

V

the anarchist



E D I T O R S N O T E S

It was decided at the L.F.A. - L.A.G. Summer School this year to start this paper to act as a correspondence journal to discuss anything concerned with the theory and practice of Anarchism. One of its immediate aims was to be an open forum on everybody's views on a national federation, where ideas on organisation and policy were to be hammered out.

I agreed to edit this magazine on the understanding that I was going to receive articles from all the local federations and interested individuals, on their ideas of a national conference and a national federation. This was to have been the basis of the first issue and it was intended to carry on from there with an open discussion to keep things going.

It can be seen from the contents of this journal that I did not receive one article at all from any federation, and just for the record, neither did I receive any cash or even addresses requiring a copy of this paper, except from some of the London Federation who helped with cash, and in the end had to actually produce the paper for me. Other than that I did not get any help except from those people who contributed to the paper and those who wrote asking for a copy, and a few individual comrades who asked if they can help distribute it.

As far as the contents of this first issue goes, they may look a lot, but remember they are the total received since the beginning of August. If you don't like them, pick up your pens and do better. Or even do anything. Remember that I was to have no actual editing powers except for reasons of space, so I have not edited or cut a single article in the paper. If you don't like what it says remember it's your own paper and it only says what you write. No write, no Say. At any rate Comrades it's your paper, so as regards to what it says or does not say don't look at me.

I do however think it only right to apologise for delaying the actual production of this paper after I had the material to print. This is partly due to overestimating my own resources as regards production and partly due to being in a dilemma at certain stages whether to openly scream for the help which was so badly needed at that time.

Lastly, I would like to thank those people who did help, either by contributing articles and money, or by direct help with the printing, distribution and selling of this magazine. In particular I would like to thank Jack and Mary Stevenson, without whom this magazine would still be a pile of loose paper at the bottom of my draw, and also Ted Kavanagh, Peter Turner, who did the covers and Jeanne and Tony Smythe.

JOHN CHAMBERLAIN.

CORRESPONDENCE ON PROPOSED CONFERENCE ETC.

Dear Comrades,

May I start the ball rolling with a few comments on the purpose of this paper, on the coming conference, Federation et alia; and perhaps in doing so start a few hares. I suggest that the paper should be brought out at as near possible an economic figure, - this does not necessarily mean a very expensive figure, as charging too much would put off potential subscribers, but anyone who is interested in Inter-Anarchist discussion would presumably be ready to pay 6d to 8d, and the paper ought not to make a loss at that rate, and also ought to find for a start about 250 potential readers. I should say we should be able to find both material and market for the journal, as often as we are able to duplicate it, each issue to be about 6 - 8 pages with no frills about production. Debate should be made less bitter when each side does not feel that the other is making it harder to spread Anarchism, and the fact that the editorship is due to revolve should also help. (I for one will be less aggressive when I do not find editorials accusing me of holding views that I never held, and which the editorial writer was advancing not long before.) I think there is room for discussion as to whether an actual editorial is advisable. I originally thought not, but now I agree with Celia that a group editorial, not necessarily on a subject under debate, would be worthwhile, if only because such a statement must of necessity be a co-operative effort, and would therefore of itself represent a striving for unity amongst anarchists. Other than the availability of space, there would seem to be only one reason for rejecting material, it may be necessary to insist that participants in a debate should show at least some signs of having read the articles they attack.

We would probably find ourselves moving faster towards agreement if major issues could be broken down into more minute discussions of details. For instance the issue of violence or non-violence might be more readily resolved after a discussion of aspects of the problem. Those who believe in the barricades will no doubt for this end bear with the pacifists if they debate secrecy, writers on which normally assume openness with authorities to be either a principle or an inconvenience; actually generally speaking the best case for openness rests on expediency. (Pace, Will Warren who would argue that always secrecy degrades radicals to the level of the state and thereby in the last analysis plays the state's game.) While I am sure I shall not be the only pacifist who will be enthralled by a debate between rival insurrectionary strategists as to how nuclear weapons or the Bubonic plague germs can be harnessed to the self liberation of the masses. Indeed there would appear to be other exigencies of insurrection worthy of debate; I imagine few Anarchists in Britain would now approve

of the summary courts and martial law that the Makhnovists and Zapatists found necessary, or the secret police formed by the C.N.T., and still fewer would endorse Bakunin's call for a Dictatorship at the time of the Paris Commune (there is still a group in Holland - "The Spartackists" who reject Anarchism as authoritarian because of that event.) (Vide polemical letter to Socialisme ou Barbarie, Janvier Mars 1956 from Theo Massen.) Much would be solved by a thorough analysis of the nature of the warfare state; take for instance the Glasgow Statement. If they are right - and I believe they are - in saying that the state has now advanced to the point where the existing ruling class is an emanation of the state, rather than the state being the executive committee of that class, then they are wrong in still using the phrase "Monopoly Capitalism" to describe this State Capitalist or Managerialist system. If on the other hand some do not accept that the nature of the Ruling Class has changed, they might say how they analyse the Class nature of the Soviet and Chinese blocs, - or indeed of Fascist states, and whether they consider these to be workers' states albeit degenerate or deformed.

A problem of course is posed purely in having an internal forum for discussion; secrecy gives way to intrigue in such cases and so there are strong arguments against a secret internal paper. However a paper to discuss Anarchist Problems and to provide for a forum for washing dirty linen in private is not best completely open - another argument for not making it too cheap or subsidised other than by subscriptions. However obviously we would not want the paper flooded with articles from non-anarchists and there may be some time in the future an argument for accepting articles only from members of the anarchist federation in what ever form it will by then be. It is of course more than possible that not only would our propaganda papers improve, once unshackled from polemic, but that those Anarchists who at the moment see no reason to join a group or join in any Anarchist activities, will be brought in by such a paper, and that the large number of people who say they "believe in the aims of Anarchism, but -" will also be more readily converted by reading inter-Anarchist debate than by reading a propaganda sheet. At first of course the paper will be met by the fact that many Anarchist Individualists oppose the federation and with it the paper; this opposition may well be broken down if debate in the columns of "The Anarchist" can get away from the broad principles of Communist versus Individualist down to discussing how Individualists would fit into a predominantly Co-operative Commonwealth. It would also help too, to explore the differences between "Permanent Protesters" and advocates of "Individual evolution" to name but two varieties.

