

The Appeal for Amnesty Conference

Does the State Exist?

AT the Appeal for Amnesty Conference at the Niblett Hall on January the 27th; Dr. A. Allot—by far the most radical of the speakers—spent a considerable time considering—“does the State exist in any real sense?”. He said that there is an analogy with Limited Liability Companies, which from the lawyers' point of view are legal fictions, but which business men find it convenient to assume exist. Dr. Allot defined the State as the coming together of a people for the greater well-being of the majority of them. A view that Anarchists naturally find naive. Having made such an assumption as to the nature of the State Dr. Allot was remarkably Libertarian in his subsequent remarks, for despite believing the State to be beneficent, he favoured a remarkable number of checks and balances. This is of course typical of the confusion in the liberal mind, for if the State is beneficent then the more of it the better; while if Jefferson was right and “that Government is best that governs least,” then by a simple syllogism so was Thoreau and “that Government is best that governs not at all.”

Earlier Dr. Allot had considered Natural Law, but though he appeared to

lean to a belief in a Universal humanistic Law, he cautioned his audience that since few Governments accept its existence, and these interpret it according to their interests, its existence is a matter of somewhat academic speculation, and a plea of Natural Law is not to be recommended in court. (He might have added that Verwoerd and Welensky believe that racial segregation is incumbent on a basis of Natural Law.)

Further defining the State he described it as the largest and most rigid of a series of voluntary communities—giving Trade Unions and business combines as an example of middle-sized ones, and showing resemblances. But he failed to say if he himself appreciated that unlike the worst of these the State is not voluntary for though one may leave one State to seek refuge in another, no-one is permitted to secede from all States and reject the laws of all States.

Naturally, with such a view of the State he held it the duty of citizens to conform to the laws; and the redeeming feature was the reservations that he then laid down. Laws must be constitutionally arrived at . . . there must be Freedom of opinion . . . (he then had to admit here that he could not say where the boundary between permissible dissent and subversion lies) . . . and that conformity does not imply acceptance of tyranny, even majority tyranny—as for existence when the Nazi Government

democratically elected by a majority of the German people proceeded to exterminate the Jewish minority. But one was left wanting to ask the awkward questions. Does the possession of colonies constitute tyranny? Does it absolve the citizens of the metropolitan country of their duty to obey laws? Does the possession of weapons of genocide by some powers constitute tyranny over others?

Nevertheless within these limits Dr. Allot built up a remarkably sound case, as he began to go through these points in detail; commenting on the title of the Conference “Personal Freedom in the Emergent Countries,” and the implied assumption that in a newly independent State about to embark on a period of industrialisation, some curtailment of recognized rights of the individual might well be both necessary and even laudable; he pointed out that there is a *prima facie* case that the individual should be free, and that “democratic” rights apply everywhere that therefore it is up to those who would excuse tyranny to put a substantiated case, not to the liberal to put the case for freedom; he added that it was something of an insult to the emergent states to imply that they were incapable of such freedoms, as those who would turn a blind eye to dictatorship in them appeared to do

Colonial rule had left the “emergent

countries” with a Parliamentary system, a tradition of Authoritarian hierarchical rule that conflicted with that system and the disease of Westminsterism—exaggerated respect for the British institutions of Democracy. He stressed as against those who were always trying to export British Institutions that a written Constitution is not such an institution, and that in Britain it is not the Constitutional forms that matter it is the spirit of the People that dictates that one allows reasonable freedoms to the opposition. Nevertheless, Allot came remarkably near to saying what Lassalle says in “Qu'est ce que c'est qu'une Constitution”, that Constitutions only have force in so far as they mirror the real confrontation of forces in society.

Dr. Allot went to quite considerable lengths to distinguish between democratic forms and democratic content, showing that a two-party system is by no means synonymous with democracy, that the old African Tribal systems had much that was democratic and that two parties seldom give perfection. With an insight that conflicted with his fundamental assumptions he then remarked that any Government is tempted to use its power in order to retain power; but did not proceed to draw the logical conclusions. He discussed tribalism, religious dissent and other causes of social factionalism and demands for economic development as the excuses given by the defenders of totalitarianism; considered the case of 18b in this country, accepting that Britain was a dictatorship during the war (though holding that the British knew at the time that it was only temporary and that otherwise they would not have accepted the imposition of controls—one must suppose that Dr. Allot has not considered how many war-time restrictions remained in force after the war, and how much even in peace-time militarism curtails liberty), and he considered what were and what were not proportionate means to keep dissent within democratic and viable limits.

