

# ANY TIME NOW

*FOR SOCIAL ANARCHISM*

AUTUMN 2006

NUMBER 25

## KEYNES: THE GIFT ECONOMY OF 2030

by Peter Cadogan

Between 1928 and 1930 John Maynard Keynes talked to several small societies on the same subject and then expanded his notes as a text for publication: *Economic Possibilities For Our Grandchildren*. It was published in 1931 as part of a collection: *Essays in Persuasion* eventually republished as Volume 1X of his *Collected Writings* 1972.

This essay is arguably the most important and extraordinary vision of the future written in the last hundred years. It has been little understood, neglected by the media and is still virtually unknown to the general public. It is time it became the property of every thinking person. The consequences of its conclusions are beginning to be felt in such things as the chronic Japanese depression and the collapse of farm prices in Britain in the 1990s that led to a 70% fall in farmers incomes. Industry as whole, in Europe and North America, is today much worried by overproduction, as well it might be since this is both a blessing, the promise of great wealth, and a curse (?), the destruction of the monetarised market by surpluses. Keynes used the simplest of methods in working out his predictions. Using received data, he worked out the rate of increase of wealth production over the past period and projected that same rate over the next hundred years to 2030. With that figure in mind he then considered its consequences for a system with money as its essential indicator and scarcity at its base. The promise is extraordinary. The material substance of the system of which we have been part since civilisation began 10,000 years ago, is about to dissolve. He predicts the end of an epoch. Money and the market are on the way out.

The material substance of the system of which we have been part since civilization began 10,000 years ago, is about to dissolve. [Keynes] predicts the end of an epoch. Money and the market are on the way out.

### The Questions

He asked himself elementary questions: "What can we reasonably expect the level of our economic life to be a hundred years hence? What are the economic possibilities for our grandchildren?" He pointed out that for thousands of years wealth production had proceeded at a very constant rate. But over those millennia there was "the failure of capital to accumulate".

The accumulation of capital in England climaxed in the sixteenth century at the same time as the ban on usury was lifted. The end-product was compound interest "enough over 200 years to stagger the imagination". He provides figures. "The value of Great Britain's foreign investments today is estimated at about £4000 million. This yields us an income at the rate of about six-and-a-half percent. Half of this we bring home and enjoy; the other half at three-and-a-half percent, we leave to accumulate abroad at compound interest."

He locates the beginnings of British foreign investment to the treasure that Drake stole, largely from Spain, in the *Golden Hind* in 1580. He considers what happens to that at compound interest and concludes that "every £1 that Drake brought home in 1580 has now become £100,000."

He further reckons that since the sixteenth century "the average standard of life in Europe and the United States has been raised, I think, about fourfold. Thus if capital increases, say, two per cent per annum, the capital equipment of the world will have increased by half in twenty years and seven-and-a-half times in a hundred years."

Then without any foreknowledge of the forthcoming IT revolution (he died in 1946 and the first transistor appeared in 1948) he can still say, given the existing rate of improvement in manufacture and transport, that "All this means that in the long run, that mankind is solving its economic problem."

### The Prospects of 2030

Those words, unintelligible to all of past millennia, are still beyond common comprehension. He adds: "I would predict that the standard of life in progressive countries in one hundred years will be between four and eight times as high as it is today. It would not be foolish to contemplate the possibility of far greater progress still."

He then asks us to suppose "that a hundred years hence we are all of us on the average eight

times better off, in the economic sense, than we are today. Assuredly there need be nothing here to surprise us... We may then prefer to devote our energies to non-economic purposes."

So discounting his two caveats, world war and a population explosion, "the economic problem is not - if we look into the future - the permanent problem of the human race". It seems to me that although the two disasters he feared did in fact happen, they have been met in terms of wealth production by the compensating effect of the high tech revolution. Thus they do not throw his time-table.

He is not a little alarmed by his own conclusion for "if the economic problem is solved mankind will be deprived of its traditional purpose... Yet I think with dread of the readjustment of the habits and instincts of the ordinary man, bred into him for countless generations, which he may be asked to discard within a few decades. To use the language of today, must we not expect a general 'nervous breakdown'."

Then Keynes, artist, breaks surface: "We shall be able to afford to dare to assess the money-motive at its true value. The love of money as a possession as distinguished from the love of money as a means to the enjoyment and realities of life will be recognized for what it is, a somewhat disgusting morbidity, one of those semi-criminal, semi-pathological propositions which one hands over with a shudder to the specialists in mental disease."

