

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"The more I study the world, the more am I convinced of the inability of brute force to create anything durable."
 —NAPOLEON, at St. Helena.

What Follows Nationalisation?

HAVING got nationalisation of some of Britain's basic industries, now nobody knows quite what to do about it. State control is quite clearly not the brilliant success that its advocates thought it was going to be, but the question to which none of them have an answer is: What is the alternative?

Anarchists have been consistent in their criticism of nationalisation from the beginning, maintaining that a change of masters would avail the workers little and that substitution of centralisation of direction within a competitive money economy would solve few of its problems and create more.

Centralisation is wasteful of time, manpower and energy. It is dehumanising and frustrating in its effects upon the people involved at all levels, destroying contact and divorcing direction from production even more than under 'free' enterprise, and does nothing to make the workers in the industry feel that they belong or have any effective say in the policy-making, or even the day-to-day running of their industry.

This has been recognised from time to time by various interested bodies since the inauguration of state-control in this country. For instance we can recall the Welsh railwaymen who demanded decentralisation—more control over the affairs of the Western Region of British Railways by local technicians with direct knowledge of the area, its problems and most suitable ways of working. But nothing has been done, and the mere fact that the Tories have from time to time taken up the call for 'decentralisation' (but without moving in that direction when they are the State), has discredited the very word among many trade unionists.

No Other Way?

But still the realisation is spreading among all kinds of workers in nationalised industries that all is not well. Their frustration is, however, likely to increase if they can see no other way of running industry except through the profit motive as expressed either by 'free' enterprisers or bureaucrats.

Two recent examples of vocal disquiet prove our point. In the *Iron & Coal Trades Review*, the president of the Institution of Mining Engineers, Major N. E. Webster, says that working for the National Coal Board has been described by a worker as: 'It's like working for a ghost.'

'From the inception of the National Coal Board,' says Major Webster, 'colliery management has ten-

CONSCRIPTS FOR NORTH AFRICA DEMONSTRATE

PARIS, NOVEMBER 23.

The police said here to-night that they had arrested and handed over to the military police 66 French Army conscripts who had been demonstrating in the Champs Elysées against their being sent to North Africa.

A hundred national service men, part of a group of 150 due to leave for North Africa this morning, broke out of their barracks in a Paris suburb to-day after a rowdy demonstration inside last night. Their demobilisation had been delayed so that they could go to North Africa and, according to the police, several of them failed to report back this morning after being given leave yesterday.

ded to be more and more regulated on Civil Service lines: rigid, inflexible and quite unsuited to the needs of so widely varied an industry.'

In an industry as large as mining, Major Webster thinks that bureaucracy might well be unavoidable. We would go further: if an industry as large as mining is centralised then bureaucracy is absolutely certain, and with it all the attendant waste in inefficiency. For it is not readily admitted by, in particular,

socialists, that centralisation makes for inefficiency, but it does. The greater the gap between administration and production the more inefficient will the whole enterprise become, and Major Webster now maintains that the N.C.B. has become 'an anonymous bureaucracy; ineffective, possibly even dangerous and potentially disastrous'. It has created within the industry a mood of 'malaise verging on desperation'

Continued on p. 4

Committee on Nationalisation Reports 'No Scope'

THE Select Committee on Nationalised Industries, set up on March 16 to investigate the workings of state-controlled industry, has reported back to the House of Commons that it can get nowhere within its present vague terms of reference.

This committee was set up by the Government, yielding to some of its own wild men from the back benches, but there is no reason to believe that the Tory Government want to have any more parliamentary control over the nationalised industries than did the Labour Government. When a general election can give your political opponents control over the nation's basic industry, it is safer to forgo that control yourself while you are in office rather than make of industry a sort of political prize.

It is possible, therefore, that the Government have quite deliberately made the terms of reference meaningless in order to frustrate the committee's functioning. If so, it has been quite successful. The Committee first reported its inability to work within the terms on April 20, but only to the Attorney-General, who agreed with Sir Patrick Spens, the chairman, that the terms of reference "make it extremely difficult to know which of the nationalised industries come within the definition, and to what extent their activities are liable to be inquired into by this committee."

You may think that it would not be difficult for the brilliant brains associated with the Government to word a terms of reference so they would make sense and give scope to the committee to do what they were set up to do. But no, instead the membership of the committee was slightly altered (it consisted of Tory, Labour and Liberal

M.P.s) and 10 of the 13 members were told to have another nibble at the terms—which they had already found meaningless!

Still, they have to spend their time (and our money) somehow, we suppose, and this is more harmless than most of their activity.

You may be interested to know just what the terms of reference said. Here they are:

"To examine the reports and accounts of the nationalised industries established by statute whose controlling boards are wholly appointed by Ministers of the Crown and whose annual receipts are not wholly or mainly derived from moneys provided by Parliament or advanced from the Exchequer, and to obtain further information as to so much of the current policy and practices of those industries as are not matters which—

- (a) Have been decided by or clearly engage the responsibility of any Ministers;
- (b) Concern wages and conditions of employment and other questions normally decided by collective bargaining arrangements;
- (c) Fall to be considered through formal machinery established by the relevant statutes; or
- (d) Are matters of day-to-day administration."

Whiteway Defends a Principle

"COLONISTS Shared Home, Shirts and Bed", "Now there's Trouble in Paradise", "No Property Colonists Took Turns To Go To Prison" were some of the headlines conjured up by the popular press last week as a result of a civil action heard in London in which a Mrs. Wexham applied for registration of a bungalow and land at Whiteway. In the course of the hearing reference was made to the origins of Whiteway Colony, and these details contained the scandal value which made the case newsworthy. It is interesting to note that most of the gutter press ignored the second day of the hearing when the real and interesting issues in the case were being argued.

Whiteway Colony has long ceased to be what its founders had intended it should be more than fifty years ago. But one feature persists to this day, namely that no member owns the land he cultivates. And this principle was at stake last week when Mrs. Wexham made her application for the registration of her bungalow and the land. A number of colonists spoke on behalf of the objectors to the application, an dall objectors to the application, and all held by them on the principle of "use-possession" only, and that it was their desire that it should never return to private ownership.

In his summing-up the Chief Land Registrar, Sir George Curtis, who referred to the case as "one of no little interest", declared that there could be no doubt that the colony throughout was operated on the basis of "use-occupation".

The question arose how that form of holding of land would be regarded outside the colony, for example in a court of law. He was quite satisfied that the

STATE OF EMERGENCY IN CYPRUS A Guarantee of More Violence

THE declaration of a State of Emergency in Cyprus was the obvious "next move" by a Government which insists that everyone is out of step except itself. Whatever they may have said about Kenya and Malaya (and even in these countries the prolongation of the struggle would indicate that their "facts" are false), there can be no doubt that the Government is opposed by a majority in Cyprus; even the schoolchildren have joined in the stone-throwing and the general hostility to the occupying forces. But it seems that there is a standard method with which the Government deals with such "crises". It first strengthens its armed forces in the "troubled areas", then it seeks to bribe the people, or at least a sufficiently large section to drive a wedge to undermine their unity, with offers of money to develop the country (one wonders why it did not do so before the "crisis"), and when this has no effect, their Generals on the

spot take over, and being men with little or no imagination, they automatically declare a State of Emergency which makes all kinds of "intentions" punishable by the firing squad or the hangman's rope, and, as happened last Monday, the army is put on a war footing, which means a legalised free-for-all orgy of abuse and summary killings and all the nauseating "incidents" which have been reported from Kenya for the past two years.

