

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"Even voting for the right is doing nothing for it. It is only expressing to men feebly your desire that it should prevail."
—H. D. THOREAU

Vol. 20, No. 39.

September 26th, 1959

Threepence

LUNAR POLITICS

POWER-MONGERS throughout the world, from our own Communists to the French Catholic paper *La Croix*, have hailed Russian achievement in its successful attempt to shoot the moon.

La Croix, indeed, while saying 'It is with hope and joy that we take part in the general emotion' goes on to point out that the Soviet success is due to greatly improved tele-control, which puts the whole earth within the Soviet field of precise fire.

And this, of course, is precisely the lesson that Mr. K. has demonstrated for the benefit of his American hosts. No mere boast would have impressed the Americans—but now, and where on earth could Russia have demonstrated their super-rocketry?

The moon rocket has three purposes. The propaganda value is colossal—as witness the shemozzle it has aroused in the press of the world—and it also represents one in the eye, not for the man in the moon, but for the men at Cape Canaveral. But more than that; it is a warning from the lunatics in the Kremlin to the lunatics in the Pentagon.

Russia could not have fired a guided missile into any other part of this world to show her skill. In any part of the Communist world it wouldn't have been believed by the West; anywhere else it wouldn't exactly be welcome—except for its secrets, and the Russians don't want those to fall into anyone else's hands. The moon was therefore ideal. It was spectacular and practical!

We may therefore take with a pinch of salt the assurances by Soviet scientists that the firing of the rocket just before Mr. K.'s arrival in America was 'pure coincidence'. Its usefulness in enabling him to speak from a position of strength, if not superiority, while in the States is too obvious, and Mr. K. is too much a master of propaganda to miss any such opportunity.

There was a time when Communist leaders aimed their propaganda at the workers of the world. Now it is aimed at the moon, in order to impress the leaders of capitalism.

NO COMMENT!

"You mustn't believe all those horrible things you hear on the wireless or television. If you've got your Refuge properly prepared, you'll be quite safe."

"Why, if those people in Japan had known what to do most of them would be alive today."

—W.V.S. Lecturer on 'A.K.P. at Chelsea, as quoted in *Reynold's News*.

RETURN TO EXECUTIONS OPPOSED

A Ceylon Government Commission reports to-day that nothing in the experience of the suspension of the death penalty here between May, 1956, and the end of 1958 justifies the reintroduction of capital punishment. It says that the murder rate in Ceylon remained substantially stable between 1948 and 1958.

The death penalty has been suspended until April, 1961.

(*Guardian* 16/9/59).

ANONYMOUS

I'll probably never get my name in the national Press again. Unless I win the pools. One thing I do know. It won't be for waiting for a bus, I'll go by Underground.—W. F. GRANT, *Kentish Town*.

Reynold's News.

No longer working class politics but lunar politics. No longer the slightest attempt to cover their imperialism in their satellites but blatant competition with the Western imperialists to colonise the moon—in spite of Mr. K.'s generous gesture 'Russia does not want the moon'.

Is this what the peoples of the world really care about?

The Big Goodbye

THE big 'hello' was over. We had seen him off at the airport. Wall-Street was saving its ticker-tape again. The Cops were putting their feet up after seeing there was no slip-up in the enthusiasm. The bums, anarchists and screwballs were out of pail where they'd been for the duration.

The movie-cameras, TV and reporters had folded up their tents and silently stolen away leaving behind a lot of dis-washing, a few butt-ends, there were gardenia-petals on the airport tarmac with a French letter and a lot of used flash bulbs.

It had been like a Mack Sennett comedy, that big good-bye. E had embraced K. F had embraced E. Each had been more affectionate than the other whilst looking for a good knife-vantage point. People had been forgotten, and there had been much dashing in and out of the jet's cabin. Vodka had been drunk, toasts to the 'Free and Peace-loving Peoples of the World'. Even the Security Chiefs had relaxed and were telling each other anecdotes about anarchists.

We were now speeding back to Georgia for a gold tournament. The President's limousine passed us. I looked incredulously at the familiar bald-headed, wrinkled figure in the back. "Mac," I said. "We've got the wrong guy." "I know," said Mac, "We did a deal. What's the diff?" J.R.

It Still Goes on More C.O.'s Jailed

TWO men were jailed for 12 months yesterday for not obeying an order to have a medical examination for National Service.

Each had pleaded guilty and each had been jailed for a month for a similar offence earlier this year.

They were sentenced by Mr. Clive Burt, at Clerkenwell, sitting as a relief magistrate to Mr. Edward Robey, who usually presides over the second court there.

In a similar case on July 21, when Mr. Robey had before him a man to whom in February he had given six weeks' imprisonment for refusing a medical examination, he imposed a fine of £5.

He pointed out that conscription was coming to an end, and refrained from making a fresh order for a medical examination.

