

"The State practices "violence", the individual must not do so. The State's behaviour is violence, and it calls its violence "law"; that of the individual, "crime".

MAX STIRNER

### In this Issue:

THE DERBYSHIRE MINERS  
THE CATHOLIC CHURCH  
AND SEX AND ALL THAT  
SEE NO EVIL  
CORRESPONDENCE

## THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY - 4d.

# Algeria: did violence fail?

THE "restraint" shown by the Moslems to the O.A.S. terror tactics and their latest "scorched earth" policy; the secret talks that have been taking place between the FLN and the OAS, and the fact that they followed the Salan trial "fiasco"—which authoritative circles predicted would result in an intensification of OAS activity; all these events it seemed to us should pose all kinds of questions for revolutionaries in general and, in particular, those for whom non-violent action is raised to a principle in all political and social struggles. We were therefore most interested to see that *Peace News* devoted its editorial last week to the subject of Algeria, but disappointed, on reading it, to find that there was no serious attempt to unravel the tangled web of violence and counter-violence and to seek to draw some objective

lessons therefrom. In their opening paragraph they write:

The outrages committed by the OAS pose in extreme form the conflict between an "idealistic" policy based on non-violence and conciliation and a "realistic" policy based on force.

We are not sure that we have understood what the editorial writer means, and unfortunately the paragraphs that follow do very little to clarify the meaning of this sentence. It seems to us that the writer is guilty of special pleading. For instance when he (or she) writes

The Evian agreement itself showed how both French and Algerians have attempted to act reasonably in revulsion

against the horror and futility of seven years of war

and couples this with the "remarkable restraint and courage [of the FLN and the Algerian People] in their refusal to retaliate against the OAS murders" as the "hopeful things about recent happenings in Algeria" we suggest that this is not simply an "idealistic" interpretation of recent events, but a superficial one; one, furthermore, that avoids subjecting the arguments of the advocates of non-violent action to examination in the light of events in Algeria. (As we have pointed out on other occasions, at least in this column, we are neither advocates of violence nor non-violence as a principle so far as the revolutionary struggle is concerned. We are certain that anarchism will not be achieved by imposition, by armed force; but we are equally certain that no privileged society will ever be destroyed if the revolutionaries are not prepared on principle to use violence at any stage in that struggle.)

Let us enumerate some of the questions posed by the Algerian struggle:

(1) *Peace News* refers to the "futility" as well as to the horror of the past seven years struggle. Of course it has been futile for those French conscripts who were killed or wounded, or who simply were separated from their friends and loved ones doing their duty for the glory of the *patrie*. In retrospect it has been futile for those *colons* who imagined that "the wind of change" could be prevented from blowing in the direction of Algeria. But at the time, supported by Metropolitan France, militarily, financially and politically, they might well have been justified in believing in their chances of winning a twenty-year respite. And the FLN and its supporters among the Moslem people; has the violence been futile?

Even *Peace News* concedes, in quite another context that "the FLN also committed acts of terrorism in the name of patriotism and have now won the right to form a government". Though we anarchists may argue that in so doing the Algerian people have jumped out of the frying pan into the fire, we think such an argument is in the circumstances an "idealistic" one, that is, it presupposes that what the militant section of the Algerian people wanted was anarchism, whereas in fact, of course what they have been fighting and dying for it to get rid of their French overlords and be governed by their own leaders. Sad but true. So let us be "realistic" about it and recognise that the violence and the horrors of the struggle in Algeria have not been futile so far as the militant nationalist movement FLN is concerned. And we think the advocates of non-violent action cannot overlook an event that occurred last week in France: Messali Hadj, once hailed as the "uncontested leader"

of the Algerian people has been given his first complete freedom by the French for more than 30 years. According to the *Sunday Times* Paris correspondent

no flags are being flown for him in Algeria. Although his ideas have triumphed and his country is about to become independent, he finds himself crowded into the background by his former disciples, and almost a forgotten man. . . . When half-a-dozen of his former followers launched the now triumphant FLN rebellion, they discarded him and his National Algerian Movement (M.N.A.) The two movements became violent enemies. . . .

Apart from the fact that the FLN achieved in seven years what the MNA did not in 37 years the following news item from the *Guardian's* correspondent Clare Hollingworth (June 10) should be given serious thought by the extremists of the "conciliation" theory:

A serious incident occurred at Bakari, near Algiers today when rival Moslem groups opened fire on one another. It is understood that the MNA fired on

Continued on page 3

## SET THEM FREE, M. LE PRESIDENT

TO hold the French Government to promises which it made to him, Louis Lecoin, editor of the journal *Liberté* started an indefinite hunger strike on June 1st.