Dr. Allot's ideas were a remarkable example of the scientific exhibit in vacuo; divorced from real life his ideas were sound and his intentions under any conditions Libertarian. Possibly the only real flaw that can be pin-pointed in the superstructure is how do you put teeth into the checks and balances? Unfortunately the same high idealism did not appear to be universal in the Conference, though the academic confusion was. Gerald Gardiner for instance at one point asked how long an Imperial Power should cling to power in colonies so as to make certain that one is not handing over to tyrannical rule from a new ruling class; i.e. how long should one maintain one's own tyranny in order to prevent someone else exercising it?

Discussion centred on what amount of

dissent is permissible and reasonable in a democratic country; whether we should accept that Freedom of a country means Freedom of the individual citizen as well. Though it was said that Freedom, like Peace, is indivisible, the substance of such Freedom appeared limited. One Ghana Students' Association member, after an eloquent appeal against Nkrumah's policies then told us that Britain had given Ghana Freedom too soon and should have maintained her rule; while a member of the Zimbabwe African People's Union held that we should not criticize Ghana, for after all, it compared well with South Africa and Southern Rhodesia. (Which one might be excused for considering a not very high recommendation.)

When Peter Benenson, the founder of Amnesty and a well-known lawyer told us that the real cause of lack of liberty in Ghana was that it lacked a sufficient Bar—by this time one was inclined to agree with him, but when it turned out that he meant the legal Bar, remembered that two-thirds of the Ghana students at College had been doing Law, because lawyers were far better paid in Ghana than any other profession, and that perhaps Doctors, Teachers and Engineers might be more immediately vital. Benenson's point was taken further by Tom Sargent of Justice who emphasized that the trouble was that Britain had not trained enough Lawyers for the colonies.

After other speakers had discussed the rights of citizens in Turkey, Ghana and the Sudan the meeting was then summed up by Professor Stanley de Smith, who repeated some of Dr. Allot's sentences out of context and tried to talk on his own behalf on the distinction between the need for strong Government and some level of basic civil liberties; on the exaltation of the executive over the legislature, saying grandly, “most of us are sympathetic to the exaltation of the executive but it is a different thing to penalise those who are dissenters who subscribe to unity but do not accept uniformity”; with which piece of meaningless gibberish I will draw a merciful veil over the rest of his speech.

The meeting ended with an appeal from Eric Barker to support Amnesty and form local groups and another from Benenson for more lawyers!

'IT'S THE SAME THE WHOLE WORLD OVER'

Japanese postal workers have been on strike without walking out. This would not be proper. Instead they have slowed down the handling of mail by adhering to rules very strictly. Consequently the mail has piled up.

Industrial Worker 18.11.61.

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 Road to Suez
Erskine B. Childers 30/-

REPRINTS & CHEAP EDITIONS

Tom Jones
Henry Fielding 3/6
The Wall
John Hersey 5/-
The Subterraneans
Jack Kerouac 2/6

SECOND-HAND

Boswell's London Journal
1762-1763 10/-
Mrs. Reynolds, Etc.
Gertrude Stein 7/6
The Government of British Trade Unions
Joseph Goldstein 15/-
Testament of Christian Civilisation
Joseph McCabe 8/6
The Irish Tangle for English Readers
Shane Leslie 5/-
Looking Backward
Edward Bellamy 3/-
The Hope of the Workers
Austin Hopkinson 2/6
David Guest: a Memoir
Pollitt, Montague, Arnot, &c. 5/-
An Introduction to Dialectical Materialism
Edward Conze 3/6
Life Under the Soviets (1929)
Alexander Wicksteed 3/-
The Building of the Bible
F. J. Gould 2/6
The Evolution of the Mass
Louis Coulange 4/6
The English Sunday
R. C. Churchill 3/-
The Meaning of Socialism
J. Bruce Glaister 3/-
Why I Am a Liberal
Sir William Beveridge 2/6
American Labour and American Democracy (Vol. 1, Labour and Politics)
Wm. E. Walling 3/-
In a Collective Farm Village
Vern Smith 2/6
Workers' Front (1938)
Fenner Brockway 5/-
Four Issues of 'Fact'
Cole, Griffiths, Barnes, Spender, etc. 5/-
Basic Principles of Scientific Socialism
A. S. Sachs 4/-
The Road to War (1937)
intro. C. R. Attlee (Limp) 2/6
The Soul of Man under Socialism
Oscar Wilde 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

Away with these Horrible Institutions!

"THE TREATMENT MAN", by William Wiegand, Muller, 18s.

REALLY the only worthwhile thing to say about prisons is, “Abolish them.” The number of really dangerous individuals in the total population, who must be confined for the safety of their fellows, must be very tiny, and should in any case be in hospitals. Unfortunately prison provides a happy hunting ground for the novelist, particularly the one who deals in angst, sin, atonement and all the rest of it.

