

'Impossibility never prevented anything.'

CONSIDERANTE

In this Issue :

SPY TRIALS  
LIKE WHERE TO MAN?  
LETTERS

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY - 4d.

A "Threat to World Peace" No More!

In spite of the aggravation of the crisis in the Congo, it would still be a minor issue, of no international consequence, but for the headline treatment it is receiving in the world press. And it is receiving such treatment because it has come under the political magnifying glass of the United Nations, which means that far from seeking solutions in the best interests of the country, the Congo has become yet another pawn in the game of power politics. In the end they will drop a battered and embittered Congo for some more juicy crisis or issue which will be proclaimed by somebody or other as "a threat to world peace". And so it goes on and will go on to the last politician's dying breath!

THUS we concluded an editorial on the Congo eight months ago (FREEDOM, Sept. 17, 1960) and in spite of the Congo "crises" that followed at the United Nations\* we found no reason to modify our views

## CONGO

### CONGO

### CONGO

#### CONGO

a threat to world peace no more!

on the outcome of the Congo crisis.

In January (*The "Political and Military Chicanery" Goes on—FREEDOM 28/1/61*) we were summarising one of our main arguments in these terms

What we maintained was that if the UN had not come in to take over the material problems of running the Congo the politicians, instead of having their hands free to play at politics would have been obliged to tackle these material problems—or fall.

These views came in for a great

deal of criticism from some readers and in particular from an American correspondent M. G. Anderson (*FREEDOM 2/3/61*) to whom we promised a longer reply than we published at the time. It is perhaps just as well that we did have still to reply, for recent events, at least as we see them, may be more convincing to him and other critics than would have been a repetition and justification of what we had written on the subject during the previous seven months.

It is, surely, a fact that the Congo

\*Remember the scenes at the U.N., with Mr. Krushchev using his shoe to drive home his points, and his demands that the Secretary General should be sacked; remember the "world-wide horror" when Lumumba was taken for a ride by his enemies and the fears that it generated in the hearts of the Western political "realists"—as they like to think of themselves as opposed to the "unrealistic" anarchists—of Russian intervention?

crisis has ceased to be considered a "threat to world peace", not because the United Nations has achieved anything spectacular in the shape of a "settlement" but simply because America and Russia have dropped it as a political bone over which they could indulge in mutual diplomatic snarling. Other, more juicy, issues have been engaging the attention of the two Mr. K.'s and their advisers. As a result, the Congo has been dropped from the main headlines. The Tshombe kidnap, to be sure, has been given prominence; it has "news value" but neither America nor Russia are supporters of Tshombe, and even Belgian and Katanga interests have made no move to secure his release.

★

IN a dispatch from Leopoldville to *The Observer* last Sunday, Andrew Wilson writes that "there is a bitter joke in the Congo that everything is coming to a stop here, even the cold war" (our italics). Stocks of provisions in the shops are running out; U.N. "financial experts" are "struggling to stop the flight of money" which has brought the Congolese franc down to a third of its former exchange value. But also, and to our minds, more important,

In Leopoldville, the inroad of nature has already begun. The main road linking the western suburbs with the rest of the city has been cut for six weeks by the washing away of a bridge, and no attempt has been made to repair it. The mosquitoes, kept down before independence by nightly spraying of D.D.T. by helicopter, are returning with the threat of malaria.

The result according, to Mr.

Wilson, is that "this vast running down has forced opposing elements on to speaking terms" and, he adds, has "enabled the United Nations to pursue a new policy of co-operation under Mr. Mekki Abbas, the Sudanese head of the Economic Commission for Africa."

The basis of his policy is optimism. Time, he believes, is on his side. If only the cold war can be kept out of the Congo a few months more, the Congolese will find their solution, not only on Katanga but also on the rival "central government" of Mr. Gizenga in Orientale Province.

We will, we hope, be forgiven if we repeat Mr. Abbas' very significant statement that "if only the cold war can be kept out of the Congo a few months more, the Congolese will find their solution", because this is just what FREEDOM has maintained from the beginning. Mr. Abbas calls it the "cold war", but who creates the "cold war" if not the politicians of America and Russia who are also the creators and dominating forces—by reason of their power of veto—of the United Nations Organisation?

We are aware of the fact that when Mr. Abbas talks about "the Congolese" finding "their solution" he is referring to the political leaders in the Congo, not the people. But then we too have, all along, viewed the internal struggle in the Congo in this light. In our *Brief Reply* (*FREEDOM 4/3/61*) we pointed out to our critics that

The whole theme of our articles on Africa and the Congo in particular is of the "tragedy" of Africa, of nationalist movements with, on the one hand, leadership more often than not trained in

Continued on page 3

#### AMBITION

HOW TO DISPOSE OF OPPOSITION AND CONTROL MEN could have been the title of the address given by H. E. Roff, Managing Director of Management Selection Ltd., at the conference of the North Region of the Institute of Personnel Management at Scarborough last week-end. Or better still—*How to be Ruthless but Virtuous.*

Mr. Roff was discussing 'top men' in industry, their drives and qualifications:

When the waist line precludes the Outward Bound type of activity, a lot of excitement and adventure can be had from the insecurity. The better the job the more people are after it with their knives out.

Perhaps in the circumstances it is as well that only 1% really enjoy the "struggle and challenge of industrial politics."

According to Mr. Roff:

Ninety-nine per cent. of people on the ladder of promotion had no real desire to reach the top, though convention demanded that they should pretend to it.

But industrial management is not all cut-throat competition, there is also the satisfaction to be gained from social purpose, of being able to "relate jobs to the interests of the community!"

#### FRUSTRATION

WE wonder how many newspaper reporters would turn up if the Anarchist movement called a press conference to clear up misconceptions about Anarchists and their activities. None at all we imagine, since we do not qualify for the kind

## ANARCHY 4

OUT NEXT WEEK asks

Why do Prisons make Criminals?

Why do Asylums make Lunatics?

What is Wrong with Institutions?

ANARCHY is Published by Freedom Press at 1/6

on the last Saturday of every month.

#### IN BRIEF

of publicity which sells newspapers.

The fascists, however, with their nasty tactics are always good for a line or two, especially when their leader, Sir Oswald Mosley, makes a bid for publicity.

Few people will be taken in by his latest statement dissociating his organisation from the image of violence which he claims is totally false!

"What is true is that the continual suggestion that we like violence is liable to give us some members who like that kind of thing. We get rid of them. We are determined to stop gangsterism in our movement now as we shall be determined to stop gangsterism in the nation as a whole when we are elected to government. A government with the capacity to do this is long overdue."

The strongest factor in uniting his band of pathological followers into a movement at all is their attraction to violence which serves as an outlet for frustrated unintelligent people who, for various reasons, would not function in any other political set-up.

