

'Politicians are a set of men who have interests aside from the interests of the people, and who, to say the most of them, are, taken as a mass, at least one long step removed from honest men. I say this with the greater freedom because, being a politician myself, none can regard it as personal.'

ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

In Defence of Individualism

THE LABOUR PARTY MANIFESTO: Room at the Top?

THE Labour Party's Election Manifesto, "The New Britain" is an important document; it is not however, in any sense of the term, a revolutionary manifesto.

An election manifesto by a party strongly "tipped" to win at the polls, must obviously be couched in terms which aim at winning the votes of the majority of the electorate. Only those parties doomed to defeat can afford extravagant manifestoes and revolutionary programmes. From which, we anarchists conclude, that the social revolution will never be achieved *via* the polls. For not only are political programmes revolutionary in the inverse ratio to one's chances of vote catching, but equally important such programmes must be "practical", which means possible within the existing social, political and economic framework.

So when we say that Labour's Manifesto is an important document, we are not also saying that it is so far reaching that anarchists should drop their traditional opposition to voting and give theirs to Mr. Wilson & Co. when the time comes! It is a reformist manifesto *par excellence*, one which the *Guardian* describes as "serious and convincing". What is important and serious is that it raises a number of practical questions, which will face a free society no less than existing authoritarian society, as well as offering criticisms of injustices in society as it is, which, apart from confirming many anarchist arguments, reveal that even politicians no longer feel able to treat the public as morons and slaves.

Labour does not accept that democracy is a five-yearly visit to the polling booth that changes little but the men at the top. We are working for an active democracy, in which men and women as responsible citizens consciously assist in shaping the surroundings in which they live, and take part in deciding how the community's wealth is to be shared among all its members.

Who other than the anarchists could have made enough people self-conscious of the humiliation of the "five-yearly visit" to provoke a denial from Labour that it treats it as such? Equally revealing, and for the same reasons, are the assurances that Labour will seek to "humanise the whole administration of the State" and ensure that "the growth of government activity does not infringe the liberties of the individual" as well as "seeking to establish a true partnership between the people and their parliament". A lot of flannel to get the votes of "thinking" people? Agreed! But we can surely learn something of the political climate and trends from the vote-catching techniques of the parties which we would suggest are

less blatant, less cock-sure, less demagogical than they were, say, even less than a generation ago.

TO dub all believers in government as authoritarians, power maniacs or sheep, as some anarchists do, is in our opinion bad for our propaganda, which after all depends for its success on the good faith of those to whom we direct it. We do not find it surprising that most people use their vote (even when they do so with no more illusions than that they are opting for the lesser of two evils, if they can see no alternative to government for the organisation of the day to day existence of the community. Anarchists on the whole, have not, unfortunately, been very effective in presenting the alternative for a whole number of reasons. In the first place anarchists tend to be reluctant propagandists. Secondly, because they have tumbled to the political and capitalist rackets, they can, as individuals, more or less live their lives free from both, and they generalise from their own situation into believing that what they can do everybody else could do *if they wished*. They, just as at the other extreme, the capitalist tycoon, can "live their lives" only because they

are a small minority. They are a privileged minority—the millionaire with the power he derives from his control over wealth, the individualist anarchist by the power that comes from knowledge plus philosophy of life—and therefore a world of millionaires or of individualist anarchists would be a physical impossibility.

We are opposed to government because all centralised authority cannot but reduce the individual to a cipher, a statistic. We equally oppose the arrogance of the individualist who declares his self-sufficiency (while enjoying the many services others provide) and who lacks the humility to appreciate that all mankind is not as enlightened as himself.

We anarchists, whether we like it or not live in a world in which 3,000,000,000 other people have daily material needs just as ourselves and if we believed that if each one of these three thousand million humans thought as we did everybody would have a square meal every day and the other basic necessities of life, we would deserve to be accused of being "dreamers", "idealists", "utopians".

Whatever socialists and anarchists may have thought in the 19th

century about the "idea" of growing the food we consume and uniting us all in brotherhood, anarchist opposition to government is opposition to imposed authority and not to the need for organisation in society. We oppose the Labour Party's "New Britain" election manifesto not because they argue that there must be organisation and planning, but because they fondly imagine that one can achieve "an expanding community where social justice is seen to prevail" by a number of reforms none of which threatens the principles of the capitalist society: that is the privileged society. By legislation the Labour Party propose to improve the lot of the poor and give every youngster the chance of rising to the top!

IT is true that in the manifesto one sights an odd moral homely floating in an ocean of financial reforms none of which are even intended to threaten the privileged class. After "thirteen years of Tory rule" and centuries during which a limited few have been sharing out the wealth of the nation among themselves, when the Clores have made their millions and Rachman's heirs have consolidated their rackets, the promise that a Labour govern-

ment will be firm about the left-overs after the feast will hardly inspire the bluest-eyed Labour fan. To promise a tightening up of legislation against the monopolists and take-over bidders now, when they have already swallowed each other up is to close the stable door when the horse has bolted. Obviously the Labour party cannot be blamed for this state of affairs, but if they meant business they would be seeking their support on the streets and not at the hustings.

