

'All our liberties are due to men who, when their conscience has compelled them, have broken the laws of the land.'

DR. CLIFFORD

In this Issue:

LAWRENCE ON OBSCENITY
OLYMPIAN GRATIFICATION
HINCHLIFFE AT THE UNITY
RUSSELL & THE BOMB
PUTTING THE SPORTSMANSHIP
INTO SPORT

APRIL 21 1962 Vol 23 No 13

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY - 4d.

Marching on!

HOW many people taking part in this year's Aldermaston March entertain hopes that the government will take much notice of their demands? We imagine that the number is not very great. From the point of view of influencing the political parties, one can expect that as the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament grows so the political parties will manoeuvre to protect themselves from influences, which electionally speaking, would lose them votes.

For the leaders, last year's March was a *triumphal* march, celebrating their first major victory. At Scarborough, the previous October the Labour Party conference had rejected the Executive's Defence programme, and thanks to the Union bloc-votes, adopted the unilateralists' programme. This was no mean achievement: the next best thing to influencing the government is to convert the Opposition! But of course, it was all a ghastly mistake. How could the Labour Party offer itself to the country as an alternative government without a Defence programme? Whatever individual members of the party may have thought, it was clear that the National Press would damn the party's chances if the decision were not reversed in time. The ghost of Nye Bevan going naked to the conference tables haunted the Party leaders and the Union executives. The Parliamentary Labour Party almost to a man closed its ranks and in-

spired by Gaitskell's impassioned rallying call to "Fight, fight, fight!", and the force of the electoral argument, defied Conference decisions.

Between Scarborough and Blackpool Gaitskell succeeded in persuading the Unions to examine their consciences and their policies. "Think—Re-think, Double-Think" and hey presto at Blackpool last October the Scarborough decision was reversed by an overwhelming majority, thanks again to the Trade Union bloc-busters!

And the CND goes marching on! This time perhaps the Canon will have lost his smile of triumph. Jaquetta Hawkes' sombrero will be at a less rakish angle and Michael Foot will be wearing an angry frown.

AS a propaganda movement we think there is no doubt that the CND has done very effective work, and the march is good propaganda. As a pressure group it is a flop for all it has with which to press the ruling class are sound arguments and a feeling for human life. Governments have no time for either, and can easily resist both. There are two pressure groups that count so far as governments are con-

cerned: they are, on the one hand the Federation of British Industries and the Bankers, etc., on the other the Trades Unions. Both can, if they have a mind to, make or break governments, because between them they control the nation's economic machine. When they grumble the government has to sit up and take notice. Of course governments have their "arguments" in the shape of the armed and other forces of "law and order"; and they can always count on the support of the Trades Unions when they are at logger-heads with the industrialists and bankers and *vice versa*. (e.g. Kennedy's "victory" over the steel

barons in America last week). But what can a middle class movement, such as CND, which has declared its political and social impotence by seeking to see its wishes implemented through the normal "constitutional channels" what pressures can it exert on government policies?

We are not criticising the CND for not having managed to rid the country of its nuclear armament. We do criticise them for their blinkered approach: of treating what are virtually revolutionary proposals as if they could be dealt with as simple questions of policy, rather like wage restraint, or the decision to tax lollipops. Unilateral disarmament implies that a nation, or a people are substituting moral values for power values in human relations. This means upsetting the whole economic and social structure; it means an end to privilege, it requires the decentralisation of power, the break-up of pressure groups. In a word it is the social revolution as anarchists understand it. And you cannot legislate for revolution; you have to make it!

Unconsciously perhaps, the frustration which gave rise to the Committee of 100 was the realisation that unilateral disarmament was a proposal so far-reaching that revolutionary and not constitutional methods would be needed to achieve it. The Committee of 100's demonstrations have been valuable in that they have made many people aware of the entrenched power of the State; one hopes that they have also made many aware of the potential power of the people when they know what they want and are themselves prepared to take action to achieve it instead of depending on the right people and the "proper channels"!

Let us be both optimistic and without illusions. The revolution cannot be made in a day; individual gestures and self-sacrifice are not enough; the building of a conscious revolutionary movement is an unremitting task, less spectacular for the most part, than impressive marches and week-end sit-downs, but in which direct action is the culmination and the consolidation of months or years of preparation. These, it seems to us are the inescapable lessons for all who want to live in a peaceful world, whether they seek their inspiration in the experience and wisdom of a Gandhi or of a Malatesta!



'Terrible lot of bomb-throwers, these anarchists!'

THE CP. AGAINST COMMUNISM

"SUCH PROPOSALS ARE PROFOUNDLY ERRONEOUS. TO TAKE SUCH A PATH WOULD MEAN REMOVING THE MATERIAL STIMULUS FOR HIGHER LABOUR PRODUCTIVITY, IT WOULD MEAN HINDERING THE BUILDING OF COMMUNISM".

The above was Mr. Khrushchev's reply to critics of the 22nd Congress Party Programme when they made the proposal that Communism should be speeded up by the introduction of measures which he (Mr. K.) considered to be "tantamount to introducing equal pay for all, irrespective of qualifications or the nature of the work performed". To make himself even clearer, Mr. K. said, a few glasses of water later, "All equalitarian tendencies are contrary to the interests of the development of production and the raising of living standards and are contrary to the education of the working people in the spirit of a Communist attitude to work."

Now we all know that Communism (as distinct from the present system which they refer to as Socialism) is planned to be put into practice in Russia when their Socialist planned production has created such an abundance that the reasonable needs of the people can be met in full. It seems to follow, from this, and the foregoing statements, that the Russian people require differential material incentives to make them work for the day when, because of an abundance of everything, there will be no in-

centive to work. In which case it seems that they probably won't!

Quite obviously, if and when Communism happens it will still be necessary for some large amount of production to be carried on. In other words people will still have to work to some large extent. So that if there are to be no differentials to bribe them into work, it will be necessary for the people to be re-educated into working without the accustomed bait. Where, along the line, is this revolutionary change in the Russian mind to take place? Are the people to be subjected to mass brainwashing? (And who is going to do the brainwashing? Which of the Russian people are fit to do the job, apart from those critics who were put in their place by Nikita?) Or will Mr. K. have to step down in twenty years time for a new leader to denounce his errors and proclaim the rightness of equalitarianism?

