

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"Government is the outcome of conquest."

—LESTER F. WARD.

Vol. 19, No. 28

July 12, 1958

Threepence

COLD WAR (CONTINUED)

IN all the indignation, mock-indignation and counter-indignation which followed the disclosure of the execution of Imre Nagy, Pal Maleter and the other two Hungarian victims of the Kremlin's present policy for the satellites, little has been discussed as to just what that policy is—and what inferences can be drawn from it.

The anarchists were practically alone in 1956 in their suspicion of the Kremlin's alleged 'liberalisation' policy following Khrushchev's denunciation of Stalin. Once the Communists had got over the shock of seeing their erstwhile god trampled into the Satanic dust, they readily joined in the denunciation of the cult of the individual and lauded Khrushchev's clean-up as a great example of the strength of the Soviet Union. To be able to admit such massive mistakes was the measure of greatness and showed clearly the determination of the Soviet leaders to eradicate forever such perversions of legality from their socialist state.

Wishful Thinking

For the non-communists the Kremlin line came as a relief from the tensions and fears of the Cold War, and wishful thinking did the rest. Everybody was prepared to believe that things were going to be better in Russia because everybody *hoped* that things would be better. Not so much for the sake of the Russians, of course, but for the sake of the rest of the world which found it very difficult to get on with the truculent 'diplomacy' of Stalin.

So Khrushchev and Bulganin (remember him?) put on their seven-league boots and peddled their goodwill mission around the world from Delhi to Buckingham Palace and Belgrade.

Until unfortunately the people of Hungary began to demand in reality some of the liberalisation which B. & K. were promising in speech. So that Khrushchev suddenly learnt a lesson which you would have thought an experienced commissar would have known anyway: that you can't be a dictator by half-measures. And since Khrushchev had no intention of ceasing to be a dictator he had only one choice to make—to establish himself in the position enjoyed for so long by the most successful dictator of modern times—Josef Stalin himself.

Into the Supreme Position

Hence the gradual elimination of all potential rivals for power in the Kremlin. Malenkov, Molotov, Zhukov, old buddy Bulganin—all went down the drain with the principle of collective leadership as Nikolai Khrushchev, step by step, marched into the position of supreme boss.

With that position, of course, must go the correct policies. You can't be a tough boss with soft policies. So with the tightening of Mr. Khrushchev's grip upon his own party and his own people had also to come the tightening of his grip upon Russia's satellites and the re-emerging of cold-war policies in international relations.

The latter, of course, has been strengthened by Russia's emergence as the first in the field of planetary satellites and her obvious parity if not superiority in ballistic missiles and H-Bombs. Easier to be intransigent when you're on top.

Rediscovering Tito

Hence, therefore, the back-pedalling on the 'Let's be nice to Tito' line and the re-discovery that he is after all a traitor to socialism. Almost any day now the zoological classifications will again be brought into action.

The murders of Imre Nagy and his colleagues can thus be seen as the re-establishment of cominform domination over the satellites backed up by Stalinist terror as of old. We are back where we were in 1952, with only the name of the dictator changed.

Nagy was killed, not because he represented any danger to the Kremlin's new master or even to the Hungarian puppet government, secure behind Russian tanks, but as a warning to Tito, to Gomulka in Poland, to any other ambitions deviationist in any of the satellites and, last but not least, to any possible opposition within the Russian Communist Party itself.

The warning rocket has gone up. A dictator's terror stalks again in the corridors of the Kremlin and

notice has been served that banishment to far-away power stations is not the only punishment that can await those who incur the master's displeasure.

No Hope from Governments

Our suspicions of the value of the 'liberalisation' mouthings of 1956 have therefore been justified. They were suspicions born of our experience of the ways of government and the knowledge that what the State gives, the State can take away—and liberty, be it never so relative, is the very thing the State is most anxious to snatch back at the first opportunity.