Nor does he neglect the religious factor: "I see us free, therefore, to return to some of the most sure and certain principles of religion and traditional virtue -that avarice is a vice, that the exaction of usury is a misdemeanor and the love of money is detestable, that those who walk most truly in the paths of virtue and sane wisdom who take least thought for the morrow."

But he warns us that this Jerusalem will not be tomorrow and only after suitable trauma: "But beware! The time for all this is not yet. For at least another hundred years we must pretend to ourselves and to everyone that fair is foul; for foul is useful and fair is not. Avarice and usury and precaution must be our gods for a little longer still. For only they can lead us out of the tunnel of economic necessity into daylight."

### **The Final Verdict**

And his last word? "I look forward, therefore, in days not so very remote, to the greatest change which has ever occurred in the material environment for human beings in the aggregate. (My stress. PC) But, of course, it will all happen gradually, not as a catastrophe. Indeed it has already begun." He gives no name to the market's successor. Anthropologists use the term "the gift economy." It will suffice.

He instances the four factors that will govern the pace of change "our power to control population, our determination to avoid wars and civil dissensions, our willingness to entrust to science the direction of those

matters which are properly the concern of science, and the rate of accumulation as fixed by the margin between our production and our consumption; of which the last will easily look after itself, given the other three."

In his very last sentence he takes a wry look at his own profession: "If economists could manage to get themselves thought of as humble, competent people, on a level with dentists, that would be splendid."

### **A NOTE ON FREEDOM** by Harold Barclay

In my investigation of anarchist theoreticians and writers it appears that the subject of freedom receives only a limited discussion. This, despite the fact that freedom is of most central significance to anarchists. Certainly the primary if not only focus of any discussion of freedom by anarchists concerns political freedom and freedom in social relationships. I have seen little on freedom as an ontological entity-- freedom as opposed to determinism.

I am sure that I share with many the experience of periodically being driven to examine the idea of freedom of the individual as opposed to determinism. And in wrestling with the issue no final conclusion results. Obviously, one problem is that the very idea is a profoundly difficult one. Even Kant appears to have given up on the matter. While I have read some of the material which deals with "free will", I know that it is indeed a subject with an enormous bibliography and that I have barely scratched the surface. Much of what I write below is ultimately derived from one scholar or another and I have forgotten to whom I should credit the appropriate remarks, a fact that I hope any possible reader will bear in mind. I write this brief note because I would like to share a proposition with others and invite comment for I have a suspicion that what is written may be nonsense, although, of course, I would hope not.

In "People without Government : An Anthropology of Anarchy" I wrote: "Freedom is measured by the number of choices open to an individual. And there are obviously fewer choices open to members of these small scale societies. But perhaps we should question how much less freedom exists in such societies if all the the members are unaware of a greater number of alternatives and if the same alternatives are available to all. How, indeed, would such societies compare to those more 'modern' ones in which there are presumably so many more choices, but in fact they are not freely available to everyone."(122).

If we apply this notion to all living things we can say that the simplest living forms are driven by what has been called instinct. Their behavior is entirely genetically programmed. Thus, they are driven down an extremely narrow road with few or no alternatives. In more

complex forms , such as birds and mammals, we find an enhanced number of choices available to them because of an expanded intelligence which allows for more memory and learning and thus less dependence upon genetic programming. In addition the character of the overall anatomy provides for enhanced exploration of the world around them so that more intelligent decisions can be made. Within the primate order we arrive at the highest intelligence and a more generalized anatomy capable of extensive manipulation of the external world both allowing for an awareness of and entertainment of a far greater number of choices.

Intelligence alone is not a sufficient explanation for such a development. The intelligence of humans would be unlikely if it were not for the fact that we have evolved anatomical features allowing for extensive exploration of the world and enormous enlargement of the cerebrum, and so development of that intelligence. Whales ,for example, may be quite intelligent animals, but their use of that intelligence is proscribed by anatomical handicaps They are unable to handle and manipulate or modify objects except through their mouths. Their world is a domain of water which surely is a more restrictive environment. Or consider dogs, cats or horses whose limbs again greatly restrict the range of usage. Compare this with humans who are characterized by a differentiation of fore and hind limbs, with hind limbs making for bipedal posture, fore limbs with hands having opposable thumbs allowing for great dexterity and this combined with eyes possessing stereoscopic vision - all coordinated--crowned --by a huge brain. No animal can so easily manipulate, modify, experiment and play with objects in its environment as can humans. As Homo sapiens we reach a condition characterized by symbolic capabilities. So humans are no longer determined exclusively by their genes and their physical environment, but primarily by the culture which they have created.

