

'If my soldiers would really think, not one would remain in the ranks.'
FREDERICK THE GREAT

In this Issue:
The Social Strike

Page 2

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY - 4d.

Crisis Season Opens

WITH the world's politicians, diplomats, permanent officials, professional Commiteemen, and experts of all kinds, back from taking the waters . . . in a word, now that the holidays are over one can expect the political crises season to begin. How else could all these highly paid officials justify their jobs? What would they do in the United Nations' skyscraper if no one came forward to complain that someone else's action, or speeches represented a threat to peace? And we may be wrong but if some of the financial experts are right in believing that the 'Free world'—as they call the capitalist West—is "in danger of sliding into a general trade recession", we must expect bigger and better crises with our breakfast during the coming months.

A good start has been made. Indian troops, 20,000 of them are said to be massing somewhere up in the mountains of the North to resist Chinese aggression. Nehru, like Drake is unruffled and has not interrupted his holidays.

The United States is busily laying the foundations for two "crises". Berlin that hardy perennial is again on the crisis agenda. It is now, believe it or not, 17 years since Germany was defeated, a new generation has almost grown to adulthood and the politicians are still wrangling about the terms for a peace treaty, and the solution of the German problem! Every year Russia is alleged to be on the point of taking action unilaterally; every year the Western politicians are threatening to resort to nuclear war if Russian action threatens the life-line to that artificial island called West Berlin. Meantime West Germany denounces East Germany and vice

versa, but trade between them increases each year! Now the United States once again foresees a serious crisis in Berlin in the months ahead. *The Observer's* diplomatic correspondent reported last Sunday that "British officials in London say they are mystified by American talk of an imminent Berlin crisis". They see no evidence for Washington speculation that the West must be prepared for the 'crunch' in Berlin immediately after the American Congressional elections." One presumes that in due course American diplomats will persuade their British counterparts that a crisis does exist calling for more expenditure on defence and diplomacy.

The other crisis (made in the U.S.) is of course Cuba. From having completely moulded the Cuban economy to suit the financial interests of its *colons*, having financially and politically dominated the island for half a century, the U.S. retaliated against Cuba's attempt to liberate itself from American domination by suddenly cutting it off from the traditional outlets for its principal commodity, sugar. The alternative to starving was to seek other outlets, and it was obvious to everybody other than the American government apparently that Castro would turn to Russia. Of course he would have to pay a price in political independence, but is anyone suggesting that he would not have had to pay a price for American "aid"?

The agreement reached between

Cuba and Russia to construct a base to accommodate Russia's Atlantic fishing fleet has provided the lunatic fringe in American politics with yet another argument for declaring war on Cuba right away! Led by Mr. Luce, owner of *Time-Life* the pro-war-advocates are seeking to make the Cuban crisis an issue in the forthcoming Congressional elections. The Kennedy administration, taking a more realistic look at the situation, not only cannot by any stretch of the imagination consider the presence of some 4,000 Russian technicians on Cuban soil a threat to the United States, but is also not prepared to repeat the fiasco of eighteen months ago—the ill-fated attempted invasion by Cuban refugees in the Bay of Pigs. Mr. Kennedy is only

too aware of the unpopularity of American policy on Cuba in Latin America, not to mention in most countries of the Western Alliance.

As a good politician, and on the eve of elections Mr. Kennedy is obviously concerned with public opinion, and this, according to the latest Gallup poll shows that

Americans are no more "invasion-minded" now than they were immediately after the failure of the invasion attempt 18 months ago. The poll shows that only one American in four is in favour of sending American armed forces into Cuba at this time. Six out of ten Americans are definitely opposed to armed intervention.

So without appeasing the whole-hoggers, Mr. Kennedy had to show "firmness" over Cuba, and this is reflected in his tough warning to all

countries that if any of their ships carried arms to Cuba, all ships of that country would be barred entry to American ports. He even added that ships carrying non-military materials would not be allowed to load up at American ports for the return journeys (in this way it was hoped that freight costs to Cuba would be prohibitively high). The world reaction to this threat was not alarm but derision. And by last week-end there were already signs that the Kennedy administration was climbing down. *The Sunday Times* correspondent wrote last week-end that "the Anglo-American diplomatic storm over shipping to Cuba would eventually blow itself out in arguments about how United States

Continued on page 2

WHY TRUST THE POLITICIANS?

— they don't trust each other!

THE political party Jamborees are over for another year. The Liberal delegates have gone home, their optimism in the Liberal future fired by the "inspiring", "forward-looking", "sincere", oratory of their leader, Jo Grimond, and by the movement's "enthusiastic" reaffirmation of its support for the Common Market. Mr. Mark Bonham Carter received a "tremendous ovation from the assembly at the end of a triumphant 25-minute speech" in which he proclaimed with no reservations his absolute faith in the vital importance for Britain of entry into the Common Market. "This is a challenge—he declared—which the Liberal Party can accept, not reluctantly and secretly but eagerly and with both hands", and delegates swamped his last words with their roar of approval.

At Brighton an otherwise dreary Conference was given a life-saving shot in the arm by Mr. Hugh Gaitskell's "best ever" speech opposing Britain's entry to the Common Market on the terms so far negotiated. How many prospective Labour candidates must have left the Sports Stadium, dreaming of the sweet fruits of victory at the next general elections!

At Llandudno last week it was the turn of the Tories to take their places before the television cameras and to proclaim to the world their belief in Europe, and Britain's role therein. At their conference the Leader appears only once on the stage, after all the Ministers and a few rank-and-file have relieved themselves of what they had to say. Mr. Macmillan speaking with all the authority and responsibility that devolves on the chief Executive of the land, concluded his speech in favour of Britain's entry to the Common Market with these inspiring words:

"This is a great moment of history. The decisions we have to take will be dramatic and perhaps decisive. In our appeal today we can look not merely to the support of our own party but to the great mass of people especially young people, who are determined that our country shall not rest upon its

achievements, great as they have been. We can look to all who are determined to read aright the lessons of the past and who are inspired by the daring as well as the prudence of our forebears, to move forward and seize the opportunities that lie ahead.

It is reported that when he sat down the cheering lasted "a full two minutes", and thus compares well with the "long standing ovation" accorded to Mr. Gaitskell and the "tremendous ovation" given to Mr. Mark Bonham Carter.

★

THE first leader in Monday's *Guardian* opens with these words: "A cool analysis of the gains and losses through entering Europe becomes daily more difficult. Mr. Macmillan and Mr. Gaitskell between them have made this the chief battleground of party politics". We agree, but we do not share the *Guardian's* apparent surprise, any more than we share that journals' view that "each of the two has come to his decision in the light of what he thought best for Britain". As a matter of fact we consider that last remark as meaningless as many others such as "the free world", "democracy", "opportunity", "free enterprise" and "free speech", to mention only a few of the clichés with which our politician's speeches and the editorial columns of the capitalist press are studded. We anarchists are not alone in treating all the utterances of the politicians with the contempt and distrust they deserve; the politicians themselves confirm our views in their declared estimations of each other! Mr. Macmillan had this to say of the Gaitskell line:

"Of course, when a party is in opposition it can allow itself to be lured by the pursuit of power without any inhibiting sense of responsibility. To this end, the leaders can, if they wish, sit on the fence without fear, if not without reproach . . . The alternative to sitting on the fence seems to be to hop from perch to perch waiting to see how things develop and where and how the maximum of party advantage is extracted."