The Summer School showed that the conference too posed problems, those Individualists who favoured having a conference, having opposed the idea of mandating delegates; while

the facts of **transport necessitate** if there is to be anything like parity between the groups that there should be such. I would like to propose, either five delegates per group, or two and one extra for every twenty members; that as many observers as wish should be allowed to come, (not necessarily to all sessions,) but that only delegates should speak. Also that all Libertarian groups be asked to send observers; C of 100 definitely; Solidarity, The Bridge, Peace News, the I.L.P., Common Wealth, and Anarcho-Pacifist communities such as the Stableton one probably; and even possibly the S.P.G.B., and the S.L.P., the Marxist Humanists (News and Letters) and the Fellowship Party.

It would probably be as well to have some fairly definite proposals for the structure of the Federation we wish to see arise from the conference, and have rival set out in some issue of "The Anarchist". Wynford Hicks had wanted me to propose a Structure based on the Syndicalist type two way organisation, occupational groups linked on one plain, and local Federations joining in regional Federations on another. I had to say after putting it, that while desirable, I thought this now impractical, but definitely such a formation would be best from the point of view of Anarchist activity. However a loose Confederation appears to be all that is immediately possible, some hope is given by the talk of Ad-Hoc committees for special functions which was proposed as an alternative to federation, these could well be formed for things like Voters-Veto and the stay out of Spain campaign. It might be interesting to explore the possibility of Civil Disobedience to put teeth into these, and I believe the emphasis on the first should be on the inadequacy of the vote; spreading apathy is no gain, casting the whole vote is.

You (i.e. me, ed.) suggested at the Summer School that a series of pamphlets ought to be brought out aimed at specific groups such as the Y.C.L. or the Y.S. This I think should be pursued as soon as possible without waiting for the Conference. However a series of pamphlets if they are to be more than single sheet hand outs entails quite a lot of work in publishing. Still we might be able to copy the Solidarity layout perhaps using the electric stencil techniques that the Spanish ex-prisoners use, or the format of the West Indian "Defender." There is also the trouble with the Y.S. that most of them accept that the Labour Party is reactionary and are quite unmoved if given copies of "How Labour Governed"; - in fact Leeds Y.S. members sell it; - but still have this ridiculous idea they can work from within. It is worth noting that there is no pamphlet in existence that adequately **treats** the nature of the state - (would be useful for giving to various Revolutionary Marxist Groups.) The sooner we start such a series of pamphlets the better, which means the sooner we find the means to turn them out; an Anarchist Federation will most certainly need means to

publish its ideas and it is doubtful whether these exist at the moment.

Last of all, it might be worth having some discussion as to whether we see Anarchism coming in the foreseeable future. Obviously we should not fix the revolution for "next Tuesday" but if the Anarchist Utopia might not come until the year 2,000, is the race likely to survive that long?

LAURENS OTTER.

o-

U N D E R O N E F L A G !

Now is the time with a resurgence of interest in the Anarchist Movement to revalue some of our long cherished hopes in the light of the world as it exists today. Much will be found wanting and t'wer better consigned to the limbo of lost causes than hang a deadweight on the eager young activists coming forward.

Undoubtedly C.N.D. with its flirtation with Civil Disobedience has quickened interest in the magnitude of the social problems facing us. Disobedience is regarded quite logically by the Ruling Caste as Political Misdemeanour, and appropriately punished. THE CRY OF PROTEST LEAVES UNMOVED THE EDIFICE OF OUR SOCIAL STRUCTURE. In short, a negative tactic. It is becoming increasingly clear that to end the Incubus of Nuclear Destruction we must have the POWER TO DIRECT THE AFFAIRS OF THE NATION ENTIRELY. As Anarchists (of sorts) we absolutely discountenance the intentions or ability of the Political set-up in power or seeking power.

The poor man in his multitudes, herded in flimsy dwellings "en masse" can read his final destruction in the equivocal politics of his rulers.

It remains to find an answer to this deadlock.

IN THE FACE OF ETERNITY, IT IS SURELY TOP PRIORITY TO END ALL PETTY DIFFERENCES AND PRESENT A COMMON FRONT TO THE DESTROYERS. Whether you prefer Bakunin or Kropotkin, Proudhon or Caspar Schmidt, childish preferences should be put apart and an organisational medium adopted which can really rally the masses for the coming struggle.

A league of Anarchist bodies is not enough! Too often underneath exist the old enmities and prejudices. The situation demands we sink our silly ideologies in a

REALPOLITIC AND CHALLENGE OUR DESPOTS IN THE ONLY WAY TO BE EFFECTIVE: FROM AND THROUGH MASS EFFORT ORGANIZED ON THE FACTORY FLOOR AND BENCH.

The stress of world politics has clearly shown that of all the conflicting "isms" Syndicalism is the only one surviving form with enough DYNAMIC TO END AND THE POTENTIAL TO BUILD A BETTER, SANER WORLD.

Not the old conceptions of Syndicalism, with its precept and practice garnered through the struggles of fifty years ago, but the bang up to date method of immediate attention at the only place where all men get together, i.e. the seat of production. UNOFFICIAL? Yes of course, OUR WILL, not the fearful steps of petty satraps.

Surely here is a task to excite the ardour of youth, boundless youth, flocking to our banners. Through our single organisational medium can the words of the ancients come true: WORKERS! YOU HAVE A WORLD TO WIN, NOTHING BUT YOUR CHAINS TO LOSE!

D. PUDE.

XOXXOXOXXOXOXXOXOXXOXOXXOX

Dear Comrades,

Thinking of the Conference which is going to take place quite soon if it is going to be in January, made me wonder.

This bulletin was thought of at the Summer School. At the Summer School much enthusiasm was shown, but comrades must have thought this bulletin was going to write itself, judging from the amount of stuff that came in to fill it.

I have my own thoughts on the Conference and shall make them here.

Before I go any further, I should like to say, that I am not an individualist anarchist, though I see nothing wrong in being one.

I see the anarchist movement being made up of all shades of anarchist opinion. Each kind acting as a balance against the others.

I think that the Stirnerites who seem to be held in so much contempt, (even if it's jocular contempt) by the syndicalists are very necessary to the movement. I could see the Syndicalists becoming authoritarian if they were not held in check by those who are not willing to sink any part of their personalities for the sake of Solidarity.

