

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

Vol. 20, No. 10

March 7th, 1959

Threepence

NOW NYASALAND

NCE, the violent disturbances in Nyasaland which started a fortnight ago stem directly from the act of federating the States of Central Rhodesia with the ban on the Labour M.P., John Stonehouse, who was to have visited Nyasaland as part of his week tour of the Federation as part of the African National Congress, can only confirm their worse. For the ban was imposed not on the governor of Nyasaland but on the Federal Government of Rhodesia and Nyasaland. As we go to the debate on the ban we can only surmise that the government will attempt to appease the Labour opposition as far as possible without, however, antagonising the much more vocal and powerful "colons" in Salisbury (Southern Rhodesia). The government has already made it clear that it has no power to interfere in the decisions of the Federal Government even though it recognises that both Nyasaland and N. Rhodesia are protectorates and therefore the direct responsibility of the Colonial Office. What the politically conscious Nyasalanders fear is that the Constitutional changes scheduled to take place next year may simply mean that control of their country will pass from the Colonial Office in London to the Southern Rhodesian Government. In their view the former is the lesser of the two evils! Which is much less a compliment to the Colonial Office than a reflection on what Commonwealth status means in a predominantly African territory governed by a local white minority. For in Nyasaland Africans outnumber the whites by 1,000 to 1, in Northern Rhodesia by 70 to 1 and in Southern Rhodesia by 20 to 1. Of the 117,000 Europeans in the countries (according to the 1946 census) 82,400 lived in Southern Rhodesia and only 2,500 in Nyasaland and one can easily imagine that in the event of an amalgamation of these three territories Southern Rhodesia will lay down the law for the other two even though the African population of Nyasaland was (in

1946) larger than that of either Northern or Southern Rhodesia!

How the governments of the Federation and of Southern Rhodesia have acted in the past fortnight both in connection with the Nyasaland demonstrations and the strike of workers on the Kariba dam project can hardly reassure the Nyasalanders to the benefits to be derived from commonwealth status under Sir Roy Welensky's or Sir Edgar Whitehead's régimes.

★

THE stoppage at Kariba followed an accident in which fourteen Africans and three Europeans fell down a 200 ft. shaft and were killed. The 6,600 strikers, the entire labour force on the project, demanded that their rates of pay should be increased from the present *fourpence an hour* to one shilling. A spokesman for the principal contractors at Kariba, the Italian firm of "Impresit", declared that an offer of an extra 2d. to underground workers—which would have raised their pay to 6d. an hour had been refused. The Southern Rhodesian government soon solved the problem by flying in troops to the dam. Work has now been resumed and a "hard core" of 200 strikers have been paid off.

Troops were also flown from Salisbury to Nyasaland on orders of the Federal Government after consultation with the Southern Rhodesian Government. Whether they will succeed in retaking the Northern Province, most of which has been abandoned by the police and security force, without considerably larger forces is doubtful. Correspondents report that though the situation was "contained" the Territorial Government was by no means confident of its ability to handle possible future developments.

★

A MAJOR thorn in the sides of the local white politicians and settlers is the rapid growth during the past months of political awareness among Nyasaland's three million Africans under the leadership of Dr. Hastings K. Banda who claimed, in an interview last week, that the Rhodesian and Nyasaland Governments had forced the "showdown" on African politicians in response to demands from white settlers. The official view is that Dr. Banda's African National Congress hopes by the use of violence

initially in Nyasaland but later elsewhere, to force the hand of the British Government in the Nyasaland constitutional dispute, and in the larger issue of whether the Federation should continue in existence after 1960.

SPRING'S IN THE AIR!

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT!

Deficit on Freedom	£180
Contributions received	£240
SURPLUS	£60

February 20 to February 26

Didcot: J.W.B. 1/-	London: J.O.H. 9/9;
London: E.P. 1/0/0;	Detroit: J.C. 14/;
London: J.S.* 3/;	London: Men Group,
per A.U. 13/1/2;	St. Louis: R.L.M. 14/;
Hitchin: L.A. 1/1/0;	San Francisco:
R.J.LaC. 14/;	London: M.W. 11/0/0;
Wolverhampton: J.G. 1* 2/;	Los Angeles:
Men. Group: per A.P. 15/5/0;	Sutton:
S.A.D. 1/-	London: J.S. 7/0.
Previously acknowledged	225 7 7
Total	15 4 7

1959 TOTAL TO DATE £240 12 2

*Indicates regular contributor.

Mutual Aid

A hundred men who have voluntarily agreed to a weekly deduction from their wages as a gift to old-age pensioners, sent off their first cheque last night for £12.

They are West Indians, Irish, Scots, Polish, Ukrainians, Hungarians and Yorkshiremen working on cooling towers at High Marnham power station, near Newark, Nottingham.

Mexborough, from which area about 20 of the men come, was chosen to receive the first remittance. After that, contributions may be switched to other towns, such as Sheffield and Nottingham.

Authors of the scheme are the general foreman, Mr. J. Clennishaw, the concrete ganger Mr. D. Salmons and Mr. I. Lee.

They hope to persuade all Mexborough workers to join in until every one of the 4,000 pensioners in the town receives an extra 10s. a week.

Said Mrs. Doria Leach, chairman and founder of the Mexborough old people's welfare committee: "We think it is a wonderful gesture. We shall put the money into a reserve fund and the donors will be consulted before we spend it."

Site agent Mr. J. T. Matthews explained that the men have signed authorities to deduct 1s to 4s a week for the pensioners while the job lasts.

"Most of them are young men with wives and families, and they are drawing between £13 and £15 a week. They say they want to prove the younger generation has a heart."

(News Chronicle)

THE CYPRUS SOLUTION NO CREDIT TO THE BRITISH

THE 'solution' of the Cyprus independence problem seems to have arrived with a whimper, not with a bang. Nobody seems quite sure just how delighted to be, but one thing is certain: nobody is going to give any credit whatsoever to the British Government. And rightly so. For five years the stupid and brutal unyielding attitude of the British has fostered hatred and dissension in the island and between Greece and Turkey. Now that a solution has been arranged it is through the offices of these two small, traditionally hostile, countries and not through any effort,

or even goodwill, on the part of the British. Indeed, even though the Government has 'yielded', the back-bench Blimps are still growling about a 'sell-out'.

In fact the British Government is now made to look pretty silly, and the familiar pattern of the 'terrorists', the exiled and the jailed returning as heroes to their people is once again being presented. Makarios, from exile, Grivas from the hills, are returning home to the acclamation of the Greek Cypriots.

The British seem never to learn. With the example of Gandbi and Nehru in India, Nkrumah in Ghana and many others, they still do not yield gracefully and early to popular demand so that goodwill can be maintained. Goodwill does not matter presumably, as long as they have power. But eventually they may have neither.

But, after all, neither do the colonial people learn. With the example of the Indian Government and, more glaringly, of Nkrumah, the frying-pan-into-the-fire nature of the change to native government has been adequately demonstrated, as has the 'Workers' Government' myth in the Communist countries.

When will people realise that if they can organise themselves to oust a foreign government they could also find the strength among themselves to run their own affairs as free men? When will they realise that they don't need governments at all?