All this, as Mr. Lennox Boyd pointed out for the government this week, contributes nothing to a solution of the political situation in Cyprus. For the *News Chronicle* "it is the old vicious circle of repression, retaliation and more retaliation". But even the virtue of the Liberals is tinged with opportunism:

"The crisis will continue to worsen until Britain makes a serious attempt to conform with the unmistakable desire of the Cypriot majority for self-deter-

Continued on p. 3

COMMENT

THE ONLY TRADE HE KNOWS

OUR readers may remember Johnnie Ramensky. He is a Glasgow safe-breaker who during the war was serving a prison sentence when he was invited to join the Commandos. He accepted and was dropped by parachute behind enemy lines in order to blow open safes containing secret German documents.

He was very successful at this, and the State was very pleased to use his peculiar talents in its service. Came the end of the war, however, and Ramensky was demobbed and went back to the only job he knows—safe-blowing. Because of his skill and particular way of working, the police always knew a Ramensky job, so he doesn't get away with anything.

Last week he was sentenced to ten years preventive detention in the High

Court at Edinburgh for blowing a safe in a Glasgow garage and stealing £16 in notes and £2 in stamps. This is his second long sentence since the war—he got five years in 1951 when his war service was 'taken into consideration'.

Although Ramensky (now known as Ramsey), pleaded for another chance, Lord Carmont, the judge said:

"In the course of a life of about fifty years you have received sentences of imprisonment amounting to nearly thirty years and from your conduct and history you cannot be trusted to abstain from crime."

Poor Johnnie Ramensky! His is a classic example of a poor devil used and abused by authority. When it suited the State it was pleased to use and profit by his criminal experience. When it doesn't need him it drops him like a hot potato and continues to punish him for doing by private enterprise what it rewarded him for doing in State service.

They didn't teach Ramensky a new and useful trade in the Commandos. They just made him a legal criminal for a short time. Was it beyond the State's powers—is it now—to have done something for him after his usefulness was over, to save him from going back to the only trade he knows?

But the State only takes. It only gives—punishment.

By ordering your Books through Freedom Bookshop you are helping FREEDOM to continue publication

(See F.P. Advert p. 2)

SINKING . . . ?

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT!

Deficit on Freedom £705

Contributions received £604

DEFICIT £101

November 18 to November 24

Northwood: E.H. £1; London: N.B.T.* 2/6; London: J.S.* 4/-; Denver: R.B. £1/18/6; Glasgow: A.M.C.D. 2/-; Cheltenham: H.R.L. 5/-; Liverpool: per C.D. 7/6; Birmingham: V.P.S. 5/-; Offley: H.E.H. £1.

Total ... 5 4 6

Previously acknowledged ... 598 18 5

1955 TOTAL TO DATE ... £604 2 11

of land on which they cultivate their flower borders and grow their crops!

MORALITY OR EXPEDIENCY OR...

THE choice between expediency and morality is one which faces most people sometime in their lives. Dependent upon the specific situation, the greater the moral impulse the more difficult will be the choice. In the field of politics history has taught us that in varying degrees morality is subjugated to expediency. Therefore, anarchists contend, since political parties must inevitably be tied to a Nationalist State, the internationalism which is one of the important tenets of anarchist philosophy cannot find expression through politics. To anarchists, untrammelled by the considerations which face adherents of a political party, behaviour will be decided by the individual according to the strength of his convictions. The course of action should therefore be clear; each individual will apply his anarchist philosophy both in his personal and social life. What is obvious to the anarchist however, is not acceptable to the majority of people and because of this "The Challenge of Our Time" exemplified by the dilemma between expediency and morality, between what is right and the demands of a false economy and a bigoted nationalism, has to be faced, not as a theoretical problem, but in an attempt to "persuade mankind to acquiesce in its own survival".

These are the problems which form the basis of a volume of essays by Arthur Koestler*, whose analysis of political and social problems are often correct, but whose solutions, coloured by his own experience as a political refugee, are sometimes unacceptable.

Koestler poses the dilemma which faced Captain Scott and his companions on their return journey from the South Pole. One of the party fell ill and a decision had to be made whether to leave the man to die alone in the wilderness or drag him along, thus slowing down the journey and risking all their lives. They chose the latter course and because of the delay all the men lost

*"The Trail of the Dinosaur". Collins, 15s.

†Scott's "dilemma" was not really a dilemma. The men took their decisions freely, and presumably were aware of the consequences. Had they reacted otherwise, conscience would for ever have plagued them and posterity would have condemned them. The judgment of history is important to such men as Scott.

their lives. This then is the choice between expediency and morality, as seen by Mr. Koestler, neither of which offer a solution.

The dilemma of Captain Scott† is extended into the field of politics; Czechoslovakia is sacrificed for the safety of bigger nations; a pact between Nazi Germany and Communist Russia is made in the interests of expediency, and so on. The degradation of moral values offers no solution to the problems of mankind. The alternative course, respect for the individual and the belief that Means determine the End, led in the case of the South Pole expedition, to the death of all. Mr. Koestler asks us to consider the fate of the Indian people if they had adopted the non-violent means of Gandhi; or the British if they had embraced pacifism resulting in the Gestapo operating from Whitehall. Faced with a major problem "reasonable compromise" offers no solution.

Mr. Koestler suggests that "the dilemma admits no final solution. But each period has to attempt a temporary solution adapted to its own condition. The attempt has to proceed in two steps. The first is to realise that a certain admixture of ruthlessness is inseparable from human progress",

(and those who think otherwise are either cranks or sectarians). The second step is to realise that the End only justifies the means within very narrow limits.

The trouble with the first step is the difficulty in knowing where progress begins and ruthlessness ends. If progress means a conditions whereby the individual is allowed full expression and development, his progress will be impeded by the amount of ruthlessness considered necessary in a given situation. When

conflicts arise between national states, it is argued that ruthlessness is necessary (on both sides) to retard the ambitions of the enemy. But did the ruthless bombing of German cities in the last war wipe tyranny from the face of the earth—or did the atom bombing of Nagasaki and Hiroshima strike a blow for freedom and democracy? It would be a comforting thought if we could believe that a little ruthlessness here and there could be applied and then abandoned without any brutalizing effects upon those using it and those at the receiving end, but once on the slippery slope of ruthlessness the "morality brake" is difficult to apply. Perhaps Mr. Koestler will act upon his own advice when he says:

"I am not sure whether what the philosophers call ethical absolutes exist, but I am sure we have to act as if they existed. Ethics must be freed from its utilitarian chains."

The pages of history are written in expediency and ruthlessness, they have failed as methods in achieving the kind of society fit for humans to live in; perhaps the "saintly ways of Mr. Gandhi" are worth a trial. After all, the results could be no more devastating than the methods of the Commissar.

