

'Differences of opinion on politics are denounced and punished as seditious, on religious topics as blasphemous, and on social questions as immoral and obscene. Yet the sedition, blasphemy, and immorality punished in one age are often found to be the accepted, and sometimes the admired, political, religious, and social teaching of a more educated period.'

CHARLES BRADLAUGH

A GOOD BRAVE CAUSE
TAMED & SHABBY TIGERS
SCIENCE IN THE INTERESTS
OF BIG BUSINESS
ANARCHISM AND
RESPECTABILITY
CORRESPONDENCE

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY - 4d.

SEPTEMBER 9 1961 Vol 22 No 29

KRUSHCHEV DOESN'T NEED HIS FIFTH COLUMN

The Russian 'Blunder'

IT is difficult to see what advantages Russia expects to derive from the resumption of nuclear tests, other than the most obvious one of developing nuclear weapons, of producing more destructive weapons than either the West or East bloc possess at present. But for the man in the street, having been told how destructive the weapons already developed are, it will be somewhat difficult to swallow the idea that the decision to resume tests after having suspended them for these past three years is a move made necessary by the aggressive actions of the West. The Russian statement declares that the Soviet Government has been compelled to take this step [of experimental nuclear explosions, whose significance it] fully appreciates, under the pressure of the international situation created by the imperialist countries.

"The policy of the leading NATO Powers—the United States, Britain, France, and the West German Republic—and of this aggressive bloc as a whole, leaves no other choice for the Soviet Union, the Soviet Government's statement says.

"The statement points out that the US and its allies are fanning up the arms race to unprecedented scope, increasing the strength of armies, and making the tension of the international situation red-hot.

"Things have reached a point where leading statesmen of the US and its allies are resorting to threats to take to arms and to unleash war as a counter measure to the conclusion of a peace treaty with the German Democratic Republic.

"Faced with these facts, which cannot but cause anxiety, the Soviet Government considers it its duty to take all necessary measures so that the USSR should be completely prepared to render harmless any aggressor if he tried to launch an attack.

"The statement points out that the USSR has worked out projects of creating a series of super powerful nuclear bombs with a yield equivalent to 20, 30, 50, and 100 million tons of TNT. Powerful rockets, similar to those which Major Yuri Gagarin and Major Gherman Titov used for their unrivalled cosmic flights around the earth, can deliver such nuclear bombs to any point on the globe from which an attack on the USSR or other Socialist countries could be launched.

"The Soviet statement says that the harmful consequences of thermonuclear weapon tests for the living organisms are well known in the Soviet Union. Therefore every measure is being taken to minimise these effects."

"The Soviet Government's statement says that the entire course of negotiations in Geneva proves that the Western Powers are pursuing the aim of actually legalising those types of nuclear tests in which they are interested and of

establishing an international control body which would be an obedient tool in their hands and, in fact, would be an appendage of general staffs of Western Powers.

"Hypocritical statements of representatives of the US and Britain about the termination of tests and international control have proved to be nothing more than camouflage.

"It is an open secret that the United States is standing on the threshold of carrying out underground nuclear tests. It is obvious that such tests, even if it is asserted that they are conducted for peaceful purposes, are nothing else but a concealed form of perfecting the available nuclear weapons or working on its new types.

"France, encouraged by the United States and Great Britain, has been carrying out nuclear tests already for a long time in spite of the warnings of the Soviet Union that it would be forced to resume tests if France did not stop its experiments with nuclear weapons.

"The statement reaffirms 'the readiness of the Soviet Union to sign at any time an agreement on general and complete disarmament that would put an end to the nuclear weapon tests'."—Reuter.

The Russian statement is clearly meant for home consumption; it uses the kinds of arguments which any of the Powers would use for justifying an increase in military preparations

and expenditure, and it is a foregone conclusion that these arguments are never acceptable to the other side, however "reasonable" they may appear to one's own side!

The *Observer* referred to the Russian decision as a "colossal blunder" and suggests that "for the first time the whole of the uncommitted world is on our side, shocked by the evident contempt with which its feelings are regarded in Moscow". Because, to our minds, the Liberals make the mistake of viewing the East West struggle as an ideological one, they give much too much weight to the psychological effect of the actions and the utterances of the big Powers. And certainly the so-called uncommitted nations, by the very fact that they are committed to neither of the blocs means that they are not going to be unduly influenced by the moves made on the East-West chess board.

They are uncommitted because they consider it in their national interest to remain outside the blocs and enjoy what advantages, mainly material and financial, that they can obtain from both sides.

The Russian move is a blunder from the point of view of the propaganda efforts of the various Communist Parties and fellow-travelling organisations in the Western countries, but it seems to us that Moscow decided many years ago that it no longer needed its fifth column to further its cause or the "workers' revolution". For the young people of the world today Russia is not the workers' paradise and Marx and Lenin the architects of revolution. For them Russia is the land of rockets and spacemen, of Gagarin and Titov. We live in the "age of science" not of ideals and social revolutions.



OUR FINANCES

In last week's *FREEDOM* we promised to present a financial statement at the end of August, and thereafter to give a weekly report on the situation. Because it would involve us in more office work, we cannot present each week an exact statement of our outgoings, which fluctuate from week to week. What we have done therefore is to arrive at an estimated figure covering our expenses for the whole year and from it obtaining a weekly average. Excluded from these figures are our Freedom Bookshop, and our book and pamphlet publishing activities, thought of course we look to the former to help finance our F.P. activities, and will give readers an idea of the extent when we close our books at the end of the year.

To publish *FREEDOM* and *ANARCHY*, to dispatch them to our readers and to meet all the expenses connected with these activities we spend on an average £70 (or approximately \$200) a week.

