

'So far is it from being true, as has been pretended that the abolition of any formal government is the dissolution of society, it acts by a contrary impulse, and brings the latter closer together.'

THOMAS PAINE.

In this Issue:

EICHMANN & THE QUESTION OF IDENTITY
TEN HOLT
E. ARMAND
NON-VIOLENCE & DIRECT ACTION
CORRESPONDENCE

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY - 4d.

'Workers of the World Unite!'—before the bosses do!

THE SECOND ONE-DAY strike of engineering and shipbuilding workers last Monday was described by the unions as an "almost complete stoppage in the major centres". Employers admit that 80 per cent of the industries' 3,000,000 workers were out. Taking into account non-union workers in rural and semi-rural work, both the union and employers' claims seem valid. Now the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions will proceed with its ballot among members of the 39 unions on whether there should be an all-out strike.

SINCE WORKERS in this country are always being reminded that wage increases which are not backed by corresponding increases in production will "price British Industry out of the market", it is interesting to learn from the *Observer's* Economic Editor that in Western Germany for the past two years the hourly rate has been going up by 10 per cent a year which is twice as fast as the increase in productivity. Germany, we learn is now regarded in Brussels (that is at the Common Market headquarters) as "the least glamorous prospect, with the lowest potential rate of growth". The word "miracle" has long been forgotten in connection with the Federal Republic. It just goes to show that workers are the same in all countries; they have the same problems, and the same bosses to fight for better conditions.

The fear of competition from countries with so-called "cheap labour" is another myth that dies hard. Wages in the highly industrialised countries soon find a common level. Even Japan which was the glaring example of "cheap labour" goods is fast catching up with European standards of pay. According to the *Daily Herald* the average Japanese worker in a big firm now earns about £6 a week which with twice-yearly bonuses and other allowances brings his wages up to £10. In shipbuilding a skilled worker earns £12. And some economists "estimate that by 1970 at the latest, industrial wages will be level with those of Western Europe.

Common Market — Common Problems

MORE AND MORE ARE the industrialists thinking in world terms, breaking through tariff barriers by establishing industries in the countries where they want to sell their goods. Thus Japanese firms have set up factories in Ireland, British firms in the countries of the Common Market, Dutch firms in this country and so on. Only last week we were given the reason for American Ford's take over of its British counter-part more than a year ago by *Fortune* the American business magazine:

The £131 millions take-over of Ford Motor by its American parent "clearly signalled Ford's intentions to press for a larger share of the growing car market

abroad" and more particularly "to exploit the full potentialities" on an enlarged Common Market including Britain. That, says an article in the current issue of the American business magazine *Fortune*, is why US Ford bought all the ordinary stock in its British subsidiary just over a year ago.

Estimating that the free world market for cars outside the US will grow at a rate of 5 per cent a year, the article states that Ford is already getting 13.6 per cent of this market and if the company no more than held its own it should be selling over a million cars a year outside the United States by 1970.

Fortune quotes Mr. Henry Ford II as saying: "There is no question that the overseas market is going to grow more rapidly than the US market, and we regard our expanding participation in

that market as not only desirable but necessary."

The English company was Ford's biggest overseas manufacturer, with sales of £269 millions in 1960 and profits of £19 millions. The German company was only about half as big, but was growing faster, says *Fortune*. If and when the marriage of EFTA and EEC took place, these two companies would freely share in the same huge market, which today bought four million cars a year and might go on to six millions by 1970. Previously the two companies had developed their own products in almost complete separation, but now they could enjoy considerable flexibility in planning, building and selling all products. Ford might, for instance, decide to set up a single wheel plant in Belgium to serve both.

It was significant that Ford had begun to move a few of its ablest people into European operating jobs. Already in the British company the chief stylist and the controller were Americans, and recently, in response to a request from the chairman of the English company, Sir Patrick Hennessy, US Ford provided a chief engineer who is described as "Ford's No. 1 man in this field."

"The vast majority of Ford management men abroad, of course, will continue to be drawn from the countries where the plants are located: but Ford is not being timid about installing American ideas, methods, and systems in its foreign subsidiaries," says the article. Mr. Ford's comment was: "We just think we knew a little bit more about the business than they do."

Apart from the fact that "Workers of the world unite" is as valid and as good a slogan as ever it was, surely in face of the internationalisation of Big Industry, workers must also see their problems in the future in international terms. Certainly the social revolution more and more can only be visualised in world terms. Far from this being a disadvantage it would seem to us to offer even greater possibilities of success than could be expected from struggles within national frontiers.

CLARIFICATION NEEDED!

IN a letter to *Peace News* (March 2) giving his reasons for withdrawing from the activities of the Committee of 100 "until its principles of action have been clarified", Herbert Read does not, in our opinion, contribute to such a "clarification" when he suggests that some of the actions of the Committee of 100 were "aggressive", as distinct from "defensive", acts of civil disobedience. As an example of the former he cites the Wethersfield demonstration. Now, while wholeheartedly agreeing with him that this action was "strategically foolish"—this view was expressed in FREEDOM at the time—we fail to understand why he should consider it an "aggressive" act compared say with the sit-downs outside the De-

fence Ministry and in Trafalgar Square, in which he participated, and which we assume, he considers were "defensive".