It suited Khrushchev's purpose for a time to dangle liberty like a bait before his Party and before the eyes of the people of Russia and the satellites. Now that it has served his purpose he withdraws it and re-establishes—with the willing, stupid, help of John Foster Dulles and Selwyn Lloyd—the anxieties and fears of the Cold War.

Those who hoped have had another lesson—there is no hope from governments.

LEBANON

Political Intrigue

AS Dag Hammarskjöld has so succinctly put it: "Only the Lebanese can save Lebanon." He did not of course mean the Lebanese people, which is a pity, but referred in fact to the Lebanese politicians and militarists.

However, for what it is worth, as a summary of official United Nations opinion in respect of how much "interference" is required by those other than Lebanese, it is a decision more likely to bring about a settlement of Lebanese internal strife than one which might have entailed dramatic U.N. (sic) assistance of a military nature.

President Chamoun must be bitterly disappointed that, as at this time, he is to receive no great assistance from Britain and America in his highly questionable conduct of the Lebanese civil war. Let it be said that of all the factors, overt or otherwise, concerned in this rebellion, none can be said to be fighting for anything but the most doubtful interests. The Lebanese people themselves certainly cannot win.

Chamoun hopes to succeed in his political ambitions, by forcing the West to take part, on the blackmail value of the Eisenhower Doctrine, which states that the U.S. will come to the (military) aid of a "country dominated by international Communism. So far he has failed to enlist help because Syria is not as yet considered to come into the "dominated" category, and U.N. military observers have decided that Syrian "massive intervention" does not exist, and the United Arab Republic is not really trying.

President Nasser has done it again. He has helped to stir up quite a lot of trouble against the Lebanon, which is for him anathema whilst tied to Western apron-strings; he has engendered a situation in which the West is scared for fear of retaliation from the East (and rightly so—though for the wrong reasons), and having set the cauldron boiling he may sit back and await developments—having been pro-

nounced innocent of any serious crime—and, needless to say, he will be first man in for any of the prizes which may eventually fall.

The simplicity of the plan is its strength, and it is an example of how the greatest gains may be made from relatively slender resources. By "infiltration" of arms (not on a "massive" scale), and "fomentation" (not proven to be of "foreign inspiration"), Nasser has in effect developed a civil war which Chamoun does not want to win until he is certain of American backing both militarily and politically. For his Presidential term expires on September 23rd, and his greatest desire is to be elected for a further term. But this is not permissible by the Lebanese Constitution—hence his need of American help. The civil war must continue in the hope that Mr. Dulles will change his mind from:

"The presence of foreign troops, however justifiable, is not as good a solution as for the Lebanese to find a solution themselves."

(Which is another way of saying: the presence of the U.S. Marines and the Sixth Fleet is too much of a risk of really serious trouble with the U.S.S.R.: Chamoun must go it alone.)

On July 24th the Lebanese Chamber of Deputies is due to meet (for the first time since the crisis began), for the purpose of electing a new President. It is quite possible that the Deputies will not turn up, since they have not yet settled on a candidate acceptable to any great number of them. If they do turn up however, the probability is that Chamoun will be displaced by a President in much greater sympathy with the aims of President Nasser than himself. A shock for Chamoun and the West—and a probable end to the civil war. The Russians will be pleased, and Nasser will have struck another blow for the United Arab Republic—and President Nasser.

The Lebanese people are unlikely to make any gains—1,400 are dead already.

FRANCE

De Gaulle's H-Ambitions

Mr. Dulles was expected to offer General de Gaulle a nuclear power plant for a submarine (Philip Deane cables from Washington) and to suggest that France should test a nuclear weapon as soon as possible to satisfy demands of prestige before joining in an agreement to suspend tests.—("Observer" 6/7/58).

TO the anarchist way of thinking, the above statement is insanely futile. The damaging effects to humans of H-bomb tests have already been acknowledged by responsible scientists all over the world, and while it is true that France does not have at the moment the necessary material to produce weapons of the magnitude of Britain and America she is clearly aiming at becoming one of the 'great' nuclear powers.