Louis Lecoin, who is 74, has been a life-long anarchist and anti-militarist who has always been prepared to pay with his person for his ideas. In the preface to his remarkable prison memoirs *Prison en Prison* he points out that "after Blanqui who spent thirty-seven years in the jails of the Monarchy, the Empire and of the Republic, I am among those who have spent most time shut up for crimes of opinion". A man of tremendous energy and initiative, he was a moving spirit in all the great international protest campaigns during the inter-war years. At the time of the Spanish Revolution he was, we believe, secretary of the French Anarchist Federation, and his activities on behalf of the Spanish comrades during that struggle and later when tens of thousands of them made their way into France before Franco's victorious army revealed the qualities and solidarity of this remarkable man. Far from resting on his laurels or making age an excuse, he took the initiative for an anti-war manifesto in 1939 which was signed by many eminent writers and public figures, most of whom backed out when war was actually declared leaving Lecoin and a few others to shoulder the entire responsibility. He was arrested in September and spent the war years in prison and prison camps.

After the war, still undeterred, he founded the monthly magazine *Defense de l'Homme* which he later handed over to a colleague when he

decided to concentrate on a campaign for French Conscientious Objectors. To this end he raised funds to start the weekly journal *Liberté* (which still appears but as a monthly) and to hold meetings to press for legislation which would end the cat-and-mouse treatment of C.O.s. Supported by a number of prominent writers and public figures, Lecoin succeeded in extracting a promise from de Gaulle that something would be done. Many C.O.s who had already spent long years in prison were in fact released, but others were still being imprisoned for indefinite periods. Since the beginning of the Algerian War nearly 500 years imprisonment have been inflicted on war resisters. But General de Gaulle and several members of the Debré Government made it known that conscientious objectors would be liberated immediately after a cease-fire in Algeria and would be assigned to social service.

The Committee for *Aid to Conscientious Objectors*, which included personalities like Albert Camus and Abbé Pierre, was created to support this action. It is because the present Government has remained deaf when reminded of promises previously made that Louis Lecoin felt it was his duty to undertake a hunger strike on the premises of *Aid to Conscientious Objectors*.

In a letter addressed to President de Gaulle, which was published in *Liberté*, Louis Lecoin declared: "Please remember that you admitted to Abbé Pierre some three years ago that it was absurd and unworthy to treat objectors like delinquents. And since then nothing has changed for them, although you are in a position to do everything. . . ."

"We will not quibble about good intentions which remained dormant for so long; things are not as bad as they were—the Governments which preceded you did not see the thing in the same light. But now it would be a very serious matter if these intentions were not rapidly translated into action. It would almost amount to perjury."

"Today when so many so-called superior officers disobey or are only partially obedient, who would have the affrontery to dissent if you gave freedom to conscientious objectors, those who have done no harm to anyone?"

"Set them free, M. le Président, and thus, into the bargain, you will enable me to stay alive."

## WHOSE FOR HUMANITY?

[The first two letters printed below appeared in the *Guardian* last week. The third letter, inspired by these was submitted for publication but was not printed at the time of going to Press.—EDITORS.]

1 Sir,—In your leading article on Eichmann's execution you say that "national courts not only have a right but a duty to try those accused of crimes against humanity."

At the Old Bailey trial of six members of the Committee of 100 on charges under the Official Secrets Act, Air Commodore Magill, Directors of Operations at the Air Ministry, was asked by Pat Pottle, one of the accused: "Would you press the button that you know is going to annihilate millions of people?" The Air Commodore replied: "If the circumstances demanded it, I would."

The day after Eichmann was executed Air Commodore Magill was awarded the CBE. Curious, isn't it?—Yours faithfully,

Jon Tinker, Secretary  
London Committee of 100.  
168 New Cavendish  
Street, London, W.1.

2

Sir,—I fail to see why J. Tinker has to compare an innocent Service officer, Air Commodore Magill, with Adolf Eichmann. An unworthy and cowardly action, I should have thought: Magill can't answer back. I don't even see why he should have been dragged into court to answer silly, emotional, and hypothetical questions about his duty. No doubt members of CND are peculiarly ill-fitted to understand questions of discipline—you only have to look at them—but surely J. Tinker understands, as most of us rejoice, that this country possesses men of the moral fibre to press the fatal button when ordered, whatever the consequences. Or wouldn't he obey that order?

Eichmann was executed, not because he killed Jews on orders, but because he was willing. Magill would probably be hanged by a victorious enemy however unwilling he had been, but what other similarity is there?

I think it outrageous that a loyal Government servant should be cross examined on his duty by pacifists without responsibility, and doubly so that he should now be sneered at by the tinkers and peasants for what he had to say.—Yours faithfully,

P. A. J. Graham (Colonel).  
The Garden House,  
Stanford, Dingley, Berkshire.

3

Dammit Sir, Colonel Graham is right. What's the old country coming to when "tinkers and peasants" are free to question, and sneer at, their betters? May I also protest that the prosecution should have dragged Air Commodore Magill into court, though in fairness to the Attorney-General, and the Judge, it should be pointed out that they did their best to protect him from all those silly questions. The trouble was that one of those damn peasants in the Dock tried to defend himself and didn't play the game according to the rules. Bad show, Sir, but what can you expect from these pacifists? As my gallant friend put it so succinctly: "they are ill-fitted to understand questions of discipline—you have only to look at them".