Later in his speech he had this to say about Mr. Gaitskell's fears for

Britain's status in a federated Europe:

Mr. Gaitskell now prattles about our being reduced to the status of Texas or California. What nonsense. But, in any case, if he really believes that, he should surely be against the whole thing, root and branch, not just wondering whether we are getting sufficiently profitable terms. Certainly, if I believed that I would not touch it on any terms.

Mr. Gaitskell, for his part, hasn't a good word for the Tories. At Cambridge last week-end he told a Labour Party rally that

the Government has scrapped its pledges of safeguarding the Commonwealth and "plumped for unconditional surrender into the Common Market". He deplored this line. Nothing the Government might say could justify "such weak and discreditable conduct. However much the Prime Minister may try to disguise it, the logic of his own argument leads directly to European federation. By going in we sign away the continued existence of Britain as an independent nation. It is sheer dishonesty to pretend otherwise."

The joke is of course that the Labour Party which prides itself with being "internationalist" is adopting the chauvinist arguments* and the Tories who stand for Queen and empire (and who charged the Labour Government with being the "liquidators" of the Empire) talk of going into Europe as "involving some pooling of national freedom of action. Nobody denies that", without batting an eyelid, or provoking more than a murmur from the delegates of Bath and Cheltenham.

*What worries former Labour Premier, Lord Attlee, apart from the instability of the governments of the Three (Germany, France, Italy) is that "it is difficult to see how our monarchy could be fitted in with this [European federation]".

(Observer, Oct. 7).

Continued on page 3

New wave of Repression in Spain

THE Franco government is doing its utmost to stifle the awakening of Spanish youth. The repression, persecution and mass imprisonment of young libertarians is a witness of this. False confessions about their supposed terrorist activities are extracted from them by torture. They are then submitted to a summary council of war which demands sentences from six to thirty years imprisonment and even the death penalty. There is no appeal and the accused may not even put forward a defence.

At the present time the régime is demanding the head of a young student, Jorge Conill Vall, accused of having taken part in the bomb outrages which

recently took place in Barcelona. Two other young men, Marcelino Jimenez Cubas and Antonio Mur Peiron, are accused of the same offence and long prison sentences are demanded for them. A young French girl Yvette Parent is also implicated and one of Mur's brothers, Luis, on holiday from France, was also arrested.

This continues the tendency to repress the activities of the C.N.T. At Vigo, Madrid and Valladolid they have started making mass arrests of libertarian militants, accused of having distributed clandestine propaganda at the time of the strikes in Spain, particularly during the recent ones in Asturias.

In the usual confused manner of the Franco régime propaganda, all this is referred to as "activity of communist agitators striving to exploit to their own advantage the labour conflicts of last spring . . .".

The prisoners are accused of having exploded several bombs in different buildings in which they only caused material damage. There were no casualties at all. From this one may conclude that the desired effect was merely psychological. It was a protest against the repression which the régime brought to bear upon the hundreds of workers who were arrested and deported at the time of the strikes in April and May.

All protests and all propaganda against the régime come under military jurisdiction. Consequently the prisoners from the provinces have been transferred to Madrid where they will be tried by military tribunals as a mere formality.

ANARCHY

is 21 this month

Secondary Modern

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

NEW DATE FOR THE ANARCHIST BALL
JANUARY 25th

IN the last two issues of FREEDOM, the writer has discussed the problems of the railways, and the resort to militant action by the National Union of Railwaymen, and the trends within the movement around the Committee of 100, suggesting that it needs to broaden its basis, to become a movement advocating social revolution by direct action rather than only an anti-H-bomb protest.

There are dangers in the latter approach, as supporters of the Committee will not be slow to point out, in so far as concentration on a single issue makes it easier to achieve unity, ensures larger meetings and protests, while broadening the basis would threaten to divide the movement into its multiple literature selling components. A more serious problem is that where there is a

single issue, it is easier to see what to do or so it seems. The protests against the bomb have taken the form of mass sit-downs, attempts to block bases and so on. When one turns to look at wider issues there does not seem to be so much that people can do together, and the movement devolves into at best, spontaneous acts of protest, and more usually into what the numerous respondents to the recent FREEDOM readership survey who disagreed with all propaganda activity called "living anarchism in their everyday lives", in other words doing nothing.

However, the railway crisis does show another possibility for militant direct action which is relevant in a wider social context than anti-H-bomb protests, and that is the development of what anarchists and syndicalists have called the Social General Strike.

THE Social Strike

This has perhaps been thought of too often in a millenarian setting, as if the strike would be the one act to usher in the revolution and the free society. In fact, when the members of the N.U.R., unfortunately mainly through their leaders, call for the sympathetic action of busmen and lorry drivers, they are calling for social action. In the early history of the labour movement the strike had a clear social function as a weapon of an oppressed class against the bosses, and each action had the full support of organised labour. More recently this rôle has not been predominant, because most strikes have been about wages, and it has been easy for the press to play up ideas like inflation, and antagonise public opinion against them. The political needs of the Labour Party have also made it fight against direct action, so as to woo the middle class vote, and prevent the workers' organisations becoming too strong.

Nowadays, however, there is far more opportunity for linking industrial direct action with much wider issues, and for involving people who

do not traditionally take part in, or even understand, working-class struggles, to become involved. The organisation of public transport is a matter which affects the railwaymen directly, but at the same time threatens the whole of society with having a useful service withdrawn just because it does not make a profit in capitalist finance. It could therefore be an issue on which workers throughout industry could go on strike, on which supporting marches could be organised, and on which sit-downs to block traffic could take place.

Other issues appear from time to time with implications far wider than the immediate interests of the people involved in the job concerned, and these could be considered as possible occasions for concerted action involving a strike. For instance the dockers recently struck in support of pay increases for nurses. During the St. Pancras rent dispute two years

ago, workers on the Shell building site downed tools and marched to St. Pancras in protest on the day of the evictions. How much more effective would each of these actions have been if workers throughout industry, and people in non-industrial work, had joined in?

Strike action involves hardship for the people involved, and should never be indulged in thoughtlessly, and propagandists should not imply that they wish to be irresponsible towards the people taking part. Among other things it might be helpful if local welfare groups could deal with such issues as strike pay.

Is it conceivable that the social strike, apart from its possible eventual revolutionary application, could be an avenue for direct action on broad issues, which would dig to the roots of our social discontents, and unite all ordinary working people in an attack on the authoritarian elements in our society? P.H.