Yesterday, when Peter Frank Culling, 23-year-old electrical draughtsman, of The Drive, Ilford, Essex, appeared before Mr. Burt, the magistrate said: "This young man is determined not to obey the law, and is apparently prepared to take the consequences."

IN Washington last week Mr. Khrushchev told the National Press Club that "it would be sheer madness to allow a new world war to come to a head". He was convinced that the Americans, like the Russians, were for peace. The following day at a luncheon in his honour he concluded:

Having made your acquaintance, I am convinced you do not want war neither with our country nor with any other country of the world. Let us have eternal peace.

The same day, at his morning Press conference President Eisenhower commented on Mr. K.'s National Press Club speech saying that

he found the Soviet Prime Minister's manner and deportment extremely friendly, and he was convinced that Mr. Khrushchev shared his horror of atomic war, which could result only in "the futility of mutual suicide." That was the one point on which they were in full agreement, but even then there was the possibility of disagreement on specific issues of policy.

We would be among the first to warn against accepting that politicians meant, or believed, the things they said, but the foregoing statements are in rather a different category, for the Big Two political leaders in this case are not whitewashing themselves *but each other!*

For years we have been told that the cold war was necessary to hold in check the aggressive ambitions of the Russians, or the Americans—depending from which side of the iron curtain the situation was being viewed, yet now Mr. K. tells the

DOES RUSSIA WANT - CAN AMERICA AFFORD - DISARMAMENT?

world that he does not believe that the United States have aggressive intentions against any country, and Mr. Ike is convinced that Mr. K. shares his "horror of atomic war which could lead . . . etc." Assuming that both men believed what they said to be true, what prompted them to say these things? If they did not believe them to be true it is difficult to imagine what political or tactical advantage they could derive from whitewashing their potential "enemy".

★

IN his opening statement in the general debate on disarmament at the United Nations Mr. Selwyn Lloyd for Britain put forward his country's plan for total disarmament by stages, a programme that would "rule out the possibility of aggressive war." Mr. K. also addressed the Assembly with a speech that hit the headlines, calling for a four-year programme to abolish all armed forces except of course "police units" for internal control.

This meant that land armies, navies, and air forces should cease to exist, that general staffs and war ministries should be abolished, that military educational establishments be closed, dozens of millions of men return to peaceful creative labour.

Foreign military bases should be abolished. All nuclear bombs should be destroyed and their further production prohibited, their energy to be used for peaceful purposes.

Mr. Herter, for the United States said that the disarmament problem was one "deserving of all our imagination and ingenuity". There would be a growing danger in an indefinite continuation of the arms race which must be prevented from "exploding into nuclear conflict."

Mr. K.'s disarmament plan which, except for the four-year limit, has (so we are told in last Sunday's *Observer*) a no more sweeping aim than the British plan, has apparently been received by Western Governments with "disappointment". And some U.N. delegates have written it off as "Utopian".

The main stumbling block to the Russian plan appears to be the question of inspection and control. Are these objections a reflection of the genuine concern of the Western powers to make sure that Russia carries out any agreements that may be reached on disarmament, or are they put forward as an excuse for continuing the arms race—possibly for reasons other than military ones?

Continued on p. 3

COMMENT

T.U. Conference

PROBABLY the most nauseating thing about the TUC conference other of course than the debate on the H-Bomb was the entrance of the Prima Donna (and postulant Prime Minister), to the tune of "For re's", *et alia* (the hall-mark surely of Conservatism), after this Bridal March we were giving by way of a homily by Bob Willis in a speech on the differences—neglecting, however—no doubt through an oversight to specify what these are. This was we were told "the most momentous election ever" (judging by the issues involved it doesn't say much for any of its predecessors), though "we have our differences" there was need for "unanimity towards Labour on the Policy and Programme of the Party".

Then came the marriage vows all duly rehearsed, the well-worn words: "momentous decision", "for the whole world", "a period of opportunity in International relations", "a chance that may not come again if we do not seize it now", "changes in Eastern and Western Government—inspired by the Labour Party" (*sic*) "areas of potential agreement" . . . and so weiner. We were told that Russia has said that they agree to no Bomb tests 'til someone else makes them first, and why shouldn't we say the same (since de Gaulle is on the verge of such tests, why not indeed?) that Russia in her proposals for Peace had not considered France and the possibility of a controlled Zone; we were told of the disastrous folly of Suez (1956 not 1951); of Labour's incredible generosity to India (Quit India), of it being high time that we in Britain gave half-pay on retirement (but not why this is not part of the Labour Programme).

We were blandly told that Labour's Social Service schemes depend on a period of industrial expansion (by far the most interesting admission of the whole speech); and that Trade Unions could not contract out of a planned society (wage freeze), that any leader of the Labour Party would not be worth his salt if he allowed himself to be dictated to by the Unions; (a motion insisting the American bases be brought

under British control, against which "revolutionary motion" Tewson asked delegates to vote, while claiming that it was already L.P. policy: why anyone should worry who murders humanity no-one explained). Democratic Socialism is apparently against stuffed-shirtism for normal happy relations.

