

FREEDOM

JUNE 23 1962 Vol 23 No 20

'No one ever heard of the truth being enforced by law. Whenever the secular arm is called in to sustain an idea, whether new or old, it is always a bad idea, and not infrequently it is downright idiotic.
H. L. MENCKEN.

In this Issue:

TIME IS LIFE
THE FOOD FAKERS
FRANCIS BACON
THERE'S STILL TIME
—OR IS THERE?
CORRESPONDENCE

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY - 4d.

The Question for the Sit-Down

Would you Press the Button?

Hiroshima pilots, the Himmlers, the Berias, the Eichmanns and the Magills of this world. Only by building up the faculty of disobedience can mankind be saved.

Those of the Committee of 100 have given the answer "No" to the question, "Would you press the Button?" And it is their plan to organize a further demonstration of this on September 9th, outside the Air Ministry in Whitehall. Unless they reach the figure of 7,000 sitters sending in pledges, the demonstration will be postponed.

This advance planning, it is felt, will enable a greater number of people to give their pledges and also to enable public opinion to be canvassed on the question, "Would you press the button?" Those of us who have felt that the Committee was losing its impact in staging badly-supported and ill-prepared demonstrations will have little cause to complain this time. Those of us who are not normally free enough to be prepared to be arrested, have ample time to make arrangements.

Demonstrators will walk from Trafalgar Square direction (there will be no preliminary meeting in the Square) at 3 p.m. and sit in Whitehall outside the Ministry (keeping off the grass) until 5 p.m. In the event of any arrests the demonstration will be extended till 7 p.m.

This statement was given by the Committee at a Press Conference last week. It is probably a fact that the Press has been asked to soft-pedal on the activities of the Committee but only nine reporters were present at the Conference, and it is possible that the news value of the Committee is declining. Even if a man goes on biting dogs it gets boring, and such is the unceasing triviality of the British Press, that there is no need to serve them with 'D' notices to refrain from comment on embarrassing details like the bomb, leucemia and strontium.

The unceasing interest of the Press in the cult of the personality was attested by the avid attention to the fact that B.R. (and his wife!) would be there. Some disturbance was obviously felt by the gentlemen of the press that very few

prominent personalities were on the London Committee of 100.

The press obviously felt that something should be done about the public image of the Committee and that the 'weirdies' should be eliminated by issuing advice on What to Wear at Sit-Downs; even Canon Collins had issued an edict on Aldermaston wear. Jon Tinker pointed out that the Press itself picked out the atypical 'weirdies' as more colourful characters for press coverage and created the image. The question also arises what is the correct wear for sitting in puddles, being dragged along by the police, or dropped into fountains? Was it not Ibsen (in *The Enemy of the People*) who said "Never wear your best trousers when you're out fighting for peace and freedom"?

The questions asked by the Press at the Conference were, coming from such a source, a little inane. The question now asked by the Committee, "Would You Press the Button?" is important. The Committee has some of the wrong answers. But the questions it is asking are important.
J.R.

ALGERIA: The Principle of Government

IT seems likely that the cease-fire ordered by the OAS following its secret-talks with the leaders of the Moslem FLN will, in fact, be respected by all but a fanatical fringe among the OAS. It will not be surprising either if some Moslems are unable to resist settling old scores either with their own "traitors" or with some of their French torturers. But probably

these marked men have already joined the mass exodus to France.

M. Mostefai, representative of the Provisional Algerian Government announced on Sunday, in the name of the FLN that when they achieved sovereignty he would promise a complete amnesty to all former active OAS members if the campaign of terror was called off at midnight. This was not so much a generous act of reconciliation as a practical, shrewd move to prevent further destruction of property and installations, as well as records without which no administration could take over successfully. It is obvious that from the point of view of its authority and prestige the new government needs above all to impress the country and the world that it is capable of managing its own affairs. If the OAS campaign were to have continued in its desperate, suicidal orgy of destruction it could have brought the country to the verge of famine, and to a state of administrative chaos, and who knows what might have emerged! The OAS have now realised that if the colons are to save something for themselves they must accept the *fait accompli* of the Evian agreement with good grace. The Moslem leaders are only too aware of the need they will have of white Algerian, or French technicians, teachers, doctors and others with specialised knowledge and experience. (After all, the overwhelming support for their Nationalist movement was based on the charge against the French that during their rule the Moslems were not given the opportunity to acquire these special skills, and obviously they will not be able to acquire them overnight). Both the Moslems and the OAS terrorists must have, for different reasons, been alarmed by the exodus of French colons on a mass scale during the past few weeks. Probably only a few among them were OAS activists; the rest were simply fear-

ful of reprisals for the OAS terror when the Moslems came to power. As in the Congo and other "liberated" colonial countries many of these white refugees will return and be integrated in the new community. One hopes that the "colonels" and the "ultras" who have been responsible for the death of at least 500,000 people during the past 7 years, will not!

★

LAST week in FREEDOM we made some reflections on violence in the context of the Algerian struggle. It seems to us that there are also a number of reflections to be made on the subject of government. Governments depend for their authority on having the Law, and the force to impose it, at their command. The military can make or break a government. But this is not the whole picture. So far as numbers are concerned the armed forces, the police and the whole machinery of law and order represent, even in totalitarian states, a very small proportion of the adult population. The authority of governments, therefore, depends on the acceptance of the principle of government by most people. In Algeria, the principle of government has never been challenged, either by the Moslem leaders or the Colonels, the colons or the OAS, only the authority and decisions of particular governments.

In the first stage of the 7-year struggle, the militant FLN was faced with the combined might of the French military forces, plus the white Algerian community all supporting the French government's campaign of subjugation which had also the overwhelming acquiescence of the population of Metropolitan France. After all, a large proportion of the non-commissioned forces in Algeria were conscripts—ordin-

Continued on page 3

MUTUAL AID IN SPITE OF TRADE WARS

REYKJAVIK, MAY 4.
The Grimby trawler "Ross Kenilworth" sank today off Snøfellsjökull peninsula on the west coast of Iceland. The Icelandic coastguard patrol vessel "Thor" took the "Ross Kenilworth's" crew of 16 aboard and was bringing them to Reykjavik.

The trawler sprang a leak in a heavy gale during the night and sent out an SOS in the early morning.

Reuter.

A PROBLEM in that abstract study known as 'Ethics' used to be: if by pressing a button you could kill a Chinese mandarin and inherit a thousand pounds, would you do it?

The abstract academic problem seems to have presented itself to several people in August 1945, phrased as "if by killing 200,000 Japanese you could end the war and thereby save the lives of many Allied soldiers and prisoners of war", would you do it? In Germany during the war the problem presented itself "If by exterminating the Jews you could save the Fatherland and make a final solution to the Jewish problem, would you do it?" The answer to both questions was "Yes", the premise of both hypotheses was false, but the ethical basis was only questioned at official level in the Nuremberg trials and in the Eichmann case. On the personal level many, notably Claude Eatherly, seem to have asked themselves the question.

