

SELF-REGULATION

"Self-regulation" is a term which has some esoteric significance with the followers of Reich. It is something of a myth, for the human child can not, of course, regulate itself any more than the young of any other mammal. The young of most insects, fish, amphibia and some reptiles can be regarded as truly self-regulating, but the higher we go on the phylogenetic scale, the more mother needs to take an active part in the regulation of her young. Of course mother can make silly mistakes; she can try and feed her baby by some arbitrary timetable which has little relation to its needs, or she can try to make it use the pot according to some equally pointless timetable. In general, baby knows best what is best for baby, and even the dimmest witted mother will do the right thing when it howls or messes itself unless she has been stuffed up with some nonsense from a child-care book. But she still does and must regulate its life, first by simple handling, later by verbal instruction. If by "self-regulation" we mean a natural response to a child's needs as they become manifest, and abstaining from pointless interference with its activities, then practising "self-regulation" is what is often known as showing "horse sense".

The trouble about this "self-regulation" business is that the well-meaning adherents often imbibe it first as a somewhat vague theory, all mixed up with Reichian mystique, and then try and put it into practice with real live children later on. Every time they have to haul the baby out of the coal-cellar, or wipe its filthy face against its will, or rescue their cigarettes from its destructive clutches, they have an uneasy pang of conscience

that they are not quite the model "self-regulating" parents they would like to be. And later, when they find that in this difficult world the ideals which they have set themselves just cannot be adhered to, and when the "self-regulated" child behaves just like a spoilt little brat, what are they to do? Some settle into a comfortable relationship of give-and-take with the children, others react with a sharp authoritarianism ("I tried giving you every freedom, you misused it, so from now on you'll just do as you're told, see!"), others resort to some sort of adult casuistry by which they appear (to themselves) to be continuing the régime of "self-regulation" modified by "the therapeutic approach".

If "the therapeutic approach" means anything, it means that the child is ill and the parent is acting *qua* therapist. This is a monstrous humbug. Childhood is not any sort of illness, even when the child is having a row with its parents. When child and parents are having some sort of row, it is unfair and insulting for the parents to take "the therapeutic approach". I have outlined above one of the most frequent causes of the child of a "progressive" home getting at loggerheads with its parents; that is because the parents are "cranks" according to the opinion of the greater world of which the child becomes increasingly conscious. A child may become very ashamed of the "crankiness" of its parents unless it is freed from conflicting loyalties and stresses within its general environment. It does not matter how "cranky" parents are as long as they provide a "cranky" community background which naturally embraces the school. I have known children from some very peculiar homes indeed (peculiar in that they were wildly different from the contemporary conventional ideal) who are perfectly happy and emotionally stable because they attended progressive schools where there was no implicit criticism of peculiar homes.

One of Neill's dogmatic statements was to the effect that there are no problem children—only problem parents. While this, like many of Neill's statements, is a gross oversimplification, it contains a

very great deal of truth. The most obvious way of avoiding facing this truth, is for parents to model their child-management according to some ideal regimen, and then when the child gives trouble it can be labelled "naughty" or "sick", whichever label fits the conceptual scheme. It matters little whether the ideal regimen is that of a Catholic home or a Reichian home, the mechanism of projecting parental problems on to the child is the same. When we say that the child is "naughty" (and in need of punishment) or "sick" (and in need of therapy), what we mean is that it is not reacting as it *should* react according to the theory we have adopted.

The ideal regimen, like most ideals, tends to neglect individual differences. Quite apart from the differences between children which are determined environmentally, there are great genetic differences between children which can only be modified partially by environment. Nowadays, with such small families being the rule, we do not see the enormous genetic differences which may be manifest in a large family of siblings. If a child is by nature sensitive and intelligent he will respond well to "self-regulation"; if a child is by nature insensitive and stupid, attempts at "self-regulation" are going to result in a harassed and disillusioned parent. No ideal regimen is right for every child, and what is just as important, the personality of the parent must determine what sort of relationship is possible.

This is not a counsel of despair; there are humane and sensible ways of caring for children just as there are cruel and stupid ways. All I am concerned to show is that parents, if they are muddled and unsure of themselves, may make a big mistake if they think that they can cling to any ideal regimen as a panacea for happy families. There is no substitute for common sense. The idea of the progressive school is, after all, to throw overboard a lot of the useless conventions of the average school and to treat children according to their individual differences, with the present happiness of the child rated as the supreme good, rather than its conformance to an ideal

model. It may seem odd that while strongly advocating progressive education I should nevertheless debunk the "self-regulation" business. It is, as pointed out before, a myth. We must and do regulate the lives of children, and the question to be decided all the time is *how* we regulate them, and *when* we abstain from interference. To pretend that "self-regulation" is practicable simply avoids the issue: Often it is the excuse of lazy and ineffectual adults; but why make an excuse? If parents are lazy and ineffective, children can be fond of them just the same. If anyone is kidded by the principles of "self-regulation" it is not the children. As a little boy from a Reichian home explained to me, "Self-regulation? Don't be daft. She doesn't give us breakfast 'cos she can't wake up. Still, they're not back from the pubs till terribly late so you can't blame her, can you?"

