

FREEDOM

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY -4d.

FEBRUARY 22 1964 Vol 25 No 6

TO what extent are the crises hitting the Western powers a reflection of a growing struggle among themselves over markets for their ever expanding industrial potential? This is the kind of question we find ourselves asking in order to appreciate the importance apparently attributed by the United States to the refusal of countries such as Britain, France and Spain to break off trade relations with Cuba. Obviously Cuba is a political thorn in the sides of influential political and financial groups in the States, and the outcome of its struggle to survive and possibly raise its standard of living in spite of America's determined attempt to force the country to its knees will, it seems to us, have widespread repercussions not only in the American hemisphere, but wherever dollar imperialism has established its hegemony.

★

THE United States' emergence as the supreme military and economic power in the world after the last war depended not so much on her exclusive possession of the Atom Bomb as to the fact that alone among the industrial nations of the world her cities were unscathed and her industries not only intact but modernised and extended.

Behind the Cuba 'Crisis'

BUSES TO GUBA—A CHALLENGE TO DOLLAR IMPERIALISM

And besides, one must not forget that while the European industrial powers were making war, the United States was busily producing arms for them and being paid by taking over their investments in Latin America as well as their gold reserves! And of course the United States was able to oust Britain and Germany in these traditional European markets. In a word, just as after World War I the United States from being a debtor nation emerged as the largest creditor in the whole world, so after World War II in a world of shattered cities and bankrupt economies the USA held once again all the trump cards.

It is interesting to note that American isolationism coincides with the period of most intensive revolutionary ferment in Europe after the First World War, and that her attitude after World War II was one of active intervention. The fact that in 1918 Europe was shaken by the Russian Revolution and in 1945 by Russia's emergence as the only

Power which might threaten American hegemony, surely justifies one drawing the conclusion that the cold war is a matter of power politics and not ideology. How else explain America's indifference (relatively speaking) to the Russian revolution with her almost pathological concern now that the Soviet Union is no longer the spear-head of revolution but a world power, second only to the United States in its military and economic resources and potential?

In terms of economic self-sufficiency and the ability to absorb population growth, the USA and the Soviet Union are by comparison with the European industrial powers, undeveloped areas of the world, and the future of mankind may well depend on the way the natural resources of these nations are developed. But today and for some years to come Germany, Britain and France, even shorn of their colonial empires, will still be the threats to peace as well as the stumbling block to any division of the world

Once again these three war-shattered industrial powers have wormed their way back into dominant positions in the markets of the world. To say that they have done so thanks to American generosity, is romantic nonsense which has no place in capitalist economics. If America "helped" her erstwhile enemies, as well as her friends, to finance their industrial recovery after the war one can be sure that such action was motivated by hard-

Freedom... is attained not by any new institution coercively introduced, nor by barricades or murder but by ceasing to obey any human authority whatsoever.

LEO TOLSTOY.

Support the Anti-Election Campaign!

headed business considerations and not brotherly love. After all what was America's attitude when her "friends" were engaged in "a life and death struggle" against Nazism? To quote from our predecessor *War Commentary* in the early months of the war:

Roosevelt's moving appeals which have reached Europe during the last few years have been strangely contradicted by his eagerness to turn the war to profit as soon as it was declared. Thanks to this great pacifist, Wall Street is rubbing its hands at the prospect of French and English orders, and the importance given during the debate on the Neutrality Act to the cash and carry provisions leaves no doubt as to the disinterested sympathies of the US for the two democracies!*

★

TODAY both the United States and the Soviet Union are faced with rebellion among their satellites and their *protegés*. Not only is it a verifiable truth that healthy people invariably bite the hand that feeds them, it is also a kind of law of nature that power begets an appetite for more power. For reasons unconnected with humanitarian or other non-capitalist considerations, colonial powers have been generating "winds of change" in their colonies and placing their hopes in the hands of people they had formerly imprisoned or driven into exile and are then surprised and hurt

*Will America Rule the World (*War Commentary*, Dec. 1939. Reprinted in *Neither East nor West*, by Marie Louise Berneri, FP 1952, 7/6).

when their new-found *protegés* double-cross them. Such has been the case with Castro and the Americans. In his struggle against the Batista regime Castro originally enjoyed American support. When he got rid of Batista he then set about getting rid of the Americans! Both from our point of view and Castro's this was obviously the right thing to do; from the Americans' it was not.

As anarchists we don't have to choose between the Castro- and American- regimes. Castro started as a reluctant revolutionary, a member of the privileged class with a social conscience and so we understand, on the whole vague ideas as to how to deal with the day to day problems confronting the Cuban people once they had made their revolution; the American authorities naively imagined that once he had got rid of Batista he would play their game. They were thinking in terms of a *coup d'etat* and not a revolution. For revolutions set in motion forces and ideas which often go beyond the intentions or the control of their initiators or their backers. From an anarchist point of view the Castro revolution has failed because it has deposed one oligarchy only to put another in its place; has rid itself of one "protector"—America—only to instal another—USSR. Yet this writer, as a professed anarchist, cannot in all honesty simply write-off the revolution in Cuba. In economic

Continued on page 4

INDUSTRIAL NOTES

Raleigh Strike Still On

The official strike at the Raleigh factory at Nottingham which is now entering its fifth week, began when A.E.U. members in the toolroom stopped work after 25 of their mates received dismissal notices. These sackings were part of a scheme by the management to solve the problem that has arisen following a cut in the American order for bicycles last Autumn. Although over 800 men belonging to other unions were also sacked, the A.E.U. was the only one to take any action. The A.E.U. and its toolroom members have suggested short-time working in place of the sackings, but the management has dismissed the plan as being unworkable.