IN spite of the fact that the Manifesto actually states the Party's "belief" in the "socialist axiom 'from each according to his ability, to each according to his need', time and again it is made quite clear that it is by material incentives that "enterprise" will be "stimulated"; just as nowhere does one discover any proposals to deprive the rich of their ill-gotten gains however many plans there are to prevent them from adding to them quite as quickly and easily as in the past (capital gains tax; public acquisition of land).

Essentially the Manifesto offers tit-bits to the poor, but no way out of their under-privileged economic and social situation. The Labour Party's proposal to abolish the 11-plus gives more people a chance to get to the top, but so long as there is a top there will be a bottom; so at best it will mean that in future the privileged class will emerge from all strata of society instead of from a hereditary ruling class.

(More Comments next week).

INDUSTRIAL NOTES

ETU MEMBERS VOTE OUT CP OFFICERS

The membership of the Electrical Trades Union have voted in favour of a ban on Communist Party members holding office in the union. By union voting standards, the returns were high, about a quarter of the membership which totals 270,000 voted.

This seems to be the final round in the struggle for control of the union. The present leadership of Cannon, Byrne and Chapple started when they took the Communist-controlled E.T.U. to court on a charge of ballot-rigging.

The union has a high proportion of Communists holding office in one form or another. These members, whether full-time national or area officials, branch officials, shop stewards or delegates, will now be banned from holding these posts. It is probable that officials will be asked to sign a declaration about their political affiliations. Those refusing will probably lose their posts as well as those declaring that they are Communists. The executive has, according to its constitution, the right to decide this and does not need a Rules Revision Conference to finalise this purge of communists.

The union executive claims that the reason for this ballot was that the Communist Party had circulated its members in the union with a document detailing what alterations should be called for at the next rules revision conference. According to this document, which some branches followed more or less word for word in their resolutions, rules revision should be made giving the conference greater powers of control of the union executive. This mainly concerns rule 3, "which is the crucial rule to be amended and deals with the general composition and government of the Union."

This was seen from the executives' point of view as an organised attempt to strip them of their powers. Quite

honestly I cannot see any union executive giving in to this sort of thing without a fight. Of course, this has all been decided on democratically by 25% of the membership, but when the ballot forms were circulated, the members also received a leaflet explaining the executives' case against the communists and stating that "within five weeks over 90 amendments were received many in the exact wording of the unauthorised circular, and others, partly in identical terms, containing the substance."

"As one outrageous example, Preston Branch, L.S.E.7. and Bristol all submitted amendments containing 200 words, each word identical." The leaflet also gives a list of occasions when the Communist Party has organised demonstrations "to intimidate the new Executive at Union's Head Office." "They invaded the Policy Conference at Portsmouth in 1961 in an attempt to intimidate delegates and they used physical violence on several officials of the Union."

The Communist Party, for its part, denied ever sending the document but there is some evidence from press reports that in actual fact they did. By this denial, they have really lost their chance to defend themselves. After all their case should be put as well. These rules, if amended, would have given the conference and thereby union membership, a decision-making role in the union. This at the present time, probably suits the Communist Party, with its active members in the union. But what of the other rank and file members? The majority did not think it worthwhile voting, even on a principle that all members whatever their political affiliations should be allowed to hold office in unions.

This lack of interest may be because they see the whole thing as a struggle for power by two groupings. This of

course is true. The Communist Party did try to maintain its control by ballot-rigging, but the present executive are just as willing to use methods which are hardly principled and it is a sad state of affairs that the members who did vote, swallowed their executives case and voted in their favour.

I am not trying to whitewash the Communist Party's record when they controlled the E.T.U. They were just as ready to attack any unofficial action. In 1961 in the power industry, Frank Foulkes then head of the E.T.U., joined with other union leaders (including those terrible right-wingers the Communist Party is always denouncing), to attack an unofficial movement in the industry. This movement had called a conference of power workers at which they decided on unofficial strike action to back a wage claim, but this was not tolerated by Foulkes and his executive.

Then there is the present E.T.U. execu-

Denby Strike Drags On

In spite of the ten-month old strike at the Denby Mill near Bradford, the management has been able to keep production going, using enclosed lorries to get scabs past the picket line.

The men have managed to keep going on their union strike pay and donations received for their strike fund. It is proving to be a very long hard struggle in defence of the principal of belonging to a union.

This week, some of the strikers went to Blackpool to lobby Trade Union leaders. They want the T.U.C. to get the Tailors and Garment Cutters' Union to refuse to handle any work coming from Denbys. The support of other unions is also being sought, including the Electrical Trades Union, the Cloth Pressers, the Transport & General Workers' Union and the General & Muni-

cipal Workers' Union. The whole dispute is to come before the next T.U.C. General Council meeting.

