

'The human mind is like an umbrella. It functions best when open.'

WALTER GROPIUS

In this Issue:

- OUT OF THIS WORLD
- THE COMMITTEE OF 100
- FOR (AND FROM) THE RECORD
- BEARD TO BEARD
- CORRESPONDENCE

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY - 4d.

Affluence & Waste

THOSE who prattle about affluence and the prosperity that flows from the industrialisation of backward countries, etc., should ponder over the hard facts issued by the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organisation. Last year there were 52 million more mouths to feed in the world, but food production showed no increase on the previous year. The bad weather was blamed for the shortage but the fact is that increases in production per head of population was larger in the more developed parts of the world than for the underdeveloped regions. In the developed areas, acreage is being reduced and productivity increased; in the underdeveloped areas production is increasing slowly not only because they lack the means to make the land more productive, but because large numbers of land workers are finding more profitable jobs in the developing industrial areas. If the present lunacy prevails more and more workers will be leaving the land; more and more machines will be produced and less and less food will be available to feed the ever-growing number of hungry mouths. Left to "free enterprise" capital development will invariably be directed to industry, at the expense of agriculture, because it is more profitable.

★
THE *New York Times* reports that:

The Federal Government has \$4,500,000,000 worth of surplus farm produce in storage — including 2,400,000,000 bushels of wheat, corn and feed grains. The cost of storing this abundance is about \$1,000,000,000 a year. The farm price-support programs cost another \$2,500,000,000 a year.

Nine months ago President Kennedy sent to Congress a farm bill aimed at cutting the cost of helping the farmers. It proposed tight controls on wheat and feed grain, with production quotas to be granted in terms of total produce

rather than acreage under cultivation, as in the past. The effect of acreage reduction has been largely nullified because farmers have tended to farm their remaining lands more intensively. The bill also included controls for the first time on dairy production.

A bill similar to the President's was passed by the Senate last May, but ran into heavy opposition in the House from Republicans and the American Farm Bureau Federation, which said it would make Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman a "czar" over farmers. The House defeated the bill, passing instead one without the strict production controls. A joint conference then worked out a compromise bill and the House passed it ten days ago, 202 to 197.

Last week the compromise bill was passed by the Senate and President Kennedy signed it into law. It included some of his proposals, eliminated or watered down others. This is what he got:

(1) Extensive wheat controls, effective in 1964 if approved by two-thirds of the wheat farmers in a national referendum. The Secretary of Agriculture would have authority to set the number of acres needed to produce the total wheat requirement, an estimated 1,000,000,000 bushels. This would reduce acreage from 55,000,000 to about 48,000,000. Thus the emphasis in assigning wheat allotments would be on actual production.

(2) Authority for the Secretary of Agriculture to set feed-grain support prices at 50 to 90 per cent. of parity. (Parity is a price calculated to give the farmer a fair return in relation to his costs.) Reduction of supports would tend to discourage excessive planting and thus diminish surplus production.

(3) A 10-year pilot program for turning surplus cropland over to recreation and conservation uses.

Although the measure was not what the President wanted, it was viewed as opening the way for possible approval

WHAT A PROBLEM - THAT FARM SURPLUS!

in the next Congress of tight controls on fed grain and dairy production. Many farm experts therefore felt that it could be a significant first step toward solution of the farm-surplus problem.

★

BRETON peasants threatened with increased rail charges for the transport of their produce to the markets used a little direct action with success, last week. Nine trains were held up in the Department of Finisterre in the extreme N.W. by

tractors, trucks and private cars which were driven on to the track at dawn in what has been described as a "well-planned operation". According to the *Guardian's* correspondent

The peasants are not alone in their revolt against the Government; they have been joined by almost all the important sectors of the community—the fishermen, the shopkeepers, the owners of small motor industries, and the intellectuals—to protest against the increased charges for freight which are due to be introduced by October 1.

An association named by its initials as CELIB (Liaison Committee for the Study of Breton Interests) has been formed to group the grievances of Finisterre, Morbihan, Côtes-du-Nord, and Ille-et-Vilaine, and it was this body

which was responsible for today's demonstration. CELIB threats caused some concessions on freight rates to be granted by the Government after a Prefect visited the Prime Minister, Mr. Pompidou, in Paris yesterday. But the promised concessions and a set reduction of 10 per cent. on a few categories of agricultural products were not enough, CELIB leaders claimed. Fishermen who catch the famous live lobsters as well as more humble fish demand at least a 15 per cent. concession.

The government obviously heeded CELIB's call for a 24-hour administrative strike for the following day it was announced that the increased freight charges would not apply to Brittany and Central France.

When the news of the Cabinet's decision reached Morlaix—the centre of the peasant "revolt"—a peasant leader said: "This is only a beginning. Our standard of living must be raised to equality with industrial workers. We shall continue to agitate until we get a fair deal."

COMMANDER WALTER SCHIRRA was launched for five and three-quarter orbits of the earth in Sigma 7 from Cape Canaveral. Pope John XXIII broke two records, by being the first pope to travel by train for a century and for the same period being the first pope to leave the province of Rome. British railway travellers were however, strike-bound on Wednesday and either didn't leave home on Wednesday, or stayed in, or around their work-places. This strike was called as a protest against the too-swift redundancy policies of Dr. Beeching's for railway workshops. Neither his recall from holiday, nor the intervention of Mr. Marples (his boss) via the goggle-box served to avert the strike nor make for less redundancy. A youth, train spotting, observed that the London-Sheffield 'Master-Cutler' train had an over-heated fitting, dangerously near the fuel tank; he reported it and was suitably rewarded by Sheffield businessmen; he was rewarded by the Transport Commission with a letter of thanks and a booklet on "Careers on British Railways". . . .

JAMES MEREDITH got in at the University of Mississippi aided by the chief federal Marshal and a lorry loads of troops. Ex-Major-General of the troops that acted in the same capacity at Little Rock, Edwin Walker, was sent for psychiatric examination and was later released on bail. Twelve Hindus from Bombay, enrolled at Mississippi University, have had a friendly reception so far. Governor Bert T. Combs of Kentucky urged Governor Barnett of Mississippi to "quit playing Custer's last stand" and join the Southern Governors' Conference. "We need to talk about freight rates and other space age problems". . . .

SARK, in the Channel Islands has decided to buy a modern, fully equipped ambulance, but since all self-propelled vehicles (except tractors) are banned by law, the engine will be removed from the ambulance and it will be towed by a tractor in its errands of mercy. The Pope has decided to cut down the time spent in the ceremony of the gesture of obedience at the Ecumenical Council. In 1869 it took seven hours; now, by cutting out kissing the Pope's slipper they hope to take only three hours. A Roman Catholic priest who disappeared from his parish in Carlisle was found to have married one of his parishioners at a registry office. He is working as a labourer on shifts at a soup factory. Laurie Hislam of Gloucestershire is walking 1,200 miles to Rome to seek audience with the Pope "about the scandal of Christians preparing for nuclear war". . . .

