

'The community that will not allow its humblest citizen to freely express his opinion, no matter how false or odious the opinion may be, is only a gang of slaves.'

WENDELL PHILLIPS

In this Issue:

A PLUM FOR MR K
AUGUSTUS JOHN
THE WAR PLOTTERS
LEADERS AND LUNATICS
CORRESPONDENCE

NOVEMBER 11 1961 Vol 22 No 36

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY - 4d.

US READY TO RESUME TESTS

HOW many people we wonder were taken in by the chorus of moral indignation that went up in official American circles each time the Russians exploded their bomb in the atmosphere? How many believe that the explosions—there have been 31 so far—were carried out for propaganda purposes, meant to “impress” and terrorise the Americans? And how many believe Khrushchev’s justification for polluting the atmosphere a little more; that it was regrettable but that the safety of the Eastern bloc, and world peace, have been their sole consideration, etc.?

Some of the answers to these questions can, we think, be found in American reactions to the Russian “crime”. The moral indignation settled long before the fall-out, and all kinds of pressure groups are already at work to get the United States to resume testing above ground.

Kennedy has now stated that the United States were ready to resume tests in the atmosphere “if this became necessary for American security and for the protection of the free world”. Preparations were

A Plum for Mr. K

in fact under way for carrying out these tests; there would be no super-bomb explosions, and he promised that fall-out would be kept to an “absolute minimum”.

According to the report Kennedy, “speaking with great emphasis” said that the United States still had a lead over Russia in general nuclear power, and this country “does not intend to lose it.” He warned, however, that the Soviet “campaign of fear” should not be dismissed as mere bluff and bluster. The atmospheric tests in the Soviet Union had probably been of value to Russian scientists and military men.

What a plum for Mr. Khrushchev! First of all he admits that America has a lead and then makes it clear that the Americans do not intend losing it. By the same token, Khrushchev can say that Russia does not intend to be in a position of inferiority in this matter and will do everything possible to close the gap. And of course this means a general resumption of tests all round. But notice too that now the Americans are contemplating tests, the argument that the Russian bomb explosions has no scientific justification and that it was simply a propaganda campaign of terror, is being modified. They should not be dismissed “as mere bluff and bluster”, etc., declared the President.

figures are theoretical, but they are supported by an impressive array of expert witnesses in the Atomic Energy Commission and the Defence Department.

It is this kind of pressure that is being exerted almost daily on the White House as President Kennedy ponders the question of whether the time has now come for him to give the signal for resumed testing in the atmosphere.

Already Governor Rockefeller of New York has said it is “unthinkable” to send American troops into battle against any Communist troops unless the American soldiers are armed with advanced, precise, and clean weapons” which can only be developed by new tests in the atmosphere. Governor Rockefeller said that the United States must not be intimidated by neutralist opinion from carrying out any test which is essential to the protection and strengthening of American security.

Alistair Cooke (*Guardian*, Nov. 1) describes the American reaction to “the drenching of the atmosphere with incalculably dangerous fall-out” as being “swift and odd”

It is a demand, from impressively responsible men, that the United States should resume atmospheric testing as soon as possible.

There is no hint of this retaliation in today’s morning papers, but the evening papers are full of it. It began with the delayed reports of a speech by Mr. Richard Nixon, the 1960 Republican

candidate for President, in up-state New York. “We should not wait,” he said, “and take a Gallup Poll of all the neutral nations around the world. The US should take its nuclear testing out from underground.”

He was echoed today by Senator Henry Jackson, a Democrat and the chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Weapons: “There is no question that the Soviets are improving the sophistication of their warheads to the point that in the long lead we may be in jeopardy. We’ll have to test in the atmosphere.” It will be hard, and could be politically perilous, for the Republican or Democratic rank and file not to say “Amen.”

At its most clamant, this new “demand” takes the form of a banner headline across the Hearst papers, which, if they no longer have the power to mobilise public indignation that they did in the days of their founder, still thunder from coast to coast:

“Urge JFK Order A-Tests: Call Air Shots Must”

It was the tentative, but depressed, opinion of American officials here in and around the United Nations that if the Administration, leaders in Congress, and the President’s Scientific Advisory Committee, shared the apprehensions of Senator Jackson, it would soon become impossible for President Kennedy to resist this appeal. American editorial opinion would quite suddenly have to halt its lamentations over the fate of

unborn children and leave to the other fellow the charge of “wanton disregard for human life.”

Two senators, one a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, the other chairman of the armed services committee are calling for immediate tests to perfect the N-bomb. The “death ray” neutron bomb would be an answer to Khrushchev’s “terror weapons”. It sounds to us more of a terror weapon than anything we have heard of so far. It is thus described by the *Daily Herald’s* New York correspondent:

Both American and Soviet scientists are known to be working on the N-bomb, primarily a battlefield weapon capable of killing soldiers in tanks without destroying the tanks or other equipment.

People working in a building could be wiped out by the rays without the building suffering any damage except broken windows.

That is a weapon! Imagine eliminating the human race, while retaining intact all the material property and prosperity of the nations!! Now all this business of establishing bases in outer space comes into proper perspective. When war is declared the VIPs will depart in their rockets to outer space, while we poor mugs are popping each other off with death ray neutron weapons. When no sign of human life is apparent the VIPs will descend like Gods to inhabit and repopulate the earth. Ah! Brave New World!

The Weapons can be Improved!

