'In . . . all matters, whenever politicians attempt great good, they invariably inflict great harm.' -BUCKLE.

In this Issue:

SECRET DEPORTATIONS IN AUSTRALIA ANARCHISM BROADCAST-3 CONFOUND THEIR POLITICS CORRESPONDENCE

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY - 4d.

MAY 19 1962 Vol 23 No 16

Secret Deportations Australia

DROGRESSIVE opinion has gained a significant victory this week with the announcement that 3 Portuguese sailors and 2 Malayans ordered to be deported some months ago are now to remain in Australia. All 5 men would have been forcibly returned to their country of origin had they not evaded arrest and sought the protection of a sympathetic public.

This does not mean that the Government has abandoned its racialism or plans to change the White Australia Policy: a few days before the announcement the Court ruled that the deportation of the 3 Portuguese sailors was legally valid.

The Government has merely acknowledged the pressure of public opinion for these particular men. In reality they have now resorted to secret deportations.

Only a few weeks ago the public learned that a Chinese deserter from Communism, Mr. W. Wong, had been seized at his place of employment, and handed back to Communist guards as an illegal immigrant, at the Hong Kong-China border in April.

This Eichmann-like operation was revealed when 2 Right-Wing Parliamentarians attempted to use the incident for

political ends. One of them, Sir Wilfred Kent-Hughes had known about the deportation but planned to prevent it at the eleventh hour when the man reached Hong Kong. This was no humanitarian gesture. He does not oppose the White Australia Policy. Sir Wilfred merely insisted that Wong should be sent to Formosa as the Australian Government does not recognise the Peking régime!!

The Minister for Immigration, Mr. A. Downer, was thus forced to send a cable -which arrived too late-requesting that Wong be held at Hong Kong. The two "rebels" then informed the public regarding the affair and stated that they believed that at least 8 or 9 other unknown Chinese deserters had been returned in this way. Their fate is not known. The Government refused to reveal their names.

Events have shown that a considerable proportion of the population are now prepared to defy the Government and break the racialist laws imposed by both the Labour and Liberal politicians.

They have now seen racialism in action. A.A.G.

ANARCHY 16 (OUT NEXT WEEK)

WILL BE ON **AFRICA**

ANARCHY 15 discusses THE WORK OF DAVID WILLS

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

IF we wanted to we could fill this issue of Freedom with reports of unrest in every part of the world. In this country strike action was threatened (officially!) by the dock workers, engineering workers, airline maintenance workers and among the nurses, not to mention the unrest in almost every other industry or service. But in all countries "affluent" or "underdeveloped" this pattern of unrest and dissatisfaction with their lot is growing among the working masses. Add to the economic unrest the political agitation: the States of South America always in ferment, now it is Venezuela and Argentina. Cuba and the Caribbean live on a political volcano. The United States has its problems of overproduction and of employment and racialism; France has Algeria and de Gaulle, Italy "prosperity" and Sicily; Franco after more than 20 years in power and American dollars to bolster him, is faced with widespread strikes in his industrial areas (is this an indication of the falangists challenging

Unrest Everywhere

his rule as well as a growing unrest Press, in Ghana about detentions of workers who can no longer live without trial, in South Africa there's where the cost of living rises faster national Labour Organisation in than their wages, and where the rich grow richer?); in nearby Portugal, police fired on anti-Government demonstrators last week; in Algeria more Moslems are being killed each day since the cease fire than when France was at war with them; Africa is seething and starving; Yugoslavia is in economic troubles and Tito has personally waved the big stick of new measures to control trade, prices and wages; in the Saar, 45,000 miners were on strike last week for pay increases—there has been no major strike in this area since 1923 -in spite of West German "prosperity". And when the crisis is not economic it's something else. In Ceylon there's trouble about the

seven of France's former West African colonies.

We are not suggesting that the unrest is of a revolutionary nature. What we are pointing out is that unrest is not a phenomenon of the "backward", hungry countries. It is general. There are more working days lost through strikes in the affluent countries than in the backward ones. They can afford to, someone will say. That is probably true, but it also confirms our view that the affluent society if anything increases the demands workers make on the employers and does not, as some maintain make them into subservient yes-men. We believe, fur-

ther, that thinking workers will not only demand a larger share of the on starvation wages in a country a case of heresy; and the Inter- cake, they will demand to enjoy, or control all the cake of production Geneva points to "forced labour" in as well as having equal rights with all their fellow citizens. Thinking workers, however much their boss pays them, want something more than money in return for their labour, they want the time to live a full and free life. We have no fear that workers in the affluent society will become less revolutionary than when they were faced with unemployment and low wages. As a matter of fact we hadn't noticed that they were revolutionary in the bad old days! What we have noticed, however, is that there are many potential revolutionaries among the "middle class", etc. . . . supporters of the Committee of 100. It makes you think, doesn't it?

Myths and Reality

lems, from our point of view, of mass communications is not so much that it conditions people to

prefer Omo to Daz, or vice versa, and to desire gadgets and useless things to which they would otherwise not have given a moment's thought, but that all kinds of myths, lies and unfounded statements, by continuous repetition become accepted as absolute truths without the majority of people ever bothering to question the bases of these "truths". For mass communications, by creating the myth that everything in the modern world is so complex that it is beyond the grasp of we ordinary mortals, has paved the way for a privileged class of "experts" whose word is gospel, whose opinions are presented as facts, and whose facts no one, who does not want to look a fool in public, would dare to question! Indeed only the experts themselves have a chance of questioning in public the facts of their fellow-experts. Incidentally we find it strange that very few people seem to learn a lesson from the disagreements between "experts". Think of two outstanding "experts" of our time, on the Origins of Man: The Pope and Prof. Julian Huxley. For millions the Pope is without question right in all he says, otherwise he would not occupy the exalted place in God's church that he does; similarly for other millions, who believe in the infallibility of Science, Dr. Huxley's scientific approach, and his eminence in the world of science stamp his utterances with the seal of truth. We believe both the attitudes we have described are equally "dogmatic". After all, the school of thought of which the pope is an eminence includes other eminences, and there is still no unanimity among them as to the facts, let alone the interpretations of the facts!

Similarly among the men of science.

Perhaps through no fault of their

own, though we think publicist-

scientists must accept their share of

the responsibility, mass communica-

tions serves up what are in reality

ONE of the really serious prob- hypotheses as facts, and scientific to getting always closer to the truth facts as truths.

> We think the anarchist approach to these questions was clearly and succinctly expressed by Malatesta when he wrote:

I do not believe in the infallibility of Science, neither in its ability to explain everything nor in its mission of regulating the conduct of Man, just as I do not believe in the infallibility of the Pope, in revealed Morality and the divine origins of the Holy Scriptures.

I only believe those things which can be proved; but I know full-well that proofs are relative and can, and are in fact, continually being superseded and cancelled out by other proved facts; and therefore I believe that doubt should be the mental approach of all who aspire

or at least to that much of truth that it is possible to establish. . . .