It would be interesting to know what is in Nikita's mind, for he recognises the presence of "anti-social elements" in Russia who "acquire incomes from sources other than labour and live a parasitic existence"—in fact they concern him so much that he recommended their suppression by "the full force of Soviet laws and of public opinion". We don't know the extent of these anti-social elements he spoke of any more than we know the numbers of Russians who were critical of the Party Programme, but it is pretty safe to guess that if the most educated Russians, in particular those belonging to the Party, are not capable of working without differential incentives the rest may not be so high-minded either.

Make no mistake, if Communism is to come to Russia its people will have to be high-minded (i.e., sensible). An abundance won't miraculously change differential-conscious people into angels. One would naturally expect the lead in this new mode of living to come from the top—the Party officials; the top-ranking Service chiefs; chief scientists; etc.; but it would seem that there is no rush on the part of these supposedly educated (and therefore enlightened)

Russians to reject their relatively high rewards.

Will Communism come to Russia? Apart from the possibility of a nuclear war, which cannot be entirely discounted, it could be that it will come IN SPITE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY. This is by no means certain, or even probable. Christianity has not come to Britain after more than a thousand years in spite of the Church. There is, surely, some sort of parallel here: the Central Committee and the Party members are to the Russian people as the Church and the schools are to the British—each preaches the Word and practises ways of getting round it. But perhaps the Marxist approach has a greater chance of success.

The ghastly failure of Christianity may in large part be due to its content of magic. The display of the bodies of Lenin and Stalin may be somewhat off-colour, rationalwise, but Russian children are spared the crucified god-man; Marxist-Leninist theory, based, as it is, solely upon economic considerations, may be sadly deficient, but it does not call upon trinitities and virgin births to impress or befog the students' minds. Perhaps the Communist Manifesto will get through where the Sermon-on-the-Mount failed.

But, if it does, will it not be in spite of the Communist Party? Before anyone dismisses such an idea it should be remembered how Khrushchev denounced some of Stalin's purges as being completely against the interests of the Party. (Not that we can take too much notice of Mr. K.'s utterances: he is just another politician in spite of some obvious outward differences when compared with the ones we turn out from Eton and Harrow. At the very beginning of his speech to the Congress he claimed: "All Soviet people say: 'This is our programme, it is in line with our hopes and aspiration'" —a stupid, unnecessary piece of exaggeration to which he himself gave the lie many times later on in his speech when referring to the Party's critics, the anti-social elements and the parasites). It could be said that the present state of affairs in the Soviet has been reached in spite of Stalin! E.F.C.

Why are we Anarchists?

—Why are we anarchists?

—Because we want to be free to run our own lives.

—Then multi-millionaires like Onassis, Clore, Getty and Ellerman are also anarchists?

In a sense they are. The difference is that anarchists want a society in which *all* are free to live their own lives. The people you named, and many others besides, believe in freedom for a privileged minority only. And in our opinion one cannot be free in a society based on privilege.

—So you believe in equality. But isn't it obvious that human beings just aren't equal?

—We believe that everyone should have equal rights—material and social—to develop their personalities and to satisfy their desires. Only in this way can each person be himself, an equal among unequals, if you like!

—But supposing I desire power and great wealth, who would prevent me from acquiring these in an anarchist society?

—Have you ever asked yourself why millions of people accept to be employed by others in spite of being aware of the fact that what their employer pays them is only a part of the product of their labour? Or why people accept to pay rent to a landlord throughout their lives?

—If they had the intelligence and the initiative, and the "guts" they would be able to become their own bosses and own their own houses, wouldn't they?

Some do, we agree. But assume for a moment that we are all equally intelligent, that we all have an equal share of initiative and "guts"; we should all get to the top. But in a capitalist system this is not possible; you cannot have "top people" without there being many more at the "bottom"; you cannot have everybody living off the fat of the land for who would be left to work the land? So a privileged society irrespective of the mental capacities, the cunning and the ruthlessness of its members, can only permit a limited number of people to enjoy the privileged status. Would you agree?

—I suppose so, but is there anything wrong with such a system? After all it's just part of the natural order, the survival of the fittest. Why shouldn't brains, genius, hard work, perseverance and all those kinds of things be recognised and be rewarded accordingly? Why drag everybody down to the lowest common denominator?

—The trouble with all these "scientific" arguments is that they are about as scientific as all the stories of the bees and the birds are relevant to sex education for the young! It is surely quite obvious that whatever truth there may be in

Continued on page 3

COMMITTEE OF 100—
INDUSTRIAL SUB-COMMITTEE
PUBLIC MEETING
INDUSTRIAL ACTION AND
THE BOMB

Tuesday, 1st May, 8.0 p.m.
Anson Hall, Chichele Road, N.W.2
(nearest Tube: Willesden Green)

Speakers: Pat Arrowsmith (Merseyside CND T.U. organiser)
Alan Sillitoe
Jimmy Jewers, TGWU, Secretary
Docks Committee of 100
Karl Dunbar, AEU, Engineers' Group, Committee of 100

Chairman: Bill Christopher, NATSOPA.

ANARCHY is Published by
Freedom Press at 1/6
on the last Saturday of every month.
ORDER YOUR COPY NOW!

Lawrence on Obscenity

THE failure of the attempt to ban *Lady Chatterley's Lover* eighteen months ago seems to have given a new boost to the Lawrence cult. As well as *Lady Chatterley's Lover* itself (with an excellent introduction by Richard Hoggart in the third impression), Penguin Books have published Harry Moore's biography *The Intelligent Heart* and C. H. Rolph's account of *The Trial of Lady Chatterley*. Henemann quickly jumped on to the bandwagon with a hardback edition of *Lady Chatterley's Lover* and a re-issue of the posthumous collection of essays and articles, *Phoenix*. Now we have a new edition of Lawrence's letters to replace Aldous Huxley's thirty-year-old edition (though it fortunately includes Huxley's classic introduction), and Penguin Books has published "A PROPOS OF LADY CHATTERLEY'S LOVER" & OTHER ESSAYS (2/6d.). This contains Lawrence's own defence of his last novel, Mark Schorer's introduction to the American edition of 1959 (the edition which successfully broke the ban for the first time), as well as Lawrence's introductions to his exhibition of

paintings and his short poems called *Pansies*, and his important essay *Pornography & Obscenity*.

