

'Since government, even in its best state is an evil, the object principally to be aimed at is that we should have as little of it as the general peace of human society will permit.
WILLIAM GODWIN

Goldwater, GREATER AND LESSER EVILS ETC

IT'S incredible how subjectively people reason in politics, or how much patriotism enhances self-righteousness. I was reminded of this anew the day after Krushchev's ouster when a co-worker pointed out smugly: "That's how they do things over there." "Yeah," I answered, "but over here they shoot 'em."

On the other hand all reactions are not quite so hopeless. Recently I went into a Drug Store while wearing my "Nobody for President" pin—the *sine qua non* of the well-dressed anarchist. (There's another election pin which says "Vote No For President" but I haven't picked one up yet.) The salesman looked at my pin and broke up. "That's right," he said, "no matter who wins, it'll be a nobody." Evidently there's a good deal of this sort of general disgust prevalent, because another friend of mine quoted someone as describing the election as a choice between a thief and a maniac.

My own analogy is that of the standard routine used by the police in which one cop clobbers the victim for a while and then the second cop comes in and gives the poor guy a cigarette. I somehow think of Johnson as the one with the cigarette.

We'll Die Laughing

Says American Correspondent

Goldwater, on the other hand, is peculiarly vulnerable (in fact peculiar, period) to lampooning and is the butt of dozens of gags. My friend in the drugstore told me that when Barry was asked how many states he thought he could carry, he answered: "All Thirteen." Then again when he was asked what he would do in the event of a Russian attack he answered: "I'd draw the covered wagons into a circle." One of his campaign slogans was reputed to be: Kill the Poor; and another Kill the Aged.

For a long time prior to his nomination I had been seeing stickers on conservative automobile bumpers reading: "AuH₂O in 64" but lately I've been encountering the liberals' rebuttal to that chemical approach which reads: "NH₂CONH₂ on AuH₂O." (NH₂CONH₂ is the formula for urea.) There are in-

numerable other bumper slogans such as: "Help Goldwater Stamp Out Peace;" "Goldwater Scares Me;" "Goldwater For Halloween;" and one reading, "Up and Out with Goldwater" superimposed on a mushroom cloud. Among the political stickers suggested by *Strike* (published by the Socialist Party of Ohio) is one expressing the sentiments, "Goldwater for Fire Hydrant" with a sketch of a hydrant and a dog with raised leg.

A more involved anecdote concerns three surgeons who were bragging about their most illustrious cases. The first surgeon described how a patient was once brought to him with a completely severed leg, but after his superb efforts the patient became an Olympic runner. Then the Second surgeon cited a phenomenal case wherein he reconnected five completely severed fingers on a patient

who subsequently became a concert pianist. But the third surgeon informed his colleagues that they weren't even in the running. It seems that one time a patient of his went horseback riding and he inadvertently rode into a stone quarry where there was blasting going on. The result was that the poor fellow was blown absolutely to smithereens. "I was immediately alerted," continued the surgeon, "while a searching party went through the debris. All they could find to bring into the operating room was the horse's ass and a pair of horn-rimmed glasses, but now it's running for President of the United States."

In this category Lyndon B. has dropped far behind. However the recent arrest of one of his aides as a homosexual engendered the slogan: "Either Way with LBJ." Other than as a macabre joke, however, it seems that poor old Barry is virtually being written off. This is perhaps unfortunate be-

cause he's probably closer to anarchism in his own bizarre way than Johnson is. Also it could be quite seriously argued that a Goldwater victory might have the beneficial result of precipitating some semblance of a left in this country.

At the moment, however, the only thing Barry has precipitated is a sort of Anarchists for Johnson campaign. It's pretty weird when you run into comrades who have non-voted for 20 years, and they tell you they've just registered so they can vote against Barry. I don't think that jolted me quite so much as the Tolstoyan—a convicted CO of World War II—who was going to contest his status as a disenfranchised felon so he too could go all the way with LBJ. Yet Goldwater is a far shrewder politician than most people give him credit for. When he learned of this trend he immediately announced that if he were elected he would eliminate conscription—obviously a crude attempt to split the anarchist vote.

Meanwhile Goldwater in caricature can hardly vie with Goldwater in person. I received a letter telling me that I can go along with "fear, appeasement and socialism" or I can take my stand with "faith and freedom." In my heart, I was assured, I know that what Goldwater stands for is what I stand for too. This gem arrived through the courtesy of Citizens for Goldwater-Miller, a worthy organization whose National Co-Chairman is Clare Booth Luce. But oddly enough Mrs. Luce's personal magazine, *Time*, had just that week (October 9th) written off Goldwater completely. Apart from referring to the "tastelessness" of his "diatribe" they observed: "Everybody remembers how he went out of his way to alienate audiences, attacking TVA in Tennessee, Medicare in front of Florida pensioners, and the President's anti-poverty campaign in the depressed, eleven-state Appalachian region. Now as his prospects of election become dimmer and dimmer, he sounded wilder and wilder in his charges against the Johnson Administration." Thereupon Goldwater decided to offset his tastelessness by branding the Democratic Party a "Fascist Organization." (Barry himself is often described as "the Fascist gun in the West.")

All in all, the British election may have been equally inane but I doubt if it was quite this funny.

H. W. MORTON.

TUBE MEN BACK, UNDER PROTEST

Further Action Likely

When London Transport introduced their new time-tables for the Underground trains last Monday, crews turned up for work at the old times and after signing on, were sent home. This protest action cut the train services by nearly half, causing chaos.