Around the Galleries

IT is a broody week within the galleries for the dealers are waiting for the latest trend of the month to make itself felt and in the meantime they eye the doors of their galleries with the calculating and blasé eye of an Old Compton Street commission doorman picking out the mugs. Yet trends there must be, for the second-raters must of necessity have someone set the pace for them and toll the pulse of the times; for in a business that panders to fashion the slickest and most uninspired are the first to receive the painters' small cut off the dealers' loot. Three artists can be grouped together if for no other reason than that they are abstract artists who

will seek a visible grip on reality however slight and these three men have chosen to wed their abstractionism to a bird's eye view of the earth.

John Barnicoat at the Molton at 44 South Molton Street, W.1., offers a series of sensual dung-coloured coastlines, while Gerald Marks at the Drian Gallery at 5 Porchester Place, W.2., builds up a pattern of overlapping interlocking planes that gain strength and depth from his use of black masses that turn his fractured crystals into a map-maker's delight of blending fields. Marks in himself is an extremely interesting character in that he has been actively associated in the past with the militant left and in his time must have sat in judgment on many a fellow artist flirting with decadent trends and one wonders what the reactions to this new mode of expression must have on his one-time political associates, for those who believe that art is subservient to politics must hold strong and doctrinaire views regarding a radical change in an artist's work but to hell with them anyway for these paintings, slight work though they may be are pleasant to the eye and easy on the mind.

The third man to soar into the broad blue yonder via Gimpel Fils of South Molton Street, W.1., is Peter Lanyon and he has landed in a series of belly flops that will worry no one. Lanyon's work in the poverty of the period almost automatically sells for he is a "must" for the parochial collector. But they are pretty and pretentious works whose charm lies in his liberal use of happy colours. Gay reds and baby blues splash together beneath a whipped cream helping of thick white, yet the brush, it would appear, has twirled around with no other object than to fill space and like reflections in a pub window they satisfy without demanding further investigation. One single painting however is worthy of mention and it is his Two Birds. Here is a painting that has demanded thought and attention for the broad mass of light blue with its jetty of yellowish white is held together with two plain simple black brush strokes. One could dismiss all this with the New London Gallery's, 17 Old Bond Street, W.1. display of Modern Japanese Painting where the eye is again caught and held by a mass of attractive colours but when those brief moments ebb away we find that we are back with the same old corn, this time served up on a willow pattern plate.

Here are the pretty Christmas cards that Collet's sell but without the birdies and the chrysanthemums. The scarlet washes and the gold leaf echo them just as they also echo almost every contemporary American abstract painter like a Punch pistache of the comic East aping the comic West. Yet they that would seek the craftsman can find it in the work of Denis Wirth-Miller at the Lefevre Gallery at 30 Bruton Street, W.1. Here are landscapes of such quiet beauty that they hug the heart, the silent marshes drifting off into desolate and silent worlds and all achieved with an economy of effort that spells the skilled artisan and could there be higher praise. True in some of his later work a laziness has crept in, in that he allows the brush to think for him and relies on an accidental dropping of paint for a needed shadow but in a month when the wallpaper squad are giving us the bird look, Denis Wirth-Miller shows us what they are seeking but can never find.

ARTHUR MOYSE.

POPE JOHN XXIII addressing the Ecumenical council said, "Mother Church rejoices that, by singular gift of Divine Providence, the longed for day has finally dawned, when under the auspices of the Virgin Mother of God, whose material dignity is commemorated on this feast, the second Vatican Ecumenical Council is being solemnly opened here beside St. Peter's tomb." . . . "In calling this vast assembly of bishops, the latest and humble successor of the Prince of the Apostles, who is addressing you, intended to assert once again the Church's *magisterium* which is un-failing and endures until the end of time: in order that this *magisterium*, taking into account the errors, the requirements, and the opportunities of our time, might be presented in exceptional form to all men throughout the world". . . .

12,000 HOMELESS MISFITS slept in common lodging houses in London last winter, or slept 'rough'. Many of them were persistent offenders, discharged from prison with nowhere to go, or homeless former mental patients. The Bishop of Woolwich told the Convocation of Canterbury that suicide was very much more often "a crime of society against the individual" rather than a sin of the individual suicide himself. An unemployed cinema operator was sent to prison for fifteen months for procuring a married woman to have sexual intercourse with him by posing as a rent collector who could get her a flat. The woman's conduct, said the Judge, was influenced by the misery of the housing situation, for she was living in two basement rooms with her husband and three young children, and was desperate. The man's wife said there had been a marked change in him since an accident in 1956. He had been a good father to seven children, four of whom were under the care of the LCC because of the lack of housing accommodation. America announced an increase in the size of her Johnston Island nuclear test restricted area to protect the eyes of people on the ground or in aircraft. . . .

SIR HUGH FOOT voted with his feet by resigning as British representative on the United Nations Trusteeship Committee in protest, it is believed, against Britain's policy with regard to Southern Rhodesia. Dr. Alex Comfort, Research Fellow in the Department of Biochemistry at University College London, was fined £2 with three guineas costs for pasting a poster without permission, advertising "The Voice of Nuclear Disarmament" the illegal CND radio-transmitter which can be heard on BBC television wavelength after close-down,

CRISIS SEASON

Continued from page 1
policy should be interpreted or could be modified". He adds:

United States officials were at pains to point out that the conclusions Britain had jumped to were exaggerated.

They also pointed out that words like "embargo," "blockade" and "boycott" were inapplicable, and that the sole purpose of the proposed restrictions was to make it more difficult and costly for Russia to maintain the Cuban economy by forcing ships engaged in this traffic to return to Europe empty.

The crisis season has gone off to a good start. Even if the Kennedy embargo seems to have misfired, that's all part of the fascinating

game of politics, and we have obviously not heard the last word on Cuba, or Berlin or a hundred and one other potential sources of "tension", "threats to peace" and the rest. Politics is a profitable profession and an expanding one. So long as the crises can be kept going there is no fear of redundancy for tens of thousands of bureaucrats, experts, tax-free secretaries, interpreters, etc. They can be relied on to keep the political pot boiling; we believe that they can be equally relied upon to prevent it boiling over for that would mean wholesale unemployment in the most privileged and profitable profession in the world today!