Herbert Read suggests that the Wethersfield demonstration even had it been successful "would have served no purpose and would have been regarded by the public . . . as a quixotic act of defiance directed against the Air Force rather than against the State". But by the same token the two demonstrations in which he took part could be interpreted as demonstrations against the police rather than against the State! While agreeing with him that it is the public that "we are trying to bring on our side" is it not one of our functions to educate the public to an awareness that the Air Force and the police are pillars of the State? Or does he, perhaps not agree with us that they are?

Herbert Read goes on to point out that

All such acts [such as Wethersfield] (equally with the more frequent attempts to break a police cordon, which is also an act inconsistent with the principles of non-violent civil disobedience) are aggressive in spirit and merely serve to alienate the very people we wish to bring to our side.

In the first place we question Read's statement that demonstrators have attempted to physically resist the police. But when he says that they are "aggressive in spirit" our immediate reaction is: "and what's wrong with that?" In the context of the above quotation is he honestly suggesting that (as well as the public, of course) "the very people we wish to bring to our side" are the police?

★

EVERY act of civil disobedience by the people is, whether violent or non-violent, both "aggressive" and "defensive", depending on the point of view from which you view it. Bertrand Russell has obviously never dreamed of destroying the State; his unwavering support of the Committee of 100's acts of

civil disobedience is not "aggressive" so far as the *status quo* is concerned. He simply feels that unless the H-bomb can be removed from the regulation of human affairs mankind lives under the permanent threat of annihilation. The fact that he does not advocate nuclear disarmament by the United States so long as agreement cannot be reached with Russia, more than somewhat neutralises his advocacy of unilateral disarmament for Britain, and his appeal on behalf of humanity. But if we understand Bertrand Russell correctly, he touchingly (ourselves included, without illusions however!) supports and identifies himself with the "quixotic", youthful, Committee of 100 actions, because he hopes that if they can "influence" the British government to abandon their nuclear argument, they will be in a position to persuade America and Russia to abandon theirs. And so humanity can go on living in the shadow of conventional weapons of war!

From the point of view of the State every action which does not recognise its legality or the authority of its protectors (the police, air-force *et alia*) is an aggressive action. Should Herbert Read argue that we need not take into account what the State thinks (which is what, perforce, the majority, "thinks") then in that case we would reply that our actions should be determined by what we think is right and not by what will necessarily win the approval of the public, the police or the air-force. And what we think is right may include what Read calls "quixotic acts of defiance". The movement supporting the Committee of 100 is as some say less revolutionary than the Committee. We do not profess to know. What we do know is that potentially it is the only significant social movement to have emerged in this country during the last twenty-five years. Our criticism, after its eighteen months of existence is, in effect, that

it has too much heart and not enough head. That is that a sense of "self-sacrifice" (if our individual friends will pardon the phrase), overrides considerations based on reason.

★

HERBERT READ answers the question "What remains to be done" with the following:

Gandhi gave as examples of defensive civil disobedience the formation of volunteer corps for peaceful purposes, publication of articles not contemplating or inciting to violence in spite of prohibiting orders and conducting of peaceful picketing undertaken with a view to

Continued on page 3

STRIKE STRATEGY

Strike Strategy published by the National Rank and File Movement (price 2d.), contains a lot of sound advice on the practical aspects of running an unofficial strike, relating to such matters as electing a committee, organising pickets, propaganda and benefit payments.

It also makes a number of points with which all supporters of FREEDOM will agree, about the nature of "agreements" between workers and bosses, collaboration between official union leaders and employers, and the importance of striking only on issues where the workers are united, and in a strong position with a good chance of winning.

Rather than quoting extensively from the short pamphlet, I will advise all readers who are involved in, or interested in the industrial struggle to get copies and distribute them.

What *Strike Strategy* does not do, or set out to do, is to relate the use and importance of unofficial strike action to a more general social and political, or anti-political set of ideas. To discuss the strong and weak points of this approach would be going outside the limits of a review, but they are the crucial factors in evaluating a movement like the N.R.F.M.

It would be interesting to see its views on that subject.

ANARCHY 13

ON SALE NOW

discusses

DIRECT ACTION

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

ORDER YOUR COPY NOW!

"LEGAL institutions",* writes Mr. Rogat, "represent our wisest effort to apply reason to the solution of certain kinds of problems."

One can well imagine the cynical comments most of us would like to make on this statement. Nevertheless this study of the Eichmann case is very interesting. Mr. Rogat believes that it would have been better if Eichmann had been handed over to an international court for trial, for by trying him themselves the Israelis became judges and prosecutors too in their own cause. It is necessary not only that justice should be done, but that it should appear to be done, even in such a case as this, and no one can imagine that Eichmann had what is usually known as a "fair trial". Witnesses who were prepared to come forward in Eichmann's defence were deterred, for Israel would not extend immunity to former Nazis. If they came to Israel they might find themselves also in the dock!