The situation is undoubtedly a serious one, but one which could easily be put right if more of our readers played some part in tackling

it. Firstly there are those who have been receiving our publications regularly every week in spite of the fact that their subscriptions are long overdue for renewal. Surely we are not making excessive demands on them when we urge them to settle up their subscriptions now without further delay? Secondly, there are too few readers who call themselves anarchists who do more for the paper than read it. Why not undertake also to introduce our Press to your friends? Thirdly, since a paper such as ours will always have to face the possibility of "deficits" those who value it and want it to continue to appear will have to do more than pay the annual subscription. Yet too few of our comrades contribute to the Deficit Fund. An analysis of contributions would show that fewer than 10 per cent. of our readers ever contribute. If our comrades don't who else should?

FINANCIAL STATEMENT AT 31ST AUGUST, 1961, WEEK No. 35.

Expenses: 35 weeks at £70	£2,450
Income from subscriptions and sales January 1st to August 31st	£1,138
DEFICIT	£1,312

DEFICIT FUND

London: Hyde Park, 1/5; Little Clacton: M.J.E. 10/-; Ilford: M.D. 5/6; Charwell: S.W. 4/3; Glasgow: J.H.* 1/6; Glasgow: A.J. £1; Leeds: G.L. 1/-; Oxford: Anon* 5/-.

Total	2 8 8
Previously acknowledged	627 5 0
1961 TOTAL TO AUGUST 31	£629 13 8

*Denotes Regular Contributors.

ANARCHY 7

IS ALL ABOUT
ADVENTURE PLAYGROUNDS

ANARCHY is Published by Freedom Press at 1/6 on the last Saturday of every month.

Power & the 'Myths of War'

A NUMBER of points raised in the article, *The Myths of War & Peace* (*FREEDOM*, September 2nd), might profitably be discussed sometime, but point 2 seems particularly relevant since it raises the problem of power in society which is really what Anarchism is about.

According to the writer one myth which we have to destroy is expressed in the view:—

That 'the fate of mankind is in the hands of a few top politicians.'

(This is certainly not a popular view since most people are convinced that the democratic machine regulates and limits the power of politicians, which arises from the "government by the people myth"!)

But whether the myth is widespread or not, is it not true that some individuals wield far more power over "the fate of mankind" than the writer seems to believe?

It is true that "no war has ever been started by politicians calling each other names" (as far as we know), but it is also true that men like Hitler (and Churchill) exercise tremendous personal power influencing events by their own decisions without reference to "briefs" or previous negotiations. Since the war how often have we heard or read about the multitude of decisions taken by Hitler which were opposed by his "advisors". Many of his decisions were against the interests "of the nation" and presumably Hitler

himself, but here was a madman with power over people and access to a kind of "press button" which he did not hesitate to use!

Within a democratic form of rule there is not the same scope for individual decision making, but during the last war it has often been said that Churchill's power was almost absolute, and that from the point of view of British survival his tendency to ignore advise and over-rule decisions other than his own was fully justified.

Few would disagree with the contention that Summit meetings are the shop fronts through which people are encouraged to buy decisions already made in secret by the professional planners and political spokesmen, but history has taught us that it is not "utter nonsense" to contemplate a situation whereby a "few top politicians" can plunge the world into war, or, as in the nuclear age, "destroy mankind".

The industrialists and armament manufacturers who supported Hitler may have done so for economic reasons, and the majority of ordinary Germans for a variety of reasons, but many did not reckon with the effects of absolute power on a political leader until it was too late. The majority, having helped him to power, were prepared to carry out the orders of their dynamic leader whatever the consequences.

It is only part of the story to claim that:

the vast armaments programmes to which the major industrial powers are committed

can only be explained in economic and financial, and not military, terms.

The desire for power can be just as decisive as economic considerations when planning the life of a nation.

The impulse towards power and the curious need to hang on to it together with the apparent need in the ordinary man to look up to a leader may be the combination which will decide the fate of mankind.

A leader with the "mystical qualities" of a De Gaulle indifferent to arguments of expediency could lead a hypnotised nation into war in spite of the industrialists who may only be interested in the "handsome profits to be made out of armaments."

A few of these in Whitehall is all we need! And although it may be difficult to imagine, do not let us underestimate the power of a few politicians or have too much faith in their practical reasoning.

R.M.

KEEP THIS DATE!
Friday 20 October

A Good Brave Cause

ANARCHISTS in this country have what has been termed as, an ambivalent attitude towards the H-Bomb and the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament; this attitude was expressed in an article entitled "Anarchists and the H-Bomb" by G. in *FREEDOM* (24/9/60) and it is my impression that the general contentions as expressed in this article have had a decisive influence over many anarchists. The following quote from G.'s article indicates his approach, he writes: "I am not at all hopeful for the survival of life on this planet in ensuing years. The rulers of this world have given ample demonstration of just how barny they are, and if I get the four-minute warning signal I shall not be very surprised. But I do think there is some genuine hope that the H-war will never be launched. Now this is tantamount to saying that there will be no more big international wars, and if this is so a new era dawns for the world. When the 'great Powers' have rattled their H-bombs for so many years without daring to use them, it may be that the bluff will wear thin and all will be forced to acknowledge that war is outmoded, not through sanity, or humanity or amity, but through sheer crude fear."

A recent editorial "Berlin on the Brink?" in *FREEDOM* (19/8/61) seems to reflect this basic viewpoint, when the editor blandly writes: "Failure to reach some agreement on E. Germany will not drive either America or Russia into war." In fact the editor goes on to write that: "The cold war has become a permanent feature of capitalist society... a more profitable aspect of modern society than an unpredictable and virtually uncontrollable hot war", which seems to imply a silent acceptance of the status quo and indicates a disturbing trust for the lunatics who govern us.

From this situation of accepting the cold war the consequent ambivalence towards the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament seems quite unjustified. The chips should be laid on the table and the C.N.D. should be opposed by these anarchists. If the Campaign should succeed the dangers of a Communist takeover in Britain are fairly substantial. With a unilateralist Labour Government the Left wing could well take control, and with Moscow backing turn Britain into a Communist satellite. It need hardly be mentioned that this would endanger the lives of all anarchists in Britain. Surely cold war is preferable to such risks for these anarchists?