I must confess that I could not follow the Colonel's arguments about obeying orders, willingness and unwillingness, etc., but I am sure he is right and can only regret that he did not expound his ideas at greater length. In a world of rebellious tinkers and peasants, we can do with the Colonel's voice of sanity and enlightenment. If I may coin a phrase, Sir, from the enemy's camp: "Button-pushers of the world unite", for in them rests the future prosperity and happiness of our old country and Empire.

Your obedient servant,  
London, N.W.3. V.R. (C.O. 1939-45).

## ANARCHY 16

(NOW ON SALE)

discusses

## AFRICA

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

"THE DERBYSHIRE MINERS" by J. E. Williams, (Allen and Unwin, 90s.).

THE study of English social history has, until recently, suffered from an excess of what may be called the metropolitan point of view. The political history of this country may well be written, without much loss, from the perspective of the Londoner since Westminster has been and remains the centre of parliamentary politics. For a proper appreciation of social history (and, indeed, of political history in its wider sense), it is necessary, however, to raise one's eyes above the metropolitan horizon. This is particularly true of the history of the Labour Movement since its centre of gravity clearly lies in the indus-

# The Derbyshire Miners

trial provinces. The French critic and historian, Hippolyte Taine, appreciated this general point when, on his visit to England in 1859, he decided to see as many places as possible outside London. "One ought to try and see," he said, "the local districts, for it is not possible to understand the social fabric properly until one has studied three or four of its component threads in detail."

For this reason every serious student of Labour history will welcome Dr. Williams' account of the development of trade union organization among the Derbyshire miners. As an example of its kind, it can hardly be faulted. The local story is skilfully placed in its national setting and told against the background of the economic and political developments of the industry. The wealth of detail packed into the book's nine hundred pages may, no doubt, put off the general as against the specialist reader. The author himself justifies the detail on the ground that it is unlikely that anyone else will rewrite the same history but there are also other grounds. More often than not the details add colour and richness to the narrative—witness, for example, the petition of the Pinxton miners in 1844 setting out the conditions under which 'we the men of Number 3 and 4 will come to work', the first condition being 'We will not work while any Blackleg is permitted'. And the total effect of the details is to underline the major moral of the story—that the history of the miners can only be properly understood when its complexity is fully revealed.

Of all the major industries, coal mining has most clearly exhibited the naked and bitter character of the class struggle. In part this has been due to the social isolation of mining communities and the dangerous character of the occupation, two factors which have combined to heighten a sense of solidarity among miners as a class. But equally important has been the fact that labour costs have been closely geared to the selling price of coal. In a free market economy, and in a situation of rising labour costs consequent upon the increasing difficulty of mining coal as the easier seams were exhausted, fluctuations in the selling price have inevitably led to bitter wage disputes. And these have been exacerbated by the

diversity of conditions and costs between one coalfield and another. Time and again in the history of the industry the owners used the differences between high and low cost areas to divide the ranks of the miners. By playing off one area against another, the owners sought to break the back of any large-scale strike. Growing realisation of this fact helps to explain the intensity of the miners' demand for nationalisation in the twentieth century. Only by nationalisation, it was believed, could the regional differences in wages and conditions be eliminated. It also helps to explain the federal structure of union organisation by a national union which was finally achieved in 1944.

As a low-cost area Derbyshire was in a relatively favourable position and, as Dr. Williams shows, this was reflected in the lack of militancy of the union. Founded as a result of a break-away from the South Yorkshire Association in 1880, the Derbyshire Miners' Association was dominated for the first thirty years of its existence by moderates. Many of the leaders were Primitive Methodists who sought to uplift the men morally and socially without resort to aggressive policies. In politics, they were closely associated with the Liberals some of whom were coal-owners. The situation changed somewhat in the years before the first world war with the advent of the Labour Party and the development of syndicalist ideas. With obvious reluctance, the Lib.-Lab. miners' M.P.s joined the Labour Party in 1909 and helped to increase the party's difficulties in maintaining a political line independent of the Liberals. When in 1912 the miners, led by South Wales struck for a national minimum, the Derbyshire leader, Harvey, distinguished himself by his violent attacks not on the employers but on the syndicalists. 'Syndicalism,' he declared, 'was an abominable and unclean thing. It

should be wiped out completely before it has a chance to do further mischief.'

