

On other pages:

Religion Considered  
as a Mental Illness - p. 2  
Permanent Protest - A  
Creed of Reaction - p. 3  
Letters - - - p. 4

# Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"The only good laws passed in the last three hundred years were those that repealed other laws."

—BUCKLE

Vol. 21, No. 51

December 17th, 1960

Threepence

## WHAT HOPE FOR THE CONGO?

FIVE months have passed since the declaration of independence in the Congo by the Belgians, but the political situation there is, if anything, worse now than it was before the United Nations intervened to establish peace and the rule of "law and order". As we wrote at the time (*The United Nations, a Threat to Peace* 13/8/60) the inevitable effect of U.N. intervention in such crises is to make them assume world-wide proportions, and for the countries concerned to become pawns in the struggle between the established power blocs as well as a happy hunting ground for 'neutral', but politically ambitious, nations.

There may be no reason to doubt the sincerity of those permanent officials of the U.N. such as the Secretary-General, Mr. Hammarskjöld, when he declared in a statement to the U.N. Council last week that he had not taken sides either between the power blocs or the political factions struggling for power in the Congo itself. But even if he tries to work according to the "rules" what chance of success can he have if some of the member nations undermine his efforts by operating their own forms of intervention in the Congo in order to protect their private interests?

Mr. H. pointed out that the development of private armies had led to Colonel Mobutu's emergence as a military leader, and added: "It is difficult to see how this could have been possible without some outside financial assistance". And this led to the creation of "authorities which often directly challenged the United Nations force and restricted it many times in its job of maintaining law and order".

This was not limited to the Leopoldville area and that part of the army under Colonel Mobutu, but it also occurred in other parts of the country including Katanga and Oriental Province. The functions entrusted to the United Nations had been challenged to such a degree that all too often conflicts between various parts of the Army and the United Nations had occurred.

Mr. H. goes on to blame the political leaders and its people and not

the United Nations for the failure of the past five months, arguing that it was the result of their failure to "take advantage of the work that the U.N. had done". Perhaps Mr. H. is not allowed by the "rules" to openly bite the hands that feed him and this may account for this singularly naive interpretation of the U.N. failure in the Congo. Surely the chaos, the disunity . . . as well as the "ingratitude" in the Congo after five months of U.N. tutelage, can be explained much more convincingly by reference to the "interests" of various powers in the economic and political future of Africa than by the tribal antagonisms, local politics, and the ambitions of the Congolese leaders. The latter have undoubtedly been exploited by the former. But the Congolese people faced with the problems of independence and the abandonment to their fate by the Belgians who, at the same time as they lowered their flag, withdrew the key technical personnel from the country (we shall discuss this tactic by the Belgians later), and assuming that there had not been outside interference, would have been faced with the overriding problem of survival which by its magnitude would have overshadowed the personal ambitions and rivalries of the Lumumbas, the Kasavubus, the Gizengas and the Mobutus.

★

IN last Sunday's *Observer*, Colin reflects that

Right from its inception Congolese politicians have attacked U.N.O.C.

[United Nations Organisation in the Congo]. The pattern has always been the same. The rivals for power first tried to enlist U.N.O.C.'s direct support for their cause, and when they failed they vilified it. This is what Mr. Lumumba did when he was Prime Minister; and this is what Colonel Mobutu and his Administration of Commissioners-General are now doing.

This, surely, is not a matter for surprise. Ritchie Calder in his article on "Chaos in the Congo" (*New Statesman*, Dec. 10) gives a vivid picture of a country left "bankrupt and paralysed by 'independence'." Under Belgian rule all key jobs, whether technical, professional or administrative were held by Belgians, not because Congolese could not be trained to do these jobs just

Continued on p. 3



## The Moscow Declaration

ONE of the ways of inhibiting people from working for a desirable object is to tell them either that they possess it already, or else that they are well on their way towards it and need not concern themselves too much.

That would explain the current conservative propaganda about our prosperity, not just Macmillan's off-hand remarks but the pattern of mass advertising with its emphasis on high consumption; and in a different direction it is the only reason that can have been behind the declaration of the 81 Communist and Worker's Parties, issued last week from Moscow.

In the summary of that document given in the *Times*, there appear the following statements:

"By the force of its example the world socialist system is revolutionizing the thinking of the working people in the capitalist countries. It is inspiring them to fight against capitalism and is greatly facilitating that fight. In the capitalist countries the forces fighting for peace and national independence and for the triumph of democracy and the victory of socialism are gaining in numbers and strength."

The declaration concludes with the optimistic note that:

"Today in a number of capitalist countries the working class, headed by its vanguard, has the opportunity . . . to unite a majority of the people,

win state power without civil war, and ensure the transfer of the basic means of production to the hands of the people."

It would be possible, and a worthy contribution, to go once more into the old points of agreement and disagreement between libertarians and communists. If the thinking of the working people has been revolutionized why do they still need a vanguard? Who decides who is going to lead? With whom is the working class going to unite? (Answer: the peasantry, intellectuals and the petty and middle urban bourgeoisie, "forces" which are apparently "vitaly interested in the abolition of monopoly domination"). When has the achievement of state power led to the transfer of the basic means of production to the hands of the people?

However, by now those questions have been answered in the minds of most people, who have become so sickened with the Russian variety of communism that they have either adopted the "ideological positions and right-wing opportunist practices of the Social Democrats" or more generally relapsed into an apathy quite oblivious to the internal crises of capitalism, the pioneering of the communist life for the whole world in Russia, or any other social issue which might claim more of their time or effort than watching its dramatic portrayal on a weekly TV programme.

Why then, when anyone who has any experience of propaganda of anarchism, socialism or probably even communism knows that the working people do not even realise that they are living in a capitalist society, do the C.P.'s of the world reel off the time-worn jargon? We are even informed that: "In the capitalist countries the people constantly demand that military expenditures be reduced and the funds thus released be used to improve the living conditions of the masses."

No wonder that the leaders of the communist and Worker's Parties are completely ignorant of the political feelings, or absence of feelings, among the masses, because far from meeting the masses of this or any other country, for when they do pay visits they spend all their time with leaders of other governments, they make sure that the masses of their own countries never get near enough to make their own views felt.

Continued on p. 4

### In Central Africa

## The Issue of Federation

POLITICS and economics apart, the importance to Africans of the Rhodesian constitutional conference being held in London, is that it provides a platform on which Africans can declare their aspirations for racial equality denied them by the existing constitution.

Having said this, one is not immediately struck by the quality of the leadership; Dr. Banda, leader of the Nyasaland African nationalist movement is the black man's Roy Welensky, politically ambitious and pompous, he shows the signs of a man in pursuit of power rather than a "political idealist" trying to achieve social justice for his own people.

But the conflict between black and white Rhodesian politicians must not be allowed to obscure the real issue which is one of basic political and social rights for Africans.