To the will to believe, which cannot be other than the desire to invalidate one's own reason, I oppose the will to know, which leaves the immense field of research and discovery open to us. As I have already stated, I admit only that which can be proved in a way that satisfies my reason—and I admit it only provisionally, relatively, always in the expectation of new truths which are more true than those so far discovered No faith then, in the religious sense of the word.*

THERE is, to our mind, the danger that the development of the social sciences and the knowledge

that Man is acquiring of himself not only is being used for the wrong ends, but will be retailed to the lay public in a way which will convince people that though they are what they are through no fault of theirs nevertheless there is nothing they can do to change the pattern of society. And this picture of mankind biologically and socially determined will be presented by "experts" using all the scientific clichés at their command and with the same dogmatism and belief in the infallibility of science, as the believers in Man's fall from grace, in his inherent wickedness, and his need for salvation who seek to oblige him to come to terms with a world in which most people are socially and economically condemned to live as underdogs. All the "scientific" dogma does which the religious doesn't, is to try to take away the sense of Continued on page 3

IF ever anarchists were tempted to vote it might have been last Friday at the municipal elections. It has been claimed by some that local politics are 'real politics'. That local politics deal in local issues on which one can be expected to have a voice and some control. Reading (for example) in the West London Observer that "re-covering the floor of Notting Hill library may cost the Kensington ratepayers £345 10s. Kensington Council are being asked to accept a tender for that amount". This is something tangible and real, floors, linoleum, books, one may see the new lino, or indeed, trip over the old on the way in.

One may, in theory, vote for the forward-looking lino-laying cultural 'goodie' or what is more often done, abstain from voting for the reactionary culture-hating, lino-denying 'baddie'; or alternatively, vote for the forthright independent economic conserver of municipal funds and abstain from voting for the squandering, grafting, pleasure-loving, power-seeking municipalizer. The issue is, on the face of it, real. The people concerned are real. You may live next door to them, you may have gone to school with them.

In the face of all this reality it would seem amazing that the abstention rate is higher in local elections thon in national elections. It may be that living next door to candidates, or going to school with them tends one to take a rather cynical view of their lino-laying activi-

ties or abilities.

The decline of independence in local elections, or indeed in local councils, has led to a realization that this illusion of real issues, of real decision-making is hard to keep up. Indeed the phoney adoption of the label 'independent' by right-wing candidates is a cynical admission of the deception.

The centralization of power in government and the financial pressures put upon local authorities to toe the (party) line is evidence of the decline of local autonomy. The recent decision to liquidate the L.C.C. was a purely partymeasure to break the Tammany-like hold of County Hall. The decision upon education in London was only rescinded when it was proved, by a series of rowdy Parent-Teacher meetings, to have touched too delicate a nerve for a by-electionapprehensive Tory party.

One will remember too the pressure

put upon St. Pancras council to instal Civil Defence against their wishes. (St. Pancras has again swung to the left) and George Lansbury and the Poplar councillors' imprisonment testify to the pressure that central Government can bring. An attempt to gerrymander London in order that it may be amenable to central government's wishes is the obvious tactic of a power-hungry group seeking to bypass any checks and balances and disguising their move as 'decentralisation'.

The local elections have been further complicated by the dock-strike, increased Liberal candidature and the CND, all tending to make confusion worse confounded. The dock-strike threat was supposed to show how the Socialists were proposing to throw us all into chaos. Perhaps the electorate thought, not unnaturally, that Mr. Gaitskell was no Socialist, nevertheless it didn't scare them, unless it turned them over to the Liberals. Now, with a miraculous eleventh hour rescue the Government and the employers can take the credit for being the peacemakers-or for not pushing us over the brink.

The Liberals, the new generation of political virgins, can 'tut-tut' at the whoring going on around them and point to their own unsullied recordsince 1918, which was oddly enough the last time they had power. By a curiously ambiguous attitude to the vital questions of the day, the Common Market

Continued on page 4

Naive or opportunistic?

"I did not join this party to become a Left-wing Liberal. I joined this party because I believe that Socialist principles were relevant to the problems of the twenties and thirties and I am more convinced than ever in my life that those principles are relevant to the sixties and seventies."

approach on our part from that of the today".

Tories. There are those who have blurred the vision of our people over the last 12 months or so by suggesting that all we have to do to win victory at the polls is to prove that we can manage things better than the Tories. We ought to be able to do that, comrades; but the real passion of our message which will And he added: " . . . we have to bring us to victory is to let the nation make it crystal clear to the country that see clearly that we are aiming at a better there is a fundamental difference in the and different society from that we have

Force is the basic argument of executive government

made by Mr. Ray Gunter, Labour's is quoted as saying that: shadow Minister of Labour, in "One of the underlying causes of our October, 1960 (at the Labour Party Conference when the unilateralists won their historic paper—or card? -victory?) Michael Foot's Tribune tells us this week that Tribune, at the time, "applauded" these sentiments, and we would suggest that it is to the credit of that journal that it did. We would, however, at the same time suggest that it was either naive or opportunist to "applaud" the utterances of a politician without serious reservations! Well, now Tribune reaps the harvest, for last week it again quotes Mr. Gunter (two years later, when much dirty water has flowed under the political bridges, and Mr. Gunter has stepped into Mr. (now Lord) Robens' shoes) not with approval but to attack him! At a meeting

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

Plato's Republic for Today

Assembly

William Boyd 12/6 John O'Hara 21/-

REPRINTS AND CHEAP EDITIONS

A Treatise of Human Nature

David Hume 7/6 John Stuart Mill 7/6 Utilitarianism The Tragic Sense of Life

Miguel de Unamuno 8/6

Collected Works Volume Eight V. I. Lenin 7/6

SECOND-HAND

Happy Youth of China (Propaganda 1955) 3/-; Lady Adela (1920) Gerald Gould and Will Dyson 5/-; German Democratic Republic in Reconstruction (Propaganda 1951) 3/-; The T.U.C. General Council's Report 1933 5/-; Mexican Revolution: Genesis under Madero Charles C. Cumberland 15/-; Principles of Psychology Arthur Lynch 5/-; Scientific Research in Universities and Industry (G.B. 1955) V. E. Cosslett 3/6; The Roosevelt Myth John T. Flynn 6/-; Eve's Diary Mark Twain 6/-; The Folklore of Capitalism T. W. Arnold 7/6; Philosophie Zoologique Jean Lamarck 3/-; Strange Defeat Marc Bloch 7/6; Can Parliament Survive? Christopher Hollis 3/6; The Ascent of Man Henry Drummond 3/-; The Twentieth Century Hans Kohn 4/-; Golden Prague Alexander Gonchar 2/6; The Foreseeable Future Sir George Thomson 3/-; A Dominie's Log A. S. Neill 5/-; Free Political Institutions Lysander Spooner and Victor Yarros 7/6; Joan and Peter & the Country of the Blind H. G. Wells 4/-; From the Other Shore & The Russian People and Socialism Alexander Herzen 12/6; Visits to Walt Whitman in 1890-1891 J. Johnson and J. W. Wallace 3/6; I Haven't Unpacked William Holt 3/-; The New Macchiavelli H. G. Wells 4/6; Songs of Liberty Robert Burns 3/-; History R. H. Gretton 2/6; The Patriot (Irish) Parliament of 1689 Thomas Davis 4/-; The Progress of Soviet Science S. I. Vavilov 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

These points are from a speech at Houghton-le-Spring recently he

weakness over the past few years has been the absence of any good thinking by the so-called Left. In this crazy world where words seem to have lost their proper meaning, the so-called 'Left' is in reality the most reactioinary 'Right'. Instead of the 'Left' being forward-looking, vigorous and irreverent, they relentlessly combat change—they shout old war-cries-nostalgic for old battlefields. Tribune always seems to me to fit in very nicely with days around Queen Victoria's Diamond Jubilee."