THE INSTITUTE of Strategic Studies says that several countries which could soon possess nuclear weapons are deliberately



holding back. China could theoretically explode a device next year, India is "buying an option" to develop weapons, Canada could develop weapons but has deliberately refrained, Sweden and Switzerland both possess necessary skills, Israel is building a reactor which could supply plutonium, Germany has ample resources to develop an independent nuclear force but is formally committed to refrain from doing so. The County Analyst of Lancashire has found strontium 90 in samples of certain cereal-based infant foods. West German scientists have sent a memorandum to the Federal Government stating that effective civil defence against nuclear weapons used indiscriminately against the population by an enemy, is impossible. Any talk of effective defence merely encourages a false sense of security among the population. On the other hand any reasonable opportunity of saving human life should not be ignored. Brentford and Chiswick Council have assured the local CND that Civil Defence arrangements in the borough are satisfactory. Hammersmith Civil Defence ordered CND supporters out of their Garden Fete because they had picketed and handed out leaflets, they said, "We have come along to see what the borough is doing for Civil Defence . . . we are not impressed by what we have seen." One of the Civil Defence officials commented, "The trouble with these people is that they are all right now but if the bomb drops they will be the first inside the shelters". . . .

"THE GUARDIAN" on Wednesday carried the headline "Police forbid Indian pacifist to tear down Berlin Wall". However, the day before, a West Berliner ripped down a section of the wall with his bare hands making a hole about four feet square, there was no reaction from the East Berlin police but the West Berlin police temporarily detained him. The Indian pacifist's attack was a symbolic act to mark Gandhi's birthday. The Berlin Senator in charge of police pointed out that he was responsible for maintaining public safety and this would be endangered if any open

attack were made. A West German fell into a canal when drunk and explained that he had jumped from a moving train from East Berlin on to a bridge and thence into the canal. For a while his story was believed. . . .

THE JOURNAL *Kommunist* complains that (forty-five years after the Revolution) it is difficult to convince Russians that private property owners are a potential danger to society. A political commentator in the Polish Communist press is in disgrace for leading an "erratic life". Brian Pollitt, president of Cambridge Union worked for a fortnight of his vacation helping with the grain harvest in the Virgin Lands of Russia. Russia has agreed to lease to Finland the half of the Salmaa Canal captured by the Russians from Finland during the war. According to Emanuel Litvinoff in the *Guardian* Batya Rezmitsky, who was ordered to be shot for currency speculation, last February, was a Lithuanian Jewess whose children were shot by the Nazis. She was sheltered by Lithuanians until the Russian advance; in 1946 she attempted with a party of 45 Jews to escape into Poland *en route* to Israel. She was caught and sentenced to five years in Siberia. She served her sentence and still wished to emigrate to Israel. She was implicated in a currency charge and was sentenced to death. She replied to the accusation that she tried to illegally leave the Soviet Union that she had not wished to remain in a country where hate-mongers and pogromists enjoyed immunity and where the murderers of Jews were treated leniently or allowed to walk in freedom. Scientists at Tomsk in Siberia, claim that pigs and hens are better farm products if they drink melted snow instead of water. The MVD (formerly NKVD, late OGPU and before that, Ochrana) has changed its name from the Ministry of Internal Affairs to the Ministry of Public Law and Order according to a decree of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation. A letter in *Izvestia* called for a purge of people who write anonymous letters denouncing their neighbours. An eight-man delegation from the British Coke Research Association visited Russia. . . .

A SPANISH military tribunal sentenced one Spaniard to death and two others to life imprisonment for terrorist activities in Barcelona. Italians kidnapped and later released the Spanish vice-consul in Milan to draw European public attention to what is going on in Spain. . . .

HENRI RECHATIN has broken the world endurance record for living on a tight-rope. He has also made a tour of France on stilts and has juggled with scythes for ten hours.

JON QUIXOTE.

The Old Old Story

INFLATION THREATENS GERMAN ECONOMY

Bonn, October 4.

The Federal Cabinet today approved the record Budget of 56,800 million marks, about £5,071 millions, for the current financial year. At the same time it discussed measures for the stabilisation of the West German economy.

The Budget has thrown into sharp relief the growing concern which is being expressed about the economy. The Minister of Economics, Professor Erhard, has repeatedly stated that something must be done to arrest inflationary trends which threaten to undermine much of what has been achieved during the last 15 years. Last week the Federation of German Industries published an urgent appeal for price and wage moderation and for an all-out effort to maintain the tempo of econ-

omic expansion.

The Minister is believed to be considering means of checking consumer spending, possibly by increasing taxes on consumption. He wants to damp down the present building boom and deflate high building prices. Finally, he is anxious to secure popular support for this "semi-austerity" programme by wide circulation of the facts of the present economic situation. He has done this in the past by copious use of advertising space in the press.

The newspaper "Die Welt" points out today that wages have risen by 11 per cent. in the last twelve months, while industrial output is up by only 5 per cent. Shorter working hours have been accompanied by increased absenteeism—one million people are staying away from work every day because of real or alleged sickness.

In his battle against inflation Professor Erhard has many hard nuts to crack. This was underlined today when the Government announced increases in rail fares and postal charges. Most rail fares will go up by about 6 per cent., but weekly tickets for workers will be up by as much as 16 1/2 per cent. Even so the Federal Railways expect to make a loss of 300 million marks next year. Postal charges for parcels and printed matter will also be increased this autumn.

(Terence Prittie in the *Guardian*.)

ANARCHY 20

ON SALE NOW

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

IN discussions on the activities of the nuclear disarmament movement, the terms 'civil disobedience' and 'direct action' are used almost interchangeably. However, despite the fact that both terms are often used loosely without their precise implications being realised, they represent concepts which develop out of quite different basic sets of ideas.

These differences have not really been examined thoroughly in the current series of discussions on the future activities of the Committee of 100 and its supporters, but they are important, just as is the difference between those for whom non-violence is a basic principle, and those for whom it is a matter of tactics; a difference discussed by Peter Cadogan in ANARCHY 20.

Civil Disobedience, as an idea, only makes sense when it comes from someone who is generally highly obedient to the civil authorities. To the writer, it conjures up a vision of a middle-aged, rather conservative Quaker, after a long period of conscientious agony, coming to the conclusion that the state, which he or she has regarded with respect if not reverence, has done something so atrocious that the self-respecting citizen can no longer remain silent, but must take some dramatic action, such as breaking the law.