This opposition to C.N.D. strikes me as being a logical development from the acceptance of the Cold War as being conducive to a good life and a long peace. However, in vigorous opposition to this viewpoint I believe a moral argument, coupled with a more realistic look at the facts, is more to the point. The H-Bomb is a foul thing and I hate it, I have no wish to base my continued existence on this ghastly inhuman weapon. Further, I would argue that we are bound to go over the brink into nuclear war either by accident, by intention (of a lunatic in power), or because a small scale disturbance unpredictably flares into sudden war (e.g., Should an uprising occur in E. Germany). With China and other countries on the verge of possessing nuclear weapons, with areas of potential crisis the world over and with numerous obvious psychopaths in positions of power it defies me how anyone who is sane could accept the balance of terror for a minute.

Life could well cease on Earth.

I think it is about time we began to state the reckless position of the world in

plain simple language, without a host of ifs and buts. We can say with unpleasant confidence that some day soon we will be murdered by the men who rule the world, we will die foul deaths, the lucky ones will be dust in a second, yet others will die long, lingering deaths in the most horrible way. In all probability we shall all die, the whole of mankind. Life could well cease on Earth. Unless... unless men live together without the State. This is the only way, the only hope, the only real possibility of survival. And it means a revolution of values, it means anarchist ideals must prevail. This is the only hope.

At this stage one is inclined to stifle an agonised howl of derision. Revolution? we ask. In Britain? Talk sense! As one understandably cynical anarchist was heard to say: "Revolution in Britain: That is when I shall emigrate." The point being that British people are not capable of the elemental upheaval required and that fascism is the most likely

result of a revolution.

Nevertheless, if one sees but a glint of hope, or one is impelled by temperament to fight a society based on the threat of nuclear war, then all our efforts should swing behind the radical wing of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament. We should press the Committee of 100 to campaign for industrial action to coincide with demonstrations of civil disobedience, and to this end association with anarchists, syndicalists and socialists in the Rank and File Movement would seem a desirable move. Anarchism must be given more serious consideration by all sections of the community and the fundamental cleavage in the socialist movement going back to Marx and Bakunin could be emphasised in all its importance.

Yet this type of militancy is quite out of tune with the wing of the libertarian movement that advocates "permanent protest". Apart from the reflection that this "philosophy" will look rather incongruous rising on a cloud of radio-active dust, one should examine a constantly recurring problem of the libertarian movement. That problem is the old bugbear of the relationship between anarchists and syndicalists.

In fact the question of the relationships between anarchists and syndicalists can never be settled for all time. In his

book "Lessons of the Spanish Revolution", V. Richards sets out the anarchist position, as he sees it, *vis-a-vis* syndicalism (pp. 133-8); the writer informs me that many anarchists agree with his stand. Although I would agree that practically all that he writes is basically sound I would argue that it is mistaken to thus consider the matter settled. Nuclear war, and the dangers of it, force one to reconsider, yet again, the role of the anarchist with relation to syndicalism. One palpably obvious fact is that any worthwhile and effective resistance to war at the present stage must develop into mass resistance and therefore must come largely into the sphere of the workers and industry. Here is where revolutionary views must be stressed and it is in such a sphere that syndicalists and certainly some anarchists are likely to discover an opportunity of being vitally relevant to society. If this sounds like using the "crisis" of the threat of annihilation to propose more unity on the libertarian Left I should admit openly to such dastardly motivation.

The only other active course is the highly dangerous one of conspiracy on lines reported by Karl Walter in his article "Conversation with a Conspirator" (*FREEDOM* 12/8/61). Although I am not a pacifist I consider non-violence the correct tactic for the civil disobedience

Continued on page 4

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

Seeborn Rowntree
Asa Briggs 30/-
Peasants in the Pacific
A. C. Mayer 35/-

SECOND-HAND

Dawn over Samarkand
Joshua Kunitz 4/-
The Soviet Spies (1948)
Richard Hirsch 5/-
Dragon's Teeth
Upton Sinclair 4/6
Authority and the Individual
Bertrand Russell 3/6
Poems from the Russian
Frances Cornford and
E. Poljanowsky Salaman 2/6
Origins of our Time
Karl Polanyi 4/-
The Great Hatred (Anti-Semitism)
Maurice Samuel 3/6
In Search of the Millennium
Julius Braumthal 3/6
The Journey of Simon McKeever
Albert Maltz 3/-
Such Darling Dodos and other Stories
Angus Wilson 2/6
Victory or Vested Interest?
Cole, Laski, Orwell, etc. 4/6
Tales from Tolstoy 2/6
Letters of D. H. Lawrence 1909-1915 and
1923-30
(2 vols.) paper-backs 8/- the two
Not Guilty (Wrps Imperfect)
Robert Blatchford 3/-
The Young Person's Complete Guide
to Crime
C. G. L. Du Cann 3/-
Mariners, Renegades and Castaways
(Paper back) C. L. R. James 2/6
The Socialist Tradition
Alexander Gray 12/6
Art Young: His Life and Times 12/6
The Anarchists: their Faith and Record
E. A. Vizetelly 17/6
In Parenthesis
David Jones 4/-
The Service of Man
James Cotter Morison 4/6
Television and the Political Image
Joseph Trenaman and
Denis McQuail 15/-
The Evolution of Revolution
H. M. Hyndman 7/6
A Revision of the Treaty
J. M. Keynes 7/6
The Trap
Allen Havens 5/6

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

Round the Galleries

ON the 31st of August, Lawrence Alloway left this country to take a teaching job at a girls' school 300 miles outside New York and one of the most influential figures, for good or ill, in Britain's post-war art scene left this *avant-garde* backwater to join the roaring boys of the New World. Schoolboy thin, rabbit-toothed, balding and pink, Alloway strode the length of London's Bond Street and for every friend made a hundred enemies and while his friends feared his caustic tongue his enemies respected his organising abilities and his knowledge of his subject matter. A writer who never bothered to handle a paint brush, he yet managed to have half the dealers in London jumping to attention when he entered their galleries and every third-rate abstract painter stood with hardboard primed and Woolworth's paint at the ready waiting like tatty demi-mondaines for the word from this Dior of the art world, this pint sized Diaghilev whose sows' ears never succeeded in becoming silk purses.