London Transport say that because of a shortage of guards, services had to be cut and so the new time-tables were introduced. These had been accepted by the two unions, National Union of Railwaymen and the Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen, together with compensatory payments for crews who have to be transferred to other depots. An efficiency bonus has also been worked out giving operating staff an extra 10/- to 15/- a week. Other permanent bonus schemes are to be negotiated later on, including an improved sick pay scheme.

As can be seen from the strength of the stoppage, these terms were unacceptable to nearly half of London's underground train crews. One of them said, "Really, with wage packets ranging from £9 to £14 a week, I think we are the cinderellas of the transport business." Although the stoppage only lasted three days, tube workers made their point and union officials have now to negotiate better terms.

The fact that these men went against the terms negotiated by their union officials has given rise to comment. Mr. Wilson, now Prime Minister, then with his eye very much on the election, said, "Whatever grievances there may be, it is intolerable that a very large part of London Transport can be brought to a halt by the action of a small minority. Agreement was reached by the representatives of both sides last week and

it is essential that the agreement be honoured. Once we get into the position of agreement which has been freely reached being broken, nothing but chaos of this kind can result."

He was careful not to put all the blame on the men, and also attacked the Tory government's policies on public services. Mr. Byers of the Liberal Party said, "The dispute is the direct result of 'very bad' communications between trade union officials and the workers themselves." It is a fact that the union officials accepted the London Transport terms, but at no time were the rank and file of the unions consulted. Their views were not asked for. The union officials accepted what they thought the men would stand, but as it turned out they did not. Mr. Wilson, Mr. Byers and no doubt the employers, both private and state, would like to see their agreements with the union officials just accepted by the rank and file.

In this present dispute, the time-tables were going to be introduced on September 7th, but pressure from the rank and file led to the date being altered and further negotiations. Union officials have been doing their utmost to get the men back and working the new time-tables. Their efforts did get quite a bit of response and men returned to work with the exception of the District Line, which was the only one that was completely closed down on the third and final day of the dispute.

One of the reasons this line held out

so solidly is because these crews are the worst affected by the new time-tables. Many of them have to move to new depots and will have longer journeys to work. As one of them said, "The new time-tables would mean journeys of up to an hour and 20 minutes from their homes to depots for the men to go on duty. And they'll have the same journeys home. For that they would get 4/6d. or 6/- "disturbance" pay. The new time-tables mean a start of 2.30 a.m. every morning for some of the early duty men. And with longer hours many would lose the little social life they manage to grab now."

It seems that most of the opposition to the union leaders came via an unofficial body of the Chairman and Secretaries of the N.U.R. and A.S.L.E.F. branches. They sent out circulars, opposing the new proposed time-tables, which were signed by Mr. Tommy Doubtfire, as chairman, and Mr. Shepard as secretary. Of course the union leaders were well aware of this unofficial threat and have tried to counteract this at branch level. N.U.R. officials have called these two men "The terrible Twins", but London Transport have said that "Nobody has done more to get the men back, or worker harder than Tommy. It isn't fair to pillory him. He's a good chap." I think their view was somewhat different in 1958, for Tommy Doubtfire was a member of a group of tube men who wanted to take solidarity action with the busmen's strike.

Apprentices Organise for One-day Strike

Union officials are quite correct in pointing out that "the apprentices of today are the trade unionists of tomorrow." But it is also correct that they are trade unionists here and now and play their part in any struggle against the employers. Often the employers use the apprentice scheme of tied indenture as a weapon to force apprentices to work during a strike and union leaders are usually willing to go along with this. In last year's building strike, apprentices wanted to come out, but union officials told them to stay at work.

It is part of the engineering union's policy to increase the percentage of the craftsmen rates that apprentices earn, this was accepted by the unions some

years back, but so far it has not been implemented. Apprentices however are now organising themselves to do what their leaders have, so miserably, failed to do. Present rates for apprentices are low and through the most part of their apprenticeship, they are used as a source of cheap labour by the employers.

The aims of the National Apprentice Committee, on wages, are that at 15 they should get 60% (i.e. £6 7s. 0d.) of the craftsman's rate instead of the present 22½% (2 10s. 0d.). This should be increased each birthday by 5% until 20 he should earn 90% (£9 11s. 0d.) instead of the present 62½% (6 12s. 0d.). They are also claiming "Four weeks paid annual holiday. A 35 hour working

Continued on page 4

Obviously there was widespread opposition to these new time-tables and the delays in the ordinary pay negotiations did not help. These are tied to the main railways' pay negotiations, which have dragged on for months. London Transport have suggested that they start their own separate negotiations, but the unions turned this down.

After a stormy meeting at Victoria, the tube men decided to work the new time-tables under protest. There is a strong possibility of further action if grievances, which stem from low pay-rates, are not settled within the next three months. London Transport are unable to attract enough staff to man adequate services and these new time-tables will mean further cuts.

If these new time-tables are to be thrown out and more pay and better conditions gained, unofficial action will have to be taken again. Organisation on this basis should be extended to include all lines. The all-important question of liaison with busmen should not be forgotten. One should support the other in any action.

MOSCOW UNDER NEW MANAGEMENT

THE news flash of Mr. Khrushchev's dismissal, sandwiched between election results obviously enlivened the day's proceedings, but it is interesting to see that his going has not created quite the kind of stir that such news would have a few years ago. Though we don't know the inside story of his dismissal, we don't expect to, do we, any more than we know the inside story of the Tories' removal of Churchill, Macmillan or of their appointment of Sir Alec Douglas Home.