My thesis in part is that what freedom we may have is a product of evolution, for evolution has provided humans with the mechanisms, the chief of which is intelligence, for being aware of far more choices than are available to any other living form. Having developed this hypothesis I find that I am not alone in proposing that humans have a degree of freedom because they have greater knowledge, greater awareness, and reason and so have available more choices than other living things. Among others this was suggested by Spinoza and several natural scientists including Judson Herrick, Theodosius Dobzhanski and James Jeans .None , however, as far as I know has tied such a thesis to evolution, namely, that the fact that humans have such a degree of freedom is the product of an evolutionary development. But, recently I find that Daniel Dennett offers a closely similar view in his book, "Freedom Evolves."Yet Dennett's idea is not the same as mine

since he considers that the evolutionary process allows for an organism to avoid disasters. In my view that process provides much more. The evolution over millenia of an enormously expanded intelligence

### **Any Time Now**

Editorial Staff: Dick Martin, Pat Murtagh,  
Kevin Carson, Larry Gambone  
Any time Now, Affinity Place, Argenta, BC  
V0G1B0 Canada  
Web Site: [www.atnzine.net](http://www.atnzine.net)  
Email: [dimar@direct.ca](mailto:dimar@direct.ca)

and anatomical modifications which combined with that intelligence makes for an awareness of far more choices to the organism than the mere avoidance of trouble.

Even with such advantage humans are still circumscribed in what they are able to do. First, as I have mentioned in "People Without Government" many or all of our perceived choices may not be available to us. A determinist will tell me that there is no uncaused cause; that everything that occurs is to be traced to some specific cause or causes. He will say that even the limited choices provided an individual human are all actually determined by the situation which preceded any given choice. Culture, physical environment and genes determine everything. Our physical make up already sets us on one path. Our early socialization sets us on another specific path and this determines future paths in life and each of these paths in turn further confine and predict our behavior and so restricts our choices. All paths are themselves heavily laden with external influences. Thus, a supposedly simple thing such as the physical make up imposed upon an individual is not just the fact of the physical makeup involved but also the social atmosphere provoked by it.. For example, In the western world being black skinned has distinct consequences; particularly, a girl may experience the consequences of physical appearance . The family in which one is born may well determine the extent of intellectual interests and economics determine the ability of a person to pursue a career.

But determinism is also a questionable doctrine. For one thing , it seems to be unfalsifiable. No matter what one may say there is always an explanation . Further, determinists do not seem to appreciate that humans are actors in this world too, and so affect what goes on in it. They are causal agents. They are part of the equation. The

**Continued on**

**Page 6**

**ANY TIME NOW #25 page 3**

## BASIC ANARCHIST THEORY by John Griffin

Back in July last year, UK Radio 4 broadcast two programmes that set me thinking. The first, "In Our Time" polled listeners to see who they thought was the greatest philosopher of all time. Karl Marx won easily with 28%, followed by David Hume on 13% and Ludwig Wittgenstein with 7%. A few days later, and with gut-wrenching juxtaposition, they put out "What Ever Happened To Anarchism?" which gave a good brief history before concluding that modern anarchism is "not so much a doctrine as a tendency," and "more akin to a fashion statement." I find it difficult to regard Marx as a philosopher, or anarchism as a doctrine, but that aside, why does Marxism continue to be influential, and why have we anarchists failed to develop a cogent alternative?

Sociologists would call this a methodological essay: it discusses how we approach the basis of anarchism, and what makes it distinctive. Before going into detail, we have to acknowledge that there are plenty of anarchists who see little point in theorizing beyond the most fundamental opposition to the bosses and the state, and of a vision of an anarchist future compressed into the phrase, "like Spain" - meaning those far-off heady days in 1936. It's an attitude I am in sympathy with, for I too glaze over when presented with specialized terminology and long referenced footnotes. Whatever the academics say, I dispute the need for highly technical styles to gain clarity and consistency. In any event, if we are to reach out to non-anarchists, we need to keep our work as accessible as possible.

For the most part, anarchism seems to operate in a little world of its own; seldom do we engage directly with the contemporary academic disciplines, but it is through philosophy, sociology, economics, etc., that students are introduced to the world of ideas. Any Time Now readers are familiar with my recent forays into libertarian economics, but our most glaring inadequacies probably lie in sociology, for it is there that our weakness has been compounded by the introduction of what I regard as alien ideas - and from our arch rival, Marx!

