

'Government is an evil & criminal conspiracy'

THE following letter from Pat Pottle appeared in the "Socialist Leader and Solidarity". We are giving it further publicity owing to the gross distortions which have appeared in the National press:—

"Five of my fellow members of the Committee of 100 were arrested on Friday, 8th December, and were charged with conspiracy under the Official Secrets Act. A warrant was issued for my arrest on the same charge but it has not been possible to put it into effect.

"The authorities and the public know that it is the Committee of 100, as a body, which prepares demonstrations. The Government seeks to victimise individuals. It is afraid to charge all those who oppose it because there are far too many.

"Every sane human being should pause and ask himself a simple question: who are the real conspirators? Us or them?"

"The Government uses secret police to break into offices, to steal papers, to open letters. Its agents search people in their homes in the early morning. It taps telephones, sends spies to meetings, whitewashes its own brutality and lies in court.

"The real conspirators are those who prepare mass murder and lie to our people about it. Wethersfield is a base from which the extermination of millions of men and women will be launched.

"The Committee of 100 offers people a method of struggle for decency and dignity. It asks to people: see the evil and act for yourselves. Do not expect the corrupt politicians to act. Do not expect the kept Press to tell the truth. Do not expect the courts to do justice.

"We say to the people: learn from your experience. As you become more effective, the government will seek to destroy civil liberties. They bring in troops. They talk of conspiracy. It is the Government itself which is an evil and criminal conspiracy. It risks our lives, plans to kill millions, says war is peace and lies the truth. It seeks to intimidate those who struggle for human survival. The mask is off. The people shall see and resist.

"The Committee of 100 organises resistance to nuclear suicide. I am proud to be associated with this work. I have made a personal decision, and hope for a while best to help the Committee in this way. The Government's victimisation must not be allowed to go unchallenged.

PAT POTTLE.

THE GOVERNMENT wants, as usual to have it both ways. And, as usual, it is the worker who is expected to pay both ways. In order to justify its pretence in the freedom of the individual to do the best for himself in a competitive society, the Government shies away from 'planning'. That is, it refrains from directing the directors of industry—or commerce—on what they should do to give some balance to the economy of the country as a whole. Indeed, the Chancellor of the Exchequer himself has said that for the Government to give orders, and expect them to be obeyed, over the whole range of industry and services in this country, would be a step on the road to Socialism!

Nevertheless, the Chancellor finds himself faced with embarrassments in attempting to prove that Conservative Freedom Works, and finds it necessary to place some kind of brake upon the helter-skelter of Never-Had-It-So-Good. It would be political suicide—with which Mr. Selwyn Lloyd seems to have been flirting for years—to put restraints upon his own friends in high places, so the obvious solution is to put restraints upon the working class, who have no friends in high places.

Hence the 'Pay Pause', an attempt at control without controls, planning without plans, and another example of the Government's flagrant class policies.

Now it is not for us to say that we think there should be no restraint upon wages, or there should be restraint upon profits and dividends. We leave that to those who think they can produce some kind of equality in a system which is based upon inequality. What we are saying is that what is sauce for the goose will be sauce for the gander, and that if the Chancellor of the Exchequer wants the dividends and profits of his friends to be unrestrained and be-

ONE of the unpleasant features which emerges from the Congo affair (and which is often seen where there is rivalry between African political leaders in general) is the hypocritical role played by that section of white colonists who, by instinct and conviction, hold the black man in contempt.

The idea that white Belgian mercenaries are fighting on the side of President Tshombe against the Central Government because they believe in freedom and justice for all men, black and white, is ridiculous when one considers white dominated Congo before "independence" from Belgium.

The cynical opportunism behind the "white Tshombe movement" deceives no-one, especially Tshombe, who is prepared to collaborate with any other tyke willing to help him keep his power.

Equally ludicrous was the shocked outcry from the Tory Government against the use of force by the United Nations in Katanga, one of the objections being that the open show of violence was morally wrong!

That champion of the Black Man's rights, Sir Roy Welensky, and his support for Tshombe's right to secede from the Central Congolese Government finds no echo in his policies for Rhodesia.

His cynical denial that military support for Tshombe which has

No Freeze for Thor!

believes in free competition, then he must expect other citizens of this sceptred isle to believe similarly about their incomes, and if he wants competition from the working class he can have it.

But of course he doesn't want it. Competition, like so much in our democracy, is a myth with only a slender backbone of reality. The top capitalists don't believe in competition any more—they believe in combining, of rationalisation, of planning, and competition is more evident in the differentials of the wage structure than among the great firms who are the effective rulers of our economy. In other words, such competition as there is exists more among those who suffer from it than among those who benefit from it.

This is the sad feature about such actions as the postmen's present work-to-rule. One has the feeling that if all other workers had accepted the pay pause, and more especially if the employers had frozen their dividends, the postmen would have put up with their lot. But because wage increases have been granted elsewhere, and higher dividends paid out, then the postmen feel justified in their action. We think they should feel justified in advancing their standard of living in accord with what they conceive to be their needs, not in competition with or emulation of workers elsewhere. But when we begin to discuss

needs, whole batteries of questions begin to bristle, and the tri-partite nature of our society has to be considered. There is the ruling class—the owners and controllers of social wealth; there is the working class—those who produce the wealth they neither own nor control; and there is the Government, allied to the ruling class yet with interests of its own.

The satisfaction of need is always a matter of power, and the cynical 'might is right' philosophy is no less than the truth in divided societies like ours. The ruling class and the Government between them have the economic and executive power to tell us what is right and to enforce it. Unhappily the working class is more divided within itself than these two and the organisations that it has created to defend itself have in any case sold out to 'The National Interest'—as laid down by the class enemies!

The needs that are satisfied are those of the capitalists and of the State. The workers are 'responsible', etc., only when they quietly serve the interests of their masters and work in agreement with them.

Now it cannot be overstressed how much the British economy is dependent upon the armaments industries. The needs of the State for weapons of all kinds, as well as the stabilising effect of the never-failing market for arms, represents a sector

of the economy which never has appeals for restraint, never suffers a slump, never has to pause for breath or anything else.

The raising of the money to pay for this colossal waste is one of the main functions of the Government. The chiselling on education, old age pensions, health, housing, road fund; the blind eye on the extent of lung cancer due to smoking, the fantastically high level of taxation in general—are only indicative of the extent to which our lives are bound up with the lunacy which the Government seeks to justify by its deliberate continuance of the cold war.

Higher standards of living among the workers are useful only in that they keep the workers quiet, and result in wider markets for consumer goods out of which taxation does well and which in any case provide a secure foundation for the armaments industries and profits for research. Higher standards are not considered good in themselves any more than any welfare for the worker is considered good in itself. It is the effect on the economy that matters.