This book begins in an atmosphere of progressive humanitarianism, with “inmates” being given psychological treatment of a fairly simple kind, but it ends with one of the prisoners being castrated. The scene is set in an American prison, and all the transatlantic obsessions come trotting out. We meet again many old friends: the Catholic priest is here, so is the man who enjoyed being beaten when a youth, the anti-Semitic Jew appears, likewise the psychopath, and there are battalions of homosexuals. Freud and Jehovah brood darkly in the background, but there are no devouring mothers and vicious girl friends. An oversight.

If there were less hints and allusiveness, this story of a prison riot would be better, I cannot help feeling. One tends to skip the passages where the characters ruminate. They do this a lot. Am I guilty? Are they responsible? Why does so and so have this particular expression? Why does he do such and such? One never finds out.

There is a real contrast between the prison officers conscientiously giving “treatment” to their charges, in an atmosphere of rationality and friendliness, and the real life of the prison, which the “treatment men” never see, where brutality reigns supreme, where some of the older prisoners have got themselves into such positions of power that they virtually run the place. We see two of these “inmates” who run a lucrative business selling the youthful prisoners by auction, to more mature men who need sexual partners. One of these slavers is a disciple of Walt Whitman, who he quotes to persuade himself that he and his boss are really running things for the benefit of the prisoners themselves.

In the outside world the officers analyse each other in their daily conversations, and in their thoughts, as well as searching their own souls. Does this really happen in real life in the United States? In Europe it is still something of a joke to give a Freudian interpretation of someone's motives. In this cloudy atmosphere everything can mean anything. No one's motives are unmixed. Doubtless we are all perverts, so what? How can anybody really hope to inter-

pret anybody? And if they could what good would it do? This endless probing is like a knife trying to cut its own edge.

In the end the riot achieves little. Everybody double-crosses everybody else. The “Treatment Man” betrays the youth he was formerly giving therapy to, and the young man is castrated by his fellow prisoners whom he was going to let down. Was the officer in love with him? Or was he merely identifying with him? Or was it all bad luck? We are never told. You draw your own conclusions. Mine are, do away with these horrible institutions!

ARTHUR W. ULOTH.

Around the Galleries

MARK TOBEY is one of those painters of world reputation that the organizers of groups and cliques fight shy of, for this 72-year-old American flutters to near the dividing line between realism and abstractionism to be pinned fly-like upon some pedant's art sheet. And here at the Whitechapel Gallery in the Whitechapel High Street is his retrospective exhibition. Eleven canvases only blaze his progress to 1940 and from then on the huge gallery gives itself up to the Tobey we know. Canvas after canvas like unto lace curtains upon viewless windows spaces the long gallery, for Tobey's art is the art of the refined brush stroke that weaves across his canvas like petit point from an old lady's needles.

He first paints his highlights upon his canvas in broad flat masses and then, be the subject the crowded streets of his American cities, or his grey abstractions, he claws his way a fraction of an inch at a time to the edges, for only then can he or will he be stopped. With the grey palette of Giacometti and a brush that he wields like a pencil he sketches in his people and his buildings with thin sad lines that fly across his canvases like uncontrolled traces upon a fading radar screen until he can no longer bother with the reality beyond his door; then begins for him the interminable weaving of his lovely shrouds to grace his sightless world. In 1943 he painted his “Flow of the night” and here is a classic example of Tobey's shifting world, for while the foreground is of his crowded streets the background recedes into the accepted Toby Abstract.

He is first and foremost the supreme draftsman for when the space between his brush strokes becomes too great he attempts to cover the gap with colours

and the effect is of stained glass and when he thickens his grey brush strokes and slackens the tightness of the whole the effect is of a sheen of dead white maggots.

Tobey has in his long working life as a practising artist travelled the world and he is one of the few artists who has deliberately courted the East. He claims to have studied Chinese calligraphy on its home ground and whether he understands it on the Ezra level I know not but the beauty of these signs will annotate his work for the rest of his working life. An old man wedded to a language of his own invention he now writes inch by inch across these large canvases the tiny strokes that none may read but only view, for Tobey has left the world of changing images for the silence of his secret script that we shall be for ever forbidden to share except as spectators.

And from Tobey's exquisite work among the noise and grime in the living heart of Whitechapel to the mundane handouts of the moment in the Bond Street area, there to tiptoe before mediocrity and to politely close the door on gallery after gallery for the space is there but not the talent. At the Molton Gallery at 44, South Molton Street, W.1., Gillian Ayres is having her second showing there and as one who has shown at exhibitions that range from the Redfern's Metavisual Tachist and Abstract Painting in England to the First Paris Biennale at the Musee d'Art Moderne in 1959 one can but assume that her work is worthy of your attention. But these huge canvases that have the appearances of slices of children's nougat are work that is so slight that one can wonder at the dearth of talent that dealers' space week after week must be filled with work of this nature.