It is encouraging to see that the struggle for power among the Russian politicians is no less intense than it is among the Americans and the British, for so long as it exists no political leader is free to develop the kind of paranoia which could lead to disastrous results so far as mankind is concerned.

To accuse Khrushchev of the "cult of the personality" is a lot of nonsense, for it is patently clear that the same medium of mass communications which builds up the personalities of the leaders can at will

snuff them out. The Khrushchevs the Macmillans and the Churchills are ordinary mortals writ large. What they do and say is of public "importance" only when they are in the public eye; and they are in the public eye as the spokesmen of government. Out of office they rapidly sink into oblivion. Who bothers about Macmillan nowadays . . . and yet it is only a year since SuperMac was front page "news" and the subject for every cartoonist. What "personalities" are these that once the prop of publicity has been removed disappear into oblivion, leaving no trace of their existence?

The only compliment Mr. Khrushchev can cherish in his retirement came from the American-Canadian impresario who has offered him a large sum of money to entertain the American public, not to a series of political lectures, but recounting the lighter side of being Russia's number one man. It is obvious that so far as some people are concerned Mr. K. has at least made an impression as a clown, and this is something to be proud of.

ANARCHY 44

DISCUSSES

TRANSPORT

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

IN two articles on Senator Goldwater (FREEDOM, June 20 and July 25) the important point was made that anxiety over the Senator's candidacy should not obscure the basic problems facing the United States, e.g., poverty amidst affluence, race prejudices, and popular jingoism. On the American body politic suffering from such perennial economic and psychological difficulties Goldwater's emergence was correctly likened to that of a pimple. However, to carry the analogy one step further, pimples can become infected and, unless treated, lead to the death of the organism. Such, I fear, is the case with Senator Goldwater. In other words, I cannot agree with your view that "the actual result of the election does not make any difference one way or the other" . . . "that Goldwater if elected in November will no more change the situation in the United States for the worse than could Kennedy for the better." I wish I could accept such a comforting view, but I cannot, for it does not accord with the facts insofar as the facts are available to me.

You use the following argument to support the thesis I find unacceptable: Government has two permanent constituent parts. "On the one hand the apparatus of power, the people who by controlling the banks, the factories, the agricultural economy and the armed forces, actually ensure that their policies are put into effect. On the other hand is the passive mass of people, whose general attitude of tolerance and passive support is necessary for the ruling class to rule, and which is manipulated by the organs of press, education and radio into supporting the former." The elected 'representatives' of the people, by contrast, constitute the transitory aspect of government, and they "play a minute part compared with the executive drive of the people really in control, and the apathetic agreement of the masses." I will grant that this is a useful conceptual framework for the analysis of power in existing societies. I will even grant that it is basic to an understanding of what is going on in the United States. However, I object to the simplistic fashion in which you have used this tool of analysis in your appraisal of the current situation in this country. Any such conceptual tool, whether in physics, biology, or political science, will prove misleading when its application is not guided by an appreciation of the idiosyncrasies of the subject matter to which it is applied. Its application to the current political situation in Great

GOLDWATER THE GREATER EVIL, ETC

Britain is a good deal easier than its application to the more complex situation in the United States. Your analysis of the latter situation appears to neglect the following factors:

(1) The possibility of a serious conflict within "the apparatus of power." You appear to believe that there is a policy consensus among American businessmen, bankers, and military leaders. Such an assumption is false. The available evidence indicates that Goldwater's nomination represents a victory of Western and Southwestern economic (especially oil and aircraft) interests over the older Eastern economic establishment. To assume a continuity of foreign and domestic policy regardless of who wins in November is to neglect this conflict.

(2) The unprecedented power of the American president in the nuclear age. Because of this it seems unrealistic to hold that it makes no difference who is president, that the president is an impotent epiphenomenon of "the apparatus of power." The person who holds that office today has, almost at his finger tips, the power to destroy the world. This would be true even if there were a rational consensus within the apparatus of power. The absence of such a consensus only amplifies the president's freedom to act irrationally. I am not suggesting that an elected Goldwater would launch missiles on his inauguration day, but I am suggesting that he could and would take steps that would rapidly lead to a nuclear showdown with the Soviet Union. It may be argued that we can discount his many bellicose remarks about the virtues of the military mind, nuclear weapons, Cuba, South Vietnam, and the Soviet Union as just so much campaign oratory, but I would prefer to make judgments in the light of evidence and not in the dim opacity of desperate hope. Goldwater appears to be deadly serious.

(3) A remarkably widespread irrationalism which has long characterized large segments of the American public, but which in recent years has clustered about the issues of anti-Communism and white supremacy. Such irrationalism is not confined to the masses, but all the evidence indicates that it is well entrenched among many in the apparatus of power—those, that is, who support Goldwater. It is a mistake to credit all businessmen and military leaders with enough rationality to stop short of a

suicidal war, yet I fear that your analysis of the American political scene frequently does just that. Furthermore, even if (as I do believe) the majority of the power élite do have enough enlightened self-interest to draw back from the brink, this is no guarantee that the irrationality of the rest will allow them to do this in time. It is unrealistic, in short, to expect that the reasonable American power establishment will be able to keep an elected Goldwater and his henchmen from plunging the world into war. They were not able to keep him from the nomination; it is gratuitous to assume that they would be more effective in restraining Goldwater as president.

In short, I think that the election of Goldwater would raise considerably the probability of war, while the election of Johnson would not affect the probability either way. This estimate in no way denies that Goldwater's candidacy is a symptom of unresolved problems in the United States and that a crushing defeat for the Senator in November (which seems likely) will effect no solution of these problems. Yet the Senator's defeat is a necessary precondition for the solution of the problems—unless we consider universal death a kind of solution.