The author believes in the rule of law as passionately as the anarchist believes in the rule of freedom. He considers that had Eichmann been handed over to an international court this would have aided the development of a system of international law, which would be recognised by all the peoples of the world. International law however differs from

*The Eichmann Trial and the Rule of Law, by Yosal Rogat, Centre for the Study of Democratic Institutions, Santa Barbara, California.

the laws of states in that it has no teeth. Its working depends entirely on the readiness of the different states to accept it. On the other hand, the laws under which the ordinary citizen lives can be enforced by the police. There is as yet no international police force, and there could only be if one big state succeeded in achieving the age-old dream of world conquest. Then of course it would cease to be international law anyway,

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

Gate Fever
Jane Buxton & M. Turner 21/-
Common-Sense about Democracy
E. Cahn (Cloth 12/6 Paper 6/-)
Common-Sense about a Starving World
Ritchie Calder (Cloth 12/6 Paper 6/-)
Common-Sense about Young Offenders
David Wills (Cloth 12/6 Paper 6/-)
Soviet Foreign Policy after Stalin
David Dallin 50/-
The Sirens of Titan
Kurt Vonnegut 18/-
Nihilism: its Origin and Nature
H. Thielicke 15/-

REPRINTS

Letters
F. M. Dostoevsky 35/-

SECOND-HAND

Reflections on Hanging
Arthur Koestler 9/-
The First Men in the Moon and
The World Set Free
H. G. Wells 4/-
Prostitution in Europe (1919 Abridged)
Abraham Flexner 6/-
Gracia: a Social Tragedy
(a literary one too!)
Frank Everett Plummer 3/-
The Revolt of the Fishermen
Anna Seghers 4/-
Crimes and Punishments
(including Beccaria)
James Anson Farrer (damaged) 5/-
Chatham
Frederic Harrison 3/-
The Coming Polity
Victor Branford and Patrick Geddes 3/6
Economic Foundations of Society
Achille Loria 4/-
Siberian Garrison
Rodion Markovits 4/-
Masses and Man
Ernst Toller 2/6
Papa You're Crazy
William Saroyan 5/-

PERIODICALS

Solidarity Vol 2, No. 1 6d.
Flame Jan-March 9d.

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

Eichmann & the Question of Identity

since the world would be all one country.

It seems to me that international law is bound to remain more a theory than a practical issue, since cases can only be settled if the states involved agree to be bound by the decisions of an international court. They may well do this on minor issues, when it is not worth the trouble to resist. But one cannot imagine a major dispute being settled by a court, (Korea, Congo, Berlin). Mr. Rogat believes that statesmen could develop a "subjective sense of obligation", which sense he believes to be the basis of the rule of law, but how is this to be brought about?

Mr. Rogat argues that "Congressmen do not accept a Supreme Court decision invalidating one of their laws because they fear that they will be set upon by the Court's pages and clerks." But this implies a different state of affairs. Here all those concerned are in the same country, belong to the same class, and are often known to each other or even related. Compared with the open wilderness of power politics this is a (relatively) sheltered environment. In the case of the integration of schools in the American South one sees a long-drawn-out, and theoretically illegal, defiance of the decision of the Supreme Court's ruling, not in this case by Congressmen, but by the local authorities and the people. So even here, when a major issue is involved, where deep emotions are stirred up, the rule of law is relatively powerless.

But in any case, where the ordinary citizen is concerned, an element of sheer fear is always present. The courts and the police can wreck your life for you. Statesmen however need only fear military defeat, in which case, whatever they have or have not done, they will be tried by the victors anyway, for "war crimes", a phrase that can mean anything—and hence nothing.

It could reasonably be argued that the example of Nuremberg has helped to make both sides of the Cold War more intransigent than they would otherwise be as strong as they possibly can be, and only submit to the arbitration of courts when so doing will win them a good opinion in the world, and not hamper the development of their power.

International law is therefore a very peculiar thing, almost as chimerical indeed as the ideal of those silly anarchists of society without law at all. To try to fit the Eichmann case into any system of legislation is extremely difficult. Not because there have been no mass murderers before. There have been many in history, and doubtless, unless we are all blown up, the world will see many more in the future. But this is almost the first time that one of them has been brought to book, like any ordinary criminal.

IT is the desire of every critic to play the midwife to genius and to proudly point to some piling artist and murmur that "there but for the grace of God."

And each critic at some stage leads from out of the shadows his contender for the crown of genius of the month only to step back into the emptied shadows with the perennial cliché "and then he betrayed me" when success and the dealers' sticky fingers take over. Last month John Berger introduced Ten Holt to us via the columns of the Daily Mail in an interview that read like a rewrite of the Sermon on the Mount for, to his credit, Berger is not one to suppress his emotions or his beliefs and to John Berger Ten Holt is the most important painter of the last fifty years.