#### STAGNATION

"THE Geneva conference on Laos is still not off the ground" writes the *Guardian's* correspondent (today Monday, May 15th). The point is that the conference was never on the ground. The delegates—those who have actually arrived at Geneva—have been in cloud-land all week-end.

At first no-one seemed to know if fighting had actually stopped in Laos. Now that this question appears to have been settled the "problem" revolves round the three Laotian representatives. One is recognised by the West, one by the East, but the third does not seem to have anyone to recognise him. To add to the difficulties the three Laotians do not recognise each other.

Meanwhile back in the village of Na Mon a report says that the opposing sides put forward their agendas for future talks during a two hour meeting.

No-one seems to be in any hurry to settle the peace plans—except the victims of the war, and they have not been consulted.

## SPY TRIALS, Scotland Yard, for the use of

IT could well be taken as a dictum of legal practice that spy trials have very little to do with spying,

but are chiefly instruments of internal policy. The results of counter-espionage by the equally secret agents of one's "own" country never result in greater safety for its population, but generally lead to determined attacks on their liberty.

Thus after the trial of the Lonsdale group, part of which was held in camera, and in which the chief evidence was given by anonymous secret policemen, Macmillan announced not only the setting up of a committee, but increased restriction on civil servants in ministries. These were to include more detailed investigation of the private lives of applicants for jobs, and greater use of passes, with random searches and check-ups on people in the corridors of the buildings. These practices were to be extended beyond the ministries which actually dealt in secret material.

All stages of the trial of Blake were held in camera, except for the prosecution speech, and the only evidence that the public were even told about was the unsubstantiated confession of the accused. Following it, an eventually ineffective attempt was made to suppress press reports that Blake had been a double agent and had been in the pay of the British secret service to spy on the Russians. It was suggested by Labour M.P.s that the government's desire for secrecy on this matter was

caused by a need to cover up incompetence in its ranks.

A far more likely suggestion is that no government wants its own subjects to know the extent to which it is involved in espionage against all other states, including friends and enemies alike. The *Guardian* takes the democratic liberal view that spying and double-crossing are highly distasteful activities, but at the same time supports them and presumably wants them to be carried on with greater vigour and efficiency than before. However, the mass of loyal subjects, not having the intellectual sophistication to work out this kind of hypocrisy for themselves, need to be convinced that their country is good, free and honest, while the Russians are bad, totalitarian and are engaged in continual spying against us. Another dose of this propaganda, and yet another committee is to be set up to discuss ways in which we can sacrifice our traditional freedom in speech and thought. At least one Civil Service organisation has protested against this, complaining that there is too much unnecessary interference with its members' private lives already.

Anarchists have no personal sympathy for Russian agents, since they are serving the ends of a militaristic power-hungry state whose existence and activities are as much a threat to our peace and lives as is our own state, the American one or any other. It is tragic that anyone should risk his neck to work for any government.

However, anti-espionage security attacks the freedom not only of potential Russian agents but of the whole population. The East European governments themselves eliminate all their political opposition, with the apparent consent of the people, by representing them as agents of the Western powers. Just as when De Gaulle after having saved the Fifth Republic from fascism with the aid of the Republican Security Guards and the Riot Police, decided to hold on to his arbitrary powers for future use against the communists and anyone else who cared to oppose him, we can be sure that once Scotland Yard extends its empire to include even more detailed control of the thoughts and speech of the state's servants, it will use its power against anyone with inconvenient ideas, whether they have sympathy with the communists or not.

If we really want the British people, as distinct from their government, to be safe, the best way would be not to have secret war plans, and a dangerous spy system. Let everyone involved, scientists, clerks or office cleaners, refuse to prostitute themselves to the state in its nefarious underground activities or to co-operate with its secret police in their security check ups. The only way to defend freedom is to fight for it now, and not to concede it bit by bit with every outbreak of stage-managed spy hysteria.

P.H.



(The following article by the French individualist anarchist, E. Armand, presents in sharp terms the individualist case for pluralism as against the monistic attitude adopted by most anarchist communists. The perceptive reader will realize, however, that there is nothing in Armand's 'perspectives' that would prevent communist arrangements—any more than mutualist or collectivist arrangements—from being realized among those who desire them. It is when anarchist communists seek to make their system the only possible one for everybody that the individualist rebels and denounces what is—in effect, if not in theory—an authoritarian aspiration. "Individualist Perspectives" was originally a contribution to Bulletin de S.I.A. (Toulouse)—S.E.P.

THE anarchist individualists do not present themselves as proletarians, absorbed only in the search for material amelioration, tied to a class determined to transform the world and to substitute a new society for the actual one. They place themselves in the present; they disdain to orient the coming generations towards a form of society allegedly destined to assure their happiness, for the simple reason that from the individualist point of view happiness is a conquest, an individual's internal realization.

Even if I believed in the efficiency of a universal social transformation, according to a well-defined system, without direction, sanction or obligation, I do not see by what right

## INDIVIDUALIST PERSPECTIVES

I could persuade others that it is the best. For example, I want to live in a society from which the last vestige of authority has disappeared; but, to speak frankly, I am not certain that the 'mass', to call it what it is, is capable of dispensing with authority. I want to live in a society in which members think by and for themselves; but the attraction which is exercised on the mass by publicity, the press, frivolous reading and by State-subsidized distractions is such that I ask myself whether men will ever be able to reflect and judge with an independent mind.

I may be told in reply that the solution of the social question will transform every man into a sage. This is a gratuitous affirmation, the more so since there have been sages under all régimes. Since I do not know the social form which is most likely to create internal harmony and equilibrium in social unity, I refrain from theorizing.

When "voluntary association" is spoken of, voluntary adhesion to a plan, a project, a given action, this implies the possibility of *refusing* the association, adhesion or action. Let us imagine the planet submitted to a *single* social or economic life; how would I exist if this system did not please me? There remains to me only one expedient: to integrate or to perish. It is held that, "the social question" having been solved, there is no longer a place for non-conformism, recalcitrance, etc.; but it is precisely when a question has been resolved that it is important

to pose new ones or to return to an old solution, if only to avoid stagnation.

If there is a "Freedom" standing over and above all individuals, it is surely nothing more than the expression of their thoughts, the manifestation and diffusion of their opinions. The existence of a social organization founded on a *single* ideological unity interdicts all exercise of freedom of speech and of ideologically contrary thought. How would I be able to oppose the dominant system, proposing another, supporting a return to an older system, if the means of making my viewpoint known or of publicising my critiques were in the possession of the agents of the régime in power? This régime must either accept reproach when compared to other social solutions superior to its own, or, despite its termination in 'ist', it is no better than any other régime. Either it will admit opposition, secession, schism, fractionalism, competition; or nothing will distinguish it significantly from a dictatorship. This 'ist' régime would undoubtedly claim that it has been invested with its power by the masses, that it does not exercise its power or control except by the delegation of assemblies or congresses; but while it did not allow the intransigents and refractories to express the reasons for their attitude and for their corresponding behaviour, it would only be a totalitarian system. The material benefits on which a dictatorship prides itself are of no importance. Regardless of

whether there is scarcity or abundance, a dictatorship is always a dictatorship.