Now the question presents itself again, "If, by pressing a button you could destroy the Russians and so halt their aggressive intentions, would you do it?"

Air Commodore Magill (now CBE) gave the answer, "If the circumstances demanded it I would." The Judge backed him up in this, as the Air Commodore was an 'officer of the crown' and as such must obey orders, therefore the parallels with Nuremberg and Eichmann were irrelevant.

The abstract problem pre-supposes a truth in its premises and free-will on the part of the answerer. It is no answer to say, "I would press the button because I must obey orders." In the terms of the problem one cannot say "I would not press the button because such an action would destroy us as well as the Russians and would not eliminate the aggressive forces in the world" (although this is probably true). The abstract problem is in itself the thing to reject. Man is not an abstraction.

The affirmation of man's humanity consists in his freedom from the compulsions of the abstract questions of military discipline and the complex permutations of political considerations. "Nobody is free at the moment of action", and obedience to the compulsive insanities of military and political necessities is a built-in mechanism which the states succeeded in instilling into the

THE LATEST FROM AMERICA SLAV CHEEK BONES & EMPTY HEADS

Suzy Kendall, is a top beauty of today. She has the high Slav cheekbones and hollow cheeks that fashion photographers love.

Suzy was born with this look—the lean 'n' hungry look. And most top models have it.

Some of the girls who haven't are going to crazy lengths to get it.

They are having their back teeth removed so that their cheeks cave in. It sounds unbelievable, but it's happening!

The idea started in New York, where ruthless model agents pretty well demanded it.

ANARCHY 16

(OUT NEXT WEEK)

Includes:

- BENEVOLENT BUREAUCRACY
- CND & CD - Are they Opposed
- FREEDOM OF ACCESS

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

ORDER YOUR COPY NOW!

ACCORDING to a report published by the Twentieth Century Fund with the title "Of Time, Work and Leisure", and written by Dr. Sebastion de Grazia, Professor of Political Science at Rutgers University, the idea that Americans, because of the use of machines and other labour-saving devices, have much more free time than they had a century ago, is largely mythical. It is commonly supposed that since 1850 the American working week has fallen from about 70 hours to 39, which should mean that there has been a gain of 31 hours a week in free time. In fact, says the professor this is "largely myth". Unfortunately we have not yet seen the report and rely on the following summary published in *The Times* (June 18):

He points out that in the statistics used to estimate the average work week part-time workers are included. If figures of only full-time workers are used the work week becomes about 46 or 47 hours, which subtracts about six hours from the free time supposed to have been gained.

In addition it now takes an average of 8½ hours a week for people to get to and from work, and at least one hour a week is occupied by "moonlighting", or the taking of a secondary job.

A further five hours a week is taken up by repairs, painting and other work in and around the house, and shopping, helping with the washing up or putting things in and out of the dishwasher and other household chores are found to take up another two hours of a man's time each week.

"If added up", Dr. de Grazia says, "all the elements that did not exist in the pattern of 1850 but do exist today (the machine pace of working, migration, the journey to work, moonlighting, women working)—all factors that take away from time off the job and yet are related to the job—the difference between 1850 and 1960 comes down to a few hours".

There is no doubting the fact that the American could have more time if he wanted it. He has what is called a large discretionary spending power, earning about \$1,100 (about £393) a year more than he needs to spend on the necessities of life, so that he could if he wished make the choice for more time.

Dr. de Grazia notes that it takes a Russian much longer than an American to earn a loaf of bread, but the American does not take a shorted working week because of it. The reason why he does not, is that he has been trained to consume and "consumption eats money, money costs work, work loses time". Dazzled by the jugglers, Dr. de Grazia says, the individual sells his time for shiny objects and while the cycle continues to spin, to hope for leisure is useless.

Examining how Americans occupy what leisure they have, he draws on statistics based on the amount spent on recreation and allied goods and services. From these he discovers that one-quarter of such expenditure went on radio and television, about the same on toys and sports equipment, less than one-tenth on reading, 8 per cent on the cinema, 6 per cent on gardening, 5 per cent on billiards, bowling, dancing, etc. in commercial places, 5 per cent on clubs, 2 per cent on the theatre and opera, and less than 2 per cent on attending baseball and football games, horseraces, and other spectator sports.

Contrasting the American ideas of passing free time with the ideal of leisure, Dr. de Grazia says sorrowfully that "such an ideal no longer exists in the United States". He believes that the commercial spirit, in business and in government, has no interest in it unless there is spending attached to it. "Instead,

Continued on page 3

"FOOD FAKING EXPOSED", by Horace Jarvis, C. W. Daniel and Co., 6s.

HORACE JARVIS goes through a list of all common foods and drinks, in alphabetical order. He begins with All Spice (or Pimento) and goes on to Water and Wine. He tells us how all these articles of daily consumption are adulterated with harmful chemicals, in order to alter their appearance or to make them go further, or even to preserve them.

This little book is really a small encyclopedia, and its arrangement makes it valuable as a work of reference, but I am not sure that it is wise to attempt to read it straight through. Having done so I am astounded to find that I am still alive.

The trouble is that it is so terribly comprehensive. Even if one lives on fruit there is no guarantee that it has not been sprayed with some noxious chemical. To eat nothing but genuine wholemeal bread seems the only answer.

The Food Fakers

If the writer were not hindered by the law of libel he would be able to tell us what food, and what brands, to avoid. As it is one's first reaction is revulsion, but one's second is bewilderment. How is one to avoid being poisoned by something? No wonder there is so much illness among civilised people, despite the longer life span and the removal of some of the gross scourges of the past, like the plagues which recurred periodically in medieval times.

Not all forms of adulteration are bad. Or at least there is one which is not. Butter sometimes has carrot juice added to it to make it look yellower, and carrots are good for you. It is a pity that

the same cannot be said for the brick dust that goes into some chocolate, or the sawdust that goes into some other products.

Bread used to be called "the staff of Life", but "Death's scythe" would be a better appellation now. I have given up eating white bread since reading this book, although it is perhaps lost labour when one considers the other poisons that I can hardly avoid taking into my system every day.

Into this puddingly white trash goes an almost unbelievable collection of chemicals: nitrogen peroxide, benzol peroxide, chloride and nitrogen trichloride, acid calcium phosphate, acid ammonium phosphate and per-sulphides. This is "nearly all for the purpose of bleaching and making it really white. Such a list is enough to make one's mouth water, and yet fatheads still talk about our pure and good bread. Chlorine, it is interesting to note, was the first war gas employed in the First World War, and for self-protection we were all given gas masks just before the Second World War. The idea of the gas masks was to protect our lungs from its poisonous effects. We suggest that new legislation is needed to protect our stomachs against the action of such chemicals via white bread!"

