

...argue against any breach of liberty from the ill use that may be made of it; is to argue against liberty itself, since all is capable of being abused.'

LORD LYTTLETON.

WAR, GOVERNMENT AND SURVIVAL
THE CABINET OF DR. CALIGARI FOR QUEEN AND COUNTRY?
CORRESPONDENCE

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY - 4d.

A TOKEN?

IN its comments on the threatened closures of railway workshops, the cause of the strike on Wednesday which will have taken place when this issue of FREEDOM reaches its readers, *The Observer* asks "what would we think of a private firm which acted in this way?"

While the question was not so rhetorical as it was probably intended to be, for after all large scale sackings have been all too common recently in the motor, aircraft and rocket industries, it spotlights one of the chief features of the traditional socialist programme for industry, and exposes the way in which it has failed the workers, and their organised unions for whom the Labour Party and nationalisation had been traditionally the instruments for transforming the national economy from capitalism to socialism.

It is true that the present crisis is being fought out under a Tory government, and one which must feel so firmly entrenched in its position that it can appoint I.C.I. directors to be head of the railways at fantastic salaries and that the machinery of consultation which had been built up under former regimes has been cast aside by the group in control at present. The point is that these things have been possible. The value of the consultation machinery is shown for what it is worth by the very fact that it can be swept aside at a moment's notice by a ruthless government. The importance of the unions voice in policy is demonstrated by the fact that although they agreed to a modernisation programme in 1959, in return for guarantees that any running down of the railways would

THEN WHY NOT A TOKEN OF WORKERS' CONTROL?

take place gradually, this agreement has been torn up unilaterally.

This has all taken place, not in a factory owned by vicious old style capitalists, but in a nationalised industry. The very fact that it is nationalised has meant that the road transport and airline interests have found it so much easier to apply pressure against rail transport.

In this situation, faced with the disruption of communities based on the railway, laying off of old workers, and the withdrawal of train services from parts of the country which will then become inaccessible, the railwaymen have fallen back on the traditional weapon of the workers, withdrawal of labour, although only for a token day.

The present situation illustrates vividly the difference between state control, and what one can call "social control", the idea of running

one facet of the economy as a joint venture by the people who work and those who make use of it, those who supply the workers with other necessities and so on. The state can decide from a central office in London that a certain branch line shall be closed, a decision made purely on economic considerations, and no doubt the economics involved are the economics of dividend repayments and taxation to keep the state going and not only its useful functions. On the other hand whenever it decides to close a branch line there are protests from travellers, local councils, local traders and the railwaymen themselves, but these are not effective in keeping the service going. Centralisation is indeed an efficient way of running an industry.

In the face of this, what is the point of a token strike. Is it as the *Guardian* suggests, a token of futility, which will alienate the support of the public, and what is more spoil the Labour Party's chances by causing its image to get mixed up with industrial militancy? (For the

Guardian, nothing is ever right or wrong in itself, everything has to be evaluated in terms of the image it might give someone of something else). Surely, the only people whose support is worth having are those who back up the workers when they need it, not those who stop at words and withdraw their support the minute a sign of militancy appears on the horizon.

In fact the only criticism that can be made of the NUR's plans for direct action are that they are not challenging enough. A strike in itself has the function of hitting the boss in order to force him to give way on a special point, and also that of demonstrating to society that everything in its economy depends on the productive worker. Now if the boss is planning to get rid of certain groups of workers anyway, it is not much use those workers going on strike, and hence the importance of national solidarity. However, from an anarchist point of view it is a pity the concept of the social strike has not been developed for use in

Continued on page 4

SUPPRESSION IN SOUTHERN RHODESIA

THE attempt by the Prime Minister of Southern Rhodesia to ban the Zimbabwe African People's Union, the main African nationalist movement in Southern Rhodesia, is bound to fail. These futile attempts by the white settlers to suppress the desire for political independence have the twin effects of increasing the militancy and determination of the Africans.

Naturally ZAPU has gone underground, the fiction that an illegal organisation ceases to exist being demonstrated yet again. Among those arrested or restricted are two University lecturers at the University of Rhodesia and Nyasaland, Dr. Terence Ranger and Mr. John Reed—both, if I remember correctly, editors of a magazine entitled "Dissent" which used to appear in Rhodesia, a serious radical outlet of high repute. Mr. Joshua Nkomo, leader of ZAPU, happened to be in Northern Rhodesia when the ban on the party was issued and he has now reached Tanganyika. It is reported that he intends to come to London, but Nkomo has been severely criticised for not returning to Southern Rhodesia where he faces restriction or arrest. Yet it would seem that he can plead his cause far better in this way than from a prison cell.

Sir Edgar Whitehead, Southern Rhodesia's prime minister—apparently a half-blind, half-deaf man—has called up territorialists and reservists in Southern Rhodesia and the country is becoming a police State—in answer to what Whitehead describes as "a terrorist organisation typical of the worst days of Fascism." According to a White Paper issued by Whitehead's Government there have been ninety terrorist acts in the territory this year—the link between

ZAPU and these acts is asserted but is unsubstantiated. ZAPU has denied responsibility. It seems that the ban has not stopped such activity, the "Daily Mail" (22/9/62) reporter writes that: "Twenty soldiers of the Rhodesian Special Air Service parachuted into mountains near the Mozambique border today to hunt for the African terrorists who have set fire to vast areas of the British South Africa Company's pine forest estates." Other reports of sabotage and terrorism continue to appear.