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 Masks of God, Vol. 2, Oriental Mythology Joseph Campbell 45/-
Long March to Freedom: China Stuart & R. Gelder 30/-
The Patriot Karl Opitz 16/-
The Revolutions of South East Asia Victor Purcell 21/-
Best Fantasy Stories (Ed.) Brian W. Aldiss 16/-
Deaths for the Ladies Norman Mailer 21/-

SECOND-HAND

Down Second Avenue Ezekiel Mphahlele 7/6; The New Face of China Peter Schmid 7/6; Patents for Hitler Gunther Reiman 3/-; Report from Germany (1945) Leonard O. Mosley 3/-; Our Threatened Values Victor Gollancz 3/-; We Will Not Cease Archibald Baxter 3/-; In Darkest Hungary (1944) G. Palocz-Horvath 3/6; It's Your Empire Alexander Campbell 3/-; Dilemma in Japan (1946) Andrew Roth 2/6; Can Capitalism Last? Frederick Allen 3/-; Something Went Wrong Lewis Browne 3/-; A Strong Hand at the Helm (1933) Vindictor 3/-; Der Fuehrer (2 vols.) Konrad Heiden 7/6; Nine Days that Shook England (1381) H. Fagan 4/6; A People's History of England A. L. Morton 4/-; A.R.P. (1938) J. B. S. Haldane 2/6; Barbarians at the Gate Leonard Woolf 2/6; Rats! The Pied Piper (1941) 3/-; I Am a Woman from Soviet Russia Barbara Moore-Patalewa 5/-; England Since the Industrial Revolution 1815-1935 J. Hampden Jackson 3/6; The Intelligent Man's Review of Europe Today (1933) G.D.H. Cole 3/-; A World History for the Workers Alfred Barton 3/-; History of Ancient Philosophy A. W. Benn 3/-; Why the German Republic Fell &c. (ed.) A. W. Madsen 3/-; Soviet Russia Fights Neurosis Frankwood E. Williams (Proof copy) 3/6; Landmarks in English Industrial History George Townesend Warner 3/-; Burma Handbook 3/6; Moscow: a Short Guide A. Kovalyov 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



Swami Advaitananda, a Hindu monk, was carried away by police, on a stretcher (in the yoga lotus position) from a CNVA demonstration at US Navy Base at Vallejo, California. Three demonstrators finished a week's fast at Spouters' Corner, Wood Green, in aid of the Oxford Committee for Famine Relief. Mrs. Helen Joseph was sentenced to five years' house arrest in Captown under the Sabotage Act, for engaging in activities which are furthering or calculated to further, objects of Communism.

THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT agreed to the sale of Blackburn Buccaneer aircraft to the South African government. These are made by Blackburn Aircraft Ltd., and are used for low-level attack and would be useful for internal security including reconnaissance. The order assures the security of the staff at Blackburn for at least two years. The South African Minister of Justice has refused to carry out an inquiry into the Prisons Service after mass escape attempts from prisons in Pretoria. A judge recently sentenced a coloured warder to ten years' imprisonment for his part in beating an African prisoner to death in Klein Drakenstein prison. The Minister of Justice was reported as saying he has the highest regard for those in the service and their "humane manner" to prisoners. Doctors in Northern Natal have agreed to bar their non-white colleagues from future social gatherings. The South African Minister of the Interior told the Nationalist Party Congress that firm action would be taken if whites and non-whites continued to mix socially. He said there were cases of "deliberate provocation" which would not be tolerated. A Stockholm Court decided that a banner which accused Dr. Verwoerd of "murder on African Soil" was not offensive to the public, for it "reflected a commonly-held view in Sweden". A charge against a group of youths for displaying the banner was

dropped. A Cheese Week intended to promote consumption of cheese in Johannesburg was cancelled owing to a shortage of cheese. . . .

TWENTY-THREE CARS were involved in a single crash near Wilmington, Massachusetts. The newly-launched M.G. 1100 car accelerated on test from 0 to 60 miles per hour in just under 20 seconds. The new model "fully sustains M.G.'s long established claim of 'safety fast'. On Labour Day in the US, American motorists killed each other at the rate of about nine an hour. In 1951 461 people were killed on US roads on Labour Day. Women in Kentish Town are planning mass sit-downs to get a crossing installed on a traffic black-spot junction. Stirling Moss was fined £3 by State troopers in New York for speeding at 60 miles an hour. Professor John Cohen, professor of psychology at Manchester University, said that everyone became a menace the moment he entered a road vehicle. Speed and acceleration were status symbols, and a vehicle became the symbol of the driver's manhood and virility. Dr. Kenneth Vickery, Medical Officer of Health for Eastbourne said in *The Family Doctor* that "This fashion of replacing the legs with an engine . . . is harmful . . . not merely because of the risk of road accidents, but because it has a direct bearing on one of the major health problems of the age, coronary thrombosis." Sir Herbert Manzoni, the City Engineer of Birmingham said, "Considered in absolute terms the car is an extremely inefficient machine. It spends a large part of its life doing nothing but deteriorate, during which time it occupies expensive land and buildings, both in town and at home." . . .

AN H-BOMBER pilot posted 100 invitations to his wedding guests but dashed back to the post office and tried to stop them. Then—he cancelled the reception and arrangements were made to sell the cake. Eventually he was persuaded by the bride's mother to go on with the wedding. He had merely had an attack of 'nerves' . . .

THE US PASSPORT OFFICE has received applications for passports to outer space. They have received applications from a Texas woman, a Californian disc-jockey (who wants to play music that is out of this world), and a Quaker, and replied "If and when space travel develops beyond the experimental stage I feel sure that appropriate passport provision covering such travel will be placed into effect. At present there does not appear to be any immediate prospect of issuing or validating United States passports for space travel."

JON QUIXOTE.

FREEDOM

October 20 1962 Vol 23 No 33

Many Reasons for Silence

It appears that in finding the Common Market editorial of 1st September incomplete and unsatisfactory I was guilty of failing to consult the files of the past year, which would have clarified some of the issues mentioned, and I am therefore grateful for the further comments in "For (and From) the Record." It is true that I never considered the subject to be one which FREEDOM was presenting in serial form, and that in hazarding to hold up the latest instalment to analysis I could be charged with being selective and over-particular. Whether it was correct or not, however, to make a detached examination of a single editorial (which, after all, is usually regarded as a separate and complete statement), it was clear (and a belated glance at those past files reveals this), that FREEDOM had certain fixations on the subject of joining Europe and that it had failed to widen the discussion beyond its preconceived and rigid conclusions. My article "For Queen and Country?" set out to correct the omissions (i.e., point out possible advantages), to remind readers that everything that was attacked in the Common Market also existed in Britain, and to draw attention to what I considered doubletalk and doublethink.

It appears that in finding the Common Market editorial of 1st September incomplete and unsatisfactory I was guilty of failing to consult the files of the past year, which would have clarified some of the issues mentioned, and I am therefore grateful for the further comments in "For (and From) the Record." It is true that I never considered the subject to be one which FREEDOM was presenting in serial form, and that in hazarding to hold up the latest instalment to analysis I could be charged with being selective and over-particular. Whether it was correct or not, however, to make a detached examination of a single editorial (which, after all, is usually regarded as a separate and complete statement), it was clear (and a belated glance at those past files reveals this), that FREEDOM had certain fixations on the subject of joining Europe and that it had failed to widen the discussion beyond its preconceived and rigid conclusions. My article "For Queen and Country?" set out to correct the omissions (i.e., point out possible advantages), to remind readers that everything that was attacked in the Common Market also existed in Britain, and to draw attention to what I considered doubletalk and doublethink.