The tenor of the negotiations which are taking place between Dulles and General de Gaulle point to France's determination to explode an "all French H-bomb if necessary" or "be provided by America with the necessary information or the weapons themselves on an equal basis with Britain". The intention of the Dulles proposal, however, based on American Intelligence resources that France is in a position to set off one small atomic bomb, is to encourage the military leader of France to feel that by testing little bombs instead of aiming at bigger ones, he is just as important a member of the alliance, which has been lightheartedly called the "Atomic Club", as the U.S.A. and Britain. Then, we are told, after the pride of France has been saved by testing bombs, a Western agreement will be reached on the suspension of bomb testing. Childish isn't it? But the possible effects on the

peoples of the world should be anything but child-like.

De Gaulle's arrogant demands have been met with friendly non-committal replies, and Mr. Dulles has given us a lesson in how to placate petulant friends—invite them home and make them a gift of an atomic submarine, but make sure that they are entirely dependent upon you for the expensive fuel and the knowledge of how it works. Cynical readers will have guessed that there are other snags attached to fashionable gifts and soft words. Mr. Dulles is urging, among other things, the building of launching sites for nuclear missiles in France, and that the U.S. should be allowed to stockpile nuclear war heads. There should be no resistance from de Gaulle on the last score since it will give him extra bargaining power, as will the hint that he might pursue an 'independent' policy with Moscow.

Meanwhile de Gaulle's demands provide an excuse for any final decision on the banning of further nuclear tests, although we are assured that Britain and the U.S. are ready to commit themselves on the issue. The fact that as late as last week it was reported that Dulles had "been converted" to the idea of a nuclear test ban, to our minds, proves nothing. Because it has been made very clear by America, that the present little publicised conference of Western and Soviet bloc scientists at Geneva, who are discussing the technical possibilities of detection and control of nuclear tests, that the conference would not commit them to suspension of tests. In fact, the scientists have stated that it is not their job to advise

Continued on p. 4

The Only Answer to Recession and Inflation Sovereignty of Common Sense

THE government's announcement that it was making "relaxations in the control of borrowing"—which was the Chancellor's cautious way of saying that the "credit squeeze" is ended—was welcomed by the Labour Opposition spokesman, Mr. Wilson, with the comment: "We are glad that the government is slowly—very, very slowly—responding to our pressure", adding that the government was now recognising its problem as recession not inflation".

We are sure that no one in the House, least of all Mr. Wilson, for one moment believed that it was Labour "pressure" which influenced this change of financial policy. As Mr. Wilson himself put it, *recession* is the government's problem just now! A year ago the trouble was that we were "living beyond our means; now apparently, we aren't buying enough, not because we have all that we want, but because we haven't the money with which to buy the goods we have already produced! So the government is giving the banks a free hand to lend money, not only for "capital purposes" but for any purpose for which "bank finance is required for the normal business of the applicant".

Now it must seem curious to some people that the Opposition, notorious for its advocacy of a *controlled* economy, should be welcoming Mr. Amory's announcement of a relax-

ation of controls, and that the Government, which poses as the champion of a *free* economy, should have any controls to relax! Of course there is really nothing very curious about these apparent contradictions. Ignoring the worth of party political slogans, which only a few anachronistic liberals still believe in (because power for them is still so remote), neither the Tory nor Labour leaders believe that a *free* economy is possible to-day. "Relaxation of controls" clearly means that there are moments when "relaxation" is expedient, politically or financially, for the very fact that the government has the powers to reimpose controls means that even when the economy is "free" it is only because the government is advised that it is in the best interests of the financial system that it should be! Which is, after all, another form of control! Consider for a moment that the credit squeeze, the high bank rate and other measures to discourage the extension of credit were imposed at a time when the demand for credit was *high* and that on the other hand the present "relaxation" is announced at a time when demand for credit is *low*. As the *Manchester Guardian's* Political correspondent points out:

Reception of the news was tinged with a gloomy sense that this change, taken with the others, bodes little good for the

Continued on p. 3

The Sovereignty of Common Sense

Continued from p. 1

country's economic future. Mr. Amory's changes are read as signs that the pressure for capital is abating and that industrial activity is slowing down. Indeed, the Government suspects that, even if the American recession should begin to disappear by the end of this year, its delayed consequences may only then begin to be felt here.

