

Mac's Guessing Game



BY his cabinet shuffle Mr. Macmillan has given the political commentators of our mass organs of communications plenty to speculate about. "End of a liberal era?" asks the *Guardian*; "Get Tougher Cabinet" affirms the *Daily Worker*; "A new crown prince for the Tories", the *Herald* assures us, and so on. A visitor from outer space could well be forgiven if he expressed surprise at the fact that the only person, the Prime Minister, who could give a first-hand account of the reason for the Cabinet shuffle, is the only one who says nothing! The game of politics would obviously lose much of its importance, and mystery if the leading politicians were to explain to the public each move they made, apart from the fact that it would remove from the labour

market a whole industry of experts, interpreters, journalists whose job it is to ferret out the "news" from the confidants of the big men, such as their chauffeurs, chamber-maids and butlers.

Indeed if a Prime Minister were to be so democratic as to disclose the reasons for his actions it is almost certain that the Press would either accuse him of lying, or praise his political astuteness in putting his political rivals off the scent of the truth. The trouble with telling the truth is that it would so simplify the relations between men that for many of them the whole spice of life would be lost. Apart from the politicians, think of the business men trying to pull the wool over the eyes of a prospective client at a business lunch; of the advertising men thinking up how to glamourize a miserable packet of detergent or a tin of bullet-hard peas; of the union leaders who build up the image of themselves as indispensable to the interests of the workers; of the self-importance of millions of petty officials who under their uniforms are more miserable creatures than their would-be victims! Think of what would happen to our Courts of "Justice" and the machinery of punishment and enforcement of the law if everybody were to tell the truth.

It is a curious fact that though both

witnesses swear to "tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth," the lawyers on both sides then proceed to cross-examine them in order to prove that they are only telling lies!

Why is it that all respectable parents attempt to teach their children to tell the truth in preparation for their going out into a world in which they learn that the hall mark of "success" is one's ability to hide one's feelings and the truth in one's dealings with others?

WHEN IS A DICTATOR NOT A DICTATOR?

MORE in sorrow than in anger the *Observer* and its Commonwealth correspondent Colin Legum, are having to recognise that Mr. Nkrumah's latest move in arresting and imprisoning without trial fifty members of the opposition, coupled with the fact that he no longer enjoys the support of a majority of the Ghanaian people, lays him open to the charge of ruling as a dictator. Mr. Legum maintains however that

Despite things said about Ghana in the past, two facts remained true until the present crisis hit the country last month. It has not become an authoritarian State, and Dr. Nkrumah was not a dictator. Whatever criticisms were felt about the Nkrumah regime (and

Continued on page 3

THE FREE WORLD

AFRICA: PROFESSOR ACCUSED OF HERESY

Durban, October 5.

Dr. A. S. Geyser, Professor of New Testament Theology at Pretoria University Theological Faculty, which is run by the Nederduits-Hervormde Kerk, is to face a heresy charge. Dr. Geyser has often boldly attacked race discrimination in the Church as being unscriptural and has defied efforts of the Hervormde Kerk to muzzle him.

He was recently told to resign from the university within a specified period, but before the time had expired he was served with two charges—one of heresy, the other of disregarding an order prohibiting criticisms of Church laws or decisions. The charges were laid by some of his senior students.

He denied the charges when he appeared before a Church disciplinary committee this week, but the committee decided that there was a prima facie case against him. The synodal commission is expected to meet later this month to consider the charges and hear Dr. Geyser's defence. If he is pronounced guilty, he will be unfrocked and dismissed from the faculty post.

Last year he figured prominently in the controversy over the book "Delayed Action", in which he and ten other Dutch Reformed Churchmen condemned race discrimination and demanded a new South African racial outlook. At the

synod last March he took a stand against the ban on non-white membership of the Church and was warned with others not to oppose existing Church law and not to criticise Church policy outside the Church. Dr. Geyser said today that he was shocked that students had preferred a heresy charge against him and he asked for a public hearing by the Church Commission.

(*Guardian*).

AUSTRALIA: LECTURER BANNED AS SECURITY RISK

Canberra, October 4.

The Australian Minister of Immigration, Mr. Alexander Downer, told the House of Representatives here tonight that Mr. Y. S. Brenner, a graduate of London University, was refused an entry visa for Australia because he was a strong security risk.

Mr. Downer made his statement after coming under strong Opposition fire for accepting security reports on Mr. Brenner, a 34-year-old German-born Israeli, who had been appointed to a lectureship in economic history at Adelaide University.

