

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

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 pathological term to describe the Middle East would be a sickening business 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 eruption 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 possible 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 enlightened 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 gun-boat (or, to be up-to-date, the para-troop) 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 do now.

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.

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 held by people not confined to, or representative of, any one nation, and generally concerned either with the individual or the whole of mankind. However, insofar as ambitions can be said to be national, its author, J. R. A. Bailey, has this to say: that "the progress we have made, given the common criteria for progress, has risen not out of great national schemes for progress, but out of a vast number 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, often goes too far. For the free process looks now to be as much art as technique; so that we should not force too strictly upon society a known and preconceived 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 too wide to help men to see into their ambitions and ideals. The author's aims are very modest or, perhaps I should say, they are modestly put. His highest is "to contribute towards purging society of those who in this matter" (of forming national, group and individual ambitions) "exploit their own and our confusions". The suggestion of "purging society" has always an unpleasant ring, but here it is unpleasant in a particular way, coming from a man who says that "the background against which the small attempts at progress are set has become so vast that it pleads more eloquently than can immediate criticism, for tolerance". I wish his intention were altogether commendable, but I wish even more earnestly that the distinctions he suggests between various kinds of progress and theories thereof did serve some other purpose than to afford a convenient framework for chronological treatment.

"To each world-outlook there is an appropriate system of ethics; and as that outlook changes, so that which has been

*By J. R. A. Bailey. Basil Blackwell, Oxford. 25s. net.

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP OPEN DAILY

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

New Books . . .

Taking it Easy Edward Hyams 16/-
Boy on the Rooftop T. Szabo 12/6
The Fearful Choice
(ed.) Philip Toynbee 8/6
Mackerel Plaza Peter de Vries 15/-
The Living Thoughts of Darwin
(ed.) Julian Huxley 15/-
The Modulor 2, 1955
Le Corbusier 42/-

Cheap Editions . . .

The Age of Louis XIV
F.M.A. Voltaire 10/6
Sainte-Colline Gabriel Chevallier 2/6
Collected Poems T. S. Eliot 5/-
Lord of the Flies
William Golding 5/-
We of Nagasaki T. Nagai 2/6
In Dubious Battle John Steinbeck 2/6

Second-Hand . . .

The Delinquent Child
Donald Ford 10/-
The Cradle of God
Llewellyn Powys 5/-
Henry Thoreau—the Cosmic
Yankee J. Brooks Atkinson 3/6
The Socialist Movement 1824-1914
Arthur Shadwell (Part 1 of set) 3/-
Hearts of Three Jack London 3/-
Sylvester Edward Hyams 3/6
The Case of Comrade Tulayev
Victor Serge 5/-
The Best Short Stories of 1929:
English 3/6
By the Sea Fred Henderson 2/6
Wind from the South
Fred Henderson 2/6
Paris
Elmer Green 3/-
Emile Zola 3/6
European Deteline
Patrick Maitland 3/-
Circus Parade Jim Tully 3/6
Position of Women in the
U.S.S.R. G. N. Serebrennikov 2/6

Pamphlets . . .

Break Through Stuart Hall 1/6

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

Postage free on all items

Obtainable from
**27, RED LION STREET,
LONDON, W.C.1**

believed right and wrong changes, too". Obvious remarks like this one are scattered throughout the book, and the "Summary of the Argument" at the end contains little with which any sensible or passionate reader would wish to quarrel. The obvious and the platitudinous may need be re-stated, but without a ring of conviction or some arresting qualities of thought or style this need will not be satisfied. The people most in need of 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 manner in which he says it.

