

ON July 9th, the American government exploded its rainbow bomb, a high altitude nuclear explosion, despite the widespread criticism from scientists throughout the world, that it might interfere with the natural belts of radiation that surround the earth.

Immediately after the explosion, it was claimed that none of these bad effects had transpired. Now however, it has been discovered that the radiation belt created by the July 9th explosion is stronger than had originally been thought, and may persist for several years. The comments of the weekly journal *Nature*, in its issue of September 8th, on this are as follows:

"There can be no doubt that both laymen and scientists are becoming more and more worried at what appear to be grave decisions concerning upper atmosphere and space research being made mainly for military advantage or political prestige. Now is the time to question the desirability of so much scientific research coming directly under the sanction of Governmental or military authorities, for it is conceivable that many scientists are unable to criticize too objectively, since they depend on political and other authorities for financial support for their work. Indeed many scientists are employed directly by the government and they are in no position to express concern or raise objections. This all takes us back to the many times (the most recent in *Nature* of August 25th, 1962) that we have pointed out the grave danger inherent in allowing science to become involved in power politics."

On the face of it this is a plea for liberalism in the relations between government and the scientific world, and the writer obviously feels very strongly about the dangers of government getting too much of the upper hand, and one can only despair at the writer's choice of the time to make his stand. For decades, science has been directly supporting the war industries of all countries, bombing strategy, the A-bombs and the series of H-bomb tests with their toll of human life and fall-out dangers, but when they interfere with current research in radiation belts, "Now is the time to question, etc."

However when one examines the argument more closely it is clear that the writer is putting forward a view that is quite impossible, that the state should be expected to finance scientific research on a massive scale, including presumably the reactors, computers and telescopes which are essential to modern physics and astronomy, and yet be expected to exempt it from the political control that is the reason for the state's existence; that the govern-

ment which thrives on military strategy, political prestige, and the power struggle, should allow direction of scientific effort to fall into the hands of people who apparently are objective enough to see that much of the energy and work put into research is useless at best, and probably dangerous, but who are unfortunately not "too objective" in feeling the need to criticize the government and get something done about it.

The scientific work done in a society reflects all the forces at work in it, and to expect it to be exempt from government control in a society where everything is subject to government control, to expect it to be free in an unfree society is as "Utouian" as to expect sex, education or industrial relationships to be free under the same circumstances.

Although these specific fields of human activity cannot achieve independence from the effects of an

## Science in the State

authoritarian environment (and it is encouraging to note that they seem to regard this as ideal) merely by asking for it, and explaining how difficult life can be when political pressure interferes with them, they do provide points at which a break-out can be made. Now in the middle of the twentieth century, when many of the activities that a free community would provide for its members, or rather those which they would organise for their mutual benefit, are organised today in connection with the state, it is not so easy to formulate a specific programme in terms of an anti-state approach. This is however, in some ways a point of strength because it removes the temptation to fall into easy slogans.

What is required if science is to produce results beneficial to human beings, which we believe would happen if the workers involved got together and controlled their own work as part of a free, anarchist community, is for each individual to apply the same objectivity to his own role in society, to the reasons why his is financed and supported by the government, as he would to a specific research project to criticize objectively whenever the work he is asked to do is connected with military or political prestige, and better still, not to do it.

The difficulty is that considered on a short term basis, from the narrow point of view which sees scientific pursuits separate from the rest of social affairs, development of

space and war research provides a kind of freedom that the scientist enjoys in terms of better job prospects, easier grants, and greater respect. As the writer in *Nature* has observed at last, this has to be paid for, possibly by the whole of the scientific world and not by the few who have got to the top, by agreeing with everything their masters proposed.

This leads once again to the conclusion which anarchists have been emphasising for a century, that an individual or a specific field of activity can only be free in a free society, and that the only way to that lies in the overthrow of the authoritarian institutions; power policies, militarism and the state.

P.H.

ADDRESSING a gathering of industrialists, trade unionists and representatives of social and economic bodies in connection with National Productivity Year, the Duke of Edinburgh told them that "the crux of the problem in increasing productivity and efficiency lay in the fact that it involved change."

"This sounds simple and obvious enough but change is one of those things which we like to encourage others to do but which most people dislike accepting themselves."

People who claimed to be old-fashioned hated to be told that they were inefficient. Change was helpful for some but awkward for others.

"Skills acquired over a long period are suddenly no longer needed, a well-understood routine is disrupted, a ladder of promotion vanishes overnight. All these things are profoundly disturbing to the individuals involved and ample reason in themselves for resistance to change. On the other hand it is even more painfully true that any organisation which refuses to accept change in any form eventually succumbs to extinction or revolution."

Change did not destroy tradition, it strengthened it. Change did not disrupt a well-run organisation, it gave it new

## THE WIND OF SMALL CHANGE

life. Change is a challenge and an opportunity not a threat.

The Duke called for the creation of a climate of opinion which looked upon scientific research, work study, and all the other aids to productivity as normal.

Of course the Duke is right about "extinction or revolution", and one is surprised that after so many years at Buckingham Palace he has made no significant impression on the institution of monarchy. Perhaps the basis of resistance to change in the palace is no different from that in industry. If change in industry means that large numbers of people will be uprooted, that a life-time's skill is overnight declared useless and its possessor made "redundant", is it so surprising that people should be resistant to change? After all, think of the number of jobs that would become redundant if the wind of change swept through the corridors of Buckingham Palace!

★

SO it seems to us that as long as the focal point of life is the money system, and the profit motive the determining factor in production, "change" will be resisted by different sections of the community for varying reasons, each defending what they consider to be their vital interests. Productivity, which must not be confused with production or output, is the application of labour-saving techniques, and economies in raw materials and plant to manufacturing and other processes. Productivity as applied to the land means greater output per acre; to a factory more units of production per machine per hour per man.

The Duke maintains that the "crux" of the problem in increasing productivity lies "in the fact that it involved change" by which he meant change in production techniques, involving not only the re-tooling of factories but the re-training of skilled work people to cope with the new techniques. And his suggestion was that many employers and employees are reluctant to make those changes. Whilst that is true it is only a small part of the problem; indeed it is only one of the by-products of the major problem which needless to say, the Duke

did nothing to ventilate with his wind of change.

We maintain that the term "productivity" is socially important, only when all production serves a public need. The following news item (from the *Daily Herald*) vividly illustrates what we mean:

Three hundred skilled men worked on as usual yesterday in a doomed factory. They were turning out high-precision jobs for scrap.

Engineers cut and planed metal wings intended for the Blue Water missile, which has now been abandoned. Their work had to be accurate to one-thousandth of an inch. Inspectors examined the parts for faults and nodded them on their way.