The point which needs stressing is that in most homes and most schools, a large part of the interference with children is quite pointless. Parents and teachers unthinkingly follow the contemporary

pattern of reward and punishment, obtains between State and Subject the humiliations and restrictions the grown-up Subject learns to from the State, he passes on to his children or pupils. If one pauses wonder just why school-leavers have resort to beating one another bicycle chains to get some fun out of life, just consider the child rearing practices of their own homes and the methods used by the good ladies in the Nursery and Infant schools. I am not suggesting that the bicycle chain or its equivalent is the chief method of socializing children in our society. What I mean that in a society where the Authority always "know best", and this is mirrored in home and school, the child has much the less chance of growing up with a sense of responsibility and a conceit of itself. If one has a very poor conceit of oneself, if one is just average intellectually in a society where merit is conspicuously rewarded if one is taken for a mug right, left centre, well, wielding a bicycle chain one way of letting off steam.

(To be concluded)

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

OPEN DAILY

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

New Books . . .

Road to Ghana Alfred Hutchinson 18/-
Why They Collaborated E. Kincaid 21/-
Pagan Spain Richard Wright 18/-
Revolt of the Mind T. Aczel and Tibor Meray 35/-
Studies in the History of Education, 1780-1870 B. Simon 37/6

Reprints & Cheap Editions . . .

The Jews in Our Time Norman Bentwich 3/6
Discourse on Method R. A. Descartes 3/6
Goodbye to All That Robert Graves 3/6
Elmer Gantry Sinclair Lewis 5/-
Hurry On Down John Wain 2/6
The Midwich Cuckoos John Wyndham 2/6

Second-Hand . . .

Essays T. H. Huxley, Herbert Spencer, Romains, &c. 4/-
The Vanishing Irish (ed.) John O'Brien 4/6
Red Eagle Dennis Wheatley 8/-
Focus Two (damaged) Orwell, Savage, Borea 3/6
Supernatural Religion W. R. Cassels 4/6
The Walnut Trees of Altenburg André Malraux 4/-
The Coming Race Lord Lytton 3/-
Crimes and Punishment J. A. Farrer 5/-
Christian Science Mark Twain 4/6
Principles of Political Economy J. Stuart Mill 3/6
The Philosophy of Humanism Corliss Lamont 6/-
Gilt-Edged Insecurity (1932) R. E. Haestler 3/6
We Are the Living Erskine Caldwell 3/6
Living Thoughts of Spinoza (ed. Arnold Zweig) 3/6

Periodicals . . .

University Libertarian, January 1/-
(All back nos. except 1 and 9 available)
Views and Comments, February ed.
We can supply ANY book required, including text-books. Please supply publisher's name if possible, but if not we can find it. Scarce and out-of-print books searched for—and frequently found!

We distribute:

Peace News, Socialist Leader, Freethinker, Industrial Worker, World Labour News, University Libertarian, Dis-sent, etc.

Postage free on all items

Obtainable from

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

On Organisation

THE main reason for our deep, resolute aversion to the organisation of anarchists into a party lies in the history of organisation, and particularly of political organisation, which has always been a hierarchical, authoritarian institution in which arrivistes at the apex exercise authority over everyone else. It is said that this is *authoritarian* organisation, and that an organisation of anarchists would turn out differently. It would . . . except that in three-quarters of a century there has not been a single example of it.

In practice, those anarchists who organise have followed exactly in the tradition of other organisers, creating the organisation first and the functions to use it for later. Organisation without exact and well-defined aims is organisation for its own sake—an instrument without a function. The mentality of anarchists being what it is—eagerly desirous of independence, intolerant of dogma, distrustful of power—an organism which sets out to achieve all possible and imaginable goals comes to have a very different meaning for each member. As long as the organisation respects everyone's interpretation it is as if the organisation did not exist; and when it requires that someone's interpretation be accepted, the organisation becomes authoritarian.

Anarchists have always insisted that the need must create the means to satisfy it, the necessity for the function must create the organ. If they believed organisation was needed, they would still never create it except for a precise aim, well-defined beforehand, and explicitly accepted by those who belong. In Italy after the war, the only anarchist activity which prospered which was widely accepted and supported, was that of aid to the political victims. And it is clear why: this committee answered to a concrete need everyone

felt and everyone was interested in. The same may be said of the newspapers, the reviews, the publishing ventures: in each case, temporary or permanent arrangements, according to the circumstances, are agreed to, and the will and energy of many are associated to achieve a single aim.

I don't know if these undertakings can be called organisations; certainly they are not the paternalistic, total, classical party organisations that the "organising" anarchists want. But they certainly represent an association of energy, in response to a definite need, existing for as long as the individual adherents consider it necessary and opportune. And if they are organisations, they are organisations *sui generis*, as various as the aims they serve, and responding to the changing will of the thinking individuals who create them and keep them alive.

As the writer of these notes sees it, the requisites for active association of anarchists seem to be these: that they be forms of co-operation that satisfy needs felt by all participants, and that the forms be subject to the will of the participants and not impair their liberty. If the aims are varied, such forms can be realised only in limited areas; or they may be realised in the vastest areas, if the aims are limited, precise and well-defined.

To want to create among anarchists a general organisation, including everyone and claiming to satisfy all needs, analogous to the political parties and the State-organisation the parties aspire to capture and to run, is utopian, because the anarchists' love of liberty opposes it and because the tendency of a total organisation is to become totalitarian. (From an editorial in the Italian language anarchist weekly *l'Adunata dei Refrattari* published in U.S.A. The above translation first appeared in *Resistance*, Aug.-Oct., 1954.)