This little book is a welcome addition to the Penguin series of Lawrence's works, but it isn't quite satisfactory. Anyone who is likely to buy it is likely to have the Penguin *Selected Essays* already, and the introduction to Lawrence's paintings appears in both books, which is rather wasteful. What this new book could have been was a good substitute for *Sex, Literature & Censorship*, the collection of Lawrence's essays on these subjects made by Harry Moore in 1953. Of the eleven essays there, five are in *Selected Essays*, so the obvious course would have been to put the other six here; instead only three of them have been included, as well as the one that now appears in two Penguin books. It would have been better to leave out the introduction to his paintings and put in *The Novel, Love was once a Little Boy* and *Making Love to Music*. It would also have been better to put in one of the two other essays in *Sex, Literature & Censorship*—Harry Moore's *D. H. Lawrence & the "Censor-Morons"* or H. F. Rubinstein's *The Law versus D. H. Lawrence*—to see just why Lawrence was so angry.

But let's look at what we have. Mark Schorer's introduction is an excellent account of the background of *Lady Chatterley's Lover* and an intelligent commentary on the actual novel, which he sees as a "great symbol" or picture—"In the background of this picture black machinery looms cruelly against darkening sky; in the foreground, hemmed in yet separate, stands a green wood; in the wood, two naked human beings dance." One day it might be a good idea to collect all the best essays on this strange novel in one volume, and Schorer would certainly deserve a place there, alongside Hoggart and Moore and Leavis and Hough and all the rest. So, of course, would Lawrence himself. *A Propos of Lady Chatterley's Lover* (1930), which is an enlarged version of *My Skirmish with Jolly Roger* (his introduction to the authorised unexpurgated Paris edition of 1926), is certainly one of the most remarkable essays written by an author in defence of his work. It begins as a defence of the novel, but Lawrence soon changes his ground and goes over onto the offensive. "This is the real point of this book," he said. "I want men and women to be able to think sex, fully, completely, honestly, and cleanly." But to do so they had to be shocked out of their habits and tabus; hence the famous words, and the thirteen "bouts", and everything that frightened the censors less than two years ago—and has now been absorbed by millions of ordinary English people, wives and servants and even game-keepers, without any sign of the corruption and depravity we were promised.

It is no longer necessary to point out

that Lawrence was a puritan. This essay shows how deeply puritanical he was. He loathed prudery, but he loathed promiscuity just as much; he refused either to shrink from sex or to play with it. He was horrified by the sexual attitudes and behaviour of his contemporaries, and was convinced that they needed "blood-sex" expressed in "phallic marriage", as described in *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. "I can't see any hope of regeneration for a sexless England," he remarked, "for the bridge to the future is the phallus, and there's the end of it." As a girl commented to me, it would be more sensible to say that the tunnel to the future is the cunt. But Lawrence wasn't sensible; hence his brilliance and his absurdity. Like *Lady Chatterley's Lover* itself, *A Propos of Lady Chatterley's Lover* fails not because it is immoral but because it is far too moral.—Lawrence never pauses to consider whether other people might have solved the problems of sex for themselves or whether his own solution might be quite unsuitable for those who haven't. Even so, the novel should be real, and so should the essay.

On the other hand, the introductions to his paintings and to his *Pansies* scarcely seem worth preserving. These two essays, both written in 1929 under the shadow of the censors who had prosecuted his paintings and threatened to prosecute his poems too (several had to be omitted from the English edition), show sad signs of stridency and strain. The former begins by explaining the modern "horror of sexual life" as a

result of the "great shock of syphilis", and goes on to a long critique of Cézanne—ending with the hope that "the English may be born again, pictorially," and the implication that this renaissance will be led by Lawrence himself. Unfortunately he was a rather bad painter. The latter essay is simply a squib which fires off the usual crack at the fear of obscene words and ideas. At the end of his life Lawrence seems to have believed that nearly everyone was against him in this struggle, and at the end of this essay he says: "We shall have to fight the mob, in order to keep sane, and to keep society sane." In fact I should have thought that surprisingly many people are pretty sane about sex; war is a different matter, and so is political activity in general, and here indeed we have to fight the mob and the mob's leaders.

Pornography & Obscenity (1929) is a very different matter, for although Lawrence's attitude is the same he has taken the trouble to write a properly worked-out expression of it instead of just throwing out a string of insults and slogans. This essay was intended to be an answer to a defence of censorship by Lawrence's chief official enemy, Sir William Joynson-Hicks (later Lord Brentford), the zealous Home Secretary who was known as "Jix" and is now known as the idiot who banned *The Well of Loneliness* and *Lady Chatterley's Lover*—but I doubt if anyone ever reads the occasion of Lawrence's wrath any more. This is one of his best essays, and that should be enough for most of us. It is also full of some of his best remarks—"What is pornography to one man is the laughter of genius to another"; "If a woman hasn't got a tiny streak of harlot in her, she's a dry stick as a rule"; "The law is a dreary thing, and its judgements have nothing to do with life"; "The mob is always obscene, because it is always second-hand"; "No matter how hard we may pretend otherwise, most of us rather like a moderate rousing of our

sex"; "No other civilisation has driven sex into the underworld, and nudity to the w.c."