Then the finished product was tossed on one side.

This has been going on at the English Electric aircraft works in Luton, Bedfordshire, since the Government officially abandoned Blue Water a month ago.

The waste was attacked yesterday at a factory-gate mass meeting by shop stewards' convenor Peter Southcott. "It's disgraceful," he said.

"Money is being spent on making scrap," he said. "It could be used to improve compensation."

A spokesman for the British Aircraft Corporation—the combine to which English Electric belong—said last night: "It is better for the men's morale if they are working."

"All the material they are using became scrap as soon as the Government cancelled the contract."

Productivity has meaning if it results both in a raising of living standards and an increase of leisure for all.

"Productivity" in the society we live in, because it is not a means to a social end, but is the means whereby industrialists hope to make greater profits for themselves and their shareholders, should be resolutely resisted by the working people, for it brings them neither greater leisure nor liberation from wage-slavery. Indeed for many it means unemployment, a lowering of living standards; for others it means starting a "new life" in the autumn of their lives, in unfamiliar surroundings and among strangers.

The attempts by the managers and the technocrats to streamline industry are resisted intuitively by most work people even if they haven't two political ideas in their heads to knock together, not because they are resistant to change *per se* but because they cannot see that "change" will do them any good. And of course they are right! Such an attitude is nevertheless a negative one, and the task of anarchist propagandists should be to make them aware of this and point to the only alternative, which, in broad terms, is that the producers of wealth must also control it for their benefit.

Continued on page 3

**ANARCHY 20**  
**next week**  
**is on Freud,**  
**Mutual Aid and**  
**Non-Violence**

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

## A NEW LOW!

FREEDOM and ANARCHY do not live on bouquets (or brick-bats) alone. Each week though we have no wages to pay, we have to find £70 to pay for paper, printing, postage stamps, and all the incidentals of running an office. Our financial situation has rapidly deteriorated during the past three months—the summer months are always difficult ones for our finances—but the expenses go on clocking up as usual. This week, in our financial statement, we record the lowest number of contributions to the Deficit Fund this year, and we

can only hope that it will serve as a sharp reminder to all those of our readers who want to see our publications in the future that something must be done very soon!

There are still three months to go to the end of the year. May we ask all who are interested in the work undertaken by the FREEDOM PRESS to help us to increase our circle of readers, in an attempt to achieve our objective of 750 new subscribers by the end of the year. And we need more sellers at public meetings; every meeting is an opportunity to introduce our ideas.



# Revolution and Anarcho-Syndicalism

LAST December in the correspondence columns of FREEDOM, I asked the editors, and naturally the readers of the paper, the following questions:— "How can the campaign against nuclear weapons be connected to a full-scale libertarian programme that is realistic and practical? Is an organised libertarian movement—if possible—desirable?" (2/12/61. It was just before Wethersfield and the over-ambitious Dec. 9th demonstrations of the Committee of 100—it was a time of great optimism and hope. That optimism and hope were dashed in no uncertain manner in the next few months.

It is now that we can ask my questions again, feeling wiser, more experienced and very wary. In fact I not only ask these questions, but reply in the affirmative—Yes, an organised libertarian movement is possible and desirable.

This brings one up against our individualist comrades, it stirs the permanent protesters—for we have a proposition of revolutionary anarchism as opposed to individual anarchism. We have, in fact, a re-assertion of the socialist tendency of anarchism. I find myself in complete agreement with Rudolf Rocker in believing that anarcho-syndicalism is the synthesis of socialist and radical thought, a meeting point at the logical conclusion of these two philosophies. It has been said that syndicalism is a narrow philosophy of life, that it accentuates work instead of leisure, that it is dull and uninspiring. Yet this seems an utterly unrealistic viewpoint in an industrialised society. Also, of course, syndicalism when coupled with anarchism is not lacking in its over-all vision of life.

Let us also get straight in our minds

## 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 Reductant Art: Jazz  
Benny Green 21/-  
The Theory of Capital Development  
P. M. Sweezy 35/-  
The Banned Books of England  
Alec Craig 30/-  
Macmillan: Portrait of a Politician  
Emrys Hughes 35/-  
Sprightly Running  
John Wain 25/-

#### REPRINTS AND CHEAP EDITIONS

Life on the Mississippi Mark Twain 9/6  
Dialectical Materialism, Vol 2  
Maurice Cornforth 10/6

#### SECOND-HAND

China in Transition (1952-1956) 6/-;  
The Roosevelt Myth John T. Flynn 8/6;  
Economics for Commercial Students  
Albert Crew 3/6; A Short History of the  
English People J. R. Green 3/-; Value,  
Price and Profit Karl Marx 2/6; New  
Hopes for a Changing World Bertrand  
Russell 3/6; Underground Struggle in  
Germany (1938) Evelyn Lend 2/6;  
Japan's War on China (1937) A. Morgan  
Young 2/6; Satanism and Witchcraft  
Jules Michelet (Paper-Back) 2/6; Select  
Writings of Emerson 3/-; The Specialist  
Charles Sale 2/6; When God Laughs  
Jack London 2/6; The Scarlet Plague  
Jack London 3/-; William Johnson Fox  
Graham Wallas 2/6; N. Chernyshevsky's  
World Outlook M. Grigoryan 2/6; The  
Banquet of Plato (trans.) P. B. Shelley  
3/-; The General Strike (1926) Sir John  
Simon (damaged: sabotage?) 5/-; Science  
and Salvage Claus Ungewitter 3/6; The  
Only Way Out (1932) Emile Burns 2/6;  
British Soldier in India (1944) Clive  
Branson 2/6; The Apostles Ernest Renan  
3/6; A People's History of Germany A.  
Ramos Oliveira 3/-; National Enterprise  
Ernest Davies (damaged) 2/6; For All  
Mankind Leon Blum 2/6; We, the People  
Leo Huberman 4/-; The Darker the  
Night, the Brighter the Stars Friedrich  
Schlotterbeck 3/-; Smouldering Freedom  
Isabel de Palencia 3/-.

### 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

that work in itself is not dull, it is working for someone else that is so grim. Industry need not enslave man, it can liberate him. Leisure is nothing without a life of content—the idle rich in their promiscuous boredom demonstrate this.

So we have our synthesis, our balance between work and leisure, between the individual and the group, between the radical and the socialist. We see this in the anarchist and syndicalist press; FREEDOM tends towards the leisure-individual-radical line and World Labour News towards the work-group-socialist line. It is encouraging to note a slow but certain balancing of these two tendencies in the libertarian movement.