Clearing up the Mess

Continued from p. 3

"This is where Mr. Graham came in, with a new idea, that the high rainfall of Lancashire is the cause . . . Grass already grows at the foot of most tips, where the soil no longer washes away. Mr. Graham decided to use the classic anti-erosion technique of terracing to help this grass to grow upwards more quickly . . . Two years ago he retired as head of the Fisheries Laboratory at Lowestoft and to crown a lifelong interest in conservation set to work to prove his point. First he sought a house in the coalfield, to provide both a base for his researches and grazing for his mare, which plays an essential part in the whole project.

"At Lowestoft, Mr. Graham had found that children will do almost anything to be allowed to ride or even to groom a horse. Now she has a dual role. Not only does her treading help to terrace the tips, but she acts as a lure to bring in many local children, who thus become helpers instead of hinderers of the work. "Supplied with trenching tools, they terrace the slopes. Then they weigh out the grass seed, sow it and count the shoots that come up. They also spread the cut grass, for one of Mr. Graham's ingenious ideas is to cut seeding grass from waste ground and spread it on the tips, so that the seeds sow themselves.

"Thus many birds are killed with one stone; for the project is experimental, practical and educational all in one. Already green patches are appearing on

seven Lancashire shale heaps, where hitherto there has been nothing but greyness. In ten years' time there will be no grey left."

IN a letter to the *Spectator* last week Mr. Colin MacInnes was attacking our English habit of getting worked up about relatively minor social evils, ignoring the major cancers of our social life. In writing about the campaign against litter, or the "anti-ugliness" serious matters affecting our physical environment, while saying little about the whole problem of urban and suburban sprawl, and the failure to come to terms with the motor vehicle, I am succumbing to this habit, but not without justification. The fathers of the whole movement in town and country planning in Britain were those two eminently Kropotkin figures Ebenezer Howard and Patrick Geddes. Their books, exhibitions, working demonstrations, and propaganda fifty to seventy years ago laid, with unusual time-lag to all the subsequent official (Letchworth, Welwyn, Town and Country Planning Association, etc.) and unofficial (Green Belts, New Towns, Town and Country Planning Acts, etc.) in the field.

The shortcomings of the latter—the fact that official policy got around to the Garden City idea (admirable in Howard's day), when it was long out of date; the fact that Geddes' regional planning has never been undertaken because different government departments and private interests have all been working in different directions; the fact that planning has become in official hands, merely another aspect of bureaucracy, and in the eyes of the public simply means some busy-body saying that you can't build a chicken house in your garden, are the shortcomings of any public action that comes from above instead of from below.

The kind of action that comes from below is bound to be, in the present state of public concern, and in the complete absence of any generally-shared aesthetic standard, puny and inadequate, but it has the inestimable advantage of being the result of public concern, and not the imposition of official policy. In a society in which the very word "planner" has become a term of abuse, the first thing to emphasise about town-planning is that in Lethaby's phrase, it begins with white-washing the backyard. The analysts of the failure and breakdown of official planning since the hopeful days at the end of the war, talk of the need for stronger central control and so on. But isn't it time to talk instead, of stronger local initiative, a more awakened public, a campaign by precept, propaganda and example, to persuade people to open their eyes and look at the squalor and mess all around them? C.W.

CINEMA REVIVAL

Film going readers of *FREEDOM* are urged to see the revival of *Les Enfants Du Paradis* now showing at the Academy Cinema, Oxford Street. The film runs for about 2 hours 40 min., and it is a rare experience these days in the cinema not to be wearied long before the last cords have heralded the happy ending.

The proprietors of the *Academy* say that the film rights will expire in August, as the film may be re-made.

The cast includes Arletty, Jean-Louis Barrault, Pierre Brasseur and Marcel Herrand.

Television on NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT

THE B.B.C.'s televised programme, *Panorama*, presented some comments on the subject (discussed elsewhere in *FREEDOM*) of nuclear disarmament on Monday night.

It was not encouraging to see film shots of disarmament talks and resounding resolutions made by government spokesmen at conferences stretching over a period of 30 years, but at least they were no more empty than the fine-sounding arguments put forward in our time in defence of nuclear weapons for peace.

Patrick O'Donovan, *Observer* correspondent in the United States, expressed the view that the majority of Americans considered war an un-American activity, but they have nevertheless a belief in the H-bomb as a sound shield against evil and could not, therefore, believe that total disaster may be just round the corner. It is not surprising that President Eisenhower shares this view, but the implied suggestion that a change in administration might "give a lead" on nuclear disarmament does not console us.

A correspondent from *Le Monde* underlined the attitude of the French Government to its bomb. It will continue with testing until such time as France is not considered an underprivileged partner of the Western alliance. What might happen if her status was equalised was only vaguely hinted at.

Mr. Nutting, for the British Government, understood the American suspicions of the Russians, but since they apparently meant business this time it was now up to us to 'clinch the deal'. It is necessary, he said, without a blush, to stop the spread of nuclear weapons to irresponsible nations.

In the knowledge that responsible nations like Russia, America and Britain have the monopoly of H-bombs many people might feel secure. The thought terrifies us.

ingham Palace Road, S.W.1) will be arranging further work camps (no pay, but travel provided). The game of volunteers and welcomes both offers of help and information about eyesores and similar jobs which their volunteers might tackle.

Another of the Civic Trust's concerns is the activity which W. R. Lethaby envisaged fifty years ago. It was a "face-lifting" operation at Magdalen Street, Norwich, and transferred to London, without demolition and rebuilding, simply by enlisting the enthusiasm of the public. It became the "face-lift" which carried out a clearance of clutter and a repainting and re-lettering campaign which has been repeated in other towns. The Trust published a five-shilling brochure about what was done; merely a series of very simple drawings of the street before and after. It is now being reissued in 10c "No-Waiting" signs, redesigned and 40 other objects removed, replaced or repainted.