'... and with a bit of luck the British will stay to protect us from Communism, EOKA, the Church AND the new Government!'

MAC IN MOSCOW Government by Gimmick

IF we are to judge from the newspaper reports (and what else are we to do, since FREEDOM did not have a correspondent with Mac in Moscow?), the most successful feature of our Prime Minister's visit to Russia was his white sheepskin hat.

The high standard of sartorial elegance for British statesmen was of course set by Anthony Eden ('The best-dressed man of 1935'). The Eden homburg hat became internationally famous, its jaunty angle creating panic among Britain's enemies at Geneva and other popular resorts, and ousted the bowler and the topper as the proper tifier for Top People and carpet-baggers alike.

This good work was carried on by Winston Churchill, who had already established one symbol for himself with his cigar. Psychologists, of course, will have one sort of interpretation for that rather phallic-looking object, but at its simplest level it stands for success, prosperity, confidence—in a word, the *British* way of life.

But Winston was not content with that. Nor was he content with one kind of hat. From a peculiar flat-topped hybrid between a topper and a bowler to a broad-brimmed Stetson, Winston had a hat for every occasion and every facet of his sparkling personality. Compared with this, the Labour politicians have been a dull lot. Poor things, they have, we suppose, been so concerned to establish their *respectability* that they have carefully shunned any indication of eccentricity. Even Nye

Bevan can think of nothing more original with which to clothe himself than an H-Bomb.

A Personality Wanted

But now we have Supermac! For reasons which are becoming increasingly apparent, it has been considered necessary to build up the personality of our Prime Minister, whose appointment as our Leader by Lord Salisbury took everyone by surprise two years ago. Thanks to the activities of the Press, aided, it is said by the services of an advertising agency (after all, if you're selling detergents or Prime Ministers—what's the difference?*) and the doubtful advantage of the vociferous adulation and embarrassing support of Mr. Randolph Churchill (with his eye on that seat at Bourne-mouth), Mr. Harold Macmillan has been built up as a lovable and able personality.

Like any good conjuring trick, it is not easy to see just how this has been done. Mac is a smooth operator, that's for sure, but his television appearances—allegedly the source of his popularity—have certainly not shown him to be a personality to whom one could warm easily. It has all revolved around a series of tricks. First he created the impression of integrity, of honesty. Not for him the shabby business of courting popularity by giving the people what they wanted. Oh no, Mac showed from the start that he was going to be a firm father, doing what

*Only that one washes white and the other whitewashes.

Continued on p. 4

Individualist Anarchism as Life and Activity

[At a time when not a few anarchists are questioning the belief that revolution en masse is the means of realizing freedom, it is particularly appropriate that we consider the contribution of individualist anarchism. Whatever disagreements one may have with the philosophical assumptions of certain individualists (e.g. that all human actions are prompted by egoism) there can be no doubt that the individualist emphasis on the here-and-now has much more relevance to the present epoch of 'admass' than the "on the morrow of the revolution" attitude of many of our predecessors and of some of our contemporaries. The following essay, by a well-known French exponent of individualist anarchism, is a useful outline of individualism as it has developed in Europe. Its author, E. Armand, is now approaching 87 years of age and is still active.—S.E.P.]

I

TO say that the anarchist movement embraces several tendencies is not to put forward anything new; it would be surprising if it were otherwise. Non-political, outside parties, this movement owes its existence solely to the individual personalities of which it is composed. Since there is no *a priori* anarchist programme, since there are only anarchists, it follows that each one of those who call themselves anarchists has his own conception of anarchism. Persecutions, difficulties and conflicts of all kinds demand that whoever professes anarchism should be possessed of a mentality which is out of the ordinary. He must also reflect, and be in a state of continual reaction to, a society composed of people who, on the contrary, do not reflect and are inclined to accept ready-made doctrines which make no demands on the intellect. To ask that all anarchists should have similar views on anarchism is to ask the impossible. Hence a wealth of diverging conceptions are to be found among them.

As the word 'anarchy' etymologically signifies the negation of governmental authority, the absence of governmental authority, the absence of government, it follows that one indissoluble bond unites the anarchists. This is antagonism to all situations governed by imposition, constraint, violence, governmental oppression, whether they are the product of all, of a group or of one person. In short, whoever denies that the intervention of

government is necessary for human relationships is an anarchist.

But this definition would have only a negative value did it not possess, as a practical complement, a conscious attempt to live outside this servility and domination which are incompatible with the anarchist conception. An anarchist, therefore, is an individual who, whether he has been brought to it by a process of reasoning or by sentiment, lives to the greatest possible extent in a state of legitimate defence against authoritarian encroachment. From this it follows that individualist anarchism is not merely a philosophical doctrine—it is a life, an attitude, an individual way of life.

The anarchist individualist is not simply converted intellectually to ideas which will be realised one of these days, or in a few hundred years. He tries now—for the present is the only time which matters for him—to practise his convictions in everyday life, and his relations with his comrades and in his contact with his fellow men who do not share his ideas.

All healthy organisms have a characteristic tendency to reproduce themselves. Organisms which are sick, or in a process of degeneration, have no such tendency—and this applies to the mind as well as to the body. So the anarchist individualist tends to reproduce himself, to perpetuate his spirit in other individuals who will share his views and who will make it possible for a state of affairs to be established from which authoritarianism will have been banished. It is this desire, this will, not only to live, but also to reproduce the species, which we shall call "activity".

This consideration will explain our title: "Anarchist Individualism as Life and Activity". Tending to live his own individual life, at the risk of clashing intellectually, morally, and economically, with his environment, the anarchist individualist at the same time tries to create in this same environment, by means of selection, persons who, like himself, are free from the prejudices of authority, in order that the greatest possible number of men may, at the present time, live their own individual lives, they themselves in turn uniting through per-

sonal affinities to practise their convictions as far as is possible.

The anarchist individualist does not live in intellectual isolation. As individuals who share his ideas increase in number, so will his chances improve of seeing his aspirations realised, and as a result he will be happier. As individuals of his kind increase, so will the power of environment over his own life diminish. The wider his propaganda spreads and the more his activity increases, the more will his life be intensified.

His relations with his companions are based on comradeship, on mutual aid. He practises mutual aid in his species. A conscious individual, he seeks to create and select others. From being determined by society, he tends to become self-determining, to live his own life fully, to be active in the normal sense of the word. That is my idea of the anarchist individualist.

II

IN the first place, then, the anarchist is an individual who negates; anarchism is an individualist concept and a product of individuals. The anarchist is naturally an individualist.

The legalists base society upon law. In the eyes of the law those who constitute society are no more than cyphers. Whether the law proceeds from one man alone (autocracy), or from several (oligarchy), or from the majority of the members of a society (democracy), the citizen must suppress even his most rightful aspirations before it. The legalists maintain that if the individual subjects himself to the law, which allegedly emanates from society, it is in the interests of society and in his own interest since he is a member of society.