IN discussing the immediate issues between East and West, Mr. Koestler advocates a militant anti-totalitarianism in defence of the relative freedoms of the West. The Method?

"... atomic weapons are necessary as a deterrent against atomic aggression, but ineffective as a deterrent against local and camouflaged aggression."

A European Defence Community "can

never aim at more than to make Europe unconquerable short of total war. But it can never aim at less than this". Therefore, the re-arming of Germany is necessary, "and the fear that this may lead to a repetition of 1914 and 1939 reflects a humiliating inferiority complex, and implies that Europe and the United States will repeat the mistakes which made German aggression possible". We suggest that it does not matter if we reflect an inferiority complex when faced with German re-arming (or re-arming of any nation), we would do well to realise that we are inferior when faced with armed lunatics.

What possible basis is there for supposing that the United States and Britain can prevent an armed Germany "getting out of hand" even if they wanted to; and what guarantee have we that an armed Germany will not line up with Russia? The possibility is no more fantastic than the Ribbentrop-Molotov pact of 1939 for peace and security! No guarantees are possible when states are competing for power, and it is no more unrealistic to suggest that all nations should disarm, starting with the Western powers, than it is to hope that freedom can be defended by the H-bomb.

IT is obvious that one would choose to live in present-day Britain rather than the Soviet Union, Nazi Germany or Franco Spain, and that the relative freedom we enjoy seems, particularly to those who have experienced the tyranny of total dictatorship, worth defending. But it is surely naive to suggest that the philosophical approach of the West to the problem of war is very much different from that of the East. Or that,

"The West has no unified philosophy, but it has a long and continuous ethical tradition which more or less articulately, more or less consciously permeates the thinking of both leaders and people and limits the former's freedom of action".

THEATRE

A Fresh Voice

"THE COMEDY OF DEATH" at the New Gateway Theatre is a most promising first play in English from the hand of Giovanni Baldelli an Italian well-known to this paper. The dialogue, though far from consistent is always vivid and at times extremely moving and poetic. It is inconsistent in the way the characters talk but it is always difficult even for a native to talk in the authentic idiom of the workers except through close association. As the play was originally written in French the task of rendering it into equivalent English must have been even harder and I feel that the entire language of the play should be overhauled by an expert.

The action takes place in a French mine during the depression of the thirties, though the programme misleadingly sets it in the present day. This does the author a great injustice and makes nonsense of the play because conditions today are so very different and it is precisely in this light that the play points to an interesting reversal of values. For an example of this one need go no further than the present strike at the Rolls Royce factory.

The French miners in the play however are kept down by sheer hunger and lack of better jobs to a life worse than the pit ponies, in the charge of an inhuman overseer reminiscent of the typical fascist bully and almost too bad to be true. Soon after the curtain rises the shareholders arrive to pay a visit, accompanied by a young priest, the brother of one of the miners who feels drawn to mingle with the workers and gauge their true feelings. Almost as soon as they arrive there is an explosion and the men and the overseer and the priest are trapped, the shareholders by this time have gone to another part of the mine and presumably get away safely.

The explosion happens far too early in the play. It is a pity that Mr. Baldelli does not allow us time to get sufficiently acquainted with the men as individual characters, their grievances, their relationship to each other. Surely the sheer drudgery of their daily task and their proximity forms an intimacy between them which would add significance and pathos to their subsequent fate. They should have been built up carefully one by one as nearly all are interesting characters. There is Andre the middle-class intellectual who at nineteen became a working man because he felt it his duty to bring some hope into the workingman's life. "A hope for a day of justice and peace!" By now he has become a cynic who spends most of his pay not on books but on booze. There is "the Cricket" full of hot blood and the joy of life, a mouth-organ musician and a natural poet when he speaks about his girls or the country around him. He is a faint echo of the young Dylan

Thomas in his sensuality. Another is Croc the ex-thief who went straight as a result of a woman's love, and was goaled for a crime he did not commit. He has the biggest grudge against society for depriving him of the only valuable thing he ever had in his life, the love of a hunchback woman who by going out sewing to provide for him died of grief and overwork. His character is not wholly convincing and too faintly sketched in. His long speech about the love for his woman again comes too early in the play, striking a false note. This could have been effective in a later act, when, under threat of certain death a man's reserve falls away from him and he reveals his innermost feelings to his fellows.

The priest, who comes into their midst by a sort of compulsion is most truly and sympathetically drawn. Each man gathers strength and comfort from him and somehow manages to come to terms with life or death. The habitual drunkard and wife-beater vows that if ever he sees the daylight again he will spend his evenings and his pay-packet with his family. The atheist intellectual finds a way back to his childhood faith through the vision of the priest. They even believe again in the brotherhood of men and in the face of death even the inhuman overseer becomes human again. But the priest dies of exhaustion and he dies too soon. He and the young boy are left behind dead while the others are saved on the sixth day of their imprison-

ment by the overseer remembering a tunnel built over the new part of the mine. Croc the ex-prisoner has stolen some dynamite (the implication here, not very clearly stated is that he took it in order to blow up the shareholders). He goes to blast a way through for the others and kills himself in the act.

As soon as life becomes a tangible reality all vows are forgotten and each man reverts back to type. The brotherhood of man is a lost dream, the overseer even before he gets out of safety is already threatening to expose the lot for insubordination and terrorism. The play ends not on a note of faith and hope but on one of irony.

It is a strong and gripping play in spite of some of its clumsy incongruities. The young sensualist talks about playing an "aubade" for his girl, for instance! And I ask myself is it an advantage for an author to see his first play performed under conditions such as those existing at the Gateway Theatre, where the prompter's strident (and female!) voice is heard throughout the tensest moments and where most of the acting is well below the standard of first year RADA students. As I have said before, a first play needs to be nursed into being, gently and surely by an experienced man of the theatre ready with a blue pencil and a cast of sensitive actors who can set the author firmly on his path. This sort of shop-window can never lead anywhere except to subsequent total oblivion. D.

FREEDOM PRESS

VOLINE :
Nineteen-Seventeen (The Russian Revolution Betrayed) cloth 12s. 6d.

E. A. GUTKIND :
The Expanding Environment 8s. 6d.

V. RICHARDS :
Lessons of the Spanish Revolution 6s.

MARIE-LOUISE BERNERI :
Neither East nor West cloth 10s. 6d., paper 7s. 6d.
Workers in Stalin's Russia 1s.

ALEX COMFORT :
Delinquency 6d.
Barbarism & Sexual Freedom boards 3s. 6d.

HERBERT READ :
Art and the Evolution of Man 4s.
Existentialism, Marxism and Anarchism 3s. 6d.
Poetry and Anarchism cloth 5s., paper 2s. 6d.
The Philosophy of Anarchism boards 2s. 6d., paper 1s.
The Education of Free Men 1s.

M. BAKUNIN :
Marxism, Freedom and the State. cloth 5s.

PETER KROPOTKIN :
The State: Its Historic Role 1s.
The Wage System 3d.
Revolutionary Government 3d.
Organised Vengeance Called Justice 2d.

GEORGE WOODCOCK :
Anarchy or Chaos 2s. 6d.
New Life to the Land 6d.
Homes orhovels? 6d.
Railways and Society 3d.
What is Anarchism? 1d.
The Basis of Communal Living 1s.