#### THE INDIVIDUALISTS.

A recent talk at the Anarchist Summer School by Sid Parker "Revolution—Mass or individual?" (FREEDOM 18/8/62) poses the individualist position in clear and sensible terms. Sid Parker points to the FREEDOM readership survey which demonstrated that "the younger its readers the less likely they were to be workers. If these figures mean anything at all it is that workers are becoming less and less interested in anarchist ideas." I do not question the veracity of FREEDOM's survey, although it might be pointed out that workers are the least likely people to have the time or inclination to reply to such a survey, but I would argue that: (a) Since the survey many young workers have come into contact with us through the activities of the Committee of 100; (b) That recent meetings addressed by Jack Robinson and Bill Christopher of Young Socialists met with a sympathetic and interested response, and; (c) That my own experiences in Hull show huge potential interest in Hull show huge for anarchist and syndicalist ideas, especially among YCND groups.

Once the workers know what anarchism is, they are sympathetic our greatest bugbear is ignorance. Recent correspondence in FREEDOM around the "Solidarity" issue shows that revolutionary socialists are reading FREEDOM and the response of the workers to the social strikes concerning the nurses and the Bomb point to an underlying knowledge throughout the country of the need for working-class socio-political action, and direct action to boot.

That old and worthy argument concerning the dangers of the iron law of oligarchy growing up in revolutionary movements is espoused by Sid Parker. I would not quarrel with him. I accept his criticism and am aware of the dangers.

TO make the walls of the Arthur Jeffers Gallery at 28 Davies Street, W.1., must surely be the kiss of death for any young artist aspiring to put a torch to the Town, for this gallery has over the years won the reputation of housing those we have loved and it *clientèle* of blue-veined, blue-rinsed ancient, in heart if not in years, could always rely on their corny sentimentalities being catered for at a price, at a price. But with the death of Arthur Jeffers, Robert Melville's more catholic tastes have been allowed to flower and this accepted figure of the London art world will now, through his recent tie-up with the Seven-Art publishing group, be able to make his own personal tastes more widely felt.

He is a slight, slim man, gracefully clothed and softly spoken, and he long ago cast off his provincial left-wing connections for the hedonistic joys of the affluent society, for the grey bread of political idealism tends too often to sour with the years. Well-informed in the matters of his trade he flies the banner of defeat by shielding every assertion with an armour of wit, yet it is the wit of the cynic who, one feels, despises the values he has to sell, for this man with the beautiful head of a Spanish Cardinal, the graceful walk of a dancer and the best wishes of Savile Row has thrown the Arthur Jeffers Gallery open to the pop art of the Tottenham Court Road School.

And here are the remnants of the touted pop artists after a few mad gay months as gutless and as dead as a hung chicken. The early trail-blazers who gingerly toyed with the theme of proletarian virility and vitality have long been cast aside, and all that is left is the giggle-squad painting pastiche cottage art and children's graffiti. Much of this is forced on the artists in that they are too incompetent to attempt any other style and incompetence demands a gimmick to cover up bad work.

Yet I do know this. Individual liberty will not bring world disarmament, and we shall never have a free society unless we have a world revolution that destroys the State and the very concept of a ruling class for all time. No ruling élite will destroy itself, though of course it may do so by accident in a nuclear war. The risk of nuclear war for them, however, is preferable to disarmament. For the ruling élite of the world cannot disarm, they depend on arms. Privilege is maintained by force and the threat of force. An executive must execute if needs be, a judiciary must judge, a legislature must impose the law. We know the State will never disarm, we know it must be disarmed by the people.

#### WORLD GOVERNMENT.

I agree with FREEDOM's editorial that spoke of the Committee of 100 as "the only significant social movement to have emerged in this country in the last 25 years", I also agree when, in the issue for 7th Oct., 1961, the editors write:—"It will take a greater force than a World Government Assembly, under whatever name, to control the lust of powerful nations and the ambitions of political tyrants; it will take a strong revolutionary world movement of ordinary men and women determined to keep power in their own hands and to be their own defenders of order and justice."

Yet, can we forget that the President of the Committee of 100 is an open and forceful advocate of World Government? Can we, who support this movement, continue to remain silent on this vital and fundamental issue? For surely World Government is the very antithesis of Anarchy! The appeal to the representatives of the various ruling élites is bound to fail as are disarmament conferences bound to fail for those very reasons we have for being anarchists. To repeat: ruling élites need arms to maintain their privileged position, need force, power, avarice, greed, hatred to keep what they have. To them, might is right.

Is it not naïve, even a bit silly, to appeal to such élites for disarmament? Is the Committee of 100 to continue to make itself a subject for ridicule by appealing, talking or referring to the organs of the State? Even this aside, is it going to have a President's views on such a subject being espoused, and then leave them unanswered. No one is suggesting Bertrand Russell and other world government advocates on the Committee should not give their views, but surely there are sections of the Committee—those

openly anarchist—who must answer him as part of the movement.

Likewise, it seems unworthy to have members of the Committee who work in organs of the State. Are anarchists on the Committee to tolerate lawyers and the like in their midst? After all, why not have an Army chaplain—they are both servants of a ruling class based on the threat of force! Such people cannot serve the Committee of 100 or show any genuine solidarity with the movement. They should be kicked out.

#### A LIBERTARIAN MOVEMENT.

"Having made our one-man revolutions we are still faced with the authoritarian economic and social structure of the society we live in, and to destroy this monster will be possible only to the extent that the one-man revolutionists are united and have this sense of solidarity." So speaks the FREEDOM editorial for Sept. 8th, 1962. And here is our basis for action. The Committee of 100, if it should embrace the concepts of workers' control and the social strike against the Bomb and apartheid, can be the Libertarian movement. We can back it with our own strength in the National Rank and File Movement and Northern Industrial Action. If the energy of the



MARGARET MEAD at the tenth Pugwash conference said: "For the first time in human history there is no contradiction between our narrowest and our widest loyalties. You can't save your family, your tribe, your country any more. You can only save the world, the whole world. In 1940 when people asked me if I thought America should go into the war, I used to say, 'I hoped not, for America's own sake, but for the sake of the world I hoped she would'. That differential is no longer possible". . . .