A dozen times and more he married mediocrity and incompetence into an "Alloway group" and while Alloway gave the charge the length of the Town his tatterdemalion squad of the moment would collapse behind him in a series of comic prat falls. As a final requiem the remnants of his RBA "Situations" exhibition has limped into Town in a final dispirited showing at the New London Gallery, at 17, Old Bond Street, W.1., and Alloway has not even bothered to pen the customary blurb for the catalogue. What will happen to these painters without Alloway to hold them together is anyone's guess, for in themselves they have nothing to offer, only the ability to ape a transatlantic style dictated not by their own observation but by the handouts of a writer who has

blinded himself by forever gazing into a setting sun. But there they are and all one can say of their work is that it is pretty.

Plumb and Cohen whose striped canvases have the gaiety of a Mediterranean coffeebar awning. Gillian Ayres' huge sprawling daub, as gay and inconsequential as a child's nursery musings. Henry Mundy's anaemic canvases with their shy making hint of erotica like unto a bloodless version of Wilfredo Lam's castration-ridden canvases fill the wall during this dead season. Yet the tragedy is there in those who are pushed aside for at least four people are missing who were once part of the original act and of them all my sympathies go out to William Green. Young and inexperienced, the dealers had him clown before the newsreel camera for their captive audience and Green happily skidded around upon his bicycle across paint-wet canvases while the audience sat in their semi-detached funkholes and screamed with laughter and the more they laughed the more he clowned but when he had served his purpose he was brutally and unceremoniously tossed aside. Let us hope that Green has learned the lesson that his own personal integrity is of more value than the plaudits of a minority of influential cynics who can only advance their own position by climbing onto the backs of others and who can only rise still higher by treading upon the faces of those upon whose backs they have risen.

Contender for the Town's vacant crown points at the moment to Denis Bowen the director of the New Vision Gallery. No friend of Alloway he has been called from off-stage to pen the full-page review in *Art News* when one would have expected the inevitable essay by Alloway's side-kick Roger Coleman. But Bowen, a minor painter in his own right, has

pursuance of its programme of amusements in the park have booked what is described as a 'bijou-miniature' circus. (How small can you get?). Mr. Edmund T. MacMichael, director of the Performing Animals Defence League has leapt into the ring and is cracking his whip at the local council. He points out that animals cannot perform tricks "by the clock" without cruelty (which seems substantially true) and by a rather tenuous logic says, "but cruelty is illegal. Therefore the booking of a circus is making every ratepayer a lawbreaker!" It seems that Mr. MacMichael's zeal has outstripped his logic.

The characteristic response to these outbursts is either a denial that the cruelty takes place or that it is not important. When one considers the cruelties that man is capable of inflicting upon himself; that animals are in the world for our use, pleasure, exploitation and consumption; that scientific lessons can

be drawn from their sufferings; that animals are lower forms of life and are either doomed to (or incapable of) suffering; that all life is a struggle and suffering is inevitable and therefore the animals must take their share.

The anarchist position does not necessarily involve the sentimental humanitarianism which is commonly found, with its sado-masochist leanings of revelling in details of animal suffering, and its counterpart of concentration camp commanders with a love of canaries. The anarchist position involves principles which reject the easy assumptions given above.

Reason teaches us that it is impossible to get an animal to perform tricks without threats and domination. Watching an animal perform such tricks gives man an unjustified superiority; to see an elephant shaving a man, or a bear riding a bicycle induces the reflection that a man does these things much better and the elephant and the bear are mere clumsy caricatures of man. Man, in the element of the elephant and the bear without his technical resources would be equally clumsy.

This concept that man is 'monarch of all he surveys' is fostered by circuses and zoos. Man as an animal is a failure until he can maintain an efficient ecology, which is a thing the humblest rodent can do.

There must be a reverence for life which would eliminate such thinking as revealed by Robert McNamara, American Defence Secretary, who said that 50 million Americans might be killed and 20 million seriously injured in a massive hydrogen bomb attack. How can we have reverence for the life of a fox, a bear or an elephant since we have apparently no respect for our own lives?

Man is a part of nature, true, an inferior specimen up to now but he has distinct possibilities if he would realize that life is for the enjoyment of the whole species.

The BBC during a gap in one of the 'Proms' on July 31st broadcast an extremely good talk by John Rae on "Children and the Myths of War" in which he said that it was necessary to provide new thinking on the subject of violence and the idea of physical courage, pointing out that no one thought that cannibalism was an acceptable way of life (echoing Donald Swann's delightful song). We seem to have accepted the fact that 'eating people is wrong'. A similar adjustment of values seems to be necessary on the subject of war. May it not be that a calm acceptance of the dignity of animals, a reverence for their (and our) lives, and a minimization of their slaughter to that which is necessary (which would eliminate slaughter for pleasure) would be a step towards this adjustment of values.

We may feel that the excesses of the RSPCA, the PADL and the LACS are not for us but the indignity of the "tamed and shabby tiger" deserves at least a boycott.

ARTHUR MOYSE.

JACK ROBINSON.

SCIENCE IN THE INTERESTS OF BIG BUSINESS

IN his presidential address to the Agricultural Section of the British Association at Norwich last week, Sir William Slater, a former secretary to the Agricultural Research Council, declared that the industry in Britain had reached a point of decision.

It must either attempt to halt technical progress and rising output, relying on subsidies from the State for its future prosperity, or press forward ruthlessly, applying science to the full, and relying on the strength it so gained over the years to face in the end fair competition from overseas producers without the need for Government support.

Sir William said that if agriculture took the first way it would always be subject to changes in political policy, to the limitation of production, and to pressure to direct its output to suit the changing pattern of international agreements.