After the war, when the miners were faced with the problems of a declining industry, men like Harvey were replaced by more militant leaders. But this did not prevent the economic character of the Derbyshire coalfield asserting itself once again. Along with its neighbouring low-cost district, Nottinghamshire, it was selected by the coal-owners as the area in which to offer comparatively favourable terms in order to break the unity of the Miners' Federation during the national strike of 1926. The tactics of the coal-owners proved successful; the drift back to work started; and for the next ten years the two counties remained the centre of Spencer's notorious 'non-political' union. As Dr. Williams comments: 'In George Spencer the Nottinghamshire employers had found a willing tool. The Derbyshire leaders had shown greater integrity but had been able to do little to stiffen the resistance of the rank and file.'

The story of the Derbyshire Association ends in 1944 with its absorption along with the other county associations in the National Union of Mineworkers.

The extent to which nationalisation has eliminated the differences in wages and conditions between the various coalfields will determine whether it will be useful for the future historian of trade unionism to investigate particular coalfields. By his book, however, Dr. Williams has clearly shown that it would be useful to have a comparable study of other contrasting areas for the pre-nationalization period. It is hoped that some aspiring Ph.D. student will be persuaded by this book to attempt a full-scale history of the South Wales miners whose record for militancy contrasts so markedly with that of their Derbyshire comrades. G.O.

## Keeping up with the sixties

"COMMUNICATIONS", by Raymond Williams, Penguin Special, 3s. 6d.

RAYMOND WILLIAMS' work is important because he is not afraid to bring his socialist convictions to bear on the field in which he is a scholar, the history and role of culture in society. It derives further value, particularly in view of the modern tendency of ideological institutions to subordinate it, from the fact that he is willing to treat

human expression through art and literature as something important for its own sake, part of the quality of the life we lead, and not merely as an indicator of some other social phenomenon, or a means to some end.

This short book sets out to analyse the processes of communication, dealing largely with what we call the mass media, because of their special relevance to the sixties. The author's point of view is that social critics have not sufficiently adjusted themselves to take account of these, and are still too content to deal solely in terms of ownership of property and political power.

As a step towards establishing the kind of approach he believes in, he presents content analyses of daily and periodical newspapers, radio and television programmes. While the tables of figures do not perhaps tell us very much of the truth, they are important in indicating that social investigators are looking for facts, even if they have not yet developed round techniques for finding and evaluating them. The air of cold detachment, in describing methods and announcing findings, is often amusing, as in "Seventy stories from twenty-two women's magazines, have been read and analysed" and "The first category is the reporting of court cases involving adultery, seduction, rape, homosexuality, indecent exposure and prostitution. The *News of the World* seems to specialize in this kind of report."

The author's views can be challenged on several grounds.

In his eagerness not to be limited by outworn social assumptions, he omits to make some obvious connections between the corruptions of culture with which he is concerned, and the economic and political facts of our society. For instance, the monopoly of the press by a handful of millionaires depends on their ownership of the publishing firms, and was secured by dealings on the Stock Exchange, not in the Editorial rooms. The debasement of language, abuse of psychology and attacks on press freedom that arise from the advertising racket, are a result of the needs of a capitalist market economy. The prostitution of journalism is partly a consequence of its being a job that has to be done for wages, and not for enjoyment and satisfaction.

Secondly, he sometimes assumes the truth of what he is trying to prove. For example on page 46, "We can learn a good deal about the tone and interest of particular newspapers simply by comparing headlines", followed by lists of headlines. On page 38 we are told that "The magazines specially published for women and girls are now very important in forming pictures of the world". Is it not possible that peoples "pictures of the world" are formed primarily as a result of direct experiences with other people, in childhood, school, love affairs, and work, and that the magazines merely reflect the character structures formed by an authoritarian society? In fact, to use a well established phrase, is not Raymond Williams sometimes dealing with the superstructure of society independently of its basis?

This book is one of a series of Penguins dealing with Britain in the 'sixties. There seems to be a fantastic pressure now to keep up with the 'sixties, which has had an influence on everything from the Committee of 100 to the Common Market. We need to remember that where tens of thousands of people are offended by the cultural poverty of our authoritarian society, hundreds of millions still suffer from poverty, dictatorship and colonialism, the evils not only of the 'sixties but of centuries before them. No amount of up-to-date rethinking will be fruitful if it ignores them. P.H.

## 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

Marx, Proudhon and European Socialism J. Hampden Jackson 8/6  
Politics and the Novel Irving Howe 12/6  
Godwin and the Age of Transition (ed.) A. E. Rodway 10/6  
Authority and Delinquency in the Modern State Alex Comfort 10/6  
The Grand Camouflage Burnett Bolloten 30/-  
In the Struggle for Equality B. Yelensky 17/6  
The Uncomfortable Inn Dachine Rainer 18/-

#### REPRINTS AND CHEAP EDITIONS

The Age of Reason Thomas Paine 4/-  
Reflections on Violence Georges Sorel 11/6  
Prison Etiquette (ed.) Holley Cantine & Dachine Rainer 7/6  
The Spanish Labyrinth Gerald Brenan 13/6