And poor old Tribune quoting chapter and verse from the socialist bible and from our Ray of 1960 shows that he is wrong and they are right. So long as they talk about socialism, of course they are right. The moment they engage in party and power politics Gunter is right and Tribune is "Victorian" as well as, in our opinion, dishonest. Forget about Gunter, and think of the Tribune's "God that failed": Nye Bevan. Is it not doubly significant that he "failed" the movement when he was the opposition's shadow Foreign Minister (assuming that history will declare that he it when he was Health Minister in the 1945 Labour cabinet). For at famous pro-British-H-bomb speech he was defending two basic principles of parliamentary (and power) politics: that force is the

basic "argument" of executive government, that in international politics might is right, as well as being considered the only respectable approach so far as the electorate was concerned.

Of course Bevan was not a "bad" man, any more than Gunter is the conscious turn-coat Tribune makes him out to be. He, like Bevan at the time, wants his party to be in office, and he, of course wants to enjoy the sensation of power of being a real and not just a shadow Minister. And to this end it is essential to create a monolithic party and one which will have popular appeal among an electorate brain-washed by mass-communications, the advertisers and the "market-researchers" in order not to have to periodically point an accusing finger at the "gods-that-fail", Tribune and Peace News should try to live without gods (human or supernatural). They would perhaps spend less column-inches and time building up personalities, which in due course they would have to destroying, and at the same time concentrate their propaganda on developing ideas, the validity of which depends on their possible application to the human problems and aspirations. To link ideas to particular individuals invites, rightly to our minds, the argument that what is advocated is possible only for and by a minority, an élite, but not for and by the "masses". Let us make ourselves clear beyond doubt!

We are anarchist and optimists rather than pessimists (which is how we would describe believers in authority whether political or religious) because not only are freedom, responsibility, initiative, security and love things we, who declare ourselves anarchists, want for ourselves (and this, in itself is sufficient justification to struggle for their realisation, but it is also clear from contact with one's fellow beings that these "wants" are universal.

Our critics will interpose: "They want love, security, they don't want initiative and responsibility". What nonsense! Love and security for the average man in our society inevitably creates responsibilities for him. (And contrary to the arguments of the critics, for the less privileged members of society—the "masses"—the responsibilities are greater. One reads of the hundreds of abandoned children of the working classes and nothing of the millions who have happy or normal lives, contributed to by parents whose sense of responsibility to their children transcends their personal needs and desires) The fact that a man or woman who, it is agreed, are responsible fathers or mothers are, at the same time apathetic employees and "citizens", is understandable, and the explanation is

not so difficult to seek. Tell a man to work harder when he knows that most of his effort will benefit his employers; demand that a man should be a more responsible citizen while at the same time expecting him to vote for a man or party who will be better able to run his life for him than he can himself, and is it surprising in such circnumstances that the "masses" should be and are, irresponsible and apathetic? We believe that the "masses" will play their full part, and develop only when a conscious minority of the people succeed in fomenting a revolution or in utilising a revolutionary situation to liberate the initiative and creative potential of the masses. To our minds this is something parliamentary methods will not achieve in a million years. You can no more mix self-responsibility with authoritarianism than you can vegetarianism with meat eating!

and the Socialist Leader are doing. It may be helping their circulations. So far as relating "immediate action to our long term aims" we suggest that when Peace News criticises

of well photographed proletarian bric-

a-brac. The cottage fire grate, the ornate

Parliament, and at the same time its editor, Hugh Brock, as well as others, such as Pat Arrowsmith lend their names to I.N.D.E.C. (Independent Iuclear Disarmament Election Campaign); when the I.L.P. champions libertarianism and at the same time engages in the election racket; when Tribune professes its love for socialism and denounces the Committee of 100 because they use unconstitutional methods, and I.N.D.E.C. because they will split the Labour vote (the party from which Mr. Foot has been excluded!), we would suggest that all they are doing in the long term is to confuse and antagonise their readers and supporters.

We think our position is clear. Whoever you give power to run your lives for you the results will be the same. We would resist with the same energy a Government in which Pat Arrowsmith was the Prime Minister, Hugh Brock the War Minister, Frank Dawtry the Home Secretary and Harry Mister the Chancellor of the Exchequer as we do the present and any possible future Labour government, not because we dislike them as individuals, on the contrary we like them, but because if they were the government they would have to resort to the machinery of coercion to do good as their predecessors did to do evil things. And that is assuming that once they were in office they still had the same ideas as to what was good or that the "real rulers" allowed them to change the rules of the game!

THOSE who complain about satirists attacking "the same old targets" will be disappointed by "Les Snobs" (Paris Pullman), which blasts those derision: Army, Church and bourgeoisie. scripted and directed the film, display any of that all-embracing "love" that work: he is more like an unsentimental

managers of a dairy co-operative to be elected to its presidency. One of the four, Courtin (Gerard Hoffmann), is a pleasant cynic who knows the importance of hypocrisy in the capitalist world; by acting the hypocrite and playing the game according to the unwritten rules, he outwits his rivals and wins election. To hold his position, however, he has to maintain a "respectable" front, at the expense of love. He decides the price is too high.

The story has echoes of pre-war Rene Clair, specifically "A Nous La Liberté." But Mocky has none of the older director's much-boosted lightness of touch: his sight gags are brutal and he goes for the enemy like an all-in wrestler. Thus, among "Les Snobs" are a provincial Lady Bountiful who keeps an idiot for a pet; the eunuch owner of a lorry fleet whose passion is running a ballet school for teenage girls; and a retired (but always uniformed) General, who at one stage is seen happily reviewing soldiers training at archery butts. They are using bows and arrows, he explains, so as to be ready for the next war but

"Les Snobs" is no feast for the eyes: sets and characters for the most part symbolise the ugliness under attack. It is also an exceedingly coarse film: police spy on an amateur osteopath and arrest him because they think he is committing sodomy, the heroine explains her distaste for men with small sex organs. Handled by Britain's Own Boulting Brothers, this would be em-

You can't beat a balanced programme; sharing the bill with "Les Snobs" is "Touch of Evil," Orson Welles's visually magnificent apologia for policemen who frame suspects when their instincts tell them that they are guilty.