Lawrence attacked pornography as well as censorship, for they both see sex as a "dirty little secret". He poured ridicule on the censorship of literary obscenity—"but even I would censor genuine pornography, rigorously." Genuine pornography was "the attempt to insult sex, to do dirt on it," and it was easily distinguishable from genuine literature, however obscene. Its effect was to stimulate not fornication, as the censors and pornographers both claim, but masturbation—"the most dangerous sexual vice". Thus Lawrence saw obscenity as a shared and pornography as a solitary pleasure, one warming its hands before the fire of life and the other choking in its smoke, and he expressed himself as powerfully against the latter as for the former. Here I think he lost his balance (as usual). The distinction between literary obscenity in general and pornography in particular is surely that pornography is simply mass obscenity, mass produced and commercially packaged and merchandised for people who want sex in the head but lack the cultural sophistication needed to appreciate Aristophanes or Boccaccio (or Henry Miller or D. H. Lawrence). The same pattern may be seen in popular music, films or television; the distinction is not so much moral as economic, not so much Freudian as Marxist. The interesting thing is that articulate people only object to literary censorship when it obstructs articulate obscenity, and seldom when it censors genuine pornography, rigorously. Like Lawrence, they are never depraved or corrupted—it's always the other fellow, and the other fellow never knows how to protect himself, except by the furtive secrecy of the dirty books business. This leads me to two other recent books on the subject, which I hope to discuss in a later issue of FREEDOM.

N.W.

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

Hanging in the Balance
Leslie Hale 18/-
Africa Today—and Tomorrow
John Hatch 30/-
The Golden Notebook
Doris Lessing 30/-
I Renounce War: the Story of the P.P.U.
Sybil Morrison 8/6

REPRINTS AND CHEAP EDITIONS

Souls of Black Folk
W. E. Du Bois 4/-
The Economic History of World Population
C. Cipolla 3/6
Salammbô
Gustav Flaubert 3/6
Tales
E. T. A. Hoffman 3/6
Blood and Water
(Looking in, Looking Out)
Charles Humana 3/6
Dangerous Acquaintances
C. De Laclôs 5/-
The Brigadier and Other Stories
Ivan Turgenev 2/6

SECOND-HAND

A Guide through World Chaos (1933)
G. D. H. Cole 6/-
Challenge of Conscience
Denis Hayes 6/-
Joseph Stalin:
A Political Biography (1949) 3/-
Mr. Britling Sees It Through and The Days of the Comet
H. G. Wells 3/6
What is Mutualism?
Clarence L. Swartz 3/-
The English Sunday
R. C. Churchill 3/-
Sons and Lovers
D. H. Lawrence 2/6
Dubrovsky
A. S. Pushkin 2/6
The Viking Portable
Dorothy Parker (damaged) 3/-
The French Revolution
(Encyclopaedia Britannica) 2/6
Mornings in Florence
John Ruskin 2/6
Money Mut Go!
Philoren 2/6
Marxism and History
John S. Clarke 2/6
I Chose Freedom
V. Kravchenko (paper-back) 2/6
Revolution in Art (1910)
Frank Rutter (damaged) 2/6
George Washington Carver
Rackham Holt 2/6
The Chus Reach Haven
Pai Wei 2/6
A Primer of Evolution
Edward Clodd 2/6

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

OLYMPIAN GRATIFICATION

AFTER a false start the promised review *Olympia** slid silently onto the counters of the liberal, the avant garde and the off beat bookshops. Silently for it was accompanied by no advanced publicity, only a sour note or two in the gossip columns of one or two middle-brow newspapers and when the first number appeared it was damned with silence and the rare notices condemned it for failing to live up to the promised eroticism that many a reviewer had expected. That the publishers to a large extent were to blame for this attitude is to be accepted for the *Olympia* Press has a long record of censorship battles and a catalogue list of titles that have seen battle in most of the courtrooms of the Free World and it was hinted that here

**Olympia*, a monthly review from Paris. Published by *Olympia Press*, 7, Rue Saint-Séverin, Paris 5. Price 7s. 6d.

'I RENOUNCE WAR'

ANARCHISTS today frequently pour scorn on the Peace Pledge Union as a moribund organisation having no contact with the realities of today.

It is however, a body of individuals gathered together on the basis of a personal pledge to refuse to participate in war, which involves the anarchist virtues of personal responsibility, disobedience and opposition to the state.

In reading this brief account of the first twenty-five years or so of the movement,* one of the striking features is the similarity between the spirit behind the P.P.U. when it got started in the late thirties, and the anti-nuclear movement of today.

They share the element of individual participation exposing the supporters to abuse and imprisonment, they attract the attentions of secret police and during the war prosecutions for sedition, bans on leafleting and difficulties in distributing their press.

The organisation of the P.P.U. was informal, and it fitted the description which Nicolas Walter has given of the nuclear disarmament movement, that no-one who thinks, thinks the slogan itself is enough, but no two people seem to agree on anything more.

**I Renounce War*, by Sybil Morrison, Sheppard Press. Paper 5s. Cloth 8s. 6d.

Like today's movement, it included members of many political and religious groups; for some of its supporters pacifism was the keystone of their social outlook, others were pacifists because they were something else.

Sybil Morrison, who belongs to the pacifism first school, and who has devoted many years to serving the movement, has written an enjoyable account of the personalities and events of the P.P.U.'s history, without attempting to evaluate the clashes of ideas which appear to be very relevant to anti-war movements today.

We are however, given a glimpse of the way the movement felt the strain whenever it threatened to take a firm line on a specific point, the differences of opinion over taking legal action against libellers, the heart searching as to whether to withdraw a poster which had brought about a prosecution.

The discussion of the issues at that trial is the main point at which the author's own views obtrude obviously. She stresses that the P.P.U. did not try to weaken the Armed Forces, or persuade young men not to join the army. Surely that is a very difficult interpretation of the Union based on its Pledge, and one which would not be accepted by all its members.

was a magazine that was prepared to defy the censors of Britain and America by printing in English and publishing in France work unfit, according to the State, for the adult minded Anglo-Saxons.

But it was published and now it stands in neat piles upon the counters for those who have three half-crowns to spend. With the poverty of the magazine field at the moment it is a welcome addition and to judge from the first number, though expensive, worthy of your coin, even if only as an antidote to the "London Magazine" and "Encounter" for the donnish pages of Leavis and the explorations into the dungy mausoleum of Lawrencian literature are beginning to bore at least one reader.