Anna Teasdale is one of the few in the gallery who has some knowledge of her chosen craft yet again it must be said that even at her best she never succeeds in achieving the level of a good magazine illustrator and it is only the juxtaposition of her accumulated symbols upon her canvases that makes her work interesting. A welcomed figure from the recent past is Richard Hamilton who in spite of knowing all the best people in the art world never succeeded in achieving a deserved reputation. He is an extremely good artist who, one feels, is a little out of place in this present exhibition, like a vicar in a punch-up, yet one must be pleased that we have the opportunity to see his work again. In place of Dali's sexually depraved rocks, Hamilton offers us erotic machinery with standing levers and ejaculating gear boxes with a simple and self-explanatory "AAH!" for a caption. Many have claimed to have started this cult of pop art and while Blake is accepted as the granddaddy of them all, Hamilton has as good a claim as any, for, over seven years ago he was exhibiting his canvases of speeding cars and painted explanations but Hamilton was ahead of his time, and no matter how meticulously he paints his horny gear-boxes the Hockneys of this world will hog the limelight by pandering to an audience as spiritually infantile as their paintings. Only Patrick Hughes plods along his lonely path, for this ex-waiter from the grey North, still continues to illustrate his titles with growing enamel paint. Known in London only by the limitations of his smaller canvases he is now flowering forth on a larger and truer scale and his biggest painting of the moment, tucked away in a cupboard within the Portal Gallery, carries for its title the epitaph for the cult-conscious companions of his present showing with his "The differentiation of nothing".

ARTHUR MOYSE.

Centre 42 movement could be canalised through the Committee and not through the trades unions, we should there have another link in a Libertarian movement.

These are, of course, just conjectures on my part. They are attractive possibilities which we can work towards. But they are the answer to that question I asked last December:—"How can the campaign against nuclear weapons be connected to a full-scale-libertarian programme that is realistic and practical?"

We see the emerging of a movement of voluntary action, accompanying direct action. A movement of experiment in education, in farming, in industry, a movement exploring the possibilities of co-operative living and production. It is the emergence of that strong revolutionary world movement that can not only Ban the Bomb, but can build a decent and sane society.

Despite one's fears of the iron law of oligarchy the Committee of 100 decentralised probably too early, those who did the most work were the effective moving spirits in the movement—which is as it should be. The essential thing is to have the Sid Parkers of the world constantly reminding us of the dangers, and of having a movement of independently-minded people, who will not be pushed around. We must be a balanced, rational, fluid movement of "disobedience combined with love: the living water of life".

JEREMY WESTALL.

THE KURDS of northern Iraq are threatened with famine by the punitive campaign of Kassem's government which machine-gunned flocks of sheep and burnt the harvest with napalm bombs, 100,000 people are homeless and the situation is aggravated by the approach of the rainy season. The Lapps of Sweden accused the authorities of encroaching on their common land by extending towns and starting iron-mines and by the establishment of a rocket-station by the European Space Research Organization. The Nagas are protesting to the United Nations against the Indian Army's military occupation of their territory, and asking for help to put a stop to the Indian army's killings and atrocities. Mr. A. Z. Phizo, the leader of the National Council, claims that 70,000 Nagas have been killed since 1955, over 100,000 were in concentration camps, 500 villages and 150 churches have been destroyed. . . .

COBHAM PARISH council has asked Kent County Council to arrange for Kent gypsies to register, in case Cobham is flooded with gypsies seeking caravan sites. According to the last census, there are 132,000 gypsies throughout the Soviet Union, and according to *Soviet Weekly* "three in five of them still speak their native Romany. But today their theatre, which goes on frequent tours, is almost the only wandering gypsy 'camp'." The Salvation Army in Boston failed to establish a home for 35 unmarried mothers and their children in a residential area. A petition signed by 100 potential neighbours, was presented. Their lawyer said "Legitimate mothers taking a walk in the area might be tagged as 'one of those girls'." Residents of Mayfield Avenue, Chiswick have sent a protest to the Ministry of Housing at the proposal to start a hostel for discharged probationer prisoners as a rehabilitation centre. "Many residents are old, and terrified at the thought of the men who will live in the hostel", said one of the organizers of the petition. "Mothers with young children will be afraid to let them out." Brighton Town Council is being recommended to consider ways of getting wider powers to deal with beatniks who sleep on the beach during the summer, a special committee may be set up. Residents of a South Coast town, outraged by the presence of beatniks feel that the only legal method to rid them of the beatniks is to give them 'rough music' (a serenade with saucers, etc.) used in Sussex to rid villages of witches, unpopular residents, adulterers, drunkards and child-beaters. One of the beatniks said, "We'll just join the bands, Daddy-o. Who knows, between us, we might be evolving a new folk-art." Policemen guarded Cypriot homes in London after an attempt was made to set fire to a Wandsworth house, and "Greeks get out" was painted on the road. A catholic school in Louisiana was closed when white people picketed the building after the admission of five negro children. Negro pupils were turned away at three white schools in Albany and a school in Baton Rouge. At Baton Rouge a crowd of white mothers shouted, "You haven't the

Continued on page 4



## THE WIND OF SMALL CHANGE

Continued from page 1

But how will this transfer of control take place, we shall be asked. We do not think it possible to offer a blue-print of revolution because apart from other considerations a social revolution is a long, cumulative process interspersed with a whole host of unknown factors, all of which play their role in side-tracking as well as precipitating the revolutionary process. But it seems to us that there are well-defined roads to revolution which must be taken. For instance, until a sufficient proportion of the 99 per cent "dispossessed" resent working to keep the other one per cent in luxury and in control of their lives, no "change" can possibly take place (all else can only be "palace revolutions"). Therefore since the "idea" must precede "action", if that action is to be informed and in the direction of anarchy, the propagation of "ideas" must be at the heart of all anarchist activity. As we have said on numerous occasions there are a hundred ways of putting over these ideas, all of them good, and none should be advocated to the exclusion of others.

But it has always seemed clear to us that anarchist propaganda should be two-pronged: on the one-hand what could be called "destructive" propaganda, in which one seeks to encourage a strong political, social, and economic malaise among the people (as opposed to the fear-of-physical-annihilation-by-nuclear-war which is the basis of the pacifists' propaganda), the kind of dissatisfaction which precludes any kind of positive collaboration between the working people and the employers or the State machine, and which if anything would tend to accentuate the antagonisms between labour and management. On the other hand we must seek by our "positive" propaganda to make people want freedom—the responsibility of running their own lives, the leisure to do the things they want to do—or, of course, to do nothing!—in the company of others or in the privacy of their individualistic refuges.

★

It also seems to us imperative that for both these aspects of anarchist propaganda to be effective they must be realistic.