These workers in dispute have shown fine solidarity in sticking it out for so long. They have remained isolated with hardly any support except for financial and, perhaps, moral. The strike will continue until these strikers are forced to find other jobs, unless support from other workers is forthcoming.

Denbys' management are not worried by the pickets at their gates, but if the goods they are producing were not handled and could not be moved from the mill, then they would have second thoughts. The transportation of products from Denbys must be stopped if this dispute is to be won by the strikers who have remained out for so long.

P.T.

ANARCHY 43

ON SALE NOW DISCUSSES

PARENTS & TEACHERS

ANARCHY is Published by Freedom Press at 2s. on the first Saturday of every month

In Defence of Individualism

AMONGST the ways of dealing with individualist anarchism adopted by non-individualists are: (1) To deny that individualists can be anarchists by suggesting that individualism is synonymous with capitalism. (2) To denounce individualists as agents provocateurs (pace Jean Grave, the pope of anarchist communism in France). (3) To profess a tolerance for individualists as eccentrics, a few of whom "it is nice to have around". Each of these ways boils down to a refusal to face individualist arguments and are based on the assumption that anarchism must be collectivist. Individualists, therefore, are either heretics who should be excommunicated or erring brothers who should be patronised. In "The Anarchist Communist Approach" P.H. avoids the ignorance of (1) and the vilification of (2), but clearly believes in (3). In spite of this, I will try to pick out some of his more specific statements for reply.

"... communists notice that freedom involves freedom to eat, have a home, freedom from being exploited at work and bombed and shot in war, as well as freedom to behave in an eccentric manner in an affluent democracy."

Does P.H. know of any individualist anarchist who does not believe that freedom involves "freedom to eat, have a home, etc."? I do not, and cannot see why he makes such a statement, since I would have thought that these things were "taken for granted" by every anarchist of whatever tendency. His insinuation that individualism is merely eccentric behaviour in an affluent democracy is baseless. Individualists have existed in every kind of society, whether impoverished or "affluent".

"... most people in the world are denied these freedoms not because they are lacking in psychological will power or desire for sovereignty, but because power over their affairs is held by an exploiting ruling class."

If most people in the world are not "lacking in psychological will power and desire for sovereignty" how is it that they let an "exploiting ruling class" deny them "these freedoms"? It seems to me that it is precisely because they lack these characteristics that authoritarianism exists. How else can one explain its origin and continued existence other than

REPLIES TO P.H.

by "most people" wanting it? If they did not, anarchists would not be the tiny minority they are, nor would the ruling class, even if it were still in being, be able to get away with the gross milking of the masses that has gone on through the ages.

"Individualists make a song and dance about what everyone else takes for granted."

I would love to know who these "everyone else" are. The Christians who believe the individual exists to serve God? The Marxist Communists who believe the individual exists to serve the Party or the "historical process"? Those anarchist communists who have preached self-sacrifice for the Cause, or, like Gaston Leval, have advocated the subordination of "the individual to the social factor"? It is because individualists put the individual above and before ideologies and institutions—even anarchist ones—that they differ from "everyone else".

"... although the phrase 'common ownership of the means of production' is harmless enough, it would be more accurate to say that in an anarchist society the concept of ownership would become redundant. The fear of individualist anarchists that the communist conception of society would lead to a new form of oppressing the individual is thus seen to be baseless. In general the anarchist emphasis is on the control

of production, rather than . . . on the ownership of production and the precise division of profits. . . ."

This is no answer at all to the individualist case against communism, and to substitute the word "control" for "ownership" is, in this context, a quibble. Effective ownership means control—I can hardly be said to own a coat if anyone can wear it without my being able to exercise any control over its use. If, in an anarchist society, "the concept of ownership will become redundant" then anyone wanting to enter into an economic relationship on the basis of individual ownership of the means of production would be denied this freedom. How does this square with "the uniqueness of the individual and his right to enjoy his personal life without intrusion or interference"? Will P.H. accept the proposition that in an anarchist milieu the individual will have the right to freely make any economic arrangements that suit him best, it being understood that he has no right to impose these arrangements on anyone who does not want them? If he does, will he then also accept the right of the individual to ownership of the instruments of production, it being understood that such ownership is the result of personal labour, or of a gift, not of exploitation? And also the right of the individual to freely dispose of his products by means of a medium of exchange?

One of the reasons that individualists

THE BRIG

THIS week, of all weeks, seemed not to be the week for witnessing, even at the Mermaid, a play about life in an American marine-corps prison. The knowledge that two of our comrades are commencing twenty and thirty years' sentences in Spain was too recent a wound to bear probing or heal over with any dramatist's platitude.