Mr. Downer said the risk would have been "so grave that any Minister with a sense of responsibility in the interest of this country could not possibly have granted Mr. Brenner a visa." The refusal of the visa was not because of Mr. Brenner's activities in the Stern Gang

or his attempt to join the Communist Party. "My reasons were greater than that," the Minister said.

Mr. Downer told the House that Mr. Henry Bolton Basten, Vice-Chancellor of Adelaide University, had told the assistant secretary of immigration, Mr. Ronald Harris, that if Mr. Brenner did not come to Australia it would not be a serious problem for the university.

Mr. Basten also said that the university would not pursue the matter further if the Government felt there was a strong security risk. Mr. Downer said Mr. Harris told Mr. Basten that he would not divulge the information given about Mr. Brenner to anyone, including the Chancellor of the University.

(*Reuter*).

SWITZERLAND: REFERENDUM ON H-WEAPONS

Geneva, September 27.

The Swiss House of Representatives today decided by an overwhelming majority (147 to 12) to recommend to the nation the rejection in a forthcoming plebiscite of a proposal for the "prohibition of the production, import, transit, stocking, or use of all kinds of atomic weapons."

The move to ban the bomb in Switzerland was originally due to Communist initiative, but gradually attracted support from non-Communist pacifists. In April, 1959, the extra-parliamentary procedure was invoked by a motion with 72,795 valid signatures. In July the Swiss Government proposed to Parliament that the "ban-the-bomb" motion should be submitted to a nation-wide referendum with the recommendation that it should be rejected.

Dr. Wahlen, the President of the Confederation, stressed on behalf of the Government that the ban-the-bomb motion should be rejected. He said that several countries already had the bomb and that "it is not by closing one's eyes that one removes evil."

Dr. Wahlen had himself advocated in 1946 that Switzerland should not acquire atomic weapons. He said frankly today that events had made him change his views. Switzerland, now faced with steadily growing threats of war, could no longer agree to have its freedom of action limited.

Dr. Wahlen said that at present Switzerland could neither acquire nor produce nuclear weapons. Should Switzerland be in a position to have such weapons later, it was clear that the country could never accept conditions incompatible with its neutrality. But before taking any action the matter would be submitted for parliamentary decision.

(*Guardian*).

STATISTICALLY INEVITABLE?

ACCORDING to a report in the *Daily Express*, America is spending millions of dollars on an anti-missile device which will shoot down any

Russian rocket which might be fired by technical or human error.

Nike-Zeus is a 200-mile range missile with an atomic warhead designed to destroy an incoming H-bomb in the air without detonating it . . . it could shoot down Mr. Krushchev's 100-megaton warheads.

Mr. Richard Morse of the U.S. Army Defence Science Board is quoted as saying that:

"Both East and West are developing city-busting rockets which will soon be completely automatic and ready for instant response at the touch of a few buttons.

"We are rapidly reaching the point where the question of a mistake is critical. I am afraid we are moving in the direction where a nuclear exchange is inevitable statistically — not because somebody wants it, but because it just happens."

We wonder what the "Peace through balanced nuclear strength" advocates advise in this eventuality?

The argument that because each side have nuclear weapons of equal strength neither dare risk retaliation by starting war can hardly apply (if it ever did) in a situation where control has become impossible.

Even if we assume that the Army Science Board are, for military reasons, exaggerating the inevitability of error we cannot ignore the possibility.

It is said that the rocket early-warning system in this country operating with Nike-Zeus could give

President Kennedy time to decide whether an attack was deliberate or accidental before ordering massive retaliation.

He could make the decision in this event which might mean the annihilation of the Russian people. But if we don't care about the fate of the Russian people, it might do well to consider what would happen if a button is accidentally pushed in the West and a missile lands in Soviet territory.

We could not blame the Russian people if they made no attempt to stop massive retaliation by their government.

An Anarchist Ball

WILL BE HELD AT FULHAM TOWN HALL ON FRIDAY OCTOBER 20 AT 7.30 TO CELEBRATE 75 YEARS OF 'FREEDOM' AND FREEDOM PRESS.

MUSIC WILL BE PROVIDED BY MICK MULLIGAN AND HIS BAND WITH GEORGE MELLY AND GUEST ARTISTS.

REFRESHMENTS WILL BE AVAILABLE AND THERE WILL BE A LICENSED BAR.

ADMISSION SIX SHILLINGS.