Sanche de Gramont covers the Paris scene including an account of Dali's censored interview for French television in which Dali stated how he "wanted to sleep" with Garcia Lorca "but it could never be" and his essay into masturbation when "I always wore the costume of Louis II of Bavaria, the only adequate uniform for this type of exercise" and an intriguing item of how the French government housed students in the closed brothels with the owners acting as house masters but due to the boisterous behaviour of the students were forced to turn them in their turn out onto the cold hard stones in the wake of the State evicted whores.

There are ten episodes from William Burroughs' "The Soft Machine" that fail to give the true flavour of this American's writings for at his best Burroughs is among the finest, if the least known, of contemporary American authors and a suppressed chapter from an earlier version of J. P. Donleavy's "The Ginger Man". Professor Henry Crannach gives with a three page article on "Chastity Belts: A mystification?" illustrated with three photographs and four pages of line drawings, referred to as "the documents", from the collections of Akbar del Piombo, the author of "Fuzz against Junk" giving twenty-three variations of man's selfishness towards his fellow men ranging from the Renaissance, the Rococo, the Baroque to the Bolognese and including the "Gay deceiver" the "Singapore Strangler" and the "Wind-jammer". It was the use of the plural when describing del Piombo's collections that makes me feel that Akbar is a boy worth cultivating when the winter nights again draw in. Some light verse of Lawrence Durrell's leads onto an article by Ann Federman pleading the case for

P.H.

ARTHUR MOYSE.

FREEDOM

April 21 1962 Vol 23 No 13

WHY ARE WE ANARCHISTS?

Continued from page 1

the argument as applied to nature it has no application to the man-made society in which we live. All other things being equal, the law of the society we live in is not "survival of the fittest" but of the "richest".

—But that is just a play on words: the richest are the fittest; they have the means to provide the necessities in times of shortage. Only the other day in Berwick market I saw a woman buying french beans at ten shillings a pound. Suppose french beans were a matter of life and death, that woman could outbid you and me every time, and survive. We who could not afford them would go under.

—But don't you see that in the circumstances the stallholder would himself have eaten the beans, assuming that the wholesaler hadn't done so before him, and assuming that the grower seeing how things were going had sold them to him rather than literally salting them away for an emergency! In other words, if it is a question of survival it is the producer who is best situated to survive. Yet, it is the producer, whether he be a farm worker, a factory or building worker who today forms the economically underprivileged majority of society.

—I agree with you up to a point. But my point is that there are a lot of people who can do the unskilled, the donkey work, only a few who have the intelligence to become scientists, doctors, engineers, technicians, production managers and architects. Face up to it: every week in the Sunday Times, Observer, in the Guardian, Telegraph and Times there are pages of advertisements for specialists, though in the unskilled jobs there are more hands than jobs.

—Not only do we agree with you; with practise, we imagine, that even a Cotton or a Clore could learn to dig his own garden! But what is the relevance, in terms of privilege, of this argument of the many and the few? Even assuming that only a very few of us have the biological capacities to become first-rate technicians, production managers or architects, and that the majority of us are no more than sound, conscientious, executors—that is, we carry out the work. Far from protesting at the injustice of the Creator (assuming we could explain him rationally!) it would be, for us, an argument in favour of the Plan (with the spiritual capital P)! For planning apart, agreed that only a few of us can be Beethovens or Einsteins, Corbusiers and Lloyd Wrights, production managers and technicians (sorry, the names escape us—we can only think of more important people like Mr. Chambers and the financial Siamese twins "Clotten"), where would mankind be today if we all aspired to be planners, "specialist" boys and girls?

—I agree, but you have not answered my question by asking another!

—You do not think so because you blindly accept the man-made "law" of supply and demand. This is a "law" invented by the operators of the capitalist system.

—I don't follow you.

Jumble Sale

Jumble Sale will now be held (positively) on May 5th at 17a Maxwell Road, S.W.6 at 2.30. Please leave Jumble at Maxwell Road or phone REN 3736 and we may be able to collect.

as it is to goods and commodities. —But workers themselves insist on the maintenance of a scale of payments which differentiates between the skilled and the unskilled, between different categories of employment. Surely these are healthy incentives for "getting on"?

—To our minds, so long as workers insist on maintaining social and economic differentials they will never be able to unite effectively to rid themselves of the common yoke of dependence. And unfortunately the capitalist class will make no attempt to dispense with differentials; on the contrary, it is they who have created them in order to weaken the resistance of the working class. How else can a ruling minority retain its power? "Divide and rule" is not a tactic limited to Imperial occupation in the bad old days of colonialism. It manifests itself in all unequal societies, whatever their state of general "affluence"; indeed it is the basis of authoritarian rule in the smallest of groups, not least the authoritarian family!

To believe, as you obviously seem to, that a sort of tooth-and-claw competition is an incentive, can be disproved by just a moment's reflection. Suppose you are working on a job with another man who you know is being paid more than you, but who could not carry out his job if you were not doing yours. Would you dismiss any resentment you might feel by saying to yourself that each of you was being paid the "rate for the job"? Would you work as efficiently as if you had been treated as an equal with him? and don't you see that the moment you start thinking this way you not only question the differentials between you and your workmate, but between you and everybody else earning more than you in the firm. Co-operation and not competition is the most efficient form of work. And free co-operation is only possible among equals.

—But somebody has got to give the orders!

—If by this you mean that where many people are engaged on a job there must be organisation, we would agree. But supposing one man is what they call a "born organiser": why should he by reason of his particular "gift", enjoy privileged status or better conditions? He can only use his gifts so long as there are people who carry out the work; without them where would he be? They, on the other hand, could manage, less effi-

ciently perhaps, but they could manage without him. But let us return to our main argument.

We maintain that in a sensible society—that is one geared to satisfy the material needs and encourage the spiritual development of every human beings—the criterion for doing a job would be that it satisfies an expressed need by our fellows. As such all jobs would be equally worth doing and there could therefore be no rational argument for giving special rewards for certain jobs; and we see no reason for assuming that people would want it otherwise. There is nothing absolute about values. Obviously in a society divided into privileged and underprivileged the worth of an individual is expressed in terms of differentials. In a society in which all have free access to the means of production and enjoy equal rights this would seem ridiculous as well as being impossible to apply.