His is not a history of progress, but of the ideas about progress expressed in the Western world. It shows continuity in chronological succession, but no pattern, no progress meaningfully described. Changes there have been, but there is no telling in what general direction, and the author, in spite of his circumspection, views them from the vantage-point of our century and of "a Europe that is moderately optimistic, that expects a vast future ahead of it which will become steadily pleasanter, a Europe whose ideal is pre-eminently material and technical progress". The author is in sympathy with this kind of progress, for it brings prosperity, and prosperity brings a measure of happiness. Pessimism, on the other hand, expressing itself in theories of fatal recurrences and decay, finds currency when some republic or empire crumbles to pieces, and when no forces are apparent capable of struggling effectively against some spiritual or political tyranny. "Little wonder", exclaims our author referring to the bulk 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 remained. 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 theories, philosophies concerned with ultimates and individual destiny. Man'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 are of little interest to the man concerned with truth and right who looks for answers that will satisfy his need, caring little whether they fit or not with whatever theory of progress may come his way. Many philosophies, which J. R. A. Bailey mentions, 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 Heidegger has a theory of progress to sell.

"National Ambitions" makes a contribution to knowledge, and most readers will find in it quite a few fresh and interesting quotations. The book however has left me unsatisfied. My fault, undoubtedly, for I expected from it what it did not promise to give. I am left asking: Why worry about theories of progress if no standard of judgment is to be drawn from them about things that matter? Why worry about progress at all since, as Jacques Maritain, whom our author does not mention, has pointed out, the very idea of progress is destructive of the value of values just as much as certain modern analysis has proved destructive of the meaning of meaning?
GIOVANNI BALDELLI.

FILM REVIEW

The Unknown Soldier (Academy)

"THE UNKNOWN SOLDIER" is the story of a group of conscripts during the Finnish-Russian war from 1941-44. It is by no means an anti-war or pacifist film, but is realistic and honest. Although coming down slightly in favour of "Country, Freedom and Religion" for which the Finns were supposed to be fighting it does not make excessive claims for their virtues.

The cast is largely unprofessional, and through it are presented the dedicated and unpleasant officer, the good soldier, the communist, the anti-disciplinarian and the one who wanted to run away.

Its goodness lies in being objective, and giving equal force to arguments which must have been frowned on by government circles, and in presenting rebellion against officers without condemning it. (Half amused incredulity from the audience!) At another point it shows the disappointment in the emotions of the soldiers on catching first sight of the desolate capital of Eastern Karelia which they have come to "liberate".

Perhaps this is a reflection of the confused position of Finland, fighting against the Soviet Union when the rest of Western Europe were with it, acting heroically and dying under terrible conditions and getting nothing at all from it; and the conflicts of the people between neutralism and pacifism and defence of the country, between peasant independence and military discipline.

The result would be a nightmare for anyone who dropped into the cinema to pass away a couple of hours, but as a study in the small neutrals' attitude to war it is valuable.
P.H.

A Long Way After Browning

A TOCCATA OF GALUPPI'S

(With apologies to Robert Browning)

The first night at the Buenos Aires Opera de Camara's season at Sadler's Wells opened unfortunately when the Argentine national anthem became inextricably confused with the overture to Galuppi's "Il Filosofo di Campagna", which therefore started with one half of the audience standing and the other half laughing at them.

—The Daily Telegraph.

Oh Galuppi, Balrassaro, this is very sad to find!

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

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

Here you come with your old music, and here's all the good it brings:

We think that your toccata was made to flatter kings,

And get up on our big flat feet when out the music rings.

We know what's what, we know what's done; we always play the game:

If, when we seek to give to states the homage that states claim,

We make ourselves look bloody fools, it really is a shame.

E.P.

Controversy: Anarchy and Utopia

MAX NOMAD'S observation that anarchism is a dying creed is largely correct. The chief landmarks of anarchist history are all a matter of the past, and even the last rally of libertarian forces to the field in the Spanish Civil War was witnessed by another, now lost, generation. It is impossible in the light of this to talk today of anarchism in a spirit of hopefulness 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 present-day left-wing movements. Events of the last hundred years, especially the story of forty years of successful socialist dictatorship in Russia, make this easy for us to see; but it 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, has always depended on certain errors. Those who criticise Proudhon, Bakunin, Kropotkin and the rest for being utopian are usually not blind to these errors. As a matter of fact such criticism consists mainly of 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 utopian parts as worthless. There is a streak in anarchist thought which contradicts the utopian elements: certain passages in anarchist writings, emphasise present protest and present 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, confused and epigrammatic way) was already present in nineteenth century anarchist doctrines is generally ignored by contemporary libertarian sympathisers.