Nkomo has asked the British Government to send troops to take over Southern Rhodesia, yet one feels his request is unlikely to meet with action, since those forces at work intent on preserving the *status quo* in Southern Rhodesia are not altogether out of tune with powerful sections of pressure in this country. Indeed, a recent loan of £3½ million by the British Government to Sir Edgar, which he described quite legitimately as "an expression of complete confidence in my Government and its policies" underlines the close relations between Salisbury (S. Rhodesia) and power here. As the "New Statesman" (28/9/62) put it: "The British Government played an important role in drafting the present undemocratic constitution (of S. Rhodesia)", thus to hope for it to send troops to end this self-same constitution is utopian.

The "Daily Telegraph" in an editorial (21/9/62) entitled "Stamping on ZAPU" claims that: "A violent terrorist organisation, Zambia, was banned in Northern Rhodesia in 1959 and that ban has remained effective. Both parties existed on occult and artificial stimulus." This is, of course, nonsense. Zambia is now Kenneth Kaunda's United National Independence Party, with another name; the 1959 ban was ineffective. The stimulus of Zambia, UNIP and ZAPU is certainly not artificial, it is very real: the blatant every day hypocrisy of an imposed Federation that preaches partnership and practices apartheid. According to T. R. M. Creighton writing in the "Spectator" (28/9/62) "Zapu is a profoundly supported popular movement, incorporating, expressing and representing the African people." Perhaps they are all staring at the stars, and possibly Nkomo is touring the world for spiritual advice, but somehow I think not. J.W.

MRS. HELEN ALLEGRA, of the Committee of 100, discharged from Holloway after a 12-month sentence said it was a "medieval monstrosity" where were lice in the punishment cells. She had found maggots in her food, she had one bar of soap a month and she had contracted athlete's foot from prison shoes. The Home Office said it could not comment on individual prisoners' statements. Cells, they said, are normally kept clean of any form a livestock. A plasterer of no fixed address said at Essex Sessions, "I have never been more comfortable than while in prison." According to the report of the Commissioner of Prisons for 1961, seventeen prisoners committed suicide. Seven murderers were executed during the same period. In Winchester prison last month, a prisoner hanged himself at the beginning of a seven year sentence for assault and grievous bodily harm. Convicts in San Quentin struck for one hour because the lettuce in their lunch boxes was too soggy. A birch was specially flown from England to administer twelve strokes to a 19-year-old prisoner in Perth, Western Australia. Prisoners at Wormwood Scrubbs won thirteen first prizes, seven second prizes, and one third at Hammersmith Allotments and Gardens Association flower and vegetable show. The R.C. Church plans to build a nunnery for the Carmelite order on the site of Dachau. A new detention centre has been opened for girls between 14 and 21, it will specialise in administering "short, sharp shocks". . . .

NONE OF THE 2,000 who illegally conducted a public assembly outside the Air Ministry in London were arrested. Three newspaper sellers in the new underground subway into Speakers' Corner, Hyde Park (including two FREEDOM sellers), had their names taken for selling within the park, which is illegal. A hot-dog seller was sentenced to six months for receiving hemp; he was conveyed to Wormwood Scrubbs prison when a message was received that the 'hemp' had been found to be grass-seed. He was released. A Pakistani immigrant learned that a man has been accused of killing him in Lahore. A charred body was found in a burned-out taxi and a 24-year-old farmer was accused of the murder of a man who had emigrated to Britain. Dr. John Robinson, the Bishop of Woolwich attacked the treatment of homosexuals as "utterly medieval". He said, "One man in 25 is likely to be homosexual. This is not a condition that can be chosen. It is due either to inborn factors, or to emotional conditions during childhood and adolescence." He further said that the law making homosexuality a criminal offence "has brought with it a train of

misery, blackmail, suicide, and police methods which most citizens regard, when they hear of them, as disgraceful". . . .

INHABITANTS OF ALTOETTING, near Munich allege that a young couple who have a crippled thalidomide baby have been punished in this way for not going to church. Dr. Suzanne Lesueur-Capelle has appealed to the Vatican in its 21st Ecumenical Council to re-consider its attitude to family planning. She declares that the intention of birth control methods allowed by the Church as the same as those forbidden and that "God will not be deceived". . . .