### The Trouble With Marx

Whereas anarchism stresses the need for individual empowerment and responsibility, Marxism places the emphasis on *mass groupings* within society, on *class*. The orientations of the two sets of ideas could not be more divergent and yet have sometimes become muddled, especially here in the UK. That marxism continues to exert an influence on the thinking of some anarchists is a sad commentary on the relative weakness of modern anarchist theory, but before

getting into that, we need to attack the theoretical basis of class, Marxism's core concept:

\* Marx portrays a highly complex hierarchical society as being divided at root between just two very large classes, which are defined around ownership or non-ownership of "the means of production", i.e., the factories etc. Class is thus horribly reductionist.

\* Class can equate to hierarchy, but only in small businesses, where the owners are also managers; elsewhere, power is exercised through a hierarchical chain. As an analytical tool, class is useless beyond industrial/economic settings, but critiques of hierarchy are applicable to all forms of authoritarianism - this is what makes anarchism so uniquely distinctive.

\* Class does not engage fully with real world social action; people interact in and between groups, not classes. Sometimes groups and individuals participate in mass actions, but there are always class inconsistencies when that happens. A big problem for would be anarchist class theorists is working class authoritarianism...

\* Mass, class-based revolutionary organizations, which stress the need for set-piece general strikes and insurrection, detract from the importance of spontaneous local initiatives by groups and individuals, such as coops and LETS.

\* Marx needs his two antagonistic classes to set the stage for a series a series of revolutionary show-downs, which he says propels human history towards a communist future. Marx is thus a reductionist, a determinist and just plain wrong! Compared with anarchism's far more fundamental yet flexible approach, Marxism is exposed as a bogus, almost abstract fabrication.

A few years ago I made out a similar argument for ditching class to a well-known English academic; his response was "But how then should we proceed?" That remark, made in genuine perplexity, illustrates the hold which Marxian styles of thinking have within the UK movement. Unlike the Marxists, we have produced comparatively

little written theory; we take insufficient time to write things down, and then work with them.

### Libertarian Sociology

They say its easy to be wise after the event, but we still do not seem to have fully grasped the importance of those very well-known, but unfulfilled demands of the French Revolutionists for "liberty, equality, fraternity; their value goes beyond mere slogans, since we can use them as core theoretical concepts: Substitute the current sociological term *community* for fraternity, and add that all three objectives cannot be met without *anarchy*, and we have the bare bones of an adequate sociology. The academic Micheal Taylor wrote a book entitled

*Whereas anarchism stresses the need for individual empowerment and responsibility, Marxism places the emphasis on mass groupings within society, on class.*

“community, Anarchy and Liberty” 1982, to demonstrate that the above “form a coherent set”, but surely we have known that since 1789?

I see the existing status-quo as a balance between opposing social pressures for libertarian or authoritarian outcomes, and anarchism as a *directional* philosophy, rather than an all-or-nothing approach with a fixed maximalist endpoint; a flexible, pragmatic, and dynamic conflict model of society. The *totally* free society is likely to be no more than a pipe dream; we can only work towards the maximum possible degree of freedom, given the prevailing psychological dispositions within society.

Anarchy, liberty, equality and community are interdependent; all are threatened by the formation of power-based hierarchies anywhere in society. Authoritarian culture has sadly become institutionalized in state, school and workplace, but libertarianism can still figure strongly in less formal settings where people find that they do have autonomy. In English popular culture, to call someone “bossy” is a form of condemnation; it remains for us to encourage these usually unlearned tendencies toward libertarianism wherever the opportunity presents itself. **“Human Nature”**

A securely established anarchist society will require a steady community involvement in its current affairs to keep authoritarian tendencies at check; I suspect that we humans will continue to produce those prone to bullying as a genetic fact of life. The anarchist project is to reintegrate the bullies back into a fully responsible society, a horrendous task given how contemporary society tends to encourage them into positions of power with high status and high salaries. In the workplace, domination and exploitation are usually inescapable.

However difficult, the attainment of an anarchist society extends beyond mere desirability to a matter of necessity, as our species drifts knowingly towards global ecological catastrophe. And the state has had us on the threshold of another catastrophe through global nuclear war for the last 59 years, but we seem not to bother much about that anymore... Most of us it seems can be induced to put up with – *or more positively, participate in* – just about anything... We didn't imagine Spain in 1936, it happened!