#### SECOND-HAND

Under Two Dictators Margaret Buber 8/6; Three Ways of Modern Man Harry Slochower 7/6; Blood is Cheaper than Water Quincy Howe 4/6; The War of the Civilisations (China 1901) George Lynch (Binding strained) 3/-; The Best We Can Do Sybille Bedford 5/-; Commercialized Prostitution in New York City George J. Kneeland (1913) 8/6; Science at your Service Huxley, Bragg etc. 2/6; Four Tales Joseph Conrad 3/-; The Shape of Things Noel Carrington 3/-; The Junior Republic William R. George 4/6; Co-Op Upton Sinclair (paper) 3/6; Modern Marriage and Birth Control Edward F. Griffith 4/6; A.B.C. of Chairmanship Sir Walter Citrine 3/-; The Stream of Life Julian S. Huxley 2/6; Light on Moscow (Penguin 1939) D. N. Pritt 2/6; The Burning Cactus Stephen Spender 3/6; Famous and Historic Trials (India) K. L. Gauba 6/-; The Use of History A. L. Rowse 2/6; The Floating Republic (Pelican) C. E. Manwaring and Bonamy Dobrée 2/6; Pilgrims (paper back) Ethel Mannin 2/6; Fathers and Children Ivan Turgenev 4/-.

#### PAMPHLETS

Anarchist Film Alan Lovell 2/-.

## 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

# The Roman Catholic Church and Sex ...

ADDRESSING a group of editors last week on the need to raise journalism to "the dignity of a mission which should truly educate and highly benefit society", the Pope also told them that "nothing is more harmful to society than lies and errors which feed mistrust and misunderstanding among men and peoples".

We heartily agree but surely such warnings coming from the spiritual leader of the Church of Rome, is rather like the pot calling the kettle black. The Church has been responsible for more misunderstandings between men, for more lies being thrust down people's throats as truths, for more suppression of free discussion, for more censorship of the written word, than all the gutter press put together. But whereas very few people believe what the yellow press says, millions of the faithful believe in the infallibility of the Pope and the "revealed" Morality and the "Divine Origins" of the Holy Scriptures!

#### SPLIT PERSONALITIES

WHAT SINISTER CHARACTERS are the "thinkers" of the Catholic Church. We always see them as split personalities: as worldly people who are at the same time life-deniers; preachers of love who hate their fellow men; saintly men who, if they could only find a way of doing without eating, would declare that they had dispensed with all the vices of men, and yet at the same time they seem to us to be arch-peeping Toms, prying into the bedrooms of the faithful, scouring literature for the "dirty passages" and seeing the films and plays which they will probably decide are too salacious for the faithful. These are the men who are above the temptations of sex and yet by laying down how and when the faithful shall indulge in it seem to us to

have an unhealthy intellectual involvement in everybody's sex life.

#### MALE ARROGANCE

ONLY RECENTLY ROMAN Catholic theologians have been laying down the moral law on slimming diets. According to Father Piero Bongiovanni, writing in a review published by the Order of St. Francis of Sales, anyone who risks their health in order to get slim for reasons of coquetry, pride or to lead others into temptation, is committing a sin whose wickedness is in proportion to the gravity of the risks incurred and the mischief intended. A slimming diet is admissible only if it is justified by serious reasons.

A wife in danger of losing her husband's affections because she has grown too stout has a duty to defend the unity of her family even at the cost of pursuing a rigid and debilitating diet. A fiancée, too, may diet if the loss of her figure is cooling the ardour of her betrothed with the risk that marriage may not take place.

These "reasons" are an excellent illustration of what we were trying to say about the split personalities among these men of God. Clearly Father Bongiovanni has an eye for the attractions of the female form when it is developed in the right places, but his counselling is for us weak mortals who cannot resist the pleasures of the flesh. To keep a clear mind on his job Father Bongiovanni has to indulge in the mortification of the flesh. Far from admiring him and others like him, we find their attitude hypocritical and . . . jesuitical!

Opponents of this "Man's world" will have observed with us that Father Bongiovanni mentions only women—"a wife", a "fiancée"—as subjects for dieting. Women have to be physically attractive to their husbands or to their fiancés. But what about the men? Are they at-

tractive to their wives and fiancées whether they are slim or stout? Not only do we find this, all too common, male arrogance, despicable; it is also indicative of the stupidity, the lack of imagination of the average male in his relations with women, in his attitude to sex. Father Bongiovanni's omission is highly significant, for who if not a disinterested observer such as he, should be expected to see both the woman's and the man's point of view in this question of domestic harmony?