ARTHUR MOYSE.

If Power Corrupts . . .

IN these columns last week (*Steps to Social Revolution*) we attempted to show that we had neither "putschist" ambitions nor "elitist" illusions so far as the achievement of the social revolution was concerned; that, on the contrary, because we believe that the revolution must be an expression of the aspirations of the people to a free, just and peaceful society—if it is to be worthwhile and successful, we suggested that it would probably come about by a series of steps in the right direction the result of each of which would be greater freedom and responsibility as well as of more widespread support among the people for the revolutionary cause. But we also pointed out that any attempts by the people to free themselves from the shackles of authority, of the State, or to destroy the pattern of privilege which dominates the existing social and economic set-up, would be resisted by those in power, and the extent of the repressive measures taken would depend on a number of factors all of which a revolutionary movement cannot afford not to take into account if it aims at something more far-reaching than symbolic gestures. Obviously we recognise the propaganda value of symbolic gestures and the need for them. But we also recognise them as a clear sign of the impotence of the people; the disunity of the people on the one hand and the entrenched power of the ruling class and the State on the other.

As we see it, the public demonstrations by the supporters of the Committee of 100 are meaningful and encouraging: firstly, because they are not organised by political party machines and secondly because they do not conform to the kinds of demonstrations which the State, the Law recognises as legitimate. For both these reasons therefore the Committee of 100 movement is revolutionary. If we refuse to bask in this ray of hope it is not because we fail to appreciate its worth and its potentialities but because we see so many clouds on the horizon which threaten to obscure it.

There are among the spokesmen for the Committee of 100 those, like Bertrand Russell who in fact are not revolutionaries, and who justify their "unconstitutional" actions on the grounds that the present government and the present controllers of mass communications make it impossible for the "voice of the people" to get a hearing. Whilst we believe that, certainly at this stage, all men (and women) of goodwill have enough in common to make joint action possible as well as necessary, it would be folly on the part of both those who, like Russell, believe in the authoritarian organisation of society and those, like the anarchists, who believe in the libertarian society, to imagine that either our means or our ends can be reconciled*.

Then there are those who believe that until you have converted every single person to your point of view you may protest as much as you like but you are not entitled to move a finger without the charge that you are an authoritarian, or "putschist"—which means, virtually, that you spend your life condemning every

minority action either from the ivory tower or from the depths of your political armchair. And finally there are those who confuse tactics with means, as if the problems involved in destroying the existing authoritarian society were the same as those with which we would be faced in building up the free society.

This latter point of view which is the one we intend to discuss here, was expressed by Angela Aspinwall, a member of the Committee of 100 in the correspondence columns of FREEDOM (Jan. 20). In pointing out that she did not question the anarchist aims, our friend made it clear that "my arguments, then specifically concern means and tactics", and indeed we cannot but agree when she writes

if it is agreed that we stand for a new order of society then we must, by all our actions, make it absolutely clear to the public that we offer a new way of tackling social problems, a way that implies complete openness, sincerity, integrity and tolerance. The good society will be brought forth only by good means . . . And a few sentences later she writes:

Looked at from the purely tactical angle, secrecy and expediency are weapons we simply must not use if we are serious in our determination to bring about a new order of living.

And still a few sentences later

Leaving aside for a moment the tactical argument against secrecy and referring the matter to the level of practical wisdom, surely the lesson of our times is that the good end can only be achieved by good means—double dealing, double-thinking, expediency and evil result only in the frustration of the end. The very considerable failures of Communism are relevant here.

As we said we are at one with her in emphasising that the ends are influenced or determined by the means, and indeed anarchists have, not just recently, but at all times, combatted the authoritarian socialists, whether revolutionary or parliamentary, on the grounds that authoritarian means cannot lead to libertarian ends. What we were discussing in the article over which she took us to task were not the means for achieving the free society but the problems facing a revolutionary movement intent on overthrowing, or breaking down, the existing order. Our friend will in all probability argue that these are one and the same problem, and it is here where we disagree. We cannot agree to disagree because we believe our disagreement is over facts and not opinions, principles or means.

We believe that the revolutionary who wants to see a free society come into being, is faced with two problems:

Firstly, if we are agreed that so long as the natural wealth and the means of production are owned or controlled by a minority to serve their interests, then there can be no freedom—no free society, it follows that those of us who want a free society must work and struggle to destroy the machinery—of law, finance, production, of the armed

OURSELVES (in trouble)

Once again we must apologise to our readers for the delay, this time in bringing out ANARCHY. We are still without our own printing machine and helpful as are our friends in the printing trade they too have their problems, and one of them coincided with the day when

forces, mass communications, etc.—which protects and furthers the privileged society.