This is what Tribune, Peace News standard objects of French Left-wing Nor does Jean-Pierre Mocky, who the lady critic of The Spectator has found so deplorably lacking in Buñuel's Osborne. "Les Snobs", indeed, is the kind of film Osborne himself should be producing, leaving "Tom Jones" to Jerry Wald.

The plot concerns the efforts of four

barrassing; Mocky however, is an artist -far more so, it seems to me, than certain more fashionable members of the New Wave, such as Chabrol.

inted ghosts and pinned flies

IN 1661 there was published in Japan the "Tales of the floating world" and in it in a few brief lines Asai Ryoi wrote the hedonistic manifesto for the minority of Japanese people who lived only for the hollow hour and the fulfilment of their cultivated appetites for, wrote Ryoi, they were

"living only for the moment, turning our full attention to the pleasures of the moon, the snow, the cherry blossoms and the maple leaves, singing songs, drinking wine and diverting ourselves just in floating, floating, caring not a whit for the pauperism staring us in the face, refusing to be disheartened, like a gourd floating along a river current: this is what we call ukiyo."

and three hundred years later we of the West have our Ukiyo-e painters supplying the demands of a minority within our society who now fear even the reflection of the moon, the snow and the blossom and who ask only for the fragile mists of merging colours that formed the backgrounds to the Japanese Ukiyo-e prints. In William Newcombe they have found an artists whose mastery of his medium is such that with a few rare exceptions each framed sheet of tinted paper is a thing of exquisite loveliness created by a master of this sterile craft. There upon these sheets of white paper he has assembled his luminous colours and allowed them to flow and mate until all strength gone they wait like tinted ghosts for the garish sun to wipe them off the page and from the mind. Yet who would deny their beauty. There upon the grey cellared walls of the New Vision Centre beneath 4 Seymour Place, W.1., they cling like fragile silk, landscapes without horizons, limpid seas that could not float a ship, skies that never knew

a wingéd bird, for this is a world where man and all the harsh realities of living are banished. But over two hundred years ago Torii Kiyomasu peopled his coloured sheets with the creatures around him that like the actor Tsutsui Kichijúro they can now mime to the centuries but Newcombe has banished not only the actor but the very stage itself and all he offers us is the captured light of his off-stage limes burning in space to illuminate a void.

Yet there are those who are willing to come to terms with life if only to be amused by certain aspects of it. They have found their off-beat pleasure in the pop art work of the Tottenham Court Road school from among the works of a group of young painters who are following the trail blazed by that youthful patriarch Peter Blake who with his "Self portrait" set the style for what has now flowered into a school. In his self portrait Peter Blake set the tone of naïve pathos that is the hall-mark of this type of work. Blake's self portrait had many good passages, notably in his handling of the blue overall but the lonely figure of himself bemedal'd with Coca Cola badges and carrying an Elvis Presley fan magazine is a creature of patronage not of endearment for the galleries that are showing this type of work are peopled by those who openly despise those portrayed upon the canvases for the only point of contact is the amused tolerance that the social philistines show to the prancing children of the gutter when the policeman is there to maintain the social division.

The fashionable Saturday Book led the way when under the editorship of Leonard Russell it filled its centre pages with essays on the care of old pewter. one's favourite castle and what and who to tip when dining at the palace, and preceded these esoteric articles by pages

shaving mug, pub windows, comic post cards and whaleboned domestics vied for the glossy pages with moustachioed cavairy troopers and always to close the quarterly an article by Fred Bason. Fred Bason was of the working class and he wrote year after year in the idiom of London's sprawling back streets and the readers of the Saturday Book must have loved Fred's reminiscences for year after year he amused them. Fred Bason in his writing offered the same naïve honesty that Blake offers on canvas and like Blake there is that undercurrent of pathos that makes one protest the company he keeps. Peter Blake has painted only one canvas worthy of record and it lives because it is a personal testament of one who has wept before the public but now he would appear to be playing to the monied minority who throng the Bond Street galleries. But twenty-two-year-old Peter Philips now leads the pack with his crash helmeted, leather coated tearaways yet too much of Philips' work raises doubts about its parentage for my taste. The screaming faces from the canvases of Francis Bacon, the pieces of printed poster worked so well into the paint that at a first and a second glance one assumes that Philips painted them and the head of a child that reminds one too much of the cover of a woman's magazine. The style and the subject matter would indeed be welcomed if it were an affirmation or a protest, for as paintings there is an overall second rateness about most of these canvases, but to me these creatures fastened like pinned filies within their rich frames are like so many ragged-arsed pantaloons trooping in to amuse those unworthy of their confi-

ARTHUR MOYSE.

FREEDOM

May 19 1962 Vol 23 No 16

MYTHS AND REALITY

Continued from page I

inferiority and frustration at being one of the pawns who has to serve the wicked "rich man in his castle".

And Malatesta because he believed that scientism, which "is the belief that science is everything; and is the acceptance of every partial discovery as definitive truths and dogmas", confuses Science with Morals, Force, in the mechanical sense of the word, with Thought, Natural Law with Will maintained that it must "logically lead to fatalism, that is to the denial of free will and of freedom".

The fact is-wrote Malatesta-that do not introduce science where science does not belong. The function of science is to discover and to state the fact and the conditions under which it invariably occurs and is repeated; that is, to state that which is and which inevitably must be, and not that which men desire and want. Science stops where inevitability ends and freedom begins.*

"Science stops where inevitability ends and freedom begins". What a simple and at the same time profound thought! On another occasion he used almost the same words and illustrated them with a simple example which everybody could understand:

. . . The function of science is to discover that which is determined (natural laws) and establish the limits where inevitability ends and freedom begins; and its great usefulness consists in freeing Man from the illusion of believing that he can do anything he likes and can always extend the radius of his effective freedom. So long as the forces which subject all bodies to the laws of gravitation were not known, Man might have thought it possible to fly at will, but remained on the ground; when science discovered the conditions required to float and to move in the atmosphere Man really acquired the freedom to fly.†

"THE thoughts which prompted our opening remarks and to which we now return via, we hope, readers will agree, thought-provoking Malatestian reflections, were concerned with the blind acceptance of the myths that (a) capitalist economics ("economics" is defined by the Oxford Concise Dictionary as "the practical science of the production and distribution of wealth") is efficient—after all, apart from the anarchists and some socialists everybody questions the operators of the system and not the system and (b) that those in the West who talk of the "class struggle" are living in the 19th century.

