

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

19, No. 30

July 26th, 1958

Threepence

THE MIDDLE EAST

DOMINATION or CO-OPERATION?

PRESIDENT BOURGUIBA of Tunisia recently referred to Algeria as an abscess. An apt description, but to find a comparative biological term to describe the Middle East would be a sickening process indeed.

This festering area, of hatred and ambition, fear and pride, fantastic wealth and abject poverty provides an outstanding example of the diseased society, and it is pathetic to see the tremendous efforts being made to deal with the current eruptions by solutions which are about as effective as wrapping a dock-leaf around a gangrenous foot.

The rebellion in Iraq seems to have taken the diplomats of the West by surprise, and the 'prompt', 'stern' actions taken by America and Britain bear the hall-marks of panic. They have acted, and in so acting have possibly brought the world to the brink of war in true Dullesian fashion, without stopping to think of the results of their actions.

In this they run true to imperialist form, and follow the pattern of behaviour of their forerunners who have not been motivated by thought but by greed. Such thought as has brightened the actions of the Western powers in the Middle East has been devoted to international intrigue and the deception of the indigenous populations and their leaders in order to perpetuate their dependence and subservience.

Fields for Ambition

But the decades of foreign exploitation and indignity have provided fertile fields for the ambitious politicians who to-day are putting the Arab countries in ferment. The seeds of nationalism have flourished in the poverty which has remained the lot of the vast majority of the people of the Middle East, for although the production of oil has brought vast wealth within their borders little of it has filtered down to improve the conditions of the people.

Once the British established themselves as the economic masters, they wanted—quite naturally—things to remain forever the same. To this end they established régimes which were essentially reactionary and which for a time served their purposes admirably. But that time is now ending, for the simple reason that the peoples of the Arab states can no longer be kept in ignorance of what is going on around them.

We have argued before that the British opposed the establishment of the Jewish state of Israel not because of anti-semitism or because it had to be carved out of what was considered Arab land, but because the establishment of a progressive, modern community in the Middle East would provide an example of standards to which Arabs could be encouraged to aspire.

From the British point of view it was a bad example. It has given the Arabs ideas, just as talk of democracy has given the Africans ideas. The peoples of the Arab countries have begun to realise what could be done if the wealth which oil production brings were used for their benefit instead of to provide fabulous palaces and fleets of Cadillacs for their British-bolstered royalty.

Only Interests

On top of these peoples has emerged a class of ambitious army

officers and intellectuals (who may have been in many cases inspired by selfless patriotism) but have seized the opportunity the situation presents to become men of destiny. And they have learned ably from their British masters the guiding principle so neatly expressed by Lord Palmerston: "We have no permanent friends and no permanent enemies, only interests."

When this is the pattern, the gunboat (or, to be up-to-date, the paratroop) diplomacy of the Americans and British can be seen as not only a risky operation in terms of immediate peace, but a futile attempt to put back the clock.

The West—and this includes France in Algeria—might as well realise now that it is not possible for them to hold down indefinitely people who realise their usefulness as the Arabs now do.

There are two principles through which work, production, enterprise, can be carried on: domination or co-operation. As far as the Arab nations are concerned domination is no longer acceptable. If the advanced nations want to continue to have access to the mineral wealth of the under-developed nations they must sooner or later accept the fact that the only way is co-operation.

Plenty to Offer

The West, with its technical know-how, has plenty to offer the Middle East in return for its oil, and if the principle becomes one of co-operation, of partnership, then the wealth of the oil-producing countries can be made available for the whole world—as long as the wealth of the rest of the world is made available for the oil-producers.

Exploitation, one way or the other, will result in conflict and, possibly, eventual mutual destruction. And it is here that we must sound the dangers of Arab nationalism. Contrary to some 'progressive' thought, we do not regard nationalism among colonial peoples as essentially a progressive development and where it becomes narrowed into xenophobia or racialism it is clearly reactionary.

This is not to say that we cannot see and sympathise with the causes which throw up those perverted human relationships, but progress as we see it depends upon a rejection of the causes of inequality by those who suffer from it as well as by those who sit on top. It is no solution to get on top and operate the inequality themselves.

This is the dreadful fallacy of nationalism. It aims at replacing one ruling sect by another, presumably more acceptable (at first) to the ruled. What it does not do is to give freedom to the ruled, although it claims to be doing so.

ALL Benefits for ALL

Now as anarchists we are interested in the freedom of the Arab peoples as well as the Jews, the Africans, the Russians, Americans, Europeans and Asians. That freedom will come when they cease to think of themselves in national terms with ownership rights over certain territories or properties, but see themselves as all members of one race with common rights to all the benefits of the earth and Man's developments thereon.

That freedom may be a long way off. In the course of our progress towards it there will be many diversionary struggles which will appeal to brief and piecemeal interests, but as of here and now we should make it clear that we are not prepared to be used in military adventures to defend the legalised robbery of the peoples of other lands.

We want to see the wealth of the West used to alleviate the poverty of the East, not to perpetuate it. We want to see the colossal amount of wealth and energy which is squandered on armaments used to lengthen the lives of others not destroy them, and instead of following the suicidal path of preparing to 'win' conflicts in which all will lose, we maintain the reasonable course is to eliminate the causes of conflict so that we all may win the fullest life possible for ourselves and our fellows all over the world.