However, knowing that Judith Malina, the producer of this play, and Julian Beck, the designer, had served time as demonstrators and tax-refusers, and further learning that the author, Kenneth H. Brown, had served thirty days in such a prison, I felt that this play would be a deepening of the experience and would make a universality of the experience of loss of liberty. It was, and it did.

I was amused to learn that the censorious Mr. Cadbury was, according to the *Mail*, denied a free ticket to this show. It is a pity, for it would attract him by its obscenity. Not the natural obscenity of the language of men, but the unnatural obscenity of prisons, militarism and power. The obscenity of the prisons in which we all live, the fetichism of the 'sad ceremonials' that the whole human race observes and the naked power relationship which passes for a way of life among so many.

The *Daily Worker* saw through its old blinkers an indictment of American militarism, and many other critics have taken it as a portrayal of life in that time and of that place, but we have our own Stake Hills, Dingle Vales, Colchesters and Shepton Mallets to show that this mindless brutality is not merely an American product.

Anyone who has been in prison will know that the time element is the first thing to go wrong. The play is a fragment torn out of time; space is limited but time is not. Every day is alike except for those dizzy peaks of human achievement, the bath, the letter, the cigarette, and those sublime moments of ecstasy, food and the toilet. In the brig, as in any prison, all one's privileges are turned into punishments. The bath is done by numbers, the letter is restricted to one side of the page (I was told: "You can say anything you like about the prison, such as 'the food is good' for instance"). The cigarette is smoked as a drill, in the play it is like a ballet; the food—"chow" in American—is indescribable but even the worst food is a pleasure in a world where pleasures are few. To go to the toilet becomes a privilege.

All this, and much more too, is shown on the stage. Unfortunately, very few of the population have been in prison so it still retains its novelty and justification for the law-abiding. Judith Malina and Julian Beck have attempted to break through the armoured personalities with this production. The det-

are not communists, is that they are pluralists, who believe that the co-existence of different ways of going on—in economics as in other fields—is a guarantee of vitality and a defence against stagnancy and uniformity. Those anarchists who agree that only a communist economy is compatible with anarchism are demanding submission to one pattern of behaviour and denying a free choice of alternative patterns. This is not anarchism, but archism. For the individualist it makes little difference whether the means of production are in the control of a handful of private monopolists, a State corporation, a federation of syndicates, or a Commune. In each case he will be at the mercy of the good will of others. He will be forced to conform or starve. Independence is equally dear to him economically as it is in other things and this independence can only be real when he has free access to raw materials, personal ownership of his instruments of production and the right to free exchange of his products for those of others. This does not exclude the possibility for the individual to pool his resources with others in voluntary group communism, or any other collectivist arrangement, but it does exclude the possibility of an exclusive, or single economy by allowing the individual to live and produce apart from his fellows if he so wishes.

"It would be provocative to suggest that individualist anarchists need a communist movement to provide audiences and periodicals in which they can express their views."

No, not provocative—just foolish. People like Josiah Warren and Benjamin Tucker were propagating individualism in the U.S.A. before any anarchist communist movement existed there, as did A. C. Cuddon in this country; Stirner and Proudhon wrote their pioneering works before anarchist communism had been heard of; during its heyday in France, E. Armand's individualist journal *l'Endehors* had a circulation of 6,000 and was published independently of the "communist movement"; and if P.H. will take the trouble to look round Freedom Bookshop he will find copies of *Minus One*, an individualist anarchist review, published with the support of individualists and sympathisers. Certainly, individualists will use any outlet they can to put forward their ideas, just as will P.H. and his comrades. As long as anarchist communist journals will publish me I will write for them, and their supporters are welcome to contribute to any individualist publication with which I am connected. I presume we can both agree that meetings and periodicals would be very dull if only one viewpoint

JACK ROBINSON

Round the Galleries

THE patterns of persecution and intolerance change with the temper of the time. They attack on a hundred varied fronts and can never be appeased for every surrender is but the opening of another door to the arrogance of self-established authority. Conform and your very conformity will be suspect, compromise and you scream your guilt to every barbarian who wears the purple of obscene authority. And yet the evil of his intolerance does not always reside behind the facade of elected office or with the State's appointed, for it is a cancer that even we of the Simon Pure minorities can allow to flower within our own breasts. When the problems of our time cease to be the squabbles of small groups seated around crowded tables and become, for a few brief days, the common coin of the universal press we must put into practice that tolerance and understanding that we are always preaching to others and when men or women err in public action or in public statement, let us salve the wound with silence until reason, understanding and compassion shall guide our tongue and pen, for if we hasten to sit in judgment on the failure of any individual to conform to our own high moral standing we shall find ourselves seated behind a judgment desk with the very forces of evil that make us a minority.