A 23-YEAR-OLD barman was fined £15 for punching a police-constable in the eye at Shepherd's Bush, a 17-year old clerk was sentenced to one month for punching a police officer in the chest, a 30-year-old stoker was fined £1 and £2 costs for putting his fist through a glass door-panel. For knocking down Floyd Paterson in two minutes and six seconds, Sonny Liston (with previous convictions) earned £100,000. The victim of the assault earned £4,816 a second for his ordeal. Gross takings from the fracas were £2,107,700 of which the Federal Revenue Bureau hopes to collect £1,400,000 in back taxes. British farm workers are to get a rise of eight shillings per week. Lucille Ball, a commedienne is to get £35,700 for appearing on Danny Kaye's TV show. Petrol tanker drivers after sporadic strikes secured by arbitration, weekly wage increases ranging from 11s. 10d. to 16s. A beauty queen visiting a cosmetics factory at Amersham, accidentally shattered a container of perfume worth £720, on her departure she was given a casket of perfume worth £2, "just to show there are no hard feelings". . . .

THE NEW YORK State Commission on Human Rights has ordered the Arabian American Oil Company to stop refusing to employ Jews. The order also prohi-

bits the company from using application forms for jobs which imply that certain creeds and ancestry are necessary for employment. A penalty of £100 and a fine of £500 for letting out council or rent housing to anyone on grounds of race or religion will be considered at a public enquiry by Washington's three municipal commissioners. The Rev. Martin Luther King was attacked by a member of the US Nazi Party when he spoke in Birmingham, Alabama and mentioned that Sammy Davis, Jr. had promised help. Dr. King would not prefer an assault charge because of his non-violent beliefs. Sir Oswald Mosley, speaking at the University of Buffalo, N.Y., refused to meet George Lincoln Rockwell whom he described as "the local lunatic". The African Students' Association in India attacked the Indian's for "colour consciousness". They claim they have no opportunity for contacts with individual Indians, they are called offensive names and stared at in the street. A ball and banquet to welcome the nuclear ship *Savannah* at Savannah, Georgia was cancelled because of the possibility that whites would boycott a desegregated function. The Nationalist town council of Brits, near Pretoria, in South Africa, has withdrawn permission for the "Boerenasie", a Fascist organization to hold an anti-Semitic and racialist campaign at the Town Hall. James Meredith is still, at the time of writing, refused permission to go to University at Oxford (Mississippi). The Junior Chamber of Commerce at Richmond, Virginia, will build a temporary "Berlin" wall 2ft. wide and 4 ft. high topped by barbed wire. They will distribute to motorists pamphlets explaining American freedoms contrasted with Berlin restrictions. According to *Billboard*, salesmen at the Soviet War Memorial in West Berlin are doing good business "a bonanza", in their own words, in anti-Communist charms and curios, anti-Communist slogan-buttons, whistles blowing "pfui" (German for a raspberry, or Bronx cheer), and memorial patches of black crepe. . . .

NEXT WEEK AT the local cinema there is a week of horror. Monday—"The Screaming Skull" and "Cage of Doom"; Tuesday—"The Spider" and "The Brain Eaters"; Wednesday—"The Night of the Blood Beast" and "The Terror Strikes"; Thursday—"Peeping Tom" and "Voodoo Woman"; Friday—"Demons of the Swamp" and "Invasion of the Hill Creatures"; Saturday—"Teenage Frankenstein" and "Blood is my Heritage". . . . LAST MONTH IN THE US was Home Sweet Home month, Better Breakfast month and Better Sleep month.

JON QUIXOTE.

ANARCHY 20

ON SALE NOW

ANARCHY is Published by Freedom Press at 1/6 on the last Saturday of every month.

War, Government and Survival

IT has become commonplace to say that modern methods of warfare have created a situation in which "error is irreversible and irretrievable" (Mumford). A recognition of this fact underlies the various campaigns against nuclear weapons and the increasing support they have gained in the last few years have raised hopes in the minds of many of their adherents that they will succeed in preventing another world war. One wishes that these hopes were destined to come true, for only the insane believe that universal annihilation can be justified in meaningful terms.

For those whose thinking goes beyond the essential superficiality of marches, banners and petitions, however, the question arises as to whether those who enjoy the annual pilgrimage between Aldermaston and London are really on the right road to the abolition of war.

From the U.S.A. has come a well-argued case that they are not. Entitled "Is It Possible To Survive",* its author, Don Werkheiser, states "... all this (i.e. peace walks) appears pitifully inadequate ... what appears to me necessary is to view war as a sort of social disease in the sense of it being an advanced stage of social mal-functioning. Viewed thus, the testing of nuclear weapons cannot be adequately treated as a separate problem. From this view, many persons most concerned about peace today are overlooking two fundamental issues:

*Published by The School of Living, Lane's End Homestead, Brookville, Ohio, U.S.A. This is a decentralist movement founded by Ralph Borsodi. It publishes a monthly journal called "Balanced Living", whose editor takes a definite non-governmental position, and several of whose contributors are of an anarchist tendency.—S.E.P.

BOOKS?

We can supply

ANY book in print. Also out-of-print books searched for—and frequently found! This includes paper-backs, children's books and text books. (Please supply publisher's name if possible).