We are, thus, not regarded as people. We are labour units, consumers, taxpayers, and our existence has significance in our usefulness to the economy. Our function is to work and pay for the devilish modern weapons with the names of ancient gods—for Thor and Jupiter and Zeus—we suffer lower standards of living to pay for higher standards of dying.

In responding to Mr. Lloyd's cynical attempt at a pay freeze, the postmen and all other workers who put up a struggle are taking the right action, even though, we fear, for the wrong reasons. It is not only for a bigger pay packet that we should be fighting the Government; not only for a higher standard of living. It is for life itself.

THE DESPERATE WHITE RULERS

been crossing the Rhodesian frontier has any official backing is not born out by the facts.

But according to a correspondent in the *Sunday Times* (December 31st):—

British Ministers are confident Sir Roy has taken every reasonable precaution to keep the border under surveillance. U.N. Spokesmen's versions of what has been taking place in Katanga are treated in Whitehall with reserve because of important discrepancies between U.N. official accounts and those of other trusted observers.

United Nations observers have a different story to tell, which could be proved one way or the other if the U.N. request for their observers to be posted in the Federation to ensure that no arms and mercenaries were sent over the border into Katanga, were accepted by the Government.

The Rhodesian Federal Government issued a statement at the end of last week rejecting the request by the United Nations. But, it is stated, the Federal Government would, if asked:—

Invite the International Red Cross to extend to air and road traffic its present inspections of all rail traffic from Ndola, in Northern Rhodesia, to Katanga.

It has been pointed out that any

such undertaking would be a completely new departure for the Red Cross, and one which is would be most unlikely to embark upon, which is no doubt the reason why it was proposed as an "alternative" to U.N. observers by the Federal Government.

The Acting Secretary General has been invited to visit Salisbury for discussions. If U Thant is not as single minded as his predecessor he may forget his purpose in the stifling morass of "evidence" and smooth talk. If he is, he may never reach Salisbury!

★

WHITE Rhodesia's concern for the outcome of events in the Congo is bound up with her own sense of insecurity and the determination of the majority of whites to keep all but a few hand-picked stooges from the African population economically, politically and socially weak.

Only in this way do they feel that Europeans can retain their vastly superior standard of living, maintained often by methods which they condemn as barbaric when committed by rebellious Africans, although official brutality is always denied except in "isolated" cases of "bullying" under "extreme provocation",

as in the official report just published by the Government on the behaviour of the security forces involved in quelling the Northern Rhodesian disturbances last year.

But, as *The Guardian* points out, the evidence is compiled anonymously from Government sources "and cannot be treated with the respect which a judicial inquiry would have received".

Equally suspect are the allegations of atrocities made today (Monday, January 8th) against the United Nations' troops in Katanga by the Federal Government.

It is not that we think that United Nations' troops are incapable of brutality, that after all is what a soldier is trained to be, brutal; but the Government in Rhodesia, and its white supporters, have shown themselves to be so untrustworthy that any anti-United Nations statement from it must be regarded as suspect as a means of drawing attention away from policies which are clearly unacceptable to the majority of Africans, and can only be maintained by force and dishonest measures.

The white rulers in Rhodesia are desperate, they sense ultimate defeat and will use any means they can to defend their privileges.

Contributors to
ANARCHY 11

include
A. S. NEILL
PAUL GOODMAN
HAROLD DRASDO

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

ORDER YOUR COPY NOW!

Fabian & Parliamentary Socialism

IN SEPTEMBER 1886 the Fabians, as Mrs. Cole has recently reminded us* 'finally made up their minds on the question of Anarchism versus Parliamentary Socialism'. With the deliberate intention of sloughing off their anarchist wing, the Fabian leaders called a meeting to consider the following resolution: 'That it is advisable that Socialists should reorganise themselves as a political party for the purpose of transferring into the hands of the whole working community full control over the soil and the means of production, as well as over the production and distribution of wealth.' To this William Morris, the leading libertarian socialist of the day, moved a rider: 'But whereas the first duty of Socialists is to educate the people to understand what their present position is and what their future must be, and to keep the principle of Socialism steadily before them; and whereas no Parliamentary party can exist without compromise and concession, which would hinder that education and obscure those principles, it would be a false step to take part in the Parliamentary contest'. After a stormy meeting, the original resolution was carried by 47 votes to 19 and Morris's rider rejected by 40 to 27.

This decision, taken in an obscure London hotel room, marked a turning point in the history of British socialism. The Fabian leaders had no immediate intention of implementing their resolu-

*The Story of Fabian Socialism by Margaret Cole (Heinemann).

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).

REPRINTS AND CHEAP EDITIONS

Fowlers End
Gerald Kersh 5/-
Pnin
Vladimir Nabokov 5/-
Undertones of War
Edmund Blunden 3/6
If This is a Man
P. Levi 2/6
The Tents of Wickedness
Peter de Vries 3/6

SECOND-HAND

Chestnuts in her Lap
C. A. Lejeune (no Credit Title) 4/-
U.S.S.R. (1944)
Walter Duranty 3/-
The Unknown Quantity
Hermann Bloch 3/6
Crime and Punishment
Fyodor Dostoevsky 3/-
Lenin
D. S. Mirsky 5/-
What is Man?
Mark Twain 4/-
The Underworld of State
Stan Harding 5/-
The Threefold State
Rudolf Steiner 3/6
Life through Labour's Eyes
George Milligan 3/6
The Last Days of Sevastopol
Boris Voyetkhov 2/6
The Case Against Socialism (1909)
preface, A. J. Balfour 3/-
Mr. Churchill's Socialists (1941)
Michael MacAlpin 2/6
The Apostles
Ernest Renan 3/-
Handbook to the History of Philosophy
Ernest Belfort Bax (scored) 4/-
The Breakdown of Money
Christopher Hollis 3/6
The Kremlin and the People (1942)
Walter Duranty 3/-
America our Ally
H. N. Brailsford 2/6
Ideal Commonwealths
Plutarch, More, Bacon, etc. 4/-
Credit Power and Democracy
C. H. Douglas and A. R. Orage 2/6

Book tokens accepted

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

tion: they were still wedded to the tactic of 'permeating' the existing parties with their socialistic ideas. But it was nevertheless an important symbolic event. For the Fabians were in the process of establishing themselves as the ideologists of a respectable variety of socialism, a socialism different in kind from the then current 'socialism of the street'. And the first principle of this new socialism, differentiating it sharply from both Marxism and anarchism, was a 'resolute constitutionalism', and acceptance of the existing political structure. With characteristic brilliance, Bernard Shaw in an article in *Today*, September 1887, put the case against anti-statism: 'I regard machine breaking as an exploded mistake. A machine will serve Jack as well as his master if Jack can get it out of his master's hands. The State Machine has its defects; but it serves the enemy well enough: and with a little adaptation, it will serve us quite as well as anything we are likely to put in its place.'