On the first day of this September, Foyles of Charing Cross Road placed on public display thirteen of twenty-five paintings by D. H. Lawrence. Of the work itself little can be said in its favour, for at its best, it is the competent daubs of any amateur painter and at its worst, the naive rubbish that a fifteen-year-old schoolgirl might paint and then destroy for fear of her mother's searching eye. Yet though they are but worthless rubbish Foyles are to be congratulated in giving us this opportunity of seeing work that for thirty-five years has been hidden away in private collections and has for too long been the

could be expressed in them.

"Stirnerism takes one to the point where anarchism starts. . . ."

How odd, then, that such prominent "Stirnerites" as Tucker, Armand and John Henry Mackay, considered themselves anarchists before they took up egoism. To me, "The Ego and His Own"—which I wish some of its critics would read one day—represents an advance on the utopian revolutionism of Bakunin and Kropotkin. Stirner's conception of the "unique", or self-owning individual, opens up a development of anarchism far more fruitful and profound than waiting for some revolutionary proletarian Godot. If a person has no ability to "realise his 'interests' and 'individuality' in spite of an authoritarian environment, I cannot see how he is going to be able to live in any kind of free way of life. I accept the view of the Sydney Libertarians that anarchism is only one among a multitude of competing human interests and that there is no reason to suppose that by some miracle it will vanquish all others. This makes individual, egoistic anarchism far more relevant than any variety based upon the expectation of a collectivist heaven on earth.

"... and it would be just as logical to suggest that the man who sang 'The working class can kiss my arse, I've got the foreman's job at last,' was a true Stirnerite, although none of the anarchist Stirnerites would dream of taking the foreman's job, but devise laborious arguments to prove it was not really in their interests."

My own argument against taking a position of authority is simple. Authority is a relationship between governor and governed which binds both and destroys the independence of each. As Stirner put it: "He who, to hold his own, must count on the absence of will in others is a thing made by these others, as the master is a thing made by the servant. If submissiveness ceased, it would be all over with lordship." A conscious egoist might misjudge his interests in this matter and in an effort to free himself from one set of chains land up in another. But since he is known to be acting in what he thinks is his own interest, it is easier for people to know where they stand with him and to bring their own egoism into play if he tries to dominate them. Authority, as I have suggested, is a reciprocal relationship and the sucker has only himself to blame if he lets himself be taken in.

Of course, this song an dance may well be about things taken for granted by "everyone else". It would be nice to think so. But I doubt it.

S. E. PARKER

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

Justice in Moscow G. Feifer 25/-
Eugene O'Neill (ed.) John Gassner 16/-
André Malraux (ed.) R. W. B. Lewis 16/-
An Area of Darkness V. S. Naipaul 25/-
South Africa: Crisis for the West C. & M. Legum 35/-
paper 12/6
Mass Persuasion in Communist China F. T. C. Yu 40/-

SECOND-HAND

Europa in Limbo Robert Briffault 6/-
As Far as my Feet will Carry Me. J. M. Bauer 3/6; Sawdust Caesar (Mussolini) George Seldes 4/-; I Rode with the Ku Klux Klan Stetson Kennedy 7/6; A Constitution for the Socialist Commonwealth of Great Britain (slightly damp-stained) Sidney & Beatrice Webb 7/6; Missouri Waltz Maurice M. Milligan 5/-; The Forerunners Romain Rolland 4/-; The Path to Peace (ed.) G. W. Keeton 4/-; Ruth Ellis Robert Hancock 10/-; About Levy Arthur Calder-Marshall 3/-; Mahatma Gandhi: his Own Story (ed.) C. F. Andrews 5/-; Regina, or the Sins of the Fathers Hermann Sundermann 3/-; Green Willow Ethel Mannin 3/-; The Trial Begins Abram Tertz 3/6 (paper-back); The Amateur Army Patrick MacGill 3/6; The Co-operative Movement in Labour Britain (ed.) N. Barou 3/6.

Freedom Bookshop

(Open 2 p.m.—5.30 p.m. daily;
10 a.m.—1 p.m. Thursdays;
10 a.m.—5 p.m. Saturdays).

17a MAXWELL ROAD

FULHAM SW6 Tel: REN 3736

penises and disjointed limbs. Literally thousands of such paintings are destroyed each year in the art classes of this country as the worthless trash of any workshop but the directors of the Warren Galleries lacked the honesty to reject Lawrence's bad work and succeeded in turning their gallery into an intellectual brothel by putting on public display work that possessed no value other than its juvenile eroticism. Yet having made their choice their right to that choice had to be defended and as on so many another occasion it was a battle fought in defence of something that in itself was basically worthless. Thirty-five years have gone and now these paintings hang on the walls of an ultra-conservative gallery and frankly . . . who cares? As I walked around the empty gallery I met but two other people who strolled in and out with the indifference of the time-killing stroller.