"If, however, the farming community decides to take the bolder course and press forward with the application of scientific techniques the way will be hard, but it will finally leave the farmers as free from political pressure as any other industry and equally free to demand the right to protection against unfair competition.

"Many large-scale progressive farmers could today stand up to fair competition from abroad without any Government support. For British agriculture to be on safe and solid ground, the rest of the farming community must be brought up to this standard, while the pioneers go still farther ahead. To achieve this, farming groups must be of a size which will permit the most effective use to be made of the available capital and allow economic mechanisation."

He pointed out that such groups needed at their head men able to understand and interpret the findings of the laboratory, who understood modern methods of management, who could apply scientific methods to save labour, who could keep and use cost accounts in the organisation of the business, and who had the time to think, read, and direct and he added:

"Is it not asking the impossible to assume that one man in every three employed in agriculture should have the mental ability, educational background, and experience expected of only the few who form the senior managerial staff in industry?"

Farming, concluded the speaker, no longer an art or a way of life, was a highly scientific business calling for highly scientific management. This could only be achieved by amalgamation. The farm would have to be as much a place of industry as the factory.

The themes of scientific management and larger units were echoed by Mr. W. E. Jones director of the National Agricultural Advisory Service. Speaking on future developments in farm organisation he maintained that

future farming operations, using business management techniques, would demand the highest standard of accuracy.

Even small errors in estimating requirements might make all the difference between profit and loss.

★
THE use of science, more mechanisation, the encouragement of communal farming are questions which have been advocated by anarchists beginning with Kropotkin, so it cannot be said that if we view the above report with horror it is because we take a townsman's romantic view of "life on the land". Throughout the report one is made aware of the fact that the speakers are only concerned with the financial problems of agriculture, and what in effect these men of science propose is that we should jump from the frying pan of dependence on government subsidies into the fire of monopoly of the land by Big Business.

The growing of food is not a matter of "profit and loss", or dependent on "fair" or "unfair" competition". It is a basic necessity for the maintenance of human life. And so long as there are hungry people in the world there is a moral obligation for all available land in the world to be used to produce food and to distribute it where it is most needed—irrespective of ability to pay for it. Where food production is viewed just as another industry, existing to make profits it is clear that only that land which can be profitably used will be farmed and the rest abandoned. It is only where considerations of need govern production that all land whether it is poor land or rich will be used to grow food.

By all means let us have all the advantages of science and education to increase the fertility of the land; let us have the machinery which will reduce the hard physical labour so long associated with work on the land, but never forgetting that what is real is that we should use the land to grow food and not for making profits for some people. It matters little whether the yield of poor land is low when the *raison d'être* is to feed the hungry. Better a low yield and full utilisation of all land than high productivity from good land and no production from poor land which is not "profitable" to work.

In a society based on common sense we will farm the land because we need the food. In the capitalist world the *raison d'être* is profit and it is perhaps not surprising that the men of science can only see the application of their specialised knowledge in terms of profits, competition, finance and Big Business.

"Farming", declared Sir William Slater, "is no longer an art or a way of life". How little these men of science know about life in spite of their knowledge of the *chemistry* of life!

(Continued from last week)
ON the topic of workers' control, I must, I fear, make another charge that we lack intellectual responsibility, or perhaps the even worse one that we don't take our own ideas seriously. When the second issue of ANARCHY was devoted to this theme, it transpired that none of the contributors was wedded to traditional anarcho-syndicalist theory. Geoffrey Ostergaard in his history of the idea, ended with the advocacy of the collective contract, and so did Jimmy Lynch in his article about the idea as applied to the building industry, so, by implication did Reg Wright in his account of the gang system in Coventry, while Philip Holgate's study of the history of syndicalism as a mass movement in three countries held little hope for those who advocate it as a path to workers' control. Editorially I drew attention to this, recommending the notion of "encroaching control", and expecting a counterblast from people who regard this as a reformist illusion or as petit-bourgeois revisionism. But not a word came. Does this mean that our anarcho-syndicalists are in agreement with the tendency of the symposium on workers' control, does it mean that they regard such ideas as not even worth talking about, or does it mean that they are not really interested in ideas, but only in striking militant attitudes? Is there perhaps some absurd flaw in the argument? We don't know unless people will take the trouble to discuss ideas as well as slogans.

★
But to go back to the concept of an anarchist society, which we have abandoned as a utopia and brought back as a "model": among anarchist theoreticians of the past this has taken two forms: one where there are no conflicting interests to resolve, a notion which we must unhesitatingly reject as either simplistic or unconsciously totalitarian, and the other best expressed by Kropotkin, which envisages a society that, in his words,

seeks the most complete development of individuality combined with the highest development of voluntary association in all its aspects, in all possible degrees, for all imaginable aims, ever changing, ever modified associations which carry in themselves the elements of their durability and constantly assume new forms which answer best to the multiple aspirations of all. A society to which pre-established forms, crystallised by law, are repugnant; which looks for harmony in an ever-changing and fugitive equilibrium between a multitude of varied forces and influences of every kind, following their own course . . .

Sufficiently short of Utopia

I MADE a calculation a few years ago that the literature of the theory of governmental administration published in this country in the first nine months of 1958 was 1,128 pages long, £4-14-6 in price and 4lbs. 2oz. in weight (not counting reprints and cheap editions) and thought how sad it was to think of the minute proportion of this effort, scholarship and sheer weight of learning had gone into the theory of non-governmental, non-coercive administration during the same period. It is not surprising that outsiders ask us in vain for modern works of anarchist theory. We have in our own tiny movement, the specialised knowledge that could produce them. What we haven't got is the conviction that the effort would be worth while and the results useful.

We need a modern anarchist theory of the sociology and psychology of power, we need to make some effort to incorporate into anarchist theory what we have learned from Freudian psychology and that of the neo- or post-Freudians. Some anarchists swear by Erich Fromm; the Latin-American ones have dis-

This harmony, he also says, in an analogy from mechanics of the equilibrium of forces,

appears as a temporary adjustment established among all forces acting upon a given spot—a provisory adaptation. And that adjustment will only last under one condition: that of being continually modified; of representing every moment the resultant of all conflicting actions . . .