YET another aspect of the physical environment which people are beginning to take notice of are the huge slugs of heaps from mineral workings. These need not necessarily be ugly, some of the dramatically shaped clay hills of Cornwall demonstrate. One local authority full of zeal to remove an old slag heap from the area known as the Warley carpet of grass and shrubs found that people did not want it removed: it proved itself a valuable local landmark. But of most of these byproducts of industry this cannot be said. "Take the area around the Cornwall coast. Within the boundary of the Lincoburn District Council on the Lincoburn coast, fifty per cent of the land—about 900 acres, is classed as derelict. The Lincoburn Planning Department is lacking the area known as the Warley Basin with modified Sherman tanks, preparing it for regeneration. But the most interesting shaped clay area is that undertaken by Michael Graham, with the support of the Lincoburn Community Council and the Environment Commission. Some readers may be familiar with Mr. Graham through his books *Slag* and *Slag*. The latter is an account of his "one-man war on slag heaps" which was recently given by Richard "Frog" Tappin.

"The Lincoburn coalfield is a grim relic of the industrial revolution as any Heaps of shale from the mines disfigure the landscape. The slag heaps are quite bare, but with a little of grass and shrubs, they will be better in ten or twenty years, nature has managed to clothe an eyesore with grass and even shrubs and flowering trees. Why on some and not on others?"

IPP Continued on p. 2

CLEARING UP THE MESS

"Once people leave their homes they seem to forget from any day to day the standards of behaviour". His answer, of course, was a law, and at the autumn of 1958 the Anti-Litter Campaign set to work to force making an offence on penalty of a £10 fine if thrown on a drop litter "in, into, or from any place" and "not to be removed unless they have access without payment". The law is ridiculous, of course, not only because it is unenforceable because the law doesn't feel guilty, and if charged, will feel, not conscience-stricken, but contemptuous of the courts. One promising method of changing unthinking attitudes is the volunteer litter collection, one called *Outrage* and the other *Courier-Attack* (both later reprinted as books), it gave a pictorial record of the results. It has steadily been merging England and changing it into a desert of wire, concrete rods, coy paths, and a few scattered trees. The roundabouts, granitic notice boards, pillars, and Things in Fields. The danger of cluttering up the town and its proposals and Borough Engineers' *Review*, led it to initiate a campaign, bully authorities and change people's minds. From this in turn grew a new object which is to encourage a wider interest in the appearance of town and its surroundings, and promote high standards.

ONE of the activities which the Trust is now seeking to stimulate is the clearing of such blots on the landscape as ruined warfield airfields, humped camps, and other eyesores. It is not as if anybody has ever bothered to clear up. Several years ago Michael Dover, son of the late Lord Dover, showed his interest to the development of national parks in Britain, gathered together some friends and set up a defence force in the national park district on the Pennine coast. Last year he organised six marries of volunteers who decided to spend their holidays of work in Somerset, Cornwall, Surrey, Glamorgan, and Northumbria.

This year, the Civic Trust (7), Buck-

Royal Institute of British Architects, who will not permit criticism as part of their professional code—a code backed and made potent by Act of Parliament.

royal Institute of British Architects, who will not permit criticism as part of their professional code—a code backed and made potent by Act of Parliament. and discussing the impact of his movement's methods in the *Architectural Journal* (21/1/60), he says, "Perhaps the most interesting thing about Anti-Litter action is its success—in its own terms of attempting to interest the public in architecture if it can be effective. In this highly individualistic country the man in the street is usually a man who has no interest or even he has not heard of the RIBA, or even the Civic Trust. It is not surprising that he should think that AUA is against modern architecture (this column has repeatedly pointed out the fallacies and highlights just one of the difficulties). It is not surprising that he should think it ideal but that cannot be achieved without starting somewhere, and *nothing* could be a good place for starting, with the public doing up with a good quality, while the public develops a hearp rubbish on its head."

"AUA seems to have itself been part of a general awakening of interest in the environment, a growing sense that something valuable was being lost, and that AUA formed a useful focus for this. It is not amazing, in an age of Aldermaston marches, that it should have been the young people who formed AUA. In some ways we are both more realistic and more idealistic than our elders. In this context it is interesting that the Action that has been most unfavourably mentioned by the architects, and the young people, is their work on the RIBA for its maritidious sins. We were called 'maritidious' and 'confidential' by the young people, and they said, 'at what the RIBA is doing'. Well, maybe, but the buildings still go standing. The young people, I think, will be in the hogwash about professionalism, just as the National Designers' Association will be in the hogwash about deterrent. . . AUA wants an aesthetic, and a confidence in the young people, and sees that professionalism is a very real barrier. What we should like to see now, would be every man his own Anti-Litter!"

THE Keep Britain Tidy Group is a voluntary organisation founded in 1957 with the aim of bringing about a change in the attitude of the public towards litter. It is a national organisation, but its main work is done in the United Kingdom. It is a national organisation, but its main work is done in the United Kingdom.

recently a local authority could have been asked to clear up the space on the RIBA for its maritidious sins. We were called 'maritidious' and 'confidential' by the young people, and they said, 'at what the RIBA is doing'. Well, maybe, but the buildings still go standing. The young people, I think, will be in the hogwash about professionalism, just as the National Designers' Association will be in the hogwash about deterrent. . . AUA wants an aesthetic, and a confidence in the young people, and sees that professionalism is a very real barrier. What we should like to see now, would be every man his own Anti-Litter!"