—The trouble with you anarchists is that you are still living in the 19th century when, I admit, the conditions of the workers were bad, and the rich were disgustingly rich. But today in this country, for instance, all this has been done away with. Taxation has broken up the large family fortunes; wealth is more widely distributed, and every child has the chance of a university education; more than half the students at Oxbridge are there on scholarships, and look at how many of our "top men" come from working class backgrounds.

—Yes, this is an expanded "you've never had it so good" argument, to which the anarchist answer should be "and if we ran our own lives it would be a hundred times better"! Of course conditions have improved—that is for the survivors of two major world wars. (After all you have to take into account the inconveniences, such as war, with the "advantages" of your capitalist society!) But it is not because the employing class has developed a conscience about its workers but because the workers succeeded in realising (in part) that by organising they could demand and obtain improved working conditions.

As to the rosy picture you present of the democratic distribution of wealth, it is clear you didn't read the financial columns of the *Observer* a fortnight ago in which the Economic Editor starts his article with these words "One of the most glaring defects of the British tax system has long been its extreme

kindness to owners of wealth and its extreme harshness to earners of income". And he quotes the very revealing figures that a half of one per cent of the adult population owns 27 per cent of personal wealth, that a further 2 per cent owns 25 per cent. In actual numbers this means that fewer than 200,000 people are between them worth £13,500,000,000 that a further 800,000 own £12,500 millions, and the remaining 39 million people own £24,000 million which is less than what the top million have to play with and with which to run our lives for us.

—Would it in fact change things very much if that money were distributed equally among the 40 million adults? Everyone would receive a thousand pounds or the equivalent in property, or commodities. And I bet you that within five years some would have squandered theirs and others instead would have used theirs to make another £4000!

—Goodness, not that old chestnut again! Look, so long as money is power, so long will man use it to exploit the labour of his fellow beings. We maintain that no individual or group has the moral right to control the wealth and the means of production of a nation for his own ends. That is why we are opposed to the capitalist system, to the nationalisation programme of the socialists, and we are anarchists and believers in revolution because we think that mankind will not be free until the ruling class are expropriated without compensation. This no government will dream of doing. Where "revolutionary governments" have done this they have at the same time sown the seeds for a new ruling class, new privileges and incentives which inevitably lead to inequalities and injustice and to the same denial of freedom which the revolution was meant to destroy.

—So in the end, after all the bloodshed and misery of a revolution the people are back where they were?

—If they make the revolution to destroy State institutions, and the system of privilege and then replace them by another government, of course, in the end, they will be back to where they were (apart from a change of Masters). But for that very reason we are anarchists and not believers in "good governments" or "revolutionary governments." As Byron put it:

"I'd have mankind be free!
As much from mobs as kings—
from you as me."

Hinchliffe at the Unity Theatre

HENRY MAYHEW, a friend of Dickens and Thackeray, a dramatist, the originator and joint editor of *Punch* (1841), was the first modern sociologist (*London Labour and London's Poor*; 1851). Arthur Hinchliffe's *Life of Kaggis*, current at the Unity Theatre, is based on a case unearthed in the course of Mayhew's investigations. It is that of an ex-butler and his motherless family who lived off 'conning' the rich, obtaining charity by assorted devices, in each instance ("my little brother has no shoes; my daughter's virtue is about to be sullied, we are poor but upright, sir," etc.) exploiting Victorian hypocrisy.

Mr. Hinchliffe does not accomplish all he might with so rich, and Brechtian, a theme. It should be funnier and more biting. It could be somewhat tighter in the first act. I'm not certain that it should have had a happy ending. Kaggis, when discovered, talks his way out of going to the treadmill. The poor so seldom win in pitched battle with the rich that it tests one's credulity here.

The play is interspersed with several lyrics, about which I shall say nothing. Further on the debit side was the poor or indifferent acting—with few exceptions: Mr. Frith, the Victorian gentleman (David Hargreaves) who was excellent, Mrs. Frith (Yetta Jacobs) and Kaggis's daughter, Helen (Minnie King) who were very good indeed. However, the chief cause for dismay was the utter lack of direction. Only the aforementioned played with consistency: they

dead-panned beautifully. But over against their straight performances alternated the sometimes farcical, sometimes straight acting of the others. It lost a great deal of its force. There was no unity of approach.

It was Kaggis, himself, who erred most, but it is in his error that one most felt the impact of the play. It was the spirit and verve of his acting that almost—but not quite—carried one through the fluctuations of interpretation. (This leads me to an aside about semi-amateur theatricals; I much prefer them when the play is original and even only fairly good—and this may be considered far better than most.) There is a quality one associates with the small or experimental theatre—the Unity seats 275; its acoustics are divine and it is admirably graded—that is absent from the West End or Broadway. It is not the structure only; it is the attitude of the company, which might best be described as an infectious gusto. This kind of production bears the same relationship to say a West End production of John Osborne's as the latter bears to a TV script. One is living theatre; the other—whether good or bad—is dead. Some kind of fatal slickness sets in.

One must add to the unfortunate and unsuccessful of the whole that one of the characters was carried off to hospital a few hours before the curtain went up; the sets were virtually non-existent (although this certainly helped convey the air of destitution in Kaggis's residence); the decor of the lobby and in-

terior of the theatre itself (about which my energetic American friend accompanying me, complained, suggesting instantaneous scrubbing and whitewash) was excessively dreary. While it is true that the U.S. is overly preoccupied by externals, and that this is conspicuous as much in the decor of little theatres as elsewhere—it still might be desirable to remove the rubble and assorted chaos that form the bomb-site entrance into the Unity Theatre. However, this is minor and remedial. The one serious flaw remains in the direction or lack of it (I see no credits given for a director in my programme notes). This makes it difficult to estimate the genuine merit of the play. If given a satisfactory hearing, I strongly suspect it is very much better than it came off on opening night.

DACHINE RAINER.



"Well, General, if the CND turn to parliamentarism, there's not much danger we shall lose our seat!"