Now if I read this to a political philosopher without telling him the source of the quotation, he would either murmur something about Adam Smith's "invisible hand" reconciling each individual's pursuit of self-interest to the general good, or else he would refer to the sophisticated modern "pressure group" theory of the state, which sees the free play of rival interest groups or lobbies, on the state machine, as a desirable adjunct to the formal institutions of democracy, in ensuring the adequate representation of separate interests. Kropotkin's view is in fact a pressure group theory, but without that central state machine on which the pressure is exerted. A pressure group theory with the middle knocked out, or more accurately a balance of power theory. Now we have in fact two models of balance of power theories: the way it used to work or was alleged to work in international politics, where again there was no supra-national central apparatus, and the way it works, if it does work, in those so-called simple or tribal societies studied by anthropologists, where there is no institutional government or apparatus of law-enforcement. What I would like from our anarchist Ph.D.s is a critique of the anarchist balance-of-power theory in the light of the success or failure of these other similar but dissimilar theories of social equilibrium. I find these theoretical questions of anarchist social organisation fascinating but baffling. Fascinating because they may very well provide the yardstick by which we evaluate our participation in the social organisations of our own society, and baffling because they continually raise problems of social and philosophical theory which either I don't understand, or which have never been presented to us in an anarchist light.

covered Karen Horney, but other anarchists like Paul Goodman dismiss that whole school of thought as "the hogwash of social adjustment". We need an anarchist theory of the welfare side of the welfare state, and its possible transformations (instead of all those middle-class jokes about false teeth and pensions).

We need to make an effort to absorb into the tradition which is consciously called anarchism all those trends, outside the political sphere of life, which are in harmony with the teachings and principles of the classical anarchists. The article in ANARCHY 4 about "de-institutionisation" was an attempt to do this in one sphere: to illustrate a trend which is in the direction of *our* ideas, and in that of no other identifiable social philosophy, and is happening now and being argued over and fought for now, in our society. There are many such tendencies and if we mean business as anarchist propagandists, we must aid them, support them and use them both as microcosms, or "models" or parables of our approach on wider issues, and as a means of gaining

ANARCHISM & RESPECTABILITY-2

the support of the people involved in them by showing them a social philosophy which generalises their own aims and experiences, as no other social philosophy does.

Because while we may have doubts or misgivings about the intellectual respectability of anarchism in its present state, we can also ask ourselves and others whether any approach but anarchism is intellectually or morally worth considering in the century of the total state, when all the forebodings of thinkers like Proudhon or Bakunin, which must have seemed rather remote or academic in the 19th century, have come true.

Take a look at the political philosophies involved in this year's international crisis over Berlin. Mr. Kennedy is a democratic liberal, Mr. Macmillan is a liberal conservative, Mr. Gaitskill is a social democrat, Gen. de Gaulle is a conservative autocrat, Dr. Adenauer is a Christian democrat, Mr. Ulbricht is a Stalinist Marxist, Mr. Khrushchev is a revisionist Marxist. They represent every aspect of the political spectrum, and it is difficult to imagine how anyone intellectually worthy of respect could bring himself to support any one of them. The most respectable thing about the anarchists, of every persuasion, is that they do not. The least respectable thing about us however, is that we make too little effort to present our ideas to our fellow-disaffected citizens, not in a way that suggests that we alone have all the answers, but in one which shows that anarchism, as a social philosophy, falls sufficiently short of utopia to be taken seriously today.

No Desire?

A SPECIAL Committee of the Methodist Church in South Africa writing in their report "Christian Convictions about a Multi-Racial Society" asserts with typical Christian arrogance that "Neither European nor African desires mixed marriages." Even though they are willing to admit that interracial marriages, if founded on common cultural attainments and spiritual ideals, are not contrary to the "law of God", they are quick to let it be known that "We do not, however, advocate general racial admixture."

The fact that the Methodist Church in South Africa is stating by implication that the laws of South Africa concerning inter-racial marriage are contrary to the law of God, a wildly courageous statement taken within the Christian tradition and reminiscent of the formative years of the Christian faith, this should not blind one to thinking that the Methodists have seen the light over racial matters.

One might have supposed that it was manifestly obvious in South African society, because of the presence of over 1,000,000 Coloured people (of "mixed" descent), that a desire for inter-racial sexual relations on a large scale was present, indeed the statement that "Neither European nor African desires mixed marriages" is seen to be demonstrably false. Further, although as an anarchist I advocate companionship and not marriage, I should have thought that there is no better way of reaching human understanding between people of differing cultures and "spiritual ideas" than by getting into bed together and sleeping in each other's arms. Of course difficulties are bound to arise, but they will arise with the clash of separate wills that any worthwhile companionship must entail.

TO CELEBRATE 75 YEARS OF 'FREEDOM', FREEDOM PRESS & THE LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP WILL HOLD

An Anarchistic Ball

ON FRIDAY 20 OCTOBER at 7.30 pm at FULHAM TOWN HALL LONDON SW6

MICK MULLIGAN & HIS BAND with GEORGE MELLY and GUEST ARTISTS

Admission 6/-

Write now for tickets to sell among your friends.

Practical Proposals

I have very much appreciated the positive approach of some of the articles in the new ANARCHY and FREEDOM. My suggestions on circulation problems are as follows:

- (1) Quoted remarks of an older T.U.C. leader, "We've won what we set out to achieve and we don't know what we want next. We're wandering about without any sense of direction. That's why we've lost our appeal". If we believe these remarks (and also what they imply), then there is obviously room for anarchist propaganda amongst trade union members

and it is on this front that there would seem to be more room for expansion.