If in matters of financial policy any difference exists between the Government and the Opposition it is not, then, on the question of controls but on when to apply or relax them; that is, a disagreement as to when exactly an inflationary period ends and one of recession begins! And in these matters the party leaders are guided by their chosen experts who somehow never seem to be in agreement among themselves, either as to the ills that beset the financial world or as to the best treatment required to effect a cure. Little wonder, then, that the layman is convinced that commonsense is of little value in understanding or solving these problems.

TO our minds it is a tragic mistake to believe that commonsense has no place in "a complex society". On the contrary it is in a society whose material potentialities, thanks to the giant strides made by science in the past fifty years, seem limitless, that the human appeal of commonsense needs to be felt if we are to avoid being destroyed.

The production of steel or atomic power are complex scientific and technological processes to which the layman armed with commonsense can contribute little. But in the matter of the purposes to which these processes shall be put, the distribution of the commodities produced, these are fields in which commonsense and humanity can, and should, play a dominating rôle. Yet here again the public is bamboozled into believing that they are matters for more experts, economic and political, to solve. And until we can break down this idea that the producers have no right or the intelligence to have a say in what they produce and why, life will proceed drunkenly from one crisis to another, from recession to inflation and back to recession with an occasional war for good measure.

For millions of people a job is simply a means of earning a livelihood. The work they do is purposeless and more often than not dreary; they drown their boredom in innumerable cups of tea and at the end of the day escape into the make-believe world of Hollywood and commercial Telly. So long as at the end of the week they have a pay packet they are not interested in how the hours of their employment are spent. The fact that the employer has bought these hours of their lives, means that they belong to him to dispose of as he wishes. Behind this attitude is the feeling that the ordinary man has no basic right to life; that he exists by permission of the State and thanks to the employer who is willing to buy a part of it in return for the means to secure the basic necessities of life.

Trade Unionism to-day is concerned with the conditions under which people work, rates of pay and hours of work. It is quite unconcerned with the social usefulness of the work people do; if an employer is prepared to pay a man to stand on his head all day, that is a job which will carry an agreed rate of pay! Capitalism is a system of production for profit and privilege which only takes into account human needs as a means for making more profit. The fact that under

this system production may purposefully be limited, or part of it destroyed to maintain prices makes "sense" for those who materially benefit by it. It makes, or should make, *non-sense* for the vast majority of the world's people who do not even have the necessities of life. Unfortunately it does not. They are always ready to accept their governments' word when they announce an economic crisis and to be the first to make sacrifices, even though commonsense should tell them that the crisis is of the financial machine which, the sooner it destroys itself, the better.

Commonsense would tell them that it is human hands and brains and not finance, which are responsible for growing the food, and for building the machines and houses we need to maintain life. Finance without human labour is powerless. Only recently we saw that London Transport with its Executive, its inspectors, its buses and its millions *but without the busworkers*, was unable to put a single bus on the roads!

IT is interesting to note that opposition to the cold war in international politics is growingly using arguments based on commonsense instead of so-called political realism. Bertrand Russell in his "Speech that was not Heard"* addresses himself to his fellow intellectuals in simple language using simple arguments. Unfortunately he believes that politicians such as Dulles and Khrushchev, whose utterances on nuclear war show a "willingness" to lead "mankind to universal death rather than make even the smallest concession in negotiations" can nevertheless be influenced by commonsense arguments of human survival, and that a "World Government is either feasible or could maintain peace.