The other critics however played it cool and most write-ups contained a slightly sour note in inverse proportion to Berger's enthusiasm. Though John Berger follows the Party line of the Communist Party, if at times a little unsteadily, he is a man whose honesty of opinion and sweetness of nature too often blinds him to the value of the work before him. For what is a virtue in the man becomes a fault in the critic.

Ten Holt is a friend of long standing with John Berger and not only do they bear a physical resemblance but both possess the same shy diffidence of ap-

An international crime, recognisable as such by all states, is unusual. Such a crime does in fact exist though, the crime of piracy. The pirate is an outlaw. He has put himself outside all governments. But the comparison soon breaks down. Eichmann was himself the agent of an established and recognised government. (What is more, it had to begin with, been elected democratically.) He could and did plead that he was acting under orders. Are we to say then that to try him is to try the whole nation-state whose agent he was? This is to bring us into dangerous waters, since it was for reasons of their alleged collective guilt that the Jews were exterminated. This is to think in tribalistic terms. The guilt of one is the guilt of all. The individual does not exist as such. He is merely part of a larger whole, his national or tribal group. And the whole group can be held responsible for the crime of one, and the crime of the group can be expiated by the sacrifice of one. This is not the realm of reason. We are back in the world of tom-toms and blood-feuds.

Mr. Rogat writes, "... Ben-Gurion said, 'One of our motives is to make the details of Eichmann's case known to the generations of Israelis who have grown up since the holocaust.' The trial may therefore validly be seen as part of Ben-Gurion's constant effort to galvanise all Jews into a tensed self-consciousness of their heroic destiny and as part of his desperate attempt to prevent Israel from becoming like other nations."

Ben-Gurion is quoted by Mr. Rogat as having made the following astonishing statement, "Whoever dwells outside of the land of Israel is considered to have no God". This is because he (Ben-Gurion) opposes the idea that the Jew can decide for himself whether to merge with the Gentiles or not, or to what extent he will merge with them and to what extent keep himself distinct. To be born a Jew is to be a Jew forever, and one's children and their children. This is the tribal point of view. In other words, the seizure, trial and punishment of Eichmann was not an example of a wise "effort to apply reason to the solution of certain kinds of problem", the problem posed by crimes against mankind in this case. It was tribal vengeance.

Mr. Rogat speculates as to whether the long tradition of sufferings endured did not have a bad effect on the German Jews, making them more submissive to the situation than they need have been, checking in them the will to break out while there was still time. He points out that the modern concept of man as a completely isolated individual, responsible for the creation of his own destiny, unattached to any tribe, a cosmopolitan on his own, is detested by many people for whom the old sense of attachment to race, nation and tradition is still a

MIDWIFE TO—GENIUS?

proach and the same sense of naïve sincerity for the humble and the good, and this in a market where Judas could have started a stall without losing face, so that Berger reads the virtues of the man into the canvas.

Yet the work is good, exciting and indeed welcome now that the abstractionists have for a time lost their dynamic.

His monumental figures, as static and as anti-human as Henry Moore's, stand like carved rock within his receding landscapes and each canvas carries its mass of broken colours as though they were cupped hands, for each time the eye is drawn to the centre of the canvas and thence to the far distance.

Yet there is still the moment of doubt; one looks for the means rather than the end in these paintings and the means lies in Ten Holt's repeated use of the same method. Each form is built up upon the white canvas with huge slabs of multi-coloured paint and it is the direction of the palette knife strokes that create the subject and the colour is of secondary importance. When he has finished his central figures he then fills in his background with a cross-patch

living force. "Machiavelli's originality consisted, it was said, in conceiving the state as a work of art which men must create; but today we have progressed to conceiving of the self in that way. To acknowledge this necessity is to take on a dispiriting burden of freedom, for we can call on the assistance of only our own resources, and they are meagre. Freedom has to be enclosed within the bitter pill of philosophy. Otherwise no one will take it.

By the very act of holding the trial, however, Israel undertakes an aggressive defence of the last and most crucial bastion besieged by modernity—the self. It denies that personal identity can be created by individual action and freedom; and asserts that it can only be discovered by understanding one's own tradition.

"It is perhaps the greatest irony of the trial that its two antagonistic forces—Israel and the Nazis—have both asserted the older view of membership and identity. . . ."

This does not mean to say, of course, that Israel is the same as the Nazis, but it does mean that both have, one in a highly perverted form, asserted "their opposition to the rootless, cosmopolitan and atomised individual; and in each case this opposition is so intense that it

†I know this is the standard modern philosophy, but it seems somewhat needlessly tragic. For this freedom of self-creation also means that men and women are ends in themselves, and therefore we have no justification to torture or brainwash them into submission, nor to kill them, for there are no ends beyond individuals. Therefore, far from being dispiriting, this new-found freedom ought to arouse in us humanitarian feelings, and make us more ready to work for the improvement of the quality of human life, as far as we are able. But in a society like ours, which appears to value suffering more than happiness, the jam of

INDIVIDUAL INITIATIVE

A petition against nuclear tests signed by 42,000 women was carried through the snow and delivered to a representative of the Prime Minister at Admiralty House last week.