(a) so far as the production of wealth is concerned it could be said that capitalist economics is efficient in that it achieves its objective so far as the non-producing capitalist minority of the population is concerned. For the majority, therefore, it is inefficient; its objective is profits and is therefore more concerned with productivity than with increasing production. Capitalist economics prospers most when "demand" (not needs) exceeds supply; it slumps, and capitalist dog eats capitalist dog (take-overs, priceslashing-war!) when production outstrips "markets". Because capitalism does not produce for needs it has to create the advertising industry (£400 million a year) to promote "demand", the cost of which is, of course, paid for by the consumer, for goods he doesn't need. And of

*Pensiero e Volontà (Rome 15/9/1924). †Pensiero e Volontà (Rome 1/2/1962).

course the capitalist system is inefficient in that it thrives on waste. Fashions as well as goods and articles must be short-lived. Change, the public is exhorted is PRO-GRESS; they don't add that it is the life-blood, the profits of the system. Capitalism is above all inefficient because every technical achievement is offset by an unbridgeable chasm between capital and labour. Strikes, economic or political—this is another myth; the political strike is widely looked upon as some kind of treasonable action incited by agitators in the pay of a potential enemy state! To our minds, if the workers were militant socialists, political strikes would be the rule and not the exception—we were saying, strikes are an important aspect of capitalist economics which must be taken into account in assessing the efficiency of the system. Clearly if instead of capitalism there were genuine workers' control there would be no reason for strikes nor for working to rule and going-slow, which is widespread in industry today, would be against the workers' interests, for under workers' control the less time a job takes to do the more time is there to live and develop.

So far as the distribution of wealth is concerned, in the first place no one will surely deny that under the capitalist system it is distributed unequally, with the actual producers of wealth (such as the land workers) being among the worst paid members of the community. Secondly, can one call a system efficient which produces gluts, surpluses of food, idle plant and uncultivated acres in the midst of hunger, land shortage, and industrial underdevelopment?

(b) So long as a society is based on privilege, on hierarchies, on élites who by reason of their inherited or otherwise acquired wealth and status are in a position to exploit the labour or the services, directly or indirectly, of others, there will be "a class struggle". The problem is as straightforward as that! What is complex is, of course, the fact that in the capitalist system human antagonisms are not only between employer and employee, but between different categories of workers as well as between different categories of employers. Because capitalism opposes co-operation and glorifies in the philosophy of "each for himself" one is not surprised by the lack of unity among workers or their demand for the maintenance of economic differentials any more than we are by the monopolistic, takeover orgy on the other side. But whereas monopoly is the health of capitalism, the strength of workers in resisting that system depends on their unity, the realisation by each of them that every man's labour is his contribution to the common pool and that independently of the job he does he has the same rights as everyone else. If we cannot accept it as a basic principle we have no right to criticise the boss class or expect to fight them successfully.

HERE then are two myths we anarchists must successfully overcome if we are to make headway with the idea of freedom. And if we tackle these problems we shall then be able to sit-down (you know!) with greater possibilities of making the ruling class sit-up, than has been the case so far!

Anarchism Broadcast - 3

(Continued from last week)

Anthony Howard

of the "New Statesman".

Norman St. John Stevas

of the "Economist".

Colin Ward, editor of "Anarchy".

C.W.—Well, in fact, of course, marxism believes that in some mystical way the State will wither away after a period of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Well, we have enough experience of communist revolutions to know that the dictatorship of the proletariat means in fact the dictatorship of the bureaucracy of one particular party, and in Russia, after forty years of "withering away" the State is more powerful than ever. All this, of course, was foretold, as you know, in the great debates in the First International in the 1870's, between the supporters of Bakunin and the supporters of Marx.

A.H.—There again you were the "fall guys". But I wonder today-today it is true that you are engaged in some mutual endeavours with the far Left. It seems to me-one of them I am interested in you have not touched on it—is the whole nuclear disarmament campaign and the Committee of 100. Do you regard the Committee of 100 as an anarchist organisation? Or have you hopes of converting it to a completely anarchist position?

C.W.—Yes, I regard the Committee of 100 as an anarchist organisation, although, of course, I must stress that it does not claim that for itself. It is an anarchist organisation for several reasons. In the first place, its militant struggle against war is a struggle against the State; it cannot be anything else. In the second place, its organisation is completely anarchistic. The Committee of 100 is not a democratic organisation. It is an organisation of people who are willing to work, willing to work for the organisation's aims. It is voluntary, temporary, it has all these characteristics which I would ascribe to an anarchist organisation, and its democracy is not the democracy of votes and cardcarrying and so on, but the democracy of "voting with your feet"; if people did not support the Committee of 100 they would not turn up at its demonstrations.

A.H.—So the whole (. . .) legend of anarchism in the past has become sitting down in a puddle today. This is a sad

C.W.—Well, think back a few years to Suez. That year of Suez and Hungary is probably the great change in the last decade from the period when the intelligentsia were talking about U and non-U (laughter) to the time when they again become seriously concerned with social issues. Now, at the time of the Suez invasion, which you will remember Anthony Eden sprung on his Cabinet, not to mention Parliament, 30,000 people demonstrated in Trafalgar Square. On the same day about 2 million watched the Old Crocks Race to Brighton (laughter). Those people who demonstrated, it seems to me, learned a lesson. They found all they could do was demonstrate in Trafalgar Square, precisely because they have surrendered their power over every possible issue to some authority outside themselves. Gradually and slowly they are beginning to learn through the nuclear disarmament campaign that people must exercise their own power and not surrender it to goveriments or authorities.

N.S.J.S.—Yes, but surely what we need is not less authority, we need more authority. I quite agree with you that the national State is the cause of war, but it is precisely because we have insufficient authority in international order that we have the possibility of war. Surely the true solution to the present world crisis is to have some form of international order, some form of international power; in fact to have more power, more power of the State and not less.

C.W.—Well, I don't know if it frightens you, but it frightens me (laughter). How is that to be brought about? By a struggle between the two world power groups in which one defeats another? I mean, we all know there is no possibility of victory in a nuclear war.

(Both questioners together - neither heard).

N.St.J.S .- I am not saying there must be a nuclear war. I am saying one must work towards some greater form of international organisation. Whereas it

seems to me that the anarchist view is to dismantle even that primitive form of organisation we have on the national

C.W .- You are quite right. I believe in the fragmentation of power.

N.St.J.S.—Exactly. Well I am pointing out to you that in my view that this is stepping in the wrong direction. We want to step forward to more order, not backward, to less.

C.W .- You say this is because you want to get rid of war. Well, who makes wars?-Government.

(Both questioners together-one said "Certainly" then the other won).

A.H.-Well, I am going to come in there. You said earlier that these people who are protesting in the campaign against nuclear weapons are doing it against government and not so much simply against the Bomb. This raises an interesting thought in my mind. Are you trying the making at this moment of a take-over bid for the whole C.N.D. campaign trying to capture it for anarchism? Their symbol at the moment is The Bomb. This is right, surely, and you are now trying to swing them, to make them see the Bomb as a symbol of all government. Is that accurate?