This particular approach played a big role in the early days of Operation Gandhi and the Direct Action Committee, and was transmitted to the Committee of 100 on its foundation. However, after two years of Committee activity, as contributors to *Peace News* have pointed out, the nuclear disarmament movement is very different to what it was, both in ideology and composition and some of the philosophical ideas handed down from the founders need subjecting to

The Committee of 100

critical examination, to prevent them becoming burdensome.

Now the religious approach to civil disobedience is largely an appeal to the authority, which the protester regards as being fundamentally justified in its existence. It is a very personal action in that he often does not wish for mass following, since that might distract attention from his own commitment, and result in its ideological dilution. The appeal of civil disobedience, as well as to the authority, who are being challenged with the position that if they persist in their course they will have to keep on imprisoning some of their valuable and respected citizens, is to other people of the same social and economic standing as the person making the protest. For this reason his normal law abiding nature is vital, the more respectable the better, and it becomes important to dissociate from such people as beatniks and agitators.

One consequence of this is that since the important thing is to break the law, openly and publicly, it is not always of such great importance which law is broken. Sitting down, gathering in a forbidden area, refusing military service or withholding tax can be equally effective ways of getting in front of the magistrate. Sitting in front of an air base is regarded as a symbolic act, in that it symbolises the crisis that has arisen in the relations between the state and some of its citizens, not because it symbolises a method by which the people could do away with the state.

If this picture of the respectable civil disobeyer is somewhat overdrawn, it is because everyone in the movement has some elements of that attitude and some of the more anarchical attitude, in various proportions.

Further, if this article is on the whole an advocacy of a different outlook and emphasis in direct action and illegal demonstrations, it implies no lack of respect for people who hold the views outlined above. For one thing they have provided a powerful driving force in the inspiring demonstrations against the nuclear state which have been a feature of the past two years, for another, the fact that someone is prepared to deny the state complete power, that there is a body of people who regard their own opinions, reason or consciences as being ultimately of greater importance than the government or the majority, is always a thorn in the government's side, and a factor which limits the power of authority, and lastly the person who resists one law today may find his attitude developing into an opposition to all laws later on.

However, civil disobedience as such is peculiarly suited to protest actions which only need to be made once, or several times over a short period, and in which it is conceivable that the state could bring in some reform to quieten the opposition of its opponents. For instance the recent fasts by Louis Lecoin and Danilo Dolci have been designed to bring pressure to bear on the governments of France and Italy to introduce laws which are quite common among the less reactionary governments of Europe. At the beginning of this century non-conformist ministers refused to pay rates that would go to the support of Church of England schools. As a result legislation was achieved which allowed a compromise solution which satisfied them.

In contrast to the attitude which accepts authority, but protests when it goes too far, anarchists attack the idea that government, the system whereby a few people seize or are invested with the power to take decisions involving the lives of millions, or thousands of millions in

the case of war, is ever a beneficial institution. Consequently the objection often raised by legalistic socialists, and often by supporters of CND, that to encourage illegal activities in support of nuclear disarmament will lead to an all-round devaluation of respect for the law is meaningless, because we do not imagine that our welfare or our liberties are based on submission to authorities, either parliamentary or judicial, but on the naturally social behaviour of the overwhelming majority of people, often in the face of circumstances in which it would be greatly to their immediate advantage if they were anti-social, and to the exercise of our freedom in the face of governmental prohibition. Whereas a government may build a dam, or release conscientious objectors, in response to acts of protest by its citizens (although neither of these have yet been carried out by the governments of Italy and France), it cannot, if it is to remain a government, give up the armaments with which it defends itself against other states, or the secret police methods with which it defends itself against its critics within. Although it may at times be in the state's economic or political interest to effect, for instance, a certain measure of disarmament, it will never do this out of ethical or moral considerations, and as in Russia or America recently, will have the power to recall as many soldiers as are needed for the purposes of any given international situation.

Since government is not based on discussion, agreement, ethics or morals, but on force, it is no use challenging it in those terms, on questions which are vital to its continued existence and not just marginal issues. What is more, and this is relevant to some of the discussion going on amongst supporters of the Committee of 100, it is not very effective to attack the state solely on one major issue.

The movement which gave rise to the Committee of 100 grew out of the cross fertilization of ideas between the broadly based, rather politically-minded anti-bomb movement of CND, which was different from the parties in that it was about a topic on which people felt deeply concerned, and the dedicated non-violent, pacifist movement which had recently livened up its activity,

and incidentally been highly receptive to anarchist ideas. The relatively large-scale support for the Committee of 100 did not come from the deeply moralistic civil disobeyers, as could be seen by the overwhelming proportions who cheerfully paid up their fines, but it came from people for whom civil disobedience, or any form of activity that demanded and offered more than the traditional, was a necessary final resort, called for by the ultimate horror of the state's readiness to use the H-bomb.

The result is a movement which is committed to the logical conclusion of an anarchist approach to the state, the opposition to its military power, but not to the root and branch attack on government at all levels which is necessary if people are ever to deprive the state of its power in society, including its power of destruction in war. This is not a criticism of the Committee or its supporters. It is inevitable and natural that people's minds and feelings should be jolted into a realisation of what government is about by a dramatic threat or event, such as an H-bomb test, rather than by the little oppressions in work and life with which we in Western Europe are faced, and the more vicious oppressions and hunger of other people in distant lands. However, in the writer's opinion, many of the difficulties which face supporters of the Committee are due to the fact that it arose as a movement concerned with a single issue, and is now realising that opposition to the bomb implies opposition to the state, and that in its turn implies a whole set of anti-authoritarian attitudes and activities which do not always fit in easily with the organisational structure and the philosophy of action which has been evolved by the Committee on its single issue.

One of the strange features of P.P.U. pacifism has been the way in which pacifism and non-violence, ideas which are relevant to war, peace and international affairs become stretched to involve other things and one gets for example, blueprints for pacifist education, pacifist economics and so on. It would be still more difficult to build up coherent "Committee of 100 economics" or a "Committee of 100 approach to education", but every-

one realises that such ideas are important and has a vague idea of what the above phrases would mean. The Committee has carried out certain tasks for which it was founded, and in one sense it ought to be able to dissolve, leaving its workers confident that other, similar committees would spring up to carry out similar work as the need arose. We are all afraid of it dissolving, or even worse of dying away, because of a fear that the movement of protest and direct action which has found its expression in the sit downs is not sufficiently soundly based to remain coherent and alive without the abstract figurehead at the top.