There is so much on white bread, and its horrors, that it might form a short pamphlet on its own. Our author blames it for producing depression, among other symptoms. Of course there are other troubles in society as well as bad food, but the one cause does not rule the other out. Sexual frustration and a diet of sawdust are not good for most people.

White sugar is almost as bad as white bread, and the modern potato, whiter than its predecessors, may not be actively harmful, but it is tasteless and mushy, so one cannot help asking oneself, "Why this craze for whiteness?"

Our society, although belief in the supernatural as such is on the decline, is riddled with superstition (which had a supernatural origin, but from which the gods and devils have disappeared). The belief that whiteness equals purity, which in turn is equal to health and goodness, is a survival from Christianity, with its belief in one's sins being washed as white as snow in the blood of the Lamb. If this sounds a fantastic explanation one can only reply that the situa-

tion which exists, where people will eat white poison rather than healthy things coloured brown, is already as fantastic as it could very well be. The connection of all this with colour prejudice is obvious, but brown skins gained by sun-bathing are regarded as signs of health. It is all very complicated and confusing. Apparently man shares with the rat,

among other characteristics, the ability to eat almost anything. This does not mean however that he does not have to pay for his omnivorousness, and no doubt many of the illnesses from which we suffer are due to bad feeding, and are therefore not really necessary. To prevent the poisoning and adulteration of foodstuffs however we must take the profit motive out of their production, and to do this would require as great a social revolution as that needed to get rid of the H-Bomb. In the meantime the safest thing is to pay a bit more, or travel a bit further, and get one's food from vegetarian and health food shops, and if that is not possible hope for the best and avoid white flour.

ARTHUR W. ULOTH.

ITALIAN FOOTNOTE

THE 40 pages devoted to the Italian Communist Party in the recent double issue of the *New Left Review* may have killed all interest in the subject for Anarchist readers. It was a very thorough bit of work, and might have been interesting if the Introduction had not been as lavishly obscurantist as the text itself—the report of a party meeting. Perry Anderson's commentary on this debate of last November is more concerned to reassure the international Communist regarding the position of the Italian Party in the Communist world than to elucidate the quality, purpose or strategy of the Italian party itself. There is a great deal about "polycentrism" in the larger field (national independence) but no mention of its endemic nature within Italy, what we used to call "regionalism", an enduring element of anarchist origin.

Typically reflecting the obscurantism

of Italian Communism today was the absence of any reference to the Church in the debate and in Anderson's 40 pages. The fact that the Communists are not fighting the Church today is significant. Their new policy, on the revival of the party soon after the war, was demonstrated when the Bishop of Milan refused to give absolution to members of the party; the local party hired a fleet of buses to take the faithful for absolution in the more liberal bishopric of Turin. Another priest a year or two later could even denounce a young couple by name from the pulpit as living in sin because they were married in a registry office and not in church. The Communists made nothing of it. And last week the civil judiciary, taking up the Church's unflinching endeavour to maintain the flavour of sin in sex, sent the famous pop singer, Cori, creator of *Serenata a Mergellina*, last year's prize song, to 10 days in prison, when it happened to come out in a court case that he had been living for 8 years with a woman not his wife. And the judge sent for the lady and put her away for 15 days.

Meanwhile, to pacify the old-fashioned Communist, bewildered by all these and other instances of toleration of priestly interference—for instance, in the schools, the Party has placarded the walls of even such a small village as I live in with a great poster promising the equivalent of £2 a week pension to all workers on the land at the expense of the state. Surely such benefits as this will be worth a mass, or even shaking hands with the Pope. So keep quiet—we're in a hurry, the Communists say. That is the immediate significance of the new attitude to the Church. If the Party is going to be in time to dispense such favours as will keep it in office long enough to secure power, there must be no delay. For the Catholic Left is a serious proposition, and the Pope himself is leftist, and his Demo-Christian government is already proposing the nationalisation of electricity; if things go on like this there will be nothing left for the Communist Party to do—except promise more and more money at the expense of the state. So today Togliatti is the very Gaitskell of Italy, a funambulist ready to trim everything down to his pubic hairs.

The longer significance of toleration has been thought out by the mythologists of the Party; let it by all means be a Catholic Italy over which we assume power and responsibility—it is easier to make Communists of children so educated than of any others. At least that's what I'm told. K.W.

LAG 1962 Summer School

The Summer School will be held at Alan Albon's (Little Marshfoot Farm, Mill Road, Hailsham, Sussex) from Saturday, August 4th, to Monday, August 6th, under canvas. The cost will be 35/- per person (children *pro rata*). Deposit with booking 10/- per person.

Speakers will include Nicolas Walter, others to be announced shortly. Enquiries and Bookings (plus deposits) to Mary Stevenson, 6, Stainton Road, Enfield, Middx. Further details will be sent to interested comrades.

N.B.: CLOSING DATE WEDNESDAY JULY 18th. Food has to be ordered 2 weeks beforehand.

BOOKS?

We can supply

ANY book in print. Also out-of-print books searched for—and frequently found! This includes paper-backs, children's books and text books. (Please supply publisher's name if possible).

NEW BOOKS

The Conscious Mind Kenneth Walker 21/-
The Abortionist Doctor X 21/-
Fabian Essays in Socialism 30/-
Hospitals and Children: A Parent's Eye View (ed.) James Robertson 18/-
The Earl of Louisiana A. J. Liebling 21/-

REPRINTS AND CHEAP EDITIONS

Collected Works Vol. 9 V. I. Lenin 7/6
Verdun Jules Romains 30/-

SECOND-HAND

The Education of Henry Adams: an Autobiography 9/-; Tito Speaks Vladimir Dedijer 6/-; The People's Budget (1909) David Lloyd George 3/-; Six Soviet Plays ed. Eugene Lyons 6/-; The Great Decision Michael Amrine 5/-; Essay on Clive Lord Macaulay 2/6; Living Things J. W. N. Sullivan 2/6; Love's Coming-of-Age Edward Carpenter 3/6; The Golden Age H. J. Massingham 3/-; People's Republic of Bulgaria (Propaganda) 2/6; Psycho-Analysis for Normal People Geraldine Coster 3/-; Essays and Letters Leo Tolstoy 3/6; Songs of Freedom (ed.) Henry S. Salt 3/6; Fundamental Problems of Marxism G. Plekhanov 8/6; The Theory of Foreign Exchanges (1890) George J. Goschen 3/-; Modern Civilization on Trial C. Delisle Burns 3/6; Rhyme and Reason (Poems) ed. David Martin 2/6; On Living in a Revolution Julian Huxley 3/-; France since the First Empire James MacDonell 3/6; Essays and Letters on Public Affairs C. H. Norman 5/-; The Tasks of the Proletariat in Our Revolution V. I. Lenin 3/-; Soviet Anthology (ed.) John Rodker 2/6; The New Book of Martyrs Georges Duhamel 3/6; The Elements of Social Science R. M. MacIver 3/6; Ancient Eugenics A. G. Roper 3/6; The Superman in Modern Literature Leo Berg 3/6; Possible Worlds J. B. S. Haldane 3/6.