It appears that in finding the Common Market editorial of 1st September incomplete and unsatisfactory I was guilty of failing to consult the files of the past year, which would have clarified some of the issues mentioned, and I am therefore grateful for the further comments in "For (and From) the Record." It is true that I never considered the subject to be one which FREEDOM was presenting in serial form, and that in hazarding to hold up the latest instalment to analysis I could be charged with being selective and over-particular. Whether it was correct or not, however, to make a detached examination of a single editorial (which, after all, is usually regarded as a separate and complete statement), it was clear (and a belated glance at those past files reveals this), that FREEDOM had certain fixations on the subject of joining Europe and that it had failed to widen the discussion beyond its preconceived and rigid conclusions. My article "For Queen and Country?" set out to correct the omissions (i.e., point out possible advantages), to remind readers that everything that was attacked in the Common Market also existed in Britain, and to draw attention to what I considered doubletalk and doublethink.

I regret that in replying to the "utter nonsense" of my article FREEDOM found it necessary to duplicate the technique used in presenting the issue of the Common Market. This takes the form of raising evils which we all condemn and then, in demolishing them, infer that they are relevant to the opposing argument. Examples?

MONOPOLIES. It was surely not necessary for FREEDOM to present evidence that it was not in favour of monopolies. Yet this was done at length. My article pointed out that to labour the argument of monopolies as a reason for keeping out of the Common Market implied that this particular evil was less apparent in Britain. The point here is the parallel of evils, which cancel out each other, and not an attempt to smear comrades as anarchist monopolists.

DEHUMANISATION. The editorial quotation mentioning the dehumanisation of workers as industry becomes more centralised is a similar picture of evil which we all condemn and which lay outside the scope and content of my brief article.

WILD ACCUSATIONS. Always, I hope, something to condemn. But in this case, instead of demolishing them, FREEDOM prefers to sneer them away. Is it so wild to suggest that the following implies partiality: "... we are not neutral ... This writer does not share the views of those anarchists who consider that for this country to go in or keep out is a choice between two evils ...". Is it so wild to regard the following as revealing a preoccupation with countries (i.e., nation states): "He (C.H.) attacks on the one hand those (FREEDOM) who advocate an economic policy of self-sufficiency for every country where this is possible ...".

Later in the editorial of last week there is the statement: "Must we again repeat that the alternative is not between the *pox Britannica* and the Common Market ...".

But when it comes to the 'crunch' and one asks what is the alternative we are given one more general condemnation of the concentration of "wealth and productive resources ...". If one sub-

stitutes, in the long extract from which this is quoted, the words Great Britain instead of Common Market, the condemnation is equally exact and valid. If this is not doubletalk then it seems that my article was correct in stating that the editors, by refusing to admit that rejection is making a choice, appear to favour staying out while denying having a preference. If we follow my logic—which FREEDOM has some difficulty in doing—it will not lead to a charge that anarchists are keeping the Tories in office, but it will lead to an honest admission that we continue to play out our lives whether the administration is Tory or Labour. And that we are affected by their policies.

The failure of my article, however, was in avoiding putting forward a purely doctrinaire point of view, and this evidently needs stating. When the Editorial entitled "No Reason for Silence proclaims: "... by saying nothing are we not doing more harm than perhaps being misunderstood as allies of a vocal bunch of Diehard Tories who threaten to canalise the capitalist opposition to the Common Market as the only opposition?" it seems to cry out for a reply of: Every reason for silence!

If we are really opposed to both elements of the choice let us say boldly that it is immaterial whether we go in or not. If Britain were to be conquered by invading Russians, Americans or Chinese, we would be prepared to hope that man would one day reassert himself, that Time the catalyst was on our side and accept that our immediate role was that of the patient eunuch. To avoid, therefore, being misinterpreted, the 'purist' must readily declare that while anarchists are helpless and ineffectual spectators of events, they are the patient custodians of an utopian ideal which is waiting for mankind to call for it. We know that neither propaganda nor activist pursuits can bring that day nearer if man has not prepared himself, in his own time, for anarchy. Someone must carry on into the future, perhaps for ever, perhaps for a mere hundred years, what we believe to be an ultimate and unique form of society, and which expresses the true potential of man in his full maturity; and that is our job.

It is no more our job, in the doctrinaire sense, to state a preference on the Common Market issue than it is to play politics at election time.

I agree that FREEDOM, however, as a topical journal must comment on the passing scene, and that to take vows of silence or to become a political eunuch would repudiate its *raison d'être*. But we would be deluding ourselves if we did not admit that to participate in daily events, and to comment on them, reduces us to being progressives rather than anarchists, realists rather than idealists. It is only at this level—in volunteering to discuss the Common Market as progressives and realists rather than as anarchists—that FREEDOM can proceed to comment. I say, therefore, that in being hypnotised by tariffs and economics, British agriculture and the concentration of political power, it has disregarded the wider historical significance of the moment and it has failed to make the honest confession that the place of the uncompromising anarchist is that of a spectator on the sidelines.

In case the editors suspect that this 'flight of fancy'—as it is sure to be

called—is meant to distract from the questions posed in "For (and from) the Record", it is time to abandon the purist's rôle of the eunuch and return to being a progressive and a realist. The Editors pose seven questions, challenging me to provide proof for some of the optimistic predictions I made in my article. Despite such qualifying statements as:

"In fact, the choice is between a very very faulty union which could confound us by becoming more progressive or no union at all." this is not really difficult.

I repeat the prediction that the Common Market means the end of the worst extremes of poverty in Europe and that the newly prosperous workers will have more bargaining power. The Director-General of the European Statistics Office states: "Between 1955 and 1959, the annual increase of production was 6.2%, although a few years ago the High Authority had reckoned with an increase of only 4.9%. If we take an average growth rate of only 4.2% the Community's industrial production would still show an increase of 90% between 1956 and 1972." Further, in the past two years wages have risen in France and Germany by 25%, in Holland by 18%, in Italy by 16%. In the U.K. the increase was 12%. It is true that this is disregarding cost of living indices and the steady inflation, but only in two of the six countries are unemployment figures higher than those of Britain. If FREEDOM's contention that the 'rich get richer', etc., is correct, they can extend the logic of the above figures.

As for the increase in the bargaining power of labour, one has only to take two aspects to realise the change from, say, the thirties. When industries become obsolete, and workers redundant, the capitalist state is becoming forced increasingly to assume responsibility for alternative employment. And this is not a matter of conscience but of the realities of capitalism economics. Secondly, one only has to take the composition of the committees set up to plan national production (NEDDY in Britain's case), to find that labour and capital sit down together with a fairly equal division of power (even if for the greater profit of the capitalist) because mass production needs mass markets.