So I do not want to see some Iron Juggernaut emerge from the Conference, run on purely syndicalist lines. I should like to see more co-ordination between various groups so that action can be taken **together** and also for the purpose of swapping speakers and anything else that might come up, such as the anti-election campaign.

I am of the belief that when the workers are ready for Syndicalism they won't come along to any movement of intellectuals for advice, but will take action themselves, not even bothering to look back at some paper organisation of people, most of whom are not and never will be in industry.

The movement should exist for propaganda: not for some big paper organisation that will flounder for lack of activity, or finish up bust, because somebody wants to do something that's very unimportant anyway, and someone else does not want him to.

The violence - nonviolence is getting like this. One side accusing the other of being violent (as if they beat up a dozen old ladies every day) and the other side making cracks like: In a revolution we could arm ourselves with rifles or pistols (or perhaps balloons on sticks) and overthrow the state by force.

So comrades, I would wait, wait and see if the people attending the Conference can sustain their enthusiasm for just one day, or even a week. Long enough to answer the letters that the co-ordinating secretary sends them for example, when he writes to ask them how they are getting on. It all costs money you know; for paper and stamps, and time too.

Hold back and think before you set up some big Syndicalist organisation at the Conference. Because I see no point in starting another paper movement like the old Rank and File Movement was.

JACK STEVENSON
(London Anarchist Group)

Dear Comrades,

Owing to lack of initiative and support from individuals and groups re the proposed conference to set up a Federation, perhaps one should rethink the situation.

A lot of people showed enthusiasm at the Summer School, when it was just a case of discussing the idea, but it is a different matter when one comes to do something. I am sure that if one of the groups organised a Conference, many people would attend; a great deal would be said; perhaps a Federation would be created; but would it work? Would it be a useful

machine on a sterile bureaucracy? Is a "Federation" necessary? or is it just a term that comes to mind; a hangover from the past?

At the moment we have a central co-ordinating secretary. Why have just one? Why shouldn't groups, whether divided geographically or ideologically, or both, have their own co-ordinators, each one in touch with all the others? This way groups could support or co-operate with each other, without the necessity of a rigidly defined common basis.

MARY STEVENSON

BILL CHRISTOPHER.

X-X-X-X-X-X-X-X-X-X-X-X-X-X-X-X-

S A C C O A N D V A N Z E T T I

Their voices were not loud enough
to convince,
On perhaps the accent was wrong,
Anyway, corruption and prejudice
Were loudest mouthed,
But did not have the last word:
That was Vanzettis,
After the cops harsh voices
and journalists shouts
had subsided,
And doors finally slammed on closed vans
and prison cells:
"That last moment belongs to us."
The agony was their triumph,
Their burning,
The flame of justice in spite of law.

RICHARD STOREY.

FINANCE

TO BRING OUT 120 COPIES OF THE "ANARCHIST" HAS SO FAR COST OVER
£5. WE CANNOT RUN OFF MORE COPIES UNTIL WE GET SOME CASH. PLEASE
SEND CONTRIBUTIONS TO J. STEVENSON, 6 STANTON ROAD, ENFIELD. MIDDX.
PRICE PER COPY 9d. (1/- INCLUDING POSTAGE)

THE TRUTH BEHIND THE CRISIS.

We are facing another crisis in the anarchist movement, but this is not only a political one, it is a personal one between the rival groups who are struggling for power. It centres around the Freedom Press Group, but without wishing to take sides I would like to draw a few rather wider conclusions that this dispute merely spotlights. Deeper knowledge and understanding of ourselves, our friends, our enemies, and the great mass of people whom we never meet can only be accompanied by a terrifying sense of disillusionment, as we realise the incompatibility of everything and everyone in the world around us. Yet we shrug it off and try to continue as if nothing was happening, not daring to admit to ourselves the unhappy truth of it. We go on as before, doing the same things, mouthing the same lies. Despite the semi-conscious feeling that our world is built on clay we feel also the need for commitment, and so take up the most convenient fight, any fight, to protect our sanity and keep us alive. We may secretly recognise the utopian nature of our pretensions, but outwardly we deny it emphatically, masking our inner doubts with apparent conviction. The great sham against which we protest has affected us too.

We, the self-confessed Anarchists, the vanguard of the new society, what sort of people are we? Are we more balanced honest, co-operative, peaceful than the other inhabitants of our capitalist/state-socialist societies? Are we less power mad? I can only conclude that the honest answer is no. We are still people, fighting one another in a tight complex of ambiguous words, hidden meanings, movements, looks, signs, expressions and intrigues that expose our unconscious desire for personal power and personal gain. There is no social behaviour which is not common to anarchists. Our morals are no better than the bosses; there's not much different about us (except for hair and beards maybe). We're human, we're out for private satisfaction too. It may not be as blatant as the obsessions of the rat-racers, but it's at least as real. Ultimately everyone seeks to satisfy his own needs, desires, feelings, and whether he can best do this by promoting the well-being and freedom of others is almost incidental. People only sacrifice immediate selfish pleasure because they reckon it will lead to other more satisfying ones; maybe a feeling of importance at "helping" the world along, maybe the hope of post-mortal reward. Perhaps all this doesn't matter, but when we refuse to admit it to our consciousness it becomes a dangerous deception. Anarchists are usually the first to see the hidden motives of personal gain in the most benevolent of politicians, but the last to admit it to themselves perhaps. I'm not trying to deplore the ultimate egoism of us all. Good and Bad don't make much sense in the face of Existence; but I

do question the wisdom of permanently pretending that we are right, we are good etc., when the evidence is that we are not.

We've kidded ourselves too long: the sympathy we feel for other people is only an extension of our sympathy for ourselves. When we feel outraged enough to protest at the execution of a comrade, or the oppression of the Spanish people, it is only an extension of the displeasure we feel when we are suffering personally. This is even admitted in phrases like "put yourself in the other person's shoes". For it is this exactly that we do. We feel sorry not for the other person, but for ourselves were we in his place. In other words he becomes a vehicle for our own self-pity; and here we come back to the crisis of which I spoke. If only we stopped deceiving ourselves as to the real nature of the present split we might lose a little of our self-righteousness, and come to some reasonable position. Furthermore, what light does the realisation spread on our demonstrations, publications, and discussions? True they give vent to our rage and flamboyance, which might otherwise be used in murdering our enemies and beating our friends, but is this adequate justification for the farce? Do any of these actually have the objective effect of helping promote life and minimise suffering, assuming that that is their stated object? It may be true that they do, but this sort of question is all important, since otherwise they have no value. One simply continues doing these things as long as one can stand it. But this raises the point that, most frequently, when disillusioned (in the literal sense) the will to continue propagandising and demonstrating fails. The combination of knowing that a) your demonstration is inspired by purely selfish motives, and b) people's apathy is almost, if not quite, invincible anyhow, is usually enough to inhibit any protest. How many Individualists turn out on demos?