Earlier that day there had been a speech, that gave a complete contrast to the hypocrisy of the whole. Joan Mellors (CAWU), though she had said nothing original on race relations (what after all is their original to say), had shown that at least someone could see that responsibility does not imply passing resolutions; that the way to combat racism is for every trade union instead of passing pious resolutions to do something at branch level in their own areas; and the sincerity with which she spoke provided a much needed contrast to that lacked by others.

The Conference had opened with the dispute between NASDU and the rest; NASDU was at pains to show that the reason it had not complied with the TUC's directive to expel its Northern members, was because the Capitalist courts would not let them and that this was not the result of any dangerous or sentimental interest in the wishes of the members concerned. A little bit later there was an amusing Freudian slip when it was said that: "Unions have done excellent work except in the field of Human Relations where Congress is negligible" (progress).

Possibly the worst comment on the Conference was given by Doherty of the CIO-AFL; after reminiscing on the 1945 Conference in a somewhat rosy-hued way he put on an extra pair of tinted spectacles to view History. The Labour Movement was of course an unparalleled movement of progress, one only had to compare the number of this present Conference with those of the first ancestors of the Unions. (One does not of course compare their living faith, the fact that *sub-judice* or not, they would have wanted to know what happened to Podola, because for them men counted).

L. OTTER



ANARCHISM: Effective Propaganda & Movement Organisation

The following is the first part of an article broadly based on an expanded version of the lecture delivered by Philip Sansom at this year's Anarchist Summer School.

MANY a libertarian will claim to be too much of a libertarian to accept any kind of label—even one saying "libertarian" or "anarchist". It is thought to be an invasion of our privacy, or at least a restriction, to allow ourselves to be known by a particular brand-name. It reduces us to a commodity packaged and labelled like detergents or tea.

Now there is, I suppose, something to be said for such an attitude, as long as one wishes to remain uncommitted to any known viewpoint. If we accept a label it makes it that much more difficult to fluctuate in our opinions. We look rather silly if we claim to observe some religious faith, for example, but then enjoy the meats forbidden by that faith; it appears inconsistent if we wear badge which implies an atheist philosophy but still observe the feast days and the fast days of some ancient creed; it looks dishonest to proclaim some political stand point but vote the other way at election time.

And if we feel that we can't live up to a particular set of principles—or don't want to, because it might be uncomfortable—it's not a bad get-out to pretend that (a) there is no set of principles worth living up to, or (b) that nobody can explain them properly to you, even if there are any, so you still don't know what they are, or (c) to profess a set of principles would be a negation of your freedom, and even though those principles represent the crystallisation of the freest philosophy yet known, the very act of identification with them would invade your liberty.

But really it all revolves around your concept of liberty. If you want to be in a position where you can say one thing to-day and the opposite to-morrow, and particularly if you wish to remain on the sidelines and thus be in an independent position to criticise the players without having to play the game, then resistance to identification, to commitment, is most necessary.

By far the bulk of spectators—in all walks of life—fall into this category

(except that at least sports partisans identify themselves with "their" team). In London, Soho, and I am sure Greenwich Village in New York and the "bohemian" circles of every city, teams with such "free" people. They adopt a certain form of revolt against bourgeois society, but it would be most unsuitable to discuss their reactions in any terms relating to babies and bath-water, for the latter is quite unknown.

These, perhaps, are special cases; they need not concern us except that they claim the right to criticise libertarians or anarchists who commit themselves to a social attitude. To be taken more seriously are those who are actually concerned about social problems but shy away from involvement for personal reasons, and, even more important, those who rush into involvement in the wrong direction.

Certainly the adoption of a label should be a matter of some thought, backed with responsibility. We have all met "joiners"—individuals who, bowled over with enthusiasm, rush to join organisations without first getting clear what they are all about. In recent years in the anarchist movement these have ranged from fairly simple workers to one young man who has since become famous as a writer of a particularly specialised kind and who is categorised—by himself at least—as a genius. But in such people enthusiasm for a new-found faith (and that is all it can be for them) is not matched by a sense of responsibility either towards the people already holding our ideas, or, indeed, to the ideas themselves. They remain an embarrassment to us all—or rather, to our relief, they don't remain.

Now obviously it is not that there is no room in our movement for new and enthusiastic comrades; it is our perpetual need. But since entry into any organi-

sation implies activity, it also implies that one immediately accepts responsibility, and becomes a responsibility also, in the eyes of the outside world.

The degree to which this responsibility matters differs greatly according to the body of ideas we adopt. I don't know a great deal, I admit, about—say—spiritualism—but it seems to me that this is a belief which has little responsibility to everyday life on this planet. Being concerned with life in the hereafter, spiritualists can wear their label without it having any effect upon the way they live their lives in this world. The interest is in the next and one imagines they can behave in the flesh without much concern for social relationships.