The future of the Federation is the main item on the conference agenda. Roy Welensky, the Federal Prime Minister, naturally favours the continuation of a central authority, but is not supported by all white Rhodesians especially in Southern Rhodesia where many Europeans fancy a break with the Federation, and with Whitehall. Their aim is to continue white domination with a "limited franchise" for Africans. The African leaders attending the conference

want to see the break up of the Federation which they feel is synonymous with European rule.

The economic argument in favour of central government is said to be the "creation of a common market for the three territories", an advantage which is apparently discounted by "professional economists".

Writing in the *Guardian*, Harry Franklin, Chairman of the Northern Rhodesia Liberal Party, points out that:

"In fact the common market always existed and the economies were always complementary—Nyasaland labour always went to Southern Rhodesia and the products of Southern Rhodesia's secondary industries and agriculture were always sold in Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland. Northern Rhodesia's copper still goes where it always went—to Europe. . . .

The railways would run as before under the interterritorial railway authority. So would the airways. The Kariba Dam would not collapse; the project would continue as a power corporation. The Customs arrangement that existed before Federation could be restored. The post offices would continue to sell stamps. All the services and departments would function territorially as they did before—some think more efficiently and cheaply. Thousands of civil servants—a great point of propaganda this—would not be out of work. The territories cannot recruit nearly enough of them at present.

The inflow of overseas capital would

not halt. It has already stopped, but would start again with the removal of political instability caused by the existence of Federation."

There seem to be few sound economic reasons for the continuation, but more important, if the majority of Africans are against it a minority cannot continue to impose its rule.

It seems to us, however, that the break up of the Federation would not necessarily bring about a change in the status of the majority of Africans without a corresponding change in the European attitude.

The government in Southern Rhodesia, and the powerful European minority, are determined to fight against any African advancement except that amount which they concede to be useful to themselves.

Federated or not, Rhodesia is not going to slip peacefully into a "multi-racial" society.

## Anti-Hanging

WE are glad to learn that the National Campaign for the Abolition of Capital Punishment\* is launching a new campaign for which voluntary workers and money are needed.

We would remind our critics who accuse us of being too concerned with the "free society" and not enough with immediate social issues, that the question of capital punishment is only one of the social problems which have actively concerned us for a long time.

Apart from the support given to the National Campaign for Abolition by this paper, we are reminded that anarchist speakers have shared platforms with people of very different social views for this purpose (and been accused of compromising our principles!), and have actively campaigned from our own public platform.

\*14, Henrietta Street, W.C.2



# Religion Considered as a Mental Illness

THE religious beliefs which people hold are largely the result of the things they were taught, both directly and by implication, as children. Thus the children of Catholic parents will usually grow up with a set of Catholic beliefs, children of Jews generally grow up with Jewish religious beliefs and other sects likewise pass on their particular religious beliefs to their children. To this extent then, religion is part of the individual's cultural heritage as much as his language, his mating habits and his local and national prejudices. On the other hand religious belief can be regarded as a form of mental illness, in the strict sense of the word, to which individuals may be subject to a greater or lesser degree.

Religion is not just similar to psychoneurosis, it is in fact a form of psychoneurosis. Without getting bogged down in psychiatric jargon, we may particularize the category of psychoneurosis to which religion properly belongs, that is the obsessive compulsive state, with an added element of paranoia dependent on the type of religion. Thus the religion of the Quakers or Unitarians which is very little of the paranoid component but is fairly closely anchored to reality and is largely obsessional in form, whereas that of Catholics and Spiritualists which depends so heavily on faith in the supernatural, has a large paranoid component.

Psychoneuroses have certain elements in common. First, they involve the domination of rational conduct by powerful emotions. Fear and anxiety are always in the background even though love or anger or jealousy may be the more obvious expression of the neurotic

state. Second, the rational power of the neurotic is affected; he does not become any less intelligent, but in the area of knowledge and beliefs where his neurotic condition is operative his judgment is undermined. He becomes subject to dynamic illusions, that is false beliefs which are not simply the result of ignorance or erroneous reasoning, but beliefs which prop up a system of thought which excludes known reality in favour of fantasy. In a sense the neurotic is wedded to his illness; he cannot let go of it even though it may make him very unhappy. If he is subject to gross illusions he will defend them by every artifice—for the threat of losing them brings on an attack of anxiety.

Mental illness of an obsessional compulsive nature, brings into play a more or less elaborate system of behaviour rituals and formalized avoidances by which anxiety can be kept at bay. Freud's study *Totem and Tabu* made an interesting comparison between the rituals and tabus of primitive peoples and the very similar practices of obsessional neurotics in civilized societies. Freud went further in his *The Future of an Illusion* and pointed out that the Christian religion was a "universal neurosis". Its importance lies in its group character. Whereas the individual neurotic has to cope with his own particular problems, and all the defences he puts up and the illusions he elaborates are subject to the criticism and even the scorn of his fellows, the Christian is in a much stronger position. He does not have to elaborate his own illusions, they are the hoary old lies that were given to him as a child by his respected parents and teachers. The obsessional compulsive rituals which serve to ward off anxiety are time-honoured and socially approved; god-eating before the altar, addressing the empty air in sixteenth-century English, all the forms of religion are powerful psychological mechanisms which bring in the magical protection of the group over the individual. The poor lonely individual neurotic has only his own puny magic with which to fight the forces of anxiety and terror. Although religion is a form of psychoneurosis, it is a phenomenon of the group rather than the individual. The individual can indeed avoid successfully the manifestations of a personal

neurosis by partaking in the group neurosis. The religious man may achieve a peace of mind and a smooth social integration by the sacrifice of his own independent judgment which religion demands.

It may therefore be argued that in religion we have the key to personal happiness. "What does it matter," one may ask, "if a man's beliefs are centred round a tissue of lies? What does it matter if he is hedged about by the observance of irrational tabus and the compulsion to perform absurd acts, if he achieves thereby a freedom from personal anxiety?" The answer is that religion does not and never has worked successfully. By his very nature man cannot live successfully by illusions. Reality is always breaking through. The crutch of religion may work for a while in a stagnant society, but the history of mankind has not been stagnant, nor is there any likelihood of it becoming so. The history of Christianity is particularly grim. The emblem of the Christians is a tortured man nailed to a cross, and they have lived up to this cruel symbol. Faced with constant revolts of the rational intellect against the wierd delusions of religious dogma cruelty has been the weapon of suppression. I do not refer simply to the cruelty of the Inquisition, or the witch-burning Protestants; I refer to the inherent cruelty of the Christian faith.