It is asked of me why I call my individualism "anarchist individualism"? Simply because the State concretizes the best organized form of resistance to individual affirmation. What is the State? An organism which bills itself as representative of the social body, to which power is allegedly delegated, this power expressing the will of an autocrat or of popular sovereignty. This power has no reason for existing other than the maintenance of the extant social structure. But individuals' aspirations must be able\* to come to terms with the existence of the State, personification of Society, for, as Palante says: "All society is and will be exploitative, usurpacious, dominating and tyrannical. This it is not by accident but by essence." Yet the individualist would be neither exploited, usurped, dominated, tyrannized nor dispossessed of his sovereignty. On the other hand, Society is able to exercise its constraint on the individual only thanks to the support of the State, administrator and director of the affairs of Society. No matter which way he turns the individual encounters the State or its agents of execution who do not care in the slightest whether the regulations which they enforce concur or not with the diversity of temperaments of the subjects upon whom they are administered. From their aspirations, as well as from their demands, the individualists of our

school have eliminated the State. That is why they call themselves "an-archists".

But we deceive ourselves if we imagine that the individualists of our school are anarchists (ANARCHY, etymologically, means only negation of the State, and does not pertain to other matters) only in relation to the State . . . such as the western democracies or the totalitarian systems. This point cannot be over-emphasised. Against all that which is *power*, that is, economic as well as political domination, aesthetic as well as intellectual, scientific as well as ethical, the individualists of our school rebel and form such fronts as they are able, isolated or in voluntary association. In effect, a group or federation can exercise a power as absolute as any State if it accepts in a given field all the possibilities of activities and realizations.

The only social body in which it is possible for an individual to evolve and develop is that which admits a concurrent plurality of experiences and realizations, to which is opposed all groupings founded on an ideological exclusiveness which, well-meant though they may be, threaten the integrity of the individual from the moment that this exclusiveness aims to extend itself to the non-adherents of the grouping. To call this anti-statist would be doing no more than providing a mask for an appetite for driving a herd of human sheep.

I have said above that it is necessary to insist on this point. For example, anarchist communism denies, rejects and expels the State from its ideology; but it resuscitates it the moment that it substitutes social organization for *personal judgment*. If anarchist individualism thus has in common with anarchist communism the political negation of the State, of the 'Arche', it only marks a point of divergence. Anarchist communism places itself in the economic plane, on the terrain of the class struggle, united with syndicalism, etc.—this is its right—but anarchist individualism situates itself in the psychological plane and in that of resistance to social totalitarianism, which is something entirely different. (Naturally, anarchist individualism follows the many paths of activity and education: philosophy, literature, ethics, etc. . . . but I have wanted to make precise here only some points of our attitude towards the social environment.)

I do not deny that this is not very new, but it is taking a position to which it is good to return from time to time.

E. ARMAND.

(From 'Views and Comments', New York, No. 25. Translation by Richard de Haan.)

\*The translator would seem to have gone astray at this point. From the context "are not able" would appear to be more appropriate than "must be able"—S.E.P.

N.W.

## BOOKS?

We can supply

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

### NEW BOOKS

The West Indies and their Future  
D. Guerin 18/-  
The Art of James Joyce  
A. W. Litz 21/-  
Comrade Jacob  
D. Cauter 16/-  
Delinquency and Opportunity  
R. A. Cloward & L. E. Ohlin 25/-  
Marxism  
G. Lichtheim 40/-

### REPRINTS AND CHEAP EDITIONS

A Writer's Journal  
H. D. Thoreau 25/-  
On the Road  
Jack Kerouac 3/6

### SECOND-HAND

Royal Commission on Population Report (1949) 3/6  
Sex in History  
G. Rattray Taylor 17/6  
East and West  
Hubert Ripka 3/-  
Blueprint for a Red Generation  
William Juhasz 3/-  
Theory and Practice of Socialism (1936)  
John Strachey 5/-  
Leaves from the Junge (Soiled)  
Verrier Elwin 3/-  
Twenty Year's Truce (1919-1939)  
Robert M. Rayner 3/-  
The World is Mine  
William (Novelist) Blake 4/6  
The Destiny of France (1937)  
Alexander Werth 5/-  
Registration and Other Stories by Contemporary Chinese Writers 2/6  
Five Year Plan of the Soviet Union (1930)  
G. T. Grinko 4/6  
Arrow in the Blue  
Arthur Koestler 6/-  
The Red Carpet  
Marshall MacDuffie 4/-  
What We Are About to Receive  
Jay Franklin 6/-  
Twelve Years in a Monastery  
Joseph McCabe 1897 (1st Ed.) 4/-  
A Home of their Own  
K. E. Barlow 3/-  
Inside Buchmanism  
Geoffrey Williamson 7/6

### PERIODICALS

Id, No. 5 1/6

## Freedom Bookshop

(Open 2 p.m.—5.30 p.m. daily;  
10 a.m.—1 p.m. Thursdays;  
10 a.m.—5 p.m. Saturdays).

17a MAXWELL ROAD

FULHAM SW6 Tel: REN 3736

## Like where to, Man?

THE first number of a "little magazine" called *New Departures* (one of thousands to be launched during the last decade) came out a couple of years ago; the double second-and-third number came out last year, and may be obtained from 57 Greek Street, London W.1, for 6s. (postage 6d). It consists of about 130 beautifully produced pages of avant-garde articles and poems, relieved by occasional pools of light in the form of reviews, advertisements and even one or two of the original contributions.

At once we are faced with the question: *What is avant-garde?* What indeed! Is it really a vanguard (why we always use the French word I don't know—is it ignorance or just sheer snobbery?), leading culture along the path of progress, or even the only valid kind of new creation? Is it a way of concealing emptiness or of perpetrating hoaxes? Is it something real, or is it just a silly word?

I don't know, but personally I always feel suspicious of any writing (or other art) that depends on mutual admiration cliques, private jokes, typographical or syntactical eccentricity, deliberate obscurity, contempt for other forms of writing, and so on—especially when its comment and criticism is decidedly superior to its original work. All this, I fear, is true of the American "Beat Generation", and a great deal of the stuff that appears in *New Departures* clearly derives from the stuff that appears, for example, in *Big Table*, and is associated with the names of people like Jack Kerouac, Gregory Corso and Allen Ginsberg. In fact there are dull poems by each of these three in this issue of *New Departures*, which show up badly against the more conventional verse of Jon Silkin, Adrian Mitchell and Patrick Featherston.