C.W.—No. I would not like to make a take-over bid for anybody. The Committee of 100 or C.N.D. as a whole is perfectly capable of arranging its own destiny. I am thinking of the lessons which its supporters are learning. After all, we march every Easter from Aldermaston to London but it doesn't get anywhere. Look at this last occasion, when it has been followed immediately by a new series of nuclear tests. Now, this must convey some lessons to the supporters of C.N.D. and the Committee of 100.

N.St.J.S.—I would like to move on to another point. I have never met an anarchist before, you are the first anarchist, Mr. Ward I have had the pleasure to meet. You are quite unlike my stereotype of what I thought the anarchist would be, and I would like you to tell me what sort of people anarchists are. Are they mainly men or are they women, are they young or are they old, do they come in one particular form of industry, or have they any particular political party or any particular religion; could you give me a picture there.

C.W.—Yes. A survey was made by the anarchist weekly FREEDOM into its readers. Those people who took the trouble to reply-after all, anarchists are not very good questionnaire answerers-(much laughter)-those people who took the trouble to reply tended to be people in their thirties, they were rather philoprogenitive-they may not have very strong ideas about the sanctity of marriage but they had plenty of children (laughter), they tended to be in what we might call creative occupations —I was delighted to find a large number of architects—the biggest single occupation was teachers.

N.St.J.S.—Self-employed, would they be, or employed by other people?

C.W.—I think there is a tendency to be self-employed, or people who have a large degree of autonomy in their jobs -after all, it's rather foolish to advocate a philosophy of freedom if you are going to be bossed around all the while.

At the same time, an investigation was made of the psychology of anarchists. Nothing very remarkable came out of that, except that they were highly intelligent, which we knew (laughter) and that they could be defined as toughminded radicals.

A.H.—Well, I looked at the survey, too, and I think you have glossed over the most striking fact about the whole thing; which is that (in) your older age group was predominantly working class, and your younger age group—and these are your categories, not mine-were predominantly middle class, and it seems to me that something very strange is happening to your movement. You are become now a kind of escape route for the leisured classes, a kind of private plaything. In the past you obviously did have your old hereditary anarchists, people who had actually worked. Now when one looks at the figures they are staggering. In the twenties-people between 20 and 30you have only ten per cent. of working class as compared with 50 per cent. in your sixties and seventies. And in the

teens, of course, you have got no working class young people at all. What is happening to your movement today?

C.W. (laughed)—Well, I would say that this is the fault of you socialists who have been so anxious to provide equality of opportunity to be unequal to people. The anarchists, like the co-operative movement or the trade union movement, simply because they are people of initiative and high intelligence, have tended to move out of the working classes.

N.St.J.S.—Well, let us leave socialism out of it and get down to something important. The religious affiliations of anarchists. Do you find, for instance, that you have a great many members of the Church of England, or do you find you have a large number of Roman Catholics, or do you find that your members are agnostics.

C.W.-Well, first of all we do not have members, we are not a party.

N.St.J.S.—Your supporters, I'm sorry.

C.W.—Well, the readers who answered the survey tended to be people who were brought up, as most people are, in one of the traditional religions and to have moved right out of it.

A.H.—I see. They are lapsed. In fact, would they be looking for a religion, as it were, and they have found it perhaps

C.W.—I shouldn't think so.

A.H.—in individualism.

C.W.—I shouldn't thing so—

A.H.-Come along, Mr. Ward, you know perfectly well that the origins of your movement are mixed up with these bogus atheist churches like the Theosophical Society and this kind of thing. You have got a long history of Humanism and mock religion in the anarchist (movement).

C.W.—This is news to me. I thought we were atheists to a man.

A.H.-Well, you are, but you are atheists sort of with your own atheist hymns. This is going right back to

C.W. (smile in voice)-Name be an atheist hymn. (laughter).

A.H.-Well, I don't know. There are quite a lot of Christian hymns you

could lay claim to; I think you could even say that William Blake in a sense was an anarchist if you wanted to. But you have always been a kind of substitute religion is the only point I am trying to make.

A.H.-Do you try to make converts, at all?

C.W.—Yes, I am constantly making propaganda.

A.H.-You are. And you really-and most anarchists wish to spread this anarchist faith?

C.W.—I would say they want people to start thinking for themselves and acting for themselves.

A.H.—Do you think there is any danger of your being suppressed by law because your anarchist faith may be undermining ordered society?

C.W.—Only when we become a serious threat to ordered society.

A.H.—And you would not consider yourselves a serious threat now? C.W.-No. Of course we are for

ordered society as against the disorder of government society. (Quiet laughter).

A.H.—But is it not true that most of the people who are in your movement are exactly the people who could not make a contribution to your free individual society; that they do tend to be -and I don't want to be rude about this-but they do tend to be the cranks and the misfits who have not managed to adjust themselves to our own community as it is today, and therefore take refuge with you, and they are the last people I should have thought who could have created a state of nature by themselves.

C.W.—He would be a very miserable conformist type of person who was thoroughly adjusted to our society today. Wouldn't you think so?

A.H.—I would quite agree— N.St.J.S .- And I must say, Mr. Ward,

you look neither like a crank nor like a misfit.

C.W.—Thank you, Mr. Stevas. Chairman And on that complimentary note we end the programme. In "What's the Idea". Anthony Howard of the "New Statesman" and Norman St. John Stevas were discussing Anarchism with Colin

A Constant Educating Effort

DEAR EDITORS.

John Boyle's letter about "Anarchist Middle Class Snobbery" makes me think that he equates "working-class" with low intelligence and scruffy clothes. I like "Around the Galleries".

I've learnt much from the specialist contributors to FREEDOM and ANARCHY. and I like wearing nice clothes. It always strikes me that these folk who go on about the "working-class" virtues have got things out of proportion, and if they'd had a working-class upbringing they'd see it is not all rosy. I remember seeing my first ballet-it was like magic for me-why should we deny ourselves culture? Anarchism fosters and encourages a genuine culture that we can all take part in. But in improving ourselves we need help-not from Governments, but from comrades, and FREEDOM gives this-not with gushy greetings at meetings, but in a constant educating effort.

It's the same in other fields like jazzintellectuals rave over the 'Blues' (be- a Secondary School education which is cause it is in the past now and they are 'sure' of it), but real rocking Rhythm & Blues numbers they scorn because, God help us, they sell well! Give then 20 years and they'll be raving about artists from the coloured areas of Chicago who are giving working-class youth such a kick right here and now.

No class, race or nation has a monopoly of vritue and my Dad would, if he had his way, employ his "working-class guts" in sending all the coloured people away. Does it make me middle-class because I think that on that point he is quite daft? Of course it appeals to the Communists, all this feeling of "identity" and "solidarity"-poor souls, like the thugs of the Right they need it bad.

The chief virtue I see in the "workingclass" in which I was born, raised and live is that they are the most sexually healthy, and if Mr. Boyle would read Reich's "Sexual Revolution" he may come to see that terms like "workingclass guts" and "emotional anarchists" (not his quote) really veil a different characteristic.

Yours fraternally, Bexley Heath, May 7. D.G.