Senator Goldwater's foreign and domestic policies both raise a number of questions which deserve continued treatment in anarchist circles. Some of these questions are the following:

(1) What is the role of anarchists in elections where the choice is (as always) between two evils, but where one of the evils is manifestly greater than the other? Is it to work against the greater evil without supporting the lesser, or is it to work against both? (It would be dogmatic to claim that the evils are always of equal magnitude, i.e., to hold that all governments are equally bad. Granted, they are all bad, but not all equally bad.) What if the anarchists in a society are numerous and influential enough to determine the result of such an election? And suppose the choice were between a Hitler and a socialist with strong anarchist sympathies, and the Hitler would win if the anarchists did not support the socialist? Would it not be unreasonable in such admittedly hypothetical circumstances to urge abstention and opposition to both candidates regardless of the consequences?

(2) Goldwater and his cohorts are fervent in their advocacy of individual

'freedom' which they see threatened by an all-powerful 'Big Brother' federal government. Translated into more accurate political terms this amounts to support for white supremacy and *laissez-faire* capitalism. Now anarchists, especially Individualists, frequently use similar terms to describe their position—of course, without intending any such translation. In view of what is now going on in the United States it seems to me to be a dangerous mistake to put the anarchist position in such terms, unless they are constantly qualified in the light of Malatesta's observation: "Intolerance of oppression, the desire to be free and to be able to develop one's personality to its full limits, is not enough to make one an anarchist. That aspiration towards unlimited freedom, if not tempered by a love for mankind and by the desire that all should enjoy equal freedom, may well create rebels who, if they are strong enough, soon become exploiters and tyrants, but never anarchists." (FREEDOM, Jan. 3, 1964).

(3) Goldwater is noted as a supporter of state and local government against the growing encroachments of a highly centralized federal government. What is the American anarchist to say to this part of the Senator's rhetoric in view of the following facts? (a) State and local governments in the South would condemn the Negro to perpetual servitude. (b) State and local governments are notoriously far more corrupt than the federal government. (c) State and local governments, if given a free hand, would adopt legislation far more oppressive to thought, expression, and behaviour than any that the federal government is likely to institute. There are many communities in this country (and not only in the South) where the majority of one's neighbours are likely to be Bible-pounding, flag-waving racists. For all its many damning faults the federal government does happily exercise some small degree of restraint on local autonomy in such communities. Given such conditions, anarchist support for community autonomy would seem to require detailed clarification.

(4) Goldwater has frequently attacked social welfare legislation in language reminiscent of anarchist writings. He argues that the community and family should care for its young, its elderly, and its incapable, rather than some impersonal federal agency. All this tender, loving care is to take place, as the

Senator sees it, under an unregulated capitalism which has elevated the profit motive to the status of the sacred and in communities and families such as were described above. Now, on the assumptions that local enlightenment is unlikely in the near future and that capitalism is far from dead, what is the anarchist to say of (e.g.) federal aid to housing, education, and health insurance? Is every social welfare law a further barrier to the growth of an anarchist consciousness, or is it possible to make discriminations? Is it possible for an anarchist to argue in the following fashion: "As long as we have capitalism such and such laws are good—and such and such are bad? To particularize: Are laws which forbid racial discrimination and censorship really in the same category with laws that support such practices?"

I think that the intellectual respectability of anarchism will grow with efforts to answer these questions. The questions have special relevance to conditions in the United States, but I don't think that geography renders them beside the point for any serious anarchist.

M. G. ANDERSON.

Hartford Conn., Oct. 12.

[(1) Far from believing that there is "a policy consensus" "within the apparatus of power", we are constantly referring to the struggle that goes on at top level. A united boss-ruling-class would be virtually invincible certainly if opposed by a disunited working class. That Goldwater's nomination represents the victory of one set of financial and industrial interests over another is, we are sure, quite true, but the extent to which one particular set of interests can dominate the policies of a country such as the United States is very slight, for however big the oil interests and aircraft interests may be, they represent only a fraction of the American economy, are one among many powerful interests all manoeuvring for advantage and preference.

(2) In spite of "the unprecedented power of the American President, "Kennedy's term in office was marked by failure to carry through his programme of "social reforms". Certainly this is not convincing proof of a president who has "almost at his finger tips, the power to destroy the world". (Incidentally if large numbers of Americans believe this they should derive some encouragement and hope from the Oswald affair!)

It is all very well to say that Goldwater "appears to be deadly serious" when he makes bellicose remarks about Cuba, South Vietnam, etc. Most Americans and others thought Kennedy was "deadly serious" when he threatened a nuclear war over Cuba.

(3) We are quite sure that there are among business and military leaders a number who are political hot-heads and would launch "a suicidal war". The fact is that such decisions are not taken by a handful of leaders, let alone a handful of madmen. War is a complicated business, involving complicated preparations, involving the agreement of tens of thousands of key people in all walks of life before the machine of war can be set in motion. The lunatic fringe's chances should be viewed in that context.—EDITORS.]