The mythical figure of the founder of Christianity is habitually plugged as a paragon of gentleness and loving kindness. Yet, as in other psychoneurotic systems, there are elements of sheer aggressiveness and vindictiveness in the teachings attributed to the Christ figure. The apologists for "Gentle Jesus" tend to gloss over his expressions of cruel hatred against those who did not give credence to his megalomaniac claims! "The Son of Man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity, and shall cast them into a furnace of fire; and there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth". Again he threatens with fire the "goats" whom he will divide from the "sheep" on his second coming: "Depart from me ye cursed, into everlasting fire". Now it is all very well for moderate churchmen and tender-minded Christians to try to explain away all these cruel threats that attached to Christ's reported teachings and say that he didn't really mean it in these terms. Either the gospels are a hotch-potch of lies or they aren't. If you are going to claim that the Ser-

mon on the Mount represents Christ's actual words—then so do the repeated threats of everlasting burning. Hell is not the invention of morbid prelates of a later date; if it is seriously claimed that there was such a figure as Christ who uttered all that is reported in the Gospels, then it must be acknowledged that he regaled his hearers with blood-curdling threats of "the fire that never shall be quenched". These sick fantasies are part of the Christian faith.

Whereas the troubles of the individual neurotic are at least of a temporary nature in that they can, at worst, be terminated by suicide, the threatened horrors of the group psychoneurosis, Christianity, do not allow this escape. Christ's malignant fantasy of "where the worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched" threatens to pursue the poor sufferer past the grave to eternity. This is sick, sick, sick indeed. In practice religion frequently fails to bring the comfort and peace of mind that it should do in theory. Even if an individual tries, and tries hard, to avail himself of all the magical devices whereby he can benefit from it, he may nevertheless find himself possessed by that awkward germ of rationality that will not let him be a mental slave. The religion when was forced upon him when he was a child may cause him acute mental suffering in later years when he tries to sort out the appalling contradictions in which he is involved. The dull and sheeplike minds may be lulled by religious belief, but the finer types of mind are often tortured by it.

That great pool of misery in our midst, the mentally sick who overburden the Health Service, they are not recruited solely from unbelievers. Every religious sect supplies its quota of neurotics and psychotics. The tabus and perversions of reason which are implicit in religious faiths play their part in the pattern of causes which brings on mental illness. Children meet the essence of adult hypocrisy in the religious instruction which is forced on them at an early age. Sometimes the young mind is corrupted by it and miseries of shame and baffled puzzlement are endured around puberty or indeed the corruption may be lifelong. But mostly religion is just one more piece of superficial hypocrisy which the child learns to deal with. It has all been watered down in our age; we no longer believe in the truth of Christ's silly rantings about the furnace of everlasting fire. Even the Catholics now talk some glib nonsense about Hell really meaning God turning away his beloved face from us. If that is the

case now one cannot help wondering why Christ didn't say so, instead of trying to frighten poor simple fisher-folk with his nasty threats.

By and large the rationalists have won a partial victory. When the Churches were powerful they ranted and raved and used every means of spiritual blackmail and physical violence to augment their power. Steadily they have had to fight a rearguard action, and where once they roared now they bleat. Living as we do in a society where we can publish articles such as *this* and have no fear for one's life in consequence, we must not become blasé about intellectual liberty. It has been hard-won, and most assuredly it will be lost again if Christianity can be revived to its former power. We must not slacken in the exercise of our intellectual liberty; we must not pull our punches in pointing out the true nature of religious belief. It is no kindness to the mentally ill to pretend that they are healthy, to pretend that their delusions are other than delusions. Above all it is serious to let the mentally ill infect others with their sickness. It is still publicly acknowledged that children are fair prey for the Church.

I have not said anything in this article as to the relevance of these criticisms of religious faith to political faith, but obviously the same mechanisms apply. All strong irrational systems of belief can take on the functions of a group psychoneurosis. The individual fascist or communist can swamp his personal inability to live with reality by giving himself up to "the Party" and to accept the crude twaddle of party dogma as uncritically as he might accept the Immaculate Conception. I have even known unhappy creatures whose criticism of anarchism was that it could not give them a burning faith, a super dynamic to engulf them. From time to time people have tried to make a religion out of anarchism, to give the movement a capital M, to invent myths and canonize our saints and martyrs. It has not worked.

As far as religious belief affects readers of FREEDOM to any extent, the readership survey showed that the great bulk of respondents had no religion, and that readers had in general progressed from nominal adherence to the usual orthodox religions to unbelief. Only the Quakers and Unitarians had gained a few members rather than lost them (See FREEDOM, 13/2/60). Thus although FREEDOM may receive letters from disgruntled Christians every now and again, we know how little representative they are of the readership of this paper. We are anchored to reality.

G.

## FREEDOM BOOKSHOP OPEN DAILY

(Open 10 a.m.—5.30 p.m. and till 5 p.m. every Saturday.)

We can supply ANY book in print required—also out-of-print searched for—and frequently found! This includes paper-backs, children's books and text books. (Please supply publisher's name if possible).

If you get tokens for Christmas they can be spent with us.

### New Books . . .

The British Co-operative Movement Jack Bailey 12/6  
A New Year's Tale V. Dudintsev 8/6  
Shooting at Sharpeville  
Ambrose Reeves 18/-  
The Rats (Poems) Allan Sillitoe 15/-  
The Thirties: a Dream Resolved  
Julian Symons 25/-  
Men of Destiny  
Stephen King-Hall 18/-  
Exceptional Children  
F. G. Lennhoff 21/-

### Second-Hand . . .

Transformation Two  
Neill, Mumford, Read, & Co. 4/6  
Uncle Tom's Children  
Richard Wright 4/-  
India Today  
Frank Moraes 5/-  
The Irish Rebellion (1798)  
W. H. Maxwell (1887) 7/6  
War Dance E. Graham Howe 3/6  
History of the French Revolution  
(1850) 10/-  
Eve's Diary Mark Twain 5/6  
The German Emperor and the  
Peace of the World (1912)  
Alfred H. Fried 3/-  
The Revolution of 1905  
V. I. Lenin 3/-  
Prose Literature Since 1939  
John Hayward 2/6  
Power and the Valley (T.V.A.)  
Henry Billings 3/6  
The School for Dictators  
Ignazio Silone 7/6  
A Hundred Years of Revolution  
Beloff, Hewatson, Jackson, & Co. 3/6  
Simple Science  
E. N. de C. Andrade &  
Julian Huxley 4/6  
British Rule, and Rebellion (1937)  
H. J. Simson 6/-  
Life Among the Savages  
(fiction) Shirley Jackson 3/6  
The October Country  
Ray Bradbury 5/6  
On Being Human  
Ashley Montague 5/-  
An Outline of the Economic  
History of England (1935)  
D. W. Roberts 3/-  
European Dictatorships (1932)  
Carlo Storza 5/-

### Periodicals . . .

New University, No. 4.  
December 5th 1/-  
New Left Review, Nov.-Dec. 3/6  
Dissent, Autumn 4/-

Postage free on all items  
Obtainable from

17a MAXWELL ROAD  
FULHAM LONDON SW6  
Tel: Renown 373

## BOOK REVIEW

### Talks on the Gita

TALKS ON THE GITA, by  
Vinoba Bhave, George Allen  
and Unwin, 16s.