Must I really provide proof that the experts and the technocrats are taking over from the *laissez-faire* businessman? I suggest that the editors study the measures by which capitalist governments control the output, markets and price structure, etc., of industry, the newly created management companies, the spacecraft whistling overhead, the attendance figures at science and technical colleges, and a portrait of Dr. Beeching.

FREEDOM asks: What evidence is there that by not joining the Market the standards of living of the workers will deteriorate? At the risk of appearing to rely on yet more bourgeois "experts" for my proof—and there can't be many anarchist economists, surely—I draw readers' attention to the latest *Observer* inquiry which shows that by a majority of 49 to 12 'British economists think that Britain will be better off if she joins the Common Market.' I cannot believe, in contemporary Britain, that being 'better off' excludes the workers.

In showing some elation at the prospect of fewer frontiers, I think I erred on the side of caution. Already a number of other European countries have applied for full membership of the Union (a better description than Market), and those who have become associates extend over Africa and into Asia and America. In a recent *Economist* there was an article dealing with the 'flow of events' and the course of inevitability. If one can cease being hypnotised by the present economic and tariff structure of Europe, and Charles de Gaulle's posing, a study of history would point to the inevitability of a far greater merging of nations than at present forms the Common Market. The break-out from the nation state has to start somewhere. To write off this moment in history as yet another capitalist manoeuvre to protect its profits is to overlook Man himself in the scheme of things, and to create the suspicion that the revolutionary is a conservative who is clutching his dogma like a lifebelt.

With regard to consumer-power being more realistic than vote-power in a prosperous community, I think the evidence is already present in the society in which we live. The economic momen-

WHY TRUST THE POLITICIANS?

Continued from page 1

Not only do we find the political leaders of the different parties questioning both the intelligence and the disinterestedness of the policies of their political counterparts; what is even more interesting is to observe similar views expressed within the parties themselves. For instance, among the Conservatives, Sir Harmer Nicholls, M.P. for Peterborough suggested that Mr. Butler's performance in the Common Market debate was not in accord with what Mr. Butler had been teaching for 20 years. "Very probably the reason was that he was not playing one of his compositions, but was giving a rendering of the Prime Minister's piece." Sir Derek Walker-Smith, M.P. said it was "a false and humiliating suggestion that Britain could only be competitive under the external stimulation of the Common Market countries" ... the negotiations were concerned with "our birthright, not just the mess of pottage". The most telling criticism on the Labour side is contained in the first paragraph of "Thoughts after Brighton", by Barbara Castle, MP (*New Statesman*, 12/10/62):

Labour has emerged from Brighton with two new assets—an unchallenged leader and a challenging policy. The two are, of course, connected. Mr. Gaitskell's speech on the Common Market was the focal point of the whole conference. But for the Left its importance did not lie in the fact that, in

saying it, he slapped down some of his closest friends as ruthlessly as he had previously slapped down his left-wing critics. His toughness in other words has become not merely an instrument for smashing one wing of the party, but an asset which the movement as a whole can exploit.

It is all the more telling because Mrs. Castle did not intend it as a criticism! She believes that Mr. Gaitskell's "convictions were deeply roused" and we have no reason to doubt this. When she adds, however "None the less his decision to put himself at the head of an all-out attack on the government's Common Market policy will have consequences which he seems to have deliberately faced" we cannot resist pointing out that if Mr. Gaitskell is a politician worth his salt, he would do so only if he expected to derive party advantage from his stand. By this we also imply that if the Labour Party managers sensed a strong pro-Market bias among the public. Mr. Gaitskell's "best ever" speech would probably have been made on quite another subject! Mrs. Castle illustrates our point when she writes:

It is no accident, for example that the nuclear test debate at Brighton—which most people thought would rekindle old bitterness—ended in a harmony of give and take. The conference had already detected in Mr. Gaitskell's speech a challenging note on foreign policy. Mr. Gaitskell in turn had sensed the ground-swell of response among the delegates. ...

Is this Unity?

WHAT surprises us about the few Common-Marketeers of the revolutionary Left is not their efforts to be realists but their political naïveté. Anarchists refuse to vote in elections not only because they are opposed to government on principle but also because experience teaches them that basically there is nothing to choose between politicians. "Politics" as the old Marquess of Salisbury once pointed out "is a dirty business". Those who go into it with the intention of cleaning it up invariably dirty their hands long before they "get in"—or they never get in! Politics is a free-masonry as well as a rat-race. How many Independent candidates have succeeded in breaking-through the Party machines? How many party-members have been adopted against the wishes of the party caucus? But apart from these considerations how many single-minded reformers, or stormy petrels have remained true to their ideas once they have enjoyed the power and plush comfort of Office? (Is it not ironical that Michael Foot's biography of Nye Bevan should be serialised in millionaire Roy Thompson's *Sunday Times*? But only if you think of Foot and Bevan as revolutionaries and not as star entertainers of the Establishment).

Now consider the origins of the Common Market, over which Liberals, Conservatives and ex-I.L.P. (Bob Edwards) L.Pers enthuse. It was the idea not of a group of stary-eyed idealists but of a bunch of experienced, shrewd and tough politicians, such as Robert Schuman, Jules Moch and Paul-Henri Spaach† (whose "influence" in or out of government office is indicative of the real "interests" they serve). Thus a "unity" of Europe has been achieved

ed from above, which could not be achieved from below. Why? and what kind of "unity" could thus be achieved?

Surely the answer is that the unity achieved from above has no connection with the unity from below, which as we understand it, springs from the peoples' feelings of oneness and economic interdependence and only they can, to quote Mr. Macmillan, "bury for good their age-long conflicts", but only by denying initiative to the politicians and financiers. The conflicts in Europe are not, and never have been, between the ordinary, exploited working people: for they have never had a say except as cannon fodder. Those who naïvely believe in the good intention of the European politicians should ponder on Mr. Macmillan's Common Market selling-point that "Western Europe was on its way to forming an economic and, in one form or another, a political unity which could—in terms of population, skill and resources—rival America or the Soviet Union" (our italics).

Is this unity; or does it stink of power politics and power blocs?

†Macmillan in his speech at Llandudno artfully contrived to drag in Churchill and Ernest Bevan on his side: "It is 15 years since Sir Winston Churchill in two remarkable speeches, one at Zurich and the other at Fulton, with characteristic vision saw the possibilities of a new Europe arising from the ashes of the old. Thus was born the Council of Europe, from which stemmed the OEEC, the EPU, the WEU, and many other constructive developments.

"Thanks to the statesmanship of Ernest Bevin, the Labour Government and most of the Labour Party overcame their reluctance to these ideas, and, indeed played a considerable part in furthering them. That has remained firm British policy ever since, with the broad assent of the British people outside the ranks of the Communists, semi-Communists, and fellow-travellers."