BERTRAND RUSSELL is certainly a very remarkable man. He became a Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, when he was 23 years old, and in a few weeks he will be 90. His first book was published in 1896, and since then he has written nearly one a year; most of them are very good, some are brilliant. He is one of the most famous living Englishmen, distinguishing himself in such fields as mathematical logic, epistemology, the history of philosophy and political thought, popular science, education, atheism, politics, and so on. He comes from a leading Whig family, he inherited an earldom, he belongs to the Order of Merit, and he won a Nobel Prize for Literature; he was the President of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament and is now the President of the Committee of 100. The glory and gaffly of the state—a curious mixture of Socrates and Voltaire.

His great virtues as a thinker have been extreme candour, clarity and eleg-

Russell and the Bomb

ance of expression, and a disconcerting and highly effective gift for sarcasm. His vices have been superficiality, unoriginality, and an unfortunate tendency to over-simplification and over-statement. He should be seen, perhaps, as an old-fashioned rationalist radical, a Utilitarian. He might easily have lived a century and a half ago when deceptively dangerous opinions were fashionable among clever rich men. In our more complicated age he sometimes seems quite out of his depth, in politics at least. On the one hand he can write an admirable analysis of the practice and theory of Bolshevism forty years ago or of the policy of nuclear deterrence today, and on the other he seems to have no inkling at all of the reasons why Bolsheviks and Cold Warriors behave as they do. In abstract discussion or straight description he is unrivalled—no one can explain Einstein's theory of relativity or Hume's theory of knowledge more clearly—but the more concrete his argument becomes, the less convincing it seems. Despite the profound intellectual sophistication of this great thinker, he seems to suffer from a strange emotional naïveté.

During the last few years his chief political preoccupation has been unilateral nuclear disarmament by the British Government as a first step to the prevention of war. (He is, incidentally, one of the Labour Peers in the House of Lords, but it is difficult to believe that his work is much appreciated in Froggall Gardens.) Russell's contribution to the unilateralist movement has been invaluable for a number of reasons, the most important being that he is a very fine and famous old man with charismatic qualities who is, as Pat Pottle said at the Old Bailey, "an inspiration to us all". But his contribution to unilateralist thought has, I think, been far less useful—even harmful. This may seem a rather hard thing to say, and even rather absurd, considering Russell's intellectual stature and reputation, but if anyone doubts it the best thing you can do is to read what he has actually written on the subject. Apart from several articles in all sorts of papers, there is a booklet called *Common Sense & Nuclear Warfare* (1959), another booklet which reiterates the same arguments called *Has Man a Future* (1961), and the last part of a collection of essays called *Fact & Fiction* (1961).

Now *Common Sense & Nuclear Warfare* is full of interesting and illuminat-

ing information about and discussion of the course of the nuclear arms race, the growing probability of disaster if this arms race continues, and the consequent necessity of an end to the arms race and so on. But he begins as follows: "It is surprising and somewhat disappointing that movements aiming at the prevention of nuclear war are regarded throughout the West as left-wing movements." Well, it may be somewhat disappointing, but how on earth can it be surprising to anyone at all? Again: "It is a profound misfortune that the whole question of nuclear warfare has become entangled in the age-old conflicts of power politics." Has become entangled? Surely not—nuclear warfare derives from power politics and can't possibly be disentangled from it, nor should it be. This sort of attitude runs through the whole book. Nuclear war is considered as some extraordinary disease which has attacked human society from outside and can somehow be cured without altering the form of society in more than a few details. This is why Russell can rightly be called irresponsible—because he proposes certain measures without realising how utterly revolutionary they are and without apparently being prepared to answer for what would happen if they were put into effect.

It is important to recognise that Russell isn't a pacifist. "I have never been a complete pacifist and have at no time maintained that all who wage war are to be condemned. I have held the view, which I should have thought was that of common sense, that some wars have been justified and others not." Fair enough. Nor is he an anarchist—indeed all his proposals for British unilateral disarmament and subsequent multilateral disarmament depend on the existence of strong national governments to carry them out and finally on the establishment

of a world government to ensure that they are carried out properly. Fair enough again. But his rejection of pacifism and anarchism leads him into a highly inconsistent position. I am referring not to the fact that he thought America should threaten Russia with atomic war after the defeat of Nazi Germany in order to enforce international agreement about atomic weapons and now of course thinks nothing of the kind—his explanation that he has changed his opinion because circumstances have changed is perfectly acceptable—but to the fact that he would put the responsibility for disarmament in the hands of the very institutions (and people) who already have the responsibility for armament.

This seems to me to be a fatal flaw in Russell's unilateralism. Of course if the rulers of the world were governed by common sense, as he certainly is, they would immediately meet and disarm. In the same way, if the rich of the world were governed by common sense, they would immediately distribute their wealth among their poorer neighbours; and if the scientists of the world, and the writers and workers and all the rest, were governed by common sense, they would join and refuse to support any wars. So what? Everyone knows this, and most people also know that the problem is that very few people in fact are governed by common sense.

One particularly interesting side of Russell's unilateralism is his view of demonstrations organised by the Committee of 100. He sees them as "a form of protest which even the hostile press will notice", and comments that "for a time, Aldermaston marches served this purpose, but they are ceasing to be news," so "the time has come . . . when only large-scale civil disobedience, which should be non-violent, can save populations from the universal death which their governments are preparing for them." What I want to know is how such civil disobedience furthers the cause of world government. It is intended to be a publicity-gimmick, but apparently it is also a way by which people can resist their belligerent government; then isn't it—or something like it—a far more promising way of preventing war by undermining the power of national states than any complicated programme of conferences and compromises leading to the emergence of a supra-national state? Has Russell without realising it lent his name to a movement

whose end is not world government but world anarchism? If so, he would certainly appreciate the irony of the situation. Anyway, I find the last three pages of *Fact & Fiction* more convincing than the whole of his two booklets and indeed all of his unilateralist propaganda written before the formation of the Committee of 100, and I have a feeling that he does too.

So I think the proper reaction to Russell (or Tolstoy or Gandhi or anyone of that kind) is to pay more attention to his manner of thinking than to the matter of his thought. The actual details of his proposals aren't nearly as important as his dedication to the central issue and his determination to tell the truth. Some people see his work for the Committee of 100 as a symptom of senile decay. Although I disagree with much of what he says, I see this work as the culmination of his long and magnificent career, as his finest hour. I hope I have half his courage and integrity at half his age.