TICKETS NOW AVAILABLE FROM FREEDOM PRESS 17a MAXWELL ROAD FULHAM LONDON SW6 AND FROM DOBELL'S RECORD SHOP, CHARING X RD WC2 OR LIBRARIE PARISIENNE, OLD COMPTON ST W1 (OR AT THE DOOR)

A Taste of Life

"A TASTE OF HONEY" which began life in 1958 as a Theatre Workshop play by a remarkable girl of 19 and enjoyed successful runs in the West End and on Broadway, has now been made into a Woodfall film that demands to be seen. It tells what might have been the sordid and sensational story of an illegitimate Irish school-girl in Salford, abandoned by her promiscuous mother in favour of a one-eyed drunkard, seduced and then abandoned again by a coloured sailor, and cared for during her consequent pregnancy by a half-queer art-student who abandons her yet again when her mother returns on the day the child is born. But in the combined hands of the author, Shelagh Delaney, and her two collaborators and directors, Joan Littlewood (come home soon!) and Tony Richardson, there is nothing in the least sordid or sensational about Jo's taste of honey and bellyful of gall.

It was a strange play, and it is a strange film. In a sense it is realistic, but it is a poetic realism; in a sense it is documentary, but it is an emotional document. It is a true tragicomedy, which is a rare thing these days, with laughter and tears not at different times but at the same time. If one had to put it into a single category, a good one would be "neo-romanticism"—and the French *nouvelle vague* isn't all that far away. You won't learn much from it about teenage problems or working-class conditions in urban Lancashire, but you will learn exactly what it feels like to

be one poor girl in a mess. Somehow, without being sentimental or satirical, Shelagh Delaney has managed to convey the hopes and fears and loves and hates and beliefs and indifference to her heroine to people quite unlike her, and also to give voice to a whole generation of alienated young women who have grown up in the post-suffragette era. Whether or not *A Taste of Honey* will mean anything to our children or even to ourselves in ten or twenty years' time, it has certainly meant as much as *Look Back in Anger* or *Roots* to thousands of people in the last three; and it has been one of my most cherished experiences, first in the theatre and now in the cinema.

I suppose the film will have more impact than the play, but I still prefer the play. I think that by adding a great deal of social-realist background scenery and outdoor action, Tony Richardson has blunted the edge of the story more than Joan Littlewood did by her weakness for making it a music-hall turn. The claustrophobic effect of the single room, relieved only by hoots from ships' sirens and the murmur of children's voices off-stage, is dispelled when the camera keeps moving—however skilfully—up and down the streets and canals and fairgrounds. Richardson is an uncomfortably restless film director. On the other hand, Rita Tushingham is not perhaps as fine an actress as the original Frances Cuka, but she is much more right as Jo—what a wonderful sad face she has! And it is good to see Murray Melvin again in the part he created (I wonder if we will ever be able to see him as the British soldier in a film of *The Hostage*). Dora Bryan (rescued from the deserts of farce), Robert Stephens and Paul Danquah also give convincing performances as the mother, drunkard and sailor. In fact it is a good film, not as good as *Saturday Night & Sunday Morning*, it is true, but better than Richardson's earlier shots at the Osborne plays, and far, far better than nearly all the celluloid rubbish produced in British film studios.

But why has the story been mucked about so much? Why does the drunkard have a glass eye instead of a patch? Why does the sailor come from Liverpool instead of Cardiff? Why does the her Geof have gone away for ever? This ought to have been conceived at Christmas? And why on earth does the film peter out in a series of aimless wanderings instead of culminating in Jo's first labour pain all alone in the room when her mother has gone out for a drink and her Geof has gone away for ever? This was a scene that had an unbearable poignancy equal to Beatie's great speech at the end of *Roots*—why spoil it? Poor Shelagh Delaney, she must be the most interfered-with dramatist who ever put pen to paper and conjured out of thin air "a bit of love, a bit of lust, and there you are"; it would be possible to write a Ph.D. thesis on the various versions of *A Taste of Honey*.

But it does seem right that Jo should wear a Nuclear Disarmament badge, considering that her creator is on the Committee of 100 and was with us in the Square on September 17th. I wonder if Jo was there too. I like to think so. I have met dozens of girls like her, and I feel that I have met her too. You could shoot the play or the film to pieces, but she would still be there, as alive as you or me. N.W.

