

'Mankind's subjection will continue just so long as it is tolerated.'

PROUDHON

In this Issue:

- THE PHONEY WAR
- ANARCHIST NOTEBOOK
- ON BEING 75
- ROUND THE GALLERIES
- CORRESPONDENCE

OCTOBER 21 1961 Vol 22 No 34

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY - 4d.

THE American magazine "Life" devotes 12 pages of its current issue to "How to build shelters . . . where to hide in cities" which is prefaced by a letter from the President in which he informs the public that during the next eighteen months the government will be carrying out a survey of all public buildings with fall-out shelter potential and "the marking of those with adequate shelter for 50 persons or more". Shelters are being stocked

Shelter and Shoot Your Neighbour

'Life' and Death

with one week's food and medical supplies and two week's water supply. "In the meantime—continues the President—there is much that you can do to protect yourself . . ."

THE AMERICAN DILEMMA

JUDGING from the television and newspaper reports which reach this country, it appears that the average American ("a kindly chap") would support his government in the event of a showdown with the Soviet Union, even if this meant all-out nuclear war.

One can assume that the majority have not fully considered the possible consequences to themselves (or the rest of the world), believing with unthinking faith that their government will take care of them by some form of defence plan.

The boom in private underground shelters, ranging from the luxurious to the plain functional according to income and status, does not necessarily indicate a lack of faith in government defence measures but is an additional survival insurance for the family who can afford it.

Each shelter (separate purchase) is equipped with a gun and ammunition for disposing of shelterless neighbours who, in the event of surprise nuclear attack, might panic (understandably enough!) and attempt to get into the dugout of the man next door.

Moral issues apart, one can see in their tenacity signs of the spirit which won the early Americans the West and deprived the Indian of the right to live

★ NOT all Americans, however, disregard the moral and humanitarian issues involved in nuclear war, but it may seem paradoxical that it is often the men who care most about people who are primarily for survival even if, some argue, it means coming to terms with totalitarianism, with the loss of moral certainty.

The moral argument against "mere survival" or for "death before dishonour" does not necessarily spring from a love of truth, but is often used by reactionaries of all kinds whose opposition to totalitarian Communism is not based on any concern for the freedom of men.

Leaving aside the two extremes of argument (which can only be put to the test when men are faced with a real situation) it does seem that the threat of total annihilation has complicated the simple division in

some minds between violence and non-violence.

★ H. STUART HUGHES, Professor of History at Harvard, one of four American intellectuals writing in the monthly *Commentary*, argues against nuclear weapons but since he is not simply "for surrender" he reasons that:

the enemy should be met with real force but only on a human scale . . . (by the use of conventional weapons).

His argument is based on the theological principle that "war can be considered just only if the means employed are commensurate with the ends gained".

Although he supported the last war as "just" he believes that an atomic war would be so drastic in its results that the principle for which it would be fought, the defeat of Communism (presumably), would not justify the end. The argument seems to be one of quantity although his horror at the means is justifiable. It is not difficult to recognise the difference between, for example, death by radiation and death by shooting.

The chief opposition to Hughes' ideas comes from Sidney Hook, Professor of Philosophy at New York University, described as "America's leading anti-Communist theoretician" who argues that:

Survival is not the main issue . . . It is the supreme issue only for Communism in whose world nothing exists but history. The West, buttressed in part by belief in immortality, whether as a myth or fact, has always maintained that there are certain values more important than life itself . . . It was Aristotle who said that it is not life as such, or under any conditions that is of value, but the good life. The free man is one who in certain situations refuses to accept life if it means spiritual degradation. The man who declares that survival at all costs is the end of existence is morally dead.

On the practical issue Mr. Hook challenges the totality of the nuclear holocaust, and questions the validity of the argument put by Philip Green, Instructor in Government at Princeton, namely that the U.S. does not have the right to involve other nations in a nuclear war.