"Since governments assume the right of death over peoples it is not astonishing that sometimes people assume the right of death over governments."

—GUY DE MAUPASSANT.

Crisis

The People are to Blame Too!

GOVERNMENTS never consult the people before they institute measures, whether these are likely to be unpopular or not, and there are no methods under our governmental system which could be used to take a direct vote of the whole of the electorate. It does not necessarily follow of course that if the people had a direct say in major decisions they would act any wiser than their elected representatives. Where there is a voting system as in Britain by which governments are elected, to some extent, that government must reflect the wishes of the people who may, however, be badly informed, either deliberately because of governmental policy, or, as is usually the case, when the people themselves take little real interest in what the government is doing—being quite willing to leave 'responsible decisions' to politicians. If they were encouraged to be responsible it may be that many more people would be interested in what is happening in the world beyond their own narrow domestic circles. As it is we see little evidence of an international spirit in Britain (or anywhere else) which would indicate that the majority of people give much thought to the lives of others outside of their own country unless events disturb the normal daily routine, even if the extent of the disturbance is only the enlarged headlines of their newspapers.

The latest crisis which has led to British and American troops being sent to the Middle East has given rise to much speculation in the press as to the wisdom or otherwise of Western intervention. Macmillan and his supporters have piously justified their actions in terms of 'going to the aid of our friends' together with that reliable standby the Russian bogey.

But people who have taken the trouble to think about what is happening know that Western 'friendship' extended to some of the Arab states floats uneasily on oil, the money for which has added to the wealth of the Arab rulers without

improving the conditions of the millions of disease-ridden and poverty-stricken people who inhabit that part of the world.

The majority of British people seem to care little for the conditions of the poor in such a far off spot as the Middle East. They are persuaded that the British Government is acting from high motives, or in most cases they frankly do not care about the ethics of the situation as long as our standard of living is not affected by these 'ungrateful wogs' and, as they believe, their communist supporters.

A News Chronicle Gallup Poll "reveals" to-day that 2 to 1 of the electorate are in favour of troops being sent to the Middle East. 78% of Conservative supporters approve of America sending troops to the Lebanon and Britain sending troops to Jordan. 10% disapprove and the remainder 'don't know'. 32% Labour supporters approve of the American action and 34% the British; the largest percentage of Labour supporters disapprove of troops being sent to the Lebanon and to Jordan by 47 and 49%. The remainder come into the categories of the 'don't knows'. The majority of Liberals—58%—approve.

We don't have to speculate long on what would have happened had the Gallup Poll figures been reversed. If they had been published we doubt if the Government would have withdrawn its troops in response to the majority opinion! But what interests us at this time particularly, is not what the Government's response would be in the unlikely event of an actively disapproving people, but the reasons why the majority of the British electorate approve of troops being sent to the Middle East. We think it is for the same reasons that they always support government actions which do not affect them personally. We do not believe that the majority of people think independently in situa-

Continued on p. 3

How Serious for the N.U.R.?

WITH little chance, or, we suggest, intention, of fundamentally altering Britain's nuclear policies, the general meeting of the National Union of Railwaymen carried a motion last week that in the interest of 'human survival' Britain should take the lead in abandoning nuclear tests and the stockpiling of nuclear weapons.

The real position of the NUR on this subject was made very clear by Mr. Sidney Greene who stated, that acceptance of the motion "does not involve any direct industrial or strike action on our part. We act within the framework of the TUC and the Labour Party", and we all know what that means!

If it was the serious intention of the NUR to press for Britain to take the lead in stopping tests and stockpiling of nuclear weapons why was it that an amendment by Swansea No. 1 branch that Britain's action on nuclear weapons should be unilateral was defeated?

The mover of the original motion said that Russia would not take the initiative because "they are too pig-headed" or America because "they are too infantile". This naive assessment of the Russian and American reasons for refusing to come to an agreement on the abandoning of nuclear tests nevertheless suggests that the delegate did not expect any hopeful policies from either America or Russia. But fear of 'going too far' by cutting across the TUC or Labour Party policies indicates to us the feebleness of the NUR intentions on this issue. The cautious warning by the Secretary, Sidney Greene, that industrial or strike action should not be taken confirms this view.

A clergyman like Dr. Donald Soper can see the need for industrial action to back up a demand for nuclear disarmament but the leaders of the industrial unions, while they must realise the importance of such action, are not prepared to enforce it because of their ambitions which

are very much bound up with their political allegiances.

We will be convinced about the honest intentions of the trade union leaders when we read that they have called a general strike to be maintained until the Government meets their demands for "abandoning nuclear tests and the stockpiling of nuclear weapons" as well as taking measures to get rid of all existing stocks which, we notice, was quietly ignored at the NUR general meeting.

WILHELM REICH

WILHELM REICH'S *Character Analysis*, regarded by many of his admirers as his most important book, is to be reprinted by Vision Press, London, and published on September 29th, at £3 3s. 0d. Orders can now be taken at Freedom Bookshop, 27 Red Lion Street, London, W.C.1.

Wanted: Cash

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT!