The subsequent history of British socialism is an extended commentary on the naive but persuasive fallacy contained in this passage and a vindication of Morris's judgment that it would be a 'false step' to embark on the Parliamentary road to socialism.

In his brilliant and polemical study of the history of the Labour Party over sixty years†, Ralph Miliband provides much of the documentation to support this thesis. The perspective from which he writes is not, it must be said, that of an anarchist: he is a Labour Party Leftist in the Laski tradition. But the material he has compiled so industriously and with a keen eye for the revealing quotation is almost pure grist for the anarchist mill.

INTEGRATION WITH PARLIAMENT

His main contention is simple and incontrovertible: 'The leaders of the Labour Party have always rejected any kind of political action (such as industrial action for political purposes) which fell, or appeared to fall, outside the framework and conventions of the parliamentary system'. At each stage in the party's growth, from the time when it was little more than a pressure group in the House of Commons to the time of its transformation into the official opposition and its subsequent emergence as the government party, the Labour leadership has consciously and deliberately steered the organisation in the direction of its complete integration with parliamentary politics. If in the process the socialist dream of a new order based on co-operative as opposed to individualistic acquisitive social relations has to be discarded, so much the worse for socialism! Complete integration has not even yet been finally achieved but, under Gaitskell's leadership, we may fairly predict that the end is in sight. When a few more manoeuvres have been executed, when the annual conference has at last been transformed into a chorus echoing the chants of the leadership, and when the wild men of the Left have been finally tamed, then the party of Tweedledum will joyfully confront the party of Tweedledee.

Miliband's study is especially valuable because it places the present tensions and strains of the party in historical perspective. The division between the parliamentary leadership and the socialist activists is no new thing: it has been a permanent feature of the party's life. What is new about the present crisis is the fact that the fundamental question about the social purpose of the party can no longer be evaded. For a generation after 1918, the year when Clause Four was written into the party constitution, labourite social reformers and socialists could co-exist, albeit uneasily, in the same party. Whatever misgivings they might have about the policies being pursued by the leaders, the socialists could persuade themselves that the direction if not the pace of the party was correct. By the end of the third Labour Government, this illusion was becoming painfully transparent. The moment of truth had arrived. The Labour leadership made it quite clear—and recent revisionism has only underlined it—that by socialism it understood, not a new social order but a regulated Welfare State capitalism. The nationalisation

†Parliamentary Socialism, a Study in the Politics of Labour, (Allen & Unwin, 35s.).

and welfare measures which the militants had seen as the beginning of the social revolution was defined by the leaders as being in themselves the social revolution. All that remained to be done was a consolidation of this 'revolution'.

In tracing the perennial conflict between the leadership and the rank and file, Miliband identifies two different sets of critics on the Left. One set which he labels the Labour Left has assumed a variety of forms at different periods—the ILP, 1900-32, the Socialist League in the 1930s, Bevanism and Victory for Socialism in the 1950s. Its purpose has been twofold: to push for more radical policies and to press for more militant attitudes in response to the challenges from Labour's opponents. Although it has accepted the categories of the parliamentary system, it has done so, unlike the leadership, with certain misgivings: its acceptance has been accompanied by 'a continuous search for means of escape from (the) inhibitions and constrictions' of the system. The other set of critics Miliband calls 'the extra-parliamentary Left' for whom parliamentary politics has always been of secondary importance, if that. The most important single group of this kind has been the Communist Party but Miliband also includes in this set the Social Democratic Federation in its various forms, the SPGB, the Socialist Labour Party, and the syndicalists and industrial unionists. The listing of these diverse groups indicates that Miliband's 'extra-Parliamentary Left' is a residual rather than an analytical category. It comprises, in effect, all Leftist groups outside the Labour Party. In view of the general tenor of his argument, Miliband's failure to consider more carefully the diversities within this set constitutes a serious weakness in his analysis. It is just not good enough to lump CPers, SPGBers et al together with the syndicalists and declare that 'beyond their more complex differences the simple message they carried was that the wage-earners could achieve neither immediate reforms, nor the emancipation of their class, without a militant assertion of their strength outside Parliament.' Alone among the groups of the extra-Parliamentary Left, the syndicalist heirs of the anarchist tradition had a clear and well-formulated position vis-a-vis Parliamentary and other forms of politics. If Miliband had stopped to consider the syndicalist doctrines, his analysis would have been much more effective.

NO EFFECTIVE CHALLENGE TO THE LEADERSHIP

Miliband's failure in this respect is all the more disappointing, because despite his own sympathies, he is very aware of the shortcomings of the Labour Left. His appraisal of these groups is, in fact, of greater significance than his more familiar criticisms of the official leadership. The Labour Leftists have always been a force the leaders have had to reckon with. On occasions, notably in 1944, they have succeeded in committing the leadership to policies more radical than the latter wished to pursue. But at no time have they constituted a majority within the party. They have seldom posed an effective challenge to the leadership and they have never come near to capturing the Labour Movement's commanding heights of power. Their victories have been mainly verbal ones which, with few exceptions, have made little difference to the party's conduct inside or outside Parliament. Miliband's judgment on the so-called 'wild men of the Clyde' in the 1920's will stand for the Labour Left as a whole: 'They didn't shape the strategy of the party. They only continued as their predecessors had done . . . to make its bark appear, at least to the uninstructed, much more frightening than it had ever a chance of becoming under its real controllers.'

That this judgment holds good of the successors of the Maxton-Kirkwood group is shown by Miliband's perceptive comments on Bevanism in the 1950s: 'Many of the political ambiguities of parliamentary Bevanism were but a reflection of its ideological ambiguities. Throughout, parliamentary Bevanism was a mediation between the leadership and the rank and file opposition. But the parliamentary Bevanites, while assuming the leadership of that opposition, also served to blur and to blunt both its strength and its extent. Themselves limited by their parliamentary and exec-

utive obligations, they fell back on the politics of manoeuvre, and were regularly outmanoeuvred in the process.'

If we accept, as I think we must, Miliband's judgments on the Labour Left, we are forced to ask ourselves the question which the author comes near to posing but does not actually pose himself: Is there any real future for the Labour Left? Despite a few optimistic signs in recent years—the emergence of the New Left groups, the persistence of 'radical' views, especially on public ownership, even within some of the more conservative-minded trade unions—the prospect of the Labour Left becoming anything more than a nuisance to the leadership remains dim. And if this is the prospect, the Leftists must ask themselves: What useful purpose is now served by their remaining in the party?