PHILIP SANSOM :
Syndicalism—The Workers' Next Step 1s.

K. J. KENAFICK :
Michael Bakunin and Karl Marx paper 6s.

Marie-Louise Berneri Memorial Committee publications :
Marie-Louise Berneri, 1918-1949: A Tribute cloth 5s.
Journey Through Utopia cloth 16s. (U.S.A. \$2.50)

27, Red Lion Street, London, W.C.1.

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP
OPEN DAILY

OPEN 10 a.m. to 6.30; 5.0 SATURDAYS
All books sent post free, so please get your books from us. We can supply any book required, including text-books. Please supply publisher's name if possible, but if not, we can find it. Scarce and out-of-print books searched for.

New Books . . .

Against the Law Peter Wildeblood 16/-
The Problem Family A. S. Neill 7/6
That Dreadful School A. S. Neill 7/6
Hearts Not Heads in the School A. S. Neill 7/6
The Free Child A. S. Neill 9/6

Reprints & Penguins . . .

Death in Venice Thomas Mann 2/6
A History of the United States Nye & Morpurgo (2 vols.) each vol. 3/6
Spotlight on Asia Guy Wint 2/6

Reminders . . .

A Dominion Abroad A. S. Neill 3/6
An Introduction to the Russian Novel Janko Levrin 3/6

Special Offer . . .

All available issues Spain and the World, June 1937 to June 1939. Approx. 84 issues War Commentary up to 1944. All issues of War Commentary and Freedom, 1944 to 1955 (only one issue missing) £10
World Scene from the Libertarian Point of View 1/6

Second-Hand . . .

A Dominion in Doubt A. S. Neill 2/6
Individualism Wordsworth Donisthorpe 8/-
The Homosexual Outlook Donald Webster Cory 10/-
An Outline for Boys and Girls and their Parents 5/6
Changing Men in the Soviet Union Beatrice King 2/-
Virgin Soil Upturned Mikhail Sholokov 3/-
Women Richard Curle 3/-

Periodicals . . .

Organic Functionalism Vol. 2, No. 6, November 2/6

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

It may be true that Western thinking pays lip-service to the ideas of freedom and democracy, but by his own admission when discussing the debasement of values in his essay "Challenge of Our Time", in the name of expediency, "The Western democracies let loose the first atomic bombs on the crowded towns of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and thus explicitly accept the principle of total and indiscriminate warfare which they had hitherto condemned", after, we should add, Japan had sued for peace. In other words, a total disregard for life and values is expressed by the West in a situation where its interests, that is state and economic interests, are not even threatened.

The fundamental error of Mr. Koestler's strictures is the implicit naiveté of his faith in States to establish peace, or to counter totalitarianism. On the face of it one would think that a "democracy" is not quite as ruthless as a dictatorship. But we wonder if the people of Kenya think this; or what the British Guianese think of democratic methods after they witnessed the constitution being torn before their eyes in the interests of British Imperialism. What is happening in Kenya can happen here, even under a democratic Government, if the needs of political expediency so demand.

"A Guide to Political Neuroses" contained in this book of essays indicates to us why Mr. Koestler is sometimes unpopular. The political neurotic is stripped of his illusions, and left shivering and naked as a warning to us all.

R.M.

Dance
International

LONDON has the privilege (for one more week), to see at the Empress Hall a superb example of Russian folk dancing by the Moscow State Dance Company who are here in their first West European tour.

The company is directed by Igor Moiseyev who has combined the dazzling riches of the authentic folklore of his country with the technical resources of choreography, dramatic art and mime.

One is apt to be frightened at the thought of the Empress Hall with its vast impersonal dimensions, and to fear a mass entertainment which might be vulgar and devoid of finesse. In this case one need not have feared. Mr. Moiseyev is evidently used to just this sort of hall in Russia and he uses it with the utmost skill. His lighting effects are superb and as soon as the performance begins one feels that the Empress Hall is the only right place in which to see these dancers. From the moment the national anthem is played there is a sense of excitement such as could not be produced in a theatre proper. We are carried away at once by the amazing vitality of this troupe. And there is a refreshing humour and subtlety about the whole conception which is most gratifying to discover. A gift of being able to laugh gently at themselves which we do not associate with present-day Russia. The orchestra is first-class though I must confess that there were times when I longed for the tones of just a single balalaika or the strains of a haunting gypsy song. But there was no singing, only in two cases were individual instruments used. These two items stood out as the best in an almost perfect whole. One, "The Khorumi" is an Adjarian male dance of the twelfth century, a dance of warriors and hunters carried out by an uneven number of male dancers to the beat of a tambour. The other, entitled "Poem from the surroundings of Moscow" is a most touching humorous scene between a husband and wife. It begins in a slow graceful movement and runs the whole gamut of the war of the sexes. It is a perfect cameo of Russian life, expressed in dance, the Russia of Dostoevsky, Chekhov and Tolstoy touched with a benign humour. It is accompanied by an accordion player who is the unintentional witness of this domestic scene. There is also a striking *tour de force*, a comic dance of two urchins wrestling, which is performed by one man, a comic football match skilfully carried out to the last detail and a most exciting Sailor's dance in which the dancers are by turn the sailors and the cogs in the great machine that makes the ship throb. It is superbly done and in the end we feel ourselves borne out to sea on the powerful destroyer.

The men are all virtuosos and perform amazing feats, they reminded me at times of Danny Kaye and the Marx Brothers in conception. The women are very much more a passive part of the performance. Most of their dances are in slow movement, rather regimented and tend to become a bore. The stage

STATE OF EMERGENCY IN CYPRUS

Continued from p. 1

mination. There are valid reasons why this desire cannot be satisfied immediately; too many outside interests are involved—Turkey, Middle East strategic requirements, NATO unity.

But there is nothing to be said for the present British policy of denying Cyprus all hope. The only way out of the dilemma is—as Mr. Joseph Grimond, the Liberal M.P., put it last night—that “the Cypriots should be told in unmistakable language that, after a period of self-government, they will be allowed to choose whether they want to go to Greece or not.”

But that is the whole point! Kenya and Malaya are colonies in the economic sense, pure and simple. The importance of Cyprus, on the other hand, is strategic in the power politics sense. To say, therefore that the wishes of the majority of the people of Cyprus cannot be granted because of “too many outside interests” and that such objections are “valid” is to state the government's case, and justify all that General Harding is setting about doing on the island! The trouble with the liberals is that they want the best of both worlds. If you are prepared to support power politics you cannot avoid the consequences: the Koreans, the Middle East and the Cyprus’.

★

HAVING said all this does not make us any the less suspicious of the Enosis movement. So far as economics and civil liberties are concerned union with Greece seems to us more than pointless; it is the conscious act of jumping from the frying pan into the fire. And for this reason one cannot help but question how popular opinion has been “worked up” on this issue. Britain is undoubtedly motivated by other considerations than the welfare of the Cypriots; but equally can it be said of the leaders of Enosis. The Church, which has been financially and morally behind the Enosis movement since 1929, is less interested in bodies than in “souls”, and it seems to us beyond any shadow of doubt that whatever good might come for the people of Cyprus from union with Greece would be spiritual (in the Church's sense); economically they would, if anything, be worse-off. From the point of view of civil liberties too it is difficult to work-up any enthusiasm as to their fate either way.