THE author says, "My heart and mind have received more nourishment from the *Gita* than my body has from my mother's milk." He interprets it in a way that gives support for his own particular form of non-violent action.

The *Gita* forms part of a much longer work, the *Mahabharata* epic. It begins by describing the war between the Pandus and the Kurus, who are united by blood. This relationship makes Arjuna, the leader of the Pandus unwilling to begin battle. Krishna is with him as his charioteer, and recalls him to his duty. Krishna's teachings become more and more elevated, and a whole philosophy of life is expounded. In the end Arjuna resumes the war.

Bhave says that this is not an argument for militarism. Arjuna's real objection was to the slaying of close kin, a serious crime in those days, not to violence as such. His pacifism was not sincere.

The *Bhagavad Gita*, along with Whitman's *Leaves of Grass*, was one of the principle influences on the writings and thought of Edward Carpenter. In particular these influences combined to produce his *Towards Democracy*. It is certainly not new in the West.

Much of Vinoba Bhave's exposition is charming, but I must say that I find Hindu thought much less congenial than that of China, particularly Lao-Tse and Chuangtse and their followers. It seems somehow rather "preachy". In Europe we are already accustomed to being told to be modest, industrious, obedient, pure in heart and so on. The Hindu preaches in a more subtle and elaborate way, but it remains preaching. But this is a personal prejudice. The student of Indian philosophy will find this book interesting and valuable.

ARTHUR W. ULOTH.

## Ye are Many — They are Few

RAYMOND POSTGATE once wrote a book called *How to Make a Revolution*. The recipe for revolution is difficult to give. The materials must be fresh, the oven must be hot, the cook must be skilful and in the words attributed to Mrs. Beeton, "first catch your hare".

Among the ingredients, strikes, boycotts and direct action have played a subordinate role and their importance needs to be re-affirmed.

If we are to believe that collection of myths, histories, philosophy and poetry known as the Old Testament, the Israelites were given to all forms of subversive activity against the various people that held them captive.

The Spartacus revolt is known to most of us from the novels of Arthur Koestler and J. Leslie Mitchell and the pamphlet by F. A. Ridley. It has now achieved immortality via Hollywood and a Royal Command Performance. This was a slave revolt of gladiators and soldiers. It could be termed a mutiny since the revolt of a soldier is regarded as being more dangerous than that of a mere civilian. The soldier is regarded as rather more than a worker in uniform. The revolt of soldiers is taken as a failure of 'the establishment' to consolidate itself.

The classical strike had the messianic idea which seems a left-over from the Biblical days. The idea that the day would come when the whole of the workers would down tools and society would cease to function. The demands of the workers would be met and the new society would be ushered in. This idea was formulated by Sorel and the early syndicalists. Sorel himself called the idea a 'myth', in the best sense of the word. Sorel thought that the belief in "The Social General Strike" would

in itself be sufficient impetus to action on the part of the working-class and because of the united belief in the possibility of such a thing happening it would help it forward.

It may be argued that the 'function of the myth' has lost its justification but it is obvious that the 'myth' as a spur to action has ample evidence. On the other side it has frequently been pointed out (as early as de la Boétie, 1530) that the overwhelming might of the State is in itself a 'myth'. All the power that the State has, it takes from individuals, largely by their consent.

In 1926, we had in Great Britain what seemed to be a full-blown Social General Strike. Investigation revealed it to have been entered upon with extreme reluctance, almost in error and given up in horror at the prospect of success. The staff work of planning the strike was non-existent but the talent for improvisation of the workers was amply demonstrated. However, the General Council of the T.U. was so aghast at the success of its members that they turned the strike into "a peaceful demonstration of civil disobedience" in which the strikers played football, not with policemen's heads or helmets, but with the police.

Very different from this was the atmosphere in the South Wales Coalfields (1910-11) when sheep were stolen off the hills to feed starving families and there was rioting and looting in Tonypany. The Metropolitan Police were drafted to the area and Winston Churchill added Tonypany to his battle honours.

Different too was the Irish General Strike which lasted twenty years. Mutual aid was a feature of early strikes, before the dead hand of big unions took over the controls. There were schemes for the boarding of strikers' children and many were taken for holidays in the

country during the strike. Communal feeding arrangements were set up too.

The lightning strike was more possible since the unions had not acquired the bureaucratic superstructure. In 1918 the electricians at London's Albert Hall had a grievance. Their demands were not met so they simply removed the fuses and the Albert Hall was plunged into darkness. Then the demands were met and there was light.

In 1919 there was set up the triple alliance in the Miners' Unions, the NUR and the TUF, with a series of demands for the withdrawal of troops from Russia, the ending of conscription, the release of conscientious objectors and the raising of the blockade. None of these demands were met but there was the repercussion of the dockers refusing to load arms on the *Jolly George* for the intervention in Poland.

Among the most curious of strikes in these years were the police strikes of 1918 and 1919. Now that we are going out for the best policemen that money can buy, it is unlikely that such a thing will be repeated.

The Unions took a beating where it hurt them most in the Taff Vale judgment which held Unions financially responsible for any loss incurred consequent upon a strike. Following the 1926 strike, legislation made it an offence for unions to partake in any strike concerned with political objects. As far as the unions were concerned, the Social General Strike was 'out'.

Strikes in this country have not generally followed the violent patterns of American strikes where the employers have called in strike-breakers and agents provocateurs. The Pinkertons made their reputation as agents in infiltrating the 'Molly Maguires' in the Pennsylvania coalfields.

JACK ROBINSON,  
(To be continued)



## What Hope for the Congo?

Continued from p. 1

as well\*, but on the principle that no native should "replace" a Belgian key worker. And when "independence" was declared these "key men" were withdrawn—by a real fear of reprisals by the Congolese or by order of the Belgian government, the truth has not yet come out. But bearing in mind the precedent of the withdrawal of the British pilots at the time of the Suez crisis, the evacuation of the Congo last July may well turn out to have been a tactical, government ordered, move intended to make the Congolese nationalists aware of their "dependence" on Belgian technical know-how†

Now, the Congolese political leaders, who, like all politicians, consider the basic demands of the "masses" not as ends but as the means to a politician's ends—which is power—suddenly found themselves with the political power to govern but deprived of the technical know-how to maintain even the basic services which were provided by the Belgian colonialists. To what extent the latter had made their presence "indispensable" (by their policy of denying advancement to the Congolese, of course) is illustrated by the following incident recounted by Professor Calder:

The telephone exchange at Kabare, an important place in the mountains, had been out of commission for two days. The news was brought by road. With two Swiss experts and a Congolese whom they were training, I drove into the mountains. One Swiss expert walked over to the instrument rack, undid the cover, and swore. He told the Congolese with us to try to trace the fault. With a bit of prompting he found it. It was a simple fuse. But no one at that telephone station had been taught how to detect a faulty fuse.‡

★

**BUT** for the fact that the political leaders were more concerned with their own struggle for power than with the well-being of the people, it would not have been impossible to replace the Belgian technicians by others who either sympathised with the cause of Congolese independence or who simply were

\*Richie Calder reports that:

When I asked the Belgian rector of the residential secondary school how he rated his Congolese students, he said: "When I was sent to the Congo by my Order ten years ago, I was told that they were savages and imbeciles. I began on that self-martyring assumption. I found they were not. Then I was told that I must not educate them in *les droits* because some would become politicians. Then I was told that I must not give them free choice of subjects because they would all become politicians. I did just those things. Of 23 boys, who all came out of the bush, 15 opted for the sciences when they went to the university. Three, by any intellectual standards in the world, are brilliant'.