Arguments based on favorable interpretations of “human nature” or class, carry limits and rigidities when highly variable human behaviors demand flexible, pragmatic methods of analysis and action. That Marx's work, much of which flies in the face of reality, continues to be influential, attests more to the efforts of Marxist academics and politicians who came after, rather than the relevance of his ideas alone. Indeed, key elements of what makes Marxism distinctive – the economic base-superstructure

relationship, historical materialism – are seldom debated these days outside student's essays. And without class, Marxism is left with not much more than a critique of capitalist inequalities; Big deal!

Anarchism will always be more than the mere “fashion statement” the BBC suggests, but it seems to me that it will be the “son of the steam engine” which will continue to offer the main anti-capitalist critique, if we persist in doing little or nothing. All which is a bit tragic, when anarchism has always had the basis of a more penetrating analysis for the social problems of the past, as well as those of the present. We are disparately in need of modern scholarly, yet accessible texts.

## SCIENCE, MYTH AND ANARCHISM

by Larry Gambone

Harold Barclay critiqued the flaws in the matricentric or goddess cult concept of early European society. See (ON THE MATRICENTRIC CHARACTER OF EARLY HUMAN SOCIETY ATN 24) He was doing his job as a scientist – which is to discover the truth as much as is humanly possible. It is important for a social scientist who is also an activist to keep science and the needs of activism separate. Science must not be perverted into ideology, though it often is. Also activism that ignores science does so at its peril, becoming an irrational faith. Another danger is an ideology that cherry-picks scientific evidence for its ends. (Like the Primitivists)

This leads me, however, to discuss two interrelated problems concerning activism and science. The first is that Reason alone gets you nowhere. Humans are also (chiefly?) creatures of emotion. Social conflict involves not so much arguments from logic and evidence but *contention between myths*. The activist is therefore someone who helps foster certain social myths over others.

A note about myth is needed before I proceed. There are two uses of the word – one which means untruth arising either from ignorance or deliberate fabrication. This category of myth would include antisemitism or the Stalinist slander that Trotskyists were Gestapo agents. The second category is narratives or ideas which embody a partial truth in metaphoric form. Thus the Myth of the Norman Yoke in 18<sup>th</sup> Century England, the Myth of the Proletariat among Marxists and Syndicalists. The honest social activist will avoid fostering, and indeed confront, the first type of myth, while aiding the spread of the latter. However, the activist must understand that her myths are myths, that they are partial and metaphorical truths, for true-believerism would

*Social conflict involves not so much arguments from logic and evidence, but contention between myths*

make the activist look foolish.

Now science will point out that Saxon society was not exactly a hotbed of peasant liberty, and proletariats tend to be conservative more often than revolutionary. Science deflates the myth. But the Norman Yoke inspired revolt from the Lollards to the Chartists and The Proletariat helped inspire generations of trade union, socialist and anarchist activists. I suggest that without either of these myths, we would be the poorer and had the yeoman farmers and worker activists taken a purely rational view of their myths, they would not have gotten anywhere, having been beaten before they started. Note that with these two examples there was a contention with other myths. The Norman Yoke struggled against the myth of King and Country and the Proletarian Myth against the myths of national unity, the "free market" and liberal democracy.

Where does that leave us with the concept of Matricentrism? As before stated, I agree with Barclay there is little evidence for it. However, there is at least **some** evidence that a seemingly non-patriarchal, female-image using, shamanistic partnership society did exist in Old Europe. A society, I would suggest that was roughly analogous to the fishing and horticultural Aboriginal societies found in Canada. That people should create a myth around this, contrasting a more humane and egalitarian Old Europe with the authoritarian patriarchal system that replaced it, is from an activists standpoint, a good thing. Why? Because it gives people hope. The ruling class depends upon imposing the idea that dominance and exploitation are endemic to human society. That it cannot be overcome and anarchism is thus a foolish utopia. It is their myth vs. our myth, and let us hope that our myth wins out in the end!

## **BANDANNA BANNED IN SPRINGFIELD MALL**

*(One more example of corporate fascism)*

SPRINGFIELD (AP) - A southwest Missouri mall defended its dress code after a security guard told a 10-year-old girl her bandanna decorated with peace signs, smiley faces and flowers violated the mall's code of conduct. Lydia Smith, who was shopping with her mother at Battlefield Mall for new church clothes when the incident happened Saturday, said she wore the orange and yellow bandanna to give her outfit some color. Lydia and her mom, Susan Smith, were eating lunch when the girl saw a mall security officer ask a nearby teenager to remove a bandanna. Then the officer approached her. "(The officer) asked me to take it off and said there's this new rule we have or something like that," Lydia said. The officer handed Lydia's mother a printed copy of the Battlefield Mall Code of Conduct, which prohibits patrons from engaging in certain activities while on mall property. Lydia had violated No. 10 on the list of 17 offenses: "failing to be fully clothed or wearing apparel which is likely to provide a disturbance or embroil other groups or the general public in open conflict." Mall officials won't clarify what clothing and accessories are prohibited. "The code of conduct is pretty clear, and, you know, I think common