To the initiated as well as to the uninitiated, anarchism is still the search for "Nowhere." But to say this, in my opinion, is 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 speculation anarchism also contains a realistic line of thought on the nature of society. In the course of making this point I want to argue that those who work out this realistic line consistently, 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 appropriated 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 follow this convention, not because of its correctness but because it saves time. Bakunin's anarchism, which was a late development of his personal history, had numerous sources: chiefly the writings of Proudhon and the libertarian aspects of Marx's work. The movement which he personally did much to arouse was similarly inspired and the early history of nineteenth century anarchism is mixed up with the early history of the socialist movement in general. It was not until after the entry of Bakunin and his followers into the First International in the 1860's 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 the Germanic sectors of the socialist movement. Leading issues between them illustrate some of the main anarchist points. State-socialists, as they were contemptuously called, and anarchists were agreed in their aim of bringing about freedom, by which they meant the removal of the oppression, the exploitation and the inequalities from the backs of the masses who suffered 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 George Molnar, which has previously been 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 draw out of 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 of its own. Such a view 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: Anarchism 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, so Bakunin argued, is not a mere instrument but an institution with its own rules of 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 utilise the organisation that already exists, made the same point: "And for not having understood that you cannot make an historical institution go in any direction you would have it, that it must go its own way, they were swallowed up by the institution." As for this dictatorship being "representative" and "transitional", Bakunin scornfully rejected this as totally unrealistic. "Thus, from whatever angle we approach the problem, we arrive at 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 or representatives of the people, cease 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 claims to govern the people. Those who doubt this know precious little about human nature." State-socialism, to Bakunin, was "freedom" imposed on people and this he regarded as a nonsensical contradiction. The history of the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia is a thorough verification of his views on Communism. He had foreseen the mutations of a revolution led by an elite, predicting in particular the change from the anti-State character of the revolution in its early spontaneous phase to the conservative, 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 rulers by another, together with a change 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 revolutionary objective is not the capturing but the destruction of the State-machinery and, consequently, the elimination of power relationships from society. This follows from the anarchist doctrine that the State signifies not merely the existence of power placed above the subjects but 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 independent sections of society: it lays down and enforces rules in a number of fields and in this way conducts affairs affecting people—nominally in their interests, in fact, as often as not, against their interests. The continual extension of the areas of State operation, already a feature of nineteenth century Europe, was seen by anarchists as a danger to freedom and consequently as something to be opposed.

Anarchists recognising that even groups which are interested in capturing power for the sake of bringing about freedom, notwithstanding the sincerity of the individuals concerned simply never get past the first objective. Therefore, the problem as it appeared to them, was always one of "how to achieve freedom" and never one of "how to capture power." But the view they held about their prospects was an optimistic one, to say the least. Clearly, there can be no talk of "achieving freedom" until we have dealt with the question of whether 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 revolutions (governments are by nature conservative and interested in upholding the status quo) he fell back on "society itself" accomplishing the change. "Society itself" meant to Proudhon "the masses when permeated by intelligence," and he said that the revolution will take place "through the unanimous agreement of the citizens, through the experience of the workmen and through the progress and growth of enlightenment." Later anarchists had a not dissimilar solution to offer: "Revolutionary collectivism," wrote Bakunin, "try to diffuse science and knowledge among the people, so that the various groups of human society, when convinced by propaganda, may organise and combine into federations, in accordance with 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 the authoritarian social environment in which they live. According to him, anarchist propaganda works on these latent co-operative tendencies and, by kindling them, brings about the social revolution. This simple-minded faith in "the natural genius of the people" has survived into our modern world. George Woodcock, contemporary follower of Kropotkin, in criticising the "pessimism" of Bakunin, has this to say: "Where, however, Burnham and many others of his kind differ from Kropotkin and the anarchists is in their pessimistic acceptance of the inevitability of the triumph of the State in its extreme form. The determinism that dominates their idea is, indeed, hardly tenable on any grounds of logic or social experience. Nothing is inevitable in society, either managerial revolution or social revolution. Only tendencies can be described, and the tendency towards the social revolution is just as much alive today, if less apparent, as that towards the final consummation of the State." Woodcock argues that while the State has made enormous progress, 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 MOLNAR,

(To be continued)

BLAME THE PEOPLE TOO!