The dilemma of the Committee of 100 movement, which involves its anarchist supporters as much as everyone else is that it has launched an attack from the top of a tower (failed to achieve its object, if that was to secure nuclear disarmament), and now looks back and finds its foundations rather insecure, due to the absence of a broadly based movement which consciously rejects government and authoritarian relationships in social ventures, and would form a natural basis from which specific anti-authoritarian attacks on the state, whether concerned with matters of international politics and local questions, would spring. This would in fact be an anarchist movement, and in saying that we are not joining the canvassers of the left-wing political parties in saying, "join us and everything will come right", but simply using the appropriate name for a movement which sees social revolution in terms of the people taking power from the state and running their own lives in free co-operation, rather than in terms of taking over state power to run other people's lives for them, as a government.

The way forward for the Committee does not lie so much in what the Committee as a body decides, but in what each of its members and supporters decides. The broadening of its basis cannot come as an administrative decision, but as a set of personal decisions that the lessons of the sit downs and the anti-bomb struggle are worth putting into practice in every other part of life, education, the factory, local community affairs and so on. Direct action of this type is the only kind that is consistent with the spirit of those who still support the Committee of 100 after its two years of successes and failures; direct action aimed not at correcting an abuse of authority, but in getting rid of it.

P.H.

BOOKS?

We can supply

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

NEW BOOKS

Life at the Top John Braine 18/-
Brendan Behan's Island: an Irish Sketchbook
Brendan Behan and Paul Hogarth 25/-
Officer Factory Hans Helmut Kirst 25/-

REPRINTS AND CHEAP EDITIONS

Leviathan Thomas Hobbes 7/6

SECOND-HAND

No Friend of Democracy Edith Moore 3/-; England and the Continent Carlo Scarfoglio 5/-; The Testament of Christian Civilization Joseph McCabe 8/6; The Advent of the Labour Party Philip P. Poirier 6/6; Political Economy John Eaton 5/-; Gandhi and Stalin Louis Fischer 7/6; The Charm of Politics R. H. S. Crossman 6/-; Mussolini's Italy Herman Finer 7/6; Cities in Flood Peter Self 10/6; The New Soviet Empire David J. Dallin 6/-; Winter in Moscow (1934) Malcolm Muggeridge 4/-; U.S.A. '53 Derek Kartun 3/-; The Programme of the League of Yugoslav Communists 6/-; A Walker in the City Alfred Kazin 3/6; The Question Henri Alleg 7/6; An Introduction to Metaphysics Henri Bergson 3/-; World without Visa Jean Malaquais 5/6; Editorial Wild Oats Mark Twain 5/-; Extracts from Adam's Diary Mark Twain 5/-; Democracy in Crisis (1933) Harold J. Laski 6/-; The Twilight of World Capitalism William Z. Foster 3/-; Skin for Skin and the Verdict of Bridle-goose Llewellyn Powys 6/-; Fanfare for Freethought Bayard Simmons 3/6; Literature of the Graveyard Roger Garaudy 3/-; The Night of the Snowstorm Wang Wen-Shih 2/6; Money-Power and Human Life Fred Henderson 3/-; Public Speaking Richard Acland 3/-; Towards a Socialist Agriculture (ed.) F. W. Bateson 2/6; The Means to Full Employment G. D. H. Cole 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

THE BEGINNINGS OF INDUSTRIAL ACTION AGAINST THE BOMB

DURING the last 12 months (and after more than five years), the campaign against nuclear weapons in Britain is beginning to turn towards the working class. This turn has already met with certain successes. The Campaign Caravan has resulted in 22 new CND factory groups. Emphasis was placed on industrial action at the last CND Conference. And there is increasing support for demonstrations by individual industrial workers. Already, as a result, we have seen the first signs of industrial action directed against the Bomb. Workers directly involved have refused to handle cargoes destined for nuclear weapons establishments. Other workers have held token strikes. This is the beginning. It is by such methods that a truly effective attack on the Warfare State will finally build up.

More and more people are coming to realize the importance of working class action in freeing Britain—and finally the world—from the Bomb. It is to these ends that the Industrial Sub-Committee of the Committee of 100 is working. Our first leaflet laid open the road when it stated: "Workers make the weapons of mass destruction, transport them, handle them, install them. They

supply and equip those who use them. When they no longer accept to do so, the politicians will have to fight their own wars'.

Our work consists in helping supporters in factories to form groups, in holding regular dock-gate and factory-gate meetings and meetings on building sites and outside power stations. One of the most important tasks is to give workers accurate information of the effects and implications of nuclear testing and nuclear war, information denied to them by the press, radio and television. We are finding increasingly that, when officially-sponsored ignorance is countered with facts, active support is rapidly forthcoming. All this work is expensive to carry on. To expand our work, as we must, we need money as well as personal support.

In particular we immediately need loudspeaker equipment so that Richard Headicar and other speakers can make sure of really successful factory-gate meetings. These are already proving successful and their effectiveness will soon be seen in the form of further support from industrial workers. But factory gates and building sites are not the quietest places. Good amplification

loudspeaker equipment is essential and very urgently needed.

We therefore appeal to all who support us in our work, to help us practically by sending us money to enable us to obtain this equipment. Please send whatever you can to the Treasurer of the Industrial Sub-Committee, Bro. Peter Turner (A.S.W.), at: 9, South Block, Peabody Estate, Lawrence Street, London, S.W.3. All monies received will be acknowledged.

Yours fraternally,

KEN WELLER (A.E.U.), EDWIN BERRY, (A.Sc.W.), MIKE WRIGHT (NUPB&PW), PETER TURNER (A.S.W.), COLIN SEAL (T.G.W.U.), FRED MOREL (N.A.S.D.U.), JOHN LANE (N.U.R.) BILL CHRISTOPHER (NATSOPA).

WATCH FOR NEW DATE FOR THE ANARCHIST BALL

October 13 1962 Vol 23 No 32

FOR (AND FROM) THE RECORD

THE long contribution from our comrade C.H. to the discussion of the "burning" topic of the Common Market published in FREEDOM last week, can most conveniently be divided into two parts; the first is an attack on the alleged arguments contained in a recent editorial on the subject ('No Reason for Silence' 1/9/62); the second part purports to present "the advantages of joining the Common Market".

Beginning with the title, which our comrade himself gave to his article "For Queen and Country?" he seeks to demonstrate that our whole approach is more than tinged with an insularity, a "Britishness" which "must have provoked gasps from continental comrades". He further alleges that we soft-pedalled the capitalist system in this country, so much so that he assumed from what we wrote that monopolistic conditions did not prevail in Britain as elsewhere, and "that there was no great concentration of wealth or power"; we are also alleged to have raised hopes of a "decentralised economy in the hands of British workers" in "the foreseeable future". Furthermore our "nationalism" is put forward in "the guise of a plea for every country to produce as much food as possible, irrespective of the consequences of the reality of capitalism as it is today, of the stocks already rotting in the storehouses of the U.S.A., Canada, and Australia".