In discussing Bevanism, Miliband rightly points out that the Bevanites were mistaken in thinking that their cause was furthered by the victories they secured in the National Executive and Shadow Cabinet elections. These successes imposed on the victors an acceptance of policies which they had no chance of affecting in any significant way. Bevanite membership of the NEC made it more, not less, difficult for them to give effective direction to the struggle against Right-wing policies. An important political truth is involved here. One of the most effective ways a ruling group can disarm its opponents is to 'co-opt' the rebel leaders into the group, thus compelling the rebels to accept some measure of responsibility for the ruling group's policies. From the Labour leadership's point of view, they would no doubt have preferred to have bought over the Bevanite leaders by promises of jobs, 'concessions', etc. but, failing that, 'co-option' by democratic election was the next best thing.

THE LEADERS NEED THE LEFT

But if this argument is valid in this particular context, is it not equally valid in a wider context for the Labour Left in relation to the party as a whole? By remaining in a party which they have no real prospect of controlling, the Labour Left serves only to legitimize the policies of the leadership, to make them more acceptable than they would otherwise appear. Without the presence of the Left, the Labour leaders could not delude the unsophisticated rank and file into thinking that the party was an instrument for the achievement of socialism. It is a mistake to believe that the Labour leaders want to get rid of the Left by expelling them en bloc from the party: the leadership's interests are best served by a Left that is both within the party and safely under control. In this way, the party can enjoy the benefits without the disadvantages of Leftism.

From the long-term historical perspective, it is naive of Leftists to fulminate against the leaders of the Labour Party for their 'betrayal' of socialism: if there has been any betrayal, it is one for which the labour Left must accept a full measure of responsibility along with the leadership.

But 'betrayal' is not the right word. To write, as Miliband does of the leaders of the General Strike and by implication of the whole Labour leadership, that 'betrayal was the inherent and inescapable consequence of their whole philosophy of politics' is to reveal one's sociological naïveté. The blurb hails the book as 'an historical essay in political sociology'. It is nothing of the kind: at most it provides merely the materials for such an essay. One has only to compare Miliband's book with that classic of political sociology, Roberto Michels's *Political Parties*† to see the point. The comparison is the more apt since it was Michels who made the observation, fifty years ago, that 'the socialists might conquer, but not socialism, which would perish in the moment of its adherents' triumph'. Assuredly, the Labour Party's development would not have surprised Michels! But there is no evidence that Miliband has absorbed the lessons of Michels.

What makes Michels's book an essay in political sociology is the fact that he looks for an explanation of political behaviour in terms of social structure. Miliband, in contrast, and despite his broadly Marxist orientation on issues like public ownership, offers a 'liberal'

†Now available in a Dover paperback (Constable, 16s.).

explanation in terms of ideas. Having carefully traced a persistent pattern in which the behaviour of the leaders is sharply opposed to that of their Left critics, he accounts for this pattern, in effect, by saying that the leaders had the wrong ideas—that they were wedded to parliamentarianism and all its conventions and to social reform rather than to socialism. This, of course, is true but not very illuminating. What one wants to know is why the leaders behaved as they did and equally why they found themselves continually confronted by frustrated Left critics.

FUNCTION DETERMINES BEHAVIOUR

A sociological answer to this question would begin with Michels's theory of 'the iron law of oligarchy', with its implication that the very creation of a complex mass organisation unleashes 'conservative' forces. And it would explain the perennial failure of the Labour Left by the fact that in such organisations the control of decision-making for a variety of reasons, such as superior access to the means of communication, tends to concentrate in the hands of the leadership. The answer might proceed by distinguishing the different roles of the leaders and the militants. It is an axiom of sociology that to a large but indeterminate extent the behaviour of individuals is determined by the roles they perform. The leadership role is clearly different from that of the militant rank and file and the ideas of both may be largely a reflection of their respective roles. For example, one of the functions of the leadership is to preserve the integrity of the organisation without which they would not be leaders. The leaders are much more concerned with this question than the militants and at least part of their 'conservative' behaviour may be explained by their desire to 'conserve' the organisation. The present Labour leadership believes—and all the evidence suggests 'quite correctly' from the short run point of view—that a programme of further extensive public ownership would react unfavourably on the party's electoral prospects. Revisionism is not merely a matter of ideas: it has its roots in the social structure.

Nor should it be forgotten that the leaders of an alternative government party perform roles not only in the party but also in the state organisation. Their state roles, either actual or potential, are in fact their most important roles. In performing these roles, the leaders inevitably find themselves constrained by forces in the state over which they have only limited control. When you find socialist governments making concessions to big business or socialist Colonial Secretaries pursuing imperialist policies, these are not necessarily due to wrong ideas or defects of character: the pursuit of such policies may be the only course open to them if they are to remain in office.

For the radical, a sociological explanation of Labour politics would lead to the conclusion, not that the Labour leaders have 'betrayed' socialism and that all might yet be well if only they could be persuaded or compelled to adopt a genuinely socialist programme, but that socialism cannot be brought about by Parliamentary means. As William Morris saw 'no Parliamentary party can exist without compromise and concession' and the price of trying to achieve socialism through such a party is and must be compromise and concession.

For some readers, Miliband's demonstration of the failure of social democracy in Britain will suggest the moral that the way to socialism lies through a party of the Communist type. The kinds of tactics and strategy that he appears to favour have always been espoused by the Communists and it is true that Communist parties have managed to play the political game without becoming disastrously infected by parliamentarianism. But Communist success—not of course in Britain but elsewhere—has been achieved only by the creation of a dictatorial type of organisation. Communist parties, unlike social democratic parties, can achieve the forms of a socialist society but neither can achieve socialism in the classical sense of a free classless society. It is a possibility that has to be faced that there is no road to such a society. But, if there is one, all experience of the last fifty years suggests that it is the third road pioneered by the anarchists and syndicalists. In Britain today there is a greater interest than there has been for two generations in this third road—the road of direct as opposed to political action. If Miliband's book, for all its shortcomings, stimulates this interest, it will have served a purpose even more useful than that intended by its author. G.N.O.

WHAT HOPES FOR 1962?

WHAT are the prospects for Anarchism in 1962? Well, we doubt that there will be world-wide social revolution during the coming year sweeping away capitalism and state communism and all their deadly variants and replacing them with the free society and all that that implies.

But before we are denounced as mere Permanent Protesters, let us assert our optimism in our belief in an extension of libertarian attitudes, wider understanding of social realities and more acceptance of the individual responsibility that must presuppose the eventual establishment of a saner social order. There!

The acceptance of only one point of view within the anarchist spectrum has always seemed to us to be too rigid and constricting to be even libertarian, let alone truly anarchist. There are some of our readers to whom the word 'Individualist' is like a red rag to a bull. To others, 'Syndicalism' has a like effect, while 'Violent Anarchist' and 'Pacifist' have been known to turn the other cheek and be most aggressive respectively in argument. We have at least one reader to whom 'Teacher' is a rude word, and, as can be seen this week, at least one more who can read between the lines of our discussions of tactics and see really sinister and unanarchistic attitudes boiling away beneath the surface. At least once a year we are advised to drop the sub-title from our front page and call ourselves 'Formerly' or 'Erstwhile' The Anarchist Weekly.