Continued from p. 1

tions like this, if they do we see no signs of it. Their responses are generally automatic, depending on which party they support or what paper they read. Racial superiority will play its part, but expediency and party loyalty will generally overcome prejudice, at least to the extent of giving support to a party policy. There is no evidence that Conservative supporters have thought about the problem, or that the majority of Labour Party supporters are thinking much more independently of their leaders. For political reasons, and because the myth must be kept alive that there are real differences between them, the opposition have criticised the Government's actions, the extent of which can be gauged by the Tory administration that "Mr. Gaitskell had, by his statesmanlike demeanour in the chamber and in his speech (last Thursday), run the Prime Minister a close second" to brilliant statesmanship! the 49% Labour loyalists are expressing disapproval because the party has opposed the Government (however mildly), the other 34% have interpreted Gaitskell's statesmanlike speech a different way, and probably constitute the 'right wing section'. Bevan displayed a little militancy for the benefit of the 'left wing' faction when he accused the Prime Minister of risking the lives of British soldiers to maintain the King of Jordan on his throne against the wishes of his people. This dishonest piece of rhetoric may go down well among sections of the Arab population, but Bevan knows that the British Government is not interested in the wishes of the King's people or in the King, but in British interests in the Middle East. If the Government could feel sure that a new ruler would not change the economic relationship between Britain and Jordan it would not care if the King lost his throne to-morrow.

We do not expect the average Conservative supporter to disobey his leader or think in any other terms but that of military strength and 'gunboats' when his economic interests are threatened. When the rank and file socialist, who is supposed to have been educated in the principles of independent thought and international solidarity, does little to oppose the actions of his party when it goes against these principles, he is on a level with his Conservative opponents. The fact that 49% of the Labour Party supporters have disapproved of sending troops to Jordan means nothing except that they are good party stooges. The miserable history of the Labour Party leaders and members is one of compromised principles and water-drowned policies (Bevan's support for the H-bomb is one important example). Is there any good reason why we should accept that the Labour Party's present opposition to the Government (and its 49% support from its members) is based on socialist principles and not political expediency? Had the Labour Party been in power last week we doubt if it would have acted differently from the Conservatives.

We have watched the Labour leaders when in power following in the footsteps of the Tories, and we have sadly followed the progress of the rank and file toeing the line with hardly a whimper.

The people are as much to blame for what Governments do in their name as the men who lead and treat them with such contempt. There would not be British troops in Jordan to-day if the people were not slavish supporters of one party or another.

LETTER FROM ISRAEL

Discrimination in the Desert

BEERSHEBA is a rapidly growing industrial centre, on the site of Abraham's well on the edge of the Negev desert. In other words it has surrounding it all the aura of mysticism and romantic religion that served as one of the many potent forces which drew the Jews back to Israel. A receptacle for thousands of immigrants from all parts of the world, there is a demand for work facilities for these peoples which is being supplied in a great measure by the exploitation of the many mineral resources of the Negev as well as building, road building, etc.

In Beersheba there is a chemical factory, which employs about 300 workers, several building factories which use stone and gypsum from the Negev, a few miles outside Beersheba is a large gypsum works, a new factory producing chamotte building bricks on the way up, and of course in the Dead Sea works, an hour or so outside Beersheba, is a great potassium factory, where potash and other elements are extracted and refined from the waters of the Dead Sea. And scattered through the Negev all the way to Eilat are other works engaged in mining and refining the natural riches from the rocks and wastes of the desert. An exciting picture, but I have discovered that beneath the surface these factories present a story as depressing as their existence is exciting.

One of the most important resources to be found in the Negev is kaolin, and this together with the gypsum makes for Beersheba an ideal location for the ceramics industry. The factory of Harsa is the result.