The Minister of Housing said at the conference that it cost more than 11 million a year to clean up the mess in the streets.

The following is extracted from an article by the Guardian's Political correspondent, Francis Brown.

THE British system of Parliamentary government as now practised has the merit of being a simple majority system. It is a simple majority in single constituency constituencies success; a party gets a working majority in the House of Commons and becomes the Government of the day; and there we all are for another four years or so.

It is a stable government, with none of the old French nonsense of government resting on shifting sands and leading ultimately to the most or less frequent adjustment of the French Parliament and with none of the fancifulness of the proportional representation which seems somehow to cheat the simple elector of a simple result. The present appears to be a very good system, and it is easy to understand, and it works in the sense that normally it produces a government which is only one step away from the case that could be made in support of conditions as they are.

But the merits of the system are now being examined critically. For some years the system has been being examined upon it, by individuals such as Mr. Harold Wilson, by committees of specialists, by the Liberals who have complained that the present voting system prevents a minority government.

Freedom THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

Vol. 21, No. 14, April 2, 1960

World Opinion & South Africa

Continued from p. 1 deprived of their slave labour) were outbalanced by the advantages ("to keep the kafir in his place", geographically, economically and socially) so that he was available for useful, underpaid work in "white South Africa").

IN the eve of the introduction of a Bill to outlaw the two African (black rural) organisations, Albert Outler, President of the African National Congress set an example to the African people, which was to get a man called to present the government with a virtually intractable problem: he publicly burned his pass and urged all Africans throughout the Union to do likewise "in an orderly manner".

As write, Press reports from Pretoria, where Albert Luthuli burned his pass last Saturday, quote government officials as stating that police will take action "against Africans who burn their passes. Many Africans will obviously have to be arrested. As the Guardian points out in its editorial (*Breathing Space*, March 28): "to burn his pass would be a desperate step for an African to take, unless he is very sure that his fellows are doing likewise. He would be burning his interests with his pass".

It is not enough Africans both trust their fellows as well as feel the issue strongly enough to take such a step. But here is an issue on which world opinion can help. Let us proclaim to all Africans who burn their passes that they are themselves responsible for their dependents in the event of their being imprisoned for their "crime".

For world opinion is being aroused by news which obliges Africans to carry reference books, there is after all, only one effective way of abolishing these badges of slavery: by burning them.

IN our opening paragraphs we made a distinction between a world opinion which is government-inspired and one which emerges spontaneously from an enlightened section of the people, not because we are determined to maintain a point of view by hook or by crook, but because we believe in the important role an enlightened opinion could play in the social and economic development of a country. A government can condemn the actions of the South African Government on moral grounds. They are all birds of a feather, however, and they may seek to appear in the eyes of their own people. The State Department's statement in Washington, which declares "violence in all forms" and "while as a matter of practice does not ordinarily commend on the internal affairs of Governments with which they enjoy normal relations", cannot help but regret the tragic loss of life resulting from the measures taken against the demonstrators in South Africa. It was as much concerned with propaganda considerations in the cold war as Russia, who described the massacre as "terrible" and "a crime". The fact that Nehru's government with its own demonstrators based on its hands could express its "strong feelings" while the British government with the hundreds of thousands of African dependents attached to its empire could in spite of Mr. Macmillan's recent "wind of change" speeches, only evince the attitude of indifference.

Mary Benson is a South African who is now on the Executive of the Africa Bureau in London.

ANTI-UGLY ACTION is a movement (no membership, no dues) started by students from the Royal College of Art in November, 1958. It has since spread to the other London schools of art and architecture. "It is these schools", writes the chairman Kenneth Baynes, "the society is run and supported by students, but it has an ever-growing body of supporters among the architects and the general public". The movement has based its activities on the notion that ugly buildings are a public nuisance and is consequently as worthy a subject for hostile demonstrations as a reactionary politician. The movement has been successful in making the public aware of its banners, funny clothes and jazz bands, so that they have been able to carry their campaigning expenses with their earnings from TV appearances and from helping to make an ITV film on their subject.

Their first demonstration was in December, 1958, when 50 students marched from Agriculture House (a pseudo-classical building) to the bridge to Calcutta House (a pseudo-modern building) where water was thrown at some demonstrators.

January, march to Barclays Bank, Lombard Street, in City, where the owners were laying the foundation stone, a mass demonstration. The demonstrators were laying the foundation stone, a mass demonstration. The demonstrators were laying the foundation stone, a mass demonstration.

February, march round the buildings in the St. Paul's area, but City not concerned. The demonstrators were laying the foundation stone, a mass demonstration.

March, meeting at new Kensington Public Library, where the demonstrators were laying the foundation stone, a mass demonstration.

April, trip to Cambridge, where the demonstrators were laying the foundation stone, a mass demonstration.

May, trip to demonstrate against suburban sprawl at Peachewen, difficult to get to, leaving the architect and holders.

November, demonstrations outside R.I.B.A. Campaign against Monica site development (Piccadilly Circus).

December, the Anti-Litter demonstrations was last week at the site next to St. Martin-in-the-Fields, whence, before banners saying "See Tomorrow From the R.I.B.A. Sharks" and "England Experts, Every Architect to Use His Ingenuity for 200 Years", they marched to the Marble Arch, where 800 balloons were released, each bearing a label addressed to Mr. Henry Brooke at the Ministry of Housing.