Mr. Macmillan was not able to receive personally the five women who called. The petition originated in a letter published in the "Guardian" on October 27—the only national paper to accept the letter. It came from Mrs. Daphne English, of South Norwood, London, and a few of her friends, all mothers who were desperately worried about the future of their children.

None of them belonged to any nuclear disarmament organisation, nor was their project allied to any political party. They simply asked any women who wanted to plead for the lives of their children and for a future free from the threat and horrors of nuclear war to sign the following petition:

"We, the undersigned women, electors of the United Kingdom, alarmed by the threat to our families and to all humanity contained in the international situation as it has developed in the last few months, implore the governments of the Great Powers, while there is still time, to reconsider their policies and to take urgent steps to secure.—

(a) an agreement to stop the testing of nuclear weapons;

may permit of no accommodation with the liberal spirit."

Attitudes to punishment also stem from this outlook. In a tribal society the very earth was thought to cry for vengeance, because certain crimes were so serious that they were thought of as disturbing the order of nature. In such a mental climate the trial of Eichmann would require no defence. But Mr. Rogat clearly adheres to the liberal view, even if he feels it necessary to express it in a manner reminiscent of the existentalists. But is it not a fact that all trials have an element of tribal vengeance in them? (One should add here, in all fairness, that not all tribal societies by any means are so bloodthirsty as those around the Mediterranean and in Western Europe! Some are noticeably more humane in some aspects of life). How can one hope to achieve justice, and arrive at the truth, by what is in fact a contest, a trial by ordeal?

The problem which obsesses me is, "What in fact is a 'war-crime' or a 'crime against humanity'? Were the bomber pilots war criminals? Their targets were women and children. Why therefore is it bad taste to compare them to Eichmann? Is it because people still believe war is glorious?"

The world moves, slowly indeed, but it does move. A few centuries ago Eichmann would have been a slave trader, an inquisitor or a crusader. He would have been considered a useful citizen, or even a hero. Of course his crimes, due to the primitive technology of the day, would have been on a smaller scale, but he would have found plenty of scope for satisfying his desires. Yet nowadays his acts are regarded as monstrous. If this miserable business does no more than display a certain increased sensitivity of conscience among the population of the world it gives us at least some grounds for optimism.

ARTHUR W. ULOTH.

(b) an immediate resumption of negotiations which will lead, under a system of international inspection, to the reduction and ultimate abandonment of nuclear weapons and the reduction of conventional armaments;

(c) a rethinking by every government of its policy on these and other points of controversy so that all considerations of pride and prestige, whether national or personal, may be laid aside in an attempt to reach agreed solutions."

Mrs. English received what she describes as "embarrassingly generous" contributions to expenses. She is sending about £30 of unused money to the United Nations Children's Fund.

After leaving the petition forms at Admiralty House, the deputation went to the United States Embassy where they spent about 20 minutes with Mr. D. Bruce the Ambassador. He congratulated them on their enterprise and was particularly impressed with the fact that the appeal was independent.

The visitors emphasised to him their concern about the proposed Christmas Island tests, a point which they included in a letter which Mr. Bruce undertook to forward to President Kennedy. A copy of the petition and a covering letter were left at the Soviet and French embassies. Later Mrs. English sent cables to Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Khrushchev and President de Gaulle.

struggling to formulate his vision then one must turn to the small canvases. Here he stands in his nakedness for when he is confined within the limits of these small areas he is unable to create the illusions given by the huge sweep of his palette knife and the broken backgrounds tend to overawe the central figure and to reduce it to a tiny heap of coloured pebbles.

Each day the New London Gallery at 17 Old Bond Street, W.1. was full of the fatuous and fashionable for the plug in the Daily Mail and the Hitchcocklike interview on the B.B.C. had paid off and the cheque books flapped among the catalogues.

The New London Gallery is now one of the most important of the London galleries, moneywise, and it is a pleasure to watch them swing into action with each new showing for I feel that given sufficient notice they could even flog the exit signs for three figures. But a salutary lesson to all those who might join the panic squads who infest these galleries is to flip through the back pages of the gallery press cutting book and to ask what became of yesterdays geniuses. Ten Holt is a good, an honest and a creative painter who has enriched our world with his work but let us reserve the word 'genius' for a later day.

ARTHUR MOYSE.

March 10 1962 Vol 23 No 8

Clarification Needed!

Continued from page 1
 wean people from things or institutions in spite of orders to the contrary. He also said that we must give greater value to the adjective "civil" than to the noun "disobedience". "Disobedience without civility, discipline, discrimination, non-violence is certain destruction. Disobedience combined with love is the living water of life". Until the Committee of 100 can recognise these fundamental distinctions it would be better for it to remain in abeyance".