†As far back as last July we quoted from the *Sunday Times* correspondent in Elizabethville who reported two arguments current at the time to explain the unexpected granting of independence in the Congo: the first was that "we thought we would stay in the country economically"; the second, "We thought that showing the Congolese how much they still needed us was our best guarantee of staying".

‡It is important, in the present struggle, to emphasise, that the inability to detect such minor faults as a blown fuse is not a question of intelligence but of ignorance. How many intelligent (and charming) housewives of our acquaintance are quite ignorant of the secrets of a fuse box simply because such problems have always been the man's job! And Prof. Calder elsewhere in his survey makes a special point of referring to "the old trouble of confusing ignorance with lack of intelligence". The Congolese, he points out, are "eminently teachable".

prepared to sell their technical know-how to the highest bidder. That the para-U.N. organisations have succeeded in recruiting teachers, doctors, scientists and other professional and technical specialists to fill some of the gaps left by the Belgians clearly shows that the "specialists" are available if only one can pay for them.§ And as Ritchie Calder shows, because the people are no less intelligent than their brethren in other countries it does not require so much "specialist" knowledge to get production and services moving at least as efficiently as before the Belgian walk-out. He cites for instance the problem of surface communications. The port of Matadi, the railways, the river boats and road transport were at a standstill. The U.N. secured the services of the man "who cleared the Suez to clear up this mess" and

§The fact that the Congo might not have been in a position to pay for specialists only arose because the Belgians had made sure that the Congo's gold reserve was safely transferred to Brussels before independence was granted. As Ritchie Calder points out: "Before independence the Congo treasury had lost most of its liquid assets."

"In 1957 those assets stood at over 10,000 million francs, or over £70m; by the end of 1959 they had declined to 500 million francs, about £3.5m. The Central Bank had previously held Congo money to the tune of 5,000 million francs, but by Independence Day in July 1960, the new government found itself owing the Belgian controlled bank over 2,000 million francs. This is a strange-looking ledger for a country whose annual exports were worth about 139,000 million francs. Note that all these transactions took place before the disturbances."

within two months services were working again to "such effect" that "exports of the Congo were only one-fifth less than in the year before independence". Indeed, the U.N. Deputy Secretary-General of the Economic Commission for Africa (how long-winded are these official bodies in describing their functions!) said that

given a relaxation of present tensions and given responsible politicians, Congo can become both a well-governed and the most prosperous African State within ten years.

What interests us in this statement is the recognition that the people of the Congo, held in a position of social and intellectual inferiority by the Belgians for the past 75 years, should be considered capable of being the "most prosperous African state within the next ten years". What these people need above all things is knowledge: the technical skills which Belgian rule, for obvious reasons denied them, and an education which will break down the tribal rivalries and antagonisms which divide them.

★

**THIS** the United Nations so-called cannot provide whatever the good intentions of Mr. H. and others who may be dedicated individuals, because the nations composing it are bent on furthering their own narrow ends. As the *New Statesman* quite rightly puts it (Dec. 10):

So long as the Russians and the Americans, and even on occasion the Ghanaians and Guineans, cynically use the Congo situation for their own political

purposes, tragedy and disaster will continue to chase each other at the expense of these unfortunate people.

Can it be otherwise so long as the relationships between peoples is governed by power politics? The *New York Times* (Dec. 5) looks upon the unfortunate Patrice Lumumba purely as "the focal point of the contest which has ranged East against West on the question of the republic's future".

Involved in that question are large issues affecting the future of the African continent and the competition between the Western and Soviet blocs for an ascendancy of influence among the underdeveloped nations. It has opened up a new arena of cold war in the United Nations. On one side are the Soviet bloc and most of the Afro-Asians—including India, Ghana and Guinea—backing Mr. Lumumba as the rightful ruler of the Congo. On the other side are the Western powers and most Latin Americans and African members of the French Community, backing the régime which has deposed him.

But what have all these "questions" to do with the basic problems of the Congolese people who only ask for the necessities of life?

It would seem that even the best intentioned people so long as they continue to think in terms of power politics or are constrained by national or similar considerations are unable to put themselves in the skins of the people they are ostensibly defending. The editorial in last Sunday's *Observer* is a classic example of this double-think. For three-quarters of an editorial dealing with Algeria and the Congo we are pre-

sented with a factual picture of the duplicity of the policies of the governments of the West. Instead of concluding that there is nothing to choose between the West and the East; instead of proclaiming that morality and politics don't mix, the *Observer* editorial concludes that at least the declared policies of this country should derive the maximum political advantage! Thus, since it "may be impossible to persuade the French Government at present to take notice of the rebels' case" we should not give the impression that we are "ganging up" with France for that would "simply mean pushing India, Ghana and other neutrals away from the West as a whole". And as if to stress the immoral, or a-moral, approach to these questions, we are told that

It is not a case of preferring Algerian rebels and Lumumbaists to Belgians or Frenchmen. It is a matter of learning to live in a situation where one-third of the world's States—the so-called Afro-Asian countries and some Latin American countries—are in a position to flout Western leadership. If we try to force a Western solution either on Algeria or the Congo, we shall simply drive one-third of the world towards the Communist bloc. Our only chance of avoiding this disaster is to co-operate with the uncommitted countries, in and through the United Nations. This means fully respecting their neutrality. Unless the West can bring itself to learn this hard lesson, its influence in the world will continue to decline.

If such cynicism is what one gets from an intelligent independent (?) organ of opinion, what can one expect from governments?

## PERMANENT PROTEST—A Creed of Reaction?

**WE** live in an age of social reaction, an age in which it is fashionable to be cynical about human possibilities, and popular to sneer at the ideals of the old radicals and liberals. We are told, with ill-concealed joy, that we live in an "Age of Defeat".

I believe that this is no more than a pernicious fashion. In any case, if the old radicalism was over-optimistic, it does not mean that its basic ideals were unsound. The free society, the new age of social justice, whether to be achieved by reform or revolution, was not just around the corner, but to have the ideal of such a society and to work towards it is not in itself wrong.