OFFICIALS of the Defence Dept. have begun a large scale campaign for a resumption of nuclear tests in the atmosphere by the United States. In a report from Washington the *Guardian’s* correspondent Max Freedman writes:

They are circulating memoranda designed to prove that American security will be endangered if these tests are not undertaken soon. They point out that it is imperative, from a military point of view, to modernise the nuclear weapons in the American stockpiles.

Some of these weapons must now be dismantled and inspected. In addition there have been developed new and improved methods of triggering off the explosion, but these devices must be tested before their effectiveness can be fully displayed.

The officials point out that it is also important to find out if high altitude explosions affect radio communications. Without adequate knowledge on this point the US might find, in an emergency, that its worldwide system of communications by radio would not work because of enemy high altitude explosions intended to disorganise its operations.

If these pessimistic forecasts are correct the Defence Department might find that its radar is unable to track hostile aircraft, the distant early warning line across Northern Canada might not function, and the great missile warning radar screen might be ineffective.

In the high altitude tests conducted by the US in 1958, it was found that radio communications were disorganised for six or eight hours over the Pacific area.

General Thomas White, former Chief-of-Staff of the Air Force, told Congress that no missile has ever been fired with an active warhead on it to see whether “the whole combination works out.”

Defence Department officials say that General White’s statement, applied in substance to all weapons systems. They add that since testing was stopped by the US in October, 1958, it should be possible by a new series of tests to improve the quality of every nuclear weapon in the American armoury.

Congressman Holifield, Chairman of the Joint Congressional Atomic Energy Committee, has agreed with this estimate. He says that a warhead weighing 500 lb. has a present range of 1,200 miles; but if the weight of the warhead were reduced from 500 to 250 lb., the range could be increased to 1,700 miles with the same amount of missile fuel. These

WELL, THE WHITE ONE LOOKS USEFUL!



Britain is not short of Land

ONE of the arguments used by the racial fanatics, now supported by the Tory Government’s measure limiting immigration into this country is that Britain is already too overcrowded and short of the necessary land required for development in order to supply the needs of “her own” existing and future population.

All their other “reasons” have been fairly successfully shot down by opponents of government policy, but on the question of limited space many people have agreed that it presented a problem, if not now in the future, made more difficult by increased immigration.

The findings of Mr. Wyndham Thomas, director of The Town and Country Planning Association, speaking in London last week at the Conference of the Federation of Registered Housebuilders, will leave the anti-blacks without any practical arguments in their campaign to “keep Britain white”.

Mr. Thomas’s statement will startle many people who have been encouraged to believe that all types of development have almost reached their limit. He said:

“One of the most widely believed bits of modern mythology is that Britain is desperately short of land. We have all the land we are likely to need, and for

all the purposes for which we are likely to need it, for as far ahead as even the most far-sighted eye can see.”

“An anti-social alliance of market pressures, aesthetic prejudices and preservative sentiment is now forcing higher densities, higher costs and lower standards in public and private housing, especially in the areas of greatest demand.”

Only a lowering of city land values through the dispersal of workplaces could make it possible to build close to city centres homes that workers wanted and could afford. Meanwhile they would continue to move out.

He estimates that although by 1981 the urban growth will have increased by 1,000 square miles only about two per cent. would represent a decline in agricultural acreage:

Nearly four million houses would be needed in the next 20 years to replace existing ones that would be more than

a hundred years old by 1981, at least two million (nearer three at the current rate) to cope with the formation of additional families able to afford separate homes, and a half a million to relieve present overcrowding.

This would absorb land at about the present rate of 35,000 acres a year, implying a total urban growth by 1981 of more than 1,000 square miles. This would, however, represent a decline in our agricultural acreage of only about two per cent., which would be accompanied by an increase of at least 20 per cent. in total farm output if increasing agricultural productivity were maintained.

Just as monetary and political interests prevent the rational use of agricultural development which could eliminate famine and hunger on a large scale, so will “market pressures” prevent the sensible use of land for housing development.

ANARCHY 9 IS ALL ABOUT PRISON

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

Augustus John

THERE are a minority of men that nature has cast for the role of genius and their lives transcend their art and age, and when men in meeting, discuss them, it is not what they did but how they lived that commands attention. They become legends in their own lives, and lesser men who cross their paths carry the knowledge that they have been saved from history's oblivion by this accident of time and geography. Such a man was Augustus Edwin John, born at Tenby in Pembrokeshire, in the country of Wales, on the 4th of January, 1877.

His father was a local solicitor and his mother an amateur artist, died when he was five. It was planned that John should follow his father's profession, but little pressure was exerted when he decided to enter the Slade at the age of seventeen with £180 and a three year scholarship won by his painting "The Brazen Serpent".

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 Story of Fabian Socialism
Margaret Cole 30/-
Harpo Speaks!
Harpo Marx 25/-
In Search of Criminology
L. Radzinowicz 25/-
The Russian Intelligentsia
(Ed.) R. Pipes 36/-
Growing: an Autobiography of the
Years 1904-11
Leonard Woolf 25/-