At the book table were copies of the book that contained the reproduction of these paintings. Published by Cory, Adams & Mackay of 39 Sloane Street, S.W.1., they offer for £3 15s. 0d. an addition to the canon of Lawrence the man, for here are his paintings and his pedantic and unoriginal views on art.

Within this same book one can have the essays of Sir Herbert Read on Lawrence as a Painter, Professor Harry T. Moore on its relationship to Lawrence's work as a writer, while Jack Lindsay discusses the influence of Modernism on Lawrence. And once again the philistines have struck not in the uniform of the State's police or with the ravings of Emile Littler and Peter Cadbury but in the tired babblings of three men who debase their craft by giving the accolade of their public esteem to such worthless painted trash for just as authority had to be defied thirty-five years ago in defence of the right to exhibit these paintings so by the same token must another authority be defied when they place their seal of approval on such artistic dross. The patterns of persecution and intolerance changes with the temper of the time.

ARTHUR MOYSE.

FREEDOM

September 19 Vol 25 No 29

THE REAL CHOICE

FROM now until the result of the Election finally releases us from the ballyhoo, we are going to be under pressure to vote. As Clement Attlee said in the 1950 Election, 'It doesn't really matter who you vote for, as long as you vote!', a sentiment that demonstrated quite clearly how much he thought there was any real choice before the electors, and how, for him, faith in the electoral system was the important thing.

This is the case with all the parties that will be entering candidates in the forthcoming shindig. The attitudes of them all have this common factor: the people must be made to believe that there must be somebody up there to take decisions for them, and that it is really important for faith in government as such to be maintained. By voting you demonstrate that you still believe in the institution of government. And this, above all, is the important issue.

Between the parties, as everybody can see for themselves, there are no great issues. They each make promises to do the same things better than the other lot—they have slightly different ways of spending the same amount of money—money that they take from us in taxation.

For, of course, governments produce nothing—they simply manipulate the wealth that we produce. By certain policies they can guide, cajole, bribe, bully or deceive us into putting the emphasis on this or that aspect of the nation's economy. They can fiddle with hire-purchase and make it easier or more difficult for us to buy the products that we produce; they can adjust bank rates of interest to make it more or less profitable to do this, that, or the other. They do not do anything other than organise us according to the ways they think we should go.

When we vote, we simply say 'We want this lot to organise us according to the ways they think we should go.'

This is looking at things in the broad sense. Individuals, of course may have individual reasons for making a choice based upon their private interests. But the people who can be said to do well under whichever government is in power are those who themselves have

power—and in Britain that means either money or the means of getting money. The rich always do well since they have the means to use any situation to their advantage, and any group with bargaining power (like industrial workers in boom conditions) can use that power to their advantage. Under any government, groups with no power—like old age pensioners—are treated just as badly as the government thinks it can get away with, although they are always played upon most cynically by the jockeying candidates.

Elections are about power, nothing else. You choose the party to which you will give your power. You voluntarily relinquish your own power. You give up your responsibility, feeling too weak or tired or ignorant to bear it yourself. Yet how many of us are ever satisfied with the result of our choice? Doesn't disillusion set in almost as soon as the new Parliament re-assembles and we see once again the same dreary old business beginning all over again.

There is a choice before us in this election, as in every other. But it is not a choice between the contending gangs of politicians. It is a choice between responsibility and irresponsibility; a choice between believing that you are strong enough and energetic enough and knowledgeable enough to run your life the way you want it—or that your weakness, tiredness and ignorance are too much for you and you must contract out of responsibility for yourself, and give up any idea that life can be more than the dreary rat-race the politicians organise for us.

The politicians are concerned with money and power—how they will spend your money after you have given them your power. You, surely, are concerned with satisfying your needs in a world which you find a pleasure to live in. These two concerns are mutually incompatible.

The choice now is simply to say "Yes" to the money and power mongers, or to treat them with contempt, boycott their shoddy soliciting and organise your lives the way you see fit. This real choice is with you all the time—it is simply highlighted by election fever, that's all.

ELECTION ANTHOLOGY-10

IN a barbarian society, we are forced to live in an asylum, where we are both patients and explorers. Certain rules, arrived at empirically, will govern our conduct in terms of that analogy.

First, I recognize the seeds of madness in myself. I know that if ever, for any purpose, I allow myself to act as a member of such a group and to forfeit my responsibility to my fellows, from that moment I am a madman, and the degree of my insanity will be purely fortuitous.