It is also true that the believers in social progress by means of authority ruined their cause by their ruthlessness, ruthlessness being a weakness of many idealists. They believed that the dawn of the new society was so close that one could legitimately speed the process by breaking a few heads. But again this does not mean that the ideal itself was a bad one. The fault lay in the methods used to achieve it, methods taken over from the old society ironically enough.

The anarchist movement has some of the characteristics of a non-conformist sect, and non-conformity has, through such figures as Godwin, had some part in the development of anarchist theory. Yet there are other strands in its development. There is an aristocratic streak if it comes to that (Bakunin, Kropotkin, Malatesta), a peasant element (Proudhon), and in Eastern countries probably Buddhist and Taoist elements. In fact, once one gets going one can trace in anarchism in different parts of the world innumerable different threads, from which the body of thought is woven. In Europe, particularly the English-speaking countries, anarchism in its more individualistic forms derives from Utilitarianism and the 'Manchester school' of economics. Rudolf Rocker, in *Nationalism and Culture* considers anarchism as an extreme form of liberalism (from Jefferson and Paine).

This is just to show that it would be on over-simplification to see in anarchism just a more sophisticated millenarian cult, thrown up by the Puritan lower-middle class. The idea of a juster form of society need have nothing to do with a fantasy of social revolution, nor with the Second Coming of Christ. It certainly seems on the face of it improbable, but it is not impossible, nor is it an irrational goal to work for.

It would seem more reasonable to regard the free society as something that will come, if worked for here and now, gradually over a long period of time, though by living in a free way, as far as one possibly can in the present day, one can experience little bits of what the free society will ultimately be like.

### Ant-Heap or Stone Age

Unfortunately I haven't a copy of George Molnar's article by me, but I have read it, and as far as I can remember he says in effect that *we can never hope to achieve a free society*. Never. In the quotation C.W. gives (*FREEDOM*, 3/12/60), Molnar speaks of "utopian anarchism" (to coin a phrase) as "naïve speculation", while in his own theory he speaks of as "realistic". Since his theory is in the nature of a prophecy I do not know how it can be said to be more real than the speculations of the utopians. Unless he possesses a Time Machine, like H. G. Wells' hero, and can visit the future and tell us exactly what it will be like, I do not see how he can claim "realism" for the future, which has not happened yet. As a vision of present society he can indeed claim to be "realistic", but, unless I have completely misunderstood him, he is also claiming that the future will be a simple continuation of the present, forever.

Hope for the future is not, as Molnar seems to assume, a sort of vague and namby-pamby daydream. It is a desire of the individual to feel himself as part of a process, a meaningful and worthwhile process in which he is able to play a meaningful part. We see this in the appeal to tradition, anarchist tradition in our case. We look back to the anarchist thinkers of the past, and to the revolutionary movements they inspired, without which we should not, in all probability, be in a position to make any protest today, permanent or otherwise. This inspires us to carry on the struggle into the future. But if there is to be no future, just a continuous present, the struggle loses a lot of its meaning. All that is left is stoicism.

I am as pessimistic about the future as Molnar, or very nearly. I think it very likely that human society, in order to maintain its teeming population on a planet of shrinking resources (plundered by man), will find it necessary to establish a form of ant-hill society, in which there will be no room whatever for any effective protest. Possibly however, after a series of wars, economic upheavals or

social conflicts, civilisation will collapse, and the survivors will be reduced to the conditions of the Veddahs of Ceylon, who were formerly a civilised people.

### A Defence of Utopia

In both cases men would probably have a kind of happiness. In the first they would be unable to think outside of the world they had been conditioned to accept. In the second almost the same conditions would prevail in fact, although the society would be libertarian in structure in all probability. Where all knowledge had been lost, or reduced to vague myths of a past age of grandeur and horror, there could be little real dissatisfaction with things as they are, and it would be many thousands of years before a new civilisation would arise, if it ever did.

Neither of these societies could really be called utopias. A utopia implies that man is becoming master of his life, his fate and his world. The modern tendency represents a curious split. At one and the same time mastery of nature is stressed, and gloried in, while on the other hand human limitations are continually insisted on. Despite the development of space travel the hero of our time is not the space-man. He is the little fellow, the little "ordinary decent man", or else the helpless masochist hero, who wallows in degradation. (There are no heroines).

To give up the ideal of utopia is to surrender to this mood it seems to me. It is to give in to authoritarianism, and I am aware that in the present age authoritarianism is more triumphant and sure of itself that it has been for a long time. Capitalism is stronger now, or at least has more prestige, than it had in the thirties.

Extreme forms of authoritarianism have triumphed in many parts of the world, so that totalitarian forms of society exist wherever capitalism does not reign. However this does not mean that one should totally despair, and such a theory as Molnar's of the permanency of authoritarian society is more likely to help it to remain than to encourage rebels against it.

It is a curious thing, perhaps not after all so surprising though, when one thinks of the social atmosphere, that in our society a sort of tough-minded (or would-be tough-minded) cynicism is respected by everybody. Two sorts of people can always be sure of an audi-

ence. The person who sees sunshine everywhere, and the person who says nothing but unpleasant things. No doubt the audiences of these two types represent different sections of the population, but I'm sure that there must be some overlap.

A variety of people from Orwell to Koestler to Gilbert Harding have made their reputations by insulting and debunking. It seems to appeal to people's masochism to be told that they are insincere, or to have their ideals exposed as "unrealistic" or based on hidden and disreputable unconscious motives. If the critic can at the same time assume the character of an "honest John Blunt, who speaks without fear or favour", so much the better.

But such harshness is no more courageous than its opposite. Indeed it is a flight from suffering. It is an effort to cope with the pain of hoping. To believe things could be better than they are is often intensely painful, because there is the continual contrast between things as they are and things as they might be. If one assumes that they will always be in their present bad state one suffers less.

I believe that social progress towards a free society is still possible, though probably not by means of mass movements, but rather through small groups. Certainly it will not come through state action. I think it will be a slow job. There is, on the other hand, a very serious danger that in a future society no protest at all, of any sort or kind, will be possible. Horrible or hopeful, it is likely that the society of the future will be very different from that of the present day.

I remember reading somewhere that in the early days of steam a mathematician calculated that it was a physical impossibility for a steamship to cross the Atlantic under power the whole way. He offered to eat the first vessel to make the voyage, but lived to regret his offer. It must have been less than ten years ago that I read in *Peace News* an article in which the writer stated that of course it was highly unlikely that man would ever penetrate outer space.

Technical progress is much faster than social change. Our social system has one foot in Ancient Egypt. But if technology can be changed it is at least a fair assumption that man can change his way of life too.

ARTHUR W. ULOTH



# Reason and Emotion

"G" S defence of reason is conducted in his usual highly emotional manner. If he would calm down a little he might get things straight. Reason and emotion should go together, although I realise that this is a counsel of perfection.