The "destructive" approach if it advocates, at this stage, that industry must be paralysed by lightning strikes, or that land workers should have a general strike at harvest time, or that transport workers and others engaged in public services should continually paralyse the life of the community, not only would fall on deaf ears, but would soon antagonise more people than it won over. The general strike is a weapon which only a people ripe for revolution can use effectively for the obvious reason that unless it achieves its objectives in a matter of days everybody, strikers and their families, will either die of starvation or the plague or return to work! A realistic "destructive" anarchist propaganda, therefore, should propose to wage- and salary-earners the kind of action which does not result in starvation even though it may demand "sacrifices" in "standards of living", but which makes the running of industry so far as the managements, the financiers, the shareholders and other parasites, difficult, as unprofitable as possible, and unpredictable. Far from seeking to

encourage the development of worker/management committees, etc., workers should refuse to take part in any committees aiming at improving "relations between the two sides of industry", or for the purpose of raising productivity or production, while at the same time demanding always better working conditions and shorter hours without reduction in wages. The aim of workers should be not to bring industry to a standstill but to make it impossible for industry to be operated along capitalist lines. We would rightly be condemned as utopian if we also suggested that this state of affairs could be achieved overnight; but in fact we do nothing of the sort. What we do suggest, however, is that the difference between the reformist propaganda of the Socialists and that of the anarchists is that whereas both aim at the improvement of conditions of the workers, the former by its belief that social and economic injustice can be legislated away, itself becomes a cog in the machinery of the Establishment, thereby strengthening the capitalist machine and perpetuating the system of economic injustice. Only the anarchists, it seems to us can demand the reforms as well as rejecting the system that is at present in a position to concede them.

★  
AS to the "positive" prong of anarchist propaganda, we must encourage the one-man revolutions—that is we must by example and by argument persuade as many people as possible to apply anarchist ideas in their own lives in every possible way. For then not only will their lives be richer and more meaningful and they will therefore be more likely to resist interference by political busy-bodies, but if they engage in propaganda their arguments and their approach will be infused by experience, understanding and common sense, and will be more successful than that of the authoritarian Left which seems more concerned to thrust its political bible down people's throats than to understand why the workers are as they are, and seek an approach which they can understand and appreciate.

But the one-man-revolution when it becomes an end in itself, and not just the starting off point, seems to inhibit, by making the individuals so involved, concerned much more with the purity of their own "souls"; and they take on the role of martyrs rather than people who have discovered for themselves some of the secrets of happiness! And this, to our minds, is bad propaganda. One of the remarks in Mr. Colin MacInnes' recent article on Anarchism in the *New Statesman* ("Eves' Children," Sept. 7) which pleased us most was when he said that: "such anarchists as I have met are not of the late-1940s ex-bourgeois eccentric variety, but sane, humorous, and remarkably consistent, in their private lives, to their anarchist principles of patient co-operation and determined persuasion". And so long as we can remain "sane and humorous" we stand a chance of communicating our ideas. For what is anarchism if not the application of common sense to our daily lives and an attempt to clothe life with a worthwhile purpose—a purpose which every free-thinking person will determine for himself?

# The more it changes...

...the more it remains the same

(From a Correspondent)

THE most noticeable thing, during my recent visit to the newly "independent" West African states—was how quickly their black masters have replaced their former white ones. To go further—as British capitalists have been forced to surrender their colonial possessions to a new African ruling class they have left behind them the British form of parliamentary capitalist democracy. In places like Nigeria, a few of the local population because of their position held before the foreign domination, are either put or bribe themselves into ministerial posts.

The Nigerian Federal government is a coalition of the northern and eastern regional governments, the western region call themselves "the Queen's opposition". In actual fact both Federal and opposition governments are inexperienced at managing capitalism. They saw their white counterparts drinking in their clubs, driving about in their big cars, and as far as the western educated lawyers and doctors were concerned—that's all there was to it.

At this stage the new black leaders of Africa find themselves faced with enormous economic problems, such as having to compete with other capitalist countries for world markets, etc. They seem forced (in the case such as Ghana) to introduce a kind of state capitalism disguised as western "democracy". The result is an African western educated bourgeoisie who elect and enlist the chiefs, sultans and tribal rulers into government posts as deputy ministers and officials—in other words they continue the old white colonial system of indirect rule.

The rapid spreading of "literacy" among the African population is being pushed forward, which is so essential to capitalist development. Recently, during a crisis in the western house of assembly in which a riot broke out among the politicians, a state of emergency was called by the federal government and an administrator was sent to govern the region. The secretary of the action group and leader of the opposition in the eastern house of assembly was said to have taken "refuge" in Ghana. From an article published in Ghana Mr. Sam Ikoku says this: "Ideologically and culturally Nigeria is under the influence of Britain and U.S.A. The constitution

checkmates the drive towards a united organic nation. Furthermore, it gives effective power to the feudalists of the north whose political organisation is the northern people's Congress".

Propaganda continues to pour out from sections of the European capitalist press that Nigeria is the "model" of democracy, of sanity and wisdom: they see it as the most stable government in today's Africa. The truth, however, is that Nigeria is anything but "stable", for self-government has been handed over in such a way as to make sure that the old order continues. Europe has passed through all these stages of capitalist development and no doubt the position of the African worker (after he has been industrialised and detribalised) will be one of a proletarian subject class. Which will probably mean the idea of the tribe and its communal basis will slowly disappear.

From my contacts with Nigerian workers it seemed evident that they still possessed that same fear-complex for their new coloured rulers, as they had for their former white ones. A very liberal criticism of the powers that be, very often result in the blacklisting of an individual from any kind of lucrative employment. This goes together with the nervousness of the government employee who has to watch his comments in public.

During the transitional stage from a tribal to an industrial society, the problem of widespread unemployment has arisen in cities like Lagos, although at the moment, it only affects the elementary school leavers—sooner or later the few Nigerian University graduates will join them and Nigeria's new leaders will be faced with their disorders.

The rivalry leading to armed conflict, as the result of the idea of the national-capitalist state is also in evidence among the newly "independent" African nations. Recently the Nigerian foreign minister warned the Ghana government "that if they didn't stop their acts of economic subversion against Nigeria, then he would use his influence to topple the Ghana government". No doubt as each little state takes its shape in Africa, the chances of inter-African wars are to be expected, for the black African despot also his his dreams of conquest and expansion. In fact, in the not very distant future one can envisage a very powerful

black form of dictatorship threatening Europe. This feeling is always with one when making a trip along the West coast of Africa.

The more black Africa absorbs "Western civilization" the more it seems they cannot manage without the whites. They rely very heavily on imports, and even more effective than the Commonwealth form of colonialism is foreign aid. This disguise conceals the real purpose and serves the interest of both USSR and USA. As the so-called "backward countries" come under the yoke of White governments because of their desperate need for economic aid, then all kinds of economic strings will be attached.