Indeed, society, as we know it, can be summarized as follows: The ruling classes, through the intermediary of the State, ensure that only their own views on culture, morality and economic conditions, are allowed to penetrate to the masses. They set up their own view in the form of civil dogmas, which no man may violate under pain of punishment, just as in former times, during the reign of the Church, there were several penalties for daring to challenge religious

dogmas. The State—the laic form of the church—has replaced the Church—which was the religious form of the State—but the aim of both has always been to mould, not free men, but true believers or perfect citizens. In other words, slaves to dogma or law.

The anarchist replies that when solidarity is imposed from without it is worthless; that when a contract is enforced there is no longer any question of rights or duties—that coercion releases him from the bonds which attach him to so-called society whose executives he knows only in the guise of administrators, law-givers, judges and policemen; that he submits only to the solidarity of his everyday relationships. Fictitious and imposed solidarity is worthless solidarity.

The socialists base society upon economics. According to them the whole of life resolves itself into a question of production and consumption. Once you solve this problem you will automatically solve the human problem, with its complexity of intellectual and moral experiences. The individual may be conscious, he may be the greatest drunkard or the worst of comrades, but he is only

of interest when considered as a producer or consumer. The call goes to all—to those who think and to those who do not. All have a right to the result of effort without needing to attempt the effort. It is necessary only to unite and to grasp the power which will permit the seizure of society and as soon as society has been seized, collectivism will be established and its function, whether by agreement or force, since any recalcitrants will be compelled to obey.

Socialism has been called the 'religion of economics' and it is certain that socialist metaphysics exists. This doctrine teaches that all the products of human activity are governed by economics. This is by no means difficult to grasp and within the ability of every mentalist. From the moment of its triumph socialism, in all its various shades, demands of its adherent that he be a good producer and a no less good consumer, putting his trust with regard to the organization of production and consumption in the wisdom of delegates, elected or imposed. Socialism is not concerned with making him an individual—it will make him an official.

Continued on p.

CINEMA

Ou Est La Grisbi De Ma Tante Rifi

NOTHING fails like success. Ever since the French carved their niche in crime films we have had a plethora of "B" (or even C with a cedilla) films which have opened with Jean Gabin ordering a *bistro* in the local *Pernod* (or is it the other way round?) and with a succession of droops of the eyelid and mutterings in a French we never encountered in Hugo Berlitz, we are on to the plot to raid a leather depository. Sometimes I feel like the American critic who pleaded for the 'goodies' and 'baddies' to wear football jerseys with numbers so that we should know who's who. In this French film, and increasingly so in American films, it is easy to tell; the criminals are more civilized and less violent.

"Raffles sur la Ville" at the Curzon

according to its 'blurb' is actually described as a raid on a leather depository. In the film it develops as a raid on a warehouse. I am convinced that the writers of 'blurbs' see a different film. A whole incident is described which does not appear in the film.

Charles Vanel appears in this film after his magnificent performance in "The Wages of Fear", this is a come-down indeed. Mouloudji appears as the pimp, he too has seen better days in "Are We All Murderers?" for example.

We have seen police corruption examined more sensitively in Wyle's "Detective Story", and it doesn't help our French any to have "Raffles sur la Ville" translated as "Trap for a Killer".

J.R.

The Anarchists: A Non-Conformist Sect—2

(Continued from previous issue)

NON-CONFORMISM has always been an economic asset at all economic levels. Dealing with a Non-conformist business associate, or employer or employee, one is assured of a certain standard of business morality in the capitalist sense, even though one expects hard bargains to be driven. Again, Non-conformist sects have traditionally provided mutual-aid societies for their own brethren.

Non-conformists have traditionally been against drunkenness, riotous living and sexual laxity. They have hated to see the indiscriminate waste of material resources by the rich, and the wallowing in gin which the 19th century poor used to escape from the wretchedness of their lot. To the Non-conformist a man should not seek to escape from facing his lot by drugging himself with gin or religious ritual. A man should face his destiny squarely and struggle to win through. The old hymn,

"Dare to be a Daniel
Dare to stand alone
Dare to have a purpose firm
And dare to make it known"

expresses the Non-conformist attitude very well. This hymn is actually quoted at the beginning of *The French Cook's Syndicate*, a pamphlet by that old anarcho-syndicalist McCartney, which Freedom Press published in 1945. I remember the old man coming to anarchist meetings, where he generally made a nuisance of himself by his defiance of the chairman, and he often quoted this "Dare to be a Daniel" hymn as a preface to his remarks.

Non-conformists, of course, meet on Sunday evenings, often in ugly little chapels and meeting rooms, with the exception of that interesting sect the Seventh Day Adventists who object to the Romish habit of celebrating Sunday as a holy day and meet on Saturdays, just as God directed—"Six days shall ye labour and on the seventh shall ye rest". And why do they go to their ugly chapels and meeting rooms on Sunday evenings? Well the official explanation is to worship God, that hypothetical construct which they are brought up to believe forms the whole purpose of their existence as a corporate body. By meeting together in this manner and listening to a sermon and taking council together and praying and singing they are somehow or other helping to bring about that day when the Kingdom of God shall come upon Earth. When this great day is coming nobody knows but—well it is coming and they must all do what they can to further it—even though it may not be in the lifetime of any member of the congregation.

All of you here who have come to this Sunday evening meeting on a cold and frosty Sunday evening can provide other reasons why such congregations gather together on Sunday evenings in ugly and uncomfortable rooms. You haven't come to hear my lecture really—all my lectures are published in FREEDOM, eventually,

and you could read it if you wanted to in the comfort of your own homes. Some of you may believe in the eventual coming of the Kingdom of God—I mean the Libertarian Revolution—on Earth and feel that by attending such meetings you are putting yourself in the picture, as it were, aiding a social current that is going to help to bring such a revolution about. But you can all supply a dozen other reasons why people should be motivated to attend Sunday evening meetings either of a religious sect or an irreligious sect.

The Non-conformist conscience has been one of the principal forces in this country which has checked the ever-present tendency for the State to assume a more absolute power than it has. In the last two or three centuries the Non-conformist element of the populace has been the backbone of the resistance to the Church, the Throne and the Aristocracy. What civil liberties we have have not been the gift of any particular political party, but have been won by the constant struggle not of Whigs, Tories or Socialists as a party, but of Radicals. Radicalism is a rather old-fashioned word today, but it describes the para-political or a-political action of those who are moved by the Non-conformist conscience. It is interesting to study a phenomenon like Conscientious Objection. None of the major political parties or Churches gave any lead whatsoever. But at the tribunals you found Methodists rubbing shoulders with Anarchists, Jehovah's Witnesses with S.P.G.B.ers (two rather similar bodies), and Quakers with Nihilist Individualists. What all these Conchies have in common is a Non-conformist protest against the State presuming to take over the function of their individual conscience.

Some of the religious Conchies refer to Christ and the Sermon on the Mount, but there is generally a good C. of E. Christian on the Tribunal bench who knows all the answers to that line—the scourging of the money-changers out of the Temple, and so forth. Of course, the Christian Conchie no less than the anarchist Conchie is really moved less by anything that Christ may have said—you can pick whatever you like from the Bible—than by his own respect for himself. If he were more self-aware the Christian would know that he has created God in his own image, hence this God is a bloke who likes a fellow to think things out for himself and to decide things on his own responsibility. At the Day of Judgment this God might say: "Yes, Tom Smith, you did this and that because your masters told you to—but you knew these masters to be a weak-minded lot of irresponsible fools. So it was out of moral cowardice that you obeyed, wasn't it, Tom Smith?—you obeyed when you knew that you should have rebelled. Now you are damned for it—to Hell with you!"