WEEK 29

Deficit on Freedom	£580
Contributions received	£355
DEFICIT	£225

July 11 to July 17

Solihull: K.P.S. 5/-; London: T.F.* 5/-;	
Prestwich: V.M. 1/-; Los Angeles: C.H.M.	
£3/3/0; London: Anon.* 1/9.	
Total	3 15 9
Previously acknowledged	352 3 0
1958 TOTAL TO DATE	£355 18 9

Gift of Book: London: W.F.

*Indicates regular contributor.

Wanted: Beds and Tents

Accommodation required, July 25th—August 2nd for comrades attending a conference in London. Please write S. E. Parker, c/o Freedom Press, stating languages spoken. Loan of tents also required—has anyone got one, the larger, the better.

Theories of Progress

"National Ambitions" is an unfortunate and misleading title for a book which studies the various ideas about progress and its directions through the ages, not confined to one representative of any one nation, and generally concerned either with the individual or the whole of mankind. However, as the author's ambitions can be said to be national, its author, J. R. A. Bailey, has this to say: "That the progress of the world has been a series of small successes made by individuals and groups"; and he warns that "the modern enthusiasm for having a few men at the centre of government who dictate the plan of the whole, with grand three-year-plans and five-year-plans, goes far too far. For the future looks now to be as much art as technique; so that we should not force too strict a upon society a known and pre-arranged pattern, but rather let the pattern develop within it".

J. R. A. Bailey's conception of progress is wide enough to include eccentricity and the pursuit of beauty among its factors, but it is not so broad as to see into their ambitions and ideals. The author's aims are very modest or, perhaps I should say, they are modest, but his highest is to contribute towards purging society of those who in this matter "of forming national, group or individual ambitions, are not their own and our confusions". The suggestion of "purging society" has always an unpleasant ring, but here it is unpleasant in a particular way, for the author says that "the background against which the small attempts at progress are seen become so vast that they plead more eloquently than can immoderate criticism, for tolerance". With his intention were altogether different, he might, but with even more earnestly that the distinctions he suggests between various kinds of progress and theories thereof to serve some other purpose than to afford a convenient framework for chronological treatment.

"To each world-outlook there is an appropriate system of ethics, by which outlook changes, so that which has been by J. R. A. Bailey. Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 25s. net.

believed right and wrong changes, too". Obvious remarks like this one are scattered throughout the book, and the "Argument" at the end of the book contains little with which a sensible and passionate reader would wish to quarrel. The obvious and the platitudinous may need to be restated, but the author's conviction or some arresting qualities of thought or style this need will not be satisfied. It is not clear, however, whether being sobered by J. R. A. Bailey's reflections are not those who are most likely to be impressed by what he has to say or the number who are not.

His is not a history of progress, but of the ideas about progress expressed in the Western world. It shows continuity in chronological order, but in pattern, no progress meaningfully described. Changes there have been, but there is nothing in that which would surprise the author, in spite of his circumlocutory views them from the vantage-point of our century and of "a Europe that is increasingly optimistic about its own vast future ahead of it which will become steadily pleasanter, a Europe whose ideal is pre-eminently material and technical progress". The author's optimism, when with this kind of progress, for it brings prosperity, and prosperity brings a materiality of life, is not shared by the other hand, expressing views in theories of fatal recurrences and decay, finds currency when some republic or some political system, or some social forces are apparent capable of struggling effectively against some spiritual or political tyranny. "Little wonder", he claims, that the theories of Greek and Roman writers, "that once political conditions had deteriorated, men no longer held ambitions for future

progress" and he adds: "The desire for Progress remains; but the object of desire was beauty; or a noble life, and the ideal timeless world of religion. *Sauve qui peut*".

This is the book's chief weakness: that of presenting under the heading of ultimate and physical destiny. Makin's quest for truth and right may be viewed panoramically, and its findings may lend themselves to comparisons which are the historian's delight, but that are of little interest to the concern with truth and right who looks for answers that will give him clarity with which to either fit or not with whatever theory of progress he may choose. Many philosophies, such as J. G. Heidegger's, appear distorted when attention is focused on what pronouncements they contain on a question which is not central to them. Some philosophers, the modern existentialists for example, are not mentioned at all, though I suppose it would be possible to say even a word of Heidegger as a theory of progress.

"National Ambitions" makes a contribution to knowledge, and most readers will find it a quite a fresh and interesting book. The book however, has left me unsatisfied. My fault, undoubtedly, for I expected from it what they who are not so far from asking: "Why worry about the future in progress if no standard of judgment is to be drawn from them about things that they will not do?" It is not clear, at all since, as Jacques Maritain, whom the author does not mention, has pointed out, the very idea of progress is destructive of itself. It drops out of existence as certain modern analysis has proved destructive of the meaning of meaning? GIOVANNI BALDELLI.

The Unknown Soldier (Academy)

"THE UNKNOWN SOLDIER" is the story of a group of conscripts fighting the Finnish-Russian war from 1941-44. It is by no means an anti-war or pacifist film, but is realistic and humane, and contains some dramatic scenes in favour of "Country, Freedom and Religion" for which the Finns were doomed. It is not a film that does not make excessive claims for their own. The cast is largely unprofessional, and through it are presented the dedicated and unselfish efforts of the grass-roots communist, the anti-disciplinarian and the one who wanted to run away. Its godliness lies in being objective, and giving equal force to argument which must have been frowned on by government circles, and in presenting rebellion against officers without condemning it (Hall amused considerably from the audience). At another point it shows the disappointment in the emotions of soldiers on catching the first sight of the desolate capital of Eastern Karelia which they have come to "liberate". Perhaps this is reflecting the confused position of Finland, fighting against the Soviet Union when the rest of Western Europe were with it, acting as a bridge between the two, in conditions and getting nothing at all from it; and the conflicts of the people between material and political independence of the country, between peasant independence and military discipline. The result would be a nightmare for those who are not so far from dropping out of existence as a couple of hours, but as a study in the small neutrals' attitude to war it is valuable. P.H.