Why then do we burn with indignation over what is happening in Cyprus? The answer is quite a simple one: that two wrongs do not make a right. We feel that the Cypriots are mistaken in their desire to join Greece. But even more mistaken is the attitude of the British Government which, on the grounds of “security”, denies Cyprus the right of “self-determination” and resorts to armed force to impose its will. The Cypriots' mistake is of judgment for which they will pay the price; that of the British government is one of policy in the carrying out of which others are the victims.

We defend the freedom of the people of Cyprus to make mistakes. We oppose, with all the indignation at our command, a Government which denies them this freedom by having recourse to the argument of force. But we shall equally oppose the Enosis movement if and when in the hour of its success it rides rough-shod over the opposition among its own people, not least the large Turkish minority what at present seems more fearful of the prospect of union with Greece than of British rule. Why? The answer might give one a clearer picture of the political forces behind Enosis... as well as of their intentions.

Future of Freedom in Under-Developed Countries

In our last issue we quoted from some of the papers delivered at the Milan conference on *The Future of Freedom*. In another paper, again on the subject of ‘Economic Progress in Underdeveloped Countries and the Rivalry of Democratic and Communist Methods’, Mr. Constantin Doxiadis made a number of interesting comparisons between the development of Communist and ‘democratic’ countries. In this connection, he said,

“we might quote the problem of two neighbour-countries, Greece and Yugoslavia, during the post-war period. It is clear to anyone visiting both that Greece has gone further along the road to development, a circumstance resulting from her enjoyment of freedom but also from the availability of foreign capital. Assuming for a moment that Greece has been left without foreign capital, Yugoslavia, who was able to recruit her forces by Communist methods, would have made far greater progress. Greece, in these circumstances would have been compelled to adopt Communist methods”.

In these remarks, Mr. Doxiadis was, it seems to us, avoiding a number of questions on the nature of the political régimes of both Yugoslavia and Greece. However, he continued:

“But even the most abundant capital resources made available to a country or the strictest communist recruitment of labour will not be enough to meet the situation without the third factor of successful use of labour—the quality of the force mobilised. Foreign capital and compulsory systems may solve the problems of the degree or cost of mobilisation, but not of its quality. There is nothing to compare with the progress that can be achieved by means of the energy and enthusiasm displayed by each individual in any country. The most important factor which, above all, conditions the quality of a mobilisation and determines its final success is the degree of interest in, and the contribution to, the total efforts on the part of each individual.”

“From the great urban centres to the most remote parts of the countryside the entire population must participate wholeheartedly in the effort for economic progress and development. This can be brought about in various ways, without the employment of communist methods of compulsion. In rural areas of large sections of the world a number of different methods have been tried out to mobilise idle labour and limited local resources by means of such incentives as government support of local schemes,

government grants, long-term loans, technical assistance, etc. There efforts were begun immediately after the war and included such schemes as the World-Relief Programme in Greece. They have been undertaken on a large scale recently in countries such as India with a Community Development Programme, Pakistan with the Village Aid Programme, the Middle East with Community Development Programmes, etc.”

In the same session Professor W. Arthur Lewis dealt with the question which Mr. Peter Wiles had been making such a fuss about, with these words:

“The question whether a totalitarian government can promote more rapid economic growth than a democratic government does not permit of much dispute—the answer is *Yes*. Its powers of compulsion enable it to enforce a higher level of capital accumulation than would otherwise occur, and to raise more resources for education and for other necessary public services than the democratic government could raise. This is not, however, the decisive question. It is known that in certain circumstances slavery produces a larger material output than does a free economy; for example, the emancipation of slavery in the West Indies greatly reduced the output of goods and services. Yet we do not deduce from this that slavery is preferable to freedom.”

★

THE most interesting paper in this session came from Mr. Eric da Costa, on ‘Cultural Freedom in an Underdeveloped Economy—an Indian Case History’. He defined the purpose of his paper as to set out the limits to cultural freedom which arise from the particular economic handicaps associated with an underdeveloped economy.

“It is argued that these handicaps are all too real, but the current view that they cannot be reduced to a large extent by self-help is an error. This error stems from a view, derived largely from classical economic theory, that there is a vicious circle which tends to keep backward economies in a state of relative underdevelopment. There is much that is plausible in such a view, which seems to have added support from at least a hundred years of economic history in South and South-East Asia. The fact that Japan broke through the vicious circle over fifty years ago has tended to pass unnoticed in a large section of current economic literature. Where it has been noticed, the fact that in Japan, the performance of the economy was greatly influenced by an expansionist Imperialist policy, aided by an aggressive martial

tradition, has tended to suggest that a similar result cannot be attained in the short period by an economy which has no expansionist forces, so to speak, outside itself. This is what makes the behaviour of the Indian economy between the years 1952 and 1955 one of the most interesting studies in the whole field of current economics. Between these years India raised herself almost completely by her own bootstraps; and in at least one year, 1953-54, her under-developed economy exhibited possibly the highest rate of economic progress in the world.”

After he had substantiated his claim he sought to relate his argument to the opportunities for cultural freedom in societies in South-East Asia.

“Indian experience suggests that the task of economic development is likely to be considerably less onerous than is generally supposed. It does not necessarily follow from this conclusion that cultural freedom is likely to grow *pari passu* with economic progress and that there is any relation between economic progress and cultural growth. In the Communist countries, there has tended, for obvious reasons, to be an inverse relation between economic progress and cultural freedom. All that can be said in democratic countries is that, as primary poverty disappears, the area over which cultural freedom can be extended will expand. There is no guarantee that new cultural activity will immediately appear and one must admit that in South-East Asia, there is some justification for hesitation in ascribing any predominant rôle to economic forces. Thus Ceylon in *per capita* national income terms enjoys a standard of living nearly double that of India. No one has contended that Ceylon's contribution to cultural growth has been significant as a consequence.

“... In India a monolithic philosophy pervades the governing class; there is a quality of sameness with simplicity and even drabness in dress and behaviour. Austerity thus elevated to a virtue has bred some intolerance; and the fact that the Congress party is likely to win elections for many years and to stay in power has invested this display of austerity with a respectability which is undeserved. Thus paradoxically the ruling class reduces the opportunities for cultural talent while providing opportunities, legal and otherwise, for its expansion. The second qualification arises from the concentration of patronage in institutions which, in advanced countries, are not dominated by the State. A State-managed radio system, for example, is probably bad in principle for any country; it is particularly unfortunate in countries where austerity is decreed by a political legend or by the accidents of power. Thus, film music was, for some time, banished from All-India Radio because the Minister in charge considered it to be his duty to educate the public taste according to his individual lights.

ROYAL SELF-INTEREST?

The Duke of Edinburgh said at Gateshead last week that the modern tendency for people to say, “I am all right, the rest of you can go and jump into the lake” was “very short-sighted, to put it mildly.” He went on:

“We are all in this together, sink or swim. Our standard of living will never get any better, indeed, it might not even remain where it is, unless we all realise that our work is for each other as well as for ourselves.”