The Anarchist, of course, has no God to judge him, but this does not free his acts from standards by which they can be criticised. Everyone has a self-ideal, and whether this is projected into outer space as a God, or retained as a part of the personality which the individual knows to be there (Freud's super-ego) it is a standard

by which every man judges his own acts and those of his fellows. According to his type of personality his judgment may be harsh or lenient.

If in contrast to the Non-conformist we consider the Catholic, we find in the latter a man confident in the love and forgiveness of his God *no matter what he does* providing he is always ready to repent and humble himself using the right magical formulae. The Catholic is free to live as an utter louse and, providing he will admit what a louse he is and acknowledge God's perfection, attain eternal bliss. The Communist is in a somewhat similar position: provided he is willing to acknowledge the perfection of the Party and regard his own individual judgment as less than the dust beneath its chariot wheels, he can do just *anything*—behave like a Fascist Beast in fact, and still remain a Good Communist. It may be necessary for him to eat mud and grovel before the Party, if they determine that he has deviated, but providing he is prepared to do this his soul is saved—and with the next right-about swing of the Party Line he may be shown to have been right after all.

Such salvation by faith does not apply to Non-conformists, religious or irreligious. Their God or self-ideal sits in rational judgment all the time, and does not believe in magic. It is true that some of the gospel-punching Non-conformist sects declare—"Only by believing on the Lord Jesus Christ can ye be saved," but they make it very plain to their brethren that such official belief is secondary to the hard facts of their way of life by which they are really judged. In the same way an Anarchist could publicly declare "Why worry about the Social Revolution!" and run no risk of excommunication—excommunication is reserved for such practical acts as pinching the funds, accepting a knighthood or standing for Parliament.

It may be objected that this portrayal of Non-conformism indicates a pretty dreary outlook for Anarchists if they avoid the frying-pan of the Non-conformist God to find themselves in the fire of their own self-judging ego ideals. As mentioned earlier, however, this self-judging is not necessarily the harsh condemnation of the Calvinist deity. In Ibsen's "Wild Duck" there is a fine portrayal of the harshness and intolerance of the worse sort of idealist, who succeeds in making people miserable by seeking to elevate them. If love of mankind does not include love of the individual and generosity to him—especially the one under our own skin—it is phoney. If the history of Non-conformism has its ugly side, it is because it has blossomed in no very propitious circumstances. The ugly tin chapels which deface the countryside in contrast to the mellow beauty of many of the churches of the older religions tell us nothing unless we understand the social struggles which created this contrast. And if our Anarchist meetings have to take place in some pretty scruffy rooms from time to time, they have a vitality which is lacking in the meetings of other sects which take place in more elegant surroundings.

G.

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

OPEN DAILY

(Open 10 a.m.—6.30 p.m., 5 p.m. Sets:)

New Books . . .

Marx and America Earl Browder 16/-
The Free Family
Paul and Jean Ritter 18/-

Reprints and

Cheap Editions . . .

The American Woman
E. J. Dingwall 4/-
Jew Suss Lion Feuchtwanger 3/6
The Aztec V. W. Von Hagen 4/-
Young Lonigan James T. Farrell 2/6
Babbitt Sinclair Lewis 3/6

Second-Hand . . .

A Hundred Years of Economic
Development in Great Britain
G. P. Jones & A. G. Pool 10/6
Sex Life and Sex Ethics
René Guyon 12/6
The Yellow Spot (1936) 4/-
The American Radio
Llewellyn White 4/-
The Treason Cage
Anthony Sampson 5/-
A Walk on the Wild Side
Nelson Algren 3/6
Stories and Sketches
George Gissing 4/-
Politics of the Unpolitical
Herbert Read 4/-
A Source of Embarrassment
Mary McCarthy 3/-
Essays in Economic History
E. M. Ceras-Wilson 20/-
'48 The Year of Revolutions
James Eastwood and Paul Tabori 6/-
The Other Germany (1942)
Heinrich Fraenkel 3/-
Inside Out George Burgher 6/-
Mexico Stuart Chase 5/6
Socialism: National or
International Franz Borkenau 3/-
Marie Antoinette Upton Sinclair 3/-

Periodicals . . .

University Libertarian, No. 8 1/-

We can supply ANY book required, including text-books. Please supply publisher's name if possible, but if not, we can find it. Scarce and out-of-print books searched for—and frequently found!

Postage free on all items

Obtainable from

27, RED LION STREET,
LONDON, W.C.1

How Nyasaland

Continued from p. 1

The prospects in these Central African territories is grim whichever one looks at it. The real powers, Kenya, as in Algeria, are the "settlers", the settlers, hopelessly outnumbered by the "natives" and who have seen that the recent events in Nyasaland prove that only the South African solutions make sense in Central Africa. Thus when Sir Edgar Whitehead insisted, at a Press Conference, that he and his government were determined to establish a multi-racial society based on equal partnership they felt far from assured. And when he declared a State of Emergency in Southern Rhodesia last week and admitted that it was primarily intended to deal with the Government "to deal with the African National Congress rather than to take action against its unruly elements, Africans also have felt far from reassured about his promise of "racial partnership". Already the African National Congress has been prosecuted and more than 400 Congress members arrested and taken to the prisons. According to the *Manchester Guardian's* Central African correspondent they include

George Nyandoro, the general secretary of the Southern Rhodesia Congress; Mr. Joseph Chiwerema, the acting president; and Mr. Joseph Malukeke, a styled African trade union secretary, who has figured in a number of industrial disputes.

And last Saturday police descended on the St. Faith's Mission Farm at Rusape and detained Mr. Guy Clutton-Brock, Mr. John Mutasa the African farm manager, and three African teachers. What is interesting about these detentions (no charges have in fact been preferred against these men) is that Mr. Clutton-Brock came to S. Rhodesia in 1949 to launch a new experiment in racial partnership on 10,000 acres of land owned by the Anglican mission. According to Colin Legum of the *Observer*

Over the past 10 years he has contributed towards creating a flourishing African-European co-operative, which is the most successful example of inter-racial partnership anywhere in Africa. (Our italics).

Yet Sir Edgar Whitehead is a fervent advocate of "a multi-racial society" in Central Africa!

But apparently instead

The Clutton-Brocks' works at St. Faith's has for some years been looked upon with disfavour by the Rhodesian authorities.

Guy Clutton-Brock is one of the dozen Europeans who have joined the African National Congress in Southern Rhodesia. His influence has always been used on the side of Congress leaders who favoured non-violent political action.

★

AT a meeting in Sutton, Surrey last Friday, Mr. James Griffiths, M.P., a Colonial Secretary in the Labour Government told his audience what Labour's policy for Central Africa was:

"We should make a plain declaration, first, that the protectorate status of Nyasaland and Northern Rhodesia shall be maintained, and that under no circumstances will we confer full Dominion status on the Central African Federation until full democracy has been established.