Let's go deeper into the question of understanding people. Would it be physically possible to feel for anyone but ourselves in any meaningful way? Try to understand even your closest friends - every attempt, every judgement leaves out the final, ultimate, deepest element in the fantastic complex of mind and body that is a human being. Yet this last unknown element is the most important of all, and it is this which by the very separate nature of our physical existence is inaccessible. This separateness of existence creates the individual, and as no two can be identical, so no mind outside our own can ever be fully known and shared. The chaotic and barbarous world which exists today is a direct result of this inevitable mis-understanding, and not of the capitalist system. If we imagine that under Anarchism we could ever eliminate the strife, pain, cruelty, hate and conflict which exist now and have always existed, then we are guilty of carrying our self-deception even further.

All that we can ask of Anarchism is that it should provide a better vehicle by which to contain all these things than exists today, to curb their most blatant excesses, and to make life bearable. Conflict and all that it produces in the way of jealousy, greed, covetousness etc. are inevitable. Life only has meaning as a bundle of opposites. Our few moments of real joy which seem only to justify our continued existence are in a sense no more vital than our miseries. Ultimately all existence is necessary. What we must now ask is, given the immutability of human nature, can Anarchism hope for any more success than any of the other forms of society yet known? Or alternatively is our existence as a small band of permanent protesters justified in that it acts as a small but noticeable rein on Authority, which might otherwise go even farther than it does in oppressing common people? Furthermore, assuming that one of these reasons is true, is the Anarchist movement making any progress towards its stated aims and objectives? If we are not, which new way must we take to get there? Are we going any way at all in fact? If so I cannot see it.

To sum up then, there are two important points to be driven home. We must stop deceiving ourselves as to the altruistic nature of our crusades; Anarchism is only a search for a personal freedom and a personal self-justification; and we must give up the belief, held by so many anarchists, that one day "things will get better", and we will all live together in peace and co-operation based on mutual understanding, after a rather sudden change in people, which makes possible the downfall of capitalism/state socialism by a responsible non-violent revolution. The frightening truth of these revelations, which we at present deny or only half admit, must be dragged screaming from our unconsciousness and laid bare. Life has meaning only as a mixture of heaven and hell, and when we fully realise the deepest implications of this, when we dare to embrace absolute honesty, then perhaps we shall see more clearly whether life is worth living or not. And if it is, then we can perhaps build a new person within ourselves, and from that progress to a new society built on a foundation which is no longer a lie.

IAN VINE
(Bristol Federation)

W A R W I T H I N M A N

Erich Fromm has long been interested in the subject of freedom, and he gives us here perhaps his clearest and most forthright statement to date. "War Within Man" is one of an interesting series of pamphlets under the general title of "Beyond Deterrence". Fromm's paper is followed by comments from six other distinguished scholars. I shall confine my remarks, however, to the paper itself.

Fromm's main thesis is comparatively simple. As is well known, towards the end of his long enquiry into human motivation, Freud developed the theory that human nature embodies two fundamental and antagonistic drives, which he referred to as the instincts of life and of death. The former is seen in the tendency for living things, including humans, to preserve their own characteristics, both in the individual by fighting for survival, feeding, etc., and in the race by uniting with other individuals to create new life. The death instinct is manifest in destructive impulses directed either inwards or outwards, and is the expression of a tendency of all living matter to return to the inorganic state from which it originally arose. The life of every individual, in Freud's view, is a battle between the two drives, ending ultimately in victory for the death instinct. As he thus regarded aggression and destructiveness as absolutely fundamental to human nature, Freud was pessimistic about the chances of ending war. It is this that Fromm wishes to controvert, and he does so by proposing a modification of Freud's instinct theory. Fromm describes two types of character orientation, which he calls the necrophilous (death-loving) and the biophilous (life-loving). These are extremes on a continuum, between which all individuals fall. Necrophilia is characterised by the wish to kill, the worship of force, authority, and order, and love of sadistic cruelty. Biophilia, in contrast, is shown in the desire to create and help others create, in welcoming freedom, change, and all that enhances life. Apart from the extremes, represented by the insane and saints respectively, most individuals are a blend of the two. Thus far Fromm's view resembles Freud's. The essential difference is that he regards dominance of the necrophilous tendencies as pathological. That is, given conditions include: Being with people who love life; affection; freedom; economic security; justice; and the encouragement of creative self-activity. "Summing up, love for life will develop most in a society in which there is security in the sense that the basic conditions for a dignified life are not threatened, justice in the sense that nobody can be an end for the purpose of another, and freedom in the sense that each man has the possibility to be an active and responsible member of society. The last point is of particular importance."

This is clearly a view which will appeal to anarchists. Indeed, it appears to be very much what many anarchist writers have said, from Godwin onwards, although it is cast in analytical terminology, and stresses the emotional rather than the intellectual.

Two important questions are raised; First, is the possibility of an anarchist society dependent on a certain view of human nature being correct, and if so which; and second, what grounds are there for believing the view adopted.

It seems to me that a free society must depend on a spontaneous tendency in most individuals to cooperate with others and work for the common good. The best known counter-view is that of Stirner, that the unrestrained hostility of each individual will suffice to keep that of others in check. This seems to ignore the obvious plight of those too weak or ignorant to defend themselves from exploitation. Or again, it is sometimes argued that it is precisely because most people tend to exploit others if they can, that an authoritarian hierarchy must be avoided. But how is this to be done, if not by the non-authoritarian cooperation of the majority? Further, it seems that only if one holds the view that, given freedom, most people will develop in such a way as to enhance the freedom of others, can one avoid the conclusion that any society must somehow impose its ideals on its members. However admirable such ideals may be, and however they are imposed (e.g. by force of public opinion), I find this incompatible with my view of a free society. These arguments also apply if one regards human nature as very variable, whether the variation be due to environment or heredity.