Harsa employs over 200 workers in the production of lavatories and other sanitary ware, and also houses a small department for "art" ceramics. This factory is one of the network of factories owned by Solel Boneh, the largest monopoly in Israel. It is a Histadrut set-up and is on very close terms of course with the Mapai. Solel Boneh owns three other factories in Beersheba including the building monopoly, as well as many other factories throughout the country. This makes it the most powerful bloc in Mapai.

Conspiracy of Silence

The management of Harsa is a sorry lot, because like many other similar concerns the managers owe their positions to their being good "Mapainiks" rather than to their knowledge of their work, a tragedy particularly in regard to the scientific and technical managers who have been responsible for much error, wastage and loss because of their lack of the specialised knowledge of their fields, and by their lack of responsibility which has resulted in foreign experts—many of them excellent men—called in to solve technical problems, withdrawing because of lack of co-operation from the factory engineers, who like all inhabitants of Israel, are very proud, and without the intelligence of some, hate to be proved wrong or failing. This irresponsible behaviour does not of course endanger their jobs, but simply results in a con-

spiracy of silence among the managers, and merely bounces back on to the shoulders of the workers¹. The upper strata of the workers in Harsa is comprised of this group of engineers, department managers and various officials on the administrative staff, and are all paid monthly, which distinguishes them from the rest of the workers in this "socialist" factory, who are paid on a daily basis.

And who are the rest of the workers, the 200 or more people who produce the gleaming mound of shiny white lavatories that stand so surreally in the hot desert sun in the grounds of Harsa—that never-ending stream of civilized "privvies" which is exported constantly to wild and jungle-like places in Africa (complete I hope with instructions for use), and to other places?

They are a bewildered and confused conglomeration of immigrants from all parts of the world; peoples of conflicting cultures, suspicious, optimistic, black and white, young and old, Asiatic, European, African, educated to the barest possible level of survival, untrained (with a few exceptions) and above all, determined to get all they can out of what life can offer them in this new land. Many are disappointed with the "promised land" which has solved few problems for them and has created many more. All have been deprived of that most important thing, the security of a cultural continuity, which they have exchanged for a different kind of security—security from racial persecution.

Exploiting Differences

This has created a social phenomenon which can only result in much conflict, misunderstanding and mistakes on the road to social integration. And this integration can only be the result of time; it is to be enjoyed by later generations, guided by intelligent education and the will to understand.

Meanwhile however this ferment of mixed peoples struggling simply to exist, has provided a hunting-ground for political birds of prey; and on the simple concept of "divide and rule" this is what has happened in Harsa.

The golden representatives of Israel's socialist government, the men who were given their jobs as officials in the factory for their reliability in the socialist, Mapai, who are on their way up in the party, several of whom I suspect of working towards political careers, find in the muddled mob of workers easy backs to climb upon, easy methods of boosting their own influence. One of the easiest is to exploit the distrust of these primitive peoples (politically primitive) one for the other, and to cash in on their weaknesses. These Mapai boys from the party are not all to blame. From amongst the workers has risen an Iraqi, who has been wooed and won by the Mapainiks, who has joined and who works for Mapai and who can get what he wants from the management simply because of his influence on other Iraqis, who are the large majority of immigrants. He has been at the factory for a long time doing no work at all; a

sinecure as a reward for his work in Mapai and his influence on Iraqi workers.

I must explain here that the "divide and rule" I mentioned manifested itself in the exploitation of the racial rivalry between the immigrants of Middle Eastern countries—Tunis, Morocco, Persia and Iraq (in other words the darker coloured races), and the East European or "white" immigrants from Russia, Poland, Hungary, Roumania. One of the most primitive distrusts in man is here used deliberately by the representatives and supporters of the (Socialist) Mapai government of Israel—the country created to end racial persecution for Jews.

The Factory Election

I will illustrate exactly what I mean by telling the story of the last few weeks here. The episode was triggered off by the announcement by two Mapai officials, sent from Tel Aviv, that Harsa was a very lucky factory because it was to be the first factory in the Negev region to have the honour of electing from its workers a committee² to sit with the management to discuss and decide on any matters concerning Harsa. They explained how lucky again Harsa was and how proud everyone should be to try out this new child of the socialist state.