★
WE do not propose to defend ourselves at length from such wild accusations—we invite interested readers to consult not only the editorial in question but a file of FREEDOM for the current year, to decide for themselves whether there is any substance to our correspondent's arguments. But for the sake of new readers and to clear the way for serious discussion, we cannot allow these allegations to pass unchallenged.

In the first paragraph of the "offending" editorial we wrote: "Surely anarchist propagandists must oppose both European preference as well as Commonwealth preference". In the second paragraph we wrote:—

It is our opinion that the concentration of the wealth and productive resources of these countries in ever fewer hands increases the overwhelming power that the class of managers, financiers and technicians already possess, thus making it ever more difficult to put over, and convince workers, of the practicality of decentralised control, and the

part they must play in achieving it . . . If we are not mistaken, the tendency of the Common Market will be to boost the largest industrial concerns at the expense of the smaller units of production. Without having any illusions about the latter, we cannot help feeling that steps towards concentration are steps in the wrong direction so far as we are concerned. And can we not make this clear without falling into the arms of the small capitalists who oppose the Common Market because they fear elimination, or at best, absorption by the hungry combines? After all we have always been opposed to both.

Far from suggesting that Monopoly is not a dominating feature of British capitalism, we have used every opportunity, such as the rash of take-over bids, to underline the fact. We would especially refer our correspondent to the article on "Un-free Enterprise: Monopoly, Individualism or Co-operation" (FREEDOM 20/1/62) which apart from opening with the sentence "We are always pointing out that the capitalist economy is monopolistic, and that all this talk about free enterprise, and the stimulation of competition is just a lot of talk with no basis in fact", warns against the dangers of imagining that a nation of small shopkeepers, small manufacturers, smallholders and "individualists" are on the side of change and revolution. In that article we went as far as recognising that

the growth of the huge impersonal corporations tends to unite the ordinary people in a way which 'individualist capitalism' did not. It seems clear to us that the potential power of say the workers in Ford's factory is a thousand times greater than that of their grandfathers who were engaged in workshops employing fifteen or twenty hands.

But we went on to add, and with this quotation we leave readers to judge for themselves the objectivity of C.H.'s attack:

That the growing concentration of production—and the consequent growth of centralised workers' organisations—tends to dehumanise, depersonalise, those engaged in industry, agriculture and public services is equally true. Anarchists must expose the growing centralisation of production, control, finance, power in their propaganda since the government is always talking about "free enterprise", "property owning democracy" as being the laudable characteristics of our "free democracies" which distinguish them from the totalitarian countries. But we should be careful to champion, or offer, as the alternative, a nation of workshops, smallholders and shopkeepers. Their "rugged independence" is as retrograde as the monopolists' world is impersonal. For us, the only alternative to monopoly is co-operation. And the only acceptable

form of organisation for production is that which not only satisfies the needs of the consumers but also recognises that those so engaged are human, responsible members of the community.

★

IN the second part of his article Comrade C.H. after ironically drawing attention to our "slight omission" asks "What would then be the advantages of Britain joining?" (Incidentally, we will not follow our correspondent and accuse him of insularity, or "Britishness"! We have carefully read his arguments but cannot find the answer to his question, apart from where he says that by joining the workers of this country will maintain their present standard of living. What evidence has he that by not joining, their standards of living will deteriorate?

His pro-market arguments can be summarised as follows: (1) that they will "contribute towards ending the worst extremes of poverty in Europe and stabilising living standards for the 'masses' at a comfortable level"; (2) that the "newly prosperous workers" in the Common Market and their unions "have achieved more bargaining power, more political power and more economic power relative to their employers and their governments"; (3) the emerging hegemony of technology, science and the managerial class.

The future pattern of capitalism, from the evidence of today, will be in the hands of 'experts' rather than profit-obsessed competitors and financiers, controlled by the mechanisms of consumption, employment and maintaining

Not our idea of Progress!

C.H. MAKES two further sweeping statements which we imagine we are not alone in rejecting. The first is when he writes:

A negative 'no-change' attitude, whether one likes it or not, is a positive declaration of Britain First and a proclamation that we want to keep to ourselves rather than merge with others.

This is utter nonsense! If we follow C.H.'s logic then the fact that at the next general elections, anarchists will not vote either for the liberal or labour parties leaves us open to the charge that we are in favour of keeping the Tories in office! Perhaps this is C.H.'s point of view, in which case we should point out to him that while most anarchists do not believe in the "all or nothing" approach, neither do we confuse change with progress as we understand it. Change for the sake of replacing one set of rulers for another, or of playing the game of one bunch of monopolists in their struggle against another is not our idea of progress. The kind of action, or change, which is to our minds worthwhile is that which reduces the power of the Executive and places the burden of responsibility and initiative on the people. This is not revolution, but it is a step in the right direction. We oppose the Common Market and the Treaty of Rome because far from resulting in a decentralisation of power they seek to concentrate political and economic power in ever fewer hands. C.H. will argue that the trend is for capitalism to be in the hands of the "experts" rather than "profit-obsessed competitors and financiers. We disagree on the evidence available, but even assuming he is right does this radically change the problem, or the description of the Common Market as put forward in the editorial he selected for his attack?

Economy - or only Finance?

THE second statement by C.H. which we challenge is the last paragraph of his article which reads:

The last word among anarchists may well be with those comrades who lightly put forward the hope that the complete collapse of the British economy will give rise to a revolutionary situation that will create the dawn of an anarchist society. They are overlooking the historical precedent, however, that the decline of an imperial capitalist state leads to Jarrow hunger marches, an awful silence in the factories and the workshops and, finally, the probability of a Hitler-type dictatorship.

Clearly, our correspondent wants the best of both worlds. He attacks, on the one hand those who advocate an economic policy of self-sufficiency for every country where this is possible, and on the other those who "lightly put forward the hope that the complete collapse of the British economy will give rise to a revolutionary situation . . ." Not only that; his final sentence, which apart from being a complete travesty of the facts, is surely an apologia of the most reactionary

a certain bourgeois equilibrium rather than being under the domination of opportunistic political parties. And this will apply to Britain in or out of the Market.

(4) "The emergence of 'rational' capitalism as distinct from 'irrational' capitalism to which we are at present submitting" and (5) the "submergence" of politics "as we have known them" by economic realities; (6) A "Europe without frontiers, despite all the talk of capitalism making it a worthless illusion, is an advance in the breaking down of barriers that separate man from man." (7) "A Europe without political parties and served by non-national 'experts' planning production and consumption is a step towards the end of governments.