The more one's label implies in terms of living with people here and now, the greater the responsibility in wearing it. The numbers who contract out of society are always small—and usually they continue to live, really, through the social efforts of others.

In spite of all evidence to the contrary, the human animal is a social animal. We live in society and therefore the more social the references of the label we give ourselves the greater the responsibility in adopting it, the wider the implications, and the more relevance it has to our everyday life.

Now the social philosophies of our time—those which have evolved over the last hundred years in answer to the anti-social development of capitalism—divide themselves into two broad streams, the authoritarian and the libertarian. The socialist and the anarchist. And in spite of their names, oddly enough it is the latter which embraces the more social approach and which demands the more social responsibility in the individual pinning that label to his breast.

P.S.

(To be continued).

Epiphenomenalism & Political Beliefs

A consideration of some aspects of parliamentary elections

EPIPHENOMENALISM is rather a mouthful, but a discussion of it may clarify the anarchist attitude to parliamentary government and the issue of non-participation in parliamentary elections. The above term refers to a philosophic theory of the relationship between mind and body. Epiphenomenalists hold that the conscious mind is not a causal agency; they see the chain of causality as being complete in bodily events, so that mental processes are merely accompanying phenomena which make no difference to what the individual actually does.

A useful analogy has been made in considering the relations between shadows and the objects causing the shadows. Suppose we are watching the shadow of a goods train upon the wall of a railway embankment. The shadow-locomotive appears to be pulling the shadow-trucks; it belches out shadow-smoke and lurches forward—the shadow-trucks lurch forward behind it. The shadow-locomotive checks, and all the shadow-trucks crowd up buffer behind it. It looks as though the shadow in front is influencing the behaviour of the shadows behind it, but we know that this is not true, the shadows have no effect on one another—they are influenced only by the movement of the objects which cast the shadows.

The apparent causal relationship between the movement of the shadows is an epiphenomenon dependent on the real phenomenon of the movement of the locomotive and the trucks.

The philosophical theory as such is open to a criticism of its laying down a distinction between "mind" and "body", but that is not pertinent to our discussion.

The average elector is influenced by the fact that he appears to see a society run by the actions of the parliamentary assembly and he is naturally anxious to have a say, however small, in this phenomenon. The anarchist objection rests on the criticism that the elector is mistaken in believing the parliamentary business to be a phenomenon; it is an epiphenomenon. Although one can break up or distort a shadow pattern on a wall by casting one's own shadow across it, such action will not affect the real events which are taking place.

Historically this is admitted. Serious developments which have taken place in European countries to any supposed causal agency of the particular ritual by which God was worshipped at particular times. Differing forms of religious worship are seen to be epiphenomena. The causal agencies are to be sought elsewhere—agricultural and industrial development, climatic changes, famines, plagues, etc. All these changes have doubtless been reflected in different forms of religious worship being observed, but few would attribute a causal agency to the manner in which the Eucharist was celebrated. Yet the people at the time did not take the historians' view. To them the whole future of their society seemed to be bound up with the manner in which the priests said that God preferred to be worshipped. Looking back at the bloody history of Christian civilization we can discern more practical issues involved in their wars than God's supposed whims of preference. But the people who fought in these wars had not this clear view, and they mistook the shadow for the substance.

Marx seized upon one of the obvious causal agents of social change—the manner of economic production—and neglected all others in the complex web of interaction. In reaction from Marx, Weber emphasised the importance of religion in the social process. He emphasised that militant protestantism tended to go hand in hand with the sort of practical, bustling efficiency of effective capitalist production. But this theory does not imply that efficient capitalist production is the result of protestant religious worship; if we consider the militant protestant's prayers and attitude to his God, we look upon an epiphenomenon as far as his productive efficiency is concerned.

There is naturally a strong emotional resistance to recognising an epiphenomenon for what it is. The devout Christian sees human society chiefly in terms of man's relationship with God. To propose that the past, present and future of human society have really no meaningful connection with his religious worship, is to threaten to strip him of dependence on a divine fatherhood. He would be lost and disorientated without his religious faith. In just the same way, the devout party man simply cannot accept that what he sees as the king-pin of his political beliefs is nothing more than

IF you ask an Italian what he or she thinks of English people, or ask for the opinions of a Frenchman on Italians, a Spaniard on Frenchmen, or any imaginable pair of nationalities one of the characteristics usually brought forward is hypocrisy. Perhaps every nation has its own particular forms of hypocrisy, and it is so easy, even for the most critical and self-critical inhabitant to accustom himself to the hypocrisy of his own country, and equally easy for the best intentioned to pick out the faults of another land.

Elections of governments are generally agreed, tacitly by politicians and openly by anarchists, to be occasions on which latent humbug, deceit and trickery are brought out into the open, and almost according to recognised codes and conventions and put up for sale. Needless to say national character puts its stamp on these affairs.