Fromm is not concerned with the first question, but he offers an answer to the second. It is satisfactory to find an eminent scholar reaching, from a different direction, views similar to one's own. And a pamphlet such as this may influence some people in an anarchist direction. But we cannot fail to note the almost complete lack of acceptable proof. Proof, indeed, is confined to Fromm's own general and in particular clinical experience, and evidence of this sort is notoriously unreliable. Rather better evidence does exist; but Fromm does not give us it, and to do so here would be somewhat lengthy.

One further point may be made. If it is indeed the case that there is a fundamental life-loving, cooperative, creative, etc. basis to human nature, it seems unlikely that its full development could take less than many generations. It is for this reason that charges that anarchists are idealistic have some truth. History shows us that society can be changed only slowly. This is not to deny the great value of every practical step towards greater equality and liberty, in industrial, educational, social and any other fields. But it is also practical to realise that so far there has never been any lack of men and women to serve in the armed, or unarmed, forces of the state; that relatively few people seem capable of operating over long periods without falling back on some form of authority, in some aspect of their lives; and that even the most idealistic of revolutions have been invariably followed by a return to authoritarian government.

I have heard it said that: "The trouble with anarchists

is that they think everyone else is as nice as themselves". It would be truer to say they think that everyone is capable of acting for his own good, and of realising that this is, ultimately, the good of all.

J.K.R.

1. Fromm, Erich. "War within Man". American Friends Service, Philadelphia, 1963. 35 cents.

X-X-X-X-X-X-X-X-

L I F E A N D S O C I E T Y

(Prefatory Note:- The editor of "The Anarchist" suggested to me that I might like to write an article on the subject of "Living in a Capitalist Society as Individualists." Thinking about this, I decided that there was little point in writing anything myself on this question since the late E. Armand had dealt with it in his essay "Life and Society". This essay does not represent the views of all individualists, but it comes as near to my own viewpoint as makes little difference. By dealing with "society" rather than "capitalist society", Armand developed a more basic approach, since the main enemy of the individualist is archist society in all its forms, not just capitalist society. Indeed, to concern oneself with capitalism instead of archism is to fall into the socialist camp, not the anarchist one. Naturally, such a short essay cannot deal in any great detail with so complex a theme, but it does emphasise that there is an alternative to the usual acceptance of "society" as beneficial which finds its champions in the Bakunins and Kropotkins.

This version of "Life and Society" has been adapted from a translation by Jules Scarceiaux that first appeared in the American anarchist journal "Man!"

SIDNEY PARKER)

Individualist anarchists wish to live their own lives in spite of and even against society. To this, the main objection of some people is that, whether or not individualist anarchists wish it, they still remain an integral part of the group they repudiate and without which they could not exist.

Even as the judge, the businessman, and the prostitute, the individualist is not outside this environment, but plainly in the midst of it. He has the same joys, experiences and sufferings as do his neighbours. He consumes their production and produces for their consumption. He could not even do without other men's efforts, whereas they could easily do without his. Like everyone else he fulfils the functions that

preserve and perpetuate the species. In a word, nothing, as an individualist anarchist, makes him differ from his fellow-men.

Now, at first sight, it would appear difficult to contest the validity of such reasoning. But, with a little reflection, we realize that the argument attributes qualities to society that simply depend upon life: the latter is too much confounded with organized society. People fail to recognize the great power inherent in life itself. They ignore the fact that very complex living organisms exist wonderfully well without organized society, as man himself has done in the past.

Indeed, to breathe, move and reproduce, are phenomena which have nothing to do with the existence of organized groups. Nowadays, man does not conceive individual existence without social function. Still, in relation to life, society is merely an artificial appendage. Many forms of society have disappeared, but their disappearance has never stopped life, for it has persisted even when continents have sunken away.

It is axiomatic that, in order to grow and to develop himself, the fiercest individualist anarchist needed "society". He needed it at an age when his character had not yet affirmed itself and when he could neither reason nor draw up any kind of appreciation.

Later on - the cause does not matter - he became a negator of authority and exploitation. Yet, because he found himself face to face with a social contract based essentially upon authority and exploitation, does it follow that he is in any way a debtor to the organization that imposed it upon him?

Besides, what is this organization?

An agglomeration of facts and institutions having for its object the maintenance of the individual in constant subjection, and his detention in an enclosure of moral conventions and economic servitude.

True enough, members of society have sometimes intellectually, morally and economically revolted against it. Although individualist anarchists have (at least some of them) profited by what these ancestors or forerunners have accomplished or written, they are in no way indebted to them - for it is a fact that these pioneers found in their activity the only reward they were entitled to expect.

"Society", if we are not mistaken, means factories, jails, armories, workers' houses, brothels, drinking joints, gambling places, manufacturers of poison gases and big business.

"Society", no doubt, is the crowd that screams "Hurrah!" at the parade of the crippled from the last general slaughter; it is the long line of hungry men and women in front of employment exchanges; it is he who takes his hat off when the flag-bearer goes by and who goes to the circus only when it calls for a sensational and risky stunt.

And must the individualist anarchist render an account to such society?

Well, factories, big stores, monstrous guns, aeroplanes, churches, mansions, and all that civilization has produced for the development of the milieu of which we are a part, could disappear, yet nevertheless life would still continue.

The life which individualist anarchists want to live has no relation to the known social life. The individualist anarchist leads the existence imposed upon him by environment because he is compelled, forced, constrained. Just as the prisoner wishes the disappearance of his jailers, so does the individualist anarchist wish to see society sink, for it impedes him, narrows his horizon, encumbers his forward movement and renders him a perpetual slave. No matter what his actions are, in the last resort they always tend to shield him from the haughty arrogance of the social milieu, or tend to reduce the latter to pieces, which amounts to the same thing.

Unless he is a fool, the prosperity and future outcome of the "social life" do not bother the individualist anarchist - it is enough for him to feel and endure its restraint and tyranny. Life, and life alone, attracts him - to live "in freedom" strongly contrasts with the existence imposed upon him by economic, political and social conditions. It is life that interests him, that solicits, enlivens and lures him. The "natural" life, the one that ignores compromises, adulteration, glitter, deception, overcharged reputation, calculation and climbing in a word, all that characterizes social life, everything which perpetuates "society."

Between "society" and life, the individualist anarchist chooses life, wishing to live it in spite of all external pressures, and forever excluding the domination and exploitation of others.

E. ARMAND.

THE WORK OF WILHELM REICH

We know little of the early life of Wilhelm Reich, what we do know suggest that it was remarkable.