We say that Gandhi is no less a myth for pacifists than Lenin is for Communists. And Read quotes Gandhi to validate his own position just as some Anarchists quoted Kropotkin as a justification for supporting World War I. Let us forget the names, the individuals, and judge their ideas on their merits! In the long term what influences mankind are ideas not personalities (it now appears that Beethoven's personality was much less interesting than Beethoven the composer; and the same might be said of Tolstoy, Godwin, Wilde, Morris and a host of other writers whose ideas are stimulating, provocative and humane). Gandhi's ideas are valid in so far as they satisfy man's aspirations and are realistic. We are prepared to consider Gandhi's ideas as ideas; when we are told that they were "Gandhi's ideas" then we have also to take into account the "personality" behind the ideas. Far from influencing us in favour, the intrusion of the personality creates problems, of a personal nature, which, if anything, tend to obscure the ideas. The reality, surely, is that in most cases the idea is more exciting, more important than the individual who has expounded it. In an age where the individual is more important than the idea it is not surprising that ideas have the same feet of clay as the mass-communicated

individuals who propound them.

The myth has it that Gandhi's movement of civil disobedience was successful in winning independence for India. The other myth is that the Labour government under Mr. Attlee was responsible. A third opinion, less mythical in our opinion, is that the problems of war plus the uneconomic aspects of 19th century colonialism, made independence a more realistic long term policy in the 20th century.

Not because we decry non-violent tactics but because we realise that violence is the only language governments respect, do we point to the fact that what India achieved on 15th August 1947 after centuries of starvation, humiliation and exploitation, Ghana and Kenya, where less Gandhian methods were used, have achieved in the space of decades. The common factor may well have been War. If so it further invalidates the non-violent Gandhian movement in India.

★
ANARCHISM has nothing to do with violence and therefore we cannot be accused of arguing for violence. We do not believe that any way of life based on freedom can be imposed by the threat, or the use of violence, and for this reason we seek to persuade our fellow beings to want freedom for themselves and for everybody else as well. Only by defending freedom for all can one defend one's own freedom. Only if one's concept of freedom transcends the petty individual, the self, can one escape from the aridity, the loneliness, of the individualist's hell, and Herbert Read's Gandhian self-righteousness.

Let's make mistakes, and if we must, pay for them. But let's see how we can best work together for the common good!

APRIL CARTER is perhaps the most sensible and intelligent of the British unilateralists whose importance derives from their work for nuclear disarmament rather than from their work in some other field, such as religion or politics, science or the arts. Like so many unilateralists, she is an upper-middle-class dissenter, and she expressed her dissent at an early age and in a powerful way, by becoming the Secretary of the Direct Action Committee against Nuclear War in 1958, while she was still in her teens. For three years she was one of the most active young members of DAC, and was arrested and imprisoned for her part in its pioneering demonstrations. But last July DAC was absorbed by the new Committee of 100, and after acting as the European Organiser of the march from San Francisco to Moscow she turned to concentrate on her work for *Peace News*. Regular readers of that paper will already know that her signed articles are usually the best thing in any issue, and many of the unsigned ones which represent its more militant and relevant mood during the last year or so clearly owe much to her.

Now she has written a short pamphlet,* on non-violent action, based on her wide reading in its history and, of course, on her personal experience in the unilateralist movement.

Two warnings to begin with. First, the pamphlet was mostly written a year ago and therefore omits any reference to the Committee of 100, though it is invaluable background reading for any consideration of the Committee's activity. Second, there seems to be some confusion over the pamphlet's title—on the cover it is *Direct Action*, but inside it is *Non-Violent Action*, and the author certainly discusses what she calls *NVA* in general rather than just direct action in particular. I suspect that this verbal confusion is a symptom of a deeper confusion, shared by most of the unilateralist left, which derives from our wish that all our protests against the Bomb were direct action when the fact is that very few of them deserve the name. In the end only direct action can defeat the Warfare State, but most unilateralist action so far has been "constitutional" or "symbolic".

These two categories of indirect action are well described in the pamphlet, and the author rightly points out that "no prolonged direct action campaign could dispense with constitutional or symbolic methods, as both are necessary for spreading ideas and creating a movement," and that "direct action builds on other ways of resistance, it does not supersede them." I think many anarchists would do well to consider both these remarks. Constitutional action is taken to include all the conventional techniques of orthodox pressure groups; symbolic action—rallies, marches, vigils, fasts, banners, badges, and so on—add a new emotional factor, so that "a symbolic demonstration is a form of drama, like a Greek tragedy, which stages a well-known myth about human destiny and which has grown out of religious ritual." The author pays proper attention to both categories, but she has no illusions about either of them. "It is possible to wage a vigorous conventional campaign for years, and even to have some support in Parliament, but for a long time to achieve little more than abstract sympathy for the cause," and "the borderline between valid symbolism and mere gimmicks is hard to define."