In Paris in 1936, it was difficult to tell, by looking at the most frequently displayed posters, that the politicians whose names were known from the press and radio were really taking part in the election. The lists on display were devoted to the "New Men", "Young France" and half a dozen other fascist groups, fortunately divided among themselves. In some of the country constituencies none of the candidates of the major parties were conceded a chance, and such groups as the "National Union of Peasants and Independents" were most important. On election day itself the most noticeable feature was lorry loads of policemen driving through the streets and clambering in and out, guarding the polling booths. The result was a left-wing

gain which increased the Communist representation and put a social democrat in the position of Prime Minister. This led to an increased offensive against the Algerian rebels, more persecutions against the opposition in France, and eventually played into the hands of de Gaulle and the right. An effective demonstration of the value of voting for progressive governments.

In Federal Germany elections were held in the autumn of 1957. The most striking feature of the campaign there was the vicious faces of the candidates which appeared on posters. No rational person would have voted to be governed by them even if he was prepared to be governed at all. One poster bore the slogan "Think of Hungary! Be careful! Vote CDU." This was in a town only a few miles from the frontier with Denmark, where a social democrat government has reigned for years, with results, which however they may be criticised, are hardly comparable to those of Hungary. If this propaganda could be successful, and apparently it was, it is clear that rational thoughts are not the stuff on which electoral campaigns get to work.

In Stockholm the city elections of 1958 displayed the Scandinavian calmness, and apparent lack of irrationality. The social democrats simply put up posters with a design of wild flowers, the conservatives exhorted voters to choose "a friendlier Stockholm", and had another poster which seemed to be a lithograph of an abstract work of art, with "Vote Right" placed in the bottom corner to balance the composition.

We are all too familiar with the English method, which seems to have two bases, equally irrelevant. The first is large portraits of the leaders, and the second the "happy family" motif which could equally well be an advertisement for a new infant school, a breakfast cereal or the benefits of a bank account.

However it is expressed, the barely concealed lying and imposition of rule by parliamentary elections, the basis is the same. Making allowances for local variation of conditions the results are the same too. Most of the people swallow the titbits and miss the substance, and agree to accept the winner of the vote as the ruler over them. There is however, in each country a tiny minority, perhaps also reflecting national characteristics in one way or another, which sees through the veil of hypocrisy and tries to break it down for their fellow men.

SYNDICALIST.

PAMPHLET REVIEW

Labour Methods

HOW LABOUR GOVERNED, 1945-1951. Syndicalist Workers' Federation. 6d.

WITH the coming election in view, the S.W.F. have produced a pamphlet drawing attention to methods of the Labour Government of 1945-51.

It is a well-written and documented piece of work, and brings back for easy reference the dozens of cases in which the Labour government undertook violent anti-working class action. There are far too many of them for even the most assiduous anarchist propagandist to retain in his memory. The pamphlet deals with Labour agreements on the use of the atomic bomb, its use of conscripts to break strikes and then the extension of conscription into peace-time; the wage freeze; the nationalisation swindle; the numerous occasions on which Labour pursued a belligerent imperialist foreign policy, over Indonesia, Persia, Indo-China and Palestine, its pro-Empire policy in Africa, which included bolstering up the colour bar; the spending of our wealth on armaments used for supporting American policy, side by side with fascist states in N.A.T.O.; and dishonesty in the controversy over the death penalty.

The last page of the pamphlet explains its motives in exposing the events of Labour rule, which are being forgotten under the influence of the more recent horrors of Toryism, and briefly puts the

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

OPEN DAILY

(Open 10 a.m.—6.30 p.m., 5 p.m. Sat.)

New Books . . .

Lady L. Romain Gary 15/-
Tombourines to Glory
Langston Hughes 13/6
The Dharma Bums Jack Kerouac 15/-

Second-Hand . . .

The Rise of Modern Industry
J. L. & B. Hammond 8/6
The Far Side of Paradise
Arthur Mizener 4/-
Destiny of a Revolution
Victor Serge 6/-

Women in Soviet Russia
Fennina W. Halle (1935) 6/-
The Delinquent Child
Donald Ford 10/-

Zeharoff, the Armaments King
Robert Newmann 3/6
Vorkuta Joseph Scholmer 3/6
Edward Carpenter: an
Appreciation Dickinson, Ellis, etc. 3/6
The Case of Comrade Tulayev
Victor Serge 5/-

The Physical Basis of Mind and
Morals Michael H. Fitch 5/6
García Lorca Edwin Honig 3/-
Soviet Trade Unions
Isaac Deutscher 3/6

The Sun of the Dead
Ivan Shmelov 3/6
Common People Philip. Callow 10/-
A Frost on My Frolic
Gwyn Thomas 4/6

Arrival and Departure
Arthur Koestler 4/-
Pastor Hall Ernest Toller 3/6
Union Now (1939)
Clarence Strait 3/-

Youth in British Industry (1937)
John Gollan 3/-
Can People Learn to Learn?
Brock-Chisholm 7/6

Pamphlets . . .