Kenneth Baynes (writing in *Crafts Review*) declares that "Architecture that is seen from the public street ceases to be a matter for discussion between the architect and his client alone; it is the concern of all who will see it. A virile public criticism of architecture is lacking at the moment; for it to arise it must be fostered by criticism and discussion within the profession; this is stifled at source by the

that "civil commitment, at any time and in all parts of the world is always to be regretted, and a couple of days later express its sympathy with all the people of the world". It convinces us that there is nothing to choose between the Indian or British governments, nor that change in an enlightened direction will be initiated by the means.

The means and ends of governments are impervious to the "winds of change". The winds will come hurricanes. Both the winds and the hurricanes must come from the people, and it is by the people of Africa that enlightened whites and blacks that our present situation and indignation and our solidarity must be heard and felt and believed. To the present government, it is a waste breath and end to frustration.

which apparently affected the stock markets much more than the Versorod group, which was only a small fraction of the total. "Capitalisation values of gold shares dropped by 20 per cent since Mr. Macmillan's 'wind of change' speech, which has dropped 13 per cent." On the other hand, the Versorod government is concerned with the only results of its policy, more than 70 dead Africans and hundreds of thousands of Starvelines.

Straight from the Horse's Mouth

The Cost of Stable Government

being fairly represented in Parliament. In recent weeks, the interests have stimulated this mood of searching inquiry. The publication of Mr. Alan Bullock's first book, *Chamberlain and the Grand Old Man*, has given prominence to the conception of "loyalty" which Bevin brought into Parliament when he became Secretary in Attlee's first Government. Bevin it was who complained so bitterly, as Foreign Secretary, that he had been "stabbed in the back" by Labour rebels. Bevin it was who contrasted the rock-like stability of the Conservative Government with the volatile political

num vote when needed. The history of Joseph Chamberlain's Liberal (and later Liberal-Labour) coalition is a strong proof of that. Moreover, tight discipline in support of a Government's policy is a necessary condition for it to be more enlightened than the views of the party's rank and file, or of the public at large. It is a necessary condition for more corporate and capital punishment is a case in point. (But few Governments have lasted for long a position too far separated from that of its party or of the public.)

Another event has also called attention to the cost of stable government—the publication of the book *Stable Government in Parliamentary control over public expenditure*. Since it is evident that no stable government can be maintained if effective decision on expenditure is taken when electors give power to a party with a particular programme, back-benchers who are not asking for the parties themselves should not present a financial statement with their election programme. Otherwise, it may be too late to do a duty for a back-bencher to vote blindly for a Government which has been elected in a position which cannot be checked and of policies which cannot substantially be altered.

It is convenient for authority to keep the system it manages as stable as possible. . . It strengthens the power of a party, and weakens the power of the

It is convenient for authority to keep the system it manages as stable as possible. . . It strengthens the power of a party, and weakens the power of the

Anarchist Propaganda

A GLANCE through the 1959 issues of FREEDOM reveals a considerable number of informative and stimulating articles calculated to inspire both thought and further reading. The general analyses and criticism of current society, too, could probably not be bettered. But does the potential new subscriber discover in the pages of FREEDOM any fairly positive outline of an alternative to the society whose ills he may to some extent already appreciate? I am speaking, of course, of over-all impressions and do not refer to specific issues of FREEDOM.

At the present time there are many people who are disillusioned by party politics and the "vote". They are generally only aware, however, of a socio-economic choice between "Western democracy" and the pseudo-Communist systems of the East. To them, neither type of system appears to offer humanity any hope of reversing the rapid trend towards the depersonalisation of the individual in vast, centrally controlled government and business hierarchies. Unfortunately, anarchist theory only reaches a small fraction of one per cent. of these people. We may bitterly reflect that whereas Heinz sauce and Beechams pills are well known to millions, a serious socio-economic alternative to capitalism or pseudo-communism may convey only vague connotations of "chaos" or else be regarded as being "against human nature" and not practical of realisation except in a very distant and doubtful future.

How can anarchists reach these people and convince them that a serious and practical alternative—a Third Way—is, in fact, possible?

In answering this question I feel that anarchists should put forward the case that only anarchist organisation is compatible with human dignity and survival in a technically advanced world. In fact, only a socio-economic organisation which rejects the concepts of power, competition, wealth, nationalism, status and class and racial discrimination is likely to meet the needs of the present human situation. Only a system which allows the individual a real and substantial voice in the control of his own destiny is likely to develop a sense of individual social responsibility capable of meeting the kind of crises presented by the population "explosion" and the hydrogen bomb. It is not, in fact, a matter of choosing a more desirable form of economic and social organisation. The urgent question is: "Can man adapt himself, socially and economically, to his changed environment brought about by technological progress and, at the same time, preserve human values and extend individual freedom?"

This question interests a large majority of thinking people. If anarchists can present their case, logically and convincingly, in the form of an answer to this question then the influence of the movement may be considerably extended.

Anarchists cannot, of course, "legislate for the future" or supply detailed blue prints of a future society. But they might describe possible initial forms of organisation in a free society. This has, in fact, already been done on a limited scale, but it seems that greater emphasis should be placed upon this positive aspect of anarchism if those potentially interested in the movement are to find an answer to their question. Further analysis of anarcho-syndicalism in Catalonia might be one convenient starting point from which to consider practical anarchist organisations of the future.