N.W.

Anarchy on the Air

With the current spate of by-elections, speculation is rife once more as to which party will win the next General Election. What would it be like not to have a government at all? To most people the alternative could only be "anarchy"—a subject which comes under close scrutiny in the programme "What's the Idea?—Anarchism", to be broadcast in the Home Service in Friday, April 27th, at 7.30 p.m.

Defending Anarchism will be Colin Ward, a 37-year-old London architect and editor of the monthly journal *ANARCHY*. On the attack, with such questions as "What makes a man an anarchist?" and "What does anarchism have to offer to-day?" will be Anthony Howard of *The New Statesman* and Norman St. John Stevas of *The Economist*.—B.B.C. Press Service.

FREEDOM PRESS PUBLICATIONS

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 5/6 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/-

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

HERBERT READ
Poetry and Anarchism cloth 5/-

TONY GIBSON
Youth for Freedom 2/-
Who will do the Dirty Work? 2d.
Food Production & Population 6d.

E. A. GUTKIND
The Expanding Environment (illustrated) boards 8/6

PETER KROPOTKIN
The State: Its Historic Role 1/-
The Wage System 3d.
Revolutionary Government 3d.
Organised Vengeance Called Justice 2d.

Marie-Louise Berneri Memorial Committee publications:
Marie-Louise Berneri, 1918-1949: A tribute cloth 5/-
Journey Through Utopia cloth 16/- paper 7/6



'What was that you said about atomic piles?'

PUTTING THE SPORTSMANSHIP INTO SPORT

WHEN the New Zealand Rugby Union decided to exclude Maori players from its 1960 tour of South Africa in deference to racism, a movement of protest quickly swung into action, collecting over 150,000 signatures to its petition. But the NZRU was not to be thwarted, and the tour went ahead with all-white All Blacks (see "On With the Game", *FREEDOM*, 23 April, 1960).

In retrospect, though, the protest against racism seems to have changed the outlook of the rugby bosses for the better, for they have just announced that the next All Blacks will be fully representative:

"The South African Rugby Board", said Mr. Hogg, chairman of the New Zealand Rugby Council, "has been informed of the New Zealand Rugby Union's intention that the next All Black team to visit South Africa shall be fully representative in every sense. This is the same as saying that Maoris, if they are good enough will be chosen.

"The South African board has raised no objection to this policy, which has also been communicated to the International Rugby Board.

"It is our desire still to maintain relations in Rugby with South Africa but we are committed to our policy."

Mr. Hogg was commenting on a statement by the South African Minister of the Interior that South Africa could not allow mixed white and non-white sporting teams from overseas into the republic, or allow mixed South African teams to compete in international sport.

This heartening decision is at least partly to the credit of all those who protested back in 1959 and 1960, but other events, too, have forced the Rugby Union's hand. The withdrawal of South Africa from the Commonwealth is, I think, one. Another is the increased attention now being paid to problems of Maori-Pakeha relations, exemplified, for instance, in the Maori Educational Foun-

ation. This was set up quite recently for the purpose of providing funds for scholarships and bursaries for Maori children, thus countering the trend for them to leave school early and take unskilled jobs. Should this trend continue, and the Foundation may, of course be unable to halt it, then we could certainly have a nasty race problem on our hands

in the next decade or two.

Thus the Rugby Union's decision does not merely reflect the concern many people are feeling for race relations, but heartens all who covet a society based on race equality.

As a sort of postscript to the above, I might mention two reports from this morning's paper. The New Zealand Golf Council, in approving South Africa's participation in the international teams' golf tournament in Australia in November of next year, has stated that when it is South Africa's turn to act as host country New Zealand should send its best team, irrespective of colour. Maybe the Rugby Union's decision was a stimulus to the Golf Council.

The other report reveals the kind of attitude which must be eroded away if race equality is ever to be achieved. Mr. E. Waddington, a member of the Gisborne Housing Allocation Committee, has claimed that State houses should only rarely be granted to Maori farm workers' families migrating into Gisborne. Maoris should be encouraged to stay on the land, where their labour is "all-important", instead of moving to the city where employment is short. Allocations of houses, it seems, should be used as a means for "curbing" the urban drift.

Now Mr. Waddington, as it happens, is also chairman of a sheep-farming company in the area. A coincidence?

Perhaps it would be unfair to condemn him, and others like him, as consciously racist, but it is easy to see the direction in which point all attempts to keep the unskilled and poorly educated members of one race on the land. Economic balance might be the justification, but a racially stratified society is the end result.

The prejudice of the racists, and the vested interest of the Mr. Waddingtons, are powerful forces to contend with, yet they must both be fought. The alternative is clear.

K.J.M.

DEFICIT FUND

FINANCIAL STATEMENT AT APRIL 14th 1962

Week 15		
EXPENSES: 15 weeks at £70		£1,050
INCOME:		
Sales & Subs. Renewals	£	£
Weeks 1-14	732	
Week 15	28	
		760
New Subscriptions:		
Weeks 1-14 (99)	112	
Week 15 (5)	6	
		118
		£878
		DEFICIT £172

DEFICIT FUND

Leeds: G.L. 2/6; Oxford: Anon.* 5/-;
Peterborough: F.W. 2/6; Glasgow: J.H.* 2/6;
Wolverhampton: J.G.L.* 3/-; Wolverhampton: J.K.W.* 2/-; Southend: P.O.* 5/-;
Hounslow: L.* 2/6; London: C.S. £5; Parma Hts.: H.P. £1/4/6; Glasgow: J.S.A. 4/-;
Shoreham: M. & D.* 2/6; Newcastle: H.B. 5/3; Victoria, B.C.: B.E. 13/-; London: S.F. 3/-;
London: J.R. 10/-; Bletchley: R.S. 5/-;
Youngstown: G.S. £5/5/-
TOTAL 14 17 3
Previously acknowledged 508 6 5
1961 TOTAL TO DATE £523 3 8

*Denotes regular contributor.