

'War is a relation of State to State  
and not of individual to individual.'  
K. J. KENAFICK

**In this Issue:**  
**PEACE WITHOUT  
FREEDOM?**  
**E. E. CUMMINGS**  
**1894-1962**

SEPTEMBER 15 1962 Vol 23 No 29

**THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY - 4d.**

THOUGH Mr. Harold Wilson as fraternal spokesman for the Labour Party at the recent Blackpool Congress of the Trades Unions movement, was careful to point out that of course "you have to deal with whatever government is in power", the tameness of the debates, the absence of controversial "political" issues, and the good press all this earned, indicate that the T.U. bosses had their eyes on the next general elections, and that while they have to "deal with whatever government is in power" they reckon to get a better deal out of a Labour Government! As to whether their members will be any better off under one government or another is doubtful. Mr. R. H. S. Crossman, M.P., in his *Guardian* column declares that

## What's Behind the Blackpool Resolution on

# 'Streamlining' the Unions?

This year's Trades Union Congress seems to me the best thing that has happened to the Labour Party for a very long time. The decisions it has taken are already making the kind of impact on public opinion that should help us to turn anti-Tory into Labour votes at the next election.

Even more important, these decisions could, if they are followed up, enable a Gaitskell government to introduce the real, centralised Socialist planning which was impossible in 1945 owing to the attitude of the trade unions to wages policy.

Mr. Crossman goes on to argue that until this year's Blackpool TUC the Labour Party's close association with the trade unions has been an electoral liability.

Just after the last election some of my colleagues became so worried about our image as a working-class trade union party that there was even a suggestion of dropping the name "Labour" as well as Clause 4. Even from a pure vote-getting point of view, the idea was ludicrous. Images aren't things you can put on and take off at will. An image is merely the impression you make on other people, and the only sure way I know of effacing a bad impression is by changing the behaviour that caused it. But one of the things a Labour Party in opposition cannot do anything about is trade union behaviour. Our trade union connections were bound to remain an electoral liability until the trade union movement woke up, took a look at itself, saw what was wrong and decide to put it right.

And thanks to Television millionaire-socialist Sidney Bernstein's decision to televise the Blackpool congress, the impression, the image, that the public has of the trade-union movement has been changed overnight. "The Tewson epoch has ended; the Woodcock epoch has begun!", and Mr. Crossman has already started counting the votes which "could be worth 50 seats to the Labour Party". . . .

THERE were three major issues debated at the Congress. Firstly there was the motion of the Union of Postal Workers asking the TUC General Council to inquire into the possibility of reorganising the structure both of the TUC and the British trade union movement. For a number of different and sometimes contradictory reasons delegates were almost unanimous in supporting this motion. Mr. Bob Edwards who is an enthusiastic supporter of the Common Market thought "a modern structure" was needed if British trade unionists "were to hold their own in the Councils of Europe", while Mr. Shanley wanted the reorganisation in order the better to challenge and not to support the Common Market. Other delegates saw reorganisation as a means for showing "a united front on such problems as unemploy-

ment, technical change, redundancy, wages and hours". The UPW delegate opening the debate considered that

"We ought to be looking at ourselves to see whether our organisation can be streamlined to meet changes in industry and improve the impact and force of our organisation. The structure of the trade union movement is secondary to the policy of the trade union movement.

"If we are serious about the possibility of greater unity, we should each be able to say that our organisation was in the melting pot with others and that all should be willing to examine the possibility of reorganisation and make a contribution to it."

The fact that only half of the male workers and a quarter of women in jobs belong to a Union was in itself a challenge to the Unions. But what does this streamlining of the Unions mean so far as the TU bosses are concerned? Of course the Trade Union movement needs reorganising if it is effectively to challenge the injustices, the inequalities, and the maldistribution of wealth that prevails in capitalist society. Workers can only speak with one voice when they have a common purpose. The present structure of the Trade Union movement creates more inter-union rivalry, more struggles between workers than militancy against the bosses. But is it militancy against the bosses, and governments that the

Union leaders are seeking to encourage by their proposals for streamlining the unions? Mr. Woodcock's remarks should make it clear that the new "image" of the T.U. is anything but revolutionary!

Resisting the temptation to go into the subject too deeply, he saw the purpose and structure of the trade unions reflecting the time when governments were indifferent to economic welfare, "and certainly to the welfare of working people." He conceded they might still be indifferent to an extent, but it was also true that they were not likely now to have a Government which would decline to accept responsibility for promoting economic health.

SECONDLY, the Congress debated the Common Market and defeated by 5,845,000 block votes to 2,000,000 a motion opposing British membership and calling for a general election before the "decisive" step is taken. It approved the General Council's own report; the critics called it a "fence-sitting" report, the Economic Committee preferred to refer to it as keeping open the door!

Thirdly they debated Wages Policy. Again this debate was dominated by Mr. Woodcock who made two significant remarks:

"We must not, as a trade union movement, give the impression that we are claiming absolute, unfettered, unqualified freedom to do whatever we like, and to hell with everyone else. That is not trade unionism."

He also defined the task of a modern society thus: "To find the practical limits of regulation we could all adhere to". This, he said, was what the Government had never attempted, and he added:

"We are not a bunch of crate eggs on wages. We have never shirked our responsibilities. We will respond to decency. We have had lots more experience than the present Government and I wish one of these days the Government would really begin to listen to the TUC instead of trying to make us the scapegoat for its own failures."

Even if a central agreed objective was established, Mr. Woodcock argued, the TUC would be subject to the same limitations as the Government. Asking himself what the TUC could then do he replied: "I don't know. I can see what the Government cannot see, that it is not so easy to move on this matter."

Union sovereignty could not be sacrificed, and there could be no final control of wages. A discussion in which the TUC took part could not lead to anything like the pay pause or the guiding light. One could not have that sort of

Continued on page 3

## LETTER FROM FRANCE

# Struggle for Power in Algeria

Paris, Sept. 2.

AT the time