We are not complaining. On the contrary, the fact that this diversity of ideas continues to bombard us, challenge us, even insult us, is one of the healthiest features of our readership and one of the reasons why we feel any sort of hope for our future. We only hope that all our readers are as alert to spot deviations and to prevent anything being put over them, by their employers, priests, tax inspectors, spouses, and other class enemies in general.

Why do we have to be either Utopians or Permanent Protesters? Why must we be either Individualists or Syndicalists? Is it not a logical thing to do to protest like crazy here and now in order to play ones' part in the progress towards Utopia? Isn't it possible to be an individualist at home and a syndicalist at work? Can't we be Anarchists in as much as we resist authority by every means at our disposal, alone when we are alone, in union with others when common interests are involved, and assert our concept of responsibility with masses if there are masses who agree with us, but

SORRY FOR THE DELAY!

If your FREEDOM was late last week, it was not altogether due to the terrible postmen and their work-to-rule. Our production of the paper was held up by a breakdown on the machine printing it, and also by the sudden illness of our machine-mind-

alone if there are not?

The last year has in fact been a rich one in providing us with examples of all kinds of protest action, and we are proud to claim the association of anarchists with all of them, from the original anti-Polaris action with canoes in Holy Loch to the mass sit-downs outside the Russian and American Embassies and Air Force bases and the Defence Ministry. More significant, though, than mere anarchist participation, is the fact that this is anarchist *kind* of action, and it is the first time in this country that so many people have resorted to such tactics.

Not that we are claiming for one minute that there are now many thousands of conscious anarchists, or that we have done the conversions. We have always maintained that it is more experience than propaganda that persuades people to the anarchist position, and lessons learned the hard way are usually the best learned. The fact that so many thoughtful, sincere and courageous individuals are now seeing the State for what it is and are prepared to challenge it, is most heartening after so many years of political apathy.

Nor is it only in the field of social protest that we see signs of movement in our direction. The eleven issues that have so far appeared of our monthly journal ANARCHY have drawn our attention to trends in social work which look in the direction of greater understanding and greater freedom for the misfits and the under-privileged of our society. The attitudes of those who concern themselves with old people, with criminals or orphans, with workers in the factory, children in school or with nowhere to play, with people as distinct from abstractions, show themselves more and more to be moving in a libertarian direction.

What seems to us to be necessary now is for the people who are not misfits or underprivileged themselves—in the sense of being able to cope, of being self-reliant and healthy, we mean, not only in the economic sense!—to realise the significance of the libertarian solution for themselves and for society in general. Indeed it is important for those who have discovered in the social sciences that freedom and responsibility have therapeutic properties to apply them to the sicknesses of society itself.

In doing so, they will discover, as the anti-bomb protesters have done, the validity of anarchism as a social philosophy that embraces the constructive aspects of their work, and shows them the way out of the frustration born of attempting to live sanely and healthily in an authoritarian world.

We hope he will soon be back at work, but the machine is going to be out of action for some weeks. Arrangements were quickly made for printing elsewhere, but some delay may occur—and we feel sorry for ourselves for having to start off the new year with a nasty bill for repairs which bodes ill for the deficit! If any readers like to take the hint, all contributions will be gratefully received!

The Editors, FREEDOM.

You say that all reforms come not from the actions of the majority, but from the agitation of a conscious minority; this is probably true for reforms, but since no country could truly unilaterally disarm unless it took from its Government the power to re-arm, we are talking of revolution, and unless FREEDOM has become Putschist it understands revolution as the conscious self-liberation of the vast majority. (If it does not so understand it, may I suggest a change in the subtitle to 'FREEDOM, formerly the Anarchist Weekly'?).

The sort of strike you refer to, frequently used to maintain differentials or some other demand aimed primarily against other sections of the working class, cannot possibly achieve permanent gains such as the one we need.

Agreed, in the past only a minority have taken an interest in shaping their own destinies, and progress has come from a militant minority; but that an Anarchist should write saying that this inevitably is a permanent state of affairs, with no apparent worry, is disturbing, for it is in fact a statement that not all men are capable of being free, and a surrender to the elitist position. Moreover, that this should be done in an editorial statement of Anarchist beliefs, during which the Editor should infer that comrades who do not share his Putschist-Elitist views are not Anarchists: is doubly worrying. It may be possible—just—for one Anarchist to hold the views expressed in the recent editorials on the C. of 100; but those views are not consistent with classical Anarchism or with any revolutionary Anarchist beliefs and they certainly should not be dogmatically represented as the views of the Anarchist Movement as opposed to the Permanent Protest minority.

On purely practical grounds your suggestion that the C. of 100 should have detailed Marshals to intercept demonstrators and order them to Ruislip is ridiculous. It could only be done if the majority of the demonstrators knew in advance all the people likely to be Marshals; for otherwise it would leave the movement wide-open to disruption by Special Branch men posing as Marshals. The sort of organization that would be necessary if the Marshals were so to be known in advance would of necessity be dangerously hierarchical. (It should not be necessary to

A Reply to our Inquest on The Sit-Down

spell out the dangers in Hierarchy, in an Anarchist journal—but since these have apparently escaped you—it is perhaps as well to mention that this would foster and elitist attitude within the movement which could only lead to results consistent with a elitist society, and also it too would leave us even more open to Special Branch disruption or to being beheaded by arrests.) The C. of 100's outward cult of Russell's personality is bad enough without adding hierarchical organization, orders from above and the other aspects of the fascist or bolshevist Parties.

It is of course no accident that attitudes to the civil disobedience movement parallel attitudes to the State. Those who really want true socialism and freedom want the maximum of conscious self-responsibility, both in the movement and thereafter in society; they envisage the movement against the Bomb as a part of the means of spreading such responsibility and they are worried by all tendencies within the movement towards committee control, cults of personality, cabalist cliquism and conspiratorial organization. Since violent force can always be overcome by greater and more efficient violence; since experience of civil disobedience amply shows that the greater the democracy, the auto-responsibility, the freedom of the individuals in the movement, the conscious desire for radical change, the greater the efficiency; since there is also ample evidence of the past to show that groups that use violence however Libertarian in intention invariably become hierarchical (instance Anarchist militias, the Nihilists and Castro's forces), it is apparent that there is a clear-cut alternative between a conscious mass revolutionary civil disobedience movement and elitist étatism which cannot long do without armaments and weapons of mass destruction. For if such a determined civil disobedience movement is not capable of

overcoming a tyranny (whether home-grown or imported) the whole case for Anarchism and with it that against the Bomb becomes an impractical and intellectually untenable dream; either non-violence can overcome violence or Government and the Bomb are necessary.