Hans J. Morgenthau, foreign affairs expert at the University of Chicago, doubts if the West would recover if 100 million Americans were to be killed and nine-tenths of the U.S. industrial capacity destroyed. But,

while it would be better to fight a nuclear war than to surrender he believes that such a war would be suicidal and absurd.

Mr. Morgenthau is prepared to be suicidal; the problem is that he is not the only one.

We hope to discuss these views in another issue of FREEDOM.

This and the recent resumption of tests in Russia has been the signal for a nation-wide rush to construct shelters. Finance houses are ready to lend money on the spot for shelter construction; building firms are vying with each other to secure your orders. According to the *Sunday Times* Washington correspondent a good shelter from a construction firm costs a minimum of £350, though apparently the government will shortly produce the plans for a do-it-yourself shelter at £50. However one can well imagine the American public falling for something less austere; how could they resist "a special, uniquely designed shelter with a sprayed, leaded fibre-glass protective coating for protection against all rays"; and then of course it must be big enough to hold the gadgets of comfort. One manufacturer's advertisement is a "fall out shelter check list" to ensure that you forget nothing, not least a geiger counter!

According to the *Daily Herald's* New York correspondent there is an "almost furtive attitude" among those who have built shelters. This was explained by one of New York's C.D. directors as follows:

"Many people believe that strangers who haven't prepared will try to take over their shelter by force". The *Herald's* correspondent comments:

Consequently shelter manufacturers are often sworn to secrecy—since this is about the only way in which American families do NOT want to keep up with the Joneses.

Deep down they are ashamed of being so selfish, but the instinct for survival is strong.

This morality of each-family-for-itself was discussed in a recent issue of a Jesuit Magazine *America* by a Catholic priest in an article headed "Ethics at the Shelter Doorway" and he concluded that it is permissible to protect oneself by refusing shelter to a neighbour. Apparently many Americans were shocked by such words coming from a priest "but privately a large number of them share his views". Since these views were expressed, other men of God have condemned them. The Episcopal Bishop of Washington has declared the every-family-for-itself approach as "Immoral, unjust and contrary to the national interest" and he added "If we need shelters to ensure national survival, they should be built on a commun-

ity rather than an individual basis, and as a public rather than a private responsibility."

The *Life* ploy is that "97 out of a 100 people can be saved" from fallout if they use the shelters, but before you rush to build one for yourself let's try and understand what these figures mean. First of all it must be made clear that your shelter "would be no protection against blast" and that "if a nuclear warhead should hit within 10 to 15 miles of you, the house might catch on fire or be blown down around you. For this reason some people prefer to place their shelter outside". The advantage presumably is that your house won't fall on top of you, but nevertheless you stand a very good chance of having your shelter uprooted by the blast. So of our initial 100 people we must write off a number "x" who will be blasted out of this world. Of those left 97 per cent. will be protected from fall-out by spending a week in their shelters where radiation would be reduced to "at least one-hundredth of what it is outside."

Now the next consideration is what to do when the food and water supplies in the shelter run out. Dad presumably will try to get out of the shelter. A proportion of the Dads of America will find that they are trapped, so the survivors will now be 100 minus "x" minus "y" ("y" representing the number trapped who will die of suffocation and starvation in their shelters). Those

Continued on page 4

Strikes the Bosses Want

THERE is significant omission from the Press reports on the strikes that are at the moment silencing the steel mills of the Abbey and Margam works, Port Talbot, and have brought to a stop the factories of the great Rootes group of car manufacturers.

The omission is of the usual denunciation of the strikers as 'harming the national economy' and 'making our customers go to our competitors'—and all the other arguments used against workers defending their standards in a boom period.

Denunciation of the strikers is not lacking, of course, and there are the usual agitators being discovered at work. The blame must always be pinned upon sinister politicians and spineless, dumb workers who don't know what they are striking for, but haven't the guts to oppose the agitators in their midst.