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
On the Outskirts Michael Frayne 16/-
What Became of Gunner Asch? H. H. Kirst 21/-
The Life and Death of Lenin Robert Payne 42/-
On the Foreign Policy of the Soviet State V. I. Lenin 7/6

REPRINTS
Ex-Prodigy Norbert Weiner 19/-
I Am a Mathematician Norbert Weiner 19/-

SECOND-HAND
Fundamental Problems of Marxism G. Plekhanov 15/-; Morals and the Evolution of Man Max Nordau 5/-; Western Political Thought John Bowle 10/-; Readings from the World's Religions ed. Selwyn Gurney Champion and Dorothy Short 5/-; My Four Years in Germany (1917) James W. Gerard 3/-; The Abilities of Man: Their Nature and Measurement (scored) C. Spearman 4/-; No Place Like Home Dominic Reeve 6/-; The varieties of Religious Experiences William James 5/-; The Government and Misgovernment of London (1939) William A. Robson 6/-; I Found No Peace (1936) Webb Miller 3/-; A Short History of the World H. G. Wells (illus.) 4/6; Spearhead Cummings, Miller, Rexroth, etc. 17/6; The Wings of the Morning (1939) Edward Hyams (damaged) 3/-; The Song of the Cold Edith Sitwell 3/-; The Spanish Arena (Francophile) William Foss and Cecil Gerahty 6/-; Georgian Adventure Douglas Jerrold 3/-; The Face of Justice Caryl Chessman 10/-;

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

AROUND THE GALLERIES

THEY strode the Paris salons of the 19th century darkly satanic, hinting at sulphur and smelling of camphor, defying God yet ever ready to bend the knee to earthly authority for they were the romantic *terribilit * of the drawing rooms frock-coated and devil-bearded, mocking the dying mythology of the agrarian society as it gave way before the brute evil of industrialism yet always with one shrewd gallic eye cocked on the pages of their bank account. Eug ne Delacroix was the personification of those romantics of that period who accepted all that an industrial society had to offer yet was unable, or refused, to come to terms with the age that provided him with his creature comforts. Baudelaire wrote of him that he reminded him "of those ancient monarchs of Mexico, of Montezuma, whose hand, skilled in human sacrifice, could im-molate three thousand human beings on the pyramidal altar of the Sun", which all in all was probably Baudelaire's long-winded way of saying that Delacroix justified his reputation as a social lion with a venomous tongue by insulting the waiters. Yet this slight, frail man's artistic life encompassed the dying hand of David and the flowering of C zanne's reputation as a painter of worth and he cannot be dismissed with a phrase for he broke the mausoleum of Established Art by taking the historical and allegorical subject-matter that formed the fodder of every yearly Salon and draping the costumes of the past on to the bodies of the living. True he lacked the courage to come to terms with his own age but like the *quattrocento* painters he dragged the past into the present with the humanizing of the men and women who peopled his canvases and his use of colour and the vigour of his style became the rallying ground for the young painters of that period. The exhibition of Delacroix's paintings, draw-

ings and lithographs at the Royal Academy of Arts, Piccadilly, W.1., has, unfortunately, too many omissions to be entirely satisfactory.

"Liberty leading the People" must surely be one of his best known paintings and this studio creation of the bare-breasted Liberty leading the people of Paris in a death or glory charge over the fallen bodies of the revolutionary rank and file must take its place with those non-combatant conceptions of moments of mass action that delight the bourgeois soul in every age and in every form of society and the sons and grandsons of those who shot down the people of Paris gazed up at this painting when it was exhibited in 1831 at the Salon with the patronising reverence that reaction always gives to those that were slaughtered that they might survive and that year they appointed Delacroix to the *L gion d'Honneur*.

If Delacroix owes a debt to any man it must surely be to G ricault for G ricault's painting of the "Raft of the Medusa" with its heaped mass of struggling bodies filling the foreground of the canvas was to be repeated by Delacroix time and time again. The theme or the period might change but here was G ricault's mass of heaving, suffering humans. "Dante and Vigil in Hell", "The massacres of Chios", "The death of Sardanapalus", and even with the "Lion Hunt". Yet Delacroix was no Hemmingway of the brush for at his finest and at his most banal his groupings were so self-evidently the bored routine of hired models and it is only in his painting and drawing of animals that action surges across his static canvases. In his painting of his coloured model he has caught the pensive and quizzical mood of this beautiful and mature woman, for given the discipline of a single and uncommitted human or the unrehearsed grace of an animal,

Delacroix could subdue his romantic bourgeois conception of past events and let his heart control his hand.

The two major paintings within this exhibition at the Royal Academy are Delacroix's first work to win him public esteem "Dante and Virgil in Hell" with its magnificent G ricault groupings and its brilliant play with light and darkness and his "Medea about to kill her children". That this second work must suffer comparison with Leonardo's "Virgin of the Rocks" is but the fault of the Frenchmen, for as in the past he made too much use of G ricault's "Raft of the Medusa" so in this Medea painting he poses an Italian Renaissance cathedral grouping in which the mass of the bodies and the draperies lead up to the focal point of a single face literally linking heaven with earth.

But in place of the Italian's clear and glowing faith Delacroix offers darkness and death and in place of Leonardo's light we have the dank world or shadowed corruption for this full-breasted Medea hiding within the dark womb of her self-created tomb is the *doppelg nger* of Liberty that Delacroix painted eight years before.

But for all that here is a major exhibition of a major painter working on a major scale. Hold out your hand you little men who cut your canvas to suit your touting dealer and then spread wide your fingers and use that as your scale for only then will your grubby little hands cover the faces of Delacroix's passive plea for the past, for though Delacroix rejected his own age, his very talent tied him to the present. He dragged out the tarnished armour and the tin swords from the lumber rooms of history and draped them upon the plump and self-satisfied citizens of the very age he effected to despise, for despite himself, he was forced to act out his role as the court painter to the only people who were prepared to pay the price he charged, and for that uneasy bargain both parties found a measure of minor immortality.

ARTHER MOYSE.

The Anti-Election Campaign is IN THE RED!