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

- The Anatomy of Work G. Friedmann 25/-
- French Profiles: Prophets and Pioneers G. P. Gooch 30/-
- Curtains Kenneth Tynan 42/-
- The Insecure Offenders T. R. Fyvel 25/-
- Moscow or Peking? A. Metaxas 15/-
- When my Girl Comes Home V. S. Pritchett 16/-

REPRINTS AND CHEAP EDITIONS

- Taking it Easy E. Hyams 6/-
- Fantasia of the Unconscious and Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious D. H. Lawrence 18/-
- The Hobo Nels Anderson 15/-
- Moll Flanders Daniel Defoe 7/6
- Selected Writings Oscar Wilde 7/6
- Commandant of Auschwitz Rudolf Hoess 3/6
- The Footsteps of Anna Frank E. Schnabel 2/6
- The Loneliness of the Long Distance Runner Alan Sillitoe 2/6

SECOND-HAND

- Letters to a Friend Winifred Holtby 6/6
- Tory M.P. Simon Haxey 3/-
- Child of Light (Mary W. Shelley) Muriel Spark 6/-
- Ludwig Feuerbach (damaged) Frederick Engels 2/6
- Selected Stories of Lu Hsun 3/-
- A Handbook of Hanging Charles Duff 2/6

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

CINEMA

ONE of the charming survivals in English court procedure is when the judge (prior to putting on the witch-doctor's black cap) says: "Have you... anything to say why you should not be given judgment according to law?"

This, according to Arthur Koestler and C. H. Rolph in their Penguin *Hanged by the Neck* (2/6), is not an invitation for the prisoner to give reasons why he should not hang but is a survival (like the ploy in front of the judge, to ward off gaol fever), from the days when the 'clergy' which actually included all who could read and write were given the benefit of their education and were not hanged.

Up to the reign of George IV this privilege was abolished but the form of question remained and 'benefit of clergy' could still be put forward even by the illiterate who with bible in hand used to 'read' a passage committed to memory. The piece chosen was:

FOR WHOSE CONVENIENCE?

According to a recent press report, the campaign started by Mrs. Barbara Castle to have penny-in-the-slot turnstiles removed from ladies' lavatories is causing "very serious concern" at the firm of W. T. Ellison and Co., Salford, the firm who make the turnstiles.

Mr. F. O. Baron, the secretary of the firm, said that Mrs. Castle might have "consulted us" before condemning the turnstile. He added:

"We like to think we are the major turnstile manufacturing firm in the country and quite half our business lies in this direction. We are now at the point of having to declare some of our 24 employees redundant due to a considerable number of cancelled orders.

"To some women it may look a bit like prison but hundreds and thousands have gone through these turnstiles while the number who have complained has been comparatively few. I think that women are glad of them really, because they do prevent vandalism and help to keep lavatories clean and tidy."

Mr. Baron said the firm would have been glad to consider ways of improving the design of turnstiles and would still be happy to consider ways of making them more attractive. He felt Mrs. Castle had done the 24 men in the fitting department of the works a "very great disservice".

Round the Galleries

A MONTH ago G. Butcher of *Art News* hailed the Max Ernst exhibition at the Tate by front paging the statement that Ernst is pre-eminent in the surrealist movement, and a few weeks later Andrew Forge, accepted doyen of pop critics, cried that Magritte was "one of the most prolific and important of the surrealists", and there you have it and you can steal a copper and toss for your choice, for Butcher has since managed to muddy the waters a little more by writing that "Magritte is not a very good painter", and that surely can be counted as an understatement, for Magritte is a very bad painter, so bad indeed that if his uncatalogued "Le Bon Sens" at the Obelisk Gallery at 15 Crawford Street, W.1., existed as a solitary painting it would not gain acceptance at an amateur exhibition. This bowl of fruit so crudely painted contains within itself every fault of the third-rate painter. The garish colours, the lack of depth, the cardboard flatness of the subject-matter and the inability to create the illusion of space are explained away by the double take technique of the subject-matter.

Yet to acknowledge the sheer technical badness of the surrealist painters is not to deny the enjoyment that they have given. In 1850 Charles Dickens foamed at the mouth with almost uncontrollable simulated rage when he viewed Millais' "Christ in the house of his parents" but now this decorous painting graces the walls, unless it's been stolen, of the Tate to evoke the admiration of pious old ladies. The surrealists have so much in common with the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood that it will be no surprise to find them sharing a common grave. The same debt to the *trompe-l'oeil* painters, the same addiction to greasy surfaces and the same ability to cover up bad workmanship by a gimmicky subject

Without Benefit of Clergy

'Have mercy upon me O God, according to Thy loving kindness: According to the multitude of Thy tender mercies, blot out my transgressions.'