And our comrade concludes: In this brief summary of possible advantages one cannot offer them as immediate encouragement to the anarchist. But one can ask, as citizens and wage-slaves of Britain Now, whether Europe offers more hope of a classless society, freedom from politics, from nationalism, from poverty, from the insularity and snobbery that has rightly been called the *pox Britannica*....

Must we again repeat that the alternative is not between (what we also think has been rightly called) the *pox Britannica* and the Common Market, whose mission as we understand it, is to consolidate the capitalist system. None of the "advantages" enumerated by C.H. are substantiated with facts or even trends. If, after reflection, he denies our contention, we will gladly present our evidence to disprove all seven of his arguments.

kind for the retention of colonialism? We do not "hope for the complete collapse of the British economy". In his first paragraph C.H. quotes our statement "We must eat not only on the day before the revolution but on the day after"—which we quoted verbatim from Malatesta—and if this has any meaning it is that the production of the necessities of life cannot be interrupted unless one's aim is to smother the revolution (as for example the deliberate walk-out by the Belgians in the Congo and the French in Algeria). If C.H. takes the trouble to consult the files of FREEDOM, he will see that what we have said repeatedly, is that there is a possibility of a revolutionary situation (as well as war) as a result of a major financial crisis, and that workers should not be expected to co-operate with the industrialists and ruling class to solve these crises; on the contrary, because they are denied the right to dispose of the product of their labour, or have free access to the means of production, workers

should consider themselves in a state of permanent war against those who control the wealth of the nation. If we are revolutionaries, in fact as well as words, our aim should be to bring about the collapse of the financial system but without a collapse of the economy! The crisis, which resulted in the Jarrow hunger marches to which our correspondent refers, was a crisis of capitalism, and if the Jarrow marchers and the 3 million unemployed and their families in this country, and the millions of hungry victims of capitalism in Europe and America had shown a little less respect for the Law and had instead taken over the uncultivated land and had occupied the "silent factories" to produce the necessities of life, it is not outside the realms of possibility that the 1939 world war would have been avoided, and we would be living in a quite different world today. But so long as the initiative remains in the hands of the privileged minority no change can be in the interests of the working majority.

The Common Market is the dream-child of politicians for whom the abolition of the capitalist system would be a nightmare; the Treaty of Rome "prohibits, as being incompatible with the Common Market, all agreements between firms, decisions made by trade associations, and concerted practices which can affect trade between members and which aim at or result in preventing, restraining or distorting competition within the Common Market". But if, as one is led to believe by the supporters of the Common Market, everything is rosy, and that the spirit of one for all and all for one prevails among the Six-Musketeers, why then these Rules for Competition in the Treaty. Indeed, why competition at all?

BEARD TO BEARD OR FACE TO FACE

READERS who were disappointed with the ganging-up on Colin Ward when he valiantly attempted to explain what it was all about on the BBC Home Service will find that the BBC has made some amends in *A Dialogue on Anarchy* by Maurice Cranston, which is to be repeated on the Third Programme on October 21st.

This production which is a continuation of a series featuring dialogues between famous men, previous programmes have had conversations between Edmund Burke and Thomas Paine, Locke and John Stuart Mill. The programmes seem to be a continuation of the old series *Imaginary Conversations*, although in this case the dialogues draw largely upon the actual words of the subjects and have a central theme around which the discussion revolves.

The programme lasts for an hour, and although some time seems, to the initiated, wasted in "placing" the background of the scene and characters, ample scope is given to the anarchist position, indeed there was a feeling that the programme was unfair to Marx. Marx was handled with competence by Marius Goring, and Meier Telznicker with a delightful Russian accent made Bakunin seem more attractive and reasonable than he probably was. A line to the effect "Paradoxes I don't mind Marx, but this is a contradiction!" had about it more Telznicker than Bakunin.

Particularly apposite to the occasion of the first hearing (the day of the railway strike) was the question by Marx, "In the free society who will see to the railways and stop people getting on the lines?" with Bakunin's answer that in Marx's society engine drivers would still be under the authority of cigar-smoking bureaucrats travelling first-class.

The BBC, for once, are to be congratulated, and Maurice Cranston especially thanked for a good script.

J.R.

The US Finger in the Common Market Pie

THAT the United States has a large financial finger in the Common Market pie is revealed by figures published last week of production of goods by American controlled manufacturing companies outside the United States during 1961. Production increased by £700m over 1960 to a total of £7,000m. An AP report from Washington states that:

Since 1957, when these figures were first collected by the department, foreign production by United States manufacturing firms has increased 40 per cent.

The output of manufactured goods by American companies in Europe reached \$10,700,000,000

[£3,600m] in 1961 compared with \$9,300,000,000 [£3,100m] in 1960, and representing an increase of 70 per cent over 1957. Large gains were reported in the production of chemicals, food and machinery, but automobile sales were down.

Strong sales showed up in chemicals, primary and fabricated metals and electrical machinery in Latin America, raising production in that area by American-controlled companies to \$3,800,000,000 [£1,300m] compared with \$3,200,000,000 [£1,070m] the year before. Sales in Canada remained unchanged at \$8,900,000,000 [£3,000m].

For Queen and Counting-House?

DEAR FRIENDS,

To me, the key phrase in the analysis of the anarchist attitude to the so-called "Common Market" is:

"The realisation by workers, capitalists and governments, of living in a society where consumer-power is revealed as a more potent factor than vote-power is but one of the changes that is leading to the complete transformation of our capitalist societies." The master-key words here are "consumer-power" for in this consuming civilisation we are—apart from the increasing likelihood of the nuclear holocaust—heading fast for disaster through the waste of the world's resources ('over consumption'—selfish indulgence!)

Anarchists do not need me to remind them by giving examples—thousands of millions of gallons of water consumed hourly by nuclear 'generating' stations while deserts remain without the irrigation which would bring humanity at large infinitely greater benefit, their wasting from lack of works (the unemployed), from lack of satisfying work (the misemployed) or from inherently evil unemployment (the mal employed—nuclear, and other, weapons 'inventors' and producers).

These are the aspects of our 'civilisation' which anarchists, humanists, rationalists and others who feel some 'commitment' should be constantly 'bringing home' to others, not only by writing or speaking but by example, by contracting-out so far as is possible—and I have proved to myself that it is possible to a surprising degree. We may be regarded, as Bertrand Russell has in other words said, as mad and only fit for incarceration but it would be 'satisfying' to be so confined in the company of all the other sane ones and kept in some degree of comfort by the labour of the mad dogs (satisfying for a while only, no doubt; reaction would probably follow!).