"Secondly, we should make it plain that the objective of our Colonial policy in all the territories in East and Central Africa is to work with their people towards the establishment of full democratic self-government, and that until this is established our authority will not be surrendered by the British Government to any minority."

We do not think we are being just cynical when we suggest that Labour policy ensures Central Africa's con-

THE latest number of the *University Libertarian* includes, among other things, a large chunk of Max Stirner on "Freedom & Self-Ownership", a hitherto unpublished account by Tom Keell, editor of FREEDOM for many years, of the controversy with Kropotkin over the First World War (Keell's account, introduced by Karl Walter, amplifies that given in the Woodcock-Avakumovic biography of Kropotkin), and a discussion by Tony Gibson of the question "Why do we hold the political opinions that we do?" This is of course an absorbing topic. As Gibson says, "With our political opponents we can see the personal emotional reasons for their beliefs standing out a mile, but with ourselves our beliefs appear to rest on reason". Could it be, he asks, that an even wider range of facts would make us change our point of view? When you see how doubtful this is you can see how dubious we, or anyone else, can claim that the ideology we favour, was selected by a process of reasoning. I agree with him. The trouble that I have always found is that when you put forward this view, people always seem to assume that you are arguing either in favour of irrationality, or else for not having any opinions. The only people I have met whose outlook really seems to be governed by reason alone, equated reason with the meanest kind of petty self-interest. (No offence meant to Stirner: I mean that they always licked their bosses' boots and kept their traps shut).

But the most interesting article in the *University Libertarian** is Harry Baecker's

continued status as British protectorates, ruled from Whitehall, for the next fifty years! For in his first point he insists that no change must take place "until full democracy has been established" and in the second that our colonial policy is to work with the people "towards the establishment of full democratic self-government" and "that until this is established our authority will not be surrendered to any minority". This all boils down to one question: how will the government, however well-intentioned it may be, by-pass the settlers who, as in Kenya, will resist any and every attempt that might be made to confer equal rights on the Africans of Central Africa who outnumber them by more than 50 to 1?

After all it's nearly eight years ago, and under a Labour government, that the Report of the Conference on Closer Association in Central Africa was published which recommended the federation of the Rhodesias and Nyasaland. In that report the government's policy "which has been repeatedly stated with the assent of all parties" was

self-government within the Commonwealth, but self-government must include proper provision for both Europeans and Africans. We have set Africans on the path of political, social and economic progress and it is our task to help them forward in that development so that they may take their full part with the rest of the community in the political and economic life of the territories.

What have "we" done in these eight years for the Africans of Central Africa? What have the Labour Party and the Trades Unions done to stop the continued exploitation of African workers. After eight years workers in Southern Rhodesia are still being paid slave wages: labour at 4d. an hour or 2/8d. for an 8 hour day! It is no excuse to say that the Labour Party has not been in power these eight years. Let's face the facts that, as we wrote in 1951 when the report was published* "it becomes more and more obvious that only the Africans themselves can achieve their liberation". We must not be surprised nor shocked if they resort to violence as the only language the majority of the settlers and governments understand or take notice of. The least the workers can do is not to prolong the violence, by seeing to it that no financial or military aid is sent from here to their age-long tormentors and exploiters.

*"A Central African Dominion" (FREEDOM Selections, Vol. 1, 1951, pp.87/9).

REVOLUTIONARY IN A WHITE COAT

"Technology for Freedom". In a previous article in the last number of the same magazine, on "Freedom and Technology" he had devoted most of his space to knocking down a man of straw, a "back to nature" anarchist, concluding that,

"The libertarian and anarchist can recruit the technologist to their ranks, but only if they realise that the motto for the full man is not 'back to the land' but *per ardua ad astra*."

Preferring spinach to sputniks, I was not attracted by this false choice, and Mr. Baecker, having got it out of his system, is free to proceed with his subject. First among the technologies a libertarian would strive to foster, he declares, is the biochemistry of contraception: the search for the pill, the safe and efficient oral contraceptive. First on the list? Well, Julian Huxley, Aldous Huxley, Bertrand Russell, and Brock Chisholm agree with him, and it is difficult to think of any other discovery which will add so much to the sum total of human happiness and to the likelihood of human survival.

The other two libertarian technologies which Mr. Baecker discusses are in the fields of power and communications. In the search for means of motive power his views are like those of Edward Hyams who envisaged the use by "bucolic anarchists" of windmill generators to produce power from sources "beyond the control of the power-maniac, whether he be a monopoly capitalist or a civil servant". Baecker's version of this aim is again some means of generating electricity with

"a technique which can be used cheaply, on a small scale, and uses abundant and ubiquitous raw materials in a simple and cheap generator. A tall order, but it has its reasons. The prosperity of a society in material goods can be measured directly in terms of kilowatts per head. We must have this prosperity, for without it our liberty is restricted by the endless need to scratch for the minimum necessities of food, shelter and warmth. So we need a cheap source of power—cheap in terms of human effort and availability of raw materials if not in standard economic terms. And we need a simple and cheap generator, which it is feasible to run on a small scale, in order that individuals and small communities may be independent of a controlling political system or bureaucracy.

"As long as we have cheap and abundant power, which yet can only be gener-

*THE UNIVERSITY LIBERTARIAN, No. 8, Winter 1959, (by post 1/2 or 17 cents).

ated by large centralised equipment, so long is the individual consumer at the mercy of those in physical control of the central generator, if the latter so choose. Complete freedom in a world in which freedom of action inevitably depends on control over one's own access to resources, can only be achieved by such a source of electrical or equivalent energy. It must also be possible for that generator to be built by an averagely intelligent and averagely skilled person, with simple tools, from simple components."

Turning to the sphere of communications, he is even more demanding:

"We require a mode of communication which is global in range, independent of carriers and free from jamming. While we are dependent on post offices, telephone exchanges, or microwave relay stations, the freedom of our means of communication is in the hands of others. When we can all be 'hams' in an unjammable ether, needing no radio licence, then we can be sure of unrestricted communication. Of course, telepathy may be the answer!

"Communication at a distance is essential, but not sufficient. We need face-to-face meetings and the mobility to achieve this contact. Again, we require a means outside the control of others—a mode of transport independent of public roads or rails, of ports and airports, global in scope."

★

AT this point, sensing that the reader will feel that he has moved from physics to metaphysics, he pauses to point out to the sceptic who will laugh "at these silly anarchists who seek to destroy co-operation, when it is human co-operation on which all our achievements are based", that

"Only when any individual can provide himself with the means of production of a full physical and cultural life to the highest standards of his community can a society be completely free. Not by virtue of statute, but by virtue of the ability of the individual to opt out without impairing his own survival."

"However, we have no wish to abolish the public power supplies, public communication links, public transport; it is indeed co-operation we seek, but voluntary co-operation. It is nonsense to talk of freedom, self-determination, democracy, when the individual has no means of opting out. The means outlined above are the bastions of the individual against public pressure, and against the obtuseness of spite of those who happen to control public services. As a last resort we must each have free and easy access to equivalent private resources and services. The large-scale technology we are developing has many boons and advantages to offer, but we can only make

fullest use of them if we are at no time necessarily wholly subordinate to that mass technology."