At this stage Direct Action is valid just in so far as it widens public consciousness on the Bomb and deepens the commitment of the demonstrators themselves. It is absurd to suppose that before we get the majority of the Trade Unions on our side we can effectively obstruct the machinery of government since we are up against the whole power of the State, and whether the editors of FREEDOM know it or not the established powers know that what is at stake is a challenge to their whole right to rule. Therefore the question that should be asked before every action is not how efficiently does it impede the authorities but who does it convert and how important is he. It is obvious that the Press will not give fair reportage to the views or actions of the movement and this is why the first necessity is that action shall be direct, that is aimed to convert the people actually engaged in making, servicing, storing or transporting the weapons or their component parts.

Now if one wishes to convert someone, obviously one starts by trying to convert by personal contact and leaflets. But in the circumstances one is up against forces that control the press, and are in a far better position to spread their views by the written word than we are; one is also up against a whole history of conditioning on a subconscious level and one is also up against the fact that defence workers have to earn a living and would love to believe that protestors are either paid to protest or else are incapable of earning a living. It is therefore necessary to meet this at a deeper level than the purely intellectual. Two possibilities occur to mind; the one no Anarchist could sanction and what is more no Anarchist—unless he first betrays Anarchism—will ever be in a position to practise . . . brain-washing; the other, non-violence, that is not a mere lack of violence, but a positive going to the people operating the evil and saying that since we hold that what you do causes suffering for others we will impede you in order to divert that suffering

Continued on page 4

Around the Galleries

AN effective, if unofficial, undercurrent of soft-selling goodwill for the Franco regime drifts around the exhibition of Modern Spanish Painting at the Tate Gallery. This is an exhibition of abstract painting by twenty-seven Spanish-born painters and is the result of negotiations between Sir John Rothenstein and José Miguel Ruiz-Morales the Director-General of Cultural Relations for the Spanish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, who found final agreement for the showing, during the Picasso exhibition. The suggestion is, that there must be an extraordinary degree of artistic licence in Spain for this revolutionary type of work to be studied and practiced and it is further said, with a waving of soft white hands, that the Spanish authorities must be extremely confident of the goodwill that they possess among the Spanish artists, that they are not only willing, but eager, that these works should be shown in the capitals of the democratic nations.

The major fallacy in this specious argument is that abstract painting can be associated with social or political revolt, for far from this being so, the reverse is unfortunately true. Of all the minor art forms that man has created none is more suited to serve a Servile State than that of abstractionism. It is a minor art form, that neither affirms, nor protests, for the artist rejects all human contact and locked within his ivory tower doodles away his dreams and his vision, his hopes, his fears, his love, and his hate. That he may achieve a sterile beauty is acceptable, for of the tens of thousands of canvases that have been daubed and paint-spattered over the last fifty years, something pleasing to the eye of man must result by accident and also by design, but when the brush has been laid aside, one is still left with a pretty pattern to please the myopic seekers of surface pleasures.

Ten years or so ago, in London there centred around the Beaux Arts Gallery at 1 Bruton Street, W.1., a group of young painters known as the "Kitchen Sink" school. Their work stuck in the

craw of the mass of the major critics, with the notable and honourable exception of John Berger, and they were quickly killed off by the jeers of the press and the public and monied collectors. Their crime was that they used as their point of departure, their own world of work and tears and pleasures and they recorded it with simple honesty, not as a grandiose manifesto for some party line, but as simple statements of truth and for that they died. For in the Affluent Society, when elderly people kill themselves for fear of the landlord's eviction notice, and when the homeless, even at this moment, walk our streets carrying their children in their arms, truth must be divorced from beauty before the hucksters will handle it; and in this hypocritical world the abstract painters found their market. Be they the bureaucratic hacks of an authoritarian state, the take-over kings of our own spiv society, or the monied Brahmins of the expense-account and the dealers' sucker list, each has found a common art form to suit them all. A mass of twisting colours that neither affirm nor protest and in the end, like the harsh light of the police interrogation squads, blinds first the eyes and then the mind.

Here then is the exhibition of Spanish Abstractionism and it is worthy of your time and attention; but not your faith. Francisco Ferreras's "collages" of tissue paper placed like the flailing wings of broken birds falling into darkness, Gerardo Rueda's canvases of single tone scarlet, broken only by the shadows of lonely ridges of paint, Federico de Echevarria with work as sickly and as sugary as the best of the Parisian top sellers; Fernando Zobel's black and white play on breaking light, Modesto Cuixart's hint of Ernst and the crawling evils of the long night, Augusto Puig with the pop appeal but without the religious grandeur of the American, Paul Jenkins; and the best, unreproduced in the catalogue, of them all, José Guevara's dead white embryonic forms lying slug-like in his black world. For

here is mastery in technique, for, examine the way Guervara overlays different textures of the same tone, each overlapping the other. This is the hand of the craftsman waiting for the social conscience of the artistic mind to guide the brush.

Here are the Spanish scrap-iron kings showing their paces with Gustavo Torner's canvases, consisting of single sheets of rusting tin bisecting his single-toned canvases and Salvador Soria's heavy reliefs upon a background of rough hessian cloth. And who will comment on Alfonso Mier's canvas? Upon a background as grey as mud he has nailed four slats of wood and intertwined barbed wire across them. Mier calls it "Picture and object 'A'" and describes it as an abstraction, so perhaps José Miguel Ruiz-Morales, the Director-General of Cultural Relations for General Franco, may explain away the obvious images that the unsophisticated may read into it and for the final sour joke they have chosen to hang five of Isidro Nonell's paintings on the entrance wall within the exhibition. Here is Nonell's tired work, weary "Dolores" sleeping the sleep of exhaustion against a wall of green shadows and his "Bodegón", the painting of the single fish and the handful of fruit. But Nonell died in nineteen eleven so they can set the dead to mock those who refuse to live.

And so we paraded at the private view. Myself and the glad-handing Sir John Rothenstein, General Sir Brian Horrocks, the brown cassocked friar with the head of a Hollywood saint and a penchant for the adjective "sensitive" for Father Roig has gone on record as seeing abstract art as a fire "burning furiously in Spain" for here to him is the new Mysticism, and I quote the catalogue; and the stupid and the expensive women with the high-pitched laugh for the thing this season, so I heard it said, is to show that you "really enjoy modern art". Only the dead paint upon the sterile canvas and the half-remembered ghost of Isidro Nonell mocked our progress as we wound around and around each other in an idiot's dance of death.

ARTHUR MOYSE.

A COOL LOOK AT THE BOOK TRADE

THE hundredth number of *Encounter* (Jan. 1962) has (as part of a rather sub-standard number), an article by Colin MacInnes entitled "A Wild Glance at the Book Trade". This anniversary number is ominous in itself for the health of the book trade, since the continuation of *Encounter* is due ultimately to a subsidy to the Congress for Cultural Freedom endowed by the Ford Foundation. The mortality-rate of 'little' magazines is higher than it has ever been, due mainly to rising printing costs and the same problem has its repercussions in publishing and bookselling.