#### GOOD LIVING - POOR LOVING?

A THEORY WE HAVE been longing to have an opportunity to ventilate in public (just to see what are the reactions to it) and Fra Bonsignori offers us the excuse for introducing it, is that the so-called middle-age spread is no more "biologically inevitable" than the "change of life" in women and middle-age in men is the end of sexual activity and pleasure. But what we have observed in many middle-aged people is a growing interest in food and a corresponding decrease of interest in sex! (Food as an aphrodisiac has been the subject of too many books for us to want to give even the impression that we would want to substitute pills for a succulent steak or a dozen choice Blue-Points! We believe that eating, and working, and love-making should be, and in the mid-twentieth century could be, pleasurable aspects of the art of living, for everybody). We are open to correction, but it is our impression that "winning and dining" to excess stupifies; it may loosen the tongue but that's about all! It is enjoyable, so enjoyable indeed that, as the saying goes, "l'appetit vient en mangeant", and so a means can easily become an end.

Continued on page 3

## DID VIOLENCE FAIL IN ALGERIA?

Continued from page 1

the FLN who returned their fire. The FLN claims that the MNA group involved is one of those working with the European extremists in the OAS, though their actions are becoming more and more incomprehensible as independence is approaching. (Our italics).

(2) The advocates of non-violence argue not only that violence breeds violence but that those who use it are corrupted by it. Like so many slogans, they need qualifying! For instance, if it were inevitably true that "violence breeds violence" where do the Gandhists who reply to violence with love fit in? And where do the Moslems fit in, who at this stage of the Algerian struggle have shown "remarkable restraint . . . in their refusal to retaliate against OAS murders"? Surely the confusion on this subject of violence arises only because pacifists tend to lump together all violence, whether it be violence in self defence against an oppressor or against the oppressed; a man who physically defends himself against an attacker and wars between nation states are both guilty of using violence. Thus the people who resist coercive laws, if necessary with violence, are no less "guilty" than their rulers who impose these laws by force. We cannot admit such arguments because they fail to take into account the motives in man's actions. Because, for the pacifists, non-violence is a kind of *credo* they can write this sort of thing:

However horrible their acts, the OAS cannot intelligently be condemned simply as criminals. The FLN also committed acts of terrorism in the name of patriotism and have now won the right to form a government.

We too refused to "join the chorus of indignation" (FREEDOM 2/6/62) from the Left over the outcome of the Salan trial. Of course we "understand" the desperate fight that the OAS and until recently, a majority of the "colons", were putting up in Algeria. We also "understand" the desperate struggle the Moslems of the FLN have been engaged in these past seven years. But we are also convinced that what the OAS, and the French governments before them, were fighting for was morally indefensible—that is, the privilege status of a minority of Europeans (what does it matter that they were born in Algeria if they had the outlook of Frenchmen, of "whites" living on the misery of the "wogs"?). The FLN in fighting for the independence of the Algerian people from colonial rule were fighting for something that was *morally right*.

(3) To this end it was necessary, as a first step, to destroy the power and privileges of the white ruling class in Algeria. Now, only some pacifists will go thus far with us, for it would be wrong to assume that most of them are wanting to do more than ensure peace in the world as it is today; in reality they are believers in the *status quo*, and all that they want is that everybody should live in peace with each other keeping things as they are: "better" governments, more "understanding" employers, "better" laws and "more comfortable" prisons; above all we must preserve law and order, but let's try to make everything as cosy as possible all round! Our discussion is not with them but with the new-wave socio-pacifists who do not shudder at the thought of breaking the law.

To these friends we put the question: We assume you agree that the "colons" privileged status had to be destroyed in Algeria: what grounds have you for believing that any non-violent action would not have been crushed by legalised violence; and what evidence have you for believing that the ruling class ever abdicates its privileged status without putting up a fight—except when opposed by an overwhelming force? Do the pacifists, honestly, believe that if the Moslems of Algeria had spent the past seven years staging passive sit-downs and protesting their allegiance to the principles of non-violence that today de Gaulle would have bothered to negotiate with the FLN at Evian, or that the OAS would be having secret talks with them? Do they imagine that the colons would now be leaving Algeria at the rate of nearly 25,000 a week, (and according to the *Sunday Times* "officials are talking of double that soon") if they had been opposed these past seven years by protestations of love and an olive branch?

(4) The *Peace News* pacifists suggest that the Evian agreement "showed how both French and Algerians have attempted to act reasonably in revulsion against the horror and futility of seven years of war." If one believes this one can kid oneself into believing almost anything! When you are bent on showing that the spirit of "conciliation" is abroad you temporarily overlook the fact that you have only recently been supporting the "Sahara campaign" against the General's nuclear tests, and his almost pathological desire to put France on the map—in terms of mass annihilation by H-bombs! As we see it the Evian talks took place, and we repeat what we wrote earlier this month, for "political and economic considerations" and not for any "love" or feelings de Gaulle might have for the Algerians' "freedom". Force, power, is the only "argument" which makes sense so far as politicians and the ruling class are concerned. Can our friends produce evidence to show that they are right and we are wrong?