The trouble about the Beat Generation is that the explanations of and apologies for its particular brand of nonsense are always more interesting than the nonsense itself, and here the most interesting thing is really the long editorial by Michael Horowitz, which is a complex and clever defence of avant-garde writing written in avant-garde prose—but see how the highly relevant quotations he uses stand out from the rest of what he says like islands of clear green sense! When Paul de Mille produced *Anacrap* at Bristol over a year ago he had good critical stuff but even better creative stuff; but hardly anything in *New Departures* comes up to the level of its defence by

the editor. This, I think, is the real test of *avant-garde* work—thus while *Ulysses* is more interesting than its commentaries, the reverse is true of *Finnegan's Wake*.

What for instance are we to make of Hans Helms' typewritten doodling, or John Cage's psychotic piano music? What is John McGrath's little piece of sub-Ionesco doing only 45 pages away from a piece of real Ionesco (his slight but amusing *Mind the Flowers*)? Am I right in being bored and even irritated by the poems of Raymond Queneau, Olivia de Haulleville (*alias*, for some reason, "Om"), Christopher Salvessen, Robert Creeley, Gabriel Pearson (late of *Universities & Left Review*, and still on the editorial board of *New Left Review*), Robert Beloff, John Miles, Kenneth Beaudoin, Donald Davie, August Stramm, and Piero Heliczer, to say nothing of Graham Reynolds' idiotic palindromes? Or is it just that I don't dig? Is the lack of communication between most of the contributors to *New Departures* and myself sufficiently explained by calling me a "square", or is there something wrong with them too?

Michael Horowitz's thesis is briefly that "tangible safeguard against the imposed lunacies is non-violent non-cooperation in the creation of new terms", which might be called a theory of cultural anarchism. But I don't think his contributors have quite grasped the distinction between anarchy and chaos. Restrictive practices and class oppression are no more cured by solipsistic tantrums and introvert gibberish in cultural affairs than they are by sexual promiscuity and amoral selfishness in social affairs, or by spinning one's own cotton or shooting one's own enemies in politics. If you want to take part in society, whether as a person in general or a writer in particular, you can't just contract out because you don't like the way other people live or write.

My thesis is briefly that most of the stuff here doesn't mean anything or say anything or communicate anything; it doesn't even "induce the poetic state", which is what Horowitz claims for it. And it's no good saying the aim wasn't communication but simply self-expression, because no sincere person prints poetry simply to express himself. The contributors must be communicating at least with each other, and their joint appearance in a magazine implies their intention of communicating with several hundred or even several thousand other people. To put it crudely, it looks like

the man who was stopped just before raping a girl and insisted that he only intended to masturbate. There's a pretty good *prima facie* case for not believing him.

This is not to say that the whole magazine is nonsense. I like Raymond Queneau's little tale and Michael Hamburger's review and Donald Davie's critical fragment, as well as the poems by Silkin, Mitchell and Featherston, Ionesco's sketch, and Horowitz's editorial; I quite like Paul Ableman's schizoid piece and Alan Davie's painting notes. But on the whole I think Horowitz's case fails. Of course the present literary situation is unsatisfactory, and it is good for people to move away from the accepted forms if they have something to say that is better said in other forms. But most of what is said in *New Departures* isn't really good in its own right. It would only be good if it were pointing a useful direction. I'm all for departing from where we are, but I want to know the destination before I leave, and this Horowitz & Co. don't tell me.

## INTRODUCTION TO REICH

WILHELM REICH, SELECTED WRITINGS, An Introduction to Orgonomy, Farrar, Strauss, Cudahy. 52s. 6d.

IN this useful book it is possible to follow the development of Reich's thought and theories in chronological order. The extracts are selected from a variety of publications, some not readily available here. There are some surprising omissions. What has happened to *The Sexual Revolution* and *The Mass Psychology of Fascism*? They hardly come in at all. Yet many people in England are introduced to Reich through these works. Some think them his best. There is no doubt that his book on Fascism is one of the most profound published on this topic.

On the other hand we get bits from *The Murder of Christ*, which to judge by the extracts here was written in a state of hysteria. An unfortunate work that should be decently buried and forgotten. *Listen, Little Man* was an excellent pamphlet, worthy to be compared with Etienne de La Boetie's *Discours de la Servitude Volontaire*, since it deals with the same question, why do men submit? I would prefer it to books about that dubious Galilean,

The old man must have become reactionary in his later years. Persecution had taken its toll. He desperately wanted to be accepted in his country of choice, the United States. He became *plus royaliste que le roi*.

In a scientific depiction of an experiment occurs the following passage, it is rather like a sudden, unprovoked blow. . . . The U.S.A. faced a dangerous situation in the first days of December, 1950, when the disaster in Korea had struck with the evil attack of the Chinese communists; with the hands of the U.S.A. bound by the pledge not to bomb their hinterland in Manchuria; with the English allies still doing business with the red dictators. . . . (Aha! Perfidious Albion again! Nation of shopkeepers!) The real danger was of course to the Korean people themselves, who were slaughtered *en masse* by the "evil attack" of Chinese and Americans combined. But the analyst of Fascism seems to have forgotten this small point. We are all liable to the Emotional Plague at times.

ARTHUR W. ULOTH.



## CONGO

Continued from page 1

Britain, America or Russia, which has absorbed all the worse aspects of the political racket, and on the other a mass of people still steeped in tribal rivalries and leader-worship who are powerless to do anything but expose their persons for the political advancement of their "leaders".

Far from suffering, as comrade Anderson suggested, from a "noble savage" sentimentality, our analysis of United Nations intervention was based on what one might call the anarchist lack of sentimentality regarding the motives of politicians! It amazes us that intelligent people, enlightened and objective people, can ever "fall" for the politician's game and assume that any of their public actions can be motivated primarily by considerations of the public good, or even by personal loyalties.

★

TAKE for example the case of Mr. Tshombe, as he is at present in the "news". All along one has considered him a stooge of Belgian (Union Minière) interests. Now according to the *Sunday Times* (14/5/61) correspondent in Elizabethville

The Union Minière is split in its counsels. Local managers want Katanga separatism to win. But in Brussels different pressures prevail.

M. Paul Henri Spaak, who has just become Minister for Africa, has already called for an unitary Congo. He is hated here as a Socialist. His party is in contact with Mr. Tshombe's victor, Mr. Bomboko, and the Katanga Opposition leader, Mr. Jason Sendowe.