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

'Whose for Humanity' The Colonel in Retreat

Sir,—If a somewhat unpopular contributor may enter your column a second—and last—time, rather than softly and silently vanish away (Lewis Carroll again) let me admit three things:

1. Yes, I was in a temper. I wrote in a five-minute flash of indignation because I thought the officer in question was being pilloried unfairly. In another half-hour I would have written temperately or not at all. A mistake, and I apologise.

2. Yes, I sneered too and became emotional; and thereby ruined my case. I apologise.

3. I never intended, or would presume, to climb into a debate on the ethics of nuclear warfare. Like religion, this needs discussing deeply or not at all. I doubt if even having four quite nice children, for whose survival I earnestly hope, is enough qualification.

In parentheses, my feelings about having, possibly, to kill a large or small number of people of any race are exactly the same as yours and your readers'.

Having said this, back to my limited point. I believe that it is neither right nor charitable to snipe in public at a Government servant for doing two things he couldn't help: declaring where his duty lay, bitter as this must have been, and earning that (irrelevant?) CBE. I didn't mention that; the dig seemed beneath comment.

If any of these words help a little to dispel the image of a blimpish clown, I shall remain—Yours gratefully,

P. A. J. GRAHAM.

[Since we introduced readers to the *Guardian's* irate correspondent in *Who's for Humanity* (FREEDOM, June 16, plus a misprint in the headline in part of the edition!) we feel we must also reprint his second letter to that paper, in which he beats an honourable retreat, and establishes the fact that an officer is not "a blimpish clown" but a gentleman. However, Colonel Graham still maintains that a Government servant must do his duty whatever it is; that is, if he is ordered to press a button which will result in the annihilation of mankind, he must do so. That is a point of view, and the more one appreciates how sincerely and honestly it can be held, the stronger is the anarchist argument against vesting in individuals power to so hypnotise other human beings that they cease to have a will of values of decency of their own. Colonel Graham in effect does not disagree with Jon Tinker's argument that there is nothing to choose between the subservience to authority of an Eichmann and an Air Commodore Magill. It just hasn't registered—yet. Perhaps the correspondence has done some good —EDITORS].

Are you helping to find those
750 New Readers?

Francis Bacon at the Tate

FRANCIS BACON is an artist who in spite of the dubious welcome that his exhibition at the Tate has received cannot now be ignored by the professional art blurb writers, for his work of the last fifteen years has triggered off a chain reaction that at least has given us the Tottenham Court Road school of Pop art.

A dubious welcome—for in spite of the corny write-ups about this "artist of horror" and the rest of the flea pit literature there was a noticeable lack of sympathy and understanding and this could be explained by the fact that many of the scabby sycophants singing automatic hosannas in time to the twitching rump of the whore of fashion ten or more years ago were vocally and publicly mocking Bacon as the comic strip artist of the fifties.

He was derided not for his incompetence as an artist but for his subject matter and Herbert Read in his particular slab of the monumental *Art Since 1945* spoke for the *haut monde* when he wrote that

"I have mentioned many names as yet internationally unknown, but the two names that are best known abroad have so far escaped my survey—Graham Sutherland and Francis Bacon. There is good reason for this—both artists are individualists and difficult to classify."

Thus spake the art pedant. The *Arts Review* dismisses Bacon with a column and a quarter on their yellow sheet flimsy dragging in Laurence Alloway's statement about Bacon's "fast dating 'Grand Guignol' and his 'creaking melodrama'" and tossed in two American Comedians of pen and posey, Charles Addams and Tom Lehrer, to load the argument, while the *Observer* headed their spread as a "Report from the Underworld" but, write what they may,

and how they may, no one can deny Bacon's importance as an influence on the other artists of our time. As an artist he can, time after time, offer work that is fantastically badly executed and his literal destruction of his early academic work was a violation of one source that he might not have been too proud to acknowledge.

Like Max Ernst, Bacon conquers his technical incompetence by giving life to the amorphous scabs of paint that fester upon his bleak canvases and around the image of broken and rotting flesh he sketches with a few brief strokes a vague hint of a background.

If anyone should believe that Bacon is a good painter then let him compare his parody of Pope Innocent X with Velasquez's original while his unfortunate flirtation with Van Gogh at its best would make bad cinema posters. Gone are the slow rhythms of the Dutchman's hot colours and the serenity of isolation that Van Gogh catches in his painted mirror leaving Bacon's misshapen hulk stumbling through a world of dead yellows, reds and greens created not by hate but by incompetence but what Bacon has attempted and succeeded in doing is to portray the clinical abstract emotion of pain.

Divorced from all social contact his broken lumps of flesh writhe, bleed and scream their unreasoning agony and there within their glass cases and crawling across their endless floors they suffer without cause or hope of redemption. Even with his triptych of the Christ without a Cross and without a faith only a purposeless torture of uncomprehending flesh. For an emotion divorced from its social context is and must be completely meaningless. Michelangelo as befits the cloistered craftsman

regarded death as a ludicrous vulgarity and his painted puppets echoed his disdain, while Mantegna who revelled in the masochism of pain hung his uncaring Christ among a group who represented a society indifferent to the suffering of others.

For Goya death was the anti-climax to the horror of living and it was left to Hieronimus Bosch to sup the full sadistic pleasure of this act of desecration and his stupid and insipid camp Christ must die time and time again among a people who loved pain for its own sake and who killed in the certain knowledge that there would always be another subject to play the obscene game. And each artist made his point by playing his central character against a social background that sang the temper of the time and this Bacon never does for by his very act of isolation he defeats himself.

Yet when all that is said the fact remains that Francis Bacon is the most important and influential artist that this country has produced since the war and his gift to the arts is that he reintroduced the artist to the human race. At a period when the arts were dominated by writers who dictated to their servile cliques what and how to paint; when the clichés of a single repeated brush stroke claimed its devotees and when the fresh clean wave of the regional artists offered us barren landscapes Bacon by the very shock nature of his subject matter drew the painter and the spectator back to a canvas that pleaded for the right of man to once more accept his role within his own universe. Bacon's stumbling brush has written a manifesto for the dispossessed in our dishonoured society and the dispossessed is man himself.

ARTHUR MOYSE.