I wrote, "I believe that a person's emotions are fundamentally healthy. They become twisted in the course of an authoritarian education, and this system of authoritarian upbringing arose in remote times out of ignorance." And G., who one would have expected to agree with this shouts, "Ignorance of what?" I would have thought that he would have realised that I meant ignorance of the causes behind natural phenomena. I should have thought that that was clear from the context, but I apologise for not adding it. Now it should be clear enough.

In ancient times it was widely believed that the world was flat, and that the sun, moon and stars were gods. There were gods in everything in fact; in streams, in trees, in rocks, in the sea, in animals. The earth itself was a goddess.

This interpretation of natural phenomena has been described as "animism", because a personality was put into objects which we now regard as inanimate, and the world was seen as inhabited by innumerable things with wills of their own. With the scientific knowledge obtainable among primitive men and in the early civilisations this was a reasonable interpretation of the world. It explained the facts or appeared to do so.

On this theory religions were based, with their complicated rituals and taboos. These gods, who were everywhere, had to be placated. From these taboos and sacrificial customs we still suffer today. This is due to the extreme conservatism of most human minds. They are bound to accept the world as it is taught to them, because for most of them there is not time to find out for themselves. The struggle for life has to be carried on.

Some people however have sufficient leisure and a higher degree of intelligence, and they are able to discover that a great many beliefs are not founded on reality.

Having asked, "Ignorance of what?" G. goes on to answer his own question.

"This is just admitting that the authoritarian miseducators (in remote times) were irrational." There is, of course, no reason whatever to suppose that they were any more irrational than their modern counterparts today. Is there any evidence that man's intelligence, during the historical period at least, has

increased? But knowledge has increased.

The magician, the theologian, the alchemist, the astrologer, reasoned on the basis of the knowledge mankind possessed in their day. Their belief in God, or the gods, was rational enough. No one knew anything about evolution, or much about astronomy. The Americas were not officially discovered, so it was not unreasonable to believe that the world ended in the middle of the Atlantic.

There were probably about the same mixture of reason and emotion in people then as there is now. This is not a defence of Catholicism, Zoroastrianism or Voodoo. As scientific knowledge increases we are able to free ourselves from the ignorance that has caused so much misery.

I am well aware that the above is an over-simplification. I have tried to make the argument as brief as possible. I believe that all the great religions stem from a common origin in the ancient Middle East. That one cannot rule out a certain deliberate use of religion by the ruling class, then as now, to keep the people in order. The rationality of this depends on whether you consider the exploitation of your fellow-men a reasonable proceeding.

I should have thought that, in general, the above ideas would be acceptable to G. They are repeated at much greater length in innumerable rationalist pamph-

# LETTERS

lets and books. But as far as I can see emotion for him is what sex is for the Christian, something dangerous and suspect. I fear that he joins the irrationalists in a belief in sin. Man is born emotional, not rational, that is to say in a state of sin. He can only be purged by Reason, which occupies the same position in G.'s theology that Divine Grace occupies in the Christian scheme of things.

What I have against so many rationalists is precisely this essentially religious attitude. Chapman Cohen says somewhere that many materialists accept the Christians' statement of their case—and then proceed to defend it! Religionists, having caused misery and boredom to countless unfortunates for many millennia, through the taboos they impose, then have the effrontery to accuse the rationalists of believing in "cold reason" and wanting to take the joy out of life. And to cap all some rationalists accept this picture of themselves. So that at times one feels there is no hope anywhere.

I entirely agree with G. that "truth is more satisfying than lies in the long run. Fact is far, far more interesting than fiction." I can only reiterate that to me reason and emotion are equally important.

ARTHUR W. ULOTH.

# A Question of Obscenity

In his review of our pamphlet *A Question of Obscenity* (issue of 10th December) N.W. is of course quite right—I agree with almost all he says. But we did not publish these essays for FREEDOM readers; we published them in fact for almost everyone else. We were aiming at the potential jurors in the next obscenity prosecution—and believe me that won't involve an author in anything like Lawrence's class. Nor was our authors' intention to define obscenity, but rather to argue for and against a repeal of the Jenkins Act, as should have been apparent to N.W. from the very first sentence of Pitman's essay.

What I find most gratifying in N.W.'s review is his remark that "what is needed now is a full-scale examination of obscenity in art and literature." If our pamphlet has stimulated similar feelings in a few other intelligent people I count our venture as successful.

I would like to add two explanations: the reason for not mentioning Lady Chatterley in either essay was the possibility of the case being still *sub judice*

at our publication date; and the retail price of 6s. was arrived at on our usual costing basis, bearing in mind that we are still a spare-time and very young 'firm' (both of us!) quite unable to print the large editions that the more commercial publishers turn out (and with the attacks on the Establishment contained in the essays I doubt whether any of the bigger publishers would have dared issue them anyway).

Finally may I, as a Reichian and a FREEDOM-reader myself of some years' standing, invite N.W. or anyone else to submit to us a MS on this subject but from the Anarchist or Reichian viewpoint? We should be pleased to consider it, though it must be written with the wider intelligent public in mind and not limited to a readership already familiar with such views. If N.W. has ever tried, from scratch, to put across our ideas to a completely uninitiated audience he will know what I mean.

Yours faithfully,  
JOHN ROLPH,  
Editor.

# The Moscow Declaration

Continued from p. 1

If the leaders of the workers did investigate the attitudes of their followers they would undoubtedly find that they were predominantly apathetic toleration. The people of Russia accept their government because it seems powerful, they can't imagine what to do without it and because if they speak out of turn they either go to gaol or suffer the hundred and one disadvantages that non-conformity brings on an individual in an authoritarian society. Furthermore, the people of America, far from joining in ever increasing numbers in the struggle for socialism, accept their capitalist régime for precisely the same reasons. Even if they do not like it positively they are prepared to demand that military expenditure should be maintained, in order to resist the import of Russian communism. In this way the example of the U.S.S.R. greatly hampers the fight for socialism.

Revolution is our job and we're doing it quite well, is what the declaration says in its 18,000 words. The evidence provided is mainly the increased industrial production of the Soviet Union and its satellite countries. There is not of course, any detailed description of how these industries have been transferred to the hands of the people. A dramatic increase in industrial production can occur either under conditions of misery for the workers, as it did in Western Europe and particularly England during the last century, or it could take place in

conditions of human dignity and freedom. The situation in Eastern Europe does not seem to have been the latter one, because where signs of agitation and political interest have stirred masses of workers, they have been workers in Communist countries trying to take the means of production into their hands and away from the new masters.

It is impossible to overestimate the harm that Communist activities have done to the cause of social revolution. The idea of communism is now identified with the totalitarian state, revolutionary activities are thought of as necessarily involving dirty underhand methods, and the sacrifice of people and ideals for opportunist advantages, and the issuing of lists of falsehoods and clichés passes off for socialist propaganda.