sense should prevail," said Les Morris, spokesman for Simon Property Group Inc., which owns the mall. Under the code, people who don't comply with the code can be asked to leave. If they don't leave, they can be arrested for trespassing. Christine Moses, director of mall marketing, noted the mall is privately owned and behavior on its premises can be regulated. "The bottom line is we want to have an environment (conducive) to shopping. Offensive apparel does not fit in with that environment," she said, although she could not say how the bandanna was offensive. Similar policies are in place at 285 Simon properties. From <http://www.rawstory.com/>

### **MURRAY BOOKCHIN 1921-2006**

Murray is no longer with us, as of July 30. An original thinker, a working class autodidact who combined anarchism and ecology, a major influence on the '60s and '70s generation of anarchists, an impassioned, if sometimes impatient fighter for liberty is gone. He will be sorely missed.

## ***A Note On Freedom Continued***

philosopher, John Searle, has pointed out that any cause or causes must be sufficient. That is, if, for example, an apple drops from the tree it can only drop to the ground. Are any social or psychological causes sufficient? I doubt it. If I were reared in an abusive family atmosphere it is not absolutely necessary that I therefore become some sort of criminal. There is only a probability that I might as there is also a probability that I could become a just and reasonable person. If a thing or a choice were predetermined it would be predictable with metaphysical exactitude but choices are only probable. My choice is not necessarily predictable. Freedom is tied to probability and indeterminacy. It seems to me that determinism is essentially the belief that a given person at a given time can only have one choice which means no choice.

My son suggested that "there is a creative faculty of the mind which often twigs a new combination and urges action on it." This is intuition or imagination at work. And must refer as well to the plasticity of the brain/ mind.(1) My brain/mind seems to gather various ideas together which emerge in the conscious mind with a new configuration apparently quite independently of me. I have no control which seems to support a lack of freedom even though such a configuration may propose new choices. At the same time one must remember that I was ultimately responsible for commencing the process.

In any case one still is faced with the "cause problem". My brain/mind may be doing something but I am not aware of it. Indeed, one thing that may be overlooked is that we may be able to ascertain the cause of one's action, but in other cases we cannot determine the cause or causes, but

that does not mean there are no causes.

There may be a degree of freedom of choice in our world despite the overwhelming importance of determinism and the limitations brought by institutions of domination. As we mature we should acquire more knowledge and more understanding and be enabled to broaden our knowledge of choices which we might not have been aware of without that knowledge and understanding. The number of choices available to a person today is far greater than those available to Homo erectus or Neanderthal man and greater still to other animals. The fact that we select one choice out of several may be determined by probable causes -- past unpleasant relations with a parent, acquired taste in certain kinds of food, being born lame, being brainwashed into particular beliefs, being reared in a culturally dominant or subordinate social group and so on--but, as I suggested above the overall awareness of the availability of the choices is a cause of our behavior as well. What one chooses was determined but the fact of the availability of the choice results from one's expanded intelligence. My freedom derives from the fact that I perceived several choices as a consequence of my greater awareness and knowledge even if whatever choice I made was still determined. All things may be caused.

In terms of the old argument that one must have free will in order to be responsible for one's actions I would suggest that among the choices of which one becomes aware may be one or more with a moral basis and one may prefer those which have that moral basis. The cause for so choosing is one's past learning or intuitive awareness. My choice for a moral alternative rather than one derived from, say, my acquired desire for wealth and power is based on my preference for the moral choice caused by my own past learning. Therefore, my choice of the moral was stronger (more reasonable) than other potential choices which had causes which were less moral. And in this way there is a certain freedom because I decided amongst several possible choices, each of which would have specific causes, on one choice-- that choice still having a cause or causes. That is, when I choose to do one thing rather than another, I am accepting that choice and rejecting the others. I have some control over the situation, especially through rejection. Is my choice predetermined in the sense that one has only one choice-- in other words no choice--? No. Does my choice have a cause or causes? Yes. Am I free? Barely. So what does this say for anyone who espouses anarchism? Only that one must be vigilant to preserve that freedom which he has which seems primarily to be the freedom to say no and the freedom to reject human imposed oppression.