A TOCCATA OF GALUPPI (With apologies to Robert Browning)

The first night at the Buenos Aires Camara's season at St. Celia's opera, was a success. Argentine national anthem been ecstatically confused with the overtone of the Argentine di Camara, which therefore started with the audience standing and who laughing at them.

—The Daily Telegraph

Oh Galuppi, Balrassaro, so telling to find!

We can only misconceive you; for we are all deaf and blind.

We can scarcely take your music, for we're in such a state of mind.

Here you come with your old blues here's all the good it brings

We think that your toccata was not so good as you say it was

And get up on our big fat feet with the music rings.

We know what's what, we know it, and we always put you in a game. Therefore, when we seek you in the homage that states claim, We make ourselves look bloody well really is a shame.

Controversy: Anarchy and Utopia

MAX NOMAD'S observation that anarchism is a dying creed is largely correct. The chief landmarks of anarchist history are past, and even the last rally of libertarian forces to the field in the Spanish Civil War was witnessed by another, now lost, generation. The political aim of anarchism is to lay today of anarchism in a spirit of hopelessness about practical advances or in terms of large-scale aims; what we can say about it will have to be quite different from discussing the political aims of the anarchists. Events of the last hundred years, especially the story of forty years of successful socialist dictatorship in Russia, make it seem as if the anarchist is not less clear that a different view of anarchism, a view of it as something that will change the whole of society in favour of freedom, than he does of certain errors. Those who criticise Proudhon, Bakunin, Kropotkin and the rest for being utopian are usually not blind to these errors. At the same time, a certain concern with an exposure of the false optimism of nineteenth century anarchist theory.

It seems to me, nevertheless, that we cannot dispose of anarchism entirely by writing off its anarchist and socialist parts as worthless. There is a streak in anarchist thought which contradicts the utopian elements: certain patterns in anarchist writings, emphasis present and absent anti-authoritarianism and play down the concern with the future and with prospects of achieving massive success. The fact that this sort of attitude (admittedly in a minor, contempt and epigrammatic way) was already present in nineteenth century anarchist doctrines is generally ignored by contemporary libertarian sympathisers.

To be initiated as well as to the uninitiated, anarchists will still the socialists say that anarchism is, in my opinion, a misapprehension which ignores certain tendencies in anarchism, and to correct such a one-sided view we have to be reminded that in addition to a considerable amount of naive optimism, anarchism also contains a realistic line of thought on the nature of society. In the course of making this point I want to refer to those who are not so far from being consistent, by freeing it from its utopian associations, are entitled to claim a stronger connection with traditional anarchism than the mere use of the word "anarchist" as an appropriate label.

It has almost become an historians' convention to regard the beginnings of modern anarchism as being connected with the activities of Michael Bakunin. I will not discuss this convention, but I will say that it is not because it saves time. Bakunin's anarchism, which was a late development of his personal history, had many sources; and it was a distinct anarchist position, the libertarian aspects of Marx's work. The movement which he personally did much to arouse was similarly inspired and led to a social revolution in the nineteenth century anarchism is mixed up with the early history of socialist movement in general. It was not until after the entry of Bakunin and his followers into the First International in the 1860s that a distinct anarchist position emerged from the contest, carried on largely within the International, between Bakuninists and Marxists.

The division between the two parties corresponded, roughly, to the division between the Latin and Germanic sections of the socialist movement. Leading issues between them illustrate some of the main anarchist positions. State-socialism, as it was then called, and anarchists were agreed in their aim, bringing about freedom, by which they meant the removal of the oppression, the exploitation and the injustices from the face of the earth, and the freedom from them. The Marxist contention was that this can

In this, and next week's issues of FREEDOM we are reprinting a paper read last year to the Libertarian Society of Sydney University by the late Michael Nomad. The paper, first published in *The Libertarian in Australia* and *The University Libertarian in this country last winter*. We hope that putting his paper into circulation again will be of interest to our readers and those of the anarchist press in other countries, some useful discussion of the issues which it raises.

only be done by the "proletariat" capturing State power and establishing a dictatorship or freedom is the consequence of the Marxist theory that the State is a mere instrument, a tool of the ruling class for the maintenance of its position.