OURSELVES

FREEDOM's financial fortunes have shown improvement during the past month, and, this week, thanks to large donations from groups in Los Gatos and Needham, Massachusetts, the chances of making both ends meet are almost rosy! But all depends on keeping up the present rhythm during the next two months. There are still many subscribers who have not replied to our reminder cards (for the benefit of others, we would point out that we have only sent out renewal notices to those readers whose subscriptions expired during the year and asking them to renew up to the end of the year. Readers whose subscriptions expire at the end of the year will be sent reminders at the beginning of 1963;

we are not asking them to renew before the new year as this would give a false picture of our current finances.)

The other encouraging sign is in the number of new subscriptions that have come in. During the past month we have received more than 50. But it is still not enough, and we urge all sympathisers to help us secure more and more readers between now and the end of the year.

It has been suggested that we should have a month's circulation drive from mid-November to mid-December. We are all in favour. Will those who have suggestions and who are prepared to take part in such a campaign please contact us as soon as possible.

Precept . . .

SIR,
In your article "The Wind of Small Change" (FREEDOM, 22/9/62) you say that higher productivity, in the society we live in, "is not a means to a social end, but is the means whereby industrialists hope to make greater profits for themselves and their shareholders." You conclude from this that the current drive to increase productivity "should be resolutely resisted by the working people, for it brings them neither greater leisure nor liberation from wage-slavery." But you imply that in a different kind of society—an anarchist society—higher productivity would be a desirable objective. "Productivity has meaning," you say, "if it results both in a raising of living standards and an increase of leisure for all."

I would suggest that this is a weak position. Living standards have in fact been raised, and leisure increased, for the entire populations of the industrialised countries of the world, as a direct result of the higher productivity made possible by the industrial revolution. No doubt the industrialists and their shareholders have taken the lion's share of the material benefits of higher productivity, but to suggest that the working people do not benefit at all from higher productivity is surely wrong. Factory workers live better now, on the whole, than kings did in the past.

But there is a more serious weakness in your position. This is your evident assumption that the impulse to raise productivity is, in itself, good. Is it? Look at the penalties which those same

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS

industrialised populations have incurred through yielding to that impulse. The working people have been uprooted from the land, herded into ugly cities, and regimented and de-personalised under the factory system. Individual craftsmanship has perished, and the mass-produced object has replaced the artefact of beauty. In the interests of productive efficiency, small firms and businesses have had to amalgamate into huge, over-organised, monopolistic corporations. Economic, and consequently political, power has been centralised, and concentrated in the hands of a few irresponsible industrialists, money-lenders, civil servants, politicians and generals. Democracy has become impossible. We are heading for the totalitarian control of everything by a tiny "power élite". Meanwhile man's religious sense has been extinguished by a wave of barbarous materialism. We worship productivity as our only god, and it fails

to satisfy us. Crime increases. So does mental illness. So does the danger of world war. The chances of building an anarchist society have never seemed more remote. And all this has resulted from the impulse to raise productivity—an impulse which you evidently share!

I would suggest that your analysis is fundamentally unsound. The basic objection to higher productivity in our present society is not that the working people never share the material benefits. That is false. It is not that the industrialists and their shareholders make unfair profits—though that is true. The basic objection is that the urge to raise productivity is, in itself, disastrous. The Taoists have always understood this. In an article on Taoist thought (ANARCHY 19, pp. 277-9), Roger Bray refers to the "consistent warning" given by Taoists against "cunning craftsmen, pernicious contrivances, and labour-saving devices in general." He quotes a story from Chuang Tzu:—

A gardener was asked why he would not use a well-sweep. Thereupon he flushed and said, "I have heard from my teacher that those who are cunning in their dealings are cunning in their hearts." The cunning in heart are not pure and incorrupt, are restless in spirit, and not fit vehicles for Tao. The gardener concluded, "It is not that I do not know of these things. I would be ashamed to use them."

By raising his productivity, man has gained great material benefits. But he has suffered a catastrophic loss of freedom, happiness and spiritual satisfaction. Is it not time that you distinguished, sharply, between higher living standards and the anarchist values which you strive to promote? In an anarchist society productivity simply could not be as high as in an authoritarian society. You must face this. Only authoritarian control makes centralisation and regimentation possible, and without centralisation and regimentation you cannot have high productivity. Nor can you have it without that single-minded devotion to material prosperity which is now destroying man's appreciation of non-material values—and thus of the anarchist values of individual liberty, voluntary co-operation, and human dignity. If even you join the modern cult of productivity, therefore, what hope is there for anarchism?

Yours faithfully,
FRANCIS ELLINGHAM.
Bishopston, Bristol, 7, Sept. 27.

. . . into Practice

DEAR SIR,

We are starting an individualist-anarchist community or colony in the highlands of Costa Rica in an excellent climate that grows almost everything, particularly in the way of tropical fruits. We invite those interested to come or write.

Our objectives include creative anthropology encompassing many forms of social experiments in an agrarian community based on voluntary poverty with a positive emphasis on the Intangibles. We'll appreciate it if you can give us some publicity.

Many thanks.

Very truly yours,
HUDSON & MADGE KIMBALL.

Catching Up!

FINANCIAL STATEMENT AT
OCTOBER 13 1962

Week 41		EXPENSES:	41 weeks at £70	£2,870
Weeks 1-40	1,315			
Week 41	31			
				1,346
New Subscriptions:				
Weeks 1-40 (310)	332			
Week 41 (17)	21			
				353
				1,699
				DEFICIT £1,171

DEFICIT FUND

London: B.L. 13/3; Auckland: K.J.M. 2/-; Ithaca: M.S. £1/13/6; Potters Bar: H.W. 8/-; Glasgow: J.H. 6/8; Ithaca: D.M. 10/-; Chelmsford: C.A. 4/-; Sevenoaks: P.J.H. 4/-; London: Anon. £3; Glasgow: H.McD. 8/-; Hounslow: L.* 2/6; Los Gatos: Comrades per A.D. £35; Bangor: J.T. £2; Oxford: Anon.* 5/-; Northampton: F.D.J.B. 4/7; E. Rutherford: A.S.* 14/-; Reading: D.D. 8/-; Wolverhampton: J.L.* 2/6; Wolverhampton: J.K.W.* 2/-; Oxford: G.F.H. 8/6; London: M.H. 16/6; Armagh City: P.T. 11/-; Needham, Mass.: Gruppo Libertario per L.T. £35; Chalfont St. Peters: S.L. 3/10; Southend: P.O.* 5/-; Shoreham: M. & D.* 2/6; Enfield: J. & M.S. 8/-; Surrey: F.B.* 5/-

TOTAL 83 18 1
Previously acknowledged 928 13 4

1962 TOTAL TO DATE £1,012 11 5
*Indicates regular contributors.

C.H.

Reasons for Silence

Continued from page 3

tum follows its course irrespective of Tory, Labour or Liberal. Professor Hallstein, President of the Common Market Commission, has aptly said: "... the European Community deals with the integration of activity in the field of economics and social policy which until now have been carried out in the Six capitals—in the Ministries, in the Parliaments and through public opinion—and which from now on are

being integrated . . .