At first there were only the 300 toolroom workers involved in the strike. They were joined later by 40 millwrights who were expected by the Company to do the work of the toolmakers. Now, this week following a mass meeting, the A.E.U. has called out its remaining 300 men. The District Secretary, Mr. F. Wilkins, said, "We expect 100% support. This is an official dispute." He was, however, very wrong for only one-third of this number gave their support. The expected solidarity

just was not there. This small amount of support did, however, result in four breakdowns in the production line which caused the management to lay off more men, the total now reaching 1,712 out of the 8,000 men employed at Nottingham. Raleighs say that, if the strike continues, production will be affected at its plant at Birmingham.

One wonders why the full support of the A.E.U. members was not given. Even before this, there were reports that some of the toolroom strikers were thinking of leaving the A.E.U. and joining a small craft union for toolmakers. I do not know what became of this move, but I feel sure that this lack of solidarity reflects dissatisfaction with the unions. Possibly they did not feel that it was worth it, in light of the fact that the other unions at Raleighs had accepted the sackings. Of course the number of unions involved did not help in this respect, but I still feel that the two-thirds who did not respond to the union call, should have given their support. The absence of this response points to a lack of education in basic union principles.

If there had been unofficial liaison between the shop stewards of the various unions, the story might have been different. However, the strike committee has been seeking support at other Raleigh factories, and as a result of their visit to the Smethwick plant at Birmingham, the shop stewards there are putting a suggestion to the men that they ban overtime in support. The strikers also hope the B.M.C. car factories, which are supplied with ball-bearing races by Raleighs, will black these supplies.

This type of backing will help the toolroom strikers, but I feel that more effort should be made to bring out the other workers at Nottingham. This can only be done by the strikers themselves and the case for supporting them should be put to the men still at work. The fact is that these men are "scabbing", for the job is in dispute. The narrow basis of the craft unions has to be broken and the principle of "one out, all out" should be applied until a settlement agreeable to the strikers is reached.

P.T.

AFTERMATH OF COLONIALISM

IN front of me as I write is a map of the continent of Africa. It's an old map showing colonial possessions and spheres of influence. The benevolent colonial powers who went to Africa to help the poor backward natives, the map shows them clearly. Britain, France, Belgium, Portugal, Italy and Spain. Just how much blood has been spilled to enable the imperialistic powers maintain their influence we will never know, what we do know is that investors have made a fortune from African wealth and in turn the workers in the metropolitan countries have increased their standard of living 'off the backs of the Africans'. It can and will be said that this is a worn-out left wing cliché, but unfortunately it is a solid fact and no argument no matter how clever or intellectual can refute it. The imperialist powers have consistently to defend their colonial administration from each other. Britain attacks S. Africa but conveniently forgets the criminal situation in the Protectorates of Basutoland, Swaziland and Bechuanaland although ironically enough if it wasn't for S. Africa the Africans in Basutoland would starve to death: half of the male population work in S. Africa. Swaziland is the richest, with asbestos, coal and iron deposits not yet fully exploited. Bechuanaland also has mineral deposits not fully exploited.

The history of the Belgian Congo was one of subjugation developing to the paternal with the resultant political intrigue and vested interest leading to chaos when the Belgians left.

Portuguese Angola vicious colonial repression but crying to the world about her liberal ideas for her *possessions*. On the other coast Kenya, Tanganyika, Nyasaland and Uganda looking to their African leaders for salvation, but finding the only thing that's changed is the colour of the skins of their rulers. The Kenyan Minister of Labour has warned African trade unionists that if they abused their freedom their governments would "take it away". In Tanganyika, Nyerere clashes with the Federation of Labour over the question of Africanisation.

Right in the centre of this mess are the former mandated territories of Belgium; the Kingdom of Burundi and the Republic of Ruanda which in the last month or so has been the scene for mass murder. It is only in the last few weeks that the national press has taken any notice.

Under Belgian mandate both countries were ruled by feudal kings of the Tutsi tribe who represented about 15% of the population the majority were Hutu peasants. Both Belgium and Germany before her, supported this position until 1959 when the Hutu revolted against their Tutsi overlords. Belgium saw the red light of danger and decided to back the Hutu majority. The Belgians tried to get the Tutsi's to share their power with the Hutu but failed, the damage had been done, the Belgians had supported the Tutsi too long and too well, by giving them preference in education and maintaining them in power. After the showdown in 1959 the Belgians then

helped and encouraged the Hutu to persecute the former ruling Tutsi's. So much so that the self-exiled Tutsi king was able to persuade Lumumba and Russia that the Hutu's were Belgium's stooges and therefore should support his claim to power.

The Belgian mandate ended in July 1962, the murders started in December and January 1964. According to the "Guardian" 11/2/64, probably panic set in due to the invasion of refugees from Burundi.

Barundi hopes to and probably will escape the Rwanda catastrophe. Hutu's and Tutsi share power under an easy-going monarchy. The two countries will not unite politically but have an economic union.