It is interesting to compare Harry Baecker's approach with Nigel Calder's treatment of the same theme in the symposium *Conviction*, from a socialist point of view. How many British Socialists, he asks "have awoken to the fact that the real revolutionary in our midst is the man in the white coat?". Calder's list of priorities is as follows:

- Staying alive.
- Conserving and enlarging our resources.
- Sharing knowledge and resources throughout the world.
- Making the most of scientific discovery.
- Injecting reason into human affairs.
- Exploring outer space.

Calder ignores the preoccupations behind Baecker's reasoning, but he makes a number of thought-provoking points. As weapons become more and more devastating, he declares, they themselves become the major cause of war. "Short of removing all possible reason for war, the only security will lie in making oneself not worth attacking—in particular, by voluntarily doing away with aggressive or retaliatory weapons." Zeta, he says, "with its promise of power and fresh water from the sea which is nobody's property, is as fine a torch for world Socialism as any yet lit". And talking of immediate technico-economic policy in this country he says:

"Our first aim might well be to become potentially as self-sufficient as possible, to provide ourselves with a firm base during the world-wide technological revolution. Agriculture moves high up the priority list: our contribution to world food supplies could be a 50-150 per cent. increase in our potential if not in actual produce. This capacity could then be used, as need be, to offset the dislocations to normal trade that are bound to arise in the future. This is not a Little England policy, nor is it 'yokelisation'—scientific and technical measures needed to achieve it at a reasonable cost would stretch us to the limit of our ingenuity, and there would be a bonus of knowledge for a hungry world. At the same time we should exploit nuclear and water power to their utmost. Electricity should become our prime mover, and we should look forward to extremely fast mono-rail transport rather than congested roads and airways. . . .

"Capital goods industries, with the maximum scientific content, should be our chief concern: better ways of making

Continued on p. 4

Individualist Anarchism

Continued from p. 2

The anarchist bases society neither upon law nor upon economics. Good citizen, good bureaucrat, good producer, good consumer . . . this flour-spattered meal trough has no message for him. After all, if it can be proved that in certain cases economics have determined intellect or morals, can it not also be proved that intellect and morals have often determined economics? The real truth must surely be that they mingle with and jostle each other; that they alternate and are mutually determining. From reformist socialism to revolutionary anti-parliamentary communism via trade unionism, all these socialist systems make a mockery of the individual and of free agreement between individuals. They give palce to the majority, to the economic contract imposed by the greatest number.

The anarchist proclaims that a transformation in mental outlook will always be accompanied by a transformation in the economic system; that a new social edifice cannot be built with stones that are crumbling into dust; that beings who have been moulded by prejudice can never build anything but a structure filled with prejudice; that it is necessary first of all to lay down solid materials, to select individuals.

If he joins a trade union, regardless of its colour, the anarchist enters it purely as a member of a particular trade, in the hope of obtaining by collective action an improvement in his own lot—but he will see nothing anarchistic in gaining a wage increase, or a reduction of working hours. From the economic point of view, in present conditions, each anarchist does what he thinks best for himself: one by working for a boss, another by acting outside the law. The one benefits from a union, the other by working in a "free

environment". None of these ways of getting by is more "anarchistic" than the other—they are makeshifts, neither more nor less.

III

SINCE the anarchist conception places the individual at the base of all these practical considerations, it follows that it takes no heed of collective morality and the general pattern of life. The anarchist regulates his life not according to law, like the legalists, nor according to a given dogma, like religious orders and socialists, but according to his own needs and personal aspirations. He is ready to make any concessions to live with his comrades, but without making an obsession of these concessions.

The anarchist knows full well that if his life is to be enjoyed to the full, if it is to be beautiful and rich in every kind of experience, he will not be able to appreciate it if he is unable to master his inclinations and passions. He has no intention of turning his life, by depriving it of the unforeseen, into a sort of English garden, carefully cultivated, monotonous and dismal. No, he wants to live fully and intensely—he attaches a thousand horses to his chariot, but he does not forget to put a bridle on the neck of each one.

The anarchist denies authority because he knows he can live without it. He is guided by the play of agreements freely entered into with his comrades, never trampling on the liberty of any of them in order that none may trample on his.

But the individualist will feel no solidarity with those whose prejudices or interests prevent him from living his life. He is "refractory"—fatally refractory—from the moral, intellectual and economic point of view. The full con-

sciousness that none of his acts can debase him inwardly is for him a sufficient criterion. Surely the essential thing is that he remains himself? Moreover, is not the anarchist constantly in a state of legitimate self-defence against constraint and social servitude?

IV

ANARCHIST work, activity and propaganda, therefore, do not consist of swaying the crowd, but of creating and selecting—my repetition is intentional—conscious individuals, free from prejudice. This will above all be a work of undermining, criticism and education linked with reconstruction. A work of free examination and independent research in all fields.

Instead of talking of love in general, the anarchist talks modestly of union and alliance between comrades—between friends who feel attracted to each other by affinities of one kind or another.

Instead of postponing individual happiness to the socialist or communist calendars he extols his present achievement of it by proclaiming the joy of living.

Instead of dreaming of building the great structure of Harmony with materials taken at random from the rubble amid the ruins of former buildings, he shows that the first task to be done is to remove the stones one by one from the great human arena.

Anarchists no more want to be masters than they want to be servants. They are pioneers, attached to no party, non-conformists, standing outside herd morality and conventional good and evil—one might say "non-social". They go forward, stumbling, sometimes falling. But they do go forward and by living for themselves they dig the furrow, they open the breach through which will pass those who deny authority, the unique ones who will succeed them.

E. ARMAND.

A Meeting of the Universities and Left Review Study Group Anarchism & Libertarian Socialism

THE above is the title of the lecture which was given under the auspices of the Universities and Left Review Study Group at Carlisle Street, London, W.1. on Sunday, 22nd February. The lecturer was Mr. Ralph Miliband, a political scientist of the London School of Economics.

Mr. Miliband devoted most of his lecture to a discussion of the opinions and personalities of Proudhon and Bakunin, and mentioned the Paris Commune somewhat briefly at the end of his lecture. The present writer was somewhat surprised that the opinions and personalities of these two men were dealt with more or less in isolation from the times in which they lived. When dealing with Proudhon, for instance, the lecturer did not relate Proudhon's social theories to the social and economic structure of France in the 19th century, nor to the social theorists who had been Proudhon's forerunners. To listen to his version of Proudhonism, Proudhon might have been a freak of nature suddenly appearing on the scene. Again with Bakunin, while the lecturer mentioned his bohemianism, his money-scrounging, his romanticism and his aristocratic origins, he did not mention the more important facts about the man. It was not mentioned that Bakunin did not come round from revolutionary pan-Slavism to revolutionary anarchism until later in life, nor was any attempt made to trace his slightly muddled theoretical position to its origins.