REPRINTS

In Place of Fear
Aneurin Bevan 21/-
This Believing World
Lewis Brown 12/-

SECOND-HAND

Report of Royal Commission
(Canada, 1946, Gouzenko) 10/-
The Builders' History
R. W. Postgate 12/6
Tolstoy: his Life and Work
Derrick Leon 6/6
Labour in Transition (1921)
William A. Orton 7/6
The Rationalist Annual, 1946
Russell, Haldane, Joad 2/6
A Nest of Hereditary Legislators
Ivan S. Turgenieff 4/-
Mahatma Gandhi
Romain Rolland 6/6
Lenin: a Biography 4/-
Down and Out in Paris and London
George Orwell 12/6
Capitalism and the Consumer
Fred Hendersen 3/6
History of the English Revolution 1640
F. Guizot 4/-
What Everybody Wants to Know
about Money
Clark, Cole, etc. 4/-
Jack London, American Rebel
Philip S. Foner (paper-back) 3/6
Penguin Russian Review (No. 2)
(Spine damaged) 2/6
Penguin Russian Review (No. 4)
(Spine damaged) 2/6
Looking Forward
Philip Rappaport 4/-
The Tour of a Socialist round the World
W. W. Moodie 3/6
The Ethics of Tolstoy
W. Reid 3/-
How we Think
John Dewey 4/-
Select Historical Documents 1715-1920
H. Butterfield 5/-
Revolutionary Essays
Peter E. Burrowes 4/-
The Highroads
C. E. M. Joad 5/-
The Industrial History of England
H. de B. Gibbins 3/-
Democracy: Today and Tomorrow
Eduard Benés 3/-

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

Life was good to John, for his talent as a master draughtsman was soon recognized and his early friendship with James Dickson Jones helped to foster his feeling for brilliant colours. Early recognition did not spoil the man however, for all his life he moved among all manner and classes of men as their equal and ever the gentle revolutionary, his pocket and his name were there to serve, yet never did he fulfil the high hopes of his teachers and his friends, for the greatness of his early promise never managed to flower into fruition.

Too much of the intellectual, John could not leave a canvas or a subject alone and too often his constant repetition and overwork killed the humanity that gave birth to the original creation. It is his love of the social off-beat that gives his best canvases their master-touch for he painted the gypsies because he loved them and their way of life, for John, the artist, sought and found his greatness in the human contact and if he left us only his "Smiling Woman", he would have paid his debt to the world. Like Hogarth's "Shrimp Girl", this magnificent woman mocks the pedant and the purist for as free, as firm, as vigorous and as full of surging life as a young tree she is John's affirmation of the glory and the joy that could and should be our birthright.

Yet John could trouble his friends, and many were hurt when he decided to paint the portrait of Alvan T. Fuller, the Governor of Massachusetts, who was part instrumental in sending Sacco and Vanzetti to their innocent deaths. John

claimed that it was not the artist's function to stand in judgment on the subject, and in this he may have been correct, but what hurt his friends and worried John afterwards was that he had stayed as a guest with Fuller while the two anarchists were awaiting death. But all that is water under the bridge, and the Augustus John that we can but remember, is not the father of Admiral Sir Caspar John, the First Sea Lord; not the fashionable academic rebel of the 'thirties, not the official war artist; or the man of the moment painting the creatures of fashionable society in the Grand Manner of elongated heads, tense muscles, and flat planes in the tradition of Michelangelo, Tintoretto and El Greco; but a sweet and gentle old man who annoyed all those now busily engaged in writing their protestations of love for him, by the earthiness of his language and his open pleasure for the glass and the tankard.

Augustus John, that little grey-bearded man with the dirty beret aslant his head and a willowy female acolyte upon his arm lightened the grey streets of our Town, and it was fitting that his last public appearance should have been at Trafalgar Square when the citizens by the hundred sat down to mark their disapproval of those who spoil our lives, and our last recorded contact with him should have been the gay sincerity of the message he sent to the people who organized the Anarchist Ball on the 20th of October.

Augustus John is dead but the loss is truly ours.

ARTHUR MOYSE.



The Smiling Woman
One of Augustus John's many portraits
of his second wife, Dorelia.
(From the Tate Gallery)

The War Plotters

... PEOPLE AFRAID TO COMPETE IDEOLOGICALLY WITH OTHERS, AFRAID OF THE GIVE AND TAKE OF NEGOTIATION AND BARGAINING, TERRIFIED OF UNFAMILIAR HUMAN CONTACTS ... THE REJECT THE PROSPECT OF INTERNATIONALLY SHARED IDEAS AND IDEALS.

This article from our American contemporary 'Liberation', discusses the growth of the new profession of civilian military strategists in the United States.

plot the uses of its products on chessboards of war. Library shelves are growing heavy with works on military strategy in the nuclear age; the vocabulary of military deterrence passes into the common realm; strategists insist that their occupation deserves the dignity of "the academic counterpart of the military profession." They complain that their art develops so slowly. Meantime, in the ranks of the older "political realists" there are quiet but important defections. George F. Kennan breaks from its sterile concepts, and Hans J. Morgenthau, perhaps the dean of the "realist" school of international relations, finds the old power structure sadly out of date.

Who are the strategists? Morgenthau is a native of Germany who advises the military applications subcommittee of the Congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, as well as Convair and the Atomic Energy Commission. Others include a professor of history who writes widely on military affairs, especially as related to Germany; another professor who specializes in the military aspects of economics; a university lecturer in public and international affairs who served as a military officer with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the Office of Strategic Services and the Central Intelligence Agency; an army colonel who is now deputy director of a university international-relations department. Paul H. Nitze, former director of the State Department policy planning staff, has been associated with the older "political realists," but he also writes on military strategy.

Sometimes a mere engineer makes the ranks of the élite who are invited to address luncheon clubs on international strategy. Henry S. Aurand, Jr., a civil engineering M.S. and missile designer for General Electric's Technical Military Planning Operation, spoke to San Francisco's Commonwealth Club in April 1960. He felt no qualms about suggesting an ultimate deterrent of 40 million megatons, to be possessed by both the Soviet Union and the United States in order to make war really suicidal.