Second, I must suspect all bodies, groups, teams, gangs, based on power, for where two or three are gathered together, there is the potentiality of lunacy in the midst of them, whether lunacy that kills Jews, lunacy that flogs Indians, lunacy that believes Lord George Gordon or the Klu Klux Klan, or lunacy that bombs Berlin. Yet I shall not hate or distrust any of my fellow patients singly. They are exactly as I am. I can see how dangerous they are, but I can be as dangerous to them if I allow myself to become involved. It will be said that I deny social responsibility. I do not—I believe that responsibility is boundless. We have bound-

less responsibility to every person we meet. The foreman owes it to his men not to persecute them—he owes it as a man not because there is an abstract power vested in the T.U.C. which demands it. Barbarism is a flight from responsibility, an attempt to exercise it towards a non-existent scarecrow rather than to real people. Each sincere citizen feels responsibility to society in the abstract, and none to the people he kills. The furious obedience of the Good Citizen is basically irresponsible. "The simple love of country and home and soil, a love that needs neither reason nor justifications, is turned by the official apologists of the state into the demented cult of 'patriotism': coercive group unanimity: blind support of the rulers of the state; maudlin national egoism: an imbecile willingness to commit collective atrocities for the sake of 'national glory'." (Lewis Mumford). We have no responsibility whatever to a barbarian society. (We recognise no moral duties towards a gang of madmen); our responsibilities to each other I believe to be boundless.

Third, one must aim at concealment. When lunacy is a norm, cynicism is a

As we go to press we await to be told what we know, that it's October 15th. *The Sun* also rises and Harold Wilson, John Gollan, Joe Grimond and Sir Alec Douglas-Home go forth to do battle. . . .

FATHER TOLD Max Mosley not to put up for Parliament as we want to keep the bomb. George Brown's bruvver was accepted as a candidate. . . .

"THE TIMES" said "This year's Trade Union Congress has been largely a waste of time." Beyond Harold Wilson's attempt to get the Fire Brigade's Union vote, an agency's error in reporting him as offering a choice "between those who are prepared to accept as their ultimate goal the present standard of living, and those, on the other hand" . . . nothing much happened except a promise by Harold Wilson to maintain the right to strike without mentioning his Government's undoubted maintenance of the necessity to strike. . . .

MR. MARPLES said that if he went to his constituency without his new beard "there would be a hell of a row". "You must look at this beard in perspective . . . During my term of office I have done tremendous work for shipping . . . but you see only a small paragraph in the press about it. When you have a beard, you are suddenly a national story." Mr. Marples said that the beard would stay at least until nearer the election. He added "I could quote some of the letters I have had. Some are very funny. Women write in and some of them have violent attachments to my beard. I am getting as much advice on my beard as I get on road and rail problems." . . .

RUSSIAN GEOGRAPHERS are searching remote Caucasian valleys for a wild creature said to resemble the Abominable Snowman. The creature is said to be about seven feet tall and covered with thick, black hair. It has a small, egg-shaped head with a sloping brow, massive protruding lower jaw, reddish slit eyes and big teeth. Its hands reach down to its knees, with long fingers. It walks pigeon-toed and with a stoop.



The creature behaves peaceably when confronted by man, but mutters indistinctly and screams danger. A young woman when it senses danger. A young man who said he had been trying to see Mr. Khrushchev for seven years was turned back by security guards. Mr. Khrushchev said to him "You ought to be ashamed." . . .

"PRAVDA" ACCUSED China of running an opium industry with convict labour to finance subversion against Russia. Dr. Hastings Banda, the Malawi Prime Minister accused five cabinet ministers whom he dismissed, or who resigned, of plotting to murder him in cold blood. He further said that the Chinese Embassy in Dar-es-Salaam was behind the conspiracy and had offered a loan of £18 million if Malawi recognised the Chinese regime. After Dr. Banda's speech the whole house (except the rebels) rose in applause and sang "Dr. Banda is the Lion of Malawi".

MR. HENRY BROOKE, the Home secretary spoke of "a certain vendetta against the police by certain members of the left wing". He said these people were "always bringing allegations against the police and insinuating that the police are exceeding their powers" . . . "I have not hesitated to order inquiries into allegations against the police, which I felt might in any way be well founded. On the other hand I have been determined to stand up for the police service

generally. . . . "I am glad to say that, however the Left Wing may snipe at the police, I have the full support of the Conservative Party." . . .

A JURY at a Glasgow inquest on the death of a man who was injured in a police cell was cautioned against finding that the police were guilty of assault. The Sheriff said that the deceased had been injured either by falling and hitting his head or by force used by the police. He cautioned them that evidence to support a finding of police assault was really such as to make wholly unsuitable. A solicitor acting for the family of William Birnie (28), unemployed labourer (the deceased), questioned the detective who replied that anyone who said they had seen the two police officers taking Birnie after his arrest into the police office with his arms up his back was lying. The solicitor said "Either they or you are lying", the detective answered "it must be them, because I am telling the truth." The policemen stated that their batons were in a locker at the police office at the time of Birnie's arrest. The forensic expert said that the batons of the constables showed a faint positive reaction to a test for human blood. "This," he added, "is a test which is presumptive and has many fallacies. It was a very faint reaction in each case." Birnie had been arrested for a breach of the peace. The jury returned a unanimous formal verdict that Birnie suffered head injuries in the cell and that as a result he died. Last November a Glasgow policeman was cleared on a charge of murder of a prisoner at a Glasgow police station. . . .