The problem of Rwanda is a serious and difficult one, the answer is not easy, when the oppressed are released from their oppression, they are either so cowed that they are zombies or the hatred built up during the oppression explodes violently. Somehow mediation must be sought and found.

In Africa 'the have' and 'have nots' are poles apart, federal co-operation is the only possibility. Political leaders twist and turn, political programmes promise the earth, and as always the ordinary people gain little if anything. Imperialist powers have taken all and given little, it all comes back to the old solution, world co-operation of ordinary people. A pipe dream? If it is, then we are wasting our time.

BILL CHRISTOPHER.

ANARCHY 36: IS ON THE POLICE

ANARCHY is Published by Freedom Press at 2s. on the first Saturday of every month

Africans Enslaved

"BLACK CARGOES", by Daniel Mannix and Malcolm Cowley, Longmans, 30s.

This must be one of the first histories of the European and American slave trade with Africa to be published for a long time. The authors believe that this trade, which by the end of the seventeenth century was already becoming of major importance to the European economy, was one of the factors which brought about the Industrial Revolution. If one sees human history as inevitably a tragic and ruinous struggle, carried on not in the interests of human happiness but for some abstract conception of "progress", and many do, then the Industrial Revolution is an entire and complete justification for wrecking the lives of millions of Africans (and Europeans) over the course of three centuries.

Slavery had always existed in Africa, as it did in all other civilisations, but until the Europeans arrived the slave trade was merely one among many other trades, in ivory, in gold, in textiles and in iron. Africa was in a stage of development roughly corresponding to that of Britain at the time of the Roman Conquest, except for the East Coast, where an Afro-Arab-Indian civilisation, based on the Indian Ocean trade, was flourishing.

When the Spaniards at the end of the fifteenth century over-ran the West Indian islands they encountered a primitive race, who were utterly unable to work regular hours, being used to a foodgathering economy. They soon died out, leaving the Spaniards with the problem of finding a labour force to work their mines and plantations. The Portuguese had begun trading with West Africa, and importing into Europe a number of items, including slaves.

The authors make very clear that the value of the African as a worker lay precisely in the fact that he was not a primitive. Very few Bushmen were enslaved, because people who are used to a hunter's life cannot adjust themselves to long hours of regular labour at another's bidding. The slaves

were mostly peasants, prisoners of war, criminals or people who had become destitute and surrendered their freedom in order to live.

Slave slaves were being imported into the West Indian and South American colonies of Spain and Portugal in large quantities. When the English, the French and the Dutch acquired American colonies this process was speeded up. The demand in Europe for luxury goods, like sugar and tobacco, and later cotton, was the cause of a boom in the West Indies, which went on till nearly the end of the eighteenth century. The mass consumer society had already arrived.

Slaves were paid for in guns, among other things, mostly harmful and anti-social, and this meant that the different African kingdoms had to acquire firearms at any cost, or be over-run by their less squeamish neighbours. Some tribes tried to avoid getting entangled in the slave trade, but few succeeded. The kingdoms had to fight each other to get slaves to get arms to fight each other to get slaves, a vicious circle. Some tribes made their own guns, a few their own powder, but they had not the productive capacity to produce on the scale the Europeans could.

Nevertheless, although social life became more and more brutalised, the tribes were strong enough to keep the Europeans confined to their coastal settlements, which they only held on sufferance in any case. The tribal ruling classes were quite as crafty as the Europeans, and would play one European power off against another.

The boys' adventure yarns I used to read in my childhood were full of the horrors of the evil kingdom of Dahomey, with its palisades of skulls. These stories never mentioned that Dahomey was a British satellite, equipped with British muskets and cannon, because this kingdom was a good supplier of slaves.

For a variety of reasons, some good, some bad, it was Britain who, after having played a leading part in the trade, turned right round and attempted to suppress it. It was not until the American Civil War however that it was brought to a final end. The Atlantic trade that is. The Arab trade continues still.

However even this was not the end. In the latter part of the nineteenth century the Europeans grabbed each of them as much of Africa as they could seize, and this could only be justified by maintaining that the Negroes were a sort of Neanderthal race—of human animals, who had to be "civilised" as far as was possible, and kept in order by the Northern European lords of the earth.

It is undeniable that African society had become much more brutal since

the sixteenth century, thanks to the slave trade, but the people had begun to repair the damage done to them, when the final disaster of foreign conquest struck.

This book is a useful account of one of the most decisive factors in the creation of the modern world.

A.W.U.

INDIAN S MASSACRED

"MASSACRE AT AMRITSAR", by Rupert Furneaux, George Allen & Unwin, 25s.

ON April 13th, 1919, General Dyer ordered his men to fire on an unarmed and peaceable crowd, which was gathered in a wide but almost totally enclosed stretch of wasteland in the city of Amritsar. The crowd was unable to

escape, and the result was nearly four hundred dead and one thousand, two hundred wounded. Controversy rages to this day. I have myself heard General Dyer's action defended, on the grounds that it prevented another Indian Mutiny.