FREEDOM

June 23 1962 Vol 23 No 20

The Principle of Government

Continued from page 1

ary citizens as contrasted with the career "colonels", who represent a class apart. The success of the FLN in resisting a modern army equipped with the latest and ghastliest non-nuclear weapons of destruction (thanks also to American aid!) depended on the growing support and sympathy they found among the Moslem population of Algeria, which outnumbers the *colons* and the French forces by at least 7 to 1. Now it is notorious that until the advent of de Gaulle, all French governments survived or were defeated on the Algerian issue. "Algerie Francaise" was the mood that swept France no less than the armed forces and the important white Algerian community. De Gaulle was swept into power on a wave of open rebellion, with the undisguised support of the French armed forces. We have suggested elsewhere that political, economic, military and personal considerations, brought about de Gaulle's "conversion" from "Algerie Francaise" to a policy of an independent Algeria. We look upon de Gaulle as a realist rather than an idealist; and the risk he took was what, in political circles, they call a "calculated risk". Not for one moment did he abandon the principle of government for revolution! One day we shall learn the truth of "General de Gaulle's conversion". We hazard a guess that the financial interests behind the Sahara development saw a more secure future in an Algerian Algeria than in trying to keep down Moslem nationalism by a series of costly military campaigns which, apart from killing more and more Moslems, and fanning the flames of nationalism, did nothing to solve the problem or destroy the movement. De Gaulle not being a God but simply an ambitious and shrewd politician, used the Referendum to confirm his return to power on the wave of military rebellion, as well as to confirm his later policies, for Algerian independence against his erstwhile military backers.

Democratic governments "is the will of the people"; de Gaulle in spite of the dictatorial powers he enjoys (all contained in the constitution, of course) can at the same time claim to be acting with the overwhelming approval of the French people. (Only Stalin received a higher percentage of Yes-men's votes!) But however much de Gaulle may want the people's vote of confidence when he cannot be sure of the loyalty of the forces of law and order, it will be recalled that even when, as was the case earlier this year, there were rumours of a *coup d'etat* by the OAS generals and colonels in France itself, de Gaulle firmly rejected all suggestions that the working people of France should be armed to meet the threat. In preferring a military uprising to the consequences of arming the people he reacted as did the popular Front government in Spain in 1936. *Coup d'etats* may result in a change of government and in the emergence of a new privileged class; but the system remains. Arming the people, on the other hand, can create more problems for the ruling class than it solves. De Gaulle's calculated risks have paid off. Curiously enough it is the FLN who have, politically speaking, saved de Gaulle's bacon. They have succeeded in commanding more respect from the OAS than the General, his authority and his armies. What he could not achieve by threats of

"punishment for the guilty" has, it seems, been achieved by the erstwhile (FLN) and the present (OAS) "rebels", in negotiations which ignored the official government altogether!

The broadcast by the "high command" of the OAS in Algeria declared that the terms, which it accepted were of a nature to bring peace to Algeria by a reconciliation "in honour and dignity". The OAS in the name of the European community, was ready to take the path now opened. "We will keep our engagements. If the others keep theirs, the exodus and scorched-earth will give way to creative and fraternal activities. Then without distinction of race and religion, we shall contribute to Algeria's future".

We would wish that this were the case, because such sentiments are the bases of the anarchist philosophy. But "honour and dignity", "creative and fraternal activities" without "distinction of race and religion" can only be achieved in communities free from authority from above; free from privileged minorities; free from employers and employees. At best a "liberated" Algeria will be "without distinction of race and religion". At the top will be Moslems and Christians; at the bottom there will be Moslems and Christians. A step forward? Yes, it certainly is for those Moslems who will now be at the top. But until the principle of government is discarded, debunked and discredited class, privilege, and all the injustices of governmental society will persist. To get rid of those it is not inspired leaders we should seek but the unity and militancy born of solidarity of the underprivileged everywhere.

TIME IS LIFE

Continued from page 1

an ideal of free time, or of the good life, has taken the field. The good life consists in the people's enjoyment of whatever industry produces, advertisers sell and Government orders".

Is the pattern so different in this country or in any of the "affluent" nations?

NOT having read Dr. Grazia's report we do not know what conclusions he arrives at, apart from the statistical ones quoted in the *Times* summary. But most readers will not need us to point out that Dr. Grazia's report is a confirmation of the anarchist case: viz, that production should be determined by needs, as well as the views we have on a number of occasions expressed in these columns that in the technological age we live in, so long as we are obsessed by the capitalist (and 19th century puritanical socialist) slogan that "he who does not work neither shall he eat" we will be concerned with problems of full-employment instead of demanding that automation and other mechanical substitutes for hand labour, should be the means for reducing working hours and increasing leisure. In an editorial on "More Parasites than Workers?"* we quoted the following by a writer in the American journal *New Leader* which seems to sum up Dr. Grazia's report in a sentence:

*As long as we persist in confusing

*FREEDOM, Nov. 28, 1959. Reprinted in *Selections from Freedom*, Vol. 9, 1959, p.224.

THERE'S STILL TIME BROTHER—

OR IS THERE?

I SUPPOSE every Anarchist or radical socialist has said at some time in his life; "of course the free society won't come in my lifetime but in by grandchildren's lifetime . . ."; has said this possibly almost in the same breath as saying that Capitalism makes wars, and that till we change society wars are inevitable. As, if there is a war there will be no grandchildren, it is time that this sort of thinking was forgotten—not that this will be easy, the concept has almost become integral to Leftist thought, and the fact that the phrase "Socialism in Our Time" has come to have a ghoulish significance appeals to the intellect but not the emotions. The habit of ignoring unpleasant possibilities dies hard. I remember that some years ago I gave a talk to the Malatesta Club, in which at the beginning as a passing reference I estimated that the vast probabilities for the world, were that it was doomed either to a Nuclear War or that brain-washing would bring in an 1984-Brave New World-Machine Stops agglomerate anthill type dictatorship; having made which forecast everyone else as well as myself was prepared to pass onto the serious business of the talk—discussing what would happen if we escaped the probabilities.