As to the Frenchman having accepted "this switch from corrupt politicians to trained civil servants", Time will tell, and before long, probably.

Let us always remember that the cor-

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS

rupt politician is 'advised' by the 'trained' (by whom?) civil servant and that, surely, we have no evidence, judging from 'diplomatic' relations, that civil servants are any less corrupt than the politicians they 'advise'. (Probably (?) the politicians would be less corrupt if they were not put up to so many of their cunning little tricks by those who, from long years of experience, 'know the ropes' and are thus able to set their seals to any 'wind of change' or change of wind?)." "C.H." is in a real trance! The so-called "Common Market" is the (free) West (End) rich man's club of finance—industrialists—the East (End) has its parallel (on a different 'social' level?).

Southampton, Oct. 6. B. CECIL BEVIS.
P.S.—Following my own precept, I restrain myself from 'wasting' more of your valuable space, time and labour.
B.C.B.

The White Peril

I HOPE that it will not be interpreted as undue defeatism to say that the Common Market will come anyway, in one form or another, whatever anybody says or does. No doubt some will benefit and some will suffer. To me it appears to be a "bad thing", as *1066 and all that* would put it, but I can see little that can be done to stop it, short of course of a social revolution.

To ally oneself with the Beaverbrook press, with patriots waving union jacks, with the "stand by the Commonwealth" brigade seems a pretty depressing prospect. I don't know how far C.H. is really correct in ascribing FREEDOM's position to (unconscious) patriotic ardour, but it is clear enough that for many opposition to the Common Market stems from patriotism. It is impossible for the anarchist to take this position, since he is an internationalist or he is nothing. C.H. makes a good case for going in, but I can't help feeling a bit uneasy all the same, although I recognise that one way or another joining the Common Market is almost inevitable.

It has been an advantage to people living in this country to be outside Continental politics, whatever the cause of this isolation may have been. The British, like the Dutch, who much resemble them, may be cruel enough abroad, but they are at least fairly humane at home. It would be a pity if involvement in the Common Market led to such a degree of unification of Europe that, for instance, the O.A.S., or some similar horror, was able to make its appearance here. The methods of the British police are bad enough already, but at least we have not had as yet to fish fifty dead nuclear disarmers out of the Thames, or find our friends hanging from trees in Hyde Park. These medieval scenes were enacted not long ago in Paris with Algerians as victims. Again, it is bad enough to have to carry passports when we travel. It is bad to have a National Insurance number. Even so it could still be worse. We might have the Continental system of internal passports, "papers", imposed upon us. This is all the more likely as the mobility of labour across the frontiers increases, and the controls there are relaxed.

No doubt this is a very insular point of view, but in a barbaric world a few islands of relative mildness are worth preserving, and, as C.H. says, we live in the real (authoritarian) world, not in the free society we should like.

National frontiers are an evil, but if authoritarianism is to continue it is better that the authoritarians should be divided. I always thought that the anarchist case against world government was that it would unite the forces of tyranny and give them greater power. Political asylum, already gravely compromised, would become a thing of the past. The same logic applies to an authoritarian United Europe.

There are other factors to be considered. We live in a world of pan-this and pan-that, Pan-Africanism, Pan-Asianism, etc. Now we have the beginnings of Pan-Europeanism. Another bloc is being created in a world already tense with fear and hostility. To the

Africans, our nearest neighbours, a new form of imperialism may seem to threaten. Indeed we already hear talk of neo-colonialism. In Victorian days sensational stories were written about the picturesquely-named "Yellow Peril". No one ever pointed out that the worst peril the world has ever known was, and is still, the White Peril, which from the sixteenth century on has systematically wrecked and plundered every other civilisation on earth! With the increasing power of America, Russia and China it almost looked as if the European section of the White Peril was going to cease its aggression against humanity, and allow itself to decline into a condition of modest affluence, like some old, retired, comfortably situated pirate. After all, this is what the Scandinavian countries have done. At one time the plague of their neighbours, they have now for several centuries been doing what Voltaire advised individuals to do. They have been cultivating their own gardens. Now they have a very high living standard as a result.

However, no such luck. A united, authoritarian, clerical, military and commercial Europe is now going to add itself to the world's super-states, and, such is the nature of big states, embark on a new career of conquest. The pirate has not retired. Instead he is fitting out his ship for a new cruise, with an improved and heavier armament.

A new form of patriotism will replace the old. Instead of being good Englishmen, Germans, Dutchmen, Spaniards, etc. we shall be exhorted to be

Freudian Slip?

The Editors, FREEDOM,
DEAR COMRADES,

I don't think it's necessary to catalogue the printing lapses in my article on the Common Market, but who is responsible for the Freudian one in:

Like Mr. Gaitskell, however, though unfortunately not with elections in mind, the anarchist as well as the socialist has to come off the fence. . . .

Yours,
C.H.

Still Behind!

FINANCIAL STATEMENT AT OCTOBER 6 1962	
Weeks 38, 39, 40	
EXPENSES: 40 weeks at £70	£2,800
INCOME	
Sales & Sub. Renewals	£ £
Weeks 1—37	1,235
Weeks 38—40	80
	1,315
New Subscriptions:	
Weeks 1—37 (274)	300
Weeks 38-40 (36)	32
	332
DEFICIT £1,153	