Rupert Furneaux's explanation is that, not to put too fine a point upon it, General Dyer was becoming senile and did not really know what he was doing. There had been days of rioting, some Europeans had been killed, and an English woman had been badly beaten up, so he was out for blood. He did not realise that the Jallianwala Bagh was an enclosed space, and when the crowd surged backwards and forwards, unable to escape, he thought he was being rushed. He appears to have been a humane man normally.

It is a horrible story, for which Indians as much as British must bear the blame, for it was Indian troops who did the shooting. They appear to have performed their "duty" with the skill and enthusiasm of the true soldier...

MAX STIRNER

Comrades,

A recent Lamb and Flag speaker pointed out that, in one sense, any action undertaken voluntarily is motivated by self-interest. The revolutionary in the torture chamber keeps his mouth shut, comrades sell FREEDOM on windy street corners, sit-downers are imprisoned, and all act as they do because they have identified with a cause and consider that their self-interest is best served by furthering that cause whatever the immediate physical hardships. However much your actions may benefit others you have your own self-interest at heart. In short it is logically impossible for someone to voluntarily do something without self-interest motivating his decision. That the decision may turn out later to have been the wrong one is beside the point.

Individualists are the same as the people described above except that they actually call themselves 'individualists'. The only ones who differ are solitaries who retire to cabbage-patches or desert islands. Solitaries apart, the hallmark of the individualist is his admission that he is motivated by self-interest.

I write this to try to clear up the vagueness that surrounds Stirnerism. Armand's article on Stirner presented by S.E.P. (15/2/64) only adds to the confusion. Stirnerites often deplore the fact that people think they are advocating the philosophy of Genghis Khan and Jack the Ripper but they have only themselves to blame. What a pity that intelligent men cannot express themselves more clearly. If the issue of 15/2/64 was the first FREEDOM I had ever read I would have thrown it down in horror convinced that anarchism (or that part of it called Stirnerism) was a creed of ruthless hostility and selfishness with the weakest going to the wall. The only positive part of the article was the 'Union of Egoists'—presumably Stirner's

way of describing mutual aid. The rest of it would put the shudders up anyone. For instance it says that a Stirnerite rids himself of the ideals of liberty and truth. Can one be blamed for taking that to mean that Stirnerites use coercion and deal in lies. Presumably what the writer means is that a Stirnerite does not regard liberty and truth idealistically but simply as things to be taken and used in a practical sense.

Stirner's contemporary, Henry Thoreau, seems to me to be a much better writer on individualism, particularly parts of "Walden" and "Life without Principle". Compare Thoreau with Stirner. Firstly Thoreau was intensely practical and showed in detail how an individual can break away from society and live his own life. Stirner's writings contain no practical proposals except the shadowy 'Union of Egoists' and consist of seemingly endless theorising. Secondly Thoreau had the courage of his convictions and actually did live his own life. Stirner by contrast was always a member (albeit an unsuccessful one) of the bourgeoisie. The FREEDOM article says that Stirner despised the bourgeoisie as people with secure jobs and regular incomes. Why then did he himself not become déclassé and slide down into the lumpen proletariat that he theoretically admired so much? Why when writing "The Ego and Its Own" did he do that bourgeois thing—getting married? Surely Stirner's egoism was merely the result of his own frustration and littleness? What was his ego ever conscious of but its own inferiority? The shrill whines of Stirner compare unfavourably with the calm rugged Yankee individualism of Henry Thoreau.

But Stirner the man is separate from Stirnerism and I should like to ask some questions regarding the latter.

1. Why is it believed that it is in one's self-interest to cultivate one's ego?

ROUND THE GALLERIES

tion, for Rauschenberg's "Pilgrim"—of a kitchen chair primly placed against an abstract expressionist painting—is but a poor echo of gestures that once had the right wing in art and politics foaming at the mouth. But no one foamed at this exhibition for, all in all, the awful truth is that so much of it is old hat, so much of it re-cooked corn.

When Man Ray a half a lifetime ago welded a row of tacks onto the underside of a tailor's iron he divorced that utilitarian object from its plebeian background and gave the monied intellectuals a meaningless toy to play with; and when Oppenheim covered a spoon, cup and saucer with fur he gave the Town a creepy giggle that five years of mass murder has relegated to its sad little role of things that don't really matter. If one is very young, then accept the exhibition of Robert Rauschenberg's work as a gay and exciting afternoon well spent. But accept the fact that there is nothing to accept. Despite the pretentious blurbs by Bryan Robertson, Gedzahler and Cage to an excellent but expensive catalogue; despite the two shillings and sixpence demanded for thirty pages of duplicated nonsense to describe thirty-four dreary collages on the theme of Dante's Inferno (that fifteen years ago Mesens of the London Gallery could have rejected in favour of more exciting and technically better contained work); despite all this, the exhibition is worthy of your time for though Rauschenberg has failed to set the Town by its ears he has shown our local talent that there are still minor masters working within a minor medium.

ARTNUR MOYSE.