This passage reads curiously in the light of the remarks of Elizabeth Orman Tuttle in her book *The Crusade Against Capital Punishment in Great Britain** who speaks of "the hesitance of the Church to endorse the abolition of the death penalty"—"Without benefit of clergy" indeed! This week-end a clergyman (The Bishop of Woolwich) came out against capital punishment. Elizabeth Orman Tuttle in her summing up comments also on the continual failure of the abolitionist campaign to gain the status of a party issue. The Bishop of Woolwich stressed that the Conservative Party in putting capital punishment resolutions on its Party agenda was branding itself as a reactionary party. But what of the Labour Party who, it is explained in Elizabeth Orman Tuttle's book were constantly reluctant to remove capital punishment from the statute book when they were in office and had Home Secretaries who, out of office, were Abolitionists, and in office signed death warrants. God preserve us from our 'progressive' friends. We understand our 'reactionary' enemies.

On the same BBC news bulletin that gave the Bishop of Woolwich's speech there was a story of an Italian who has served seven years' imprisonment for the murder of his brother. The brother has now re-appeared alive and well.

This is the latest of the type of case, eleven of which are recorded in the third abolitionist book (by Leslie Hale*) of errors in the administration of justice. Anarchists are well aware of the fallibility of the law. Sacco and Vanzetti

*Stevens & Sons, 30s.
*Hanged in Error, Penguin Special 2s. 6d.

and the Haymarket prisoners are typical examples, of human error plus prejudice. Given the death penalty there is no possibility of restitution or rehabilitation and in Leslie Hale's book many examples are given of the way the forces of order' fight to maintain their error as justice.

For example, in the Pelizzioni case where an Italian was involved in an affray at Clerkenwell and was condemned to death, Mr. Negretti, the barometer manufacturer took an interest in the case and the only way he could get the Italian (who had volunteered a confession) prosecuted was to bring a private prosecution. The second Italian was found guilty of the same murder, on his own confession. The law now had victims for the same noose. They managed to save Pelizzioni's neck and his own face by trying Pelizzioni on a wounding charge, acquitting him of it and releasing him. This all took place in 1856 and Leslie Hale says it could happen now, since the Court of Appeal now exists which could refuse to hear the murderer's confession (as they refused to hear Ware in the Manchester bomb-site case). They could also do a secret enquiry at great speed (as in the Christie case) and Mr. Negretti or Pelizzioni would be denied permission to attend!

These three books are valuable aids to the war against capital punishment which it seems must be won without benefit of clergy, of politics—parties—or of doubt!

Consideration of this question leads naturally to consideration of the questions of crime as sickness, prevention and their de-institutionalization (or people dynamiting) the question of justice as vengeance and the law as the holder of property rights. The *Crusade Against Capital Punishment* is the runner of a campaign against all punishment which must come.

JACK ROBINSON

Fulham Town Hall Oct 20

cepted the newspaper report that one of the galleries had threatened to kick out old friend Mesens out of their gallery if he dared to enter it, for without the past and present help of Mesens there would have been no joint exhibition, it was a good gag but the combined advert makes me a sceptic.

For the rest it is with regret that I record the suicide by poison of Arthur Jeffress of the gallery at 28 Davies Street, W.1. He was found dead in room 71 in the Hotel France et Choiseul in the Rue St. Honore in Paris and it is said that this rich, well-groomed and well-travelled American feared a third world war and now he lies dead and the gallery continues as before. Osbert Lancaster, the front page cartoonist of the *Daily Express*, lounged on a large padded seat in the centre of this quiet, plush gallery when I made my round and around this tall, grey-moustachioed, grey-suited and diplomatically dignified member of and recorder of the Establishment hung his gouaches of the Levant. Slight and pretty things that could only hint of his Maudie Littlehampton vignettes in the *Express* with but one exception, his "Assouan", landscape as lovely as a Chinese water-colour by Pan Yun. Past Robert Melville the enigmatic keeper of the gallery and down the stairs are the Alphabet drawings of Peter Soderlund. After the second World War it was considered the thing among the better type of well-heeled university students to have one of Piranesi's prison etchings upon one's wall.

These sombre, mind-dark interiors of shadowed stone were made more monumental and Kafkaish by the addition of rising and falling flights of tiny iron steps spanning the huge vaults and parabolas. Soderlund has done this to a lesser degree in that he had taken the letters of the alphabet and drawn them in crumbling stone in a deserted world so that all the knowledge of the world rots in these twenty-six monumental edifices tongueless in a barren universe.

ARTHUR MOYSE

WHEN IS A DICTATOR?