The "revolution" of African national "independence" has left capitalism intact. Although I observed much dissatisfaction (particularly among the Nigerian youth) with their new African masters.

The well-planned residential areas for civil servants patrolled by policemen; the television gazing, the sport-drug, and the Victorian version of European morality and Christianity—mould a newly-formed middle-class African, apart from those who embrace Mohammedanism. The African students' contact with Europe and "western civilization" seems disastrous. Many return to their villages and towns in Africa with money-making ambitions: a few of the doctors practice medicine as a side-line and go into politics, whilst the rest set up their fashionable practices which only the rich can afford.

From my conversations with many of the local population in Lagos, I got the impression that they hoped sooner or later the army would take over control of the government thus creating a situation similar to that in the Congo. A dictatorship, with various local regional interests resulting in armed conflict. The result however, as far as the African workers are concerned will be bitter disillusionment and disappointment as they elect one "leader" after another with promises which they can never keep. Africa's black advocates of state revolution; reactionary and professedly revolutionary alike, dominate the African scene. Yet they are really no different to their European white counterparts, many who in the name of "socialism" administer and manage capitalism.

## DISOBEDIENCE & DEMOCRACY

MICHAEL FOOT said in a recent speech that we must 'sharpen the weapons of democracy'. Surely the present world situation has reached a point where the weapons of democracy have been shown as blunt instruments inherently incapable of being sharpened. The ease with which democratic government becomes total government and the speed at which voters can change their allegiance from democratic parties to totalitarian ones should be a warning that democracy can do with a very searching re-appraisal. It is not only the weapons of democracy that are blunt, it is a general bluntness of feeling and reason that goes with the impotence that is generally felt and expressed.

There is not so much a divergence of opinion, as a division between those who care for their own survival and those close to them, and those who don't. Where normal instincts have atrophied and people don't care, reasonable argument is ineffective. Obviously the first step is to get all those capable of feeling to care, and to care and behave violently is better than not caring at all. It seems that a cross on a ballot paper is the hallmark of social illiteracy and irresponsibility, and there is no evidence that Michael Foot and Allan Skinner are immune from the baleful influence of power in the political sense.

With the bomb banished, the knowledge of how to make it will remain, and a different type of social organisation must be found to contain that knowledge. It is certain that this will not be achieved by the delegation of responsibility, no matter whose name is on the ballot paper.

An arms programme is not implemented from the centre, it is ordered from the centre and carried out by a

periphery of organisations and individuals who have renounced responsibility for their actions. The arms are used by uniformed agents who take an oath of absolute obedience. This dangerous situation has resulted in mankind teetering on the brink of self-destruction.

The significance of the Committee of 100 is that it represents an outbreak of strong feeling. If time was on the side of survival, it would be a good omen that the feeling is strongest among the youth. Those in CND who want to proscribe, restrict, and restrain this feeling and its expression in action are doing the cause of humanity a disservice. I suspect that the politicians within the movement in the last analysis care more for their particular political form than humanity. The affection of the Communist Party has been described as the kiss of death and all forms of political affection appear pretty lethal. When a man becomes a vote he ceases in the minds of those seeking his vote to be a man, and to either INDEC or the Tory Party is a mass to be manipulated. The assumption of power by INDEC means that they will have to undertake the organisation of violence with all the expediency that this means. Individual violence has never been a threat to mankind of his survival but organised violence has and is. In point of fact the repressions associated with organised violence have resulted in a much more potent and complex individual violence. The concern of many members of CND for a preservation of a respectable image, fails to understand the significance of Eatherly and Eichmann. Eatherly is regarded as subnormal because he has a conscience and has rediscovered his individual responsibility, and Eichmann as normal because he was untroubled by his conscience. An organ-

isation of violence that is, I understand, seeking to acquire weapons of mass murder had no moral right to try and hang him. Justice would have been seen to have been done had a revulsion of his acts driven a victim to destroy him.

As the CND becomes more powerful its very commitment to the forms of society will allow it to be canalised and used, particularly if the British bomb becomes unnecessary, then its ultimate aim frustrated. By its rejection of the forms of society, even if not wholly a conscious rejection, members of the Committee of 100 at least recognise that the bomb is not just an aberration of an otherwise satisfactory society but an extension of the policeman's truncheon.

The imagination of the people who feed the war machines of East and West with their skill, work and obedience has to be fired, and it will not be fired by an act of expediency carried out by Mr. Macmillan or Mr. Gaitskell making use of CND to carry out what is necessary to the Alliance. It will only be done by challenging the vehicle of collective violence, and by the creation of a new situation, where the rediscovery and exercise of personal responsibility in human relationships, aims at seeing that physical power is used in connection with physical activity, and not used to manipulate human beings.

This will be done by individuals in the periphery declining in no uncertain terms to co-operate with the centre, and seeing ultimately that no such unhealthy concentration of power is ever likely to arise.

The Committee of 100 has made a small but significant step.

ALAN ALBON.



**Catastrophe ?**

DEAR EDITOR,  
I am prompted to write by the appearance some two FREEDOM issues ago of a review of Fromm's book *The Art of Loving*. Before your readers succumb to the reviewer's advice "please buy it", they should know how Fromm stands vis-a-vis many of Freud's most critical and advanced concepts.

Fromm is a very famous and representative member of the Neo Freudian revisionists—or as they are sometimes called a catastrophe. Although these revisionists present a critique of society, they have in fact amputated Freud of everything that is objectionable to traditional notions of rationality and morality and have produced an ambiguous patter to have won the dubious distinction of being best sellers.

"Over-emphasis on sexuality!" Indeed! There is nothing left of Freud's theories for Fromm. Freud is stripped until there is nothing of Freud left. For Freud the whole concept of the repressed unconscious (and Freud defined psychoanalysis as a study of the unconscious)—our ultimate hidden essence lies in infantile sexuality. But perhaps Fromm realises that this wine is too strong for the palate of the general reader so he has made it into sugar pop. Compare Fromm's sermon on the different varieties of love with Freud's statement: "There is no longer any place in present day civilised life for a simple, natural love between two human beings."

Freud saw society in the process of becoming sicker and sicker—not wiser and wiser like the revisionists. Freud established a link between happiness and sexuality (in the widest erotic sense). The revisionists have cut this by spiritualising happiness. They have abandoned Freud's concreteness of the body and have landed psychoanalysis in the impasse that religion reached and from which it can only be rescued by returning to Freud's original concepts.