This is Apartheid Leslie Rubin 1/-
How Labour Governed 1945-51
(S.W.F.) 6d.

Periodicals . . .

Organomic Functionalism
September 2/6

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

DISARMAMENT

Continued from p. 1

That the political observers are not so sure as to the answer is clear from a recent *Guardian* editorial (21/9/59) in which it is conceded that

Mr. Khrushchev may be genuinely convinced that the West has argued about controls so as to avoid steps towards disarmament.

On the other hand it can be equally argued that if Mr. K. is "convinced" about the pacific intentions of the United States, and is anxious to strengthen the Russian economy by diverting the war economy to raising the standard of living in Russia and the underdeveloped countries of the world, then nothing is stopping him from taking the necessary steps independently of any agreement with the Western Powers. Equally while it may be true that any agreement on inspection would provide the West with more new information about the East than the latter would learn of the West, what does it matter, if Russia's intention is in any case to disarm completely? At present however it would appear that Russia's plan for complete disarmament allows an inspection system to operate only when it is no longer needed!

But whilst the political spokesmen of the West are urging that Russia should give proof of its sincerity over disarmament, what steps have been taken by the West to convince Russia of their own sincerity in this matter? According to Max Freedman in the *Guardian* (21/9/59).

Almost everyone seems determined to make Premier Khrushchev's disarmament proposals except President Eisenhower and Mr. Herter. . . In private talks with reporters American officials have expressed the utmost scepticism about Mr. Khrushchev's proposals to the United Nations, but they have refrained from public criticism.

No such restraint has been visible in the American press, whose attitude has ranged from mocking derision to contemptuous rejection. It has chosen to magnify every little episode of temper by Mr. Khrushchev, every sombre indiscretion, every gesture that can convey the rough bluster and menace incarnate in this imperious dictator. Can such a man, the press asks with triumphant sarcasm, really be judged as a sincere friend of peace when he comes before the United Nations and asks for universal disarmament?

And what steps have the Americans taken to remove the anomaly of China's exclusion from the U.N.? Mr. K. was obviously right when he declared that "it was inconceivable that anyone could seriously think that a stable and reliable solution of major problems could be achieved without China". After all what would be the point of the West reaching agreement over inspection and control with Russia if a similar agreement with China were not made?

It is possible that Russia does want some measure of disarmament not because her rulers are peace lovers, but as Mr. Philip Noel Baker, who met Khrushchev last December, put it in an election speech last week, for "the most practical and materialistic reasons, that his [Mr. K's] plans for Russian economic progress will be gravely imperilled if the arms race goes on". The best test of Mr. K's sincerity would therefore be to analyse the economic structure and situation as it is at present in Russia and decide whether there are grounds for accepting this theory. (Incidentally it is interesting to note that Mr. Herter is said "not to regard it as totally impossible that the Russian government may now be

THE City of Efficient Consumption, described in last week's *FREEDOM*, takes the divorce between consumption and production to its ultimate extreme. In the second of their three "ideal types", Percival and Paul Goodman* seek by contrast, the elimination of the difference between production and consumption in a decentralised society to the units of which they give the name "The New Commune".

They had observed in discussing the Green Belt type of plan that the impulse behind the garden city idea was a reaction against the squalour and degradation of the urban environment in the industrial revolution. The garden city plans aimed at quarantining the technology and were based on "the humane intuition that work in which people have the satisfaction neither of direction, nor of wages, is essentially unbearable; the worker is eager to be let loose and to go far away."

Mindful of Daniel Burnham's injunction to "make no little plan", they decline to see the separation of work and the rest of life as immutable, and propose an "ideal type" in which they are re-united, not by scrapping the technology, but by re-shaping it closer to human requirements:

"Starting from the present separation of work and home, we can achieve their closer relation from two sides: (a) returning parts of the production to home-shops or to the proximity of the homes and (b) introducing domestic work and the productive part of family relations, which are not now considered part of the economy at all, into the style and relations of the larger economy."

Like Kropotkin and some other anarchist thinkers, they seize upon the technical possibilities for decentralisation which industrial advances and new sources of power have brought:

**COMMUNITAS: Means of Livelihood and Ways of Life* by Percival Goodman & Paul Goodman (University of Chicago Press, 1947).

ready to accept a measure of genuine disarmament.)