If the world were guided by commonsense there would be no need for governments or politicians, competition for markets, frontiers and capitalist methods of production. The future of mankind depends on the sovereignty of common sense among the people themselves for the alternative is that politicians should be persuaded to cease being politicians, capitalists being capitalists, power maniacs being power maniacs, and this, to our minds, is asking even more than that you and I should cease being their dupes!

*With which Bertrand Russell was to have opened in Basle last week the nuclear disarmament campaign conference banned at the last minute by the Swiss government. Extracts of his appeal appeared in last Sunday's *Observer*.

ANARCHIST IDEAS TODAY

must make the militants of the anarchist movement feel that it is a worthwhile weapon in their hands. I said that it must fulfil several rôles but perhaps it would bring out my general point if I said that that was just one rôle, that a paper, just like an individual, should feel, that it was necessary to express anarchism in several ways, to have something to say to everyone. We should consider the question of technical excellence in our propaganda. Many people I know read the *New Statesman* or *The Observer* for its film and theatre criticisms, and are so dragged down into their political net of intellectual respectability. We should try to make our literary articles better than theirs, so that people will read *FREEDOM* to see what we have to say, and so get dragged into our political net instead.

The organisation of Freedom Press is a subject which usually arouses very high feelings, which I can understand, since when I first came into contact with the anarchist movement I felt a violent antagonism to *FREEDOM*. This is not the time to go into a detailed discussion of the particular issues involved beyond saying that I am now on the side of *FREEDOM* in controversy, and that I think that if all the energy that is put into fault-finding were put into working for the paper, most of the reasonable grounds for criticism would disappear. It is perfectly true that the paper has to carry comments on current events the facts of which are generally culled from national newspapers, with anarchist comments interspersed. Whether one regards these as a vital way of interpreting events, or as a lot of clichés depends chiefly on one's interest in anarchism, but if they are sometimes written in a cliché-like form (and I myself have been guilty of this), then I think this is partly due to the fact that the same people are doing it week after week and doing too much. To anyone who feels a concern over the quality of anarchist propaganda, and its effectiveness, I would suggest reading the articles on current events, not as a sedative but to see exactly how anarchism can have something to say

Reconciling Reason With Feelings

DEAR COMRADES,

I do not consider that my head is in the sand. (See "Propaganda, Some Anarchist Reflections", *FREEDOM*, June 28, 1958). It seems to me that the majority of anarchists do live their ideas as far as they can, and indeed they appear to do so much more than I. I am not speaking now of "sympathisers", but of the tiny minority who do profess and call themselves anarchists. I suppose I meet about a dozen or so in London in the course of a year. As much as can be done, in the way of classic anarchism, they already do.

I think that the failure of the anarchist movement to spread is due to a vast number of causes. But recent meetings at the Malatesta Club have helped to crystallise in my mind an idea that has been developing there for a long time. It is that the anarchists have failed to reconcile reason and feeling. Emotionally many people are tied to the old society, yet their reason tells them that the old ideas are superstitious and must be given up. They are often glad to give them up, and feel emancipated, but the old feelings are still there, while at the same time a purely rational world is sterile and rather dull.

Anyone coming to the Malatesta Club on any of the last few Sundays would have believed that he had stumbled on a meeting of the National Secular Society. There are in London innumerable bodies of people to whom the American expression "radical" might be applied: the Independent Labour Party, the Socialist Party of Great Britain, the Trotskyists, the Peace Pledge Union, the Ethicists and the Humanists, the people who are against colonialism, the people who are against the H-Bomb, the opponents of the colour bar, the Fabians, the Naturists, the Vegetarians, and many many more. Their members are all good folk. They read *The New Statesman*, *The Observer*, *The Manchester Guardian*, or

Freedom Press Execs Please Copy

"We are indebted to *Business Week* for unearthing, in its April 12 issue, the news that metal-buttoned Navy blue blazers, complete with embroidered pocket patch, now are being worn as 'modest status symbols' by Prentice-Hall executives. About 30 P-H division heads have the sport coats, which designate them as members of the group that meets regularly with president John G. Powers to trade 'secrets' and help with 'cross-fertilization of ideas'. The pocket insignia—and a matching tie-clip—shows the letters 'P-H' on an open book and bears the words 'Executive Staff'. P-H supplies the tie-clips and the pocket insignia; the execs have to buy their own blue blazers." from *Publishers' Weekly*, 18/5/58.