Whose standard of living was the Duke talking about?

ANARCHIST NOTEBOOK

Freedom Press Publications

Freedom Press Publications

WE have come to the conclusion that FREEDOM's readers are too polite, too understanding or too indifferent to bother to enquire what has happened to the fourth volume of our FREEDOM Selections (1954). So far as we know no cynic has even suggested that the series has petered out! If he had he would be wrong, for not only will the fourth volume appear, but the fifth volume is already under way. During the past months we have had a number of technical setbacks and difficulties—with which we will not bore our readers by detailing—and which account for the serious delay in publication of the fourth volume. We believe these difficulties have now been overcome and that it will be published by April. The price of each volume is five shillings for readers of FREEDOM who order direct from Freedom Press (cloth edition 10s. 6d.)

Also held up for the same reasons is the second volume of Voline's work on the Russian Revolution. *The Unknown Revolution* (which is the title given to this volume) will be published in America by *The Libertarian Book Club* (G.P.O. Box 842, New York 1, N.Y.) and in Britain by *Freedom Press* (price 12s. 6d. cloth), will be available next month. To our minds this is the more interesting of the volumes, dealing as it does with two specific, but politically and socially vital, episodes of the revolution: the Kronstadt Revolt and the Makhnovist movement in the Ukraine.

Individual Action Ceases Publication

SHORTLY after the arrival of the November issue of our New York contemporary *Individual Action* a letter has been received from its editor stating that owing to lack of funds he would not be able to publish further issues. Why is it that minority movement papers in America since the war seems unable to last long enough to become established? Apart from the high costs of production compared with this country, we wonder whether the key to their failure is their personal approach, that is, their

one-man editorial approach, which may particularly interest a small circle of friends and acquaintances of the editor but equally irritate outsiders. It may or may not be significant that the weekly journal *Manas* (published in Los Angeles), which contains only unsigned editorial and contributed articles, is completing its eighth year of publication in spite of a small circulation and a complete lack of the “chatty” approach. *Individual Action* we feel was somewhat dominated by two or three contributors who spent a lot of time talking about themselves. Is that the wrong approach for any revolutionary paper—and especially for one that is trying to make its way in a society swamped by “personalities” (real and artificial) and starved of ideas and incitements to do one's own thinking?

The Libertarian Movement in Argentina

FOR some fifteen years the libertarian movement in Argentina has existed illegally. The overthrow of Peron has, at least for the time being, brought to an end the underground existence of our movement. A report on the “revolution” issue by the F.O.R.A. (Federación Obrera Regional Argentina), the revolutionary syndicalist organisation affiliated to the I.W.M.A. (International Workingman's Association), was issued in October and apart from, what appeared to us, its excessive optimism as to the significance of the “revolution”, it announces the re-opening of the F.O.R.A.'s branch offices and its return to legality. The first action of *Accion Libertaria*, organ of the Libertarian Federation of Argentina has also been published, filled with optimism and determination to continue, in full light of day, a struggle that has never ceased during the twenty years of its existence. So far we have received no copies of the anarchist journal *La Protesta* which for a number of years, in the late twenties, was published as a daily with a weekly literary supplement of a very high order.

LIBERTARIAN.

Dance International

Continued from p. 2

becomes alive only after the men come on. Their predominance and superiority is most striking. A wonderful evening with the accent very much on the male!

Under the same auspices (those of Peter Daubeny), Pilar Lopez presents her Spanish Ballet at the Palace Theatre. It is a pity that Madame Lopez calls her company a ballet, because ballet is precisely the one thing that this troupe should not touch. I did not see their first programme, but the first half of programme two is entirely devoted to “The Three Corners Hat” with choreography and production by Pilar Lopez. It is a tasteless affair, the conception is utterly vulgar, the decor and dresses are bad and the whole affair is unkind to Madame Lopez and shows her in the worst light. Even the ensemble work was very poor as if the entire company were out of their depth.

But after the interval the evening came miraculously and tremendously to life with Federico Casado giving us a superb display of Zapateado and some exquisite guitar accompaniment by Luis Maravilla. After that we had five variations on Spanish folk dancing to music by Rimsky Korsakov, this just failed to come off. But in the primitive Flamenco

number “Gypsy Love”, Madame Lopez at last comes into her own. All the artificial ballet nonsense is thrown overboard and here we get the traditional basic dance rhythms of her native Spain executed with true passion. Pao de Ronda here makes a brilliant partner and the number was repeated in a cleverly abridged version amid shrieks of enthusiasm from a delighted audience.

Of the men it is difficult to decide who is the best once they have acquitted themselves of their somehow indifferent ensemble work. With a solo each becomes a marvellous executant. Ernesto Lapino hitherto somewhat awkward due to his extreme height gives us a most accomplished and exciting exposition of El Polo, in which his hands become like cracking whips and Federico Casalo who uses his entire body as a perfect percussion instrument is a joy to watch. The accent here is again on the male!

I hope Madame Lopez will stick to the native rhythms of her country from now on without embellishment. In this way she will go on delighting her audience who on this particular night, by the end of the second half, were reluctant to depart.

D.

**FREEDOM needs
more readers and
more funds
URGENTLY!**

LETTER

The Crisis in Israel

It may well be that there are arguments that would have cogency in opposition to the editorial of November 12 (suggesting that Israel should disarm and use the resources thereby saved to help Arab refugees), but those put forward by Bernard Gelstein (FREEDOM last week) are certainly not among them.

The chief weakness in the editorial, as I see it, is that it seemed to wish for action from a State such as no State has ever yet taken, nor is ever likely to. But this is nothing compared to the massive weakness of Gelstein's case, and I only wish I were more surprised than I am that he should hold these views.

To start at the end of his letter and work backwards, it should be clearly understood that anarchists do not hold their 'few universally applicable principles' merely for the sake of purism, sterile or otherwise. This is in any case contradictory, for principles which are universally applicable can hardly be called sterile. It is rather the expediencies of those who apply different principle, or lack of them, to different situations, who are basically fruitless, blundering from one tactic to the next at who knows what cost in human life and suffering.

I cannot, of course, speak for any other anarchist than myself, but I am an anarchist because the anarchist case is truly realistic, not because it is puristic; because the so-called practical men who apply the type of expediency which Gelstein advocates just do not solve the problems they pretend to tackle—indeed they create more as a result of their expedience; and that to go on and on in the same old way is to perpetuate the problems and entrench their very causes even more firmly.

The quotation from *Encounter* is a double-edged one from Gelstein's viewpoint. 'The enemy will always be changing,' says Mr. Hampshire 'as one preponderating group succeeds another . . . and so we must dizzy ourselves by hopping from one doubtful ally to another in true Hitler-Stalin-Churchill fashion—thereby ensuring that one preponderating group always succeeds another and our enemy is forever before us . . . or behind. But never eliminating 'the enemy' altogether.

And, says Stuart Hampshire, 'it is always easy . . . to miscalculate the direction from which the greatest threat to the most essential liberties comes.' That, it seems to me, is a most important passage for Bernard Gelstein to note. Is he sure he has not miscalculated any directions?