Of Jewish stock, he nevertheless had an unbiased and areligious education. He spoke German and his parents were citizens of the Austro-Hungarian Empire and lived near its capital Vienna. His father was a well-to-do farmer and Reich spent his early years in a background of rich experience and with the enlightened education of a private tutor. From the age of ten to eighteen he went to a high school.

After his father's death in 1914, Reich, then only at the age of seventeen, directed the farm himself, at the same time continuing his studies. In 1915 the property was destroyed by the war and Reich joined the army until 1918. Subsequently he entered the medical school at the University of Vienna, earning his living by tutoring fellow students. He obtained the degree of M.D. in 1922. From 1922 to 1924 Reich did post-graduate work in neurology and psychiatry and became first clinical assistant at Freud's psycho-analytical polyclinic in Vienna from its inception until 1928, deputy director until 1930, directing the teaching during all that time at this institution. From 1930-1933 Reich worked in Berlin, as lecturer at the psycho-analytic clinic, teaching and practising psycho-analysis also at various other institutions.

As a refugee from Nazism, he was welcomed into Norway. There he began his research into biophysics at Oslo University and lectured at its psychological institute. Reich went to the U.S.A. in 1939, continuing his research and teaching as associate Professor of Medical Psychology at the New School for Social Research, New York. He founded the Orgone Institute in 1942 and its research headquarters, and Reich's home, were for some thirteen years in 280 acres of beautiful countryside in the State of Maine. In 1949 the Wilhelm Reich Foundation was created by students and friends to secure the future of Reich's work.

FIRST DEVELOPMENTS FROM FREUD.

As Freud's student and co-worker, he felt the short-comings of psycho-analysis even in the early twenties. He reaffirmed Freud's original and revolutionary theory of sex energy, (libido) while most of his colleagues were trying hard to make Freud's theory respectable and socially acceptable. Extensive psycho-analytic work and information gained from many "normal" people whom Reich met in the course of Social work, showed him that in sexual intercourse, as normal in our society, hard mechanical hythms, and sadistic or masochistic thoughts and actions, tiredness, or even disgust, after the act, were usual. Reich reserved the term orgasm for tender passion, melting into the intense mutual surrender of a crescendo of waves of involuntary pelvic movements, and the subsequent feelings of serenity and well-being. All these Reich discovered, were criteria of healthy intercourse. Reich saw the rarity of this as a direct

result of the prohibition of pleasurable, and specially, activities in childhood and adolescence. Prolonged clinical observations led to the theory that the measure of the health of the patient could be judged by the capacity for orgasm. The release of energy (libido) was seen as physiological as well as psychological. This took Reich beyond psycho-analysis. At this many professionals took grave exception.

Resistance to analysis made the old methods ineffective. Reich saw these as protections against the guilty sensations of sex. A direct attack on the protections in analysis proved effective. The use of his "Character Analysis" led, at last, to an understanding of the masochistic character. To distinguish "secondary drives" from "primary" ones was a useful alternative to Freud's theory of the death instinct. Reich's method is still the only way to penetrate the tightly armoured character of the masochist. He noticed that anxiety used as defence went with tense muscles in the patient's body. He called this "muscular armour" bound up biological energy; mind and body aspects of one basic energy. This was the start of his method that makes the idea of the separation of mind and body invalid. This unifying concept led Reich to his method of "vegetotherapy". This technique made it possible to combine work on both mind and body at once, with massage and other means of relaxing tensions. This new method was better in that the emotion bound up in each muscle was released and pushed out with dramatic force. This helps the patient to feel more. This brings anxiety and awareness of deeper tensions; these too are treated in turn.

Reich called this "sex economy" or energy economy and made a deeper study of this energy.

A.S. Neill runs his school "Summerhill" in Leiston, Suffolk on the theory of self-regulation; that healthy people have a rational morality. When Reich and Neill met, they found their theories and practise similar and were friends for life.

Reich always considered the social application of his work. He was at first attracted to Marxism, but saw also the influence of the dictatorship structure of society. Direct contact with politics shows that man is not ruled by reason, but by emotion.

Our way of life moulded such people, and they in turn continue that pattern. Man deprived of his true nature lacks the power for freedom and will follow or lead, for irrational or ulterior motives: Reich called this the "emotional plague", an illness in the body of society. An illness that cannot be cured by moralists or by emotional appeals to pull one's self together; but only by doctors or psychologists, using the method of science. It is the rational approach to work; to affirmative attitude to love, that is the difference between a healthy

group and a neurotic one.

Malinowski's work in primitive tribes fits in well here. Organised religion Reich regarded as similar to organised politics, but the deep feeling of oneness with the world gained meaning in the discovery of the energy in man as well as outside it. Thus unlike those that call all religion neurotic, Reich made it possible to distinguish between the healthy feeling of oneness which one small energy system feels as part of the ocean, and the perverse symptom of striving towards this oneness, and show the characteristics of either pathetic neuroses or clearly life-denying emotional plague.

The importance of the orgasm as an involuntary release of energy led Reich to study it thoroughly. Research into the nervous system, reading and clinical observation led to the formula: Mechanical Tension - Energy charge - Energy discharge - Mechanical Relaxation. The nature of the charge was assumed to be bio-electric and showed that the opposites of anxiety and pleasure was natural fact and with measurable as charge or lack of charge of the human body. Emotions were seen to be feelings of this charge in the body.

This was found to apply to all living things even to unicellular animals.

In his search he studied decaying grass; finding that it decayed into microbic form; looking at every stage at its pulsating rhythms, its blue radiation etc. Low speed films were taken of it and contradicted orthodox theories. Were these protozoa from the air or from the decaying matter itself? Sterilisation and heating to incandescence showed that no external agent was possible. Heffad found the elementary energy of life, the transition stage from matter to energy.

The nature of this energy eluded Reich for a long time. Long years of experiments were necessary. Theories were evolved and broken before this energy which he called "orgone" was understood and was found to be a form of static electricity. It was found to be excited by voltaic electricity and radio activity. This and the simple means of concentrating the atmospheric orgone in an iron-lined box with sides of alternate layers of steel wool and rock or glass wool, with a material such as celstex soft board on the outside, made great progress possible in research. With this machine many experiments were possible. For example:

- 1) There is a temperature of 2-3 degrees in and above this orgone accumulator, varying with the weather, than as measured in the surrounding air.
- 2) The body temperature of persons inside rises; this in the coldest weather.