BOOKS P

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 Civil War in Spain (ed.) Robert Payne 36/-
- Talks to Parents and Teachers Homer Lane 8/6
- La CNT en la Revolucion Española..... Jose Peirats (Vol. 3 only) 16/-
- Commonwealth versus Sacco and Vanzetti (ed.) Robert P. Weeks 22/-
- Marx, Proudhon and European Socialism J. Hampden Jackson 8/6
- Rebel in Paradise: a Biography of Emma Goldman Richard Drinnon 48/-
- Anarchy and Order Herbert Read 16/-
- Sex and Society Alex Comfort 21/-
- Darwin and the Naked Lady Alex Comfort 18/-

SECOND-HAND

- Peace and Opinion Evan Luard 7/6;
- Money Writes Upton Sinclair 7/6;
- Alexanderplatz Alfred Doblin 5/-;
- The Problem of the Moscow Trial (1933) G. W. Keeton 6/-;
- Balcony Empire Reynolds and Eleanor Packard 3/-;
- White Madam Myrna Blumberg 3/6;
- Military and Political Consequences of Atomic Energy P. M. S. Blackett 3/6;
- Proletarian Literature in the United States Coldwell, Dos Passos, Farrell, etc. 7/6;
- Under Cover John Roy Carlson 3/-;
- The House on the Square E. Kazakevitch 3/-;
- The Revolt of Asia Robert Payne 5/-;
- Such a Simple Thing Lavrentov, Gorki, Alexei, Tolstoy, etc. 3/-;
- The Uprooted Oscar Handlin 5/-;

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

... and no man foamed

THOSE who can buy everything must of necessity turn to the gutter for their gifts, and the society that produced the plastic lily will seek its scents from off the decaying rose. Within the closed society of our time, so self-contained so clinically clean, those who produce, and how they produce, offer to the gelled few the hypnotic fascination, yet repellent horror, of the conquered but unruly barbarians without the city gate. The empty and rusty can of meat, the useless debris of the junk-man's yard, the overflow from the alley dust-bins demand, by their very nature, the exquisite setting divorced from the world that made them, for their beauty lies within their alienation and their fascination in that they are decayed. It is for this reason that Robert Rauschenberg has been ill-served by the Town in that his massive retrospective exhibition is being held within the Whitechapel Gallery in London's East End. The Whitechapel High Street is a winding road of broken houses, grimy strip-lit cafés, tarted catch-penny shops and shadowed public houses, and to enter the Whitechapel Gallery is but to continue the abysmal journey, for the debris of my society is continued onto the walls of the gallery.

Rauschenberg as an entertainer belongs to the world of the stage; his offerings are as ephemeral as a café society comedian's jokes and he has most assuredly found his niche as the designer of stage

and costume gear for Merce Cunningham's Dance Group. Yet for all that, without his own minor talents Rauschenberg offers a needed and traumatic kick to the art Establishment and this exhibition of work spanning the last fifteen years is an exciting and worthwhile rendezvous for the young and the dispossessed. Robert Rauschenberg has been brought to this country at the instigation of Bryan Robertson, the O.B.E. Director of the Whitechapel Art Gallery and Robertson has seen fit to introduce Rauschenberg as the John the Baptist of our native but naïve pop art, with the unfortunate Kurt Schwitters, as its lawmaker. Yet to me Rauschenberg would appear to owe a greater debt to the surrealists of the '30's than to Schwitters, Picasso or Duchamp. His work lacks the old-maidish meticulousness of the midwars surrealist groups yet there is little that could be out of place among their works. "193466" is a covered pail in a frame of wire netting and one remembers Roland Penrose's "Captain Cook's Last Voyage" (a tailor's dummy within a wire frame) "created" in 1936. Rauschenberg's "Empire II" is a chimney cow mounted on an ancient trolley and recalls Dali's 1938 mildew taxi with its interior rain. Again one would be hard pressed to find within the Whitechapel exhibition anything like "The Pool" of the 1938 Paris exhibition with its costly bed and wall paintings situated within a mass of rotting vegeta-

Far from there being a "new Indian Mutiny" the troops remained stoutly loyal to their British masters, while, although Moslem and Hindu rioted together, the Sikhs kept out of it, and even made General Dyer an honorary Sikh. Charming!

Mr. Furneaux believes that the massacre helped to encourage the cause of Indian independence, just as the murder of Christ stimulated the growth of Christianity. He may well be right. However, once independence had been achieved Hindu and Moslem flew at each other's throats and perpetrated a mutual massacre that puts General Dyer's achievement in the shade. The British feared the cry, "Hindu and Moslem together!" for their policy had always been to play one group off against the other. However once the British were expelled the fruits of this policy made their appearance in a horrifying blood-bath. Nobody comes well out of the story.

A.W.U.

LETTER

Surely enlightened self-interest (as opposed to blind grasping) is best served by disciplining the ego rather than developing it. I understand that the Buddhist Nirvana is the highest state that men can achieve and to reach it the ego is annihilated.

2. This concerns the practical application of Stirner's theories. The article said:

"In Stirner's Union one may sacrifice oneself for others so long as one does not invoke the sacred character of the Union. You will do it simply because it is pleasing and natural for you to do so."

So logically a Stirnerite could be the man in the torture chamber and could make the greatest sacrifices for others providing he finds it 'pleasing and natural to do so.' I believe that a Stirnerite would end up the same as any other anarchist except he would always have elaborate philosophical reasons for his actions. In my article on Free-will (25/1/64) I pointed out that free-will can only operate within confines determined by instinct, heredity, upbringing and environment. The same laws of Nature would apply to Stirnerites as everyone else. The 'Union of Egoists' would end up in a PRACTICAL sense much the same as a commune or syndicate. Unless, that is, they retired to cabbage-patches in which case they would need no union. Is not a Stirnerite the same as everyone else except for the philosophy and the labels? What are the distinguishing marks of a British Stirnerite in 1964?