Ordinarily the strategists are more conservative in their proposals. Most have rejected massive retaliation on the grounds that it is unrealistic under the new conditions of East-West thermonuclear parity. They prefer to consider a limited war, nuclear or non-nuclear. The problem is that none can promise that non-nuclear war won't become nuclear war or that limited nuclear war won't become unlimited nuclear war. For a while the prospect of total nuclear war was held improbable, but opinion has shifted now to make it a very real possibility, even a probability. One breakthrough for the feasibility of war is traced to January 1959, when several RAND strategists came out with separate writings reappraising the prospect for the balance of terror. According to a fellow strategist, the reappraisal came to a head with Congressional hearings early in 1959. The "alarming view" then quickly spread that the American thermonuclear striking power might soon become decidedly inferior to Russia's and the nuclear deadlock be unbalanced. The accepted view now considers the deadlock to have been unsettled by disparities in the means of delivery and protection of nuclear weapons. In other words, the nation with more missiles to deliver warheads and with better means of protecting its striking force and population has an advantage in intimidating the enemy. It does not matter if the nation with three hundred more missiles does not intend to use them to start a war. Just the fact of having them gives it a psychological head start that unsettles the "balance".

Deterrence is described as being concerned with "influencing the choice that another party will make, and doing it by influencing his expectations of how we will behave." It would seem a rather capricious foundation on which to rest the fate of mankind. The strategy for dealing with the Soviet Union is one aspect of conflict strategy, which also applies, for example, to unruly children, criminals or aggressive drivers. The common element is trying to influence their actions by our threats of reprisals. At the same time it is necessary to assume that the enemy is "rational," meaning that he will respond to our threats as we expect him to respond. A non-strategist

may question the wisdom of trying to manipulate a nation as one would a naughty child. He may wonder too how a strategist without deep knowledge of Soviet culture and psychology—or even with it—dares to pin millions of lives on the correctness of his guess as to how the adversary will respond or what its criterion for "rationality" is. From the official United States viewpoint, the U-2 flight was fully rational, but the Soviets seemed to consider it irrational.

Strategic literature is replete with small phrases that represent assumptions regarding Soviet military behaviour, especially in response to Western moves. The phrases appear innocuously as "In the eyes of the Soviets . . . They are also likely to think . . . The Soviets may believe." Considering the present stakes, who has the moral right to make free and easy predictions of this nature? With similar unrealism the strategists sometimes refer to the enemy as "he," on the questionable assumption that government contains no pull and haul on policy-making and that, consequently, our policies cannot influence the forces represented in Soviet decision-making.

An occasional strategist, such as Brodie, worries that we may be so aggressive about deterrence as to cause an enemy to fear us too much, "especially if what we make him fear is our over-readiness to react." Such qualms worry few plotters. Their principal fear is that the enemy will find the threat of nuclear retaliation not sufficiently credible.

It is important to say what the strategists are not interested in. They are not interested in disarmament or disengagement. They are very interested in diplomacy or diplomats, except for Talleyrand, Metternich and Machiavelli. They are uninterested in world government or in a United Nations strengthened against world anarchy. As historians, they manage to avoid consideration of man's long struggle upward from bestiality. As international-relations experts, they rarely see the newly independent peoples as anything but potential accretions to American power. They seek a mechanistic formula for war and peace, perhaps because they fear the entry of human forces, the unpredictable quirks of human personality and the unsettling ifs of history.

SOVIET INTENTION

Critics realize that the military framework in which United States foreign policy is imprisoned has caused much of the nation's trouble, but they find no reasonable way to change this framework. Even a thoughtful pacifist may fear that substantial unilateral disarmament by the United States would encourage attack. It may not, but it may. The unknown factor is Soviet intentions.

Continued on page 4

THOUGHTS ON POWER

ARE OUR LEADERS MAD?

ARTHUR ULOTH'S "complete disagreement" with our approach would seem to us to hinge on only one question. We agree that it is an important one, but nevertheless one on which reasonable people should be able to reach agreement because it is a question of facts and not opinion or conjecture. The question is contained in the last two sentences of his first paragraph:

People in all walks of life commit suicide, and occasionally murder. The danger comes when one of these unbalanced people comes to hold a position of supreme power.

He illustrates his contention in the second paragraph with the examples of Stalin and Hitler "as well as some of the Roman emperors". Perhaps we should forget about the Roman emperors, "and other rulers in different periods of history" for the time being, and content ourselves with events and leaders in our own times.

Who are the individuals, suicidal, murderous or just "unbalanced" who have in fact held positions of supreme power? Before we start thinking of the likely candidates, let us attempt to define "supreme power". As we understand it, and we are naturally open to correction, it is the absolute power which an individual enjoys to direct the lives, the action, the thoughts, of all the members of the community by reason of wisdom, hypnotic powers, or the exclusive possession of a weapon of coercion (it could be as fantastic as a portable "death ray" or as pedestrian as an age-long taboo!). In other words we maintain that for an individual to enjoy supreme power he must embody in his person not only the desire, the ambition, or the God-sent-mission, to direct, control or guide the lives of all other members of the community, but also the power to enforce his wishes upon those who might not recognise either his wisdom or his authority. Among the latter are, on the one hand, the Arthur Uloths and the writer of these lines, who neither want to rule nor be ruled, and on the other, those who are as avid for positions of power as our would-be "supreme ruler".