- 3) When the time has been allowed for the counter tube of a Geiger Muller Counter to soak up orgone, it reacts with a greater number of impulses per second than to very strong atomic radiations.
- 4) With gentle handling remarkable light, sound and spark effects can be drawn from lining things with an ordinary light bulb equal to the effects of many thousand volts of voltaic electricity.
- 5) The decisive experiment "XX" shows that protoplasmic matter can develop from concentrated free orgone energy. From this plasmatic bionous matter protozoa develop.

These experiments can of course be performed by anyone with the necessary apparatus. The above and many others open up a great field of research, as yet barely touched. The many forces found and used by Reichenbach, Mesmer, Lakhovsky and de la Warr, Eeman, Brunlan, Kilner, Abbot and others can all be better understood by this non-mystical and strictly scientific method.

??

RE - BIRTH

Reality from whence he came is far behind him,
 Crushed beneath cold concrete and stark steel.
 Un-man awaits
 The World of pure power which is not to be.

In the Westlands where the evil started,
 Some attempt to temper steel with truth,
 But in the Eastlands a harsh philosophy
 Bows a vast multitude before the false god.

Infinitely smaller than a man's hand,
 Yet looming more ominous with each passing day,
 Until the night of super-history
 And the peaceful, empty dawn.

o-

ANTI-WAR INTERNATIONALISM

A great deal has happened in the last two years. The more closely we are aware of the new ideas, actions and experiments in organisation the more we shall be able to develop our own rapidly growing contribution.

Last year, in common with others, we set out to build the anti-war International of direct action. It took us from the Red Square to Athens.

In conferences, summer schools and by the printed word direct actionists have taken the initiative in ideas - in ideas that lead to deeds. Internationally the stock of direct action and non-violence is high, magnificently underwritten by the march on Washington.

Yet the anti-war struggle is still just beginning.

We need to appreciate more clearly, I think, that we are setting ourselves a task that has defeated the whole of civilisation to date. We are concerned not just with ending war (as if that was not ambitious enough!) but with the positive replacement of war by a universal, creative, non-violent society.

We may well fail. Past precedents are consistently against us. It alarms me that people close their minds to the possibility of failure when recognising it, in fact, makes our case stronger. The obverse side of effective idealism is inscribed 'scepticism'.

Today the militarisation of the state is accelerating everywhere. The Moscow Test-Ban Treaty plainly does not mean a thing. Immediately after the treaty was signed the US Congress voted an extra hundred million dollars a year to maintain test preparedness! Article 4 will provide an easy get-out for all, as soon as the French tests take place in the Sahara.

The answer to war preparations by governments is peace preparation by us - against governments. If international opinion at grass roots level determines that there shall be no war then there will be no war, politicians and generals notwithstanding. If people will not fight war is 'off'.

But we have talked like this before - before 1914 and in the 'thirties'. Why should it be any different this time? The simple answer, it seems to me, is the Bomb. Not just its destructive power but the effect of that destructive power upon men's thinking.

On all previous occasions wars, at worst, could be muddled through. Win or lose most of us would survive somehow. The Bomb ends that estimate. Total nuclear war would not eliminate

man as a species but it would mean no survival or negligible survival at the various Bomb-receiving ends. That means us.

This is new, different. It makes people look at war itself - not only as a moral matter, but as matter necessitous, with or without morality. This may be crude ground for us to start from but it is the actual ground. We must start from the facts.

We, in the organised anti-war movement, claim higher motives. But we are not very numerous. I think our numbers will increase substantially but that of ourselves we shall always be too little and too late. Without the active support of tens of millions it is impossible to win against war. But the issue will be decided not by the anti-war movement as such but by people in general. And people in general do want to survive and are perfectly capable of doing something about it especially when they can recognise for themselves the idiocies of their militarised political leaders. It is this that gives us solid ground for believing that eventually mass action will be possible and effective.

Experience has added a new dimension to the anti-war movement. We have found that the issue of freedom is inseparable from that of peace.

This leads us into deep water - opposing the police-state-type restrictions imposed upon our friends in Greece and making this clear to Queen Frederika - demanding the freedom of independent organisation in the Communist countries - supporting the Nagas against Indian militarism - opposing Mao's new imperialism - supporting Cuban independence without falling for the Kremlin's duplicity - opposing Portuguese colonialism and contesting apartheid in Africa.

Sometimes people having used non-violent means and failed will determine to fight to be free. Where then do we stand, we who subscribe to non-violence? If we also subscribe to freedom the answer is not so difficult. There is a formula.

Non-violence is a principle that can and must govern relations between established nation-states but where previous historical conditions obtain, i.e. those of absolutism or colonialism, people who feel driven to arms are to be supported by non-violent direct actionists and the violence minimised by the strength of that support. This is not to compromise principles because principles are essentially statements about freedom and the historical process.

But to return to the questions of war and peace. Frankly my own opinion is that we cannot avoid World War III. I take the point that is commonplace in America, namely that World War III has already broken out. (Did the second world war break out in 1933 or 1939?)

We are not up against war in the abstract or war in the future but actual war - now. It is piecemeal and peripheral and building up all the time. At present the organised killing is more or less limited to South-East Asia. The killing curve undulates but never collapses.

I see local wars coming on the Chinese borders with India, Burma and the Soviet Union, in Nagaland, in Cuba and Latin America, in South and Central Africa - and in Germany. We have had about twenty wars since 1945 and there are plenty more to come. These are liable to increase in frequency and worsen in intensity. The new forms of warfare are emerging - first it was napalm, now it is the chemical destruction of crops in Viet Nam. The future belongs to VTOL, the hover-tank, Transport Command and psycho-chemical warfare. Why should we assume that there will be a tidy line drawn between these wars and what future historians will call World War III. There will be no such line. W.W.III is on now.

These new-look conventional wars may or may not escalate into nuclear war. They have not done so so far and my guess is that they won't. But the possibility always remains. I am appalled by campaigners who will get all worked up about an imaginary nuclear war that might never happen and are quite indifferent to real slaughter going on all round them!

We face death by a thousand wars. If we do not defeat those wars we shall face the Bomb. We have therefore to get at war at every level and at every place. We have to cure the causes of war, openly disrupt preparations for war and really stop wars that have actually broken out. We have to do this in every country on earth simultaneously and with such maximum strength as the uneven development of the anti-war movement will permit.