Any prolonged non-violent campaign must lead to direct action, and this too is well described in the pamphlet, as we would expect. The author discusses strikes, consumers' and producers' boycotts, pickets, civil disobedience, physical intervention (such as sit-downs and sit-ins), and action against the State—"the last and most extreme form of *NVA*". She also discusses the Gandhian idea of the "constructive programme",

the insistence that negative action must be supported by positive action, that a protest against evil must lead to work for good. She ends with a brief consideration of the types of non-violent campaign and a suggestion that "non-violent action is democracy in action" (what we would call anarchism in action). At every stage there are dozens of interesting and relevant examples and comments based on the intelligence and good sense which make her work so valuable. There is none of the wild rhetoric, the empty abstraction, or the woolly sentimentality that so often disfigure pacifist and left-wing thought—read almost any unilateralist article in almost any paper, and you'll see what I mean.

Nevertheless I am not quite happy about this pamphlet. In avoiding any kind of sectarian argument the author seems to me to have evaded some of the fundamental issues. I would just suggest briefly that most of what unilateralists call direct action is in fact *symbolic* action, partly because it can't work (consider the illegal demonstrations at military bases during the last decade), that the question of numbers is central, not peripheral; that the significance of most demonstrations, whether legal or illegal, is in their effect on the participants, not on the public; that the structure of unilateralist organisations (or any other organisations planning non-violent action) is far more important than might be thought; and that the actual minute-by-minute behaviour of non-violent demonstrators is also far more important than might be thought. In fact I think we need to be more self-conscious and self-critical, to develop more tolerance and discipline, to realise *exactly what we are doing*. I don't think April Carter considers these issues enough, so that her pamphlet turns out to be more on the lines of Anthony Weaver's *War Outmoded and Schools for Non-Violence*—raising more questions than it gives answers. Perhaps this was what she intended, but I feel that she is one of the few people in touch with the unilateralist movement who is capable of writing a really useful account of non-violent direct action, whether as a general history of the movement or as a more ambitious shot at "reflections on non-violence". Nearly all the literature of pacifism and non-violence is too academic, too vague, too evasive, too abstract, too unrealistic, too diffuse, too long-winded, too soft-centred, too tender-minded, too bad. What we need now is something *good*, something that really comes to grips with the subject in theory and practice. This pamphlet shows what she could do—I wish she would.

*Published by *Peace News*, 1s. 6d.
 N.W.

E. Armand

FROM his companion has come the sad news of the death of Emile Armand on Monday, February 19, at the age of 89.

Comrade Armand—whose real name was Ernest L. Juin—was born in Paris on March 26, 1872, the son of a Communist. Despite a secular education, he was attracted to Christianity in his early youth and was an active member of the Salvation Army from 1889 to 1897. He then came under the influence of Leo Tolstoy and in 1901—together with Marie Kugel—he founded a Christian anarchist journal called *L'Ère Nouvelle*. After a time he abandoned Christianity completely and became an individualist anarchist, which he remained until his death. Comrade Armand engaged in many activities: editor, publisher, essayist, poet, playwright, lecturer, translator. Like other militant comrades in France he did not escape the "attentions" of the State and spent 10 of his 89 years in prisons and concentration camps.

From 1901 onwards he edited and published a number of periodicals, including *Hors du Troupeau*, *Les Refractaires*, *Par delà de la mêlée*, and *ende hors*. After his release from internment during World War 2, he started *L'Unique* which he edited until the end of his life, notwithstanding ill-health and the difficulties of old age. He was also the author of several books and of many pamphlets—among which was a large and comprehensive survey of individualist anarchism: "L'Initiation Individualiste Anarchiste" (first published in 1923, a new and enlarged edition—"Iniziazione Individualista Anarchica"—appeared in Italian in 1956). In addition he published works by Gérard de Lacaze-Duthiers, Max Stirner, Albert Libertad, John Henry Mackay, Benjamin Tucker, Manuel Devaldes, Ixigrec and other individualist writers.

Of Comrade Armand, Catherine Campoursy once wrote: "... he gives the impression of a man of simple manners, devoid of any vulgarity, who does not place himself upon any pedestal". An incident which happened during a conversation I had with him in Paris in 1953 confirmed her words. A South African comrade, who was present, asked him why he, a "conscious egoist", had spent so much time in prison. He replied (I quote from memory) that it was a "risk of the trade" and illustrated what he meant by pointing out that, just as a steeplejack risked his life daily in his "trade", so the anarchist propagandist risked imprisonment in his. This unaffected answer carried much greater conviction than any melodramatic gesture, or mock-modesty about sacrifice for "the Cause", would have done.

The death of E. Armand has deprived the libertarian world of one of its best-known figures and a living link with "la belle époque" of the movement in France. But his contribution to the clarification and dissemination of anarchism and, in particular, his insistence upon individual autonomy as the basis for any free milieu, will not be lost. One of the wishes he expressed in a recent letter to me was that his book *Iniziazione Individualista Anarchica* could be translated into English. It would not be an unworthy memorial if his wish could become a reality.