- (2) Apart from those in the London area, most anarchists have no regular contacts with others. There would seem to be need for some kind of link-up amongst isolated anarchists with a view to their co-operating (possibly on a regional basis) in the propagation of anarchist ideas and the sales of FREEDOM.
- (3) Generally broad appeal in the pages of FREEDOM and ANARCHY, to the majority of thinking people who view with alarm the rapid trend towards the depersonalisation of the individual in vast hierarchies, manipu-

Showers in Shropshire

THE Old World charm of Shrewsbury is shattered daily by a never-ending stream of roaring, fuming cars and heavy vehicles. Right through the town go these modern monsters, spluttering and stalling as they pit their gears against the one-in-six gradient called Wyle Cop. John Betjeman would surely lose his last shred of patience should he stand on its shop-lined pavements on a Saturday afternoon. But, as though this were not sufficient desecration for a town that prefers to be remembered for its annual flower and agricultural shows, it recently became the scene of a savage street battle in which a police inspector's leg was broken and a sergeant's arm dislocated. It started when a police officer checked a drunken group of seven youths.

The most alarming thing about the affair was that only one man, so it was reported, out of a crowd of 150 bystanders, attempted to stop it even though each policeman had to contend with four or five kicking, butting, punching youths. The *Shrewsbury Chronicle* commented,

An Englishman can now be identified by his readiness to cast decency in the gutter and hound a minority of a different colour; to stand by and watch outnumbered policemen risk serious personal injury to uphold laws that obtain for a common good; to watch passively as a helpless child goes drifting to his death.

How can these things happen? Has some biological change produced a nation of cowards? Is there a reasonable explanation for it—and is it one that permits of a solution to the problem?

Disregarding the *Shrewsbury Chronicle's* last example (hardly justifiable if we remember the many reports of holidaymakers who have died this Summer in attempts to save complete strangers from drowning in the sea), the others can be explained. And the nearest the *Chronicle* got to it was to say that "The remedy lies with the individual".

The *Chronicle* editor has, it seems, failed to grasp the fact that Englishmen are not encouraged, or even allowed, to be individuals.

The keeping of the peace has been made the responsibility of the Police. To take an extreme view on the matter, why should any ordinary Salopian interfere with a Bobby's job? If an electrician uses a carpenter's screwdriver he is liable to have the Union come down on him a bit sharpish. Policemen are becoming more and more segregated from US every day: more and more often they are to be found living in little police settlements: their pay has been elevated to a figure that puts them in a middle-class bracket. Soon, perhaps, their children

will no longer mix with ours in the State schools.

Englishmen of to-day are no more brave and no more cowardly than their grandparents. If an Englishman can be made to feel that he is doing a dangerous job for the common good he will do it. Whether they were fooled or not makes no difference—thousands of young Englishmen were only too ready to throw their lives away in the "common cause" of 1939-45. Nor is there any reason to doubt that they would do the same again tomorrow should persuasion be as successful as it was last time.

If Shrewsbury, or any English town, were a real Community in which the people had it upon their own shoulders to arrange by common agreement, the running of its affairs—instead of delegating and delegating and delegating each "duty" to remote professional bodies—then surely if a group of troublemakers threatened the peace of their Saturday evenings the whole town would descend upon them and, if need be, dampen their over-exuberant spirits in the Severn, having first ascertained that all would get out safely.

The editor of the *Shrewsbury Chronicle* is sharp enough to observe that the "struggle has been removed from life" and has been "replaced by boredom and frustration". But he cannot for some reason tell his readers that it is the State, or the Authorities, or our Leaders that are doing this very thing. Why so blind? E.C.

A Good Brave Cause

Continued from page 2
campaign at this juncture. Maybe later the time will come for a little discriminating assassination but that time is not yet with us. If the October killings take place there could be enormous panic which might set off a nuclear war. I sincerely hope that the report by Karl Walter is either a hoax or that the conspirators will wait awhile, striking, perhaps, unannounced.

Sanity and Love.

With so much melodramatic talk in the air about the future as far as nuclear war is concerned, such a phrase as the "annihilation of the human race" runs from the lips so often that one's being is chilled from fully envisaging the meaning of the words. We pause and recognise that

Correspondence

- laton by governments and large corporations, etc.
- (4) To meet immediate financial needs (a) an appeal to FREEDOM readers to become regular weekly contributors during the present critical period or (b) to double their subscriptions to the end of the current year.
 - (5) An appeal not to "hoard" copies of FREEDOM. If every copy, once read by the subscriber, was placed in a club room or other place used by a number of people then a wider public would quickly be reached. At the worst, they might be left on trains and actually be read (especially in the absence of anything else to read) and provide a welcome change from the thousands of daily newspapers left each day in railway carriage compartments.

Glasgow, Aug. 29

Should we ignore Lorjou?

DEAR FRIENDS,

Arthur Moysé tells us that Lorjou's "Christ" is awful and should be ignored. For which reason I am not quite sure—for it being life-sized—in screaming colours—or for being just Christ! I have not seen the painting myself (nor am I likely to) so perhaps a London reader could take a second look.

I am interested in what others think because Lorjou calls himself an anarchist, has painted many large satirical and other pictures of protest which, to my knowledge, have never been shown here. His one-man show at Wildensteins three years ago was mainly still-life and flowers and his colour then was considered by the critics a little too strong for our palates!

Arthur Moysé might think these facts to be irrelevant when considering this one painting—personally I do not for Lorjou has been ignored in this country for too long and by art critics in particular. It, may or may not be a deliberate

policy but try and find some of his pictures or reproductions of them anywhere, or an evaluation of his work and it will prove most difficult. As for being a "lesser known French realist" this seems to be true only in England. He has been shown around the world and I believe at this moment his pictures bring a higher price than Buffet's.

Sincerely,

Newport, Aug. 22 MILWARD CASEY.