Continued from page 1

about the distasteful personality cult built around him), his Government was being maintained in power by the consent of the great majority of Ghanaians. It is doubtful whether this is any longer true. The point has arisen where in a fully working democracy the Government would have resigned and held new elections. Dr. Nkrumah has instead decided to lock up his opponents, alleging their complicity in a plot to overthrow the Government by force and assassinate him.

This is a curious line of argument. It could possibly be shown that both Hitler and Krushchev at some stage or other enjoyed "popular support", but nobody would deny that their regimes were anything but dictatorships. "Popular support" is more often than not a negative, relative attitude to governments; that is, that the government is not as bad as its predecessor. Obviously Nkrumah enjoyed popular support because he was the man who symbolised Ghana's liberation from colonial rule, and he has exploited this popularity to build himself up (where were we reading that one Ghanaian paper on the occasion of Mr. N's birthday, published 28 photographs of "His High Dedication" as he is known to his admirers) and to squeeze out, by means foul and fair, all those politicians and leaders who might challenge his authority. After all, this is not the first time Nkrumah has locked up the opposition or used legislation which was contrary to the most elementary concepts of civil liberty and democracy. Colin Legum weakens his whole argument when he adds that Ghana, like most newly independent countries, cannot be ruled by "weak government".

But if there is any meaning in the use of such terms as "weak" and "strong" as applied to governments, it is surely that a "weak" government is one which is representative of all the people and a "strong" government is one which rules in the interests of a party or a group respectively of the opinion of the people. To our minds most governments are of the "strong" type simply because a "weak" govern-

ment—which is another term for democratic government—just does not work. How indeed can a government represent both the interests of the exploiter and the exploited; of the privileged class and the under-privileged; of high finance and of old age pensioners? There can be no democratic government without social and economic democracy—that is equality. But if equality existed then government would be superseded, or so modified that it would bear no relationship to the strong government of reality, or the "weak" government of Mr. Legum's imagination.

Whatever may have been the benefits bestowed on the Ghanaian people by Mr. Nkrumah's government, the truth of the matter is that in these five years of "independence" a large number of Ghanaian politicians and business men have been busily feathering their nests at the expense of the people. Mr. Nkrumah's recent attempt to clean up some of the corruption in top circles not only points to the extent of the corruption but the fact that the leading figures are still allowed to spend up to £20,000 building themselves houses, without the taint of corruption, shows that in spite of his Marxist-socialist philosophy Mr. Nkrumah has no intention of sweeping away the new privileged class. On the contrary, his power, especially if it is true that he no longer enjoys popular support, will depend more and more on surrounding himself with a sufficiently large number of privileged, moneyed bureaucrats and influential people whose status depends on the continuation in power of "His High Dedication". Surely all this is too obvious to deserve further elaboration. Equally it is obvious that whatever the people of Ghana may have thought of him in the flush of independence celebrations it was inevitable that before long they would realise that for them the old adage that *plus ça change plus c'est la même chose*, applied. Hence the strikes, and the demands by the government for more sacrifices... by the workers.

Nasser the Statesman

MUCH water has flowed under the political bridges, since British and French and other interested politicians were pointing out that the Suez canal was in danger so long as a raving lunatic was at the head of government in Egypt. Not only has shipping continued to pass through the canal in ever increasing numbers, but the political experts are now seeing in Nasser a politician of high calibre! This new assessment of him follows the recent coup d'etat in Syria where having the beginning threatened to send his army to crush the rebellion—in the best tradition of political bluff—he then had second thoughts, when it became quite clear that his bluff had been called, and accepted with "dignity" (to use the Guardian's term) the loss of one member of his cabinet (!) Arab Republic. Nasser's setback far from bringing joy to his enemies of only a few years ago is viewed almost with apprehension. He commented in the *Sunday Times*

"Adversity" should be read to be believed. The following are the concluding paragraphs:

In London, at any rate, the smiles of satisfaction at Nasser's Syrian reverse have not been many, and they have not lasted long. Those who had hated Nasser in the past found that there was really no satisfaction to be felt at the return to a separatist Syrian regime, dependent on army patronage, lacking a political basis, uncertain of popular support.