Sometimes those of us who point out the dangers of war and give factual and scientific proof of the dangers of war being occasioned by accident are accused of scaremongering and told that the hysteria we may breed is dangerous. But if a man is standing on the edge of a precipice it is more dangerous to lie to him about the height of the fall than to tell him the ghastly truth. If he knows the truth he may faint and fall, but at least he will not try risking a jump down the cliff. The position the world is now in is quite simply this, if the cold war continues unchanged as it is; there is—according to the inventor of Radar (Watson Watt) and to other eminent scientists—a balance of probability approaching statistical certainty that war will happen by accident. If it continues and the mutual hatred between the supporters of the rival systems increases then there is strong danger either of a Fascist revival or of a spread of the Stalinist system; so that Totalitarian dictatorship will become world-wide. (Indeed this could happen in other ways, though the evidence is that Stalinism could hardly do better than it is, whatever the West did). If a social-democrat revival rectifies some of the surface evils in the world, and if its

Neutralist wing is sufficiently strong to bring about a lessening of world tension the cost in the increase in the powers of the state will be enormous; especially if it disarms and has to bring about the economic changes necessary to prevent unemployment; and this way too lies 1984 *et al.*

If we accept that War is the greatest of all forms of tyranny—usually bringing in its wake other forms of tyranny; and that all tyranny involves social war between rulers and ruled; we reject the thesis that there is an alternative open to man, fight or submit to tyranny—there is only the choice, Anarchism or submit to war and tyranny. Accepting this then the movement represented by CND—C of 100 must be looked on as the last hope; but a hope only if it comes to the logic of its own convictions. Unilateral Disarmament can only be permanently achieved if the state is deprived of the power to rearm; therefore Unilateralist aims are nothing less than Anarchist aims if they are correctly understood. More important than the nominal aims however are the means of civil disobedience (which if adopted on a mass scale lead directly to Syndicalism), is the central point of hope in the new radical revival. The position cannot be too brutally stated; the Free society can only come if it comes in time to prevent world destruction or world-wide brain-washing; it can only come if the nascent revival utilizes to the full the potentials of its own forms of action, involves far greater numbers than at present it even considers involving, and realizes that its aims can only be won by social revolution of a kind that leaves no room for the growth of a new class society.

For those who may think this prospect too grim it is well to remember that every emergent form of Capitalist society since the first has needed to build a Trade Wall against its more established rivals, when it is only dominant in one State. Though sometimes it can do this through Tariff barriers, it frequently needs a conflict of ideologies (either a religious crusade, or the mask of a self-styled revolutionary movement), to protect developing home industries from being swamped by others. During the early Stuart period, the Long Parliament, the rule of the Cromwellian Army and the Stuart restoration alike, Britain was almost constantly at war with Holland. The rivalry and recurrent wars between Britain and France at the turn of the 18th-19th centuries started before the

accession of Louis XVI, were unchanged by the Declaration of the Republic by Thermidor or Brumaire, by the crowning of Napoleon or by the restoration of the Bourbons—the Napoleonic wars were merely part of a far longer period of war. The American Civil War was not caused by a disinterested wish of the North to abolish slavery (Lincoln had been a pro-slaver and was a life-long white supremacist The rise of Stalinism in Russia was necessary to the emergent Managerialist class; if Russia had been able to trade with the West on Capitalist terms, the new Russian industries would have been swamped; if the Western industries had become socialised the barrier would again have been broken and the rising Salarial in Russia would have had their power broken, if the West had turned to Communism even on Stalinist terms Russian industries would have been swamped; therefore the rising ruling class wanted a Government that would provoke enmity abroad, that would prevent a spread of either socialism or its perversion of Socialism to the West—in order that the Free Trade that Peter the Great introduced should be abolished Stalin was necessary, Red-Brown Referendum, Stalin-Hitler Pact, Concentration Camps and all. As it is now necessary to the new Chinese rulers.

Dissident Bolsheviks rightly saw that Stalinist policies propped up the Western ruling class, failed to go on to see why, are now blind in a similar way to the real reasons of the Sino-Soviet breach, and also to the fact that by now the Stalinist ruling class is as necessary to the Western Capitalists as the Capitalists are necessary to Stalinism. Therefore while the ruling classes may squabble about the divisions of the spoils neither side wishes to see the other overthrown so suggestions that the American Government really want to see revolt in Eastern Europe are as absurd as suggestions that the Stalinists really wish to advance Socialism. The drive of Capitalism towards war about which revolutionary socialists have always been certain, is at its strongest where new forms of Capitalism are finding outlets in newly developed nations and in times of transition generally; for then the normal rivalry over the division of spoils is reinforced to become a struggle to survive in any form and at this stage the emergent ruling class has greater hopes if it can utilise an ideology. Tawney showed the link between Protestantism and nascent Capitalism, the expansion of Mohammedanism was necessitated by a similar Trade growth which in turn produced the Crusades; but since the wars of religion rising ruling classes have used both Jacobinism and Bolshevism.

Continued on page 4

COMMENT

MINORITY ACTION & ELITES

SOME of our friends, notably Laurens Otter, confuse our concept of anarchism by stages with the withering away of the State as expounded by the Marxists. Hence the accusations that we are "elitists" when we express our view that social changes will be brought about by militant minorities. But in fact it seems to us that the distinction between what he fears and what we aim at, as realists, is so clear. The Marxists say that the proletariat must capture, or seize, the seats of power; in other words they must become the government. In practice this means that "a party of the people" must replace the party of the privileged class—after all Lenin, who has still his niche in the mausoleum, admitted this in so many words. The anarchists say that the socially, politically conscious section of the underprivileged must do all in their power to take away the initiative from the State in all those matters which concern the well-being of the community. In other words the anarchists urge the people to do always more themselves: that is, to starve the State of power based on the services it "renders" to the community. The Marxists (not to mention the Labour Party "socialists") on the other hand—believe that only a revolutionary elite can "guide" the people from the slavery of capitalism to the

stateless socialist Utopia: in other words, that "a revolutionary government" will teach the people to free itself from the need of government. So not only the Marxists but the anarchists as well believe in "the withering away of the State" but with the fundamental difference that the anarchists believe action to this end should come from below, whereas the Marxists believe that it should come from above. For the anarchists it is the task of the enlightened and militant minorities among the people to educate and "liberate" the apathetic and inhibited majorities; for the Marxists the State will wither away when the new power elite will have educated and legislated for the masses to manage without them. Not only will the difference between the two minorities or elites be obvious to all but the most obtuse; it is also a verifiable fact that those who enjoy positions of power tend to seek to consolidate rather than abdicate, them. The Parliamentarians and the Marxists in principle, do not agree with the anarchists on this point. It is not that our observation is at fault. According to them we have overlooked one crucial point: which is that at present, the *wrong* people are in power! Please, somebody give us examples of the *right* people!

They're no 'Trots' ...

DEAR COMRADE,

In your issue of June 9, 1962, you publish some rather startling comments about our paper *Solidarity*. You refer to it as 'a lively duplicated journal, whose political affiliations we ignore, though we imagine (sic!) it to be one of the multifarious one-and-only Marxist or Trotskyist groups which 'truly' represent the workers' interests'.

Why on earth do you imagine this? Since when has 'imagination' been a basis for political commentary? And since when do your editors stick political labels on journals with which, on their own admission, they are unfamiliar? We don't really mind when Stalinists, Trotskyites and others of their ilk refer to us (erroneously) as 'anarchists'. But it gets a bit thick when uninformed anarchists start referring to us as Trots. ...