S. E. PARKER.

Thanks, Warnings and Exhortations

THOSE of our readers who follow our financial fortunes and watch us try to deal with income and outgoings as Christ was alleged to have dealt with loaves, fishes and hungry mouths, will be relieved, as we have been, by the response to our reminders that subscriptions are due for renewal. Not only have, at the time of writing, more than 60 per cent of those so reminded in this country responded by renewing their subscriptions, but something like 80 per cent of those who have renewed have added a little bit extra for the Deficit Fund! Though we have sent them stereotyped acknowledgment cards, because otherwise we would not be able to cope with the administrative side of our work, we hope they will accept our word that the fact of renewing their subscriptions promptly and in many cases of adding shillings or pounds to help us deal with that crippling deficit, has touched us beyond words, and we only hope that we can be worthy of the task we have undertaken. We would add a special word of thanks to those comrades and friends whose initials are adorned by an asterisk: our regular, devoted helpers who week by week share our financial anxieties (and who rarely receive an acknowledgment card!). We hope it means something to them when we say that we look upon them as part of the Freedom Press group.

★ ★ ★
 AT THE END OF THIS month all those who have been receiving bundles of *FREEDOM/ANARCHY* and have also received a letter asking them to let us know their requirements for the future, but who have not replied, will have their supplies suspended. This is a second reminder. If you don't reply, don't complain if we

stop sending our publications (and those of our readers who obtain their copies through such "agents" will know, when they are told that *FREEDOM/ANARCHY* haven't arrived, the reason why! Harass your agent comrade! and if he doesn't budge subscribe direct and we will see that you get your copy every week.

★ ★ ★
 THE RESPONSE TO OUR APPEAL for 750 new subscribers this year has been most disappointing so far. Yet with a little effort on the part of all our comrades and sympathisers it should not be difficult. Now that we have sent out all the renewal notices we are feeling in the mood to tackle the problem. Unlike the Church and other so-called charitable organisations (did you hear that programme on the Home Service last Sunday "Buy a Flag!") which call in the specialists to sell God and Misery to the general public, we want to persuade our readers that the more readers there are of *FREEDOM/ANARCHY* the better will the world be. And since we cannot afford more than a nominal sum on advertising, you, our readers must introduce our publications to the millions who have never heard of our existence. Some of your friends may be U, even be the "lively minds" that the *Guardian* suggests comprise its 250,000 readers. We are only looking, for the moment, for another 750 people, besides yourselves, who think for themselves. Britain, America, Canada, Australia, New Zealand... are there not among the 250 million English-speaking citizens of these countries 750 willing to part with a subscription to *FREEDOM/ANARCHY*? Let us know soon!

The Project

"SINCE last night I have been waiting here at the base watching the workers putting the finishing touches to the wonder of the age. The apex which pointed at the night sky now points up into the blue sky waiting for the supreme moment of entry.

"This is undoubtedly the summit of man's technical achievement. The masterly feat of engineering based on complex mathematical calculations is a tribute to the enduring values of our civilization. It can never now be said that our way of life is doomed to failure, when we are prepared to make such sacrifices for this journey into the unknown. The readiness to make such sacrifices is in itself the highest value of our civilization.

"It is said by some of our critics that the sacrifice is too great compared with the results achieved. Where else on earth would people take on such a burden? It is for the future we are planning and any present inconvenience is only for greater future glory.

"As I stand here history is being made. The work of innumerable hands is almost completed and our achievement will stand for all time as a monument to our skill. It is doubtful if any other nation on this earth is capable of similar feats of engineering, lacking, as they do, the resources of wealth and manpower necessary to assure success.

"It is a bright day and he will soon be journeying into the darkness of the other world, but he need have no fear since all the comforts of life here on earth have been provided including food and services.

"Other nations may take this as evidence of our resources and will hesitate before attacking us. There have been complaints that with food shortages, our resources would have been better spent on irrigation projects or similar feats of engineering. We would point out that we have a special obligation in the world today to maintain our way of life and this forward-looking project removed from all taint of short-term policies is the way our rulers have chosen. Work has been provided for our citizens regularly; without such programmes where would work be found?

"What would happen to the hundreds of thousands of workers? Of craftsmen? Of artists? who have been working on this project for years? Without this concept of man's future destiny we could not plan ahead, the very structure of our government, with the workers at the base, the artists and craftsmen in the interior and at the apex, the governors and priests, a very pyramid of power!

"Without this pyramid no power!
 "Enough of speculation, we are on the threshold of achievement. Let those who come after determine whether we were right or not.

"A procession is approaching, ready for entry. Workers rush hither and thither making last minute touches. Heads of government and priests drive up with soldiers in attendance. The ranks are drawn up of the faithful servants. At a signal from the priests the soldiers slaughter them and the rows of servants are now ready to join the mummy of our late Pharaoh in his pyramid tomb."

JACK SPRATT.