This made many people in Harsa indeed happy—but not for the idea itself—any more than the bright boys from Tel Aviv or the big bosses of Solel Boneh were much uplifted by it. But nevertheless a ripple of excitement ran through the factory as the election campaign for the representatives for the workers' committee was set in motion.

There was little open ballyhoo. Instead, quietly and smoothly the rival factions set to work, each calling meetings. The "Iraqis" (a compound name embracing all the "black" races present) and the "Roumanians" (a similar compound name for the "whites"—I am a Roumanian to the "Iraqis") meeting; one in the synagogue, the other in the Mapai headquarters, and the plots were hatched. Ambition, suspicion and power-lust were feeding hungrily on both sides. And several days later the votes were taken by secret ballot.

I would like to say here that not all the factory took sides in this issue. Some were unaware of the whole procedure, had not attended the meetings and had voted as honestly as they could. Among these was a group of Israelis—who supported the idea of the committee on idealistic grounds. They are an intelligent group, some had university educations, and they despise the political corruption that they are aware of around them. They had fought in the resistance and in the war of Independence ten years ago and remember the years of struggle for the creation of Israel. They had memories of comradeship and mutual danger, idealism and courage. They hope some day for the emergence of "true" socialism, from the amorphous mess which constitutes socialism here now.

For this reason they supported the election of a workers' committee now. All my arguments against it and my own example of refusing to vote were of no avail against the past memories and sentimental attachment to ideals and the desire for justification in the future.

Political 'Realism'

For in spite of all evidence to the contrary, these young intellectuals all trust in the future to justify and thus reward their efforts and passion spent in the creation of the State; and they see no further than the political road and the development of the State in international status. This they call "realism" although many agree "in theory" with the anarchist analysis of the situation, which, however, they consider inapplicable in practice. So they voted for a committee of workers who did not ask for the responsibility, to sit with a management whom they know to be crooks.

Well, two days later my Israeli friends lost much of their naïveté. The results of the election came in and the news came out.

The voting had been rigged completely. There had been a "pact" for the "Iraqis" to vote also for two Roumanians, so that of the five representatives from the daily workers, two would be "white" and three "black", a sort of calculated proportional representation. But the pact had been broken, bribes quietly accepted, and all the five representatives were "black". Not one "Iraqi" had voted for a "white". This was the work of an Iraqi leader who was reported to have ordered the breaking of the pact at the last minute so that the "whites" would not suspect.

As "Iraqis" are by far the majority in the factory the Roumanians had been fixed. Their own machine had backfired and the management was to have the pleasure of sitting with an all "black" committee, except for the two representatives from the monthly workers, who were Roumanians.

The tragedy is that the Iraqis do not simply want "self-government". As I heard one of them say: "Soon all Beersheba would belong to the Iraqis—and then look out!"

Next day all the "whites" were licking their wounds except that a strange thing happened. The whites broke up into small groups of Poles, Roumanians, etc. each trying to earn prestige and make capital out of events, rushing around with lists of names for petitions, competing with each other and threatening their own compatriots against signing petitions other than their own.

Discrimination

I am glad to report that the Israelis in the art department sent them all away refusing to have anything to do with racial warfare.

In case this story seems unimportant or flippant to anyone I wish to report that this is a picture met with in many factories. And the rotten structure of the factories in the Solel Boneh combine is a familiar story. I want also to report that many new "black" immigrants are herded into wooden huts for a long period of time, whereas "white" immigrants from Eastern Europe are housed in 2- or 3-room apartments very quickly. And that in general here, the answer to "Who will do the dirty work" is "The darker races of Jews."

The problem here is that it is true that unfortunately the "black" races are the more uneducated and primitive judged by the western standards which prevail here in Israel, and are mostly unable to do other than "the dirty work". This, is of course, another aspect of the present phenomena and may disappear with education in the next generation.