NEW BOOKS

- Travels with Charley John Steinbeck 21/-
My Enemy's Enemy Kingsley Amis 18/-
The Life and Ideas of Robert Owen (ed.) A. L. Morton 18/-
The Relvers William Faulkner 18/-
1916: Year of Decision James Cameron 18/-
The Independent Progressive School H. A. T. Child 25/-
Margin Released J. B. Priestley 25/-
The World in Winter John Christopher 16/-
On the Prevention of War John Strachey 40/-
The Man on Horseback S. E. Finer 27/6

REPRINTS AND CHEAP EDITIONS

- History (ed.) Sir Julian Huxley 50/-
The Tourist Guide Jaroslav Hasek 5/-
50 poems e. e. cummings 8/6
The Aims of Education A. N. Whitehead 9/6
Pierre and Jean Guy de Maupassant 3/6
Hitler: a Study in Tyranny Allan Bullock 10/6
Our Man in Havana Graham Greene 3/6
Rhinoceros and Other Plays Eugene Ionesco 4/-
The Great Tradition F. R. Leavis 9/6
Vanished Supremacies Sir Lewis Namier 8/6
The Eighteenth Century Background Basil Willey 9/6
Sweet Bird of Youth and Other Plays Tennessee Williams 5/-
The Triple Thinkers Edmund Wilson 6/-
States and Morals: a Study in Political Conflicts T. D. Weldon 7/6
Power without Glory Frank Hardy 25/-
Mountain Standard Time: Three Novels Paul Horgan 21/-
A Vision W. B. Yeats 30/-

PERIODICALS

- Screeches for Sounding, Vol. the first (and the last) (ed.) Dave Cunliffe 2/-

Freedom Bookshop

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

17a MAXWELL ROAD

FULHAM SW6 Tel: REN 3736

namely, the subjective and the institutional aspects of war.

"By 'subjective' I mean the underlying inner-processes which are so developed in human beings that unresolved conflict becomes a basic pattern of character structure. By 'institutional' I mean the conventional habits of inter-human relationships by which we express our pattern of underlying drives."

The author devotes the rest of his brochure to developing his thesis regarding these two aspects of war and to suggestions as to how the drives towards destruction can be reversed.

The part dealing with the subjective aspects of war is based upon concepts that will be familiar to those who are acquainted with psycho-analysis and its offsprings. Don Werkheiser sees in the immaturity of rulers and ruled the psychological causes of war. In particular, it is this immaturity of the individual, this fixation at some pre-adult stage of development, that makes the masses depend upon the chief war-making institution: government.

"That is to say, the same feelings of fear, hope and dependency which we as children felt about our parents, we now transfer to some fictitious entity called 'government'. Then we are predisposed to react to 'government' as if it were our childhood parents.

"But since government is an abstraction, an imaginary entity, we cannot actually react to it because there is nothing to which to react. However, there are real human beings who do things in the name of government. If mere men take our money away from us without our consent and spend it without consulting us, we feel robbed. But if they first perform certain rituals by which they are vested with the symbol of authority, we tend to react to them as if the symbol and the human substance were one."

It is the immature who need leaders, who look to others to take responsibility for their lives. And their leaders are often psychopaths "dominated by sick-minded values".

"We can do something about our own immaturities. But when we permit other men to commit in our names invasive acts of force and violence that we could not bring ourselves to commit, we only convert our own personal diffi-

culties into impersonal problems too vast for any mere human to solve."

Werkheiser next examines the institutional aspects of government. Much of what he writes will be well-known to anarchists, but, by illustrating his arguments with an analysis of the origins and evolution of the U.S. government he makes his critique of government from a somewhat different angle to that to which European anarchists are accustomed.

Accepting Franz Oppenheimer's view that "The State ... is a social institution forced by a victorious group of men on a defeated group", he strips away the mythical trappings of a popular origin that surround the foundation of the federal government of the U.S.A. and shows it to be no different in its essentials from any other government. "We find that the essential feature of political superiors ruling political inferiors was established in the very beginning and has only grown and expanded with the passage of time." Then follows a closely reasoned exposure of such beliefs regarding the American government as "the U.S. government is of, by and for all the people".

Another aspect of government he examines is that of the granting of legal privileges for the purpose of economic exploitation. In this section of his essay he largely follows the economic theory of those individualists grouped around the American anarchist Benjamin Tucker.

To conclude his case against government the author mounts a withering attack upon the idea that the U.S. government differs from most other governments in not only having a democratic constitution, but also in starting as "a mutual contract, entered into by all the people, who rule themselves through hired agents". Drawing upon the ideas of Lysander Spooner he has no difficulty in demolishing this error with a cold logic which should make any rationally-minded democrat who has the courage to confront it writhe in shame at being the dupe of such a naive legend.

The last part of "Is It Possible To Survive?" is the least satisfactory. Perhaps this is to be expected, since the author now turns from criticism to making positive proposals. In other words: How can "the trend toward

irretrievable disaster" be overcome?

As he sees it, millions of people will have to be "psychologically re-educated" in order to become mature and also to realize the nature of the "organized irresponsibility known as government". What is demanded is, in effect, the greatest change in human attitudes and practices that has ever been known and this change must be accomplished in the shortest possible space of time.