Secondly, assuming that the existing Order has been overthrown then the new Order that takes its place will be the free society only to the extent that we have succeeded over the years, of propaganda and preparation, in fostering a general desire for freedom, self-government (which means responsibility).

In other words while we are not so blind to the facts of life as to believe that the overthrow of the old order will automatically herald in the free society, neither are we so naive or "christian-like", as to believe that the privileged minority will ever forego its privileged status except when it is faced by force superior to its own.

Therefore, as we see it, the role of the revolutionary is two-fold: on the one hand that of seeking to imbue his fellow beings with a passionate desire for freedom for themselves and a deep respect for the freedom of others, on the other a hatred for authority in all its manifestations. So far as the former is concerned this love of freedom can only be transmitted by example and by the word, by integrity, openness, tolerance—in fact all the virtues which our correspondent lists as paramount for the achievement of the "good society".

But these are not the weapons with which to fight to destroy the privileged society. Angela Aspinwall writes:

These people we are called upon to hate will cease to be devils and bastards only when treated consistently with courtesy, respect and truthfulness and when it is clearly understood that we are appealing to them, as to everyone else, in terms of common humanity.

These people will cease to be "devils and bastards" (terms we never use since they refer to the "outsiders" of present society who might well be our allies!) only when they are shorn of their power or privileged status! We know, and acknowledge the fact, that many of the pioneers of revolutionary anarchism and socialism sprung from the privileged classes (and it should also be acknowledged that a very large number of them, in spite of their radical ideas were basically, authoritarians) but they are surely the exceptions that prove the rule. In any case, power, privilege, is not a disease which affects one "class" from which another is immune. The policeman, the general, the manager and the foreman—to mention a few—spring from all different kinds of social backgrounds.

The point we are trying to make is that if it is true that power corrupts then you cannot destroy a power structure by reason, courtesy, respect, etc. . . . The ruling class are not, in their positions of power by accident or through ignorance. Power and privilege are prizes for which some people would betray their friends and sell their souls. Against such people the kind of "treatment" Angela Aspinwall advocates would meet with no response—on the contrary as we have seen in the past months, the policy of openness, etc. of the Committee of 100 has simply resulted in an intensification of the measures the authorities are taking to destroy it.

There is only one way of destroying the privileged Society: by confronting its power with the greater power of the people. This will not happen overnight, it may well be a long process but not an impossible one, as contemporary history can demonstrate with vivid examples.

ANARCHY had to be run off. As a result of the delay in printing our binders were unable to give immediate service, and so the delays mounted up and in the end FREEDOM and ANARCHY were dispatched in the same envelope.

Don't Look Now, But I Think The World Has Ended

THERE is something gratifying in the contemplation of the cataclysmic. The horrible fascination of the spectacle of the world disintegrating by atomic explosions, the whole B.E.M. approach to S.F., such catharses as *The Day the Daily Express Caught Fire* all serve to purge us of this perilous stuff of living.

From India where those hopefuls of yesterday Mahatma Gandhi and Vinoba Bhavo emerged (whatever became of Jayaprakash Narayan? Probably 'looked bad on the bills'), new hope for mankind has risen, with an astrological forecast that because eight planets are now in Capricorn, and just after midnight there will be an eclipse of the sun, there will be 'a great calamity on earth'. It is possible that this may mean the end of the world. But don't rush for the exits since if it was going to happen, it would by now have happened and major technical difficulties would have prevented you reading this issue of FREEDOM.

However, there are several other theories, that make it seem that this planets' acting the giddy god will not be so calamitous. We are told that this happened before (in 1524). The arks were made, businesses were sold up, and many moved up to the mountain top. And nothing happened. So they say, but do

In the margin

THE UNCOMFORTABLE INN, by Dachine Rainer, Abelard-Schuman.

THIS is a novel I liked very much. "The Uncomfortable Inn" is the story of Eleanor Small, poet and writer, who seeks a solution to her domestic and creative problems by going to live in Greenwich Village, New York. By chance she obtains rooms in a large house in Bank Street, which is run by Daphne Spencer, an eccentric woman who had been "a gay young thing" during the 'twenties. This house is inhabited by a variety of psychological and physical bums who cannot fit into the world 'outside'. By cajolery and bullying Daphne Spencer endeavours to 'reform' them, but really does not want them to be 'cured' because their existence is her *raison d'être*. Homosexuals, drunkards, abandoned mothers, anyone down on their luck—all these are fair game for her crusading campaign. A campaign which she never wants to end in success, for that would be its undoing.