The lesson to be learnt here is that the socialist party government will use these tragic situations to further its own power instead of combating the evil. This is no surprise to anarchists, but is a tough pill for the Israelis here to swallow. Many of the "white" people involved in the race-hate in Harsa have concentration camp numbers stamped on their arms and most suffered in the Ghettos. But here again in Israel, race shows intolerance for race, power is more important than common interest, and justice and freedom are as far away as ever. The Jew returned to Israel is subject to the persecution of Jew by Jew, just as in other lands Christians are subject to persecution by Christians, as in every "civilized" country on earth, man is persecuted by man.

Beersheba, June 1958.

F.S.

The Oil Goes on Flowing

AMIDST the confusion of events in the Middle East, a confusion which almost defies analysis and is further confused at this distance by the thousands of tons of newsprint which are expended daily upon the reporting of it, one salient feature may be seen clearly. It is that the oil, which is what most of the trouble is about, continues to flow.

Although this particular Middle East crisis has all the appearances of being potentially the worst yet, and far more serious in its possibilities than Suez, not a single pipeline has been cut, not a single gallon of oil has gone to waste. All oil companies in the area report that operations are continuing normally.

The significance of this single fact is not hard to find, it is after all the *raison d'être* of economics. We have constantly read in our newspapers long dissertations on the vital importance of Middle East oil for our economic survival, and the consequent necessity for protection of our interests there, but seldom is it mentioned that it is still more vital for the countries of the Middle East to sell their oil to us. Without the British and European market for oil,

the Middle East would lose its greatest source of income.

Neither the USSR nor the USA have any need for Middle East oil, both are already over-producing. The USSR sells its surplus to China and the USA has had to cut its possible production by two-thirds. Africa consumes very little oil, the Far East produces its own relatively small requirement.

All the countries East of Suez in the Middle East have a stake in the sale of oil to Europe, either directly or indirectly. Kuwait heads the list with an income of £10 million (and a population of 200,000); Saudi Arabia earns the same amount with a far greater population; Iraq, £70 million; Qatar £12 million; Syria £6 million. Jordan derives an income from Britain for as long as the oil continues to flow through her pipe-lines and Jordan remains pro-British; the Lebanon is a trading nation which requires other nations with money to spend with which to trade. In brief: no oil—no income, and a return to the absolute poverty which existed in past years.

Britain has simply squandered

away her strong position in the Middle East, by greed, bad diplomacy and a failure to adjust to the onward march of events. It is facile to suggest that all the troubles in the Middle East stem from Russian chicanery, just as it is absurd to assume that Egypt is mostly responsible. An expanding nationalism may be regarded as a partial explanation, but some of the blame must also be placed upon America which now controls 60 per cent. of Middle Eastern oil, compared with 13 per cent. before the war, whilst Britain which formerly controlled 80 per cent., has now dropped to 30 per cent.

The real explanation must rest on the fact that it is not always possible to take the wealth of another nation without allowing sufficient benefits from that wealth to be derived by the people from whom it is taken. The imperialistic methods used by the British in the Middle East are now coming home to roost in the form of a rising nationalism, fired by the propaganda of forces equally as bad in fact, but without, as yet, the stigma of a known reputation.

¹I could give examples but they would be too technical for this article. Enough to say that in this country which has desperate need for development in industry, such incidents occur frequently. ²This committee or council of workers to sit with the management is a system practised in a number of factories in other parts of Israel.

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:

- "Too intellectual!"
- "Yeah, I read it."
- "Glad to see it's as good as it was years ago when I subscribed to it. Passing the copies you sent on."
- "I'd send some money to them but I just can't." (Laid off in Jan.—no job in sight).
- "I like the paper even though I can't discuss it intelligently. You know I'm not the intellectual type."
- "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."
- "Don't send any more copies. We have top security rating and 'no work—no eat'. I know you'll understand."
- "Surprisingly good. Keep sending it."
- "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 communityers 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 reevaluation. 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.

FREEDOM MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

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, 32 Percy Street, W.1. (Nr. Tottenham Court Road), from 12.30 p.m. Saturday, 2nd 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 Baldelli.
- 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 led 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 war-like 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 Edgar Whitehead, said last night.

He told an election meeting at Mabelreign, 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