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS

even descend to less sedate levels with *The News Chronicle*. They are all in favour of making life better for everybody, doing away with poverty, getting rid of irrational taboos, educating people in order that they may become more enlightened. Cruelty, dirt, ignorance, starvation, disease are their enemies.

Go to almost any of their meetings, and you will hear roughly the same thing. We must raise mankind, by the means of some authority or other. There is one movement, and one only, which says in effect, "You can do all this much better without authority, and indeed, if you try to use authority, it will fall on your own heads." That is the anarchist movement. Yet this movement seems bent on assimilating itself to the others, and losing its uniqueness. Anybody coming, as a stranger, to its meetings would be justified in thinking, "Here is another minority group of worthy well-thinking reformers. This will do as a change from the World Governmentalists, or the Neo-Sufis, or the Society for the Raising of Humanity by Means of Universal Telepathy." No wonder we don't get people staying. Good intentions and noble sentiments are two a penny.

Anarchism is more than a social or political creed, or even a personal philosophy of life. It is a system of psychology, at least potentially. This system is based on the belief that man's deepest feelings are social. Now, most psychological theories assume a basic antisociality in man. So the anarchist idea is unusual, to say the least.

No movement or body of thought has succeeded in reconciling man's reason with his feelings. The two are usually regarded as quite separate. "Lift up Your Heads" urges the title of a rationalist anthology in my bookcase. "Hearts not Heads in the School" retorts A. S. Neill from the shelf immediately above. But of course both heart and head are part of the same organism. Hear how ridiculous it sounds if you say, "Don't let your legs rule your ears, or your nose rule your hands." In a whole man, one who had achieved an integrated personality, there would be no question of conflict between heart and head.

It would be a wonderful thing if the anarchists were the people to achieve this reconciliation. If they did the movement would have a new vitality.

London, July 2. ARTHUR W. ULOTH.

FREEDOM PRESS

SELECTIONS FROM 'FREEDOM'

Vol. 1, 1951, *Mankind is One*
Vol. 2, 1952, *Postscript to Posterity*
Vol. 3, 1953, *Colonialism on Trial*
Vol. 4, 1954, *Living on a Volcano*
Vol. 5, 1955, *The Immoral Moralists*
Vol. 6, 1956, *Oil and Troubled Waters*
each volume paper 7s. 6d.
cloth 10s. 6d.

The paper edition of the Selections is available to readers of *FREEDOM* at 5/- a copy

E. A. GUTKIND :
The Expanding Environment 8s. 6d.

VOLINE :
Nineteen-Seventeen (The Russian Revolution Betrayed) cloth 12s. 6d.
(Kronstadt 1921, Ukraine 1918-21) The Unknown Revolution cloth 12s. 6d.

V. RICHARDS :
Lessons of the Spanish Revolution 6s.

RUDOLF ROCKER :
Nationalism and Culture cloth 21s.

MARIE-LOUISE BERNERI :
Neither East nor West paper 7s. 6d., cloth 10s. 6d.

PETER KROPOTKIN :
The State : Its Historic Rôle 1s.
The Wage System 3d.
Revolutionary Government 3d.
Organised Vengeance cloth 2d.

JOHN HEWETSON :
Ill-Health, Poverty and the State cloth 2s. 6d., paper 1s.

ERRICO MALATESTA :
Anarchy 6d.
Vote—What For? 1d.