I may seem to be a long way from the problems of organisation which is what this article is really about! But it was necessary to try to go over this ground because the problem of means, i.e. organisation, arises out of the nature of ends.

Since it is true that what we are setting out to do is quite unprecedented it must follow that our thinking has to be equally without precedent. No previous society has faced anything like our danger or our opportunity.

If the answer to war is mass, non-violent, international insurrection leading to the overthrow of all war-making governments then the organisation to make that possible has to be created and built up.

We inherit a number of Internationals. 'We' in this context means radical opinion engaged in the anti-war struggle. They are ILCOP, the WRI, the IFOR, the Quakers and the 'Oxford' International Confederation. Besides these there are countless professional industrial and commercial international organisations

that have some real interest in peace. Finally there are innumerable individuals with personal links abroad, and this, the great unorganised International is perhaps the most important of all as a present foundation of enormous potential power for the future.

At the study conference at Charbonniere someone (I think from France or Germany) said "The WRI is not an international organisation, but a series of national organisations with an international secretariat." Whether this is true or not it helps to raise the key question - "What is an international organisation?" We must answer this.

An international organisation, it seems to me, is one in which the whole membership acts and thinks internationally - individually. In practice this means that the members in one country will regard the problems of another country as as much their personal responsibility as their own domestic matters. And as far as circumstances allow they will go to other countries to act with their friends there in total disregard of political frontiers. In the past there has been no such organisation. We are now in the process of creating it. The SCI, with its work-camps, meets much of the definition but it does not regard itself as being explicitly part of the anti-war struggle as such.

We have had a lot of experience since, say, the San Francisco to Moscow Walk - the Red Square, Everyman III, Dusseldorf, Athens, Amsterdam, Oxford - these are just some of the main headings so far.

We are now surely in a position, speaking from experience, to be more specific about the next stage in the development of the direct action anti-war International.

It is not and will not be a formal thing as past Internationals (especially the dead political ones: 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th) have been. Its central secretariat, if it has one at all, will never be particularly important.

The International will first and foremost be a live relationship between people of different countries (ultimately all people of all countries) made real by a large and increasing number of individuals and groups being continually in touch with one another over matters of war and peace. It will be produced by and will itself produce international thinking at a highly critical level and in total disregard of national political frontiers.

(This does not require any diminution of national cultures. On the contrary we need to disseminate the great attributes of these vast national assets more effectively throughout the

world - the American sense of scale, English toleration, German efficiency, Japanese militancy, French and Italian arts of living, Buddhist calm But it is invidious to start listing. What of the Russians? Perhaps their laughter and their tears.)

The International begins from a decentralised position i.e. the coming together of established national organisations. The international conference develops thinking and can make recommendations but decision about action has always to stem from conviction on the ground. The task of the International is therefore to help to infuse all the national organisations with a real internationalism that will be indestructible in face of the greatest of tests - war between their respective governments. This cannot be done by paper resolutions from 'the top' but only by proposals for action that are good in themselves and executed by ordinary mortals in significant numbers. And viable proposals for action will only result from a continual and thorough study of the international situation.

Decentralisation that leads to isolation and powerlessness defeats its own purpose. That purpose is to make sure that power remains in the hands of the people and never gets into the hands of 'leaders'. Decentralisation calls for quite new qualities of intercommunication and a built-in series of decision-making agencies and interlocking functions. These have to be devised to ensure flexibility, a quick reaction rate and the conditions of easy internal self-development.

The impending French nuclear tests will test and try our fledgling International. Today, as I write this, I know that our French friends in Action Civique Non Violente are meeting in Lyons to decide what to do and that people from Britain, Germany and elsewhere are present and taking part in the discussion.

Internationally it is self-evident that we shall next be engaged in defining policies and devising actions to synchronise with those of Action Civique and others in France, and, we hope, North Africa. This month, too, an important conference will take place in Japan (called by Zengakuren) and we have already asked them what they think they might do about the Tahiti test prospect with a view to our concerting world-wide action in their support.

As with the French tests so with every other problem we face. The form of the organisation will arise gradually out of the war problem and what we do about it. If one particular problem disappears the organisation for that problem should disappear with it. The experience will remain - to be built into the organisation designed for the requirements of the next problem. Continuity and development will be maintained by the continuity of people - not of office.

Good intentions are never good enough. The problem of power has wrecked or made life very difficult for all preceding organisations. We have to understand the problem and solve it at the beginning, here and now, as we stand on the ground floor of the as yet unbuilt International of direct action. Later will be too late.

I am not proposing a scrappy ad hoc organisation. I am tempted to call it a proposal for international social cybernetics but that is not quite human enough. It is people, relationships and ideas that count as they are manifest in deeds. Too many good men have allowed themselves in the past to be hypnotised by the problems of structure. That spell we have to break.

At Committee of 100 demonstrations in Britain we have learnt that we are able to think quicker and act faster (if we so wish) than police and troops. This is partly because we do not work through a hierarchical command structure, as police and troops do, and have devised rudimentary means of reacting more quickly than they can to changing circumstances. This same principle, it seems to me, applies to international organisation. My thesis therefore is that the new International is basically in the mind, in communications, in particular functions and above all in deeds. I use the present tense because my concern here is first and foremost to discover a fact about ourselves internationally and then to suggest to others that they consider whether it is a fact and if so how we should build on it.

PETER CADOGAN.

-o-

Dear Editors,

During the long debate in 'Freedom' on the anarchist attitude to violence those comrades who maintained that they would be prepared to use violence put forward the following argument. They stated that as an anarchist movement develops, a point will be reached when the State, having failed to suppress it by legal or semi-legal means (ridicule, intimidation, smear campaigns, arrest of leading militants, suppression of propaganda organs) will resort to brute force to smash the movement. And if it is found that violent resistance is the only practicable defence against the State onslaught then they would support such 'defensive violence'.

Their position is unrealistic for the following two reasons:-
 Firstly they seem to think that an anarchist movement which knows it will be attacked when it develops beyond a certain stage is going to remain passive until the State strikes the first blow. Or perhaps their definition of 'defensive violence' permits the anarchists to strike the first blow when a clash is anticipated. Whichever it is they know full well that people willing to use violence in the long run will use it in the short run as well, use it in fact long before a full-scale clash