FREEDOM may be the 'official' anarchist paper, but this surely does not give it the right to give its readers such garbled comment. Ignorance may be bliss, but downright misinformation isn't. The author of your article must move in very narrow anti-political circles if he (she?) hasn't yet come across *Solidarity*.

For your information—and as a plug—we have already produced 13 issues of the paper. These make our 'political affiliations' (or lack of them) abundantly clear. We have also produced a number of pamphlets on industrial topics ("Renault Workers Fight Back", "Belgium: the General Strike", "The Standard Triumph Strike", "What Next for Engineers?", "The BLSP Dispute"); on the civil disobedience movement ("The 100 versus the State", "The Civil Defence Fraud"); on historical topics ("The Workers' Opposition"); and on questions of socialist theory ("Socialism Reaffirmed", "The Socialist Programme", "The Meaning of Socialism", etc.).

May we agree with you, in conclusion, that the 'healthiest' explanation of the May Day riots would be to attribute

them to the Young Socialists. 'Healthiest', certainly. But also the true explanation. We were there. And we're not 'imagining' things.

ERIC MORSE,
Whipsnade, June 12. Editor, *Solidarity*.

... Who said they were?

WE "imagined" (imagine v.t. Form mental picture of, conceive, guess, take into one's head—*Concise Oxford Dict.*) what we imagined, simply because, after having loyally, as well as with interest, read *Solidarity* we could not be certain what that journal stood for. "For Workers' Power" declares the sub-title of *Solidarity* which is, itself, the organ of "Socialism Reaffirmed". What a lot of words that need defining! Comrade Morse admits that "Stalinists, Trotskyites and others of their 'ilk' refer to them 'erroneously' as 'anarchists' which just goes to show that they don't make themselves clear beyond a doubt. Unfortunately Comrade Morse's letter only clarifies one point: viz, that he and his friends are not anarchists, thereby confirming our reading of their journal. Neither are they "Trots". As a matter of fact we did not, as he suggests, refer to them as such. Indeed we have never really understood the subtle ideological distinctions between a Trot, a Trotskyite, a Trotskyist, a Stalinist, a Leninist and a Marxist. To us simple-minded "Utopians" they all seem to be authoritarians, and as obsessed with the idea of power and an "inspired" leader or ideology as the Christians are with their First Cause. And like the Christians who, in having to keep up with the times, are obliged to denounce the infallible pronouncements of past Popes, so the authoritarian Left, to survive, are continually having to denounce their Gods-that-failed. Apart from a few sycophants and publicists who for their own reasons are *plus Trotskyste que Trotsky*, Stalin's rival for power was already being denounced as an anti-Trotskyist, to our recollection, at the time of the Spanish Revolution in 1936! Comrade Morse may well imagine that we live in a make-believe world where "ignorance is bliss", but he has got us wrong. We know the authoritarians and—to quote his expression—"their ilk". We were producing an anarchist paper at the same printer as, and on the "stone" alongside, C. L. R. James who, at the time, was editing the Trotskyist monthly *Fight*. For years we rubbed shoulders at Marble Arch with the Ted Grants, the Jock Hastons and the Jerry Heeleys "plugging" their *Socialist Appeal* ... and their authoritarianism. We always admired their energy (how so much could be done by so few—and this applied to the Trotskyists in all countries where they were able to operate) and were equally opposed to their authoritarianism. The same could be said of the pre-war Communists. This is not meant as autobiography; we recall the past because we would like to assure comrade Morse that FREEDOM's editors are not just starting to peep into the wicked world from their political cradles!

"For workers' power"—which is *Solidarity's* sub-title—is, to quote our American contemporary, *Manas*, in another context, one of the "slogans and epithets [that] get a lot of uncritical use"—at least in the authoritarian left. We believe in solidarity because we believe in freedom; that only when the individual will cherish being himself will he be equally conscious of the freedom of others to live their own lives. The man or woman who deeply, consciously resents the humiliation, the injustice of having to depend on the will, or the power (economic or political) of another to secure the means to live, will never exploit another man for his profit. To our minds "workers' control" means that the workers in a particular industry demand or enjoy, complete control over production as well as the disposal of the commodities they produce. "Workers' power", as we see it implies not only control by workers' of their own activities but power to subjugate others to their will. We appreciate that these slogans must be taken in the context of a society in which the power is in the hands of those who are not "workers". But the fact remains that the Marxists believe that the "dictatorship of the proletariat"—is this not synonymous with *Solidarity's* "For workers' power"?—is a necessary stage in the emancipation of the people, even after the privileged class has been overthrown.

Lonely are the Brave

I should like to add a postscript to the review of the film *Lonely are the Brave* which appeared in FREEDOM on May 25th, just pointing out that some important details of the original story (in Edward Abbey's *Brave Cowboy*) have been altered during its passage to the screen. The hero of the film is called a "loner" and his friend is in prison for helping illegal immigrants; in the book they are both anarchists and draft-dodgers, and the friend is in prison for being a conscientious objector on anarchist grounds. When they were at the State University together the two friends had distributed a protest against military service signed by themselves and P. B. Shelley, H. D. and Emiliano Zapata, and when the hero breaks out of the prison he is hunted down as a dangerous Red. The point of this is simply that while Hollywood can just tolerate a libertarian fable when it is dressed up in traditional "Western" clothes and scripted by someone like Dalton Trumbo (who also worked on *Spartacus*), the cinema Establishment will not tolerate the same fable when it is dressed in its original anarchist clothes or scripted by a genuine rebel. Of course there is nothing surprising in this, but anarchists ought to know what has happened, and they aren't likely to learn from the capitalist or "socialist" press. It's an interesting and revealing example of civilised censorship at its most skilful.

Hampstead, June 8.

N.W.

Algeria Liberation?

DEAR EDITORS,

As you have seen fit to choose Algeria as the peg upon which to hang your homily addressed to Anarcho-Pacifists, would you permit one of the simple-minded "love and conciliation" tribe to assess that subject with just that degree of ruthless "realism" you favour in your dealings with these Anarchists who have renounced the institution of War and ask you point-blank, what in the name of blazing hell the squalid shambles of the past eleven years has to do with "freedom", "liberation", "end of tyranny" and all the other slogans of the up-and-coming ruling clique in Africa and elsewhere which in your more soft-trained "anti-colonial" tantrums you seem to echo in dutiful "left-wing fashion"? The wretched women and children of Algeria as well as not a few no doubt basely uncommitted mules have been living (or dying) in an orgy of "realistic" savagery perpetrated impartially by the French and FLN war machines in order that one gang of aspiring politicians may succeed another gang too well established to deserve the same adjective. In this bloody exercise of "realism" and "self-defence"(!), let us have a thought or a prayer (if you will permit the aberration) for those many brave or just plain ordinary souls, French or Algerian, Muslim or Christian, who contrived to keep comparatively sane and to cling despairingly to the "lifeline" of day-to-day endeavour as human beings.