HERBERT READ :
Art and the Evolution of Man 4s.
Existentialism, Marxism and Anarchism 3s. 6d.
Poetry and Anarchism cloth 5s., paper 2s. 6d.
The Philosophy of Anarchism boards 2s. 6d.
The Education of Free Men 1s.

TONY GIBSON :
Youth for Freedom paper 2s.
Who will do the Dirty Work? 2d.

K. J. KENAFICK :
Michael Bakunin and Karl Marx paper 6s.

F. A. RIDLEY :
The Roman Catholic Church and the Modern Age 2d.

ALEX COMFORT :
Delinquency 6d.

Marie-Louise Berneri Memorial Committee publications :
Marie-Louise Berneri, 1918-1949: A Tribute cloth 5s.
Journey Through Utopia cloth 18s. (U.S.A. \$3)

27, Red Lion Street, London, W.C.1.

Continued from p. 2

about them. If you don't think it is being said well enough, there is a very simple remedy. This brings me to another general point, that of one's degree of commitment to anarchism.

Some people argue that one should not do anything to commit oneself to any doctrine or theory, and I think that attitude is certainly better than the serious-minded person whose life is forfeit to his ideal, but I think that there is a sense in which a person can quite rationally devote himself to a cause, and imply by that that he can be depended on to contribute something, to go to a meeting, to take a turn on selling papers, even if he does not feel like it just at that moment. Here again we are going to fall foul of the progressive psychologists who will describe any such commitment as compulsion and neurosis. Here I think we must simply ignore them.

The other type of specific anarchist activity which I would like to mention is that of the affinity groups drawing in part on my experience over the last few months of the Hampstead Libertarian Group. Well, there just wasn't enough affinity. I think that among our mistakes, to which I contributed, was that we were discussing anarchism too much in the abstract. Discussions as to the best way of achieving one's ideals can be very fruitful if they take place between people each of whom is doing something to put his own ideas into practice, but we allowed the internal discussion to achieve too much weight relative to our outgoing activities. The affinity group should always be ready to give support to any of its members who want to try out something new. We were however, a little dogged by the premature mental tiredness which assumes that all of anarchism has been explored already, and nothing is left but the two alternatives of being a stale old veteran or a resigned sceptic.

We have been far too apt, both in our outlook on discussions and in written propaganda to confuse new thinking and original thinking. The difference is made clear by Erich Fromm who shows in "The Fear of

Freedom" that for an idea to be original does not mean that no-one must have thought of it before, it means that the person concerned must have come to that thought himself. We have been too eager for newness, instead of realising that individual originality is the important thing. The affinity group is certainly the most promising unit for anarchist activity, and I think greater efforts should be made to encourage their formation in England. Perhaps a national anarchist centre might be a good idea so that people in the provinces would be able to keep in touch by correspondence with the day-to-day activities of the movement in London. However, it is also a good basis for international co-operation, for I can think of many points on which groups in towns and cities even in distant lands could be of mutual help.

I will try to summarise what I have said in a dozen sentences.

The British anarchist movement has suffered a theoretical break-up due to the very healthy tendencies of self-examination which work within it. This has been due largely to an appreciation of the complexity of the psychological factors involved in the antithesis between authority and freedom, and that many of the former hopes of anarchists have little chance of being realised. It is time we started to regroup our ideas and I suggest the following. To see whether it is worthwhile putting more confidence in the rightness of anarchism, and not being intimidated by our own investigations in psychology. To try to make anarchism more clear-cut, but to broaden our appreciation of what we agree on, and to each look at the traditional anarchist ideas and see that perhaps there is even more to them than we had previously thought.

I cannot myself claim to be a very original thinker, and much of what I have said to-night is probably that the pendulum has swung too far and that we should pull it back again. However, this is too mechanistic an analogy; perhaps it would be better to say that we have left our field fallow long enough and now we have the opportunity to reap a bumper crop. P.H.