★  
THE fundamental mistake made by our non-violent action friends consists, in our opinion, in confusing the means to achieve a free, peace-loving, society, with the tactics for destroying the stranglehold of a privileged society maintained by violence. They seem to believe that it is possible to bridge the chasm which divides the privileged class from the struggling masses, employers from employees, justice from "law and order", authoritarianism from libertarian institutions, simply by love and conciliation. We believe that both these human sentiments will regulate the affairs of Man in a free society. It is nonsense to believe that one can overcome a system which sets man against man, as a law of nature, by opposing those who are its privileged elite with arguments about love. Millions of our fellow beings yearn for love; give them the love. But to the power-crazed politicians, to the money-rotten industrial and financial tycoons, to the upholders of law and order, from the Field-Marshal to the humblest P.C. we must respond, to quote our old pacifist friend Alex Comfort, "not with a salute [nor with love and conciliation!] but a smack in the mouth."

(continued from last week.)

SOME readers may object that I appear to be making a song and dance about a piece of pomposity which will really impress nobody, and least of all those who actually have dealings with police matters and know many things from first-hand experience. The Report of a Royal Commission like this is strictly for the birds, and has about as much relation to reality as has the Book of Common Prayer. That it is so is a pity, for some Royal Commissions do in fact produce much valuable material, but this one on the police is a mere £50,000 down the drain, and conclusions that the *Daily Mail* would welcome are given the official seal that was to be expected. But the more important aspect of the Report lies in the discussion of the role of the police in society rather than any "facts" which the Commissioners claim to have established.

Chapter III contains an interesting discussion of the development of the modern police force which replaced the system of local constables. Up to the beginning of the 19th century England was governed by the Justices of the Peace in an administrative capacity. They had at their command the local constables for petty, day to day work, and the power of the military for more serious trouble, e.g., the suppression of riots. What they lacked in efficiency, they made up for in frightfulness, hence the hanging of petty offenders. With the rapid industrialisation of the country and the growth of towns the old system of policing became increasingly ineffective, and energetic administrators called for a new system, by which the State should maintain a whole-time specialist force with a centralised political control to serve the needs of a modern State. Such a concept was recognised for what it was right at the beginning, namely a *standing army* maintained not with the object of protecting the State from foreign States, or aggressing against foreign States when this appeared profitable, but an army maintained to enforce the power of the state over the community.

Such a concept was vigorously opposed. Our ancestors of more than a century and a half ago had in many respects a healthier respect for the freedom of the citizen and for communal associations than is common today. At all levels of society the idea of the State maintaining a standing army directed against the citizens, was opposed. As

## SEE NO EVIL-2

late as 1822 a Select Committee found against the creation of a State police force on the grounds that it would be too great a political danger to the liberty of citizens. However, it was just a matter of time before such a standing army was created. As in many fields of British history legislation was introduced piece-meal, and resulted in the complex picture which we have today, London got its police force by the act of 1829, which is why the Metropolitan Police comes directly under the Home Secretary. The counties and boroughs got their police forces by later legislation and so today we have the local police forces which have 50% of their cost paid out of local funds. It is this pattern of development too which has resulted in the astonishing degree of personal power enjoyed by the Chief Constables who run these forces, a power which has encouraged certain Chief Constables to snap their fingers in the face of the local watch Committee and seek support from the Home Secretary.

The Commission as a whole has upheld the general local structure of the police forces, more for a sentimental regard for "tradition" than for any concrete reason, for they admit that, "We do not regard the creation of a national police service as constitutionally objectionable or politically dangerous". One of the Commission, Dr. Goodhart, declined signing the Report, and produced his own individual Memorandum, which makes somewhat refreshing reading after the tone of the majority Report. Dr. Goodhart is a toughminded centralist who comes out strongly in favour of the creation of a national, centrally controlled police force. While disagreeing profoundly with his whole concept of a desirable social system one can respect his Memorandum for its refreshing lack of humbug and cant.

Anarchists are in favour of decentralised control of affairs. A local com-

munity is generally healthiest and happiest if it is running its own affairs. I should like to make it clear, however, that such an attitude does not commit one in the slightest to give an iota of support to the sentimental plea of the Royal Commission to retain our grand old tradition of the local police force, with a local big-wig at its head and partly paid for by locally raised money. If we are to view the situation realistically we must admit that in fact by the present system the State has a standing army utterly under central political control in every part of the country. The archaic forms of organisation which are tolerated make not the slightest difference to the practical functions of this army. It may be remembered that when there were widespread labour troubles in the Welsh coalfields, no Welsh sentiment was allowed to interfere with the policing of the area, and the strikers were beaten up by police specially rushed in from various English counties. If Dr. Goodhart's centralist plans were put into effect the only practical effect would be that various local big-wigs would feel slighted and look back nostalgically to the days when *Mudshire* had its own police force with a peculiar design of helmet.