The question is, however, whether those people whose immaturity creates the need to be governed by an external authority will be willing to undergo the "psychological re-education" needed to become self-governing individuals who do not wish to aggress, or to support aggression, against others. To put it another way, can one free those who do not want to be free? Indeed, can one become a free, "self-actuating" individual by looking to an other? From this angle, proposals for vast schemes of psychological re-education appear to be barking at the moon. At best, we cannot inculcate mature behaviour, we can only hope to evoke it, and if the immaturity fixation is indissoluble we can only shrug our shoulders and try to avoid those who have it.

Don Werkheiser recognizes that these problems exist and is no optimist in his views. Nonetheless, if we are to survive, he maintains, we must attempt the seemingly impossible and transform our coercive, self-aggravating system of war and unfreedom into a network of voluntary associations. He concludes his brochure by giving a list of proposed voluntary associations ranging from "nutritional co-operatives" to arbitration associations. Not all of these associations are to my taste. In particular, the "marriage bureau co-operative" ... "to assist, and to provide counselling and preparation for marriage" conjures up a vision of professional match-makers waving their degrees in psychiatry, or manipulating an electronic brain, so that they may interrogate two individuals whose qualities fit the appropriate categories, but who awkwardly refuse to like each other.

Disagreements apart, Don Werkheiser has produced a stimulating analysis of our condition. He would not pretend to have covered every problem, nor to have exhausted the problems he does deal with, but he has given us a work

which can be of great help in understanding the mad-house of which we are inmates.

Don Werkheiser's specifically economic views are set out in another of his works—a short pamphlet called "The Role of Government in Fulfilling Desires". This deals with the role played by government in creating the conditions for economic exploitation.

The State "may be defined as an organization of one class dominating over the other classes" (Oppenheimer). Accepting this definition Don Werkheiser argues that the State cannot be used to end economic exploitation—that it is, on the contrary, the cause of exploitation. There are, he says, two ways of fulfilling our economic needs: the economic and the political. "By the economic means everyone has an equal opportunity to fulfil his desires; by the political means some individuals seek to fulfil their desires by imposing their wills upon others". The political means may be armed appropriation of a product or a person; or armed exclusion from "free access to the use of natural powers". "The major armed exclusions are land monopoly, credit monopoly and exchange monopoly. The unearned income received by armed privilege in land is called rent; by armed privilege in credit is called interest; and by armed privilege in exchange is called profit".

Because they all wished to use the State in one form or another the author rejects the programmes of Marx, Silvio Gesell and Henry George. His own inclinations are towards the mutualist proposals of the Benjamin Tucker school of anarchism.

There is much in this pamphlet that will be of interest to anarchists, but its brevity and its exclusive concern with economics make it rather fragmentary and one-sided. Men have other desires than economic ones and to make "economic man" the centre of our thinking and action is no more satisfactory than to make "religious man" or "psychological man" the centre. The individual is not reducible to a mere economic category and any attempt to make him so can easily threaten the extinction of his uniqueness, without which life becomes a mechanical routine, pre-ordained and empty.

I do not wish to suggest that Don Werkheiser intends such a thing. It is obvious from his other writings that he is for the individual and against the herd. But from this particular essay, one can get the impression that he thinks the solution to human problems lies in the economic sphere alone.

S. E. PARKER.

THE CABINET OF DR. CALIGARI

the chase across the expressionist roof tops; the dummy in Cesare's coffin; the flight of Caligari to the shelter of a lunatic asylum and the final exposé that the director of the lunatic asylum and Caligari's exit in a strait jacket with all the thespian stops full out.

The authors have argued that Caligari is meant to symbolize those obsessed with the desire for authority and willing to violate all human decencies to attain and keep it while Cesare the somnambulist is the ordinary individual drilled to kill and to die without reason and without explanation while the overpowering of Caligari and his frenetic removal in a strait jacket is given as reason overcoming insane authority. Eric Pommer of DeccaBiocop assigned Fritz Lang to direct the film but unfortunately Dr. Robert Wiene was finally given the stint. Wiene was not too happy about this, for his own father was insane and he talked Lang into changing the original story by adding an introduction to the film wherein the hero and heroine meet as inmates in a lunatic asylum. As a final insult Wiene added an appendix, wherein the hero wanders among his fellow lunatics, Cesare is now one of them, when he meets the director of the asylum. After a screaming session in which the hero is now carried off, the benevolent Dr. Caligari obliquely informs the German audience that the screaming hero is really the madman and that he, Caligari, understanding his obsession will now be able to cure him. Janowitz and Mayer rightly roared their rage at this perversion of their polemic against authority but to no avail for Wiene, by his simple addition of "before and after", had convicted the hero as a madman, glorified authority and publicly ridiculed those the kidnapping of the heroine by Cesare

