goes Horses retired on double helpings of oats and sugar have done more than their share of work. One might even say that I nearly leaned over backwards to praise the efforts of the editors. My criticism of FREEDOM is in a sense, re-echoed by the Editors' reply which says "We have no doubt that there are many intelligent young men in our movement who could do what we are doing with a freshness of ideas which we old hacks have probably lost by now!" The fact that no one has yet come forward is not my fault or the editors, but that does not detract from my criticism of the paper as made.

Just for the record, my letter was provoked by a discussion between myself and three other comrades (regular readers of FREEDOM) on a rainy Sunday afternoon between mouthfuls of cheese and stale bread. I have read my letter diligently and nowhere do I indicate that I represent anyone's opinion but my own. Having been acquainted with the Anarchist movement for some years I would be the first to yell the usual clichés about someone else representing me. And as for the "stale steak", don't we all know that one man's poison is another man's indigestion.

As much as I like the Editors as people I will be "arrogant" enough to assume that none of them are vested with the infinite knowledge of "God", nor do they

even boast a Freud, so I cannot take them seriously when they tell me that my letter was a mere bit of exhibitionism laying my innermost motives bare, while at the same time finding me arrogant and a political dilettante, whatever the last adjective may mean. Surely the halos don't gleam any brighter on the editors' heads? I was also informed that I should only read the Yellow Press because I usually start reading an article with its title. It appears that I am bitter and my criticism is only that of "self-criticism".

Come, come now Editors, to have psycho-analysed me in half a column is indeed no mean feat and I may even consider going to regular sessions if the price is right. Conscience having pricked

Pilgrimage of Peace

I have recently received a typewritten leaflet, sent to me by a friend in France, entitled "Our Home is the World", which describes a projected march across Europe, similar to the Aldermaston March, though on a much larger scale. The purpose is to demonstrate against the war in Algeria.

The ideal of being a "citizen of the world" is as old as civilisation. To-day, with modern means of transport, one would have thought that this ideal would be stronger than it has ever been before. In fact, however, it appears that by bringing people together one has only given them a better chance to quarrel savagely with each other.

"Why not then an attempt to bring back sanity to this violence-ridden world by choosing a path of NON-VIOLENCE and DISPOSSESSION voluntarily through compassion and understanding? . . . WHAT CAN WE INDIVIDUALLY DO?"

Not all the suggestions included in this leaflet would meet with anarchist approval. Writing letters of protest to statesmen is a method which appears to have had little success in the past. Protest must be backed up by effective action to influence statesmen. A protest against a war will not have much effect, but a strike on a sufficiently large scale, sufficiently well organised, could do so.

8,000 postcards of protest against the death-sentence on Djamira Bouhired are claimed to have influenced the French President, which is all to the good, but the sentence is only "suspended until such time as the case was thoroughly retried". Meanwhile the girl will probably die in prison from the treatment she has received. It is good of course that something has been gained.

Nor will anarchists have much faith in appeal to the United Nations. The United Nations is an organisation under the control of the United States. No doubt the rulers of the United States would like nothing better than to take control of Algeria. There is oil in the Sahara. If the United Nations' forces take over in Algeria that is what it would mean, the forwarding of American imperialism in Africa at the expense of French imperialism. However, the people of Algeria themselves would benefit from the cessation of hostilities, whatever the cause.

There is much more to be said for the final suggestion for action made in this leaflet. "Join the 'pilgrimage for peace', personifying the desire of the people for peaceful settlements of political differences. The aim of this pilgrimage is to bring the message of non-violence to the man in the street, as well as to the persons involved with the government; to raise funds for the victims of suppression, and to show our protest against the denial of HUMAN RIGHTS."

This seems a more direct appeal at least. Statesmen are ruthless and hard of heart (as statesmen that is, in private life they are often amiable), but they could not function at all if the majority of the people did not enthusiastically support them.

The real fault for man's inhumanity to man lies not with the rulers, who are a tiny minority, but with the ruled, who in early times gave away the responsibility for their own lives to kings and priests, and who have never really desired to have it back again, although they have revolted occasionally when things have become a bit too tough.

The key to the future lies in the changing of people's minds and hearts, so that they will increasingly reject authoritarianism and exploitation. It is necessary to overcome the authoritarianism which has become ingrained in them. How this is to be done is the problem.

Vinoba Bhave's campaign for the voluntary surrender of land by the landowners of India, for the benefit of peasants who were poor or landless, is cited in this leaflet, as an example of non-violent action, which has succeeded quickly and on a large scale.

somewhat the Editors throw in the sugar-coated pill and say "Dear S.F., we know you mean well . . ." Of course I bloody well mean well or I would not have bothered to write the letter. Why not discuss some of the suggestions I mentioned in my letter, instead of trying to find out why I make them in the first place. Who can really know the motives that move one to do or be the hundred and one things one does or is. The obvious is only half the truth the rest is mostly your guess which is as good as mine. But life has continued on half-knowledge for so long, and much has been achieved, perhaps, in our new society we will know it all.

S.F.

There must therefore be some way of overcoming apathy and fear, which humanity has not yet really discovered. "The Pilgrimage is scheduled to begin from Austria by July, via Yugoslavia (if permitted), Italy, Switzerland, to finish in France or in Algeria.

Another branch might begin from Scandinavia through Holland, Germany, Belgium, to France. It is desirable that on the same day token pilgrimages begin from as many towns as can be organised, each group going up to the next town or village, to meet and send resolutions to the French Government, urging a cease-fire. People may join in it for a short time, such as from a few hours a day to a whole week, or they can join for the whole route, which will take roughly three months to cover, mainly on foot . . . Gradually the pilgrimage may become a walking seminar for better understanding, by breaking down barriers in our own minds."

This who may wish to join the pilgrimage are asked to write to:

PEACE PILGRIM,
c/o Mrs. BACON,
Merau Gasse 26,
Graz,
Germany.

A.W.U.

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

Every Sunday at 7.30 at
THE MALATESTA CLUB,
32 Percy Street,
Tottenham Court Road, W.1.

LECTURE - DISCUSSIONS

JUNE 29.—Tony Gibson on
PARANOIA AS A SOCIAL FORCE
July 6.—Arthur W. Uloth on
MAN AGAINST SOCIETY
JULY 13.—Donovan Pedely on
ANARCHISM & DEMOCRACY
Questions, Discussion and Admission
all free.

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP 1958 SUMMER SCHOOL

August 2nd—4th.

Subject: "WAR AND PEACE"
Speakers to be announced

Bookings are requested as soon as possible. Write: JOAN SCULTHORPE, c/o Freedom Press.

★ Malatesta Club ★

SWARAJ HOUSE,
32 PERCY STREET,
TOTTENHAM COURT ROAD, LONDON, W.1.

ACTIVITIES

Every Sunday at 7.30 p.m.
London Anarchist Group Meetings
(see Announcements Column)

Trad Jazz at the Malatesta

Every Friday and Saturday from 7.30

THE MALATESTA JAZZ BAND

Members(1/6) and their guests (2/-) only.
MALATESTA CLUB
32 Percy Street
Tottenham Court Road W1
Jazz Men welcome
Organised by IAC

Every Wednesday at 7.30 (prompt)
BONAR THOMPSON speaks

FREEDOM

The Anarchist Weekly

Postal Subscription Rates:
12 months 19/- (U.S.A. \$3.00)
6 months 9/6 (U.S.A. \$1.50)
3 months 5/- (U.S.A. \$0.75)

Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies
12 months 29/- (U.S.A. \$4.50)
6 months 14/6 (U.S.A. \$2.25)

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

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