Even the thought that Nasser's fall may have been brought nearer gives no cause for cheerfulness; it is wildly improbable that his regime would be followed by a better. By accepting the defeat frankly as a defeat, not attempting to fight it out, and declaring (as he did on Thursday) that he would not oppose Syria's re-entry into the international organisations, he has shown self-control and good sense. Some deep-rooted impressions are being revised. Nasser's mistakes have been grave; it is probable that the bill for them has not yet been paid in full; but he does seem

INDIVIDUALISTS concern themselves little with a future society. That idea has been exploited and can nourish the believer just as exploitation of paradise nourishes the priest; but it resembles paradise in that a description of its wonders has an enervating, soporific influence on those who hear it; it makes them forget present oppression, tyranny and bondage; it weakens energy, emasculates initiative. The individualist does not put his hope in the future society. He lives in the present moment, and he wants to draw from it the maximum results. Individualist activity is essentially a present work and a present accomplishment. The individualist knows that the present is heir to the past and pregnant with the future. It is not in some tomorrow that he wants to see the end of encroachment by society on the individual, of invasion and oppression of one person by another. It is today, in his own life, that the individualist wants to win his independence.

To be sure the individualist often fails in his attempts to free himself from the yoke of existing domination. Considering the forces of opposition and oppression, this is very natural. But the future will profit automatically from what he gains. The individualist knows very well that he will not exploit the whole forest, but the path he opens will remain, and those who follow him, if they want to, will take good care of it and broaden it.

The individualist is incapable, it is true, of outlining in full detail the map of "future humanity" as it would be if his demands were won. Thus he cannot make a topographical work; but on the other hand he can foresee with certainty both the nature of the terrain and the quality of liquid that will fill the rivers and the possible kind of culture. "The new humanity" is not for him absolutely *terra incognita*.

The individualist can, therefore, even now indicate what a "future humanity" will be. He knows it will resemble the present world in nothing—less by changes in detail than by a complete transformation of the general mentality, a different understanding of relations among men, a universal and individual change of state of mind, that will make certain methods and certain institutions impossible.

Thus the individualist can affirm with certainty that authoritarianism will in no case continue in the future society. To imagine a "world to come" where there would still be a trace of domination, coercion and duty is nonsense.

The individualist is sure there will be no longer room for intervention of the State—of a governmental, social-legislative, penal, disciplinary, institution or administration—in the thought, conduct and activity of human beings.

The individualist knows that relations and agreements among men will be arrived at voluntarily; understandings and contacts will be for a specified purpose and time, and not obligatory; they will always be subject to termination; there will not be a clause or an article of an agreement that will not be weighed and discussed before being agreed to; a unilateral contract, obliging someone to fill an engagement he has not personally and knowingly accepted, will be impossible. The individualist knows that no economic, political or religious majority—no social group whatever—will be able to compel a minority, or one single man, to conform against his will to its decisions or decrees.

We have here a whole series of certainties on which there is no quibbling.

"Future humanity", as the individualist conceives it, "unrolls itself" without terminal station, without point of arrival. It is eternally becoming, indefinitely evolving. A humanity of the dynamic type, if one can so express oneself, ignores stops *en route*, or if there are stops at stations, it understands that this is the time strictly necessary to let off those who want to try an experience that will involve only them.

The future humanity, "the new humanity", as the individualists understand it, constitutes a gigantic arena where, as much in thought and custom as in technique, all imaginable projects, plans, associations and practices will struggle and compete with each other.

It is because of these well-established characteristics that "the new humanity" in no way resembles, can have no meeting place with ours, "the old humanity". It will be poly-dynamic, polymorphous, multilateral.

When someone asks exactly how, in "the future humanity" that individualists want, one will solve some litigious point, it is clear that the questioner does not understand. But one can reply with certainty that there will never be re-

Individualism THE FUTURE SOCIETY

[Earlier this year, the question was raised, in the correspondence columns of FREEDOM as to what individualist anarchists propose for a future society. The following extracts from a contribution to L'Encyclopedie Anarchiste present one individualist view. They first appeared in English translation in Resistance, Vol. 7, No. 1.—S.E.P.]

course to violence, compulsion or force to adjust a difference.

A good number of individualists think that the coming of "the future humanity", as we have sketched it, depends on an attack on serious, rational and continued propaganda, against authoritarianism in all spheres of human activity, whether in political or social economy, in morals, in art, in science, in literature. Arguing from the fact that the individual is born into—is thrust into—an already organized society without being allowed to consent to it or reject it, or able to defend himself from it or oppose it, they deduce that this primordial fact confers on the victim the *right to life*, without restrictions or reservations.

That is, the right to consumption, independent of all economic politics; the right to individual choice of the method of production and the means of production; the right to choose the consumers he wants to benefit by his exchange; the right to choose whether to associate with others, and, if he refuses to associate, the right to means of production sufficient to maintain himself; the right to choose his associates and the purpose for which he associates.

In other words, the right to behave as he finds most advantageous, at his own risk, with no limit other than encroachment on the behaviour of others (to put it another way, the use of violence, compulsion or coercion towards one who behaves differently than you).