Against this background, Eleanor Small describes her life at this period and the three men who, to a greater or lesser extent, are involved in it. There is Dudley Livingston, father of her child and editor of anarchist journals; Pete Bowles, business man and lover of the arts, with whom she once had an affair; and Thomas Conway, writer and Catholic, with whom she falls in love and who falls in love with her, and who refuses to consummate their love because of the chains of his religion.

"The Uncomfortable Inn" is no mere 'love story' with an 'exotic' setting, however. It is a serious portrayal of the lives and feelings of those who, by choice or necessity, exist on the margin of the mores and institutions of society. Although it is prefaced with the conventional disclaimer regarding "resemblance to persons" being "coincidental", etc., its autobiographical origin is obvious. Older readers of FREEDOM will, for instance, have little difficulty in identifying the character called "Dewitt MacDaniels" who edits *The Political*, and the source for "Dudley Livingstone" can easily be deduced by reading the biographical note

we know anybody who was alive then? Very well then.

There is a theory of separate universes or pluralistic solipsism (to give it its simple name), which makes it highly probable that the world *did* end in 1524 and also explains several obscure phenomena including the behaviour of public men.

You know how it is that it *always* rains on the day when you've forgotten your raincoat, it is *always* the No. 30 that turns up when you want a 74, the lights are *always* green when you're a pedestrian, and *always* red when you're a motorist. Further statistical evidence of this kind is readily observable (see Hooflunger *The Hostility of Objects*), but it has been readily pointed out that we can't *all* get wet, wait for buses, have lights against us, be short of coppers, etc., etc., so pondering on this subject there has emerged the theory of pluralistic solipsism (or p.s. as he's known to friends). Put briefly (as there's not much time) the theory is that *we all* live in different universes!

This means that the world that ends next Tuesday is the Indian astrologers' world and not my world. My world is a compound of annoyances, rain, 30 buses, red lights, wrong numbers all directed at *me* personally. The world *did* end in 1524 but not my world. Mine didn't start till 1913.

P.S. explains why Adam Faith and the faith of Adam have so little in common. Why Woodrow Wyatt and Hugh Gaitskell don't see eye to eye. Why Mr. Macmillan and Mr. Krushchev cruise on their lonely ways 'like sputniks that pass in the night' as the poet says, with sad little uninterpretable 'bleeps' to outer void space.

But this has its bright side too. This p.s. world can be an anarchistic world. The world of tyranny and hate has disappeared for those who won't hate or be tyrannised. The world of money and the rat-race cease to exist for those whose values are different. The world of superstition and charlatanism cease for those who are aware and sceptical.

The Indian astrologers can keep their world! And that goes for Adam Faith, the Archbishop of York, Woodrow Wyatt, Hugh Gaitskell, Harold Macmillan and Uncle Nikita and all!

JACK SPRATT.

on the back cover. Again, anyone with a knowledge of those poets who came to the fore in the 'thirties will be able to make a good guess as to who the unknown poet is whom "Eleanor Small" visits.

Literary detection apart, however, let me conclude by affirming my belief that this novel has added to Dachine Rainer's stature as a creative writer. Known before as a poet and essayist (those who recall "Retort" and "Prison Etiquette" will remember her work in both these fields), she has now given us a book richly varied and containing some remarkably fine passages of writing. I look forward to her next.

S. E. PARKER.

SIGN OF THE TIMES?

Two letters from the Correspondence Columns of the *Guardian*:

Sir,—This silly controversy about whether or not Lord Snowdon should work for the "Sunday Times" could have, if one looks hard enough, a serious side.

It may be that when he saw the tenders for the restoration of Kensington Palace Lord Snowdon decided that he ought to make a contribution. If this doubtful assumption is correct, then he is to be congratulated on being the first member of the Royal Family to have a conscience about such a waste of public money.

Yours faithfully,
Brian Stokes.

THE AFFLUENT SOCIETY

Cape Canaveral, January 24
A United States rocket which was to have put five satellites into orbit simultaneously with an 80ft. Thor-Able-Star rocket, failed to build up enough thrust and plunged into the Atlantic Ocean today. . . .

The five satellites in today's abortive attempt weighed a total of 219lb. They were attached to a rack inside the bulbous nose of the rocket which cost £1,200,000.—(B.U.P.)

*See Russell's *Penguin Special* "Has Man a Future?" in which the only references he makes to anarchism are derogatory. We hope to discuss this work in due course.

Anarchism: Individual or Communist?