(1) I would distinguish between mind and brain where the brain refers only to the "gray matter" while that gray matter is the foundation and warehouse for a body of acquired ideas--mostly the impress of culture-- and together the two facets, the one genetic and other learned, comprise the mind. There has been research in neuroscience including neuroplasticity which seems to support to some extent the idea of freedom. Since this is a field with which I am unfamiliar I refrain from further comment.

I wish to thank Alan Barclay, Larry Gambone, Amorey Gethin and Stuart Piddocke for their comments on this essay.

## **A VICTORY FOR NATIVE PEOPLE IS A VICTORY FOR ALL PEOPLE!**

By Larry Gambone

Non-Aboriginal people ought to support Native People in their fight to maintain their treaty rights and to regain the territory stolen from them. They should also support the teaching of Native languages, spirituality and culture. They should also demand that the school books no longer whitewash the invasion and theft, but tell the truth to our children.

This should be done, not only from a sense of justice, a sense of humanity and decency, but also from self-interest. How so, you might well ask? In two fundamental ways. Both Native People and the great mass of Newcomers face many similar problems. The source of these problems is the same.

Let's deal with the common problems first. When the European conquerers came to the Americas they stole the land, forcing the inhabitants onto a few small parcels. In South America they turned the inhabitants into serfs, and in the North, when they didn't kill them outright, turned many into wage laborers. They were able to commit these crimes with speed and efficiency because they had years of practice at it. The free peasants of Europe had their lands seized by brigands and were turned into serfs. The remaining common lands were later stolen by the landowning "nobility" through the Enclosure Acts. The first colonization was against the Irish, who were also rounded up and sold as slaves, long before the "nobles" enslaved Africans.

Once the European rulers had made sufficient inroads into the Americas, they began the practice of cultural genocide. Agents called missionaries were sent to destroy native beliefs. Sacred areas were desecrated and Elders were maligned as "pagans" and "devil worshipers." Native languages were stamped out. A similar process occurred in Europe. Peasants were forced to convert to the master's cult at sword point and had to abandon their nature religions. Those who kept the old ways were tortured and murdered by the hundreds of thousands as "witches and devil worshipers." Jews and Muslims suffered similar pogroms. Efforts were made to destroy old customs like dancing around the May Pole and many sacred megaliths were broken up. People were forced to give up their languages and speak French, English or Castilian. Few people now speak Occitan, Breton, or Gaelic. Catalan just survived. Long gone are Cornish and Manx, and countless other local languages and dialects across Europe.

The Invaders forced a foreign concept of government upon Native People. Self-governing communities became subject to bureaucrats, politicians and police of a distant and uncaring state. But so too are the vast majority of the Newcomers a powerless mass. They vote in elections, but the outcome is the same -- little changes, and what improvements are made -- with a tremendous effort -- are soon taken away again.

What was the source of these problems common to European workers and Native People? Europe once had its

own Aboriginal People, the remnants of which are the Basques. Mediterranean peoples arrived during the early Neolithic and integrated peacefully with these original inhabitants. Later came the Celts who may have evolved out of these "Two Founding Nations". Then came the invasions of Slavic and Teutonic tribes, who as tribal peoples had a fairly egalitarian outlook. There did not seem to be a complete social and political break with the past.

The Roman Empire changed all this. Julius Caesar gloated how his armies slaughtered some two million Celts. Even taking exaggeration into account, this act foreshadows the genocide to come in the so-called New World. Roman conquest of Western Europe imposed a powerful centralized state and a class system. The former inhabitants became slaves and their lands were stolen by the conquerors.

Some Celts and Teutons became Romanized, and when Rome collapsed in the Fifth Century they imitated their former master, with a class system of serfs, lords and kings. Attempts were made by various kings like Charlemagne to re-establish the Empire. While Rome was gone, the Roman Church persisted and imposed its authoritarian, woman-hating, sex-hating, child-abusing, nature-despising ideology on the ex-tribal peoples. In Eastern Europe the role-model was the Byzantine or Eastern Roman Empire, and the results were similar. While the Roman Empire was never restored, individual countries like France, Spain and England became empires modeled upon it. On the backs of peasant farmers, fishers and hunters were created the monsters that terrorized the globe from 1492 on.

We are a damaged people. Traumatized by 80 generations of bullying, exploitation, child-abuse, race hatred, misogyny, cruel religious cults, sexual repression, cultural and linguistic repression. Is it any wonder many of us go insane, commit suicide, take up drugs or alcohol? (By the way, I am not saying that Whites suffer as much as Indians. Not at all. Compared with them, we are privileged. But nonetheless, we suffer the **same type** of problems, if not the same degree of intensity, and for essentially the same reasons.)