GREAT efforts were made by a few comrades in the Anti-Election Campaign, without counting the cost. But the bills are now coming in!

The main burden of the cost of the Trafalgar Square entertainment has been borne by one comrade, and the cost of 'Election Guyed' has been borne by another. The collection in the Square was quite inadequate, and any present readers who enjoyed themselves there but left before the collection was taken are invited to help defray the debt.

'Election Guyed' was sent out on spec to all readers of FREEDOM and ANARCHY, and some orders came in as a result. Once again an invitation is issued to all those who enjoyed it to help cope with the deficit. And PLEASE will all those comrades who sold copies get their cash in as soon as possible!

If contributions are sent in specifically for any part of our anti-election endeavours, will the senders please mark them so? If they are not earmarked for any special feature, the cash will be put to the general anti-election fund and apportioned out according to the outstanding debts.

But at the moment, please remember, two comrades stand to lose heavily if generous contributions are not forthcoming!

FREEDOM

October 24 1964 Vol 25 No 33

ANARCHIST AND 'THE LESSER EVIL'

[The following is inspired by the second part of M. G. Anderson's article on Anarchists and the American Dilemma which we therefore suggest should be read first]

COMRADE ANDERSON puts a number of questions to us as anarchists, and suggests that "the intellectual respectability of anarchism will grow with efforts" to answer them. As a matter of fact we would suggest that these questions have often been answered by anarchists, though one must assume that they have been answered unconvincingly at least for some readers.

It seems to us that so long as the anarchist movement is as small as it is in the States and in this country, its role should be to use every possible occasion to make anarchist propaganda, and to oppose all governments. If the anarchist movement became strong enough to be considered a decisive factor, electorally speaking, between a Hitler and a socialist, then, asks comrade Anderson, what do we suggest anarchists should do, and he makes it clear that he would hope our answer would be the "reasonable" one of saying we would choose "the lesser evil". Actually the question as well as the circumstances are even more "hypothetical" than he admits! The role of a strong anarchist movement in such a situation would surely be to advocate the social revolution, not out of a sense of bravado, or indifference to the issues at stake. On the contrary we say this with a strong sense of social responsibility, and because we do distinguish between "evils". In the first place, if parliamentary democracy has any validity as a form of social organisation, it is that everybody plays the game according to rules with which they agree, and in those circumstances there can be very little to choose, for an anarchist at least, between one Administration and another. But where a Party seeks to capture the administration by breaking the rules, to oppose its intentions by securing a majority of votes, may well give the majority a moral advantage, but will not prevent those seeking to take over by force ignoring electoral majorities and the like. Hitler came to power though he could not poll a majority of votes at the elections held in March 1933. Mussolini ignored the voting majority and "marched" to power. The Popular Front government in France in 1936 under the Socialist Blum, only delayed the assaults of the Right, and was in office for only a year. In Spain the victory of the Popular Front was only the signal to the alliance of Military- Church- and Landowners to redouble their plans to seize power irrespective of the votes of the majority. If the anarchist movement has a role to play in practical politics it is surely that of suggesting to, and persuading, as many people as possible that their freedom from the Hitlers, Francos and the rest, depends not on the right to vote or securing a majority of votes "for the candidate of one's choice", but on evolving new forms of political and social organisation which aim at the direct participation of the people, with the consequent weakening of the power, as well as of the social role, of government in the life of the community

When comrade Anderson tells us that in America, State and local government are more racist, more oppressive, more corrupt than the "highly centralised federal government", and that Goldwater supports the former against the latter (why then is he standing for the highest office in the federal government? To destroy its power from within? But if he is, then how could Goldwater pursue the aggressive, war-like foreign policy Anderson attributes to him) he sees a dilemma for anarchists because they believe in a decentralisation of power. It is true, but there would only be a dilemma if we ever suggested, or believed, to come nearer home, that Home Rule for Wales or Scotland, involving government, Parliament, police, judiciary and the rest would be any less oppressive than government in Westminster. We have never in fact fallen for the arguments of the Welsh and Scottish Nationalists, any more than for the Nationalist movements in India and Africa.

Individual freedom is only possible in a society in which no-one has the power or possibility to exploit his fellow men, and in which no able-bodied person is dependent on another for the right to work to live. The Goldwaters of this world are concerned with "individual freedom" to exploit one's fellow beings. But in this respect is he all that different from a Johnson, or a Kennedy, or a Truman? Anyway as to degree, governments are much more influenced by the pressures exerted on them than by the personal preferences, or background of those who compose them.

And this is a point which comrade Anderson overlooks in part. He recognises that Goldwater's nomination is not so much a popular trend (in fact he forecasts that "a crushing defeat . . . in November . . . seems likely"), as the success of one group of interests at the expense of another. (Incidentally why should anarchists find anything to choose between these and "the older Eastern economic establishment"?) But in this hour and age, government policy is necessarily the resultant of all the political and economic pressures that are powerful enough to influence policy one way or another. And obviously in the Western World at least, organised Labour as such is a power which no government can ignore. Government therefore is possible in such a situation only so long as the capitalist class and the working class each accept the existence of the other as a kind of "law of nature": accept the existing approach to production and distribution; and accept the administrative machine by which the life of the community is regulated.

As anarchists we seek to create a situation in which there can be no *modus vivendi* possible between exploiters and exploited, between the privileged and the non-privileged between employer and employee, where government as such can no longer maintain the balance of power. In other words we are not concerned with choosing between governments but of creating the situation where governments can no longer operate, because only then will we organise locally, regionally, nationally and internationally to satisfy real needs and common aspirations.