I rather fancy he has by his bland statement: . . . the Israel-Arab hostility has been engendered neither by Israeli power politics nor by conflicting economic interests, but by the resentment of

the Arab rulers at having an enlightened and flourishing community in their midst . . . Truly here is subjective arguing with a vengeance . . . although we can sympathise with Gelstein's identification with the cause of Israel, we must ask him not to over-simplify in this manner

Surely the Israel-Arab hostility stems from the establishment of the State of Israel in what was previously regarded by the Arabs as Arab territory. And the establishment of a State is an act of power politics. Now that the Russian bloc has begun arming the Arab countries, America is beginning to think about 'guaranteeing' Israel—in other words both sides in the Middle East are being used in the greater power-political struggle. But this only extends and aggravates the hostility which has been expressed in constant sniping and border incidents since the 'cessation' of open hostilities in 1948—which ended with Israel occupying much more territory than before the war began.

So doesn't this represent a 'conflicting economic interest'? Especially now that oil has been struck in the Negev? For this is the area which was previously Arab. Certainly the Arab rulers are resentful of the progressive character of the Israeli economy—but that's because their own peoples will start making demands that will undermine their own feudal control. And the discovery of oil in Israel will directly interfere with (a) the Arab blockade and (b) the oil interests of the Arab countries.

B.G. is worried that an Arab occupation of Israel would mean that Jews would be forced into conditions similar to those 'enjoyed' (?) by the Arab refugees. So am I, but I am also worried by these conditions of the refugees—is he? If so, he didn't mention it, and if not then he is ignoring—as the Israeli State seems also to have done—the tremendous propaganda value of the Arabs of these thousands of wretched people on Israeli territory.

Just as he is ignoring—if we want to be practical and expedient (which is always at someone else's expense)—the tremendous propaganda value of a grand gesture by the Israeli State towards those Arabs. How the sabre-rattling of Nasser would be undermined if a large programme of re-habilitation for those Arab refugees were announced and commended by Israel!

War, says Gelstein, is the only course of action possible to ensure the survival of Israel. When? Now, when Israel is stronger than the Arabs? Does he advocate the preventive war that some Israeli politicians are said to be urging? Or should they wait, while Egypt, Syria, the Lebanon, Saudi-Arabia, Trans-Jordan are arming, meanwhile arming them-

It would be easy to present the return of Ben Youssef to Morocco as the finale of an operetta. Acclaimed by his faithful subjects, saluted by his turncoat enemies, honoured by the French authorities who had exiled him two years ago on the pretext that the Moroccan population no longer respected him, the Sultan is put forward to-day as the symbol of new-found national unity and Franco-Moroccan friendship. The government's turnabouts and official tirades provide food for laughter, it is true, but they are not the important thing. This little historical anecdote allows us only to

measure the littleness of men, even though those men are statesmen, in comparison with the gravity and size of the problems.

In the overpopulated towns that have sprung up like mushrooms in the course of the last two decades, the brood of *affairistes** had established themselves, and capital disturbed by international instability or social pressures was brought in and invested in the expectation of quick profits. A square metre of land in Casablanca increased in value until it exceeded the price of that in the Champs Elysées in Paris. Did such prosperity transform the country and benefit the Moroccans? That would have been logical. But the colonial system has no logic. So, when the Americans built bases in Morocco, the French Residency insisted that the native workers should be paid at the rate normally used by French employers and not in accordance with American rates. At the same time the natives were prevented from forming trade unions. The paradox went so far that the Moroccan workers, if they wanted to organize themselves, had to affiliate with the CGT—controlled by the Communists. On the other hand the Paris government enforced customs regulations favouring the sale of French manufactured goods. In addition the Moroccan nationalist movements developed rapidly, profiting on the one hand by the determination of the young local bourgeoisie to obtain their share of the cake and on the other hand by the popular discontent in the shanty towns that jostled each other around the boundaries of the old cities, which had become too small. To resist the pressure of the Istiqlal, the independence party, which the Sultan had been astute enough to support, the French Residency relied on the forces of repression—a classical tactic—and on the most backward feudal elements, that is to say on the chieftains of the mountain clans and southern tribes. When we recall that the removal of Ben Youssef was "justified" in particular by the argument that one of his daughters used to go out walking unveiled and had been seen—in a bathing costume!—we can see that French civilization made use of peculiar reasoning.

When the sorry schemes of the experts at the Quai d'Orsay were revealed as quite ineffectual it became necessary to recall the Sultan and gravely explain that what was black yesterday had suddenly become white. Here again we must not allow ourselves to be impressed by official declarations but must try to look straight at the facts. The French business leaders who knew that a title to property has no value if it is not backed up by solid political power are, in the majority, partisans of Ben Youssef's return. Why? Simply because the instability of Morocco was such that business could no longer be carried on. A large number of businesses, factories, and offices were being put up for sale and finding no takers. Some months ago one of these captains of industry, a big operator in fats, made a strong attempt to put forward a more realistic policy. He was not in the least a leftist; quite the contrary, for he had in other days financed Fascist groups, in particular the Cagoule. But he had realized that it was necessary to choose an understanding with the Moroccan nationalists rather than complete disaster. His name was Lemaigre-Dubreuil, and he was assassinated in Morocco by enraged French colonialists.

What line do the important French industrialists and business men take? Under the old Sultan, Ben Arafa, the straw man of the Residency, police order reigns, but social life can no longer be carried on; and if the discontent of the native wage-earners is to be disarmed then wages must be increased—for example, from 30 to 70 francs.

*Politicians who use their inside knowledge to feather their nests.

Letter from France

The Moroccan Tragi-Comedy

measure the littleness of men, even though those men are statesmen, in comparison with the gravity and size of the problems.

In the overpopulated towns that have sprung up like mushrooms in the course of the last two decades, the brood of *affairistes** had established themselves, and capital disturbed by international instability or social pressures was brought in and invested in the expectation of quick profits. A square metre of land in Casablanca increased in value until it exceeded the price of that in the Champs Elysées in Paris. Did such prosperity transform the country and benefit the Moroccans? That would have been logical. But the colonial system has no logic. So, when the Americans built bases in Morocco, the French Residency insisted that the native workers should be paid at the rate normally used by French employers and not in accordance with American rates. At the same time the natives were prevented from forming trade unions. The paradox went so far that the Moroccan workers, if they wanted to organize themselves, had to affiliate with the CGT—controlled by the Communists. On the other hand the Paris government enforced customs regulations favouring the sale of French manufactured goods. In addition the Moroccan nationalist movements developed rapidly, profiting on the one hand by the determination of the young local bourgeoisie to obtain their share of the cake and on the other hand by the popular discontent in the shanty towns that jostled each other around the boundaries of the old cities, which had become too small. To resist the pressure of the Istiqlal, the independence party, which the Sultan had been astute enough to support, the French Residency relied on the forces of repression—a classical tactic—and on the most backward feudal elements, that is to say on the chieftains of the mountain clans and southern tribes. When we recall that the removal of Ben Youssef was "justified" in particular by the argument that one of his daughters used to go out walking unveiled and had been seen—in a bathing costume!—we can see that French civilization made use of peculiar reasoning.