S. E. PARKER (FREEDOM, Jan. 6), seems to have the mistaken idea that communism and individualism don't mix. Of course, like most writers in FREEDOM, he fails to define his terms at the beginning. What he means by communism and individualism may be something entirely different from my conception. To me, communism is sharing all things in common; in other words, everything being free to all for the benefit of all. "For the benefit of all" is the key phrase for otherwise things could not be free if they were not employed for the benefit of all. As soon as an individual employs goods other than for the benefit of all he is in competition with his brothers and therefore not a communist. A capitalist to me, is one who competes with his brothers for goods and who employs the goods thereby not for the benefit of all but for his own exclusive benefit or for the benefit of exclusive groups. Of course the capitalist will always say that he competes for the benefit of all, but let us not be fooled, he competes for himself and not for all. A communist cannot use money, for money is the

Correspondence

chief instrument of competition.

The communism which I define has nothing to do with the Communist Party in any nation. A political party cannot be communistic, for political parties must be authoritarian to exist and goods, as actions, cannot be free when there is authority. As long as any individual or group has the final say, things cannot be free.

I define individualism the same as I do communism, for both must be for the benefit of all and anti-authoritarian to exist. If individualism, as communism, is anything less than for the benefit of all, then it is a type of false individualism described by Parker as the individualism which is "nothing more than an apology for economic privilege and monopoly". Such a false individualism must be authoritarian to be effective and if it is authoritarian it is anti-individualism.

So why does Parker continually want to separate communism and individualism, unless he means something else by the terms than I do? If he does, then let him make his definitions clear. The truth is that one can't be an individualist unless he is a communist, or vice versa. If Parker is not a communist then he must compete against his brothers for goods and he can only compete with authority or force and such is anti-individualism. How else can Parker be an individualist unless all things are free? He admits that the labourers are "dependent upon the sale of their labour to an employer and thus are not free", so how does he expect a man to be free in any other community than a communist one?

Parker wants me "to recognize the right of others to form different patterns of life to that of libertarian communism". Of course, I don't know what he means by libertarian communism but as I stated before it means to me the sharing of all things in common and if one is not doing this he is competing against or stealing from his brothers, with authority

naturally, and I don't recognize the right of any one to use authority, not even myself.

Parker, contradicting his competitive life, says in effect that the individual should not "be subordinate to other individuals" or groups and I agree. I respect everyone as my brother and no one as my master. I wish Parker could see that the only way to be an individualist is to be a communist. Of course, being a communist does not mean that we can co-operate with authority. As Parker points out in his conclusion, some primitive communities, and I think of the Bruderhof Communities of Germany, England, S. America, and USA, and the Arche Community of Bollene, France, have a strong patriarchal, authoritarian rule which is no closer to communism than the Soviet system.

In his first two paragraphs Parker pointed correctly to the close relationship between economics and authoritarianism in speaking of the authority of capitalists. But later he says that the economic question is secondary to individualism. Why doesn't he make up his mind? I say they go hand in hand. One cannot be an individualist unless he shares all things for one must be authoritarian to compete for things. In the beginning Parker recognizes that competition and individualism don't go together but later he says their relationship is not important.

Parker continually identifies communism with the authoritarianism of groups. If he is referring to authoritarian communism he is correct but to me this is not communism. Certainly the authoritarianism of labour unions is just as bad as that of the state. I approve of neither unions nor the state, for both seek their own instead of the welfare of all. But a communist must be an individualist and cannot be a member of authoritarian groups. He is the opposite of authoritarianism. He alone is responsible for his communism and his individualism. Communism is not opposition to individualism but a necessary part of

it. It is the only guarantee of individualism. One must live for the benefit of all but a slave or robot of none.

RICHARD FICHTER.

Organisation Loyalty

OCCASIONALLY Anarchists are met with the comment, "oh of course you are against all organisations," and the implied assumption that we are impractical dreamers, incapable of achieving anything, and that we are a handicap to other movements because of our Purism; and at various times a similar belief within the Anarchist Movement creates divisions—in America not so long ago one group decided that having an editor or an editorial group was authoritarian, and though its paper survived for some time without either it soon died—in Czechoslovakia during the thirties a semi-mass Anarchistic movement wound up first its organisation and then its paper for the same reason.

If we are to have any serious hope of achieving a change in society voluntary organisations are a necessity; and so naturally Anarchists have in the past spent a fair amount of time considering built in guarantees to prevent organisations becoming authoritarian. But the real disease of organisation, which can, whatever the constitution, cause it to become authoritarian or sterilely bureaucratic, is organisational loyalty—the belief that one should not criticise such and such a movement or paper, because, "it is ours", "on our side", "it is the movement of the Workers", "the revolutionary vanguard", or merely "that it is the best civil disobedience movement we have". Once such a feeling takes hold of a movement whatever built in guarantees there may be, there will be such psychological pressures to conform that dissidents will come into line against their better judgment or be squeezed out of active participation.