I am an individualist. I admit quite frankly that I am interested in No. 1. Yet I realise that it is in my self-interest to work for the movement and try to behave in a socially responsible way. I might rescue someone from drowning but only because I (ME) do not like people to drown and it could be me next time. Perhaps one day I will become a solitary and retire to the Outer Hebrides. But whatever happens I think it would be a good thing if the pedantic, ambiguous writings of Stirner were either translated into coherent language or consigned entirely to the dustbin. For it there is no practical difference between Stirnerism and other anarchism of what use is something the ambiguity of which puts people off anarchism altogether?

Fraternally,
London Feb. 16 JEFF ROBINSON.

TO ALL ANARCHISTS

DEMONSTRATION

Last September 21, comrades of the FIJL (in exile) were arrested by the French authorities and charged with "association with criminals". These arrests were made in collusion with the Spanish Government.

Several of these comrades have since been granted "provisional liberty" (this entails handing in their passports, forced residence, and police supervision).

However, six still remain in prison and a seventh—José Pascual (who is tubercular)—is confined in hospital. Our comrades have remained in prison for nearly six months without any sign of a trial. By the time this statement appears they will be on a protest hunger-strike.

In solidarity with these comrades, anarchists are going to demonstrate, in London, outside the French Embassy this Saturday (Feb. 22nd). We are assembling at 10.45 a.m., corner of Sloane Street and Knightsbridge (Tube).

Please support our comrades by joining this demonstration.

FREEDOM

February 22 1964 Vol 25 No 6

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

THE ONLY VALID REVOLUTION...

DEAR EDITORS,

Surely, we must have realised by now that the working class has no messianic role to play, it is a worthless concept, a myth belonging to the last century. The idea of revolution, as still envisaged by some anarchists, is like Krishnamurti's definition of religion: "A peg on which people seek to hang all their unsolved problems". History shows that a revolution can only lead to great suffering, possibly greater tyranny, but never a free society.

Let us face facts, we are going to be with government for the rest of our lives, and we might as well accept this, just as we have to accept the reality of money.

There is a world of difference between a socialist government on the Scandinavian pattern, and a fascist regime; if you don't believe it, brother, try living under Franco! This is no apology for government, but let us hope that anarchists have something better to offer than a rather puerile anti-election campaign. I say this, even though in a past election, I, with others, had great fun taking the mickey out of the Labour leaders at St. Pancras Town Hall; I consider that this proved nothing, achieved nothing, save perhaps, to make us seem like a bunch of eccentric cranks to some people, who might, otherwise, have been sympathetic to our libertarian ideas.

The Labour Party, like all other organisations, has its quota of power-seeking

maniacs, but it is also supported by a great many people who do so out of a genuine desire for social justice. Could one say as much for right-wing parties?

The only valid revolution is that which takes place within an individual, when he discovers that he can be free; he may do this without even having heard of Anarchism, although contact with the libertarian body of ideas will confirm and give cohesion to his experiments with, and quest for freedom. The integration of the individual, the responsibilities which his newly found freedom impose upon him, is the only worthwhile revolution, he is now on his own, and not answerable to any outside authority. To such an individual, relationship with his fellow men will now be based on complete integrity both in thought and deed.

To me, an anarchist is an integrated being, who can be free regardless of his social environment, and, as such, can act as a catalyst within society, his liberty of both thought and action setting an example to his less fortunate fellows, still shackled by their conforming hedonism, fears and prejudices. As I see it, there is no other valid way of changing society, for this can only change for the better to the extent that the individuals who constitute it are successful in becoming their own masters, instead of by violent upheaval, which can do nothing to change the personality of a man, except possibly for the worse.

London, Feb. 14. E.J.B.

171 PAPER-BACK COPIES OF *Fanny Hill* the eighteenth century novel were ruled as obscene by Sir Robert Blundell, the chief metropolitan magistrate and ordered to be forfeited to the police who seized them. The expurgated edition is still for sale, and a paper-back of this edition is forthcoming. One of the characters in *Fanny Hill* "considered pleasure, of one sort or another, as the universal port of destination, and every wind that blew thither a good one, provided it blew nobody any harm". Raids were made by police on Soho bookshops, and a photographer and bookseller were summoned for distributing 'obscene matter'. The publishers of *Fanny Hill* are contemplating fighting cases as brought up in the provinces—since they feel that the Metropolitan magistrate's ruling only holds good for London. C. H. Rolph, writing of the Obscene Publications Act in the *Guardian*, says: "New statutes often fill an emotional need, enabling their authors and sponsors to feel that they have found and supplied the answer to a problem—the Litter Act was one example, and the 'Flick Knives Act' was another. Neither of them has changed a thing." *Lolita*, banned in Australia, has been prescribed as a set book for an Australian university English course. *Time* in its survey "The Second Sexual Revolution" writes: "It remains for each man and woman to walk through this sexual bombardment and determine for themselves what to them seems tasteless or objectionable, entertaining or merely dull. A healthy society must assume a certain degree of immunity on the part of its people".