But in fact one doesn't have to look far to see that the initiative in these two disputes is not with the strikers but with the employers—and neither is it difficult to see why.

The results of a poll recently carried out by the Federation of British Industries are, in the words of Sampel Brittan, Economic Editor of the *Observer*, 'as gloomy as anyone expected'. It seems that 'output is being held up by shortage of orders' and 'the number of industrialists who plan to cut their spending on new plant and equipment exceeds by a clear ten per cent. those who are planning increases'.

In other words, the Government's 'Disinflationary' measures are hav-

ing the desired effects: they are reducing home demands in an attempt to balance imports with exports. The car industry—one of the biggest users of steel—has had a very bad summer, and orders are today at the lowest ebb for many years. There are exceptions, of course—Jaguars among them—but certainly Rootes are not.

Although new models are being introduced at the Motor Show (the results of long term planning), manufacturers stuck with lots of last year's models are anxious to shift those before stepping up production on new ones. They are also anxious to save overheads, curb the workers' demands, trim the wings of the shop stewards if possible, and generally get into training for tighter competition.

All these are accomplished by a strike. If the workers can be goaded into striking just when the bosses want them to, and the strike can be made to fail, with attendant hardships for the strikers and their families and disillusionment with the shop stewards who were forced to call the strike, the bosses can look forward to a period of quiet for some time afterwards.

Not only that. By sacking their 8,000 workers, rendered idle by the strike of 1,000 workers at the subsidiary Acton factory of British Light Steel Pressings, the Rootes Company are saving themselves £70,000 a week in wages and overheads. At a time when orders are not coming in anyway, this is a great benefit, and the whole operation suits the company very well.

Similar factors are at work in the steel 'strike' in South Wales, and were at work in the recent dispute at Ford's, ostensibly about a tea break!

The Trotskyists are being blamed by the employers for having caused the strikes by their beastly agitation. And no doubt these politicians are proud to be held responsible by workers who think 'militancy' means 'having a go' at all and every opportunity.

But the class struggle is a two way affair and is not quite so simple a matter as that. The employing class is cunning, and what's more, has its pulse on events much more than the workers do.

In a recent 'Tonight' TV programme, Andrew Shonfield, a journalist on economics, said that when money is scarce it's as good a time as any for the bosses to have a strike.

Note that. *The bosses* to have a strike!

No wonder there is no serious drive by the Federation of British Industries to push the Government to make unofficial strikes illegal! They want the workers to be free to strike when it suits them!

What does this mean? It means that what we have been asking for a very long time becomes much more necessary: the workers must find more effective means of struggle than simply a walk-out strike. They must study the market also and use their judgment on what tactic of struggle fits a given situation.

Yes, the bosses are cunning. So must the workers be!

ANARCHY 9

IS ALL ABOUT

PRISON

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

ON BEING 75

IF we use FREEDOM's 75th anniversary as our theme this week, it is not because we consider that longevity in a publication, no less than in human beings, is a sure sign of wisdom and rightness. Indeed too often is it a clear indication of senility and an ossification of thought, a nostalgia for the past and an inability to think in terms of the present. Since the main criticism of anarchists and anarchism is that our ideas are ahead of our times, these critics can hardly accuse us, on this occasion, of also living in the past! That accusation however comes from the Left: the Communist, Socialist and the self-styled "New" Leftists who, in fact, are so imbued with Establishment politics, with authoritarian ideas and organisation, that when, we would almost say, *driven*, even beyond the limits of their faith in party politics, they discover and propound more or less libertarian solutions, their "discoveries" are hailed by a bunch of bored intellectual publicists (political and literary) as "original", "far-reaching", "revolutionary" ideas which keep the pot of mass communications boiling for a week or two. But the "New Left" (at their most "original" which is not very often), the Committee of 100 (when they start seeking a direction for their civil disobedience), the War Resisters, the Freethinkers, the Penal Reformers, the Sex Reformers, the Rank-and-Fileers, The Syndicalists, the Pacifists, the Socialists (when they are not simply concerned with winning elections) and the Communists (when they are not concerned with serving the interests of Russian hegemony) the moment they start thinking and stop sloganising, must surely see their particular interest as part of a whole: for their will be no sexual freedom without freedom of thought; there will be no socialism or communism so long as there is privilege; there will be no workers' control so long as there are bosses; there will be no disarmament so long as there are nation states, power politics and government; there will be no penal reform so long as there is social injustice. There will be no achieving of these positive aspirations so long as the