The *New York Times* correspondent in Leopoldville writes (May 6):

It is just possible that the Société Générale, and with it Union Minière, has decided that its over-all interests in the Congo outweigh its local interests in Katanga. At any rate, there are some knowledgeable observers here who flatly assert that Union Minière has "dropped" Mr. Tshombe.

Then there are the local settlers and small business men. For all that is known, Mr. Tshombe still has the fierce loyalty of the vast majority of the 12,000 Belgians who live in and around Elisabethville, Jadotville and Kolwezi, the major mining and population centres of southern Katanga.

But recent arrivals from Elisabethville reported that even the business men were beginning to be disenchanted with Mr. Tshombe. Local store and manufacturers have been feeling the effect of the loss, through the President's political stubbornness, of their markets in the rest of the Congo. . . .

At the end of the week, it looked as if it would take a miracle, in the absence of friends, to save President Tshombe's political future.

Mr. Andrew Wilson, *Observer* correspondent in Leopoldville, points out that so far as the intentions of the new Belgian Government were concerned

It is freely known that the final severance of all ties with Mr. Tshombe was part of a change of policy, and that the same change included a decision to cooperate with the United Nations.

And the Central Government which until last week had refused to accept responsibility for the detention of Mr. Tshombe, now admits that it in fact ordered his arrest in Coquilhatville on April 26, as he was about to board a plane for Elisabethville. And assuming that he is brought to trial (and not detained indefinitely (or eliminated "while attempting to escape")) he will be charged not only with high treason but also, according to President

Kasavubu, with the "assassination of the now much lamented Patrice Lumumba who, it may be recalled was originally arrested on the orders of Kasavubu himself, who then handed him over to Tshombe to ensure that he would not escape! Could one hope to find a better example of hypocrisy and cynicism?

President Kasavubu having, in a most unconstitutional and undemocratic way, rid himself of his two main rivals, Lumumba and Tshombe (and confident that he can bring their respective lieutenants and successors (Gizenga† and Munongo‡ to heel), announces to the world that he is proposing to recall the Congo Parliament which has not sat since September (Like Fidel Castro, but perhaps for different reasons, we are not swept off our feet with enthusiasm or hopes when politicians announce that they will be holding elections or recalling Parliament). The people's parliament is in the public squares and in the factories and not on the upholstered, traditional "front benches".

According to a *Reuter* report the recent deliberations indicate that the Congo's future will be based on a strong Central government (which is what the much maligned Lumumba was demanding) with the President—that is Kasavubu—enjoying executive power "to be exercised with the approval of the Premier or any other competent Minister". In other words the kind of "democratic" set-up that exists in France today with President de Gaulle governing and the elected Deputies drawing their inflated salaries. (Incidentally we note that just as de Gaulle under the guise of legality assumes special powers when he considers a crisis exists, so "the Congo Government" published last week an "Act of Internment" under which it claimed legal powers to detain Mr. Tshombe for six months without trial. Legality! Surely the most abused word in the politician's vocabulary!

★

THE possibilities are that in the months ahead things will settle down in the Congo. The United Nations' representatives there will be able to justify their existences, and the Press will seek to point to it as one more victory for "collective" whatever-they-call it. In reality it will be nothing of the sort. If things settle down it will mean that the economic and political vultures, Congolese, Belgian, United Nations and the rest, will have found a *modus vivendi* which is acceptable, at least for the time being, and until they are ready for another "crisis", out of which the promotor(s) hope to derive profit. One thing is certain, however, and it is that if, and when, the Congolese people know what they want their first job will be to sweep away these self-

†It is interesting to note that Gizenga was not so foolish as to get caught in the trap of attending the Coquilhatville "palaver", and is now, in the words of the *Sunday Times* correspondent "the only important dissident Congo leader". He should go a long way!

‡While Mr. Munongo has, apparently, declared that any attack on Katanga will meet with scorched earth tactics, he is also reported to be going "much farther than anyone expected in meeting U.N. demands". One comment from the *Sunday Times* report which was an unwitting comment on the expendability of politicians read: "Expectations that Katanga would collapse in Mr. Tshombe's enforced absence have proved groundless. Business goes on as usual!" Which is just what we anarchists have always maintained!

appointed Big Brothers who organise their very lives for them.

I AGREE entirely with the viewpoint on Eichmann as originally stated in *FREEDOM*, namely that the Israeli Government wishes to show that law has eventually triumphed; but what happened, as you state, was that the concept of law broke down. It was insufficient. Law could not protect the just; law was thus proved not to be justice. It is natural however that the Israeli Government wished to assert the eventual triumph of law for without law no Government can live; also, as you say, there was the political necessity to clear the Hungarian Zionists and Social Democrats who were involved, of the charge of collaboration that was levelled against them. To do this it is necessary to show patiently in what a position the leaders were put; when of a thousand people you are told to save five hundred, you are in effect made to condemn five hundred to death. But the only sane policy in a dictatorship is non-co-operation; just as in brain-washing, co-operation is death; non-co-operation is life.

One could hardly follow Arthur Uloth, for all that; I would be in favour of letting Eichmann go free—in other words, to walk out of the Court a free man, but I suspect Arthur Uloth wants him to be heavily protected by police and military, and perhaps the death penalty meted out upon anyone who kills this one man? I would be all for letting him take his chance in the Jerusalem streets! While one condemns the legalistic farce because it is a legalistic farce, does one also condemn the whole business of punishing the Nazis? If so, one would condemn the Anarchist movement for much of its activity against tyrants; leaving altogether alone the so-called "Jewish problem" I fancy if one day Gen. Franco were brought along to a Free Spain, he would not be given exactly the freedom of Barcelona either. The truth is that anarchism has never refrained from attacking tyrants and ex-tyrants.

The Zichrony-Stein argument, of course contains some truth in it, but in effect it is a new distortion of the old Communist Party line in Israel. This always said it was for the Arabs to turn out the Jews; very good, if you are an Arab and can do so, I suppose; but a senseless line for a Jew (in Israel) to preach when the obvious answer is "you're another". The Communists could not resist recruiting the few half-wits they can always get to adopt their line; so we had these few odd Jewish Communists, in Israel, stating that the Jews had no right there and the Arabs should drive them out. You can appreciate that the Communists secured more Arab support. The Trotskyist variation is aimed at making this more

### A NEW RECRUIT FOR THE HUMAN RACE?

Mr. Brian Allen, who has assisted his father, Mr. Harry Allen, in five executions in British prisons, said yesterday that he is resigning his post as assistant hangman.