who would seek to challenge it, so that this film that was to be a negative protest against authority, became the glorification of all political, military and medical father figures. The Americans in 1962 now offer their harmless and bowdlerised version and there is little that one can say about it. Caligari is scripted as the All-American psychiatrist, a cross between the God of the New Testament and a TV master of ceremonies, while Glynis Johns in an ensemble of erotic little girly dresses screams prettily in and out of the bathroom and up and down the stairs while the nose-clean lunatics make with the funny lines. For a brief moment Roger Kay who produced and directed this cliff-hanger has thrown in an original Berlin Sturm background, of sketched-in fragmented doorways but it is too brief to be of any consequence. The walled womb of dirty crystals that housed the original film has gone with the crazy chimneys and the Germanic shadows and we are left with an American film that can be accepted and forgotten as a conveyor belt production off the cheerful thriller assembly-line but bears absolutely no relationship, other than the title, to Janowitz and Mayer's original. But should the purist wish to point the quivering finger of admonition at at Hollywood's cultural bastardization of the classics let them first point to the graves of Lang and Wiene and remember that the tragic figure of this film was Carl Mayer who became an aimless vagabond rejected by an industry that had become too mechanical for his talents. This little man who once wandered through London's Soho died of cancer in 1944, having lived out the tragedies of his one major film then to die rejected and forgotten.

ARTHUR MOYSE.

RELIGION, MIRACLES AND ANARCHISM

IT is not often that we discuss Religion in the columns of FREEDOM, partly because we feel that in this country it does not possess the legislative powers to impose its dogmas, its prejudices or its faith on those who do not recognise the existence of a God with superhuman power or the authority of a Church which alleges that it speaks in His name.

This does not mean that we think religion, faith in the existence of a personal God, of an inspired morality and in an after-life of eternal happiness (or eternal misery!) are, in any case, to be praised or encouraged; we feel that so long as religion is a personal matter, which no one has the power to thrust down the unwilling throats of non-believers, we have no reason to direct our attention as anarchist propagandists to "expose" these beliefs and this faith. Indeed anarchists have always defended persecuted religious minorities just as we defend persecuted political or racial minorities: for the obvious reason that we believe in the freedom of individuals to hold whatever views they like regardless of what the majority believes. And we respect and defend the freedom of others because we expect and demand that others should respect ours.

For these reasons, we have defended the right of Mr. Colin Jordan and his friends to hold and express Nazi ideas and earn a living like anyone else without being discriminated against. The fact that he not only holds these ideas but publicly expresses them entitles us also to combat them publicly on equal terms: i.e. free speech. We know that if Mr. Jordan's views make their way the result will be among other things, denial of free speech to the anarchists. But can one prevent such a situation by supporting measures which would gag the Nazis now, without defeating our own ends? Obviously the only weapon we possess to prevent the growth of, what we consider to be, anti-social, authoritarian or obscurantist ideas is an intensification of our propaganda for social, libertarian and outward-looking ideas. People tend to assume that in the contest between social and anti-social ideas the latter invariably prevail; a view influenced by the Church's emphasis on the "wickedness" of Man (which has more to do with self-justification than facts).

If the contest were between ideas alone, we have no doubt that the "good" ideas would prevail; but there can be no dialogue between authoritarian and libertarian ideas, because at a certain stage the former must, by definition, be implemented by force using the machinery of government either legally (the vote) or illegally (the coup d'état).

The political, religious or other views of our fellow beings are, so far as we are concerned, their business. It is only when they combine to impose their views on others either by monopolising the means of life or penalising socially and economically those who refuse to pay lip service to them, that we believe it our duty, as well as our right as thinking human beings, to defend ourselves with every weapon at our disposal, by force as well as with arguments.

Organised religion seeks to convert mankind to its idea; as such

it cannot expect to enjoy immunity from criticism or even ridicule. To suggest as many do there is something sacrosanct about religious ideas but that political views which are based on thought, and observation as well as being deeply held, can be lambasted with impunity by any Tom, Dick, or Seaton, shows how unthinking and conditioned most people are. The Church presumes to know what is good for our "souls" as the politician presumes to know what is best for our physical well-being. So long as their presumption is limited to words we can ignore them or challenge them with words.

★

TWO readers this week take us to task for having reprinted a news item from the *Guardian* involving a crippled man whose three children and mother-in-law died in a fire at his home while he was in Lourdes praying for a God-sent cure, to which we gave the headline "Faith Rewarded?". It is significant that both correspondents should imagine that we printed the item, and gave it the headline we did, to "poke fun", and both thought the item was irrelevant in an anarchist paper, since it was intended as a serious comment to a serious problem—that is, faith in the supernatural, also drawing attention to those money-making rackets, such as Lourdes, which with the connivance of the Church exploit the gullibility of millions of miserable people. Are these matters an anarchist paper should ignore?

We do not believe in the existence of God, nor in an after life, nor in the miracles of Fatima, nor the "visions" of the peasant-girl of Lourdes nor in the miraculous powers of its springs. (And we don't believe in them because in our opinion no convincing evidence has ever been produced).

The fact that millions of people have faith in all these is no reason for suppressing the view that religion is another form of brainwashing and as such, not in Man's "best interests"!