OUR JUSTIFICATION

We were arguing that the passing of time does not invalidate the ideas embodied in the anarchist philosophy. Not only have the aspirations of anarchists been the aspirations of all men of goodwill throughout the history of Mankind. But the passing of the years—with the experience of the dismal failure of authoritarian Socialism and Communism in country after country—has also confirmed the rightness of the anarchists' insistence that the means are as important as the ends: that freedom can only be achieved through freedom or conversely, that authoritarian means can only lead to authoritarian ends. In FREEDOM's very first editorial in 1886 (reproduced in full elsewhere in this issue) this theme is put forcefully in the concluding sentences of the argument against Property:

We look for this socialization of wealth, not to restraints imposed by authority upon property, but to the removal, by the direct personal actions of the people themselves, of the restraints which secure property against the claims of popular justice. For authority and

affairs of Man are regulated by government, state, privilege, authority, force and prejudice. This we affirm, and have, we think, illustrated over the years with example after example.

The fact that we have been affirming these simple truths for the past 75 years does not invalidate them; the fact that we have been saying more or less the same things—all that has changed is the emphasis and our way of expressing ourselves—surely does not make us "old-fashioned".

(Incidentally, what is "new" about the New Left? We invite readers to purchase a copy of *Peace News* for October 6, in which they will find contributions on "A New Political Basis", by two members of the *New Left Review* Editorial Board, viz, Edward Thompson and John Saville. What have they to offer? By-elections! Yes, by elections! And John Saville for instance is so concerned about the revolutionary nature of the Committee of 100 that he warns them of the

"danger of running ahead way beyond any real mass support. I am not arguing that this has already happened but it could easily enough. The sit-down and mass arrests is not a tactic that can be used every other week-end, and to be as effective as it has been up to the present, it must be combined with as wide a variety of different kinds of propaganda campaigns as are open to us."

But, dear Mr. Saville, it has not yet been effective! To be effective civil disobedience must not be a week-end outing but a daily occurrence. Resistance to government is obviously made of sterner stuff than some of the New Left oracles are prepared to bear. They believe in government; how can they be made to see that the purpose of civil disobedience is not to change government but to destroy the power of the ruling, privileged elite, by confronting it with the power of the people?)

property both are manifestations of the egoistical spirit of domination, and we do not look to Satan to cast out Satan.

Have the passing of 75 years made these criticisms less valid? Has the nature of government changed? Is the State stronger or weaker than it was 75 years ago? Has Parliamentary Socialism and the ballot box brought us any nearer to the achievement of socialism? Is there any sign of the "withering away" of the State after more than 40 years of authoritarian socialism in Russia?

The much acclaimed New Left is simply the old discredited authoritarian, Marxist, Left in modern dress. It would be a pity if the present flood of youthful goodwill and revolt were to be diverted into authoritarian channels, and exploited by yet another bunch of potential political leaders masquerading as revolutionary leaders! If only to prevent this happening, would be justification enough for FREEDOM and ANARCHY's continued publication!