It will no doubt be the same if and when the Anarchist society is built; for it would be possible to have a pattern of society erected entirely to the designs of Armand and Sid Parker and still for social pressures on critics to make it authoritarian; while alternatively a quite non-Anarchist system of Socialism, without such pressures could become Libertarian.

Now the Anarchists need Civil Disobedience Movements, we will need Syndicalist Industrial Unions, we do need to build Anarchist groups to agitate within such wider movements; but always the Anarchist should remember that uncritical Organisational loyalty implies exactly the same abrogation of personal loyalty as does the Ballot Box.

LAURENS OTTER.

Marxist Map Makers

A SMALL, but significant, clue to relations between the two communist allies, Russian and China, has appeared in Hong Kong.

New maps of China received there from Peking have left unmarked China's frontiers with the Central Asian Soviet Republics of Tadzhikistan and Kirgizia although current Soviet maps clearly mark the official border.

Similarly, the entire Chinese frontier with the Mongolian People's Republic (Outer Mongolia) is unmarked on the Chinese maps whilst the Soviet's all have a precise line of demarcation separating Outer and Inner (Chinese) Mongolia.

This is the first public admission of any border dispute although Peking has always claimed that areas of East Siberia around Khabarovsk were also settled by Chinese colonisers at least 30 years before the coming of the Russians in 1860. A.A.G.

CAMBRIDGE READERS-

Please Note

Formation of Cambridge Anarchist Group.

Monday 12th February, 1962.

Old Music Room,

St. John's College at 8.30 p.m.

Those interested please get in touch with Mr. Krishnan Kumar at St. John's College.

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.

FEB 11 Arthur Uloth

Men against Women

FEB 18 Philip Holgate

Freedom in Education: Some Problems

FEB 25 Bill Christopher

The Rank and File Movement

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 1-11

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.

Deficit Already!

FINANCIAL STATEMENT AT FEBRUARY 3rd 1962 WEEK 5

Expenses: 5 weeks at £70	£350
Income from Sales & Subs.:	
Weeks 1 & 2	£70
Weeks 3, 4, 5	£106
	£176
DEFICIT	£174

DEFICIT FUND

Nottingham: R.L. £2/10/-; Hartford: M.G.A.* £2/3/-; Glasgow: J.H.* 2/6; Southend: P.A.O.* 5/-; Manchester: J.M.C.E. 10/-; Newcastle: H.B. 3/3; Lincoln: A.R.B.* 10/-; Blackpool: F.A. £1/5/-; Bletchley: R.S. 10/-; Hounslow: L.* 2/6; Bexley Heath: D.G. 10/-; Washington: T.M.B. £1/1/-; Warrington: J.H. 10/-; Wolverhampton: J.L.* 2/6; Wolverhampton: J.K.W.* 2/-; Blackpool: J.A. 6/-; Bristol: N. & S.A. 5/-; Maidstone: S.P. £1/5/-; London: P. & G.T.* 5/-; Belfast: "Liam" 4/-; Glasgow: I.D. 10/-; Hove: A.R. 3/-; Glasgow: J.H.* 3/3; Frankfurt: H.B. £1/10/-; Seattle: J.F.C. £1/1/-; London: A.M.A. 10/-; London: P.G. 9/6; Hounslow: L.* 2/6; Cheltenham: L.G.W.* 4/6; Pittston: A.R.* £5/7/4; Wolverhampton: J.L.* 2/6; Wolverhampton: J.K.W.* 2/-; Ilford: M.D. 5/6; Northwood: E.H.* £1; Coleman's Hatch: O.M.* £2; London: S.B. 5/-; Southend: P.A.O.* 2/6; Miami: Friends, per P.S. £17/10/-; Woodford: A.S. 19/6; Oxford: Anon.* 5/-; London: B.S. 1/-; Glasgow: J.H.* 2/6; Melbourne: Comrades, per B.F. £7/19/4; Wolverhampton: J.L.* 2/6; J.K.W.* 2/-; London: R.C. 10/-; London: R.S. 3/6; Hounslow: L.* 2/6; Surrey: B.F.* 5/-; Belfast: "Liam" 3/-; Oxford: Anon.* 5/-; London: Mrs. C.F. 1/3; Southend: P.A.O.* 5/-; Cardiff: I.T. £1/10/-; New York: V.W. £32; London: C.P.P. £1/10/-; Nuneaton: D.H. 5/-.

TOTAL 94 7 11
Previously acknowledged 31 7 6

1962 TOTAL TO DATE £124 15 5

*Indicates Regular Contributor.

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

Printed by Express Printers, London, E.1. Published by Freedom Press, 17a, Maxwell Road, London, S.W.6.