Mr. MacInnes concludes his article: "It is the situation as a whole that must be considered, and the context altered."

A wild glance at the book trade would not reveal the horrible things in the wood-shed. A wild glance by an author foiled by the atmosphere of the 'world's greatest book-store' hungry for more royalties and resentful of lending libraries is fresh and stimulating but does not take in the 'situation as a whole'.

Not that the cool look of a bookseller is any more apt to take the larger view but a bi-focal glance may bring things into perspective. Let us hope that astigmatism does not develop.

Colin MacInnes compares the usual book-trade standard of service with conditions in other shops. The selection of three shops for favourable comment—Marks & Spencer, Cecil Gee's and Dobell's leads to a suspicion that the best is being compared with the worst. The decline of standards of 'service' is general in all retail shops, this quality is a drag on the general pattern of mass selling and the self-service store is the logical culmination of the trend.

The book-trade's sights (in the higher brackets) have long been set on the 'jack-pot or nothing' target. Many publishers are resolved on a 'best-seller or bust' programme. The dreams of selling books like selling soap flit through the pages of the *Bookseller* and are even more obvious in the American trade.

The tendency to monopoly and take-over bids in the book trade is a primary condition for the standardization of the product.

A mass-market has no room for scholars, either as salesmen or advisers. The 'egg-heads' are a minority, and what is more, a minority with a non-expanding purchasing power, so catering for them means merely an addition to the overhead costs. Egg-heads are apt to browse and what is needed is a quick turnover. If one works out the average profit on a book as 2 x and one's overheads are x, profits are x. Any keeping down of overheads and boosting of turnover is pure profit. The rise of the paperback is due to the extra provision of outlets and the cutting down on production costs.

The book trade has alternatively been cursed and blessed by what one might call the precious-life-blood-of-a-master-spirit ploy. This is the description of a book carried on the end-paper of the old Everyman series. (One of the new Everyman paper-back series has 'tarted-up' the covers of John Fletcher's play "Tis Pity She's a Whore".) The book business according to an author of a book on "Retail Shops" is 'one of the few in which one may remain and still be a gentleman'. Consequently, the business is overwhelmed with cheap labour of people who just love books. Unfortunately a certain ambivalence is necessary to succeed in the book business. On the other hand many a tycoon has foundered on the rock of making books pay like any other business.

It is highly improbable that there can be a great number of people available to staff bookshops who know the whole book output of the United Kingdom and can identify any title immediately it is

requested. It would be impossible for even the world's greatest bookstore to stock all titles in print. The solution to this problem is obviously specialisation and not the present policy of general book-selling of a few best-selling 'lines', and a confession of ignorance of any other titles if enquired for; this saves time, and money.

With the marketing of books it would seem there is a difference in degree amounting to a difference in kind. Books in general are not a need. A substantial part of book-buying is on impulse. This in turn is based on a feeling of guilt at reading which has not been overcome. Especially reading for pleasure.

It is doubtful if books can be made fashionable. The book-club and the best-seller have been attempts to do this but all they have done is to produce the lowest common factor of intellectual attainment.

Books, unlike long-playing records, always demand a total response from the consumer. The demand made in the case of some books, is too overwhelming. One cannot simply run a campaign "Read more books" without reference to what sort and what type.

It is doubtful whether any drive to step up sales of books by the methods suggested, recommended books, the top-twenty, recording booths with extracts, film-shots of scenes from books, blown-up photos of authors, readings by authors, 'hand-outs' on books could succeed in promoting the steady sale of desirable books. Persons responsive to these appeals are rarely the type capable of independent thought necessary to profit from the reading habit. (Taking a cool look at that last sentence it sounds if book-reading were snobbish—let's face it, it is, in the best sense of the word).

True, we need to break down the barriers between the public and books to... 'only connect' but the display stand, the deposit system, the open cash-desk are only palliatives for symptoms of a graver disease. The bookselling trade functions within the context of capitalism, and further since it is concerned with ideas, in the context of the state. It is those contexts which must be altered.

Mr. MacInnes seems to be unaware that publishers do go into the retail trade. Restrictive practices in the book-selling trade do not theoretically allow this, for one cannot, as publisher, place oneself in a privileged position as a retailer of one's own books.

There is a delightful piece of *lassez faire* capitalism known as the net book agreement (1899). This is still in force although it is menaced by the Monopolies Commission, who may call it to account, but since the Commission's function is merely advisory (*vide* decision on Imperial Tobacco Company), it seems unlikely that Sir Frederick Macmillan's work in this field will be seriously interfered with by his relatives.

The most serious quarrel a libertarian can have with Mr. MacInnes is on the question of libraries. The provision of free reading matter to the general public (even though paid for out of the rates) is a step on the road to a free society, although like the Health Service it has its anomalies. The position of the struggling author is one of these. It is possible that by eliminating the middlemen of publishers, trade-counters, wholesalers and book-sellers, the author might send up his own share of a book's sales.

The early history of book-selling was of authors securing guaranteed buyers upon publication and financing his own

A Reply to Our Inquest on the Sit-Down

such things invariably harm the revolutionary cause: I can still imagine one or two circumstances in which I would be prepared to use violence.)

Short of Non-Violent Resistance to win the heart's and minds of the workers involved; and short of massive civil disobedience by the majority (which would include strikes, sabotage, deceit, the methods of the good soldier Schweik, and the kernel of those of Lysistrata—had Lysistrata been a Satyagrahia not a Duragrahia she would have advised taking soldiers to bed and converting them therein) there is, it is true, room for other a-violent protest. Ignoring the somewhat masochistic conception of personal witness, regardless of the efficacy of such action, one is left primarily with that form of action which appears to be the limit of the horizons both of Kingsley Martin type Fabians and FREEDOM—the a-violent publicity stunt. Like all publicity gimmicks this has value just in so far as the stunt publicizes what you wish to publicize—and equally like all such gimmicks there are dangers, chiefly that one may fall into accepting the values of those to whom publicity and advertising is the normal business.

Whereas with Sharpeville, or the suppression of Civil Liberties by a Government, one can hope to get fairly accurate reportage in the National Press, and where the main aim is anyway just to call attention to a factual and undisputed happening, there is no very great need to relate one's actions to one's aims. But where the reportage will

certainly be selective and probably inaccurate the protestor should shape his publicity stunt so that it illustrates some part of his case. For instance on the Bomb if one wishes to do some act of civil disobedience short of non-violent direct action, then one would be well advised to try to illustrate the conception that it is possible to resist tyrannical authority without the use of violence, since guerrilla warfare just is not sufficiently effective to be a viable alternative to Nuclear Weapons.