If we overlook for the time being the Uloths and ourselves (have no fear, we will not forget to re-introduce ourselves in due course!) we are left with a very large number of people all interested in maintaining, consolidating or achieving positions of privilege which are, and can only be, based on power over the lives of other people.

Willy nilly we are born into a

THE EXTENSION OF POWER

THE privileged minority are the victims of their own greed. Apart from the very important fact that in usurping culture, knowledge and education they spawned the most determined rebels within their own class, the growth of industrialism, by which larger profits could be made than by the cultivation of the land, has not only extended the horizons and the frontiers of the privileged minority but also their dependence on a new class of technicians, scientists, financiers and super-salesmen undreamed of a century ago.

class-divided world, in which for some of us the red carpet of social and economic privilege is laid down even before our contemplated arrival. But for most of us our, often, unexpected arrival is preceded by overtime at work, housing problems, a tightening-of-the-belt, and a checkered future which is determined by the family fortunes and the imponderables of 11-plus examinations, to mention only two of the obstacles barring the way to most children. (Agreed that the children of the privileged class are as much the victims of their environment as the children of the have-nots are of theirs. But . . . !).

This is not a digression but an attempt to draw attention to the fact that the underprivileged majority find themselves in the position they are, not because they are less intelligent nor potentially less able to occupy more "responsible" jobs than the privileged minority, but because of the accident of birth and the very palpable fact that the society into which they are born has for a very long time been based on satisfying primarily the needs and aspirations of the privileged. And such a society depends for its existence on the needs of the majority being subordinated to those of a minority. (Let us hasten to add that, we anarchists are as unconvinced by rule of the majority as we are of rule by the minority, since we mistrust the intentions of those who desire to rule just as, in despair, we question the intelligence of those who accept to be ruled).

Now, how does a minority, manage to retain its power in the teeth of a dissatisfied—to say the least—majority? The unobvious, brutal, answer is: force. Call it the threat of—, call it law-and-order, call it the fear of unemployment or "insecurity"; blame the Jones', "tradition", "human nature", "survival of the fittest", the wickedness of man" or "man's aggressivity"; indeed, call it by any name you like but you cannot escape from the fact that a minority rules over the majority because it disposes of the machinery of State, that is, the armed forces, the Civil Service, the police, the judiciary, the prisons, mass communications, the means of production as well as the raw materials below and above ground. In a word, they hold all the cards of power except the aces which are held by the people, the majority, who are the producers of the means of life (and the luxuries of the privileged minority!), but who have still to discover what they hold up their sleeves!

The "supreme power" of an individual, which Arthur Uloth refers to, which is in fact absolute power, is a thing of the past. Whereas in the distant past the absolute monarch secured his power by granting sinecures and property to loyal soldiers and financial backers, today it is the other way round. The monarchy—where it still persists is no more than an expensive, dormant, appendix in the social organism—and governments, are the vocal stooges of the industrialists, the financiers and the permanent civil

servants who between them seek to regulate our lives. Not only has the number of aspirants to "supreme power" increased as taboos have been broken down, but so has their dependence on others increased in to maintain their power.

To our minds those who today wield the least power in the Western bloc are the politicians. (Let us qualify this by saying that if the governments of the West European and American bloc have real power of decision it is only because their spokesmen are themselves influential members of the ruling élite in their respective countries. Fact or fiction?). In the Russian bloc, though the financier and industrialist, as we understand them in the West, do not exist, effective power must (unless one believes that everything from a sputnik to a shoe-lace can be ordered and controlled from Khrushchev's office in Moscow) be widely spread amongst scientists, technicians, bureaucrats, soldiers, policemen and politicians. When Mr. K. at the recent Russian Party Congress declared that the very speech he was then making had been "examined and endorsed by the leading collective" he was being more honest, more realistic as to the powers of the political leaders than for instance, such impotent political nincompoops as our Lord Home who, perhaps because he was at the time of his appointment widely described as a Macmillan stooge, now cannot make a speech without threatening her Majesty's potential enemies with an H-bomb (made in Britain) right in their vital spot. Dear Arthur, let the old cock crow if it satisfies his ego!

OUR TASK

OUR task is to expose the hypocrisy of the political game of creating political crises, of "negotiating", patching-up, postponing, but never solving or eradicating them. Our task is to deflate these newspaper-personalities not to inflate them, which, unwittingly, our friend Uloth does when he suggests they might well hold positions of "supreme power". Just think of the awe in which people such as Hitler, Stalin, Roosevelt and Churchill were held in by the organs of mass communications, and in consequence by the masses. They are all dead, politically if not physically, and at the time of writing Adenauer, Krushchev, Kennedy and Macmillan are the "personalities" that have replaced them.

LEADERS AND LUNATICS

DEAR COMRADES,

It is not often that I find myself in such complete disagreement with the editors of FREEDOM as I do on this issue. The editorial of November the 4th seems to me very much mistaken. "Are our leaders suicidal lunatics?" Well, how do we know either way? The truth is most likely that the ruling groups in society are composed of people very like ourselves, including clear-headed and stupid folk, gentle (at least in personal dealings) and ruthless, happy and unhappy. It is these last who represent perhaps the greatest threat. People in all walks of life commit suicide, and occasionally murder. The danger comes when one of these unbalanced people comes to hold a position of supreme power.