A common objection to anarchism and one calling for a convincing answer is that it is "contrary to human nature," and can never be realised for that reason.

The answer to this question lies, I think, mainly in examination of the scientific evidence of social anthropologists, who emphasise the extreme malleability of human behaviour. There is, in fact, no fixed "human nature". The ubiquity of the "human nature" common to our own culture is no evidence that it represents a basic "human nature". In general, the ability of the individual to envisage a different "human nature" is restricted due to the fact that he is generally only capable of seeing things in terms of his own culture. Thus, the "progressive" who may accuse the anarchist of interest in the movement because of psychological maladjustment is himself incapable of objectivity because of his social and cultural encumbrances. He still has some emotional vested interest in the present order of things. In answering the "human nature" question it would seem that anarchists should emphasise this difficulty on the part of the individual to understand possible forms of human behaviour not motivated by the general pattern of his own culture.

Cultural conditioning would seem to account for the difficulty in establishing and maintaining experiments along "community living" lines. Such groups might, however, survive and thrive if they continually kept to the forefront the nature of this difficulty and made a specific study of new and old behaviour patterns. Whilst the investigation of waning cultures is a very profitable line of study, anarchists might—at the same time—consider the characteristic of group living adapted to the needs of the present and the future. Most groups of the past have tended to place emphasis upon conformism, whereas a desirable form of group is one which would recognise individual differences which were not actually disintegrative and anti-social. I feel that experimental groups should study past social devices which were used to ensure group integrity and, at the same time, attempt to evolve new ones based upon positive relationships to the rest of society—rather than upon retreat or seclusion from it.

The modern anarchist case might also be tied in with certain technological developments like those of automation. Only a free society, for instance, is likely to employ automation to meet human needs and not primarily to serve the ends of privileged classes. Present socio-economic systems may, indeed, restrict the introduction of automation for at least two major reasons: (1) Superabundance of goods cannot be sold at a profit and (2) the human being is often a cheap "serf-mechanism" when counted against the cost of intalling automation. The latter might, in fact, almost completely release human beings from monotonous work and be instrumental in helping to create highly diversified forms of free society (including pastoral and also other forms of community which we may not, so far, have envisaged).

In this brief survey I have, perhaps, echoed the views of some writers who express the opinion that anarchist theory should be re-written in the light of contemporary developments. Whilst this calls for a considerable amount of research work, it might be possible for anarchist writers to pool their present knowledge and resources and to run an initial series of planned weekly articles to enlighten the potentially interested along the lines which I have suggested. This modern case for positive anarchism might later be presented in book form for the benefit of a wider public under some such title as "The Free Society".

Despite the possibility of TV in every room and two cars in every garage there is a widely diffused but generally aimless protest against existing forms of society. (This is exemplified in current teenage

culture and in other forms of youth protest against adult authoritarianism. At the present time its force is dissipated in things like "rock and roll", cheap records, juke boxes, special kinds of clothing and in harmless "youth conferences" for the more mature).

A systematic re-statement of the case for anarchism (or a "Free Society") in the 1960's might do a great deal to provide a positive goal capable of uniting both the apathetic and those who may consider that there is no realisable goal for which to strive.

Unfortunately, time does not appear to be on the side of the anarchists. It would seem to favour the powerful controlling organisations which have at their disposal increasing facilities and monopoly to influence the minds of the people through State education and centrally controlled sources of information and entertainment. There is also danger in the facile optimism which regards more "prosperity", a more enlightened attitude towards sex or a more "democratic" relationship between executives and subordinates as signs of progress towards a Free Society. The farmer who adopts a kindly attitude towards his cattle and pays increased attention to their welfare is more concerned with the production of milk and beef than in extending the freedom and mental horizons of his charges. More orange juice, more food, more industrial psychology, more technical education and more luxuries tend to make for healthy, well-adjusted and contented employees capable of performing their jobs and doing more readily what they are told to do. In America, too, the boss may come to dinner. But he is, after all, still the Boss.

A.J.

A Bad Week!

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT!

WEEK 13	
Deficit on Freedom	£260
Contributions received	£221
DEFICIT	£39

March 18 to March 24

London: Anon.* 2/3; London: J.S.* 3/-;
London: P. & G.T.* 3/6; New Haven, Conn.:
E.L. 17/9; Leicester: P.D.K.H. 10/-; Man-
chester: G.M. 3/3; Brooklyn: M.S. 14/-;
Youngstown: G.S.S. 14/-; Wolverhampton:
J.G.L.* 3/-; Cambridge: J.P.H. 16/3; Fal-
mouth: R.W. 1/6; Middlesbrough: P.E. 8/-;
Enfield: M. & J.S. £1/0/0; Chelsea, Mass.:
J.M. 14/-; Stockholm: O.H. 5/-; Surrey:
F.B.* 5/-.

Total	7	0	6
Previously acknowledged	214	9	5
1960 TOTAL TO DATE	£221	9	11

GIFT OF BOOKS: Ilford: M.D.

*Indicates regular contributor.

ISRAEL AND ARABS

IN FREEDOM of Feb. 6th a letter from "The Third Force" movement in Israel says: "When Israeli leaders angrily and very loudly protest on international platforms against anti-semitism and national discrimination, they should be reminded by sincere friends of Israel that the Arabs are also Semites, and that the enforcement of exile and decay on a million of Arab refugees and the degradation and spoliation of 200,000 Israeli Arabs are acts much more substantial and inhuman than the smearing of swastikas."