Yours sincerely,

DAVID SEDLEY.

London, N.W.2. June 16.

Don't Stop!

FINANCIAL STATEMENT AT JUNE 16th 1962

Week 24	EXPENSES: 24 weeks at £70	£1,680
	INCOME:	
	Sales & Sub. Renewals	£ 1,025
	Week 24 ...	5
		1,030
	New Subscriptions:	
	Weeks 1-23 (182)	206
	Week 24 (5)	7
		213
		1,243
	DEFICIT	£437

DEFICIT FUND

Denver: A.J. £1/1/6; Shoreham: M. & D.* 2/6; London: R.O. £3/8/0; S. Francisco: p.p. group* outing Los Gatos, June 3 (per 'Incaricato') £17/10/0; London: J.R. 12/-; Wolverhampton: J.L.* 2/6; Wolverhampton: J.K.W.* 2/-; Gravesend: T.C. 8/-; Nunceaton: D.H. 2/6; Co. Down: J.H. 2/-; Oxford: Anon.* 5/-; Menlo Park: I.U. 14/-; Glasgow: J.H.* 5/-; Glasgow: A.J. 2/3; Hounslow: L.* 2/6; London: L.O. 12/8; London: P. & G.T.* 5/-; Wolverhampton: J.L.* 4/6; Wolverhampton: J.K.W.* 4/6; San Francisco: I.R. £4/14/-.

TOTAL 31 0 5

Previously acknowledged 646 8 8

1962 TOTAL TO DATE £677 9 1

*Indicates regular contributors.

There's still time Brother?

Continued from page 3

It is of course basic that every ruling class is at its safest when it can accuse its enemies of aiding the national enemy or weakening the State in its hour of need, so that from time immemorial rulers whose rule is menaced at home have sought refuge in foreign wars, finding in alien adversaries allies in their internal struggles. (Now as the Russian ruling class is no longer menaced, it unlike the Chinese one wishes to ease off the tension.)

Therefore any "revolutionary" movement that adopts practical aims, that decides that the masses will never become revolutionary and that it has a (God-given right) historically ordained duty to lead the workers to the new society and that the revolution must be made by an elite on behalf of the masses not only risks being taken over as a front for a new ruling class which will use its theories to justify setting up a new oppressive regime, but it also helps to create world situations in which the risk of war is greater than it would otherwise be.

In the past such situations however terrible nevertheless did not threaten mankind's future. In the past regularly Anarchists have met the answer to their argument that oh well such and such a group has the same aims as ours eventually but one must learn to walk before one can run—one must build a system which will educate and fit people for a free society. In the past, time and time again, the practical men have been betrayed by their leaders who have battered down their followers and fastened on those masses to be educated a tyranny no less vile than its predecessors. In the past mankind has survived this succession of rulers and the wars they have brought in their train but in our age with Nuclear Weapons and Germ warfare on the one hand and brainwashing subliminal advertising et al on the other, continued survival of Mankind as a freedom loving race can no longer be taken for granted. In the past the choice was Anarchy or Chaos, now it is Anarchy or either Extermination or the Ant-hill of the Brain-washed.

This means that while the CND—C of 100 is the only hope, it is also only a hope if it totally eschews all elitist concepts; and does not find some new "practical" revolutionary theory. There is a danger of this, a danger that cannot be overestimated, the mistakes the revolutionary movements made in 1789 and 1917 have done immeasurable harm, the world cannot survive a third such mistake; and it is from among ourselves that the danger comes and against ourselves that we must beware. In the Maltesta Club talk to which I referred earlier, considering the radical revival that was then due but not apparent, I suggested that there was a danger that practical non-Utopians might produce a "scientific" Anarchist theory and that this might become the basis of a new class philosophy. Now we are already seeing calls for a party of Direct Action on the one hand and theories as to how the present minority movement that the C of 100 represents could while a minority movement, by using secrecy, sabotage, or what have you, coerce the majority. The majority they tell us is apathetic and by definition must remain so. At present another minority keeps it in ignorance of the facts and it is only when this minority is overthrown by a radical minority if necessary by violence that we can hope to spread Anarchist consciousness.

Such a theory differs in no vital respects from the elitism of the Bolsheviks; we've seen where it leads before. Against it one can only put the traditional Utopian wildly impracticable answer of the Anarchists, we stand for the self-liberation of the vast majority; we stand for the growth of revolutionary consciousness and for the formation of revolutionary organisations of the vast majority, suitable for transforming society. Wildly impracticable and visionary yes, but the only hope. This hope is strengthened by the fact that in Non-Violent Resistance (the taking upon one's self of another's violence in order to persuade others to consider one's arguments more deeply), we have found at last an effective means of conversion that involves a minimum of coercion that therefore helps people to become free in themselves, as they come to see the need for freedom, and at the same time demonstrates the need for people to do things for themselves rather than relying on politicians to do it for them. It is therefore a pointer on the road to self-liberation. The C of 100 or its derivatives therefore if it concentrates on going to the workers (directly involved or

otherwise) and persuading them to act for themselves can become a real revolutionary Anarchist Movement. If on the other hand it adopts elitist "revolutionary" techniques whether or not coupled with pseudo-Anarchist theories; it will mean that we have had our last chance of keeping the world going and transforming it into something better and we have failed to take it. Will our Grandchildren have a time?

LAURENS OTTER.

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.

JUNE 24 Maurice Goldman:
Eros, Culture and Psycho-analysis

JULY 1 John Pilgrim:
Record Recital—Men at Work,
on Strike and in Prison

JULY 8 Frank Hirschfield:
Anarchism or the New Age

JULY 15 Maurice Goldman:
Time, Money and Death

Hyde Park Meetings

Sundays at 4 p.m. onwards
(Anarchist time) (Weather permitting)

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.

2nd Wednesday of each month at 8 p.m. at Morris Bradley's, 15 Pyrland Road, Newington Green, N.5.

3rd Wednesday of each month at 8 p.m. at Donald Room'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). N.B.—June meeting in N.2. will be held at 45, Twyford Avenue.

Last Friday of each month at 8 p.m. at Laurens and Celia Otter's, 57 Ladbrooke Road, W11 (for May and June).

NEW MEETING
3rd Tuesday, 1st meeting, July 16th, 242 Amesbury Avenue, S.W.2. (Streatham Hill, Nr. Station).

ANARCHY Nos 1-15

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 only

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

1 year (40 issues) 40/- (\$6.00)

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

FREEDOM PRESS

17a MAXWELL ROAD

LONDON, S.W.6, ENGLAND

Tel: RENOWN 3736.