Lourdes is one of the most publicised places in the world, and its attraction is the "miraculous powers" of its springs. The Catholic Church, in which the crippled man, to whom our correspondents refer, presumably has unbounded faith, has the most highly organised propaganda machine in the world. Why is it considered by so many to be bad taste to expose the phoney claims of Lourdes and the mumbo-jumbo of Rome, but in the interests of truth to expose the phoney claims of Moscow Communism and of Western Democracy?

We know there is a lot of brainwashing in Moscow and New York. But what can any reasonable person say of the Faithful Mr. Budd, whose faith in Lourdes resulted in no miracle, whose two children were burned to death while he was praying for a miracle and who then, according to the *Daily Express* (8/9/62), is reported as having said, on his return to England: "My faith in life has now been renewed"? The statement can be taken two ways. One hopes that what he meant was that he had lost faith in God and Lourdes! Our reporting of the incident was an expression of our lack of faith in miracles.

For Queen and Country?

ALTHOUGH a recent editorial dealt with the Common Market issue from the point of view of the anarchist propagandist (. . . we must eat not only on the day before the revolution but on the day after . . .), a subject of such magnitude in our lives seems to deserve a further examination based less on an approaching anarchist society as on the prospects for the next ten or twenty years. This calls for the kind of assessment that anarchists are frequently reluctant to indulge in because it means abandoning the strictly theoretical and/or ideological approach to contemporary issues and declaring themselves for or against topical questions that are essentially bourgeois, capitalistic or even, as with the Common Market, nationalistic.

The invidious situation of apparently having to choose between I.C.I. and I.G. Farben, between Lord Chandos and Signor Mattei, between Imperial Preference and its European equivalent, is one that rightly embarrasses any intellect that regards such institutions as the running sores of a sick society; and the FREEDOM editorial clearly showed this. Like Mr. Gaitskell, however, though unfortunately not with elections in mind, the anarchist as well as the socialist has to come off the fence, and in hazarding to state its case on the matter the editorial was prepared to concede this. Since we are living and working in a bourgeois capitalist society, it was inferred, and we are contributing to that society; reluctantly or otherwise we are in it and of it, and will be affected by its evolution and transformation. We have even to face the fact that on the issue of the Common Market 'we' are British, that it is the future of 'our' agriculture and industry on which we must decide, that we must consider whether to subordinate 'our' national sovereignty to 'theirs'.

If the Editorial shows little enthusiasm for such a task, and in fact by refusing to see it as necessarily a choice between

two evils appears to be wanting to reach a decision without seeming to be committed, we must feel sympathy. But in ultimately rejecting the present proposals for a united Europe (. . . we oppose the Common Market . . .) it consciously commits itself to taking sides. A negative 'no-change' attitude, whether one likes it or not, is a positive declaration of Britain First and a proclamation that we want to keep to ourselves rather than merge with others. This might seem a sweeping interpretation of the point of view put forward, but how else can one read, for example, this quotation:

... however prosperous we may be in the Common Market producing Refrigerators for Europe, in a social crisis (presumably the Dawn of the Revolution!) we would need food and not refrigerators to keep alive."

The main objections put forward can be summarised as follows:

That anything that tends to concentrate wealth and power is to be condemned, and that such monopolies will make it more difficult to create a decentralised economy in the hands of the workers.

That this tendency is worse within the Common Market than in Britain.

Thirdly, that there will be a general readjustment of industry and agriculture and this will be to the detriment of British agriculture and the prospects of a future revolution in this country, when it will be necessary for us to feed ourselves.

That although the Treaty of Rome aims at the unification of Europe, it is an illusion so long as the economy is based on capitalism. Unity imposed from above is a step in the wrong direction.

That propaganda might well delude the 'masses' into believing that the Common Market is a revolution by legislation.

Monopolistic Britain

In considering the first of these one could hardly be blamed for assuming that such monopolistic conditions did not prevail in Britain, and that there was no great concentration of wealth or power. Implicit, too, in this objection is the suggestion that it is not impossible to imagine in the foreseeable future a decentralised economy in the hands of British workers. Is this realistic? Is it even an honest presentation of the facts? The Britain we know is far from an innocent craft-and-guild economy; the Britain we don't know, that stays out of sight, would show us to be the most monopolistic country in Europe. One has only to think of the property companies and the retail trade, from bread to circuses, and to reflect that only in Britain is every High Street lined with Boots, Burtons, Marks and Woolies, Lyons and Odeons, to realise all this. By contrast, multiples and chain enterprises have only recently come to Germany, Italy and France, the giant property companies are only now being formed. Industrially, I.C.I., A.E.I., Tate & Lyle, Rank Flour, Imperial Tobacco and others, can dictate the conditions in their particular industries as state capitalist monopolies, not a single West European country is as advanced.

The fear that the Common Market giants, by one arrangement or another, will tend to merge and create an absolute monopoly that would allow them to dictate to the consumer, overlooks a number of solid facts. Not least is article 86 of the Treaty of Rome which declares null and void any agreement between enterprises . . . and any concerted practices which are likely to affect trade between the Member States and which have as their object . . . the prevention, restriction or distortion of competition within the Common Market. It is not possible, of course, to rule out changes and secret bargaining, but British monopolies can well match them, as in the case, for example, of British Oxygen with its 95% share of its vital industry.