Bakunin is seen at his best in attacking this view. "They say that this State yoke—the dictatorship—is a necessary transitional means in order to obtain the emancipation of the people, the liberation or freedom is the goal, the State or dictatorship is the means. Thus to free the working masses it is first necessary to enslave them. The State, as an instrument, is not a mere instrument but an institution which is necessary for working. It is impossible to capture an institution and force it to go your own way, it has an influence which cannot be nullified by the policies of those working within it. Kropotkin, talking of "sincere Republicans" who want to utilize the organisation that already exists, made a same point, saying "having understood that you cannot make an historical change in any direction you would have, it that it must go its own way, they were swallowed up by the institution." It is not surprising that Bakunin scornfully rejected this as totally unrealistic. "Thus, from whatever angle we approach the question, it leads to the same sorry result: the rule of great masses of people by a small privileged minority. But, the Marxists say, this minority will consist of workers. Yes, indeed, of ex-workers, who, once they become rulers, will be able to force the people to be workers and begin to look down upon the toiling masses. From that time on they represent not the people, but themselves, and their own aim is to govern the people. Those who doubt this know precisely little about human nature." State-socialism, as Bakunin was "freedom" imposed on people and this he regarded as a fundamental contradiction. The Bolshevik Revolution in Russia is a thorough verification of his views on Communism. He had foreseen the nature of the machinery that would be set up in particular the change from the anti-State character of the revolution in its early spontaneous phase to the authoritarian, power-seeking nature of the established Soviet government.

As against the political revolution of the Marxists (which virtually amounts to the replacement of one set of ruling classes by another) the anarchists, in the slogans of the governing ideology) anarchists advocated a "social revolution" meaning a change from one form of social organisation to another. The difference between a social revolution as seen by anarchists, and any other revolution lies in this: that the social revolution objective is not the capturing, but the destruction of the social machinery, the means of production and power relationships of society. This follows from the anarchist doctrine that the State signifies not merely the means of power, but the entire structure of power relations which includes a whole set of relationships between members

of society. The State on this view is a centralised institution which claims competence to interfere with dependent society in various ways, lays down and enforces rules in a number of fields and in this way can affect affecting people—non-ally in their interests. It is, as often as not, against their interests. The final cause of the creation of the State, in the first phase of nineteenth century Europe, was seen by anarchists as a danger to freedom and consequently to be opposed.

Anarchists recognising that even groups who are interested in capturing power for the sake of bringing about freedom, notwithstanding the sincerity of the individuals concerned simply never get past the point where the problem as it appears to them was always one of "how to achieve freedom" and not one of "how to capture power". But the view of the State as a means of capturing power is not the only one. Clearly, there can be no talk of "achieving freedom" until we have dealt with the question of the social changes of the kind envisaged by the anarchists can be accomplished at all. Already Proudhon saw that there was a problem here for him. After rejecting the notion that governments can bring about social revolution, he argued that governments are by nature conservative and interested in upholding the status quo) he fell back on "society itself" accomplishing the change. "Society itself" is defined as "the masses whom permeated by intelligence," and he said that the revolution will take place "through the unanimous agreement of the citizens, through the experience of the workman and through the progress and growth of enlightenment." Later anarchists had a not dissimilar solution to offer: "the social revolution" wrote Bakunin, "is to be accomplished by the diffusion of intelligence among the various groups of human society, and convinced by propaganda, may organise and combine into federations, and thus by their natural tendencies and their real interests".

Kropotkin's work was almost entirely devoted to proving that man is by nature co-operative and altruistic and that the non-co-operative, aggressive tendencies in people are the result of authoritarian social environment in which they live. According to him, anarchist propaganda works on these latent co-operative tendencies and leads to a social revolution. This simple-minded faith in "the natural genius of the people" has persisted into our modern world. It is one of the chief characteristics of Kropotkin, in criticising the "survival of the fittest" has this to say: "Where, however, Burnham and many others of his kind differ from Kropotkin and the rest, is in their conviction that the continued existence or viability of the triumph of the State in its extreme form, the determination that dominates their idea is, indeed, the only one that will follow from the course of social experience. Nothing is inevitable in society, either managerial revolution or social revolution. Only tendencies, on any grounds of logic or logic, are inevitable. The tendency towards the social revolution is just as real as the tendency towards the State." Woodcock argues that while the State has made it possible to exist, the continued existence of society in its present form depends on the co-operation of the workers, and therefore the real power lies in their hands. "The consolidation of the State and the social death that will follow thereon will never be completed if the workers once become aware of their power and kill the State by the paralysis of direct economic action". GEORGE MULNAR.

(To be continued)

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

OPEN DAILY

[Open 10 a.m.—6.30 p.m., 5 p.m. Sat.]

- New Books . . .
- Taking it Easy Edward Hyams 16/6
- Up on the Roof-top John Steinbeck 2/6
- The Fearful Choice [ed.] Philip Toynbee 8/6
- Mackerel Piea Philip Toynbee 15/6
- The Living Thoughts of Darwin [ed.] Julian Huxley 15/-
- The Modeler T. 1955
- Cheap Editions . . .
- The Age of Louis XIV . . . F.M.A., Voltaire 10/6
- Saint-Gobain Gabriel 10/6
- Collected Poems T. S. Eliot 5/6
- Lord of the Flies . . . William Golding 5/6
- Woe of Nagasaki T. Nagai 2/6
- Dubious Battle John Steinbeck 2/6
- Shardwell [F.] 10/6
- The Delinquent Child . . . [ed.] 10/6
- The Cradle of God . . . Donald Ford 10/6
- Henry Thoreau . . . Lewellyn Powys 5/6
- Yankee . . . B. C. Brown 3/6
- The Socialist Movement 1824-1914 . . . Arthur Shadwell [F.] 10/6
- Hearts of Three . . . Jack London 3/6
- Sylvester . . . Edward Lysons 3/6
- The Case of Comrade Zerkov . . . Victor Segal 5/6
- The Best Short Stories of 1929: . . . 3/6
- Wash . . . Fred Henderson 2/6
- By the Sea . . . Fred Henderson 2/6
- Wind from the South . . . 2/6
- Paris . . . Elmar Green 3/6
- European Dataline . . . Elmar Green 3/6
- Circus Parade . . . Patrick Maitland 3/6
- City of Women in the . . . 3/6
- U.S.S.R. G. N. Serenbrinoff 1/6
- Puffblower . . . 1/6
- Breat Through . . . Stuart Hill 2/6

We can supply ANY book required, including text-books. Please supply required name if possible, but if not we can find it. Scarce and out-of-print books searched for—and frequently found.