That this is such a very poor Report indeed does not necessarily reflect upon the inferior ability of those who sat on the Commission as compared with the ability of those who have sat on other Commissions. The fact is that the subject under investigation—the police—is one which arouses guilt and confusion in ruling class minds. The facts of policing are not pretty and the tradition in Britain has been to elaborate fictions to cover them. That some policemen always have and always will use illegal violence, take bribes, regularly perjure themselves, blackmail, bully and rob, is not a cause of either surprise or for our feeling morally superior. It is *they* who have the unusual temptations, and, granted that they are generally just a little bit nastier than most other men (or they would not have joined the police) how else would you expect them to act?

Police work is sordid, and where it is not sordid it is very dull. The police have done the dirty work for the ruling class at home, just as the army have done the dirty work of the ruling class abroad. The continuing need for a police force is an expression of the strains and divisions within our society.

G.

## ... &amp; Freedom &amp; Contraception

Continued from page 2

The *bal du ventre* may well lure one into the arms of the first temptress, the rumblings of an over-replete stomach working desperately with an invasion of quantity and quality is an obstacle to sexual play. The subtle, invisible emanations of a *Cuire de Russie* go to a man's head, and produce the results intended; a head befuddled (as opposed to stimulated) by the fumes of alcohol seeks solace on a cool pillow rather than on a warm breast. "Good-living", which includes good-eating for most men depends on a good wife-cook and/or a bank balance plus a Michelin Guide and Raymond Postgate. The art of love-making demands a much greater personal, imaginative effort, which so many of the middle-aged people one observes seem unable, incapable or unwilling to make. The culinary art of Europe is at the command of any and every fat wallet; the art of love and love-making not only eludes, one would almost be inclined to say that it is destroyed by, the fat wallet and all it stands for. Among a certain class as well as at a certain age, "good living" is a substitute for sex; a substitute demanding less effort, less involvement, less commitment, less imagination, less risks of unhappiness. In a word it is so much easier to appreciate the finer points of a *sole meuniere* than it is to understand, stimulate, love, and go on loving a fellow being, more so when one also bears in mind that women too have feelings! Hence the attractions of a plump, unprotesting, undemanding, *sole meuniere*!

## PREPARE FOR RAPE!

LET NO ONE accuse us of being cynics so far as sex is concerned, for we can think of no human activity more pleasurable than that of love-making!

The cynics are the Catholic Church whose interest is purely material: the propagation of the species, and the more of them that are good little Catholics the better! Apart from these considerations sex is a sordid business which men can enjoy but which women have to pay for or abstain from. There is however a very curious exception to the rigid Catholic rule about birth control. Last month, in an issue of *Studi Cattolici* published under the auspices of Opus Dei, three Roman Catholic theologians expressed the opinion that "in times of revolution and violence it is lawful for women, particularly for nuns, to take contraceptive pills and precautions against the danger of becoming pregnant through rape". According to the *Observer's* correspondent in Rome their defence is

a corollary to the well known Catholic doctrine that it is lawful to resist personal violence. It implies no modification of the Roman Catholic Church's traditional attitude against the use of contraceptives in normal sexual relations.

For one of the learned theologians the time factor creates problems, for to be effective, like anti-sea-sickness pills it has to be taken some time before the emergency arises! Just is it is psychologically bad to think about being sea-sick so is it inhibiting and morally dangerous to spend one's time thinking about the possibilities of being seduced by a virile young soldier however clumsy he may be as a lover!

Another of these learned abstainers can find nothing "evidently or absolutely unlawful" for nuns or other women who have a hunch that they may be raped taking contraceptive pills as "a preparatory defence", but such a ruling must not apply to "wives who submit unwillingly to their husbands". You see it is not the women that these intellectual eunuchs are defending but Mother

Church. A married woman *cannot* be unwilling when the "rapist" is her husband; the nun *must* at all times be unwilling. A man's world even among these saintly men. How much simpler, and healthier life would be without man-made Gods and life-denying, sex-starved (some) saints and moralists! But "thank-God" that women are more artful than either those who would seduce them against their will and those who would fetter them with guilt complexes and the fear of unwanted babies. Every Catholic woman, worthy of her sex, should find a hundred reasons for "fearing" attack from her next door neighbour's husband at any moment, on both sides of their terrace house from now onwards.

## GET THEE TO A NUNNERY-DAD!

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH is slipping. Some time ago Pope John's predecessor decided that God could admit the theory of evolution; then, that sex by the calendar was O.K. (Catholics can now buy a handy little slide-rule affair to work out when Dad should be resisted and when Mamma can accommodate him (but if he forces her against her will, that's alright by God). And now Pope John has told journalists that there is nothing more beautiful than the Truth. (We learn that God, hearing this latest infallible pronouncement in his name, felt obliged to seek admission to Hell. Unfortunately, Satan was not there; having also heard the News, he was seeking admission to Heaven), and soon nuns will be allowed to think about sex, if only to protect themselves from sex. Still, it's the thin end of the wedge. We may still live to see a happily married Pope spending his honeymoon in Casteldolfo. Down with the hair-shirts! Let the skirts billow in the breeze.

That's what old LIBERTARIAN thinks anyway!