DEFICIT FUND

E. Rutherford: A.S.* 7/-; Shoreham: M. & D.* 2/6; London: N.D. 4/-; Leeds: G.L. 2/6; Wolverhampton: J.L.* 2/6; Wolverhampton: J.K.W. 2/-; Hounslow: L.* 2/6; New York: B.C. £3; London: D.R. 10/-; London: B.H. 2/2; London: M.M. 2/6; London: R.E. 16/9; Stockholm: O.H. 5/-; Karori: G.B. 10/-; E. Rutherford: A.S.* 7/-; Nuneaton: D.H. £1; London: B.B. 6/6; Hailsham: A.A. 14/6; Oxford: Anon.* 5/-; Hailsham: A.A. 14/6; Oxford: Anon.* 5/-; London: W.C. 13/10; Wolverhampton: J.L.* 4/-; Wolverhampton: J.K.W.* 2/-; Glastonbury: D.A.P. 10/-; Farnham: D.M.B. 4/-; Surrey: F.B.* 10/-; Birmingham: F.D. £8/10/-; Hove: H.C. 7/7; Hounslow: L.* 2/6; London: Anon. 10/-; Glasgow: J.L. 1/3; Southport: D.N.S. 1/2; Glasgow: J.H.* 3/6; London: M.S. 15/6; Bristol: N. & S.A. 5/6; London: Colney: E.H. 9/-; London: T.B.B. 4/4; Glasgow: J.M. 2/6; Shepton Mallett: E.H.S. 11/-; Bromley: L.A.E. 4/-; London: B.D. 4/-; Gloucester: J.H. 2/6; Southend: P.O.* 5/-; Ilford: M.D. 2/9; Shoreham: M. & D.* 2/6; Edmonton, Alb.: W.G.* 7/-; London: G.M. £1/5/-; London: J.W. 8/-; London: G.H.T. 8/4; Hove: A.R. 4/-; Reading: C.S. 2/-; St. Albans: K.L. £1/0/3; Reading: E.P. 3/3; Huddersfield: A.L. £1; Glasgow: J.S.A. 4/-; Altrincham: J.B. £1/0/6; Leeds: G.L. 4/6; London: D.S. 4/6; London: A.H. 4/-; London: H.V.W. 8/-; London: T.E.B. 4/-; London: J.K.R. 2/6; E. Rutherford: A.S.* 7/-; Hornchurch: D.J.P. 5/-; London: P.S. 7/-; Keighley: S.K. 2/-; Southend P.O.* 5/-; Peterborough: A.V. £1; Witney: R.P. 13/6; Hounslow: L.* 2/6; Wolverhampton: J.L.* 2/6; Wolverhampton: J.K.W.* 2/-; Swindon: F.E.W. 4/-; London: J.S. 4/4; London: A.M.B. 3/3; Glasgow: J.H.* 8/6; London: P.N. 16/8; London: B.H. 6/1; London: E.S. 1/-; New Malden: J.T. 5/-; London: M.B. £1/8/6; Petersfield: R.F. 2/4; Shoreham: M. & D.* 2/6; London: A.S. 2/4; London: P. & G.T.* 5/-.

TOTAL 39 17 8
Previously acknowledged 888 15 8

1962 TOTAL TO DATE £928 13 4

*Indicates regular contributors.

"good Europeans". Meaningless phrase! What have the different European nations in common? The English are as different from the French as either are from the Chinese. If one can be a good European, one could equally logically be a good Earthman, why not?

So what will happen? We shall be deluged with a lot of sickly cant about "Europeanism", which will have the purpose of covering up the differences between the various countries. One fascist publication I have already seen decorated with the headline, "Europe—we will defend you!" Underneath were pictures of bridges, cathedrals, works of art, the Leaning Tower of Pisa and whatnot. I suppose there is a danger that some sinister "wog" (Dr. No?) will run away with the Mona Lisa if Mosley and his merry men are not on the alert. The place of the Jews in the New Europe will doubtless be taken by all those of non-European descent, thus playing right into the hands of African and Asian chauvinists and racists, who would be only too glad of a chance to denounce all white people as enemies.

Another force that will seek to exploit the situation will be the Roman Catholic Church. This organisation has not much use for anti-colour racism, it is true, though its record in the matter of anti-semitism is more dubious. However it does desire a united Europe, united under Rome of course. I am sufficiently old-fashioned to believe that the Reformation was a benefit on the whole. I should not very much like to see the countries of Northern Europe brought again within the Roman orbit.* It is true I suppose, as C.H. says, that as people become more prosperous the hold clericalism has over them diminishes, but a good deal of the power of the Catholic Church is based upon the "pressure group" of ardent believers who are able to work themselves into positions of influence. Avro Manhattan writes on this subject in *The Catholic Church Against the Twentieth Century*. These sort of fanatics will exist in any sort of authoritarian society, however prosperous. Machines and prosperity do not necessarily end superstition, as used to be believed, though they may change the form superstition may take. The rise of Nazism took place in a society suffering from slump, nevertheless it was a modern, mechanised, progressive, educated, technically efficient society, that one could hardly believe would so suddenly become worse than medieval. But it did. Therefore one cannot simply rely upon modernity to do away with the power of superstition and irrationalism.

As an anarchist, as a human being indeed, I want to see a united world. But a forced unity will get us nowhere. How people hate each other when forced together by economic or political

World 'Peace Strike' Activity in Britain

TWO circulars have been issued in this country, calling for individual acts against war during the week of the "world wide general strike for peace", 5th to 11th November, 1962.

One leaflet, calling for token work stoppages, has already been distributed to 500 shop stewards and Trades Union branch officials. The other, calling for a boycott of goods made by those who also manufacture weapons, is now being distributed to peace groups and interested individuals.

The aim of the shoe-string group who issue the leaflets, and associated groups abroad, is to encourage and support individual acts against weapons. But it is also hoped to secure a wider hearing among ordinary people for the various arguments against war preparation.

The boycott leaflet explains how:

Mass demonstrations depend for their publicity on what the national press thinks newsworthy. The papers might think the aims of the demonstrators worth reporting or they may think it more important that some of the demonstrators wear beards. But a buying strike is a series of individual demonstrations; people mostly hear about it not through the press but from the individuals taking part. So tell your friends and neighbours, your suppliers (they are always interested to hear of custom being withdrawn) and the local papers, either by word of mouth or by letter.

No arguments against war are included in the leaflets themselves, as it is intended that any participating groups and individuals should participate on their own terms and make their own propaganda.

Further information may be obtained from The General Strike for Peace Acting London Committee, 148A, Fellows Road, London, N.W.3, or the New York Committee General Strike for Peace, 63, West 14th Street, New York 11, N.Y.

reasons! National differences, far from diminishing, become exaggerated, antagonisms are exacerbated. People should be allowed to work towards unity in their own time and at their own pace. It is quite possible that a united Europe would be as full of seething racial hate (of Europeans for each other) as the old Austro-Hungarian Empire, another forced association, was.† It was this empire, after all, that produced Adolf Hitler.

The above considerations make me less sanguine than C.H.

ARTHUR W. ULOTH.

*Holland, traditionally the liberal and Protestant fortress, is now seriously threatened by the growth of the Catholic population in her southern provinces.

†Hearing the exclamation "Scum!" in English female accents on top of a Paddington bus this afternoon I anticipated another anti-colour outburst. The bus was full of Negro workers. But the next words were, "You ought to go back to Italy where you belong!"

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.

OCT 14 Philip Sansom:
Anarchism and Organisation
OCT 21 Martin Grainger:
Struggle for Socialism

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.

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 Lellie's, 242 Amesbury Avenue, S.W.2 (Streatham Hill, Nr. Station).

3rd Friday of each month at 8 p.m. at Donald & Irene Room's, 148A Fellows Road, Swiss Cottage, N.W.3.

Please note that the meetings at Fellows Road, N.W.3 are now on the third Friday, not the third Wednesday as hitherto. Next meeting 19 October.

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 1-19

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/- (\$.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