Whereas no-one seems to deny that the Russian economy could be expanded considerably without any problems of markets to absorb the goods produced, how to dispose of the almost limitless productive potential of American industry is a problem of the first order; so much so that for some considerable time American heavy industry has not been working to full capacity. And though Defence spending has continued to increase, and the standard of living in America is still the highest in the world, some 4 million American workers are without jobs. Is it reasonable to believe that the ending of the cold war and general disarmament, would strengthen the American economy? Whatever may be the intentions of the American political leaders in this question of disarmament, there is no doubt in our minds that the industrialists and the real rulers of America will not hear of any plan which for them will only mean a further cut-back in production. Their obstinacy over China is no less significant than the concerted efforts of the American capitalist Press to forestall any attempts at easing the so-called "tension" between the two power blocs.

America, in fact, cannot afford to end the cold war. But if Russia can then she has in her hand a trump card more far reaching than any rocket, more (politically) explosive than all her H-bombs put together. For by accepting all the conditions of control and inspection which the Western powers are demanding, and proceeding with her own disarmament unilaterally if need be, not only would Russia be strengthening her economy but at the same time removing the excuse for continuing a cold war economy in the United States. Big business could of course soon find another enemy to threaten the American way of life and her free-institutions" but there is no guarantee that the public would swallow the bait quite as easily this time! Or would they?

THE NEW COMMUNE

"As to home shops, we must think of the present sudden proliferation of machine tools. Previously it could be said that the sewing machine was the only productive machine widely distributed. But now, largely because of the war, the idea of thousands of small complete machine shops, powered by electricity has become familiar. And, in general, the change from steam power to electricity and oil has relaxed one of the greatest causes for the concentration of machines around a single driving shaft. Which part of the manufacture requires a factory (for instance, an assembly line) and which does not (for instance, turning a small part) depends on the analysis of production and the proximity of plant and homes. And, further, the new factories are themselves no longer nuisance buildings; many are neater and certainly handsomer than the homes and monumental buildings of the some communities; therefore, the proximity of factories, home-shops, and homes is possible and desirable.

"Ralph Borsodi, going back to the old conception of Aristotle, has proved, often with hilarious realism, that home production, such as cooking, cleaning, mending, and entertaining, has a formidable economic value. The problem is, without destroying the individuality of home production, to lighten and enrich it by the technical means and some of the expert attitudes which belong to public production. And vice versa, to restore to the home many services that are really most humanly satisfactory there, but are now unfeasible because of the drudgery, lack of tools, etc.

"But the chief part of finding a satisfactory productive life in the environment of homes and families consists in the analysis of personal relations and conditions: e.g. the productive co-operation of man and wife, which exists on farms, or the productive capacities of children and old folk, now simply excluded from the economy. But this involves sentimental and moral problems of extreme depth and delicacy which could only be solved by the experiment itself."

A CHIEF cause, declare the Goodman brothers, of the "living meaninglessness of industrial work is that each machine worker is acquainted with only a few processes, not the whole order of production; and, even worse, that the thousands of products are distributed where the worker has no acquaintance at all" and they ask whether it would

not prove to be more efficient in the long run if the men are working for themselves and have a say in the distribution.

"A say in the distribution" here means not merely economic democracy or even socialist ownership. These are necessary checks, but they do not give a political meaning to industrialism as such. What is required is the organisation of economic democracy on the basis of the productive units, where each unit, relying on its own expertise and the bargaining power of what it has to offer, co-operates with, and delegates authority to, the whole of society. This is syndicalism. And to guarantee the independent say of each productive unit it must have a relative self-sufficiency; this is regionalism and the union of farm and factory."

On the diversification of individual work, they note that within any one industry work can be divided on such grounds (for instance team work and individual work, or physical and intellectual work) and the right industries can be combined in a neighbourhood (for instance, cast glass, blown glass, and optical instruments, or most important of all, in their opinion, industry and agriculture.

The problem, they say, comes down to this, "to envisage a well-rounded schedule of jobs for each man and to arrange the buildings and farms so that the schedule is feasible", and this leads them to the integration of farm and factory in a context of regionalism and regional autonomy with

(a) Diversified farming as the basis of self-subsistence and, therefore, small urban centres (two hundred thousand).

(b) A number of mutually dependent industrial centres; so that an important process of the national economy can be under local control.

(c) These industries developed around regional resources of mine, field, and power.

DIVERSIFIED farming alone, they observe, is economically independent, and this is why small farms have always been a root of social stability, though not necessarily of peasant conservatism. On the other hand, taking advantage of mechanisation, "they import power and small machines and pay

with the products of domestic industry and cash crops farmed perhaps co-operatively with large machines. Such a farm then is the type of productive unit, independent in itself but linked with the larger economy of the other farms and of the town."

In industry, the problem is the reverse. Since every machine industry is dependent on the national economy. "But by regional independence of industries and by the close integration of factory and farm workers—factory hands taking over in the fields at peak seasons; farmers doing factory work in the winter; town people, especially children, living in the country; farmers making small parts for the factories—the industrial region as a whole can secure for itself an independent bargaining power in the national whole. . . .

They follow this with diagrams of the physical planning of a region on this model, and a glimpse of a piazza in the town centre, and of "a farm and its children"—the farmstead being of a kind of extended family house combined with a youth hostel.