The announcement was made after the christening of Mr. Allen's baby daughter at St. Bernadette's Roman Catholic Church, Whitefield, Manchester. At the Junction Hotel nearby, which he and his father, the chief executioner, now run, Mr. Allen, who is 27, said:

"It all started a few months ago when I was working at Prestwich hospital. I qualified as a State-registered mental nurse. That meant I had to take a very serious vow that at all times I would do all in my power to save and preserve life. I came to the decision that the keeping of the vows was completely incompatible with my position as assistant executioner."

Mr. Allen said that his wife, who is also a nurse, agreed with his decision. *Guardian* 9.5.61.

### Point of Order

The Southern Presbyterian Church last week marched boldly up to pronouncing disapproval of capital punishment—and then got hung up on a point of order. A committee that had worked for a year recommended the new stand to the church's annual assembly in Dallas, only to have a Georgia clergyman point out that the answer to Question 136 of the Larger Catechism ("What sins are forbidden in the Sixth Commandment?") exempts the taking of life for "public justice, lawful warfare or just defence." Embarrassedly, the delegates backed off, and the death penalty remains Presbyterian policy.

*Time*, May 12, 1961.

# Eichmann, Israel, Third Force

[TRANSLATOR'S NOTE:— In *FREEDOM*, 6th May, 1961, you publish a letter from Zichrony and Stein, speaking for the "Third Force" Movement in Israel. I am not suggesting that the name was "copyright" or even then original, but I would like you to point out, to avoid confusion, that this group is one of the many small split-offs from the international Trotskyist movement, and is not connected in any way with the "Third Force Movement" organised in Cairo, Alexandria and Jerusalem in the late 'forties, consisting of Anarchists and Left Socialists, the then secretary of which was contributing "Middle East Notes" to *FREEDOM* at the time.

As one of the members of that group, formerly in the Polish Anarcho-Syndicalist group and now an Israeli, is in London at the present moment, I asked him if he would like to comment on the various articles on Eichmann, and letters from this "second Third Force" in *FREEDOM* and elsewhere, and the viewpoints it represents, on Israel.]

feasible of acceptance though. I may mention I have no stolen property in my home, whatever Messrs. Stein and Zichrony may have, and I can only wonder where they got theirs. But it is not logical entirely to adopt the propaganda line of the Arab feudalists.

Of course, there have been military atrocities by the Israel forces; these were far, far less than those by the Trotskyists in power. One certainly cannot equate them with the Nazis. There is a great deal of difference between deliberately aiming to destroy five millions, and in the course of battle destroying an innocent two thousand. Also, one must bear in mind that the Rightists provoked certain demonstrations against the Arabs, which we condemned at the time. This had the effect of scaring them from their homes when war began.

It is true the Israel Government has not allowed the several hundred thousand to re-settle in their homes. This I also condemn. But one must also go on to condemn those who will not let them re-settle anywhere else. That is to say, the feudalists and oil-rich kingdoms, which are determined to keep this question alive. The communist-trotskyist line is that these are part of a colonial liberation front. But it would not do to allow educated Palestinian and Jordanian Arabs into a slave-country like Saudi Arabia where they would have an unsettling effect!

Is it not worth pausing a moment to note the curious alteration of views on the Jewish settlement in Palestine, which we have seen especially in pacifist circles and now also in *FREEDOM*?—*viz.* that precisely when the kibbutzim were of a nationalistic nature, these were lauded as then—in the mandatory period—that being pacifistic, libertarian and even anarchistic experiments. If ever, it was kibbutzim were built on "stolen" land—*viz.* land purchased by capital. Then it was that the nationalistic and chauvinistic spirit was built up against which we can at least claim to have protested though history has passed us by. But then it was that some contributors to *Peace News*, *FREEDOM*, etc., regarded the kibbutzniks as pioneers of a new civilisation. Now, however, that fruition has come to pass, they are not so sure of the new civilisation. Not that I blame them for that; but it is not so much completely the other way either.

The fact is that Jews coming in from Eastern Europe have of necessity become proletarianised. To adopt this leave-Israel-it's-Arab attitude is convenient to a few who have chosen to go back to Europe as bourgeoisie. But the fact is that so far as at least as Eastern European Jews are concerned, they never had any choice in the matter: it was Israel or nowhere for most of them after the war, but at any rate it has subsequently become a choice of being proletarians in Israel or middlemen and pedlars elsewhere; there just was not another proletariat to absorb them. We lost our opportunity, and no libertarian pro-

letarian movement has grown. But there is a vast libertarian feeling even now. And the fact remains that of all the world's politicians, only Castro and Ben-Gurion dare put arms in the hands of the people, and for old revolutionaries, that is a pointer to the state of feeling.

On several occasions I think, it has been asked how it came about that the Jews, who suffered under the Nazis, could behave "in the same way". It is sheer nonsense to say that it is the "same way": those who say that, simply do not know what happened in Europe or in Palestine but have merely swallowed a few slogans.

However it is true that the younger generation are much tougher in their attitude than the older generation; the oft-quoted remark is "we would not be soap". The Israel-born, or Jew here since childhood, has a sense of national consciousness all the keener for the continual state of alarm over border raids, and so on; in Europe, there was only a religious, race consciousness that was largely passive and obedient. But of course it is not only those who have changed. I have seen it also in my generation, and one cannot really pass it all off on to the patriotic Zionists, Ben Gurion, etc. It was our responsibility too; for it was the libertarians who kept urging amongst the Jews in Europe, the "don't be soap" line and insisted on the forms of violent sabotage and strike, anything as the alternative to going along quietly hoping to be the one chosen to play the violin in the concentration camp orchestra. In Warsaw the Jews who carried on this insistent campaign were the "politicals", Anarchists, Bundists, Communists, and the rest; it was time and again these restless ones who avoided the general fate while others went off to organised work camps and never came back. Thus it was they too who created a kind of national consciousness. In Rumania, this had effective consequences. Many of the Rumanian Jews who found they did not have to be slaves, became nationalists instead, as if that was the alternative. It is those who submitted, only few of whom survived, who are the "quietists" who would no doubt have been the model farmers in a kibbutz, in an Arab Palestine, that might have found more favour in the present temper of the British Left. But unfortunately or fortunately history did not work out that way.

At present there is in Israel an aggressiveness but also a decentralist feeling; strong currents both of nationalism but also of anti-authoritarianism. There is certainly no dictatorship, but we of the old revolutionary movement from Europe are also an anachronism, as would no doubt be the case there too. On the other hand the situation might radically change if there were an influx of Russian Jews, understanding though rejecting Soviet Communism, who might turn to libertarian thought. In the neighbouring Arab countries, for all the Stalinist-Trotskyist ballyhoo, you have the nationalism but not the anti-authoritarianism; either it is feudalism as in Jordan or Saudi Arabia; or else aggressive nationalism of the Nasser type. Can there ever again be a Jewish-Arab worker's organisation? Some striking libertarian developments will be seen with Israeli cooperation in Ghana and elsewhere in Africa, where the kibbutz idea is more suited to conditions than parliamentary democracy. But so long as nationalism lasts there will be no more Arab-Jewish movements.