Now a case can be made for expounding political, social or any other historical theory by dealing with personalities à la Lytton Strachey, but it is a means of exposition which has great dangers attached to it. Personalities may conceal as much as they reveal about the ideas with which they are associated. If, for instance, I were to advertise a lecture entitled "Marxist Socialism in the 19th Century", and then deal at length with the personality of Karl Marx, his family virtues, his friendship with Engels, his vanity, his squabbles in the 1st International—my audience would have reason to complain that I had simply avoided the topic of Marxian Socialism. We do not all agree that "History is Gossip".

A young man in the audience accused Mr. Miliband of deliberately choosing the two figures associated with 19th century anarchism which were most easy to guy as people. I felt that this accusation was unjust: the lecturer had not in fact "guyed" either Proudhon or Bakunin—most of what he said about them was true but not very relevant to the topic of his lecture. In any case there are plenty of other 19th century anarchists who could be more effectively guyed and discredited if one wanted to.

Now it might be suggested that the lecturer thought that his audience would know all about the development of anarchism and libertarian socialism in the 19th century and that he was merely using two figures to illustrate some points. If this was so at the beginning of his lecture, the comments of the audience must have soon undeceived him. Even the young man mentioned above, who referred to his own peculiar view as that of "we anarchists" made elementary

howlers, such as claiming Alexander Herzen's Liberalism as anarchism. Mr. Miliband had plenty of time to realize the degree of naïveté of his audience where anarchism was concerned, yet in his later remarks he made little attempt to get back to the advertised topic of his lecture. He went on to criticise those Anarchists and Israeli Kibbutzim who merely sought to create "green islands of virtue" in the capitalist morass. This was a strange non-sequiter to his earlier remarks about Proudhon and Bakunin.

In the discussion which followed the lecture it was evident that the self-declared Marxist and others who attacked an Aunt Sally figure of anarchism, would have benefited from the lecture which Mr. Miliband had not given. In fact, they would have benefited from a long series of lectures on the subject. Many of the most vocal elements plainly did not know what they were talking about—and how should they if they had never got beyond repeating the usual Marxist clichés about Anarchism instead of tackling Anarchism itself? All this seems a very great pity, for if a number of people get together to form a study group their object should be study and not the upholding of any particular political line. The danger is that study will be replaced by mere indoctrination.

The prejudices and limited objectives of those running the show may be handed on to the younger members who started out in the hope of having their minds broadened and their grasp of social facts widened. There is little satisfaction for anyone who represents intellectual freedom in the spectacle of other people simply being indoctrinated with his own ideas. The Anarchist movement, somewhat in spite of itself, gains some adherents who simply replace their previously-held irrational -isms with a dogmatic anarchism which is equally irrational and wild. How much more is this sort of ideology-swallowing true of those political groups who set out to

catch voters. The vote of a deluded fool is as useful as that of an intelligently convinced man.

Mr. Miliband teaches students at the London School of Economics. There, although a certain originality of thought in students is somewhat refreshing to bored tutors and markers of exam papers, a certain framework of political assumptions is taken for granted in the teaching and assessment of academic progress. One would expect, after all, a theological college to take the existence of God for granted. Teachers of political science are rarely much acquainted with Anarchism, although one university lecturer in political science does contribute articles to FREEDOM and other anarchist journals. However, the members of a discussion group have not got to pass any university examinations in political science. They are free of that burden—free to explore ideas without there being a set syllabus laid down by a Board of Examiners. Some Marxists no doubt resent one meeting being spent in the nominal consideration of "Anarchism and Libertarian Socialism". But to make the gesture and yet by-pass the subject, as was done on the evening in question, is a peculiar compromise. G.

PRODUCTION AT ALL COSTS

Lord Ferrier said the diesel-electric locomotive, unsatisfactory as it might be in many technical respects, was only a stepping stone to almost universal electrification on main lines. "A massive programme of railway electrification would be one of the greatest contributions which we could make to promoting employment in this country and to stepping up the use of steel."

(In the House of Lords debate on Modernisation of Railways)

Government by Gimmick

Continued from p. 1

In foreign affairs there has been confusion in the sending of troops to Jordan, cynicism with regard to our ally America's ready acceptance of the new Iraq régime, a 'brink' scare over Lebanon, and ignorance in trying to prop up Batista in Cuba. Over Formosa there seemed uncertainty and evidence only of Britain tagging along behind America, whose unyielding policy on China finds no response anywhere in Britain, while all the time in the background, nagging away like an ulcer, was Cyprus, a source of shame and confusion for the British, and more recently there is the high-handed treatment of the Maltese.

When unpopularity began to show itself clearly, Mac the unflappable began to flap audibly. Reversing

his economic policies he switched on the green light for hire purchasing, hoping to create such a boom that the rising unemployment figures would go into reverse. They didn't. They are still going up.

A Flop, A Chance

Mac thought he would go to the people. He went on a tour of North-East England, to show the flag, as it were, in an area with bitter memories of the years of depression (when they rejected him as an M.P.) and with growing fears of a new slump. But nobody has ever said Mac is unfloppable: he flopped.

The Formosa crisis has yielded to the Berlin crisis. While Dulles bravely faces his cancer he even more bravely faces the possibility of war in Europe. For Britain, on Europe's doorstep, such a war, even if not fought with nuclear weapons (tho' why shouldn't it be?), would be a little more serious.

So Supermac saw his chance when Khrushchev proffered an invitation to visit the Workers' Fatherland. True, it was only to be a reconnaissance trip 'to find out what is going on in the Russian mind', but clearly Mac hoped to do such good work that he would immediately soar again in the public's estimation as a statesman of world stature, laying the foundations for a lasting peace.

'He's off!' shrieked the headlines as Supermac was launched from London Airport. 'He's arrived!' they cried as he touched down at Moscow. And after? The talks with Mr. K. were private, but then Khrushchev suddenly made a major offer for a summit meeting and a 20-year pact at a public meeting in Moscow while Mac & Co. were inspecting a nuclear research institute at Drubna.

Since the purpose of Mac's visit was to prepare the way, if possible, for a meeting of Foreign Secretaries in the near future, Khrushchev's speech, which brushed aside the idea and called for a meeting of heads of state, can be only described as a snub. While the method of pre-

People and Ideas

things rather than new ways of consuming them. What we make should be built to last. The aspect of automation to which we should look is the self-regulating, pre-programmed machine tool (extremely flexible, just the thing for custom-built jobs), rather than to the transfer machine and mass production. The markets in the undeveloped territories, on which we could be gambling in this scheme, would in any case take time to develop: meanwhile we could be encouraging the semi-developed countries from which we buy our food also to aim at being more self-sufficient by building up their industries."

Baecker and Calder are talking of different things; one of a programme for enlarging human freedom by increasing the technical autonomy of individuals and small groups, the other of a programme for bringing this country's means of livelihood up to date. But there are, as you can see, certain parallels between their programmes. They are both talking about decentralisation, as Kropotkin did sixty years ago, in *Fields, factories and Workshops*:

"A reorganised society will have to abandon the fallacy of nations specialised for the production of either agricultural or manufactured produce. It will have to rely on itself for the production of food and many, if not most, of the raw materials; it must find the best means of combining agriculture with manufacture—the work in the field with a decentralised industry; and it will have to provide for 'integrated education', which education alone, by teaching both science and handicraft from earliest childhood, can give to society the men and women it really needs."