But is planning on these lines worth while? Or rather, is the formulation of this kind of "ideal type" for a society, worth the effort? The Goodmans' answer is this:

"Now it might be said that all these provisions—small units, double markets, the selection of industries on political and psychological grounds, etc.—that all this is a strange and roundabout way of achieving a unified national economy, when at present this unity already exists with a tightness and efficiency that leaves nothing to be desired. But first, it is always a question whether the regional and syndicalist method is not more efficient in the end, when invention, for instance, is not inhibited and the job is its own incentive. But most important of all, it must be remembered that we are here aiming at the highest and nearest ideals of external life: liberty, personal concern, responsibility and expertise; and to say in what a man lends his hands to. Compared with these things, the present set-up, that does not even make the attempt to find living meaning in its work, has nothing to offer."

Their final model, a plan for "maximum security and minimum regulation" will be described next week.

C.W.

Pie in the Sky

You will eat, bye and bye
In that glorious land up in the sky.
Work and pray; live on hay
You'll get pie in the sky when you die.

A STORY has been told of a little boy, who, when he learnt the news of the projection of the first Sputniks, promptly announced that he no longer believed in God. He will obviously grow up quite immune to ideological seduction by the preaching evangelists who roamed America at the time when the libertarian syndicalists of the I.W.W. were trying to organise the workers to fight against capitalism in one of its most brutal phases, when it was advancing to exploit previously untapped resources.

However, the time seems to be fast approaching when that kind of religion will be as dead superficially as the cults of the ancient Babylonians. Its inner function will of course be taken over by something else, and the new god is building up his claims week by week in the form of miracles. There is no reticence on his part when it comes to giving a sign for the followers to cotton on to.

The papers announced last week that the appropriately named Lunik had been dispatched on its course to the moon, and the following day that it had made a direct hit. The achievement has been generally ascribed to "the Russians". Which Russians were responsible for it? In fact it is obvious that until the successful launching had been made only a handful of them knew anything about Lunik, any more than they did about any of the other projectiles. Further, no-one had consulted them as to whether they wanted the moon to be hit, whether they wanted "their" flags to be scattered across its surface whether they wanted Russian men and animals to be sent in and out of space before those of any

other country. Perhaps if the question had been put to them they would have chosen that the money should be spent on developing roads and railways so that they could travel around their own country in comfort instead of sending lunatics hurtling through space in discomfort. That would of course have been denounced as reaction, lack of foresight, and a reminder that the people do not know what is best for them; even further proof of the necessity of government, which allows the best and most creative men to come to the top and steer the people in the most suitable direction. The people, if they had not had a government, would probably have chosen to develop their farmlands, to build houses for themselves, they might even have indulged in luxury consumption. They would certainly not have realised the prime necessity of producing satellites and rockets. Moreover, despite the disclaimers of Mr. Nixon and Mr. Lloyd, both of whom announced their lack of interest in such "achievements", we can be sure that the British and American governments are spending thousands of millions of pounds and dollars on research of this type, or translating the money into human terms, the gap between the toil which most people are forced to devote their lives to, and the reward in access to the results of their work is correspondingly great. Disposal of wealth in this direction is not a subject for choice at election time. Wherever the cross is made, people in England, America and Russia will have their labour extracted from them to provide for research which is of no benefit to them, just as they will provide for defence programmes, police forces, financial rackets and all the other concomitants of the authoritarian system in its highly developed form of to-day.

International lawyers are putting out statements about sovereignty on the moon and no doubt before long some

of them will be drawing big salaries as experts in the newly opening field of "interplanetary law", providing rationalisations for the fact that the mightiest will rule as in all other aspects of law. Some scientists are pointing out that to hit the moon was a Pyrrhic achievement since it destroyed a valuable crate of scientific instruments which could have served more useful purposes left intact. No, the reason for the rocket was neither legal nor scientific, but part of the psychology of government. Only government can deliver the goods in space, therefore you have to put up with it. Only a communist (capitalist) state can lead us in the race against the Americans (Russians). The real function of space research is to make the people feel that the state is necessary. It creates objects of worship to which individuals can sacrifice themselves. The scientist takes the place of the priest, and the laymen that of the followers. However much that little voice speaks up in the individual asking for peace, freedom from restrictions, a chance to enjoy life in its material and emotional aspects, and to be in control of one's own being, there is something more powerful to which it has to be sacrificed, either God, the State, scientific progress, or the supremacy of a race.

We can only begin to break the hold of the state by turning our eyes away from the sky and back to ourselves; by forgetting about gods or satellites, and remembering human beings, the land around us and the people with whom we come into contact.

To achieve this on a large enough scale is a tremendous task which is being opposed by all the political, religious, commercial, and power-holding forces in the world. However, there are some signs that the spirit of humanity is still alive and has potential power which has not yet been awakened.