Mr. KRUSHCHEV lost his deposit, Mao was self-elected to a seat at the top table, one of President Johnson's best friends was too Platonic, and Mr. Grimond had power thrust upon him. . . .

PRESIDENT JOHNSON decided that he was even too busy to visit Dallas, Texas, which he had promised to do for the first time since his predecessor was assassinated. At Corpus Christi in Texas, Police investigating a reported plot to kill President Johnson discovered an armoury of weapons and Nazi souvenirs. The owner claimed he was merely in the gun-supplying business. One of the results of the Warren Commission report is to increase from 400 to 8,000 the Secret Service list of persons potentially dangerous to the President. In Reno, Nevada, President Johnson, according to the *Daily Telegraph*, had to coax people to come and shake his hand. On the other hand, it is reported that Norman Thomas, Robert Gilmore (Quaker director of Turn Towards Peace) and Bayard Rustin are giving critical support for Johnson with the slogan "Part of the way with LBJ"—this includes voting for him. . . .

DISCUSSING HECKLING in the late election the Reverend H. V. Little writes in the *Guardian* that organized heckling is the logical answer to the loud-speaker since the "tyranny of the multi-voiced" can only be replied to by amplification. Brian Behan is reported as saying, "Of course I haven't voted today. I think anyone who voted is immature. They are none of them worth it." . . .

AIR COMMODORE SIR FRANK WHITTLE called on electors in the Staffordshire constituency of Smethwick to vote on the issue of immigration to "show all the politicians how strong the feeling on the subject really is". He said the immigrants could be better served by assisting in the establishment of industries in their homelands. "We cannot afford immigrants of any colour unless they have exceptional ability. Many had failed to make the grade in their

AND in the meantime Comrade Anderson poses the question when he writes:

Now, on the assumption that local enlightenment is unlikely in the near future and that capitalism is far from dead, what is the anarchist to say of (e.g.) federal aid to housing, education and health insurance? In every social welfare law a further barrier to the growth of an anarchist consciousness, or is it possible to make discriminations? Is it possible for an anarchist to argue in the following fashion: As long as we have capitalism such and such laws are good—and such and such are bad.

We would reply that so long as we have capitalism and government the job of anarchists is to fight both, and at the same time encourage people to take what steps they can to run their own lives.

Without the money it raises by taxation from the people, the federal government could do nothing about housing, education and health insurance. In a sense "every social wel-



own country" and had been attracted by the benefits of the welfare state. Immigrants aggravated the housing shortage, the need for more school space, the cost of national health, and road congestion far in excess of anything they contributed to society. In the event of a national emergency, Sir Frank is reported as saying, these people would have "not much loyalty" to their adopted country. He went on to say that in 1950 he failed to convince Mr. Patrick Gordon Walker (then Secretary of State for Commonwealth Relations and last week the Labour candidate for Smethwick), that with every pair of hands there was an extra mouth to feed, and extra body to clothe and shelter, and, more often than not, extra children to feed, clothe and shelter. Mr. Patrick Gordon Walker, in answer to an election meeting question said that the present rate of immigration to Britain may be "too high". When a questioner asked what limit Labour aimed to place on the number of immigrants, he said, "Until we get into office I am not sure. The present Conservative administration of the Commonwealth Immigrants' Act may be letting too many people in at a time when social problems are being created." He repeated that a Labour Government would try to secure agreement with Commonwealth Countries to get an effective form of immigration

control. "We may or may not succeed. In the meantime we will keep the present kind of control." A heckler said that Mr. Walker had opposed the Immigration Act. Mr. Walker said that he had opposed certain measures (in the Act) proposed by the Government because their form was discriminatory. Mr. Patrick Gordon Walker was defeated by 1,774 votes. There were 13,000 abstentions from voting at Smethwick. Nevertheless Mr. Gordon Walker is to be Foreign Secretary in Mr. Wilson's new government, a seat will be found for him later, also one for Mr. Frank Cousins, seconded from the T.G.W.U. to be made the new Minister of Technology. . . .

NO POST or seat for Fenner Brockway who was defeated by eleven votes at Eton and Slough. There were 14,000 absent voters. The post of Minister of Housing and Local Government went to the substantial pundit Richard Crossman and not to the 'shadow' minister. Fulham's Michael Stewart who got the Secretaryship of Education and Science which, according to the *Sunday Telegraph* Mr. Crossman expected, Mr. Stewart was, notes the *Evening Standard*, "too philosophical to be jubilant in spite of his increased majority". His majority increased by 2,000 but 13,000 voters were missing on polling day. Perhaps Mr. Stewart was worried where they went. In any case the anti-Election campaign (Fulham division) asks the comrades to keep spare leaflets and posters, they may come in handy again soon. . . .

QUEEN FREDERIKA moved out of the Athens Royal palace. A prisoner was brought in to give evidence at the Royal Academy enquiry on how Challenor was framed. Five Greek-Cypriot actors declined to take part in an ABC Television play set among British troops in Cyprus. They decided it was "a matter of principle". . . .

A CAFETERIA in Ann Harbor, USA advertises "Courteous, Efficient, Self-Service".

JON QUIXOTE

soundness of this approach: to build up a hospital service or a transport system, for instance, from local needs into a national organisation, by agreement and consent at all levels is surely both more economical as well as efficient than one which is conceived at top level, firstly in the ledgers of the Treasury then in the Ministry departments concerned with the specific problems, where the Treasury, political and other pressures, not necessarily connected with what we would describe as *needs*, influence the shaping of policies.