Vol 1 No 1 OCTOBER 1886 FREEDOM'S FIRST EDITORIAL

THROUGH the long ages of grinding slavery behind us, Freedom, that unknown goal of human pilgrimage, has hovered, a veiled splendour, upon the horizon of men's hopes. Veiled in the trembling ignorance of mankind, their misty unreasoning terror of all that revealed itself as power, whether it were an apparently incomprehensible and uncontrollable natural force, or the ascendancy of superior strength, ability or cunning in human society. The inward attitude of slavish adoration towards what imposes itself from without as a fact beyond our understanding, that is the veil which hides Freedom from the eyes of men. Sometimes it takes the form of the blind fear of a savage of his "medicine" or his fetish, sometimes of the equally blind reverence of an English workman for the law of his masters, and the semblance of consent to his own economic slavery wormed out of him by the farce of representation. But whatever the form the reality is the same, ignorance, superstitious terror, cowardly submission.

What is human progress but the advance of the swelling tide of revolt against this tyranny of the nightmare of ignorant dread, which has held men the slaves of external nature, of one another, and of themselves? Science and the arts, knowledge and all its varied shapes of practical application by ingenuity and skill, the binding and enlightening force of affection and social feeling, the protest of individuals and of peoples by word and deed against religious, economic, political and social oppression, these, one and all, are weapons in the hands of the Rebels against the Powers of Darkness sheltered behind their shield of authority, divine and human. But they are weapons not all equally effective at all times. Each has its period of special utility.

We are living at the close of an era during which the marvellous increase of knowledge left social feeling behind, and enabled the few who monopolised the newly acquired power over nature to create an artificial civilisation, based upon their exclusive claim to retain private, personal possession of the increased wealth produced.

Property—not the claim to use, but to a right to prevent others from using—enables individuals who have appropriated the means of production, to hold in subjection all those who possess nothing but their vital energy, and who must work that they may live. No work is possible without land, materials, and tools or machinery; thus the masters of these things are the masters also of the destitute workers, and can live in idleness upon their labour, paying them in wages only enough of the produce to keep them alive, only employing so many of them as they find profitable and leaving the rest to their fate.

Such a wrong once realised is not to be borne. Knowledge cannot long be monopolised, and social feeling is innate in human nature, and both are fomenting within our hide-bound Society as the yeast in the dough. Our age is on the eve of a revolt against poverty, in the name of the common claim of all to a common share in the results of the common labour of all.

Therefore, we are Socialist, disbelievers in Property, advocates of the equal claims of each man and woman to work for the community as seems good to him or her—calling no man master, and of the equal claim of each to satisfy as seems good to him, his natural needs from the stock of social wealth he has laboured to produce. We look for this socialisation of wealth, not to restraints imposed by authority upon property, but to the removal, by the direct personal action of the people themselves, of the restraints which secure property against the claims of popular justice. For authority and property both are manifestations of the

egoistical spirit of domination, and we do not look to Satan to cast out Satan.

We have no faith in legal methods of reform. Fixed and arbitrary written law is, and has always been, the instrument employed by anti-social individuals to secure their authority, whether delegated or usurped, when the maintenance of that authority by open violence has become dangerous. Social feeling, and the social habits formed and corrected by common experience, are the actual cement of associated life. It is the specious embodiment of a portion of this social custom in law, which has made law tolerable, and even sacred in the eyes of the people it exists to enslave. But in proportion as the oppression of law is removed, the true binding force of the influence of social feeling upon individual responsibility becomes apparent and is increased. We look for the destruction of monopoly, not by the imposition of fresh artificial restraints, but by the abolition of all arbitrary restraints whatever. Without law, property would be impossible, and labour and enjoyment free.

Therefore, we are Anarchists, disbelievers in the government of man by man in any shape and under any pretext. The human freedom to which our eyes are raised is no negative abstraction of licence for individual egoism, whether it be massed collectively as majority rule or isolated as personal tyranny. We dream of the positive freedom which is essentially one with social feeling; of free scope for the social impulses, now distorted and compressed by Property, and its guardian the Law; of free scope for that individual sense of responsibility, of respect for self and for others, which is vitiated by every form of collective interference, from the enforcing of contracts to the hanging of criminals; of free scope for the spontaneity and individuality of each human being, such as is impossible when one hard and fast line is fitted to all conduct. Science is teaching mankind that such crime as is not the manufacture of our vile economic and legal system, can only be rationally as well as humanely treated by fraternal medical care, for it results from deformity or disease, and a hard and fast rule of conduct enforced by condign punishment is neither guide nor remedy, nothing but a perennial source of injustice amongst men.