The right to the guarantee that he will not be forced to do what is personally disagreeable or disadvantageous, or hindered from doing what he wants to (he will not, therefore, resort to physical force, deceit or fraud in order to gain what appears useful, advantageous or agreeable to him). The right to circulate freely, to move wherever he pleases, to propagate those doctrines, opinions, propositions and theses that he feels impelled to, with the reservation of not using violence in any form to put them into practice; the right to experiment in

all fields and forms, to publicize his experiences, to recruit the associates needed for their realization, on condition that only those who really want to will participate and that those who no longer want to can withdraw; the right to consumption and means of production, even if he refuses to participate in any system, method or institution that seems to him disadvantageous.

The right to life, that is, the right to make one's own happiness as one feels impelled to, alone or together with those one feels particularly attracted to, without fear of intervention or intrusion by personalities or organizations incompatible with one's ego or with the association of which one is momentarily a part.

These individualists think that the guarantee of the right to life, thus conceived, is the least a human individual can demand when he realizes what an authoritarian and arbitrary act was committed in bringing him into the world. They think also that all propaganda for these demands favours the advent of a transformed mentality, characteristic of all new humanity.

The struggle for the abolition of the monopoly of the State, or of any executive form replacing it—against its intervention as centralizer, administrator, regulator, moderator, organizer or otherwise in any relations among individuals—equally favours, these individualists think, the emergence of this mentality.

I am aware that a good number of anarchist individualists have no interest in the "future humanity". For them "without risk of erring too far, we can assume: 1. That there will never be a general, collective life from which authority is absolutely excluded; 2. That in all societies there will be individuals or groups who are protestants, malcontents, critics and negators. Without doubt, we will witness transformations, improvements, modifications, even upheavals. The capitalist system of production may vanish in the end, gradually or forcibly. Little by little, one will work less, earn more; reforms will come, menacingly, inevitably. There may be an economic system unlike ours. But whatever the social system, good sense indicates that its permanence depends on a system of regulation adapted to the average mentality of the people in it. Whether they want to or not, those to the right or left of the average regulation must conform their behaviour to it; and it matters little whether its basis is exclusively economic, or biological, or moral.

"Experience indicates that towards refractories they will use only arguments men can dispose of: politics or violence, persuasion or compulsion, bargaining or command.

"The crowd always goes towards him who speaks well and carries himself well. Its anger lasts no longer than its admirations. It is always easy to fool and seduce. One can no more base oneself on it now than a century or a thousand years ago. The mass belongs to the strongest, the most superficial, the most slippery. In such a situation, what do anarchist individualists do, what will they do?"

"1. Some reply that they will remain within the *milieu* and struggle to affirm themselves—without concerning themselves too much with choice of means, for their great concern—the concern of their life—is, at all costs, to react against external determination of their lives. It is to affirm oneself, if not to diminish the pressure of the *milieu* on oneself. They are reactors, refractories, propagandists, revolutionaries, utilizing all possible means of battle: education, violence, ruse, illegality. They seize occasions when Power is abusive, to stir up rebelliousness among its victims. But it is for pleasure that they act, and not for the profit of the sufferers or by abusing them with vain words. They go, they come, mingling in a movement or withdrawing, as their independence is or is not in danger of restriction, parting company with those they have called to revolt as soon as they pretend to follow them, acclaim them or constitute themselves a party. Perhaps they do, more than they are.

"2. Others situate themselves on the margin of the *milieu*. Having somehow obtained means of production, they pre-occupy themselves with making their separation from the *milieu* a reality.

Continued on page 4

Celebrating Freedom

IN the *Daily Telegraph* recently (25/9/61) a photograph was published showing an armoured tank, with a soldier manning a machine gun fitted with a barrier rather similar to the kind one sees at our busy road junctions to prevent people from crossing except at the official zebra crossing. The caption under the photo reads:

An armoured vehicle, fitted with an electrified barrier for controlling the crowds, on show in a United States Army parade in Berlin at the week-end. The parade was held as part of the celebrations marking the 174th anniversary of the United States Constitution.

From police with truncheons, to mounted police with sticks or sabres (depending on the country). Now we have the last word in crowd control: the electrified barrier mounted on an armoured car. Those who are in the front will get electric shocks and those behind, if they don't move may well be sprayed with machine gun bullets. (Committee of 100 please note). This is progress! It's good to live on this side of the iron curtain, but beware of finding yourself on this side of the electrified barrier!

Don't Forget the
Anarchist Ball
Oct 20