The trouble with the manifestos of the Zichrony-Stern group (like the Communists), is that while they are not true one must deny them, but one is then—deliberately—put in the position of seeming to defend what one opposes. If for instance I said Macmillan was the same as Hitler and concentration camps were full of his opponents, this would be untrue; yet for you to reply thus would put me in the advantageous position of accusing you of supporting Macmillan! Yet the truth must be said, if for no other reason than to say Macmillan or Ben-Gurion are no better than Hitler, is also to say that Hitler was no worse than Macmillan or Ben-Gurion. In short, it is inverted fascism.

Tel-Aviv.

J.B.G.



## Don't be blinkered by principles!

DEAR COMRADES,

One of the troubles with using principles as the sole guide to action and thinking is that it tends to limit one's horizons and produces a predictable answer every time. In fact this writer is almost convinced that principles are often a barrier against rational thought, a short cut in fact always leading to the same place. This affliction is suffered by quite a few contributors to FREEDOM. To view the world through Anarchist-Principled glasses and seeing as a result only black and white, good and bad; degrees are only useful apparently in weather-reporting and there can be no degrees in oppression or Individual Liberty.

Hence no war can ever be justified as it's always only atrocious folly. All governments are bad, all politicians are crooks, etc., etc., to wring a minor concession such as some governments are worse than others is like trying to get Coca Cola out of a Moscow samovar.

The Israeli Government is as bad as the Nazi government for after all haven't they created the Arab refugees and for all we know they may have gas ovens stacked away somewhere in the Negev. Because Politicians are often a plague and a pain, Truman, Hitler, Stalin, Churchill and Attlee are therefore lumped in the same category.

This lumping together makes intelligent analysis of people and circumstances impossible, individual psychology which plays such a vital part in politics is rendered impotent, by such a superficial view of things, it tends to make Anarchist Political Analysis nonsensical to any serious student or intelligent layman. Reading some contributors in FREEDOM one gets the impression that all Anarchists are angels with a built-in set of "goodnesses" wondering why the hell the rest of the world fails to see the light.

The tendency among some contributors is to expect the world to act according to their high principles, and any effort short of that is delegated to the Anarchist dustbin there to rub shoulders with such ideas as 'The Welfare State is a sop to the Workers', 'Religion is all mysticism and bunk not forgetting the opium of the people', to mention but a few.

## Slipping!

WEEK 19

Deficit on 'Freedom'	£380
Contributions received	£387
<b>SURPLUS</b>	<b>£7</b>

May 8th to May 13th

Worthing: B.D.B. 4/1; Canterbury: Anon. £2/6/1; London, S.E.23: W.G.G. 2/6; Glasgow: M.W.K.\* 5/-; Seattle: J.F.C. 2/1/-; Falmouth: 2/6; Auckland: K.J.M. 6/6; Glasgow: J.H. 1/6; Wolverhampton: J.G.L.\* 2/6; Brazil, Niteroi: M.G. 8/8; Los Angeles: S.S. 70/-; Seattle: D.W.C. 16/-; London, S.E.1: J.H. 19/6; Hampstead: P. & G.T. 2/2; London, W.C.1: M.G.\* 2/6; Woldingham: F.B. 5/-.

Total	10 15 6
Previously acknowledged	376 15 10

1961 TOTAL TO DATE £387 11 4

GIFT OF BOOKS: Kindly presented by widow of John Boyland.

### 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  
Vol 7 1957: Year One—Sputnik Era  
Vol 8 1958: Socialism in a Wheelchair  
Vol 9 1959: Print, Press & Public  
Each volume: paper 7/6 cloth 10/6  
The paper edition of the Selections is available to readers of FREEDOM at 5/- post free.

### PAUL ELTZBACHER

Anarchism (Seven Exponents of the Anarchist Philosophy) cloth 21/-

# Letters to the Editors

The same logic can come to the conclusion that because there are many Eichmanns, Adolf Eichmann is therefore less guilty and because Eichmann's death cannot compensate for all the suffering he caused, he should go free to practise his favourite pastime elsewhere.

In all fairness not all Anarchists subscribe to such "principled dogmatism" and FREEDOM's Editorials have sometimes shown its teeth by acknowledging human sentimentality which immediately brings protests from the more orthodox and even threats of ceasing to subscribe.

Personally I'm not against principles as such but a principle in my opinion should act as a gentle nudge in the right direction and not act as an irrevocable dictate that clouds the reason and allows no venue for human feelings or frailty. One can become just as much a victim of a principle as one can of an authoritarian institution. It's imperative that such principled laden thinking must not become the official "Anarchist line". We can no longer dismiss the USA as just "Little Rock's", Sacco & Vanzetti, McCarthy, Juke Boxes, Coca Cola and Hollywood. Nor is the USSR just one Regimented Camp with a smaller edition in Siberia. Nor is Israel just another Middle Eastern State, nor is African

## The Purpose of Civil Disobedience

The Editors, FREEDOM.

DEAR COMRADES,

I think you misunderstand the purpose of civil disobedience. There are basically three sorts of illegal demonstration without violence. The first, which is basically that advocated by Thoreau and Tolstoy, and which in a much watered-down form was christened by Gandhi, Satyagraha; non-violent resistance proper is designed to convert people to views that conflict with conventional ethics. The method is to challenge a person actually putting into practice a theory one considers evil, by putting one's self in a position to take others violence on one's self. This is most effective, when there is the maximum of empathy between resister and resisted. It must be in conjunction with conventional means of persuasion and is more likely to be effective, if one previously informs the resisted that it is to happen. This method was used at the two Pickenhams, at Foulness and is used on the Loch.

The second which Gandhi called Dusa-graha, a-violent bloody mindedness, is only suitable when used as a mass movement or at least as part of a mass movement. It necessitates the sympathy of a very wide section of the population, and the arguments and ethics behind it must at least be known to the resisted. In this it would be suitable not to inform the resisted. For an application to the Bomb, one must envisage for instance, a day when some of the Unions have declared the bases black, then it would be suitable to maintain action groups at every base, to resist all blacklegs thereon at any time that was convenient to the resister and inconvenient to the resisted.

Thirdly one has the form of action which Bertrand Russell obviously intends the Committee of 100 to do, which was used by the Direct Action Com-

mittee at Harrington, and which Soper apparently considered the Aldermaston squat to be (as did Mervyn Jones Pickenham); this is an illegal protest aimed purely as a publicity stunt, to gain support either for future industrial action, or in the cases of Soper and Jones, Action.