FREEDOM PRESS **PUBLICATIONS**

SELECTIONS FROM 'FREEDOM'

Vol 1 1951: Mankind is One

2 1952 Postscript to Posterity

3 1953: Colonialism on Trial

4 1954: Living on a Volcano

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)

HERBERT READ Poetry and Anarchism cloth 5/-

cloth 12/6

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

Inborn?

DEAR COMRADES.

Your correspondent A.C. (FREEDOM 5/5/1962) seems to think that the sense for freedom is inborn and hereditary I know of no scientific evidence to support this theory. If A.C. can produce such evidence, he should do so at once -it would be "epoch-making" in every sense of the word. If he has no evidence, how will he support his theory? Yours fraternally,

Freiburg, Germany, May 11. Z.A.R.

Constructive?

TO THE EDITORS.

To understand some of the articles in FREEDOM is often a bit too much for the average working man who's only had why when I try to perpetuate anarchist ideas and encourage people to take FREEDOM weekly it is frequently met with poor response, which was why I wrote "rabbiting" to the letter page in the first place, and Mr. Stevenson then says I think anarchy is a beautiful but impossible idea, and heaps more coal on the fire with the middle-class bus drivers argument. FREEDOM the other week (breaking the thought barrier) also said, Arthur Moyse-to whom I hold no disrespect, quite the reverse- was a working man himself, but these are rather arguments of diversion since what I said was: "The anarchist movement appears to be 'riddled' with 'middle-class' snobbery, etc.", and implied that the paper hadn't a working class appeal.

Another point that logicians would jump on was your mention of being "jammed tight" at a football match (rather loading the question), why not say "sat comfortably"? as the opportunity does avail itself.

True the anarchist movement doesn't have a party line to feel an identity with but it does have a cohesive qualitative social line.

May I just conclude by saying that constructive criticism was the intention I had in mind when writing and that this is more of an expression of the would-be purchasers of FREEDOM that I write for. The first attitude my friend took when he read the other week "How cataslysmic can you get" was how intellectual and modernistic can you get. More articles like the "Nursing Grievances" and "Problem Families" type (they were both tremendous) would win more support.

Yours fraternally (really), Altrincham, May 13. JOHN BOYLE. P.S.—I should have been more clear over the term 'working class guts', it was meant in a literary sense.

That Dreaded Human Nature

TO THE EDITORS,

How interesting it was to read the letter in last week's paper headed "Human Nature Menaces Mankind". Although I tend to be extremely impatient with folk who write letters of this kind and talk about that old chestnut 'Human Nature', I will attempt to give him an answer which he certainly won't

How Crazy Can You Get?

If a Channel bridge is built in preference to a Channel tunnel, motorists will be able to drive on and stay the night in a motel built over the middle of the Straits of Dover.

The motel will be over international waters and will therefore be free of all taxes.

This prospect was put forward today by Mr. Jules Moch, former French Minister of Works, who is chairman of the Channel Bridge Survey Company.

He was speaking in London and said he would be seeing Mr. Marples about the bridge tomorrow.

It was understandable if ministers faced with this big problem took time, but he knew both here and in France the ministers had a large conception of their duty.

Then Mr. Moch gave some more details of the latest plans for the 20-mile long bridge.

Built over the Channel with the motel would be a large turning point so that motorists could head out over the sea and turn back if they wanted to.

There would be two helicopter stations. These would be emergency Evening Stardard. points.

Man, like animals, he says, is happier in the herd. How interesting; yet another of these strange people who speaks for the whole of mankind who, like the politicians, knows what pleases everybody. So long as he has a large number of personal freedoms. What personal freedoms? Freedoms that are of no importance like choosing between capitalism or capitalism? It won't be long before you can't even cross the road where you like. If you don't believe me go to Speakers' Corner on Sundays and try to cross from Oxford Street. I've got you well weighed up Mr. A.D.L. from Barnt Green, you only want the freedom to do as you're told by your betters (you think). Those honest-togoodness, broad-minded men of vision like Mac of Suez who bombed hundreds of poor bastards because another like him, an honest man of vision, Abdul Nasser had upset the apple-cart of some of his wealthy friends, I know it was Eden who took the blame but Super Mac was in the government at the time, and I didn't see him in Whitehall being knocked about by the police.

I have no doubt that those whom Mr. A.D.L. calls squealers, bigots and fanatics will get a good laugh when they read this. They may squeal and be fanatics, but bigots is a title surely reserved for the men of vision such as he who leaves it to the chosen few to settle the world's problems, as they probably will, simply by destroying it. It's so strange that the men of vision are always on the side of the power blocs, that the Mr. A.D.L.s here and in every other country support; and those of the others are cunning scoundrels, or imperialist crocodiles. You see Mr. A.D.L. what I'm trying to say is that you are Joe Soap, the every-man, and it's thanks to you we have very little freedom of any kind and what we have got we fought for and we fight every week to keep. You daren't kill the goose that

lays the golden egg (to quote George Orwell). You see, most of us know your type, it has a big name, you are masochistic, long to be dominated and we want to kick away the props on which you stand so you understandably don't like us, or our ideas.

But surely as an intelligent human being, you can see that we too are human beings, not perfect either, who are not as you are. Therefore please do not talk about human nature, as all people are different, and all have a slightly different nature which stretches as far as between Adolf Hitler whose band waggon was leapt onto by all of your type in Germany and Jack Stevenson who jumps on nobody's and wants nobody to restrict his freedom at all. JACK STEVENSON.

Economics is Dull!

THE EDITORS, FREEDOM.

It is all quite understandable-your emphasis on economic questions as opposed to a narrow concentration on the anti-nuclear movement, but it does seem to me that you have forgotten something you mentioned only last week. Both Colin Ward on the BBC and you editorially emphasised the value of experience in the direct action movement -perhaps your longer experience of such activity leads you to underestimate just how much we are discovering these days in the Committee of 100. Politics has become exciting and meaningful, and Peace News week-by-week informs us all of the world-wide social movement, surely the most interesting social development for years.

Besides this type of experience, a sort of Voyage of Discovery to the New World akin to Drake and Co. of the last Elizabethan era, economics, comrade, is most terribly DULL. However, your point is accepted—we do need to widen our horizon, whilst remaining on the

skell to fire his first broadside against

INDEC in the guise of an attack on

CND and its Communist supporters.

dates in the morning and heckle Mr.