Postage free on all items obtainable from 27, RED LION STREET, LONDON, W.C.1

An Anarchist Revival?

WHEN S.F. wrote that provocative letter a few weeks ago, about FREEDOM going out to grass, the Malatesta Club group membership falling from twenty-two to half a dozen, and the movement up to its neck in the Slough of Despond, you suggested that he might be seeing nothing but the reflection of his own despair. You may now make the opposite suggestion about me, for ridiculous thought it may be, I think we are in for an anarchist revival.

What are the hopeful signs? Well, one is the amount of correspondence which S.F.'s provocative letter actually succeeded in provoking. How many times, since FREEDOM became a weekly, have you invited readers to write letters? How many times have you published a controversial article in order to stir up controversy? I do not remember, but I do know that your efforts did not succeed in starting a flourishing correspondence about anarchism, until very recently. There have been, of course, scattered missives; and there have been flare-ups about Esperanto, partial vegetarianism and Herbert Read. But now, for the first time in years, people are publicly wondering what the anarchist movement is for, and how it can be improved.

P.H.'s lecture, which you finished serialising a fortnight ago, puts into neat, precise words a question which I think many anarchists are now puzzling over privately: "In view of the new knowledge about human behaviour, what can anarchists do to push society in the direction of anarchy?" This is a question which, until recently, the anarchists have avoided asking. Some have pretended the new knowledge was a myth, and that it was still only necessary to tell the masses how to act. Others have pretended anarchism was a way of life, quite unconnected with society at large. The few who have both taken account of the new knowledge and continued to make propaganda, have often excused themselves by saying, either that their object was merely to attract people of broadly anarchist opinions into the movement, or that they made propaganda for their own amusement.

The dilemma was; and is, that fairly recent researches into psychology and anthropology, while they have tended to show that relationships based on voluntary co-operation are happier and more productive than those based on authority and obedience, have also tended to show that people's attitudes and convictions cannot be changed by appeals to reason. So the traditional anarchists were right about what kind of society would be healthiest, but wrong about the means by which such a society could be established. Insurrections and assassinations cannot change the basis of society, because they do not change people's basic thinking patterns; eloquent appeals to

reason cannot change the basis of society either, for the same reason. So what are the anarchists to do?

Never mind the answer. For the purposes of this anarchist revival I am talking about, it is not the answer to the question which matters, so much as the frank, fearless discussion of the question. Anarchists are beginning to take a new interest in pushing or modifying society at large. They may grow enthusiastic. The more tortuous-minded may rig up a number of leaky ramshackle solutions to the anarchist dilemma, and begin to make new kinds of appeal to reason, with as little chance of success as the old kinds. If the movement grows active enough (whatever the activity), it may increase in numbers and influence to such a point that people in general will have to take notice of the anarchist view whenever they consider any social question; and this may constitute a sufficient modification of thinking habits to modify social habits slightly, which may stimulate a further interest in anarchism and so on, in a kind of slow spiral towards the sovereignty of the individual.

Let no one accuse me of wishful thinking; I do not think it at all likely that the slow spiral is about to begin. But I do honestly believe that the anarchist movement will probably grow more active, and as a result increase in numbers and influence, to some small extent, in some places.

Fraternally,
D.R.

READER REACTIONS

HERE are some reactions to FREEDOM:

1. "Too intellectual!"
2. "Yeah, I read it."
3. "Glad to see it's as good as it was years ago when I subscribed to it. Passing the copies you sent on."
4. "I'd send some money to them but I just can't." (Laid off in Jan.—no job in sight)
5. "I like the paper even though I can't discuss it intelligently. You know I'm not the intellectual type."
6. "I agree with FREEDOM. But anarchism has been known for so long, and we're as far away from a free society as ever. It seems hopeless."
7. "Don't send any more copies. We have top security rating and 'no work—no eat'. I know you'll understand."
8. "Surprisingly good. Keep sending it."
9. "Certainly a different approach!"

The people quoted are industrial worker, engineer, nurse, ex-teacher, aspiring writer, stenographer, etc.
U.S.A., 13/7/58. D.S.H.

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS

Pro-Life

Would you please allow us the use of your columns to appeal for collaborators in a project to form a small urban community?

We are looking for young people to join in buying a large house. The community we envisage would be a loose one with no narrowly-defined aim or ideal; co-operation to be as much as possible on a practical level with the maximum freedom for each member as regards interests, etc.