I have tried to define the possible forms of action that Nuclear Disarmers would try, and have tried to point out that there is a danger of over-hierarchical development—both dangerous intrinsically, and dangerous because since non-violent direct action is primarily trying to get people to take responsibility for their own actions, it can obviously be only done effectively by people who are already taking such responsibility themselves and not relying on the orders of Marshals. Brize Norton was far away the most successful demonstration on December 9th purely because the Oxford Committee had gone for quantity, asking people who were not prepared to behave in such an auto-responsible way to stay away; so when the police arrested the bulk of the Marshals, it didn't matter as we had deliberately made ourselves superfluous.

It will be seen that it is not the fact that FREEDOM is criticizing the Committee of 100 to which I am objecting, but the fact that it is criticizing precisely those few points where the C. of 100 is doing the right thing, both in Anarchist terms, and in terms of efficiency. It says nothing about the nauseous way that at some briefing meetings people talk in awed terms about one Leader, it fails to mention public meetings at which political opportunists like Warby have been asked to speak and at which people talk in terms of "this is the sort of leadership that your committee has to offer." But since criticism must always be informed it is perhaps necessary that we should examine how the support for the C. of 100 is constituted. Because of its history—arising out of an amalgam of the DAC and the more radical sections of CND militants; we have the unusual position of having a leadership that is generally more radical, determined and militant and which has a greater understanding both of civil disobedience and of the tasks ahead than its supporters. All too often these supporters believe that the Bomb is a single evil that may be cured in isolation from the rest of the system. Many of those supporters who do see it as a part of the system are under the curious impression that except on this

issue the Labour Party or Communist Party is Socialist. Various Trotskyists, having spent their lives in conspiratorial little groups that think they can capture the Labour Party and then bring socialism from on high, show themselves to have the same paternalist élitist conception of the social revolution as did their Leninist forbears. They, the Stalinists, and other Fidelist Castrati still intend to capture society and "impose freedom" consequently they are apt to turn to what *Peace News* describes as a wish for a non-violent *coup d'état*; a wish that I fear FREEDOM appears to share, a desire that would better befit the supporters of the Bomb and which might be expected from supporters of Capitalism and the State.

I would end by drawing one final parallel between attitudes towards the Committee of 100 and attitudes towards the State. Frequently when criticizing either the present Committee or the old DAC, I have been met with the report: "You know people aren't ready. Given the state of the movement's consciousness what would you do if you were on the Committee?" The position is exactly the same as in the days when I was at College and was criticizing some Government action. I would be met with the retort: "Well, what would you do if you were Prime Minister?" and my interlocutor would think he has scored a victory when I replied, "Shoot myself." In both cases the Anarchist duty is to criticize in order to draw attention to the defects in the system; in both cases the Anarchist has no duty to adjust his theories to what is practical within the existing level of consciousness, for all his activities should be devoted to raising that level of consciousness so that people may act as Anarchists. With the Committee there are at the moment certain advantages that many of its members share our beliefs to a greater or lesser extent, believing in Workers' Control and in the self-liberation of the people; but there are dangers in any movement if the leadership is more radical than the membership, for they are bound to become authoritarian and consequently degeneration must set in. One is reminded of a quotation from (of all people!) Karl Marx: "Nothing can so harm a revolutionary movement as gaining power too early."

Yours fraternally,
LAURENS OTTER.

[Laurens Otter raises many points which we have no space to answer this week, but before doing so at all we must make clear that at no time do we claim to speak for the Anarchist movement as a whole. Like Laurens Otter, we speak for ourselves.—Eds.]

Continued from page 3

ing to ourselves so as to demonstrate to you the harm you do. This can only be done effectively if done in a spirit of empathy for the obstructed, which is why the conduct of non-violence demands a forbearance that FREEDOM considers namby pamby; it can only also be effective if the resister shows himself ready to take on himself that suffering which he is trying to divert from others, which is why non-violence demands goal-sentences that FREEDOM considers inopportune.

Paying fines, being bound over and disregarding one's word, going to some other point to demonstrate than that which one has previously announced, using wire-cutters, going into hiding and half a hundred other acts of bloody-minded resistance may well under certain circumstances contribute to our ends, but at the moment they can only alienate those we wish to convert and their use is hardly conducive to our effort to demonstrate a totally different set of values to that held by the supporters of the Bomb. (Most members and supporters of Polaris Action would argue that even had we a majority movement such acts that were not positively non-violent would do more harm than good; but I make a distinction between a-violent resistance (resistance which lacks violence but lacks empathy) and non-violence, the difference between what Gandhi called Duragraha and what he called Satyagraha; but this difference is only symptomatic of the fact that I am not such a rigid Pacifist. While on purely opportunist grounds I can say that Insurrections, Assassinations and other

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

publication and doing his own book-selling. Like many other products the saving of costs by mass-production is offset by inflated costs of distribution, advertising and administration. It has reached the phase where a paper-back publishing firm makes a supplementary charge of 1/- for all orders for less than a dozen copies, where an American paper-back firm cannot take orders for less than five copies, where W. H. Smith & Son will no longer handle the *Socialist Leader*, since presumably the circulation is too small to be an economic proposition. The tendencies to monopoly in distribution mean that accounting machinery must be installed which must go through the same motions for a 2/6d transaction (on credit) as a £1,000 deal. Experts show the cost to be the same in work-hours so the smaller accounts must be eliminated.

This means that the smaller periodicals must set up their own distributive machinery forcing minorities into an even more minor role.

If one considers the situation as a whole one is bound to conclude that the state of the book trade will not be eased by Mr. MacInnes' shot in the arm. There is indeed 'a failure of the book and public to connect'. But this is no temporary sluggishness of the circulation or superabundance of clots but is a morbid thrombosis which permeates the whole blood-stream of our society. The poisonous effluence of the profit motive pulsing through the hardened arteries of the state will lead to the death of literature if not transfused with a new living blood. "BIBLIOS".

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP GENERAL MEETINGS

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

JAN 14 Brains Trust
JAN 21 Sybil Morrison (P.P.U.):
Pacifism

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

This season's meetings are being held at 4 Albert Street Mornington Crescent NW1 at approximately monthly intervals.

ANARCHY Nos 1-10

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 22/6 (\$3.50)

AIR MAIL Subscription Rates

(FREEDOM by Air Mail,
ANARCHY by Surface Mail)
12 months 50/- (U.S. & Canada \$8.00)

Postal Subscription Rates to FREEDOM only.

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

Air Mail Subscription Rates to FREEDOM only.

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

Cheques, P.O.'s and Money Orders should be made out to FREEDOM PRESS, crossed a/c Payee, and addressed to the publishers:

FREEDOM PRESS

17a MAXWELL ROAD
LONDON, S.W.6. ENGLAND
Tel: RENOWN 3736.