The resolution is for the European Newcomers to shed the imposed Roman heritage and go back to the true and ancient roots. Of course, we cannot re-create the ways of Old Europe in America, any more than the Plains People can restore the annual buffalo hunt. But we can reject Empire in all its vile forms. We can reject a world view that is anti-nature, anti-woman, anti-child. We can reject inequality and base our property relations on usufruct and not political power. We can return to decentralized, self-governing and federated communities that practice mutual aid, gift-giving and reciprocity.

In doing this, we would create a society based on justice. With justice, Native People's rights would be restored. In doing this, our ways of being, our outlook, would be similar to those of Native People, but without stealing from them, without become False Indians as so many well intentioned, but none the less imperialist New Agers and counter-culturalists have done.

When we Europeans look at a Native Person who has refused to assimilate the ways of the white man, what we see is much of what we have lost. It thus makes sense for us to make common cause with the First Nations, to help heal our own wounds, to restore our freedoms, as much as theirs.

## PUBLICATIONS WE LIKE

- \* TOTAL LIBERTY Summer 2006, fine non-sectarian anarchist zine, 47 High St. Belper, Derby, DE561GF UK
- \* SPUNK – beautifully produced! Donation, Box 55336 Hayward CA 94545 USA
- \* CUNNINGHAM AMENDMENT, for “revolutionary acts of joy” L1 1005 Huddersfield Rd. Bradford BD12 8LP UK
- \* PRAIRIE FIRE – good info – donation – IWW Madison Branch, Box 2442 Madison WI 53701 USA
- \* RED AND BLACK NOTES, sadly, the last issue. donation, Box 47643, Don Mills, ON, M3C3S7 Canada
- \* THE MATCH! - the best anarchist zine! \$3.00 US Box 3012 Tucson AZ 85702 USA
- \* ANCHORAGE ANARCHY, clear headed anarchism, \$1.00 Box 230332 Anchorage AK 995230332 USA
- \* REBEL STEW – fine new anarchist zine, donation, Box 2351 Falls Church, VI 22042

## WHAT'S NEW?

- \* RED LION PRESS – **new address**, Box 297, Stn. A, Nanaimo BC V9R 4W7 Canada.
- \* VANCOUVER YIPPIE! Web site:  
<http://www.geocities.com/vcmtalk/vancouveryippie.html>
- \* NANAIMO ANARCHIST NETWORK Web site:  
<http://www.geocities.com/vcmtalk/nan.html>
- \* GOD'S HIT LIST – noted anarchist writer Chaz Bufe's latest pamphlet is a good Christmas present for your favorite Bible pounder. Quotes all the most hateful, vengeful parts of the “Good Book's”, Old Testament, revealing it as a virtual how-to primer in genocide, misogyny, child abuse, sexual repression and all-round weirdness. \$2.00 See Sharp Press Box 1731, Tucson AZ 85702-1731 USA
- \* NORTHEASTERN ANARCHIST #11 In terms of anarchist social and political theory from an activist and practical perspective, this is the Numero Uno publication to read. Inside are two articles on the Mexican Magonista movement, a peasant based anarchism that is organizing in Oaxaca, “Especifismo”, an organizing concept originally developed in Uruguay, the NEFAC Workplace Position paper, Notes on Quebec Nationalism and much more. \$5.00 Box 250-159 Columbia University Stn. New York, NY, 10025-9991 USA  
<http://www.nefac.net>
- \* JUMPING THE FENCE – a well produced book with finely crafted cartooning by Nelson BC cartoonist and ATN contributor, Josh Wapp. With a great deal of courage Josh tells of his experiences with the mental health system and psychiatric drugs when he is diagnosed as having schizophrenia. From [joshwapp@hotmail.com](mailto:joshwapp@hotmail.com) (Include JTF Comic in subject heading)
- \* THE OYSTERCATCHER #3 Anarchist writer, Ron Sakolsky, known for his ground-breaking “Gone To Croatan” and the excellent “Surrealist Subversions” also produces an interesting regional zine. Includes poems, excerpts from a novel in process, “An Anarcho-Surrealist Manifesto”, “Lost Utopias” among other things, examines the relationship between the Orkney Island and Denman Island where Sadolsky lives. I read this zine from cover-to-cover, rare for me these days! Donation - copy c/o ATN