The revisionists have done the same with sublimation, Freud's link between culture analysis and psychoanalysis. They have abandoned yet another link with the body and have returned to

**LETTERS TO THE EDITORS**

traditional notions of western morality challenged by Freud. They have dropped the death instinct too—in fact everything that is Freud.

Compare Fromm's meaningless, "harmless" notions of productive love with Freud's analysis of the underground of love and the painful way in which sexuality becomes tamed from polymorphous perversity to become susceptible to a fusion with affection and tenderness! Although the revisionists may have advanced along sociological lines they remain a catastrophe for psychoanalysis and for the understanding of neurotic humanity.

Yours faithfully,  
MAURICE GOLDMANN.  
London, N.W. 3, Sept. 12.

**S.E.P. replies**

DEAR COMRADES,

In the editorial comment on my lecture "Revolution/Mass or Individual?" (FREEDOM, 8/9/62) certain points were made to which I would like to reply:

1. That the concept of individual insurrection is "hopelessly unrealistic".
2. That "there is no such animal as the individualist".
3. That "there are not enough islands, or acres and cows, on this planet for everyone to practice, let alone demand, the right to individualism".

Point 1. is rather strange, since the editorial writer himself had previously stated that "anarchist propagandists" must "aim at encouraging individuals to make their own 'one-man' revolution." Surely it is clear by now that without free individuals there can be no "free society"? Unless, of course, one believes in some metaphysical entity by whose will or working the "free society" is pre-ordained—e.g. God, History, The

Class Struggle, Reason. One may argue that individual insurrection is inadequate—which the editorial does about its twin "one-man revolution"—but that is not the same thing as arguing that it is "unrealistic." If there is any unrealism around it belongs to those who still look with dreamy eyes to the "people" or the "workers" in the hope that—at least—they will now "get the message".

The editorial writer appears to believe that individualist anarchists are isolationists, or 'solitaires', who do not accept associated effort towards a common goal. Some individualists may adopt this position, but many do not. From the pioneering days of Josiah Warren (an ardent communitarian) and Max Stirner ("the union of egoists") then the latter have stated that individualism and association are not contradictory. But they have continually and strongly insisted that associations exist for the benefit of associations. I enter into an association with others because I think it to be in my interest to do so, not because it is a "Duty", or because I have a belief in association or "unity" for its own sake. It was with this in mind that I said in my lecture: "If one may talk of the anarchist revolution at all, it is only in terms of a continuing process of individual insurrection in which free relationships are a product of individual action, and agreements are made on an inter-individual level without the intervention of authority in any shape or form." (Emphasis added).

If the second point is not a mere debating point, then the editorial writer has spent about a column of print arguing with a myth! The Little Oxford Dictionary states that individualism is "Egoism; social theory favouring free action of individuals." Used in conjunction with the anarchist negation of authority, this definition is a fair enough description of my position. It has nothing to do with any "cult" of an abstract Individual, however. The individual of whom I speak is the concrete, living individual—is me, and you and him and her, with everything that implies in the way of appetites, aspirations, thoughts and actions. As for the view that the hermit "owes" society for his ideas and knowledge, one can only reply with E. Armand:

"Do not challenge the individualist anarchist with the existence of a heritage, fruit of the labour of former generations. Before examining the actual worth of this heritage so far as it concerns him, the individualist will tell you that the fact of having been

thrown into a world in which he must, willingly or unwillingly, submit to organisation (i.e. an imposed collective—S.E.P.), amply compensates for the hypothetical advantages of the heritage in question."

The third point is so speculative and, in relation to our present numbers, so academic that it is hardly worth commenting on. If, one distant day, "everyone" has become an individualist anarchist then they will, no doubt, be able to cope with the technical problems they will face, just as they have coped with the psychological problems of how to bring into being such a state of affairs. In any case, in the event of such a miracle, conditions will have so changed that we can have no real notion as to what they will be like. For myself, the whole idea of a universal free society is so remote from the contemporary scene as to belong more to the realm of social fiction (if not to the millenarianism of certain religious sects) than to that of immediate concern. Together with other comrades, I cannot conceive of anarchist ideas being held by more than a small minority during my lifetime. I am willing to describe my ideal society to anyone who asks me, but I do not base my life on the assumption that it will be achieved—even in the indefinite future. Anarchism is a present activity, or not at all.

The question of how to live as free men, when the means of life are in the hands of monopolists, can only be answered by saying that we cannot live as completely free men in such a situation. What we can do is maintain a "permanent protest" and try to create an alternative, "boot-leg" economy within, under or around the prevailing one. There is much to be said for "beat" view of disaffiliating as far as one can from the commercial cannibalism of the status quo. Indeed—to be speculative—if sufficient individuals did this it might prove an effective way of disintegrating the power structure or, at least, of making authority that much weaker by virtue of the size of such an ungovernable "world".

My faithful critic F.B. seeks to make an identity in kind between my "ideal of individual autonomy" and "the Christian doctrine of self-regeneration" (FREEDOM 1/9/62). He is mistaken. Christians do not really believe that the individual can ever become strong enough to "regenerate" his self by his own forces. Although they speak of "self-improvement" they regard this as possible only through the "grace of God", which can be obtained by the

acceptance of "Christ the Saviour". In other words, they look to the intervention of an authority external to the individual as necessary for his "salvation". This view has nothing to do with the individualist concept of "self-liberation", which rejects the intervention of any external authority—supernatural or secular.

F.B.'s own belief in "economic necessity" is far nearer to the Christian's dependence on an outside force than is my attitude. He repudiates both mass uprisings and individual insurrections—both of which imply the exercise of human wills—and has to console himself with his particular metaphysical entity "Economic Necessity" on whose benevolent development he must rely.

Yours fraternally,  
Bristol 3, Spt. 15. S. E. PARKER.

**LONDON FEDERATION OF ANARCHISTS**

**CENTRAL MEETINGS**

- meetings to be held at The Two Brewers, 40 Monmouth Street, WC2 (Leicester Square Tube) Sundays at 7.30 p.m.
- SEPT. 23 Bonar Thompson (Benefit Lecture) Round the World in Eighty Day; or Jane Eyre.
- SEPT 30 Jack Robinson What is Anarchism?
- OCT 7 Denis Robyns Freedom & Art

**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).
- 3rd Tuesday at Brian and Doris Lelie's, 242 Amesbury Avenue, S.W.2 (Streatham Hill, Nr. Station).
- Notting Hill Anarchist Group (Discussion Group) Last Friday of the month, at Brian and Margaret Hart's, 57 Ladbroke Road, (near Notting Hill Station), W.11.

**ANARCHY Nos 1-18**

Still Available 1/9 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.