When the sorry schemes of the experts at the Quai d'Orsay were revealed as quite ineffectual it became necessary to recall the Sultan and gravely explain that what was black yesterday had suddenly become white. Here again we must not allow ourselves to be impressed by official declarations but must try to look straight at the facts. The French business leaders who knew that a title to property has no value if it is not backed up by solid political power are, in the majority, partisans of Ben Youssef's return. Why? Simply because the instability of Morocco was such that business could no longer be carried on. A large number of businesses, factories, and offices were being put up for sale and finding no takers. Some months ago one of these captains of industry, a big operator in fats, made a strong attempt to put forward a more realistic policy. He was not in the least a leftist; quite the contrary, for he had in other days financed Fascist groups, in particular the Cagoule. But he had realized that it was necessary to choose an understanding with the Moroccan nationalists rather than complete disaster. His name was Lemaigre-Dubreuil, and he was assassinated in Morocco by enraged French colonialists.

What line do the important French industrialists and business men take? Under the old Sultan, Ben Arafa, the straw man of the Residency, police order reigns, but social life can no longer be carried on; and if the discontent of the native wage-earners is to be disarmed then wages must be increased—for example, from 30 to 70 francs.

*Politicians who use their inside knowledge to feather their nests.

With a nationalist Sultan like Ben Youssef, who claims a share of the real power and who wants, for the young Moroccan bourgeoisie, participation in putting the country "into production", the French employers can reach an understanding and not become the victims of too great a working-class pressure. They will be able, for example, to raise wages from 30 to only 50 francs.

But who are the most stubborn and obtruse of the colonialists? Quite simply the little settlers, the little businessmen, and the civil servants and officials (including those who are attached to the French trade unions). This is a phenomenon found not only in Morocco but in Tunisia and Algeria as well. The white man's privilege is defended more bitterly by him who possesses only the nationality of the colonial power than by him who possesses, over and above this privilege, that of money.

This was brought out clearly when the Moroccan wage-earners set up the Centrale Marocaine du Travail, their own trade-union federation. Neither the local unions of the Communist CGT nor those of "Force Ouvrière" gave them any help. Very much on the contrary. Under the hypocrisy of general formulas they "warned" the authorities and their own confederation "against any haste" and increased their warnings. S. PARANE.

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

LECTURE-DISCUSSIONS

Every Sunday at 7.30 at

THE MALATESTA CLUB

155 High Holborn, W.C.1.

(Nearly opposite Holborn Town Hall)

DEC. 4—Arlo Tatum on

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF SOCIAL

COHESION

DEC. 11—To be Announced.

DEC. 18—Annie de Witt on

ANARCHISM IN HOLLAND

DEC. 25—No meeting.

INFORMAL DISCUSSIONS

Every Thursday at 8.15.

OPEN AIR MEETINGS

Weather Permitting

HYDE PARK

Sundays at 3.30 p.m.

MANETTE STREET

(Charing X Road)

Saturdays at 5.30 p.m.

GLASGOW

INDOOR MEETINGS

Friday evenings at 7 p.m. commencing

Friday, October 14th at 200 Buchanan

Street.

The Malatesta Club

155 HIGH HOLBORN,

LONDON, W.C.1.

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

Informal Discussions Every Thursday,

at 8.15 p.m.

Saturday, 3rd Dec., at 9 p.m.

Bonar Thompson reads from his own

published works:

"THE WORLD OF BONAR

THOMPSON".

Thursday, 8th Dec., at 8.30.

Discussion: Bill Corrin on

"ARCHITECTURE AS SHE IS

'BUILDED'".

Thursday, 15th Dec., at 8.30.

Discussion: Bernard Gelstein on

"THE BASIS FOR LIBERTARIAN

IDEAS".

Saturday, 17th Dec., at 9 p.m.

"A FAREWELL TO HIGH

HOLBORN"—

"TEARS PROVIDED".

FREEDOM

The Anarchist Weekly

Postal Subscription Rates:

12 months 17/- (U.S.A. \$3.00)

6 months 8/6 (U.S.A. \$1.50)

3 months 4/6 (U.S.A. \$0.75)

Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies

12 months 27/- (U.S.A. \$4.50)

6 months 13/6 (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

What Follows Nationalisation Continued from p. 1

'It is high time,' he says, 'that administration came second to production, and management is allowed to pursue its primary function of organising the getting of coal.

Will They Abandon It?

Major Webster, of course, speaks from the management side, but at least from the *productive* management side, and in any move towards workers' control, the mining engineer would naturally find himself becoming more integrated with the productive operative than with the unproductive administrator.

The same misgivings about nationalisation have been expressed in a different direction by Bob Edwards, M.P. for Bilston and general secretary of the Chemical Workers' Union. He said, in a speech at Leicester last Saturday:

'Mere public ownership of the means of production would of itself bring no nearer our democratic ideals unless methods of carrying through this social revolution led to the means by which workers, technicians and consumers could control their own economic destinies.

'It is significant to note the large number of strikes that have taken place in nationalised industry. Unless past and present mistakes in management and human relations are corrected, public ownership as an instrument of industrial democracy will be discredited and will be increasingly abandoned by the Labour, Co-operative and Trade Union movements.'

Such an abandonment could not come about, as we see it, without considerable conflict within these movements. For while those at the

bottom may cry 'Forward', those at the top cry 'Back' and the trade union or political party official can see himself in a sinecure on a nationalised board far more easily than he could see a revolutionary alternative being developed among his followers.

Experience Teaches

But that raises the whole question of workers' organisation in industry, about which we are not nearly as pessimistic as some. The large number of strikes in nationalised industry to which Bob Edwards referred show that the workers are not prepared to tolerate conditions under public ownership that they would not stand for under private control. The workers supported the idea of nationalisation because they expected something better from it. Now that it is beginning to be demonstrated in practice not to be the great advance they hoped for, the opportunity is arising for a constructive alternative to be placed before them with some degree of success possible.

It is incumbent upon all those who can see a real alternative to be as energetic as possible in making it known for there is always a number of workers in industry receptive to new ideas when they fit a situation and are in line with their own experience. It is the habit that so many people have of resisting new ideas because they do not line up with their experience which is so annoying to those who can think in abstract terms and see the rightness

of their case in principle—but is it such a bad thing?

If we believe that anarchist ideas are correct, we do so because we ally our analysis of situations to our experience. The vast majority of people, however, do not bother to analyse but proceed from experience, and their conclusions are wrong because their experience has been limited and is coloured by wrong ideas which have been rammed into them. But in the field of industrial organisation, we have already seen popular rejection of private ownership, as a result of experience and years of socialist propaganda.

It Depends On Us

We are now seeing the beginnings of the rejection of public ownership as at present organised, but it is unthinkable that the majority of workers will want to return to private control; some third alternative must be found and here, naturally, is where we think anarcho-syndicalism or, at the very least, some idea of direct workers' control, will stand a chance of finding popular support.

The extent, or rather the rapidity with which our ideas find acceptance will depend to a large extent upon the energy with which we propagate them. It is not true that everything is against us. Many influences are, and many barriers have to be overcome, but the greatest allies of all are on our side—the failure of the alternatives and the workers' experience of them.

ANARCHO-SYNDICALIST.