FREEDOM is correct, therefore in saying that the tendency is "to concentrate political and economic power in ever fewer hands." But is its alarm not a little manufactured? Particularly when it writes of the Common Market being "... a huge monopoly which regulates every moment in the lives of millions of human beings. A kind of Russia . . . etc.?" Does it really see that as Europe's fate? Could it not be persuaded that Europeans might have rather more to say over their destiny, and that those 'ever fewer hands' could be those of fairly conscientious administrators whose purpose is purely technical and professional? The Marnskelds and the U Thants, in my estimation, are preferable to the Macmillans and the Clores of this world. And it is the dogmatists and not the technocrats who become the ambitious, megalomaniac, political dictators.

Unlike the editors of FREEDOM, then, I do not trouble to look under the bed before going to sleep.

To sum up, and again this is done reluctantly because as an anarchist my place on this issue is on the sidelines, I think the economic evils on both sides tend to cancel out each other but on the social level the Common Market, IN TIME, could achieve a breakthrough in containing and perhaps eliminating nation states, political parties and much of the hostility that exists between peoples to-day. After all, the British Isles is populated by Scots, Welsh, Irish, Normans, Celts, Danes, Spaniards, Saxons, etc., but one hardly realises it. A thousand years has achieved a lot. Is it too much to ask my comrades to wait patiently for another thousand?

Finally, I thank Arthur Uloth for his contribution. When I have lived in Sicily or Greece for a year I, too, have these nostalgic memories of dear old England, a haven offering political asylum (except to Soblen) to the liberal refugee, a country free of the horrors of the O.A.S., identity cards, Pan-Africanism and police who throw the bodies of nuclear disarmers into the Thames. But such nostalgia is something I would not commit to paper. Fears "that a United Europe would be as full of racial hate as the old Austro-Hungarian Empire . . ." and that "the place of the Jews in the New Europe will doubtless be taken by all those of non-European descent . . ." certainly do not draw on the evidence of Europe at the moment. Colour prejudice, race prejudice and class prejudice are far more evident in this 'island of relative mildness.'

At least, however, A.U. makes no secret of his distaste for living with foreigners; and he is correct in feeling that I am taking a sanguine view of the future. But I believe this to be one of those moments of history when the progressive, if not the anarchist, might show a little more faith and optimism in MAN, and a little less fear of his passing schemes and inventions.

The Art of Loving

IT seems that Freudians, such as Maurice Goldman, are as reverential towards their idol as are the Marxists towards Marx. That Freud's ideas should be subjected to revision seems in itself a heresy as far as some Freudians are concerned.

To refer to Fromm's "sermons" on the different varieties of love is inane, and to state that Fromm sees society becoming wiser and wiser is untrue; if one simply reads the first chapter of "The Same Society" in which Fromm asks of western civilisation "Are we Sane?"—coming to the conclusion that we are not—one would see at once that his social psychology is both radical and libertarian.

Yet I do not consider Fromm infallible—he is open to criticism and I violently disagree with the tepid conclusions to his latest book "May Man Prevail?" Though the book is certainly not harmless or meaningless. To refer to the neo-Freudians as a catastrophe is only possible, one feels, if their work has been read without objectivity.

Hull. J.W.

'Bird Man' an appeal for Freedom

DEAR SIR,

I don't know whether you have seen the November issue of *Films and Filming*, but in case you haven't, I thought you might be interested in the enclosed cutting.*

*Burt Lancaster, filming with Visconti in *The Leopard*, took time off from location to introduce his film of Robert Stroud's life, *Bird Man of Alcatraz* at Venice. Lancaster won a Jury award for his performance. He also won the respect of most of the critics and reporters present at a packed press conference. He told them bluntly that *Bird Man* is intended as a plea for Stroud's release. He said that in his opinion the United

African Notes

EACH NIGERIAN FEDERAL MINISTER receives a 30 thousand pound house when he takes up office. These houses are said to be getting "old fashioned", when government ministers entertain their African counterparts for cocktails. In the event of the houses being declared "antiquated" then the Nigerian taxpayers' money will be used to build new and even more costly ones. Most of the houses are provided with three or four garages where they keep their luxurious cars.

RECENTLY THE NIGERIAN *Daily Times*, the biggest paper in the country published a statement given out by the Lagos town council complaining of the numerous beggars on the streets which include the blind, cripples, lepers and mentally defective. The presence of the beggars says the council is a disgrace to our city, and even worse an embarrassment when foreign visitors and "very important persons" visit Nigeria. Incidentally, the *Daily Times* is owned by the London *Daily Mirror*. Apparently the Lagos town council have no alternative scheme for the beggars if and when they forbid begging. The only way the beggars can eat is to beg, they have no accommodation problem for they sleep in the streets. If they forbid them to beg they will just die.

COMMENTING ON NIGERIAN "freedom" the Nigerian *Daily Times* says this: "This is the only country in black Africa where a politician can be as active as he wishes, without taking the risk of being bundled into a detention camp". In spite of this statement the new administrator Dr. Majekodunmi sent to restore "order" in Nigeria's western region—has just thrown a politician into prison under the first detention order to be issued in Nigeria since the country became "independent" 23 months ago. The managing editor of the government opposition paper has been restricted to live in a certain area, and the new "emergency regulations" put "Nigeria's democratic" government in the same class as Ghana's.

PRESIDENT WILLIAM TUBMAN recently paid a "state visit" to Sweden, he is described as "the poor man's friend". Reason for his visit—Sweden has just invested 250 million kroner in Liberia to "develop" a big industrial project. The Swedish Social Democrats gave Tubman the same reception as given to a foreign monarch. No doubt Dr. Nkrumah would receive the same ovation. They are all "poor man's friends" in diplomatic circles.

States Government was refusing to release Stroud for no other reason than they now believe him to be a homosexual as a result of his imprisonment.

Lancaster is anxious that people who see the film should be able to sign a petition in cinemas where it is shown asking for Stroud's release. The producers have asked that such a petition be available to sign in every country in the world.

So far, no plans have been made for a petition in Britain. If, when you see the film, you would like to sign a petition on Stroud's behalf, ask the cinema manager why he is doing nothing about it. And write to Mr. Lancaster's representative in London: United Artists, Film House, Wardour Street, London, W.1.

Yours faithfully,

GEOFFREY MINISH.

London, S.W.3, Oct. 14.

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 21 Martin Grainger:
Struggle for Socialism
OCT 28 Maurice Goldman:
The Group Mind.

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 Tuesday at Brian and Doris Lelie's, 242 Amesbury Avenue, S.W.2 (Streatham Hill, Nr. Station).

Last Wednesday of each month at 8 p.m. Tom Barnes', Albion Cottage, Fortis Green, N.2. (3rd door past Tudor Hotel).

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.

Last Thursday of each month at 8 p.m. at George Hayes', 174 Meleod Road, Abbey Wood, S.E.2.

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/- (\$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.