But we must resist the temptation of going beyond our correspondent's "terms of reference"! What we have been saying at some length, Malatesta summarised in a sentence when he wrote [1924]: "Since no one can do everything in this world, one must choose one's own line of conduct."

The anarchist propagandist cannot at the same time attack government and point to the alternatives *and* be involved in the electoral struggle without either his propaganda suffering or his becoming a supporter of government. There are today in this country and the United States thousands of pressure groups representing as many interests and millions of supporters to ensure that no government pursues policies which have not the acquiescence of a section of the community which counts. But those reformists who expect . . . socialism from the Wilson government or the Russian or Chinese governments, are barking up the wrong tree. All they will get is more government. Socialism—no less than anarchism is society without privilege, but government cannot abolish privilege without creating privilege. Anarchists therefore reject *all* governments. But, we repeat, this does not mean we do not recognise that some governments or political leaders are worse than others. This awareness does not, however, distract us from our anarchist objectives because we think that if anarchists have anything to contribute to the future wellbeing of the community it is as anarchists, and for anarchism.

From 'Fings' to . . .

WHEN our small back page feature 'Fings' was introduced a few months ago, it was given that horribly 'twee' title because nobody at the editorial meeting could think up anything else on the spur of the moment. We are sorry to have lumbered our readers with it for so long (and been lumbered with it ourselves) and have now decided to change it.

The feature itself has, we think, proved its value in a modest way. FREEDOM has always existed as a means of contact between anarchists but hitherto strictly on a movement-functional basis, ignoring the fact that many of our readers have needs or have something to contribute outside of purely propaganda. In spite of some criticism, we think that, as long as we keep it within bounds, and don't let FREEDOM degenerate into a lonely hearts agony rag, this column will fulfil a useful function.

It does, of course, cost a little to insert each item, but we don't want to

make a charge since if we accept payment we can hardly pick and choose what goes in. Anyone who sent in his money and his ad would be entitled to have it printed. Since we don't want to sell our space for any old thing, and since we are forced to admit that the anarchist movement has a lunatic fringe, we prefer to retain the right of selection—for your own good, dear reader, as well as ours!

This we can do only if we continue to make Contact Column free; which we much prefer to do. But it does use up our space, and, we repeat, it does cost us something in time and money.

We should like, therefore, to draw the attention of those readers making use of Contact Column, as well as everything else, to the adjoining column—the Deficit Fund!

Insertion of items in this column is FREE, but readers whose items appear are invited to remember the Deficit Fund!

. . . Contact Column

Personal?

DEAR COMRADES, I suppose if one addresses a letter 'To the Editors of FREEDOM' and then proceeds to call them liars, one cannot be accused of being personal...

LETTERS

cence. This we should have ignored, I suppose? We should have presented to the Spanish police all information we could have laid our hands on...

Individualism

S. E. Parker lists in his article (FREEDOM, 19 Sept.) three ways of dealing with "individualists" which the rest of us use. Well, let me say straight away that I consider individualism to be incompatible with capitalism...

here I come to the crux of my disagreement with Parker—why does he, against all the evidence, assume that only a person committed to private ownership of property can be an individualist?

ANARCHIST FEDERATION OF BRITAIN

Co-ordinating Secretary: Tom Jackson, 10 Gilbert Place, London, W.C.1. London Anarchist Group "Lamb and Flag", Rost Street, Covent Garden, W.C.2...

Notting Hill Anarchist Group

Secretary N.H.A.G., 5 Colville Houses, London, W.11.

REGIONAL FEDERATIONS AND GROUPS

Birmingham Group Peter Neville, 12 South Grove, Erdington, Birmingham, 23. Bristol Federation Irregular meetings—enquiries to c/o Martin Howells, 7 Richmond Dale, Clifton, Bristol 8...

Apprentices

Continued from page 1 week. Full union negotiating rights for apprentices. The payment of full wages during sickness. Dave Stringer writes from Liverpool...

We can only offer our support and suggestions to apprentices, etc. By next month we hope Industrial Youth will have been taken over by the lads on the Oldham and Rochdale Apprentice Wages and Conditions Committee.

way, at least 10,000 strike leaflets will be circulated in Manchester alone before Nov. 2nd. It says that apprentice committees have been formed in Manchester, London, Merseyside, Tyne-side, Clydeside, Sheffield and Dundee...

Contact Column

Has anyone got a 'Guy Fawkes' election poster to loan or donate? Unused, without wall preferred. Contact Jack Robinson, Freedom Press. Books—for Americans only...

Oh Dear!

Table with financial statement for week 42, including expenses, income, and deficit.

Table with deficit fund details, listing contributions from various locations like Southend, New Malden, etc.

FREEDOM PRESS PUBLICATIONS

- SELECTIONS FROM 'FREEDOM' Vol 2 1952: Postscript to Posterity Vol 3 1953: Colonialism on Trial Vol 4 1954: Living on a Volcano...

OFF-CENTRE LONDON DISCUSSION MEETINGS 3rd Wednesday of each month at Jack Robinson and Mary Canipa's, 21, Rumbold Road, S.W.6 (off King's Road), 8 p.m.

Freedom weekly FREEDOM is published 40 times a year, on every Saturday except the first in each month. Anarchy monthly ANARCHY (2/3 or 30 cents post free), a 32-page journal of anarchist ideas...

PROPOSED GROUPS BRADFORD Anyone interested in Anarchist discussion group and folk-singing contact Sid Frisbee, 100 Bierley House Avenue, Bierley, Bradford. WATFORD-HERTS Anyone interested get in touch with Ian Roxborough, 44 Tanners Hill, Abbots Langley, Watford...