THE LORD CHAMBERLAIN gave permission for producers of an anti-capital punishment play "Hang Down Your Head and Die", presented at Oxford, to describe instead of showing a man being pressed to death. A mime of the execution of the Rosenbergs was substituted for by a narration of the execution. Christopher Simcox is to appeal against the death sentence passed upon him for murder. He was sentenced to death for another murder sixteen years ago and reprieved. Paul Winocour of 38 Pembroke Villas, London, W.11, is organising protest action. The leader of a gang who used mental patients to produce knitwear was sentenced to death in Moscow. Jesse Parker (23), a Negro, of Dallas, was executed in the electric chair at Huntsville, Texas, for raping a white woman in 1961.



A WHITE FARMER in Virginia, Orange Free State was fined £25 for common assault on an African who was drowned after the farmer threw him into the river on Christmas day. A lawyer for the widow of an African detainee who was found hanged in his cell walked out of the inquest when his submissions on torture used against prisoners were disallowed by the court. Mr. Vorster, Minister of Justice in South Africa said that 49 complaints of assaults by policemen or warders on 90-day detainees have been made since last May. 23 people said they had been hit or kicked, and twenty said they had been given electric shocks. Mr. Vorster said that investigation of 32 of the complaints had been completed and seventeen were still being investigated. He said that none of the cases had "substance". A South African judge said that the jury's verdict in finding two men 'not guilty' of murdering an African was 'totally wrong'. An African and a European employed by the Forestry department claimed that they fired in 'self-defence'. The man was shot in the back.

A JAMAICAN lorry driver, Eric Taylor, at Bow was boycotted by his fellow-workers who held a meeting and said "either he goes or we do". He was kept on by the firm without working. He said, "I never dreamed that I would be the victim of racial trouble like this. I want nothing other than to be allowed to do a decent week's work for my money. Now I feel a big fraud because I am taking money under false pretences. A lorry driver later explained that the Jamaican would be exploited by the management and their decision was in

his own interests. "We think Taylor will be exploited by the management and in the end we shall all suffer. He seems an intelligent man and we have nothing against him as we have worked with coloured men in the past. But we feel that when we are entitled to receive double time or time and a half for working overtime, he will be content with his normal pay. That has already occurred with coloured men employed on other work at the depot." Schoolboys held a demonstration in Wimbledon by picketing for eight hours a shop which carried "white only" accommodation advertisements. The shopkeeper said, "I accept they wanted to make their point. But I shall not meet their demands. I think coloured people prefer advertisements that state whether they are wanted. It prevents any snub when they call personally".

A POLL AT Bristol University found that E. S. & A. Robinson's building was the ugliest post-war building in the city. It was decided by the students to burn a replica and present the ashes to the architect. 20,000 people marched to Portsmouth Guildhall with a petition against council house rent increases. 1,000 Young Socialists marched through the West End to Westminster to lobby M.P.s for a better deal for youngsters leaving school. According to Anthony Howard, of the *New Statesman* there were only forty in the audience addressed by Bessie Braddock, M.P., at Central Hall, Westminster at a rally following the march. Howard claims that the Young Socialists are suspected by Transport House of having been taken over by Trotskyists and that the major meeting organized by the Trotskyists was crowded.

MR. MAURICE MACMILLAN, Economic Secretary to the Treasury, introducing a bill to wind up the scheme of compensation for war damage, said that the original scheme was one of the "success stories" of the war and its immediate aftermath. Some four million claims were made and compensation paid in respect of about 3.5 million properties. Claims not concluded within ten years would be extinguished. New claims resulting from the explosion of unexploded bombs would be dealt with by the War Office.

JON QUIXOTE.

... DEMANDS NO COMPROMISE!

EDITOR'S REPLY

IF, as our correspondent maintains, an anarchist "is an integrated being, who can be free regardless of his social environment, etc.", why does he worry about "changing society", or make distinctions between political parties and regimes? At the beginning of his letter he tells us anti-election-anarchists that there is "a world of difference between a socialist government on the Scandinavian pattern and a fascist regime" and that if we don't believe this then "brother, try living under Franco". But friend, you have also said that an integrated anarchist is one who is "free regardless of his social environment", and you made your meaning even clearer when you refer to "his liberty of both thought and action setting an example". Now which is it? Is not our correspondent confusing between freedom of thought which is possible for some individuals in whatever environment they find themselves, and real freedom of action which is not possible in any authoritarian—that is governmental—society for all but the few individuals who wield the power?

Anarchists are opposed to all governments—and therefore to the elections by which, in the "democracies", rival contenders for office are chosen—because they cannot think and act freely so long as other individuals are empowered to determine and control their daily lives for them. To say that some governments or regimes are less oppressive than others is too obvious to deserve repeating, least of all in an anarchist paper. It is as obvious as saying that a broken leg is less crippling than an amputation. But just as nobody would express a preference for either, and could at most look upon the former as a lesser evil, so with governments, surely?

WE quite agree that among Labour Party supporters there are those who are "motivated by a genuine desire for social justice". The same could be said of some CP supporters; and that some also strongly believe in socialism. And anarchists obviously find ourselves

having much in common with them over ends. But socialism by the ballot box is a question of means, not ends, and on the means we profoundly disagree with them.