Stalin was probably mad. About Hitler there can be no doubt at all. Some of the Roman emperors were insane, and other rulers in different periods of history. Such people would be perfectly prepared, had

Firstly not only have the countries concerned survived the loss of their super-men; they all boast that they have never been as prosperous as they are now . . . without them! Secondly, with the exception of Britain (which loves animals more than it does human beings, and which explains why it supports Churchill's "bull-dog" spirit to this day in spite of the valid denunciations by his critical civil and military "colleagues"), the Stalins, Roosevelts and Hitlers (not to mention the Mussolinis) get the criticism and oblivion they deserve. Why? Not because they were mad, as comrade Uloth suggests, but because they have been used as the scapegoats for the real "powers behind the

throne" and because once the spotlight of mass communications has been turned elsewhere they assume their normal stature, and the world can only see them as vain, weak, ambitious, lonely, ruthless, unbalanced, stupid, or whatever human being can be in given circumstances. But are we asked to accept that the worker in Russia, in Italy, in Germany, America, France and Britain is now any less a worker, a member of the other class, than he was when the other set of supermen were in office? If not then these self-professed champions of the people are no more the defenders of the people than their much denounced predecessors?

THE WORKERS DON'T KNOW

"OF course the social system has not changed", declares Arthur Uloth adding, "And no doubt revolution is the only answer". We agree 100 per cent. And when he writes

But we should be living in a fool's paradise if we imagine that 'it can't happen'. As long as these weapons of mass destruction exist there is always a risk that they may be used, or set off by an error of judgment that cannot be corrected in time. We are again in agreement! We have never said that "it can't happen". Indeed, if he had read our last editorial in conjunction with the others we have written on the subject he would have found in the opening sentence of *The Myth of War and Peace* (Sept. 2) the following:

In the kind of world set-up which regulates human affairs the possibility of war at some time or other is inevitable. . . .

And far from assuming that "accidental" war could result from a technical hitch we have sought to pour cold water on these fantastic "stories". But neither do we believe that war will be the result of what comrade Uloth calls "the obvious fact of human irrationality". Wars are launched by the ruling class for reasons which are, for them, very rational: namely, the preservation of the *Status quo*, in other words their survival as a privileged class. Our argument is that for them to take such a step they must feel that their security is threatened. In spite of Mr. K and the Committee of 100 (to whom, in spite of what some of our critics may say, we have offered all along 100 per cent. support so long as they don't sell-out to the establishment, or "New"-Left politicians) we do not consider that they are, or feel,

so threatened and for these reasons we see no missiles on the launching pads just waiting for the unknown "criminal" to press the button that will start the fireworks and the deadly blast and fall-out.

Arthur Uloth will, we hope, permit us to underline his concluding point that the weapons of mass destruction "may be used, or set off by an error of judgment that cannot be corrected in time". All wars are an error of judgment so far as the losing side is concerned and viewed in retrospect, but there is a chasm of irrationality between the argument that we are threatened by suicidal lunatics "in positions of supreme power" and that wars are the result of "an error of judgment"!

Would that the ruling groups were lunatics; one would know how to deal with them. They are not lunatics but people who, as the saying goes, know on which side their bread is buttered, and have their finger on the pulse of public opinion, market trends, Common Markets and subversive activities*. Only too well do the ruling class know what they want. It's the working people who serve their interests who still don't know what they want. And we are asked to believe that the former are the "lunatics"!

*Mr. Bruce Reid, Press Officer of the Committee of 100 stated, according to the *Sunday Times* that the Special Branch of Scotland Yard was paying special attention to their activities on Home Office instructions. "The Police were very much in evidence at meetings we held at the docks". We would add that at the Committee's Trafalgar Square meeting on October 29 this writer saw a group of four plain clothes men all wearing CND badges mingling with the crowd.

LETTER

more rational than average, which I doubt very much. History does not bear it out. Some ruling classes, the British ruling class for instance, have shown themselves to be clever, and have successfully maintained their power over long periods. But they have made many mistakes, for which they have sometimes had to pay heavily. In the present situation however, one mistake will be enough to finish us all off.

Of course the social system has not changed, and, so long as we are not blown up in the process, the ruling classes of the world may well be in process of consolidating their power. And no doubt revolution is the only answer. But we should be living in a fool's paradise if we imagine that "it can't happen". As long as these weapons of mass destruction exist there is always a risk that they may be used, or be set off by an error of judgment that cannot be corrected in time.

ARTHUR W. ULOTH.

The War Plotters

Continued from page 2

The strategists' authority rests first of all on the unknown factor of Soviet intentions. And this broad unknown area is monopolized by anti-Communist propagandists whose assumptions the strategists often accept without question. Harvard Professor Henry A. Kissinger sneers at "our continued efforts to discover 'reasonable' motives for the Soviet leaders to cease being Bolsheviks." Lumping together outdated Lenin precepts, partial quotes from Khrushchev and excessive statements from Mao, Kissinger serves them up as a poisonous stew of implacable "Communist" hostility. On this basis of questionable reference he then discounts any genuine Soviet desire for accommodation with the West. Colonel William R. Kintner, deputy director of the Foreign Policy Research Institute of the University of Pennsylvania, similarly espouses the demon theory of Russian Communism. Changing governments, the passage of time or internal popular pressures cannot have the slightest influence on the Communists' plan for world conquest.

The virtual refusal of some strategists to accept a possibility of Soviet change is illustrated in remarks of Klaus Knorr, in a 1957 pamphlet issued by the Center of International Studies, Princeton University:

Mere protestations [by the Soviets] of peaceful intentions are likely to express

no more than a tactical maneuver. Mere changes in the personalities of the leaders will mean little as long as the present system remains essentially intact. . . . Even if we perceive present trends indicating such basic change, as some of our analysts do, we must assume, for the time being, that these trends are tenuous, subject to abrupt reversal, and of uncertain consummation. Much as we hope for some changes, to be on the safe side in so momentous a matter, we must assume that intense hostility to the West is still, and may be for a long time, central to Soviet motivations.