Propagandists of the Soviet Union extol its technological achievements, its educational programme, its level of commodity production and ignore or obscure the fact that the ideal of revolution is to change the values of a society, and to free its people from economic dependence. The fact that the Soviet Union can build dams, sputniks, education factories better than capitalism (and H-bombs and missiles!), but with no less cost in human terms will convert people neither to socialism nor to friendship with Russia. It will only make the rulers and bosses more ready to join hands with their opposite numbers in Moscow, who have been so successful in the com-

plex task of shepherding and disciplining the population of their state.

It is against this background that we have to get across to people the idea that neither America nor Russia, the Communist International nor the Socialist International will give them a society which will respond to their needs instead of dragging them for its needs; but that the possibility of such a society is still there: that it is worth doing something to free themselves from the oppressive and neurotic society in which we all live today, East and West of the Iron Curtain, whether we are workers, peasants, intellectuals or petty bourgeoisie; and that the only way out lies with the people themselves.

P.H.



With acknowledgements to the late Duke of Wellington—or whoever.

# 'New Reader' Looks at 'G'!

DEAR MR. EDITOR,

Tut! Tut! How "G." exemplifies the closed mind attitude with his dogmatic assertions, that I have ventured to deplore! Obviously he has not read much about psychology.

It would be rather interesting to know just what G. considers a truth or a fact to be in terms of mental concepts. Both words are applied to different things as history goes by. Even in science ideas change, new viewpoints are adopted, as it meets the impact of new discovery.

I would not dare to suggest that we be not guided by rationality. But I do deplore the raising of rationality to the status of a god, and the sole means of regulating human conduct when so many other factors are apparent. Human behaviour is conditioned so very much by irrational urges arising from the subconscious. G. mentions Hitler. Nazism was real, as we all know only too well. It existed as a social factor. It was not an illusion, an untruth. And the way to try and prevent it happening again is not to discard it as irrational, but to endeavour to understand what irrational motives brought it into being. Only by studying irrationality can reasoning be brought to bear on causes.

No single scientific discovery is made by the use of reason alone. Reason is a means of comparing possibilities, of assessing values; but before this is possible the possibilities, the values must come into consciousness. This takes place by the formulation of ideas, and the birth of a new idea takes place outside the field of logic. It is a product of the imagination, resulting from some inspirational flash that nobody can explain in terms of mechanisms. Logic only begins to apply when an idea becomes cogent. It is a means of excluding the impracticable.

Rationality is one facet of human thinking. It is a means by which man preserves a balance. But a balance is not an ultimate. It is a state of flux by which humanity progresses. To use reason certain premisses are necessary, and only by being convinced that these premisses are valid can logic be satisfactorily applied. Now conviction arises from belief. At one time it was believed that the chemical elements were the ultimate state of matter. Then came the atoms, and now the electrons. Does G. suggest that no further penetration will ever be made into deeper origins still?

In actual fact, nobody knows. People can believe either that the universe works on a mechanistic basis founded on elec-

## D. H. Lawrence "Fascist"?

The Editors,  
FREEDOM.

I was distressed to see that "G", in answering the rather pompous H. W. Heason's criticisms of FREEDOM, saw fit not only to drag D. H. Lawrence into the argument, but to label him as a fascist!

Has he ever really read Lawrence? If there was one thing Lawrence hated it was authoritarianism—and that included racism. (And is not Racism itself an Idea, a Concept, and therefore strictly intellectual?)

I fear "G" is as wide of the mark about Lawrence as he was recently about Reich—scientific rationalists should stick to . . . scientific rationalism!

"We know what we are, but we know not what we may be . . ."

Or was Shakespeare a fascist too?

Yours faithfully,  
DAVID MARKHAM.

Coleman's Hatch, Dec. 7.

## £99 in 2 weeks

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT!

WEEK 50  
Deficit on Freedom £1,000  
Contributions received £941  
DEFICIT £59

December 2 to December 9

Boston: I Tre Gruppi, Part Proceeds Social (per D.L.P.) £12/15/6; Australia: C.C.W. 10/-; Australia: H.P.S. 2/6; London, N.I.: E.G. 2/9; Ashbourne: R.E.W. 1/-; Wolverhampton: J.G.L. 5/-; Oxford, Anon. 5/-; Dundee: A.S.L.R. 2/-; Coleman's Hatch: D.M. 3/6.

Total ... 14 7 3  
Previously acknowledged ... 826 13 2

1960 TOTAL TO DATE ... £941 0 5

\*Indicates regular contributor.

trical energy, or that beyond such ideas lie deeper ones still. In fact G. simply does not know whether the Virgin Mary ascended to Heaven in her bodily form or not. Nor do I. He can believe that she did not, but that is all he can do.

Any psychologist will tell him that all beliefs are founded on a pattern instilled in the subconscious by the experiences of life and of the race—so we are back where we started. Until G. can control his subconscious mind he cannot be completely rational.

What G. is really trying to do is to eliminate any consideration of subjective thinking, and to view the world as an outside mechanism that impinges on him, bringing about reactions that are automatic, and capable of being viewed dispassionately in cold blood. Even science itself is now beginning to realise that such a detached attitude is unrealistic; and when such problems as are involved in sociology are broached, the standing aside from the rest of humanity is clearly impossible.

Irrationality is not just loose thinking. Let G. face a six-inch plank placed between two buildings fifty feet above the ground, and see if his reason will give him the same utter conviction that it is as safe to cross as if it lay on the ground. The very fact that one can argue about these things without limit shows that they are based on beliefs and not on facts.

My plea is for a removal of this adolescent frame of mind that sees everything in cut and dried terms, and assumes that solutions will arise by reducing man to the level of an electronic computer. Because it is an illusion.

Yours faithfully,

Linby, Dec. 6. H. W. Heason.

# Meetings and Announcements

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP and MALATESTA DEBATING SOCIETY

IMPORTANT

MEETINGS WILL BE HELD in basement, 5, Caledonian Road, N.1. (near King's Cross Station)

Sundays at 7.30 p.m.

All Welcome.

DEC. 18.—Philip Sansom  
ART, SEX AND SYNDICALISM  
DEC. 25.—No meeting.

1961

JAN. 1.—Jeremy Westall on  
A UNIVERSITY LIBERTARIAN MOVEMENT?

London Anarchist Group  
AN EXPERIMENT IN  
OFF-CENTRE DISCUSSION  
MEETINGS

1st Thursday of each month at 8 p.m.  
At Jack and Mary Stevenson's,  
6 Stainton Road, Enfield, Middx.

Last Wednesday of each month at 8 p.m.

At Dorothy Barasi's,  
45 Twyford Avenue, Fortis Green, N.2.

1st Wednesday of each month at 8 p.m.  
At Colin Ward's,  
33 Ellerby Street, Fulham, S.W.6.

Study Group on Non-Violent Defence

(Organised by CND)

Every Thursday at 8 p.m. at  
18 Campden Grove, W.8.  
Admission 1/-.

# 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

17a Maxwell Road

London, S.W.6. England

Tel.: Renown 3736