The basic requirements in its members will be a thoroughly pro-life attitude and a general spirit of non-conformity backed by awareness of the many faults in society at large. We hope it will be possible to provide educational facilities within the community for its kids, at least at the primary stage; our kids will be self-regulated and we want to protect them as much as possible, and as long as possible, from the anti-life manifestations in outside society. As this will mean satisfying the local education authority of our ability to provide education, anyone having academic qualifications or a teacher's training would be especially welcome. Our ideas on the education of kids are fundamentally those of A. S. Neill.

We invite anyone who thinks he or she might be interested, to get in touch, giving some idea of interests, ideas and aptitudes, by writing c/o FREEDOM. Single persons ought not to feel automatically excluded (one member of the present nucleus is divorced and has a four-year-old son), but it is unlikely that anyone not really interested in kids, nor envisaging having any, would fit in.

Any ready cash towards a deposit would be helpful, but we would not suggest anyone otherwise interested should hold back for lack of it.

I.L., P.D., S.D., C.M.

Getting Away From It All

Missing Scientist Found Grooming Horses, says the front page headline of an American paper reporting the discovery of Albert C. Reed, an aeronautical scientist who disappeared in July 1952 on his way to a meeting at California Institute of Technology. He had been working on a secret project there after having been a World War II test pilot and subsequently working on various aviation projects. Interviewed at Hollywood Park race track, last month, he expressed no desire to go back to his former work and said he would go on working with horses. His employer, trainer Frank Carr, said he is "one of the best groomers I ever had."

Wild Rides

In the June 14 issue of FREEDOM you were asking some questions in the article "Finding a Way Out" that I have been concerned with for some time and think I have an answer to one of the questions at least. Not a complete answer but a partial hint perhaps of the reason for the general decline of such alternatives as the Kibbutzim which I haven't seen but have read and talked about with others who have been on the scene. Some of these people I've talked to about the Kibbutz were communiteers themselves living in the Macedonia community in Georgia and some of them were bruderhof members of Rifton, New York. I've also spent some time with a small group of Catholic Workers trying to get started on the land. From all this I have surmised that all these communities and attempts at community be they in Israel or elsewhere have in common an orientation which is religious (not necessarily spelled out but still there. In the Bruderhof one must accept as true the virgin birth to get in as full member. In Israel most Kibbutzim are orthodox some which professedly free of orthodox still religious, take Mulford Spiro's study for example) and industrious.

The deleterious effect of religion is generally known, but this business of work, of devotion to duty needs re-valuation. The chief competitor of the community is the outside capitalist world. If people, youths in particular can find more leisure time, or put it another way, more time for personal expression they will go there to the larger society with all its shortcomings rather than to the principled but overly devoted smaller community.

The lesson to be learned here is that community planning should subordinate the devotion of work principle (and get rid of the religious one) to dionysian sports and activities. One way to do this would be to make full use of modern machinery and of labour. Thus, more time for sex and wild rides through the night.

Compare the daily round of a chaver or bruderhoffer with that say of an Apache Indian of around 1880. For the first it's work from morning to night. For the latter the usual routine is of hunting, eating, starving, feasting, stealing, and passing life away in savage indifference. Which one is the more attractive life if we cut out the stealing? Ask any kid that isn't too badly spooked and he'll settle for the Apache programme I'm sure. And why couldn't this with certainly a few modifications be the pattern of future community life rather than the grim example set forth by the Kibbutzim or Bruderhof or even the French communities of work which Erich Fromm so warmly described?

Yours truly,

Minneapolis, July 4. COLIN CONNELL.

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENT

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

Every Sunday at 7.30 at
THE MALATESTA CLUB,
32 Percy Street,
Tottenham Court Road, W.1.

LECTURE - DISCUSSIONS

JULY 27—No Meeting.
AUG. 3—Summer School,
(see announcement)

Questions, Discussion and Admission all free.

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP 1958 SUMMER SCHOOL

August 2nd—4th.

THIS year's Summer School will be held in the Malatesta Club, Percy Street, W.1. (Nr. Tottenham Court Road), from 12.30 p.m. Saturday, August to Monday, 4th August.

Theme: WAR & PEACE

PROGRAMME

Saturday:
12.30 p.m. Buffet Service at the Club
2.30 p.m. Speaker: Giovanni Baldoni
6.00 p.m. Supper.
7.45 p.m. Jazz Session & Social.

Sunday:
10.30 a.m. Speaker: Jack Robinson.
1.30 p.m. Lunch.
3.00 p.m. Meeting in Hyde Park.
6.00 p.m. Buffet Service at Club.
7.30 p.m. Speaker: Tony Gibson.

Monday:
10.30 a.m. Summing up & Discussion
by Philip Sansom
Alan Albon.

1.30 p.m. Lunch.
Lectures 1/- each or 2/6 for four.
Meals will cost 2s. 9d. each.

Provincial and London comrades are asked to book meals in advance.

London comrades who can provide accommodation and provincial comrades requiring accommodation are asked to write:

JOAN SCULTHORPE,
c/o Freedom Press,
27 Red Lion Street, London, W.C.1.

★ Malatesta Club ★

SWARAJ HOUSE,
32 PERCY STREET,
TOTTENHAM COURT ROAD, LONDON, W.1.