Thomas C. Schelling, formerly of RAND and now of Harvard's Center for International Affairs, would have us throw out the last vestiges of international confidence on the highly debatable premise that East-West relations can be nothing but jungle law. His reasoning:

... where trust and good faith do not exist, and cannot be made to by our acting as though they did, we may wish to solicit advice from the underworld or from ancient despots on how to make agreements when trust and good faith are lacking and there is no legal recourse for breach of contract. The ancients had devices like the exchange of hostages, drinking wine from the same glass. . . .

But Herman Kahn of RAND, after many pages on likely Soviet military provocations, permits himself the speculation that both the United States and the Soviet Union are *status quo* powers. He allows the possibility that military fear of each other is the worse peril facing either.

For years the Stalinist foreign policy was depicted as part of the Communist drive for world domination. Yet now Hans Morgenthau tells us that Stalin's foreign policy owed nothing to Communism but sprang rather from the traditional objectives and techniques of Russian foreign policy. Rather a late date to revise basic concepts after fifteen years of anti-Communist propaganda. Before letting the strategists gamble millions of lives on deterrent strategies, let us make sure that their theories on the intentions of the adversary are not equally outdated.

Another question for scholars without a built-in bias is the nature of the Soviet military threat. For years the "enemy" has been popularly depicted as poised for a massive attack on Western Europe or the United States, despite prospects of global radioactivity and political-economic chaos. The fact that the attack did not come does not mean that it was not intended. It merely meant, according to the strategists, that the United States was too strong. Said Morgenstern:

The fact that the United States has not been attacked (directly) by Russia since the end of World War II is due either to the possibility that Russia did not want to attack us (even of our deterrent force had been much smaller or perhaps even zero) or to the strength of our deterrent force, presumably in particular to our nuclear capability. We can forget about the first possibility; we would have been attacked had we been much weaker.

Can we simply forget about the first possibility when the alternative he proposes, pursuing the arms race, threatens at any time to extinguish civilization?

George Kennan put forth contrary views in 1954 and 1957, views that instead of being disputed by the strategists were simply ignored. He said in a 1954 work that "I have never seen any evidence that the Soviet leaders have at any time since World War II (or before, for that matter) desired a general war between the Soviet Union and the major capitalist powers, or looked to such a war as a likely means of achieving their objectives." He added: "The Soviet leaders are not like many of us; they do not suppose that military victory solves all problems; they know that it is only a beginning and not an end."

Kennan reiterated this view of Soviet intentions several years later, adding: "I do not believe, in other words, that it was our possession of the atomic bomb which prevented the Russians from over-running Europe in 1948 or at any other time." Again he charged that Western thinking was overmilitarized. The Russian Communist threat, he conceded, was political and military but more political than military, a threat associated with the weaknesses of Western civilization.

HEIGHTENED TENSION

Morgenthau now tells us that "Khrushchev's new imperialism seeks to conquer the world neither with military might nor with the gospel of Marx and Lenin, but with the technological and productive capacity of the Soviet Union." It will be an imperialism of trade and aid, emulative example and Soviet productivity, he asserts. Even the Korean war, which Paul Nitze has blamed for United States military preoccupation, becomes in Morgenthau's analysis something other than the usual example of Communist aggression. Morgenthau writes off the Korean war as an accident or miscalculation, and not part of the Communist grand design for world conquest. Yet the second thoughts of foreign-affairs experts fail to penetrate the easy assumptions of the strategists.

These divided counsels take on terrifying proportions in the 1960's. In these years, the strategists have pledged, the balance of terror will be precarious. Some see the so-called missile-gap years as an invitation to the Soviets to launch a full-scale nuclear attack if they can keep down their own damage from American retaliation. And as the United States fears surprise attack, so might the Soviets fear a preventive strike by a panicky America. As both nations plunge

deeper into the missile race, with its weapons that cannot be called back, the tensions become more potentially catastrophic. If, in this era of presumed imbalance and heightened tension, the adversaries could find grounds for confidence in the other's underlying intentions, the fears of war could be eased.

One requirement of strategic reasoning is a willingness to speculate on all military possibilities, and especially the worse. This bars the strategists from ruling out or even using ordinary judgment on the "threats" that they might believe, in broader political perspective, not really to exist.

Thus the conclusion: "Once the Russians believe themselves to have achieved a substantial thermonuclear superiority over the United States, they could put heavy pressure on the West and they might decide that they did not want to continue living in a world in which the United States, Britain, and eventually France or even Turkey could threaten and blast Moscow or Kharkov."

This possibility was posed at a 1958 Princeton University conference on NATO strategy. It was qualified or refuted by other participants, who doubted that Soviet leaders wanted to destroy their nation-building efforts or risk over twenty million Russian casualties. But such non-military reservations are not always raised by military strategists.

Herman Kahn explains that total nuclear war is not unthinkable, partly because the Soviets "know that they can take an enormous amount of economic damage and be set back only a few years in their development." Do the Soviets know that? Do they believe it? Kahn's colleague, Bernard Brodie, actually disputes it in his contemporaneous work, *Strategy in the Missile Age*: . . . the fact that a nation has in the past undergone and successfully recovered from great injury does not mean that it will be blasé about a possible repetition of such a catastrophe. The Soviet leaders are not eager to see 1941-1942 repeated, let alone run the risk of having the damage and casualties of those years greatly exceeded.