A Positive Importance

I have been following FREEDOM and especially ANARCHY with great interest. Negative thinking of the type George Molnar has recently offered is surely helpful in this context; I suspect that many of those who write to (and in) FREEDOM could use more of it, to awaken them to the self-deceptions and self-contradictions inherent in Bakunin's and our own temptation "to organise, to create association." But does not Molnar stop too soon? When such thinking is applied not merely to the state but to our own attempts to dominate, doesn't it enable a momentary condition to emerge within us which is without domination or aggression? And is that condition not a source of total and healthy personal action? Without such a condition even "anarchism as permanent opposition" is merely the ego's negative reaction to the domination of others. If this is true, "revolutionary programmes" are indeed deceptive as Molnar sees, but personal action on every level—not merely the "political" abstracted from the whole—has a positive importance which he seems to ignore. That is why Alexis Ferm is correct to say that "A. S. Neill is doing more for freedom than all the propaganda papers put together." That is also why I should like to see more articles in ANARCHY on the psychological implications of daily living (in the family, in the context provided

it bubbling by, when we feel the warm passionate love of a valued companion or are stirred to our depths by the gentle, tingling touch of sensitive hands we can only feel a sense of suffocating horror at the thought that all this can go, can be stolen away from us, by a nuclear flash. All life, for all time, gone beyond recall.

For those sensitive hearts, for those people whose lives have been butchered by the grimmest of the twentieth century one can only feel a hopeless sympathy when they find they can resist no more. Yet for the young, whose greatest tragedies are Suez and Hungary, who never really felt the last war intensely, and never realised what man had done to Japan, the only concern must be a struggle, however fruitless, to try to bring some sanity and love back to the world.

JEREMY WESTALL.

Postscript on Accidental War

Since writing the above I have read "The Myths of War and Peace" (last week's FREEDOM), an article which by its very calmness makes one begin to detect a writer who sees that panic is spreading and who feels this must be calmed for it is dangerous. Indeed this is an admirable approach, but is it truly honest?

On one issue I detect a certain mental blindness in the writer, and that concerns the dangers of an accidental war. Is this really "One of the biggest myths of all time"? It reminds one of the dogmatism of the Prime Minister when he pronounced that: "There will be no war by accident." Concerning this statement by the Prime Minister, Bertrand Russell writes the following in "Win We Must" (a recently published pamphlet of a recent speech): "It seems charitable to suppose that he believed this when he said it; but, if he did, he was ignorant of things it is his duty to know. The danger of unintended war arises, at present, mainly through the American doctrine of instant retaliation. American military authorities believe—or pretend to believe—that, at any moment, Russia may make a surprise attack upon NATO countries. There is not a shred of evidence for such a view, and very strong

evidence against it, but it is held and proclaimed and made the basis of American strategy. Radar stations in Canada, Greenland, Yorkshire, and many other places, are perpetually on the look out for approaching Russian missiles. They have frequently misinterpreted flights of birds as approaching bombs and, on at least one occasion, they mistook the moon for a Russian attack. Whenever a mistake of this sort occurs, American airmen armed with bombs get into the air. They have practised such speed that they can now be off the ground within two minutes of receiving the warning signal. Hitherto, mistakes have been discovered in time, but this is a piece of luck, upon which it would be most imprudent to rely. If one key man is drunk or insane or suddenly ill, the mistake may not be discovered. Since the Russians, like the Americans, expect a surprise attack and also believe in instant retaliation, one such mistake may easily precipitate a full scale war."

These are serious words based on sound facts. Does the writer of "The Myths of War and Peace" think they are phoney? Does he know of the facts as depicted in Russell's statement quoted above? R.J.W.

by our present sick institutions) by those who recognize that the temptations to dominate must be continually seen through and that no anarchist programme or theory can substitute for such constantly renewed insight. Could Alex Comfort help here? Would studies of the relevance to anarchist thought of Blake or Krishnamurti be useful? And wouldn't it be healthy for the whole tone of FREEDOM to move toward that of ANARCHY—toward dispassionate analysis, including self-analysis, and away from that excited polemicism which is for all of us a standing temptation to self-deception.

Yours,
Oberlin, Ohio. THOMAS WHITAKER.

The Solitary Demonstrator

STOCKHOLM, 2/9/61.

"Ban the Bomb", "Atom Bomb should be used for peaceful purposes", "Stop playing with fire, Mr. Khrushchev", were the texts on a placard carried by a solitary coloured student from Kenya on his way to the Russian Embassy in Stockholm to-day. He was stopped by the Police before he reached the Embassy and taken into custody. "It is not allowed to demonstrate in this way in Sweden"—it was reported in the press here. H.

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP CENTRAL MEETINGS AGAIN!

meetings to be held at
The Two Brewers,
40 Monmouth Street, WC2
(Leicester Square Tube)
Sundays at 7.30 p.m.

SEPT 10 Jack Robinson:
Anarchism and War
SEPT 17 Jeremy Westall:
Rhodesia and the Bomb
SEPT 24 Ian Celnick:
Subject to be announced
OCT 1 Arthur Uloth:
Subject to be announced
OCT 8 Philip Sansom:
Freedom and Progress

Hyde Park Meetings

Every Sunday at 3.30 (if fine)

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.

NEW MEETING
Last Friday of each month at 8 p.m. at Laurens Otter's 57 Ladbrooke Road, W.11.

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/- (\$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.

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
Vol 10 1960: The Tragedy of Africa
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/-

CHARLES MARTIN

Towards a Free Society 2/6

RUDOLF ROCKER

Nationalism and Culture cloth 21/-

ERRICO MALATESTA

Anarchy 9d.

JOHN HEWETSON

Ill-Health, Poverty and the State cloth 2/6 paper 1/-

VOLINE

Nineteen-Seventeen (The Russian Revolution Betrayed) cloth 12/6
The Unknown Revolution (Kronstadt 1921, Ukraine 1918-21) cloth 12/6

Marie-Louise Berneri Memorial Committee publications:

Marie-Louise Berneri, 1918-1949: A tribute cloth 5/-
Journey Through Utopia cloth 18/- (U.S.A. \$3)



FREEDOM PRESS PUBLICATIONS