It seems to me unfair to compare the two. When the Jews first settled in Israel and "made the desert bloom again" the Arabs who lived there benefited by it as well, except that the wealthier Arabs became alarmed over the fact that this was helping improve the standard of living for their countrymen and would cause discontent among the great number of their oppressed masses who lived in such dire poverty. And when Britain turned part of Palestine over to the Jews in 1948, the Arabs in the surrounding countries decided to get rid of them by driving them into the sea. They raised an army and warned all the Arabs living in Palestine to withdraw while they sent their armies to drive the Jews out, and promised afterward to return the fleeing ones to their homes. The Israelis warned them that if they left they could not return, but if they stayed on they would be taken care of. But most of them left, very confident that they would soon destroy the Israelis and return. They lost, of course, and forgot their own rules that "to the victor belong the spoils." And that to allow a million to return would be to place a huge "fifth column" in the heart of Israel, which is surrounded on all sides by Arab enemies in much

greater numbers, who would seize any opportunity to destroy them.

And where were their Arab brothers who enticed them away from their homes? The refugees could have been placed in a number of Arab countries which really needed them and could use them—with funds from the U.N. and even Israel. But Arabs refused as they preferred to use them as an example of Israel's cruelty; and as a scapegoat for their poverty-stricken masses to vent their frustrations on. Some of these poor Arabs in the country surrounding the refugee camp actually escape into the camp, which is helped by U.N., as they can live better there!

The Israelis' policy is to help keep families together, and therefore, in accordance with this some Arabs are allowed to return to rejoin their families. And the Arabs who remained in Israel have the rights of citizens, and even have some of their members in the Knesset. I was told by an Arab guide when I was in Israel that they live better than they ever did, including education for their children.

So how can you compare the self-imposed exile of those refugee Arabs with the ravings of frustrated Nazi fanatics who go around shouting that all the Jews should be put into gas chambers and wiped out, even here in the U.S.A. Washington, D.C. LILLIAN KISLUK March 10.

Where are those
New Readers
for FREEDOM!

The Individual in the Authoritarian Society

DEAR EDITORS,

I am amazed at B.F.'s letter (FREEDOM, 1-1960) which implies that I believe in the possibility of individual expression in an authoritarian society. Such a conclusion is deduced from wrong premises. If he assumes that I am an anarchist then, theoretically speaking, I am anti-authoritarian. But he cannot infer from this that I believe that the full development of the individual is possible in our present society. When I speak of freedom as against the utopian freedom of tomorrow or of the expression of individuality now as against its future devel-

opment I certainly reject all lulling sort of coming tomorrows which implies the destruction of the last hopes of the believers and any expectations of compensation.

Talking in terms of freedom and individuality here and now does not mean acceptance of authoritarian society but on the contrary its rejection with its corollary the State, police, army, exploitation, etc., and the realisation that full freedom cannot be realised in such a society. I believe it could be, there would be need for me to be an anarchist and to spend sixpence on anarchist publications.

If any attempt to put into practice the theory of spontaneous activity ends in Her Majesty's gaol I unmistakably assure B.F. that any attempt to put anarchism into practice will undoubtedly end in H.M. gaol also. So to live in an authoritarian society B.F., as myself, to compromise. The difference between him and myself is that he is trying to rationalise his compromising by speaking in terms of an unauthoritarian tomorrow and by projecting his repressions into a future society, thus justifying his escapism whereas I accept anti-authoritarianism as a way of life, as an attitude to be judged today and not tomorrow and feel no need to justify my failure.

According to B.F. my "strictures of conscience and duty are irrefutable" pointless, since neither of these bourgeois virtues has any place in anarchist philosophy. B.F. is right but the anarchists are not philosophical beings or a special class of individuals isolated from others by the wall of China. They live in a bourgeois society and have many of the bourgeois virtues and very often when they speak in terms of morality or organisation they think and act as bourgeois and authoritarians, therefore attacking such virtue does not harm the anarchist.

In my previous letter to FREEDOM I expressed my views on organisation and do not think they need to be emphasised. Replies to other points contained in B.F.'s letter are implied in my answer. There is one more thing only on which I would like to remark, namely, that internal authority is as dangerous as external authority and much more difficult to dispose of. It is easier to rebel against the visible authority than against the invisible authority within oneself.

Sydney, March 15 J.G.

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP and MALATESTA DEBATING SOCIETY IMPORTANT

MEETINGS are now held at CAMBRIDGE CIRCUS "The Marquis of Granby" Public House, London, W.C.2.

(corner Charing Cross Road and Shaftesbury Avenue) at 7.30 p.m.

ALL WELCOME

APRIL 3—S. E. Parker on THE FUTURE IS NOW

APRIL 10—J. M. Pilgrim on ANARCHISM AND SCIENCE FICTION

APRIL 17—No meeting

READERS IN BOSTON, MASS.

If any comrades living in or around Boston, Mass., would like to get in touch with others and perhaps form a group, will they write to Freedom Press. They will then be put in contact with the Comrade who is enquiring.

FREEDOM The Anarchist Weekly

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

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

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

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

FREEDOM "REPRINTS"

(VOLUME 9 READY SHORTLY)

Still Available:

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

Vol. 7, 1957, *Year One—Sputnik Era*
Vol. 8, 1958, *Socialism in a Wheelchair*

each volume paper 7s. 6d.
cloth 10s. 6d.

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

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