ACTIVITIES

Every Sunday at 7.30 p.m.
London Anarchist Group Meetings
(see Announcements Column)

Trad Jazz at the Malatesta

Every Friday and Saturday from 7.30

THE MALATESTA JAZZ BAND

Members(1/6) and their guests (2/-) only.
MALATESTA CLUB
32 PERCY STREET
Tottenham Court Road W1
Jazz Men welcome

Every Wednesday at 7.30 (prompt)
BONAR THOMPSON speaks

FREEDOM

The Anarchist Weekly

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

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

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

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

Will France ever be Independent of Algeria?

THERE is little doubt that, in order to be politically independent, a country has to secure a certain degree of economic, social and cultural self-support, of which it can be deprived, either by being exploited, and therefore prevented from developing harmoniously, or by becoming itself parasitic, which implies the impossibility of living on its own resources, in a sane and healthy way.

The problem of the relations between France and Algeria, or between Russia and Hungary, can be examined from both sides with a view to the independence of the occupied or on the liberties of the occupiers themselves. In the case of Algeria, the dependence of French economy on the natural or human resources of this land have been greatly exaggerated; the links can be severed without any real damage for the standard of life of the metropolis; it is in fact a certain state of opinion and political affairs which prevented the return of the "recalled" soldiers to other activities, a new distribution of the budget with less commercial subventions, military, naval, aerial, colonial and administrative expenses of the imperial type, investments and rehabilitation reserved for home development in town and country, etc. France can very well produce its own food and absorb the products of its own industry, without colonies and in equitable co-operation with its West European neighbours. Its best interest seems to follow the recent examples of Holland, Denmark, Switzerland and Germany, instead of spending all its efforts towards overseas possession which it cannot even dream of retaining in the long run.

As for Algeria itself, it is quite possible that independence would mean

economic collapse of a resourceless, highly-eroded and over-populated country, whose active male population has to emigrate to the metropolis in order to keep body and soul together and to nourish the family at home. And it certainly would produce the decline, under very dangerous conditions, of the administrative, commercial and colonial "élites" of European descent, whose fortune is linked to the military occupation.

There is indeed a great difference with the Hungarian case. Here we have a little nation achieving over a thousand years a high degree of agricultural development, where self-reliance, civil rights, religious tolerance, cultural autonomy are a long tradition, and whose transformation into a satellite state, exhausted by requisitions and occupation, is purely accidental, and superficial being the work of military power alone.

Nobody would have suffered if in 1956, the Russian army had left the country in which they represented an inferior living standard, education and civilisation; even the Russians themselves would have been all the better for it in the long run, not to make war and warlike domination their national industry, but making their own butter instead of guns, tanks, H-bombs and sputniks. Hungary would have become a neutral and pacific nation, complementary to Austria, and with the same sort of half-liberal, half-socialist régime; and the only victims—if any—would have been a little gang of executioners and political inquisitors obliged to leave the land in the train of the Russian army.

The eventual independence of Hungary from Russia, and even of Algeria from France is a very serious issue, because it

is doubtful that Algeria may ever become an independent nation. In the first place, it never was. The old Ibero-berber population, which is of the same stock as the most ancient historical inhabitants of Spain, France, Italy, etc., and which has preserved its own language without writing it, has remained sedentary, peasant-like and pagan at heart under an interminable succession of conquests by warlike, tribal, monotheistic nomads, through centuries of Punic, Roman, Vandalic, Gothic, Nordic, Arab and Turkish occupation. Now, there is what is called the European Algerians, mostly emigrated from the various Mediterranean countries and naturalised, and whose only attachment to France is that they are not Muslim, and enjoy a special, privileged stature under French rule. They alone would be a quite sufficient population for the miserable resources of an exhausted country: nearly one million, some tied to the land for many generations, some recently arrived from Armenia, Turkey, Greece, Malta, Sicily, Corsica, Majorca, etc. And last but not least, the administration and army from the metropolis, partly coherent with the interests of the "Europeans" and however disliked by them, because they represent, to their eyes, the ignorant arrogance of the foreigner, of the proconsul, of the doctrinaire, etc. The only cultural link between all these groups of different levels, creeds, manners and origins being the French language, more or less learned at school by ten millions of inhabitants and of occupiers, it remains naturally either to integrate them into a real social unity, or to realise a separation on amiable terms.

For the moment, France is a prisoner of its conquest of 1830, and Algiers ap-

pears as the true capital, from which the "general will" is promulgated in the most authoritarian style to the "hexagon" abroad.

ANDRÉ PRUNIER.

Reserved Occupation

Certain occupations might have to be specially reserved for Southern Rhodesia Europeans who did not reach fully skilled standards, the Prime Minister, Sir Edgard Whitehead, said last night.

He told an election meeting at Mabelrain, Salisbury, that the Southern Rhodesia and Federal Governments had a special duty to European workers.

The Governments had persuaded immigrants to come here in the assurance that they would find better conditions and prospects than at home.

The United Federal Party would honour that assurance. It would take active steps to ensure that European workers were protected from cheap labour.

—Rhodesia Herald 3/6/58.

T.V. Snoop

TV cameramen of the British Broadcasting Corp. can pick up distant comment to go right along with crowd shots through a new amplifying device. It's called the gun microphone. The 3-foot-long barrel, mounted on a camera, can be aimed to record sounds from unsuspecting sources.

—Morning Democrat (Iowa) 19/6/58