IN JOHANNESBURG Suliman Saloojee, aged 32, a solicitor's clerk, who was detained under the South African 90-days law, jumped to his death from the seventh floor of police headquarters while being interrogated by security branch detectives. Mr. Vorster, the South African Minister of Justice, said that the 90-day laws would be suspended as soon as the Government was satisfied that circumstances warranted it. It was never meant to be a measure of punishment but a way of obtaining information. . . .
JON QUIXOTE.

DIRECT ACTION AGAINST APARTHEID

THIS was the call of Frank Cousins at T.U.C. last week. He claimed that 65,000 dockers would rally to such a move instigated by the T.U.C.

This challenge can be taken two ways, the first, knowing full well that the T.U.C. could never issue such a call, Frank Cousins can hide behind this fact and continue to parade as a real active militant against apartheid. Or secondly, the challenge can be real and sincere in which case a token stoppage could be effected, thus throwing down the gauntlet to all trade unionists in the country.

According to the Editorial in the *New Daily* two *Daily Express* reporters visited the docks on Thursday and found that 99% of the men disowned it. We all know what a wonderful job *Daily Express* reporters do, plaguing the life out of people for sensational copy, but

to claim, that from their interviews they assessed that 99% of dockers would not boycott S. African ships is a bit too much even for the most ardent readers of the *Daily Express* to swallow.

Let's be frank I for one do not expect the dockers to fall over themselves to boycott S. African ships, for one good reason. In any trade dispute, in the ultimate, the dockers are expected to express their solidarity in practical terms, consequently they are always 'under the cosh', whilst we workers in other industries who could possibly assist, carry on taking our weekly earnings, and the dockers understandably are a bit fed up with this situation. Therefore if we want the dockers to boycott S. African ships, we have got to assist, either by *boycott where we can, or undertake the task of ensuring that dockers receive their weekly earnings whilst 'blacking' S.A. ships.*

In June of this year, five thousand dockers stopped work for four hours in Sydney in support of the action of three gangs of dockers who refused to handle a cargo from S. Africa. A few weeks ago, sixty waterside workers in Sydney refused to unload the *New Zealand Stars* cargo of 1,000 tons of frozen fish from S.A. In Fremantle 400 dock workers sacrificed one and a half hours pay to hold a meeting and reaffirmed a previous decision to protest against the handling of cargoes to and from S. Africa. It was reported that Swedish dockers have carried out similar action.

It is heartening to note that there is a move afoot in Royal Arsenal Co-operative Society for their shops to cease selling S. African goods. My Lord Sainsbury please note, take a step further from prominently labelling your goods S.A. to chucking them out altogether.

Several shops in S. Wales are pulling a stroke, they are selling S. African goods the name S. Africa blacked out and the word 'foreign' substituted. Evidently the boycott is having some effect.

Mr. Cyril Lord, the carpet and textile manufacturer, has opened a new factory in South Africa. The factory is to be on the border of Bantustan from where Africans can be brought to work in his

factory and then returned at night. He stated there is nothing political about this; it is straight business (*Guardian* 15/6/64). When talking to the *Guardian* reporter whom he accused of twisting his words he stated "I am not 'anti' anybody. We have to work with them to see that South Africa will grow and prosper. Today they are doing more for the native than in any other country. I think the native is getting a better deal in South Africa than anywhere else in Africa."

Asked whether from choice he would have moved his factory to any place other than South Africa, Mr. Lord replied: "No I would not. I think everything is all right there. You have got to treat the natives as children and gently. Our people out there are being very kind to them and are bringing them on very well."

One can hazard a guess that Mr. Lord will pay his workers children's wages.

Sir John Maud, Britain's first Ambassador to S. Africa, he thought S. Africa racial policies 'stank'. He blew sky-high the excuse of the Afrikaans intellectuals for apartheid, that separate areas would benefit both African and Europeans, when he stated: "The real weakness of separate development is that it leaves of the 11 million Africans 7 million living in the so-called white area alongside 3 million whites who are permanently to retain absolute sovereignty in that area."

"There is no separate development in the white area, and in that area the blacks are encouraged to migrate from their 'homelands' but not to bring their families with them. Therefore the policy is one which breaks up the family."

S. African Prime Minister Verwoerd has called a halt to the recruitment of mercenaries for Tshombe. To date there has been 1,500 applicants recruited from an office in Jo'burg. Verwoerd stated there was already a manpower shortage in S.A. This is obvious, they are all in the 'Special Branch'.

Anti-Apartheid has hit the headlines again thanks to Frank Cousins, let's keep it there by doing something about it.

BILL CHRISTOPHER.

ALEX COMFORT,

Art and Social Responsibility (1946).