**FREEDOM PRESS PUBLICATIONS**

**SELECTIONS FROM 'FREEDOM'**

- Vol 1 1951: Mankind is One  
Vol 2 1952 Postscript to Posterity  
Vol 3 1953: Colonialism on Trial  
Vol 4 1954: Living on a Volcano  
Vol 5 1955: The Immoral Moralists  
Vol 6 1956: Oil and Troubled Waters  
Vol 7 1957: Year One—Sputnik Era  
Vol 8 1958: Socialism in a Wheelchair  
Vol 9 1959: Print, Press & Public  
Vol 10 1960: The Tragedy of Africa  
Each volume: paper 7/6 cloth 10/6

The paper edition of the Selections is available to readers of FREEDOM at 5/6 post free.

**PAUL ELTZBACHER**  
Anarchism (Seven Exponents of the Anarchist Philosophy) cloth 21/-

**CHARLES MARTIN**  
Towards a Free Society 2/6

**RUDOLF ROCKER**  
Nationalism and Culture cloth 21/-

**JOHN HEWETSON**  
Ill-Health, Poverty and the State cloth 2/6 paper 1/-

**VOLINE**  
Nineteen-Seventeen (The Russian Revolution Betrayed) cloth 12/6  
The Unknown Revolution (Kronstadt 1921, Ukraine 1918-21) cloth 12/6

**HERBERT READ**  
Poetry and Anarchism cloth 5/-

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

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

**PETER KROPOTKIN**  
Revolutionary Government 3d.  
Organised Vengeance Called Justice 2d.

**Marie-Louise Berneri Memorial Committee publications:**

Marie-Louise Berneri, 1918-1949: A tribute cloth 5/-

Journey Through Utopia cloth 16/- paper 7/6

Neither East Nor West paper 7/6

**OUT OF THIS WORLD**

Continued from page 2

brains to get an education. Why don't you go back north, where you belong?" About 3,500 members of the Ku Klux Klan met in Albany to protest against the integration attempt. Chief Walter Wetzel of the Blackfeet Indian tribe attended, in patent-leather shoes and clerical grey business suit, a meeting of 78 Indian tribe leaders on the Cherokee Reservation in North Carolina. They wished to project a 'New Image'. A Sioux chief said, "We Indians simply have not been organization-minded. We don't speak with one voice. No two tribes have the same views".

THE UNITED NATIONS Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation reported unanimously that continued nuclear testing could seriously harm mankind for thousands of years to come. It had been "clearly established that exposure to radiation, even in doses substantially lower than those producing acute effects, may occasionally give rise to a wide variety of harmful effects, including cancer, leukaemia, and inherited abnormalities." The United States announced that it intends to complete its remaining high altitude and atmospheric nuclear tests at Johnstone Island in the Central Pacific within four to six weeks. The tests being lower will not cause another radiation belt but means that more of the radio-active material will come down to earth as fall-out. The Russians exploded a bomb of fifteen megatons in the Novaya Zemlya area in the Arctic. . . .

DANILO DOLCI claimed success for his hunger strike against Italian Government delays in building a dam in Partinico. The Treasury has decided that new valuations of the land to be flooded would begin immediately. Dolci says that if work on the dam does not begin as promised by the end of March he will fast again. Brian McGhee, sentenced to 84 days detention at Colchester for disobeying a lawful command, has gone on hunger strike. A private of the British Guiana Volunteer Force refused to shave off his beard and was dismissed

from the service. He said he was following in the footsteps of the Apostles and no earthly man could make him change his plans. The former treasurer of the Committee of 100 was fined £25 for his part in the sit-down last March. He did not appear in July as he was in Moscow for the World Peace Congress and so he forfeited £5 recognisance. A CND demonstrator, Peter William Finch of Fulham was sentenced to nine months imprisonment for breaking an undertaking to keep the peace. He was fined for insulting behaviour at an Oswald Mosley meeting by shouting "Down with Mosley". He said, "I have no

**OH DEAR!**

**FINANCIAL STATEMENT AT SEPTEMBER 15 1962**

Week 37	EXPENSES: 37 weeks at £70	£2,590
	INCOME:	
	Sales & Sub. Renewals	£ 1,223
	Weeks 1—36	1,223
	Week 37	12
	New Subscriptions:	1,235
	Weeks 1—36 (266)	291
	Week 37 (8)	9
		300
		1,535
	<b>DEFICIT</b>	<b>£1,055</b>

**DEFICIT FUND**

Wolverhampton: J.L.* 2/6; Wolverhampton: J.K.W.* 2/6; Billston: J.W.P. 2/6; Southend: P.O.* 5/-; Shoreham: M. & D.* 2/6; London: P.A.B. 8/-; London: A.M.A. 9/-.	TOTAL	£112 0
Previously acknowledged		887 3 8
	<b>1962 TOTAL TO DATE</b>	<b>£888 15 8</b>

\*Indicates regular contributors.

faith in the law. This was a cooked-up charge against me." A. R. Seaton was chairman of the Sessions. According to *Muhammad Speaks*, the American-Muslim paper, freedom riders convicted in Mississippi were confined in death cells during their imprisonment. David Wyers, one of them, is a conscientious objector and has five months more to serve. Canon Collins, chairman of CND, said should a trade union decide that the best way to forward CND's cause was to call a strike, then CND would support it. "There is no intention on the part of the campaign to engineer strikes. We will support them if they are started." He was asked to speak to Purley Young Conservatives and a group of them were thinking of setting up a Conservative CND within the Party. Three clergymen who spent six days in jail at Albany, Georgia, said the guards threatened to put them in cells with "hot and cold running blood". "I was frightened," said one of them, "But I felt we were doing some good." Christine Farr (17) who took her General Certificate Examination as police waited to arrest her for failing to appear on a 'sit-down' summons, passed the examination, she wishes to be a teacher. Previously her mother had left home and returned. She was 'fed-up' with "Ban-the-Bomb" activities. Mr. Farr had said, "I have hardly taken Kathleen out in the past six months. We shall have to revise our schedule." Mrs. Joy Baker was released on bail after her three month sentence for getting credit without disclosing she was an undischarged bankrupt. She wanted a lavatory for her seven children and the Public Assistance Board would not help her to install one. Zensl Muehsam, widow of Erich Muehsam (who died in a Nazi camp in 1934) died in East Germany. She was listed to be handed over to the Nazis along with Margaret Buber-Neumann and others in 1939. Brigadier General Paul W. Tibbets Junior, pilot of the plane which dropped the atomic bomb at Hiroshima said, "I would do it again! I never took it personally, since I was acting under military orders. I can assure you that I don't have any pangs of conscience."