Since this is concerned solely or primarily with publicity, it would obviously be bad tactics not to inform the press. (Experience incidentally shows that Satyagraha in fact gets more publicity than does the pure publicity stunt.

In the wider context of the Anarchist struggle, I would suggest that while Dusa-graha is ideally suited for bringing down a system of Government, it is not suited to building an Anarchist Society. To build Anarchism one must have Anarchists, to convert people to Anarchism one needs Satyagraha. The two phases of the struggle are separate but Anarchists should beware of bringing down the old order before they are ready to build the new, for the resulting chaos could well bring fascism. The problem

mittee at Harrington, and which Soper apparently considered the Aldermaston squat to be (as did Mervyn Jones Pickenham); this is an illegal protest aimed purely as a publicity stunt, to gain support either for future industrial action, or in the cases of Soper and Jones, Action.

Since this is concerned solely or primarily with publicity, it would obviously be bad tactics not to inform the press. (Experience incidentally shows that Satyagraha in fact gets more publicity than does the pure publicity stunt.

In the wider context of the Anarchist struggle, I would suggest that while Dusa-graha is ideally suited for bringing down a system of Government, it is not suited to building an Anarchist Society. To build Anarchism one must have Anarchists, to convert people to Anarchism one needs Satyagraha. The two phases of the struggle are separate but Anarchists should beware of bringing down the old order before they are ready to build the new, for the resulting chaos could well bring fascism. The problem

## PENSIONED WILLY-NILLY

"THE GOVERNMENT'S PENSION SWINDLE", by Jim McKie. An ILP Publication, 3d.

THE new pension scheme has been accepted by the mass with the usual grumbling acquiescence. Those lucky enough to be contracted out by their employer have escaped this latest fiscal tribute to welfarism, although the government has got its revenge by increasing their national insurance contributions. Some, like the present writer, are now compelled to contribute to both government and employer's schemes. Their wage packet is consequently smaller and their only consolation is the promise of an annual refund that represents only a fraction of the money deducted. The state, in fact, has once again shown that it has nothing to learn from the private capitalist when it comes to milking the populace.

Jim McKie has written a useful exposure of this latest government racket and he makes the following important points:

- That "the object of the new Act is to increase the share paid by the worker and decrease that paid by the Exchequer".
- That the workers, who are supposed to be the main beneficiaries, create the surplus out of which the employer pays 'his' share.
- That the new scheme is largely intended to subsidise the existing one. "Graduated contributions, for example, in the year 1981, will amount to £391 million, and graduated pensions to be paid out in that year will be only £63 million. Thus, three-quarters of these con-

tributions will be taken by the Treasury. Saving for a rainy day is the idea; that is, saving for a future government's rainy day!"

In conclusion the author outlines the ILP's own proposed pension scheme. Although this would be non-contributory, in contrast to the schemes of the Labour and Conservative Parties, it would not be fundamentally different from them in its mode of obtaining money, since the individual would be forced to contribute to it whether he wanted to or not by virtue of the fact that it would be "a charge upon the national income". In other words, the money needed would be raised by that government method *par excellence*—compulsory taxation.

Not only this, but the proposed I.L.P. scheme would further deny individual freedom of choice by forbidding existing pension schemes to recruit new members. This would mean that not only would the coercion of a government scheme be substituted for the coercion of many employers' schemes, but that it would be impossible for any voluntary association to be formed for the purpose of mutual aid in old age. Willy-nilly we should all be cared for by Papa State and would not be allowed to exercise individual responsibility in this matter. It is the old story of a party in opposition successfully pointing the evils of that in power, and at the same time proposing a remedy concocted of the same essential ingredients.

Spokesmen of the I.L.P. have often claimed that they represent 'libertarian socialism'. To judge by this pamphlet their policy may well be socialist; it is certainly not libertarian.

S. E. PARKER.

Spokesmen of the I.L.P. have often claimed that they represent 'libertarian socialism'. To judge by this pamphlet their policy may well be socialist; it is certainly not libertarian.

S. E. PARKER.

## Bouquet

DEAR FRIENDS,

I must congratulate you on the latest issues both of FREEDOM and ANARCHY. Your account and analysis of the Whitehall demonstration of 29th April was surely the best published. . . .

I am also pleased to note some serious attempts to explain Anarchism in articles ("Will it Work?" etc.) which can be understood by people of the mid-20th century rather than the late 19th.

My 17-year-old daughter was one of those arrested in Whitehall, and I hope that by reading this week's FREEDOM, she will be able to appreciate the true anarchistic nature of that demonstration, and see in it something more than just an effort to ban the bomb.

Yours sincerely,  
W.G.G.

London, May 7.

## A.E.U. Democracy

DEAR COMRADES,

The following is an extract from a letter received this morning. The writer is a friend now in industrial dispute with the Pressed Steel Company at Swindon.

"You may have read that six wild-cat strike leaders were suspended by the Union, of these six only one was in fact employed at Pressed Steel, the rest being part of an eleven-man area committee. This committee met to vote on the recommendation to make the strike official. The Union executive to be fair did order the committee to vote against the proposal and did warn those who voted against the executive's decision that they would be sacked, the vote went 6:5 to make the strike official so the six were sacked. AEU democracy. What price Haxell?"

No further comments needed, I'm sure.

Yours, etc.  
Woldingham, May 5. F.W.T.

## LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP CENTRAL MEETINGS

Every Sunday at 7.30 pm at The Swan, Cosmo Place, Southampton Row WC1 (Holborn, Russell Sq Stns)

All Welcome.  
Liquid refreshment available.

## 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.

3rd Thursday of each month at 8 p.m. at Donald Room's, 148a Fellows Road, Swiss Cottage, N.W.3.

## Freedom The Anarchist Weekly

FREEDOM appears on the first three Saturdays of each month. On the last Saturday, we publish ANARCHY, a 32-page journal of anarchist ideas (1/8 or 25c. post free).

### Postal Subscription Rates to FREEDOM and ANARCHY

12 months 30/- (U.S. & Canada \$5.00)  
6 months 15/- (\$2.50)  
3 months 8/- (\$1.25)

### Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies

12 months 45/- (U.S. & Canada \$7.50)  
6 months 22/6 (\$3.50)

### AIR MAIL Subscription Rates (FREEDOM by Air Mail, ANARCHY by Surface Mail)

12 months 50/- (U.S. & Canada \$8.00)

### Postal Subscription Rates to FREEDOM only.

1 year (40 issues) 19/- (U.S. & Canada \$3)  
6 months (20 issues) 9/6 (\$1.50)  
3 months 10 issues 5/- (\$0.75)

### Air Mail Subscription Rates to FREEDOM only.

1 year (40 issues) 40/- (\$6.00)

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.



**FREEDOM PRESS PUBLICATIONS**