For our correspondent *revolution* "can only lead to great suffering, possibly greater tyranny, but never a free society", but it will be noticed that though he implies that we should use our votes since "we are going to be with government for the rest of our lives" he does not tell us as categorically as he did in defining revolution where *government* leads us. Indeed after his piece on good government versus bad, he switches to a definition of his one-man revolutionary who is so perfect that he obviously intends him to play the "messianic role" which, he wrongly, alleges we anarchists have allotted to the working class!

If authoritarian revolutions produce "possibly greater tyranny", then by the same logic governments, all of which, by definition, must be authoritarian, can never lead to freedom of the individual, or to a free society? One has only to use one's powers of observation to see that the trend in this age of technology, mass communications, mass production and consumption, is that the power of the ruling class, and the role of governments is greater than it ever was in the past.

And the improved standards of living in the "developed" (by which we mean the "have") nations of the world cannot be attributed to good government as opposed to bad. If anything they are the by-products of the rival groups within the capitalist system whose insatiable appetite for more power and profits, has inevitably created a need for mass markets. That the over-riding considerations of the capitalist system are markets and not people (though people, make up the markets) can it seem to us be demonstrated beyond any shadow of doubt. All governments, and aspirants to office, declare that their policies are directed to increasing production and consumption, (which is a vote-catching formula to which every party must subscribe if it doesn't intend to commit

political *hari kari*). However, when it comes to the point the party in office, Labour or Communist, Liberal or Tory it makes no difference, is at the controls of a "machine" designed to perform a particular function, and just as you cannot make a motor car fly, neither can the machinery of government be used to introduce socialism or the free society.

NOW, when our correspondent writes that revolution can only lead to greater tyranny possibly, and never to a free society, it seems to us that he is confusing revolution with government. All popular Revolutions, unlike *coups d'état*, generally have had as their intention not a violent *change of government* but the *breakdown of all the institutions of government*. Many have succeeded to that extent. They have failed because the successful revolutionaries did not always have a clear idea of what kind of organisation should take over the functions of government which dealt with the day to day affairs of the community; or because they believed in "revolutionary government" as do the marxists and other authoritarian revolutionaries; or because the revolution produced courageous and capable leaders (in the best sense of the word) who found themselves increasingly being urged to take decisions for others; or because of *force majeure* it was not possible to immobilise all the political leaders of the establishment (left or right). And so the oversights, the hesitations and the doubts have been seized

SIMPLE ARITHMETIC

If every reader of FREEDOM found just one more reader our sales would be doubled

upon by the "politicians" and have led to the reintroduction of government. It is not, however, the revolutions that have produced "greater tyranny, etc." but the governments which have taken over.

So, if our correspondent is pessimistic about the chances of revolution to pave the way for a free society, then he should be a thousand times more pessimistic where governments are concerned. And therefore if he really desires a free society the last thing he should do is waste his time, or seek to use our columns, to peddle the reformist arguments about government!

Let us repeat: We are anarchists and not parliamentary socialists (or communists) not because of any fundamental disagreement over ends but because of a disagreement over means.

Far from believing in the "messianic role" of the working class, the anarchists' aim is to abolish the working class in so far as this term refers to the underprivileged majority in all existing societies, whether they are referred to as capitalist, socialist, democratic, people's republic, African people's federation or what have you. What we do say is that no revolution can succeed without the active participation of a large section of the working, producing, section of the population. We make our own one-man revolutions, which in more prosaic language means that we are clear where we stand in relation to the State and to society. In so doing we may well have transformed ourselves; but we should have no illusions that we have also done very much to change society or undermine the State. Our attitude to the State has changed but its attitude to us has not. The power of the State, the values of authoritarian society can only be challenged, and destroyed by a greater power and new values.

If one accepts this approach then one must also recognise that the only potential power capable of overthrowing the authoritarian system of privilege under which we live, is to be found among those members of the community who are not privileged, and this comprises

most of the working population and their families. Those of us who are anarchist propagandists direct, therefore, our arguments to "the people in the streets" and not to their masters. We do not advocate or seek a compromise, a *modus vivendi*, between the haves and the have-nots, between employer and employee, between justice and injustice, between equality and inequality. Such contortions we leave to the parliamentary socialists and their supporters in the knowledge that their methods do no more than prolong the evils, the social inequalities and the tensions we seek to destroy.

BECAUSE we hold these views we are anarchists, and when elections take place, we use the occasion to make propaganda for anarchism by attacking the extravagant promises made by the politicians in their scramble for votes and by seeking to persuade our fellow beings that if they want to be free and responsible people they must be prepared, and want, to run their own lives. Our correspondent and others recently who have been apologists for the Labour Party and voting, are, in our opinion, not anarchists—or at most they are jaded anarchists—and it seems to us that their contributions are more suited to journals such as *Tribune* and the *New Statesman* than *FREEDOM*. No reasonable person surely expects an anarchist journal to give space even to ballot-box revolutionaries when virtually every political journal and all mass communications (not to mention the politicians themselves) are at present engaged in conditioning the people for the (still unknown) day when they will be solemnly called upon to entrust life and liberty to others by simply making a cross on a piece of paper. If the anarchists' "rather puerile anti-election campaign" succeeds only in making some people feel uncomfortable it will have done something towards breaking down the blind faith many otherwise progressive people have in the potentialities of the ballot-box. But given a concerted campaign by all anarchists we can do more than make some people feel uncomfortable.