★

THEY both know what they want.

But the means? Calder, as a socialist says what you would expect: "the ultimate choices about what we are to do with our knowledge must rest with democratic government. The only sure way of seeing that industries do what is right for the community and for the world is the Socialist way". "It should not be our purpose to order the experts to step back and make room for humanity. We must enlist their help and stir their consciences in the name of humanity". Harry Baecker is neither so confident nor as vague, as he looks for "the outlines of methods, the spurs to action, the analysis of means, the suggestions for deeds, the map for getting from here to there," and he is convinced that until we

"can present a concrete pattern of actions and of their initial results before those whom we wish to convert to our cause, until we can point and say 'Look

sending it clearly shocked Mr. Harold Macmillan, who, as an old Etonian and ex-Guards officer, has certain ideas of the proper way to do things. Indeed, at a reception after Mr. K.'s 'shock' speech, Macmillan was heard to mutter 'This is an extraordinary method of diplomacy'.

So from the friendliness and warmth of the first days' meetings the diplomatic temperature in Moscow fell considerably. So did Mac's hopes of a triumphant homecoming, with all the ballyhoo to lift him back into public grace.

Now Supermac is really on the skids. There is even talk that his health is cracking up under the strain, since he was suffering from a bad cold all the time he was away. Can it be that he has missed the boat completely as far as choosing the election date is concerned? And of winning it?

Politics is a matter of gimmicks all the time, but Macmillan has relied upon them more than most Prime Ministers, the emptiness of his policies (for can anyone say what they are, other than 'conserve?') being hidden only by the advertising campaign on his personal behalf and the ineffectuality of the Opposition, equally devoid of policy.

Gimmicks are fine as long as they work. Then they will take the minds of the public off their realities and create the illusions by which governments justify their existence.

But gimmicks that fail are most embarrassing. In his choice of head-gear Mr. Macmillan obviously hoped to be taken for a wolf in sheep's clothing. As it turns out, he comes back looking sheepish.

here, this is how we do it, how we achieve freedom', so long shall we merit the jeers or disregard, or even contempt, of our hoped-for allies", and he asks a series of questions:

"Are there scientists and technologists already of our persuasion, willing to tribute their spare time and to pool knowledge to form a correspondence academy? Are there owners of machine shops, laboratories, engine works, or those who have access to who are willing to construct working models, carry out experiments, etc. the suggestion of the academy? If an academy achieved a technological success could we disseminate and market cheaply as possible?"

In his final sentences he gets a little closer to the here-and-now, pointing that

"very often it occurs that a decision has to be made between two lines of research, or production, or organisation each equally favourable in outcome, the foreseeable economic prospects of organisation (by which the anarchist technologist is employed). In such a case the libertarian can act on behalf of course which it seems to him will be more favourable to the advent of a libertarian world community."

We are back then, to the day-to-day choice in our lives and means of livelihood, between libertarian and authoritarian solutions. The prospects are brighter, in this instance, since they solve themselves into the alternative big-scale and small-scale solutions to the same technical problems, and fortunately other people besides ourselves are interested in this distinction. Perhaps the real task as anarchists is to persuade people to change their order of priorities.

FLYING SAUCERS AND GIRAFFES

DEAR FRIENDS,

The attitude of the Editors of FREEDOM to flying saucers reminds me of an old Dutch farmer who went to America and saw a giraffe. He scratched his head and said: "there ain't no such beast."

Yours truly,
Oxford, Mar. 1. J. W. SHAW

[Is friend Shaw suggesting that the Editors of FREEDOM have seen and been in communication with spacemen and flying saucers but are making out that they haven't? If so then friend Shaw is also talking a lot of nonsense! If only those of our readers who are in touch with spacemen would take the trouble to arrange a meeting between us and them, and if once having met the spacemen we deny their existence, then our critics will be justified in comparing us to the old Dutch farmer. Until then we content ourselves with asking friend Shaw the same question we asked our other flying saucer correspondent in justification of our attitude: does he believe in God? If not, why not?—EDITORS].

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

Regular Sunday meetings now held at "Marquis of Granby" Public House, Rathbone Street (corner of Percy Street, Rathbone Place and Charlotte Street), 7.30 p.m.

MAR 8—Alan Albon on SUBSISTENCE FARMING
MAR. 15.—Speaker from the Bruderhof speaking on THE BRUDERHOF COMMUNITY

FREEDOM

The Anarchist Weekly

Postal Subscription Rates:
12 months 19/- (U.S.A. \$3.00)
6 months 9/6 (U.S.A. \$1.50)
3 months 5/- (U.S.A. \$0.75)

Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies
12 months 29/- (U.S.A. \$4.50)
6 months 14/6 (U.S.A. \$2.25)

Cheques P.O.'s and Money Orders should be made out to FREEDOM PRESS, crossed a/c Payee, and addressed to the publishers

FREEDOM PRESS
London, W.C.1. England
27 Red Lion Street
Tel.: Chancery 8364

FREEDOM PRESS

SELECTIONS FROM 'FREEDOM'

- Vol. 1, 1951, *Mankind is One*
- Vol. 2, 1952, *Postscript to Posterity*
- Vol. 3, 1953, *Colonialism on Trial*
- Vol. 4, 1954, *Living on a Volcano*
- Vol. 5, 1955, *The Immoral Moralists*
- Vol. 6, 1956, *Oil and Troubled Waters*

- Vol. 7, 1957, *Year One—Sputnik Era*
- each volume paper 7s. 6d.
- cloth 10s. 6d.

The paper edition of the Selections is available to readers of FREEDOM at 5/- a copy

- VOLINE:
Nineteen-Seventeen (The Russian Revolution Betrayed) cloth 12s. 6d.
- (Kronstadt 1921, Ukraine 1918-21) The Unknown Revolution* cloth 12s. 6d.

- V. RICHARDS:
Lessons of the Spanish Revolution 6s.

- PETER KROPOTKIN:
The State: Its Historic Role 1s.
- The Wage System* 3d.
- Revolutionary Government Organised Vengeance* 3d.
- Called Justice* 2d.

- RUDOLF ROCKER:
Nationalism and Culture cloth 21s.

- GEORGE WOODCOCK:
New Life to the Land 6d.
- Homes orhovels?* 6d.
- Railways and Society* 3d.

- HERBERT READ:
Art and the Evolution of Man 4s.
- Existentialism, Marxism and Anarchism* 3s. 6d.
- Poetry and Anarchism* cloth 5s., paper 2s. 6d.

- The Philosophy of Anarchism* boards 2s. 6d.
- The Education of Free Men* 1s.

- JOHN HEWETSON:
Ill-Health, Poverty and the State cloth 2s. 6d., paper 1s.

- F. A. RIDLEY:
The Roman Catholic Church and the Modern Age 2d.

- ERRICO MALATESTA:
Anarchy 9d.

- Marie-Louise Berneri Memorial Committee publications:
Marie-Louise Berneri, 1918-1949: A Tribute cloth 5s.
- Journey Through Utopia* cloth 18s. (U.S.A. \$3)

27, Red Lion Street, London, W.C.1.