Meanwhile, the consumer in a capitalist society has shown in his preference for supermarkets, multiples and 'popular' brands, that he does in fact get better value than by shopping at the corner store. France, which is only now breaking down the stranglehold of the small shopkeeper, is providing the most

recent example of this.

On the evidence, then, rather than on sentiments, there is no reason for imagining that a 'decentralised economy in the hands of the workers' is more likely in an independent Britain.

The third reason offered in opposing the Market is based on the need to protect British agriculture. Here no attempt is made to conceal the preoccupation with Britishness and the inference that we must consider ourselves a separate and independent state. In the event of a revolutionary situation arising it is visualised that this could take place only in Britain, and for this reason—since a capitalist Europe would hardly help us—we need to be able to feed ourselves. Such an insular conception of an anarchist society must have provoked gasps from continental comrades. Never before could British agriculture, preserve of gentleman farmers and landowners, have been put forward as the hope of the revolution! If anything could confirm Europeans in their estimate of British insularity it must be this instance of anarchists wanting to preserve 'our' agriculture for 'our' revolution.

It is true that the Editorial does not state its motives so explicitly. Nationalism is put forward in the guise of a plea for every country to produce as much food as possible, irrespective of the consequences, of the reality of capitalism as it is today, of the stocks already rotting in the storehouses of the U.S.A., Canada and Australia. That it should not be like this, starvation amidst plenty, we are all in agreement. But is it realistic to pose a present-day problem then answer it with a solution based on entirely hypothetical circumstances?

When the editorial protests that a unification of Europe is one imposed from above, and is therefore a step in the wrong direction, it is guilty of comparing this with a non-existent anarchist ideal. In fact, the choice is between a very very faulty union which could confound us by becoming more progressive, or no union at all. And even FREEDOM will admit that though European unity (in its present form) was imposed from above, the peoples of the Common Market (peasants and workers alike) are almost wholly in favour of it.

The last reason for putting Britain First, that the 'masses' might believe the

Common Market is a 'revolution by legislation', depends on whether one is in the habit of applying the word 'revolution' to the most minimal phases of evolution. The reality is that the 'masses' are unlikely to care either way so long as their society is producing the goods.

The Advantages

By a slight omission the Editorial failed to mention any of the advantages of joining the Market. Many of these, one must admit, are highly individual and depend on one's personal estimate of priorities. But since, in the first instance, the Common Market is mainly an economic union, one might begin with this aspect.

Keeping strictly to a comparison of two capitalist societies—not an easy task, as was stated earlier, for an anarchist—what would then be the advantages of Britain joining? The immediate one, despite Mr. Gaitskell's 50-50 estimate of prospects, would be the maintenance of our present standard of living. The economic readjustments that would follow would take about ten years to complete, and at the end of this period, unless there is war (equally possible if Britain stays out!), it is certain that we shall have contributed towards ending the worst extremes of poverty in Europe and stabilising living standards for the 'masses' at a comfortable level. If British agriculture suffers a loss, for example, it will be the Italian peasant's gain. If 'our' workers become redundant (and British Railways, the coal mines and the cotton industry, are showing it's happening, anyway), there will be an interchange with European industries. This may sound, on the face of it, like transferring legions of slave labour. But in fact this is the case in Britain now as people drift from the land to the cities, from North to South, from Ireland to England.

It may be suggested from this that the class lines will be strengthened and that workers will lose their bargaining power and many of their present social advantages. The pattern in the Common Market so far, however, is showing that newly prosperous workers and their unions have achieved more bargaining power, more political power and more economic power relative to their employers and their governments. It is almost a truism that the higher the living standards of a particular group or class, the more indispensable (and therefore more powerful) it is to the capitalist society in which it functions. One may object that the gains of the workers will be fractional compared with those of capitalists and their monopolies, but this will be true only in the transitional stage. The realisation by workers, capitalists and governments, of living in a society where consumer-power is revealed as a more potent factor than vote-power is but one of the changes that is leading to the complete transformation of our capitalist societies.

The major change, however, that is taking place is more far-reaching and absolute than the trading effects of the Common Market. It concerns the emerging hegemony of technology, science and the managerial class. The future pattern of capitalism, from the evidence of today, will be in the hands of 'experts' rather than profit-obsessed competitors and financiers, controlled by the mechanisms of consumption, employment and maintaining a certain bourgeois equilibrium rather than being under the domination of opportunistic political parties. And this will apply to Britain in or out of the Market.

It seems apparent, then, that in a prosperous capitalist state the needs and wants of its population will be calculated with electronic efficiency irrespective of elections and party platforms. The goods will be produced and the machines kept turning whether or not it is to the immediate gain of individual capitalists and their companies. This pattern is already fairly advanced in France. The 'experts' have taken over from competing capitalists and rival political parties. One may abhor the dictatorial powers of de Gaulle but the evidence shows that Frenchmen, from being the most politically-minded individuals in Europe, have accepted this switch from corrupt politicians to experts and trained civil servants.