We believe each sane adult human being to possess an equal and indefeasible claim to direct his life from within by the light of his own consciousness, to the sole responsibility of guiding his own action as well as forming his own opinions. Further, we believe that the acknowledgment of this claim is a necessary preliminary to rational voluntary agreement, the only permanent basis of harmonious life in common. Therefore, we reject every method of enforcing assent, as in itself a hindrance to effectual co-operation, and further, a direct incentive to anti-social feeling. We deprecate as a wrong to human nature, individually, and therefore collectively, all use of force for the purpose of coercing others; but we assert the social duty of each to defend, by force if need be, his dignity as a free human being, and the like dignity in others, from every form of insult and oppression.

We claim for each and all the personal right and social obligation to be free. We hold the complete social recognition and acknowledgement of such a claim to be the goal of human progress in the future, as its growth has been the gauge of development of Society in the past, of the advance of man from the blind social impulse of the gregarious animal to the conscious social feeling of the free human being.

Such, in rough outline, is the general aspect of the Anarchist Socialism our paper is intended to set forth, and by the touchstone of this belief we purpose to try the current ideas and modes of action of existing Society.

ROUND THE GALLERIES

STUPID GAME FOR BIG MONEY

THE "New New York Scene" at the New London Gallery at 17 Old Bond Street, W.1., appears as a must on the list for the footslogging London painters, for paint-spattered jeans and brooding eyes outnumber the well-heeled better types in this long basement gallery. That the inspiration for the London painters has shifted from the continent to the United States is undeniable yet of late there appears little to fear and little to learn. The Hard Edge school after a brief life appears to have shot its bolt and a more fluid style now holds the stage but that is more the work of gallery politics than of aesthetic values, for on the receiving end are the rich snob collectors and it is obvious that an important gallery catering to pop tastes can in a few brief months dictate which group is in and which group is out. Behind the gallery is usually the grey eminence of one man and if he can corner the market in pop

abstract painters he can write his own ticket with the dealers.

It is said that Coleman, of *Art News*, broke with Alloway in this battle for the stage of the New London Gallery with Alloway pushing his Hard Edge clique and Coleman re-grouping with the Fluid Abstractionist lads. All this would be a stupid game if it were not for the big money behind it for when a canvas sells for two or three hundred pounds a commission or a gift makes a nice Christmas present and already there has been one reported casualty and a familiar face is missing from the New London Gallery.

Frankly there is little that can be said about this exhibition that has not been said already. The American style of the moment is looser, their colours more garish but they exude a confidence that is lacking in these islands; but in the end all one can say is that the paint

has been slapped on to fill the canvas and when the brush has been laid aside little has been said. For the value of these canvases is that as long as their artificial prices can be maintained they are simple and easy ways of investing money for aesthetically they could rot in the dealer's cellar until they are ready to be cashed. Time and time again we view these banal canvases whose only interest lies in their echo of past masters.

Frederic Benrath's brown and oily wash, at Tooth's gallery of 31 Bruton Street, W.1., on first viewing evokes memories of Constable's "Branch Hill Pond" and as we approach dissolves into the spongy wash of Benrath's £120 "Eloges II", while Anna Meyerson at the Hanover Gallery at 32a St. George Street, W.1. may stick pieces of rough tin and/or chicken wire to her canvases, yet the only canvas that holds our gaze is the one where she has gilded the lumps of bitumen that spatter it, but like the Italian Primitives of which this is but a rude echo it lies embalmed be-

Continued on page 4