Like many other Americans today, the strategists seek an impossible, mathematical formula for peace, a means by which X arms or Y military maneuvers will improve the chances of peace by Z factor. They want to avoid the malleable human area where we still retain some power over our fates. Even in this human area they try to make events appear predetermined or mechanistic: the Paris summit meeting was long foredoomed to failure; no change in the Communist system is conceivable; all Khrushchev's rages are synthetic; reactions of the Soviets can be predicted largely by duplicating our own. These are responses of people afraid to compete ideologically with others, afraid of the give and take of negotiation and bargaining, terrified of unfamiliar human contacts. Intellectually they are provincials, morally they are neutrals. Humanistically they reject the prospect of internationally-shared ideas and ideals.

Probably this approach to foreign policy is appropriate for a society rapidly becoming fossilized, but it is not an approach that promises either peace or national survival.

(From *Liberation*, Aug. 1961).

LETTER

The real scandals in Education

DEAR COMRADES,

'Parent' of Bucks has a touching faith in the accuracy of the *Daily Herald* and his local paper. I remember now that one of our staff queried the *Herald* figure but got no retraction or explanation. Even if by juggling with figures and adding in a few heads of comprehensive schools it were possible to make a case for £1,100 p.a. as an average teacher's salary, 'Parent' knows that it is as inaccurate as it is to pretend that a headmaster is an average teacher. Until January 1st the teacher's pay remains at a scale varying between £10 and £20 a week. Head teachers have a different pay scale.

I went on strike with my union, the National Association of Schoolmasters. This strike was successful in its aim of getting the N.A.S. representation on the salary negotiating committee. As 'Parent' knows, the National Union of Teachers called off its strike and its Executive gave in to Sir David Eccles. He hardly needs to make his observations about unionism and union leaders after that but it is better to resist than to accept whatever the authorities hand out and in teaching as in so many other jobs, pay negotiations cannot be conducted by individuals but have to be carried out by collective bargaining. This is why some form of militant unionism is necessary.

As for principles, I have always felt that workers' control was a sound one. The 'act of worship' in schools is a piece of trivial hypocrisy demanded by the Government and the parents. Why not a parents' strike on this? But it is certainly trivial in comparison with the real scandals of over-sized classes, inadequate buildings and poor text-books. Also let us hope for strikes to get rid of teachers' supervision of school meals and to gain pensions for the widows and orphans of teachers.

Yours,
TEACHER.

Brighton, Nov. 5.

The Anarchist Ball HAVE YOU SETTLED FOR YOUR TICKET?

DO YOU STILL OWE FOR TICKETS? SOME readers may have been puzzled by the figure of only £9 shown in our brief account of the financial result of the Anarchist Ball of last month. The figure represented what was left of money from the sale of tickets after all expenses had been paid!

Incidentally, there are still a few tickets left unaccounted for. We should like to close the account for the Ball as soon as possible and would be grateful if all those who still owe us for tickets would please settle up within the next week.

FP-LAG.

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP CENTRAL MEETINGS

meetings to be held at
The Two Brewers,
40 Monmouth Street, WC2
(Leicester Square Tube)
Sundays at 7.30 p.m.
NOV 12 Maurice Goldman:
South Africa: the Background.
NOV 19 Ian Leslie:
Subject to be announced
NOV 26 A. Rajk: The Lesser Evil.
DEC 3 Bob McKean: Anarchism: the
Missing Link.

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.
Last Friday of each month at 8 p.m. at Laurens and Celia Otter's, 57 Ladbroke Road, W.11.

JAZZ CLUB

New season's meetings will be held at 4 Albert Street Mornington Crescent NW1 at approximately monthly intervals.
Friday November 17: Jack Stephenson on *The Trumpet* (Part II)

ANARCHY Nos 1-8

Still Available 1/8 Post Free

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.

Keep it up!

FINANCIAL STATEMENT AT
NOVEMBER 4th, 1961 WEEK 44

Expenses: 44 Weeks at £70	£3,080
Income from Sales & Subs:	
Weeks 1-43	£1,330
Week 44	£54
	£1,384
DEFICIT	£1,696

DEFICIT FUND

London: S.F. 7/-; Southend: P.O.* 10/-;
Glasgow: J.H.* 1/6; Nuneaton: D.H. 2/10;
Bursley: J.R. 18/11; London: J.W.L. 6d.;
Chicago: J.A.C. 14/-; London: M.G. 6/-;
Hounslow: L.* 3/-; London: S.J. 6/6; Petaluma: B. & A.M. 1/-; Oxford: Anon.* 5/-;
Winchester: D.G. 10/-; Wolverhampton: J.G.L.* 2/6; Wolverhampton: J.K.W.* 4/6;
London: G.B. 5/-; Shoreham: M. & D.* 2/6;
Alberta: W.G.* 7/-; London: C.H. 4/3;
London: S.W.T. £2/16/-; New York: Freie Arbeiter Stimme £26/5/-; Hong Kong: M.S. 7/9; South Oxhey: H.Y. 4/6; Ilford: R.O. 5/-; Blackpool: F.A. 15/-; London: A.F. 5/-;
London: K.L. 12/-; London: P. & G.T.* 5/-;
TOTAL 38 6 3
Previously acknowledged 873 3 8

1961 TOTAL TO DATE £911 9 11

*Indicates regular contributor

Only £780 Short!

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