Gaitskell in the afternoon but INDEC

Perhaps Mr. Gaitskell is political

realist enough (if that is not a contra-

diction in terms) to know that if he

were in office, whatever his promises to

the electorate, he would have to accept

nuclear arms. After all, did not his

predecessor, Attlee, sanction the first

(and second) atom bombs and did not a

Labour government carry on research

is no need to worry. We can rely on

Mr. Krushchev to produce a change in

party line sooner or later, to bring them

out of the Campaign. The Party's re-

liance on centralism (democratic or

otherwise) makes them not over-keen

supporters of civil disobedience or direct

action. After all, they might disobey

Mr. George Brown has the complaint

that his microphone was taken from him

and broken. The microphone (like the

monolithic County Hall) is a symbol of

giganticism. George Brown's audience

was too big to be reached by the un-

aided voice of one man, or too unruly

to be mastered unaided. The growth

of the totalitarian orator (and the 'pop'

singer) dates from the invention of the

microphone. The Greek city state was

conditioned in size by the number that

could be reached by one voice. True,

the amphitheatre was and acoustical

device but mob oratory and rock-'n'-roll

only survive with loud speakers. In

Lessons of the Spanish Revolution, V.

Richards calls the microphone "the curse

It is in itself a weapon of aggression

and calls forth aggressive responses. In

the same way that George Brown and

the Labour Party bosses have decided

against face-to-face relationships and in

favour of block votes, expulsions, high

level decisions and microphones for

mass meetings they, and all parties, have

decided at local level on the same tactics.

Local politics have ceased to be real

A Soviet court is reported to have

sentenced five men to death for armed

robbery. Their gang robbed 37 shops

and 46 families and terrorised the dis-

trict around Saratov, a town 450 miles

south-east of here. Other members of

the gang reveiced long prison sentences.

J.R.

Reuter.

Moscow, May 11.

of modern times".

politics.

As for the Communists in CND there

is a different matter.

into the hydrogen bomb?

King Street.

high seas. Would it not therefore be possible to do some elementary explaining, in human language, of economic problems-for they are so damned difficult to understand. What we need is a Kropotkin in the Fields, Factories and Workshops to explain economics without jargon and doctrine. Another thing

Herbert Read's "Postscript to Posterity" Freedom Selections", Vol. 2) the other day and he writes: "The root of all our misery is in this irrational monetary system, and that therefore any direct action against secondary follies, such as war and famine is largely a waste of effort." Now, though not fully understanding what our comrade was driving at, it does seem that his view is very relevant

that is quite beyond me, at least, is

finance and money. I was reading

to both the anti-nuclear movement and to your editorial "Fear and Food" last week. I mean, should we stage a sitdown outside the Bank of England?

How does the financial system work? What are the basic wrongs and how can they be righted? I may be alone with this mystery, though I don't think so. Hull, May 13. J.W.

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP CENTRAL MEETINGS

meetings to be held at The Two Brewers, 40 Monmouth Street, WC2 (Leicester Square Tube) Sundays at 7.30 p.m. MAY 20 Arthur Uloth: After London—What? MAY 27 Laurens Otter: There is Still Time Brotheror is There? JUNE 3 Jack Robinson: Evolution or Revolution? JUNE 10 Raya Dunayevskaya: Subject to be Announced JUNE 17 Nicolas Walter: The Committee of 100

OFF-CENTRE DISCUSSION MEETINGS

1st Thursday of each month at 8 p.m. at Jack and Mary Stevenson's, 6 Stainton Road, Enfield, Middx.

1st Wednesday of each month at 8 p.m. at Colin Ward's, 33 Ellerby Street, Fulham, S.W.6.

3rd Wednesday of each month at 8 p.m. at Donald Rooum's, 148a Fellows Road, Swiss Cottage, N.W.3.

Last Wednesday of each month at 8 p.m. Tom Barnes', Albion Cottage, Fortis Green, N.2. (3rd door past Tudor Hotel). Last Friday of each month at 8 p.m. at Laurens and Celia Otter's, 57 Ladbroke Road, W11 (for May and June)).

Cambridge Meeting

The Cambridge Anarchist Group For details of meeting place, etc. contact Krishnan Kumar St John's College, Cambridge

ANARCHY Nos 1-14 Still Available 1/8 Post Free

Freedom The Anarchist Weekly

FREEDOM is published 40 times a year, on every Saturday except the last in each month. ANARCHY (1/8 or 25 cents post free), a 32-page journal of anarchist ideas, is published 12 times a year on the 1st of each month.

Postal Subscription Rates to FREEDOM and ANARCHY 12 months 32/- (U.S. & Canada \$5.00) 6 months 16/- (2.50) 3 months 8/6 (\$1.25)

Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies 12 months 47/- (U.S. & Canada \$7.50) 6 months 23/6 (\$3.75)

AIR MAIL Subscription Rates (FREEDOM by Air Mail, ANARCHY by Surface Mail) 12 months 52/- (U.S. & Canada \$8.00)

Postal Subscription Rates to FREEDOM

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

Air Mail Subscription Rates to FREEDOM only I year (40 issues) 40/- (\$6.00)

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

FREEDOM PRESS

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

Aldermaston rallies cause only mild jealousy to Mr. Gaitskell for he knows Westminster. This unlobbied virtue has that there will be enough schizophrenic souls who will canvass for his candi-

Confound their politics

Continued from page I and nuclear disarmament they can parade a spotless political virginity untried in the rumpled, heated bed of its charms for a betrayed electorate who feel that here, at last, the true and faithful love, which is Liberalism (not license), may be found.

The Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament has, for some curious reason, felt it must have a voice in local aaffirs. Even local groups have been known (with the ruthless impartiality of the Catholic Church) to point out which local councillors are CND supporters.

It is perhaps no coincidence that Mr. Gaitskell's pressure on CND coincides with the formation of Independent Nuclear Disarmament Election Committee. CND itself with it loose organisation is not amenable to party discipline. It was formed in the days when the Labour party was seeking to expel members of Communist 'peace fronts' so CND has no members, only supporters. INDEC is a different matter. The hecklings in Glasgow and Hyde Park were sufficient occasion for Mr. Gait-

FINANCIAL STATEMENT AT MAY 12th 1962 Week 19 EXPENSES: 19 weeks at £70 £1,330 INCOME:

Sales & Sub. Renewals: £ £ Weeks I-18 Week 19 927

New Subscriptions: Weeks I—18 (138) Week 19

DEFICIT £232

DEFICIT FUND

Wolverhampton: J.L.* 2/6; Wolverhampton: J.K.W.* 2/-; London: C.W. £7/17/6; Nigeria: Anon. 2/-; London: J.H. 3/-; Southend: J.O.* 5/-; Glasgow: J.H. 2/6; Nottingham: J.D. 5/-; Exmouth: A.B.H. 8/-; Hounslow: L.* 2/6: San Francisco: C.A.S. £1; Cleveland: D.H. 2/-; Alberta: W.G.* 6/10; Niteroi, Brazil: M.G. 8/6; Altrincham: J.B. 8/6; London: Anon. 4/2; London: P. & G.T.* 5/-; London: Anon. (per P.T.) 2/5; Enfield: M.S. 2/4: London: Anon. 1/-.

Previously acknowledged 581 19 8

1961 TOTAL TO DATE £594 10 5

*Denotes regular contributors.

TOTAL 12 10 9

Printed by Express Printers, London, E.I.

Putting Back the Clock

Published by Preedom Press, 17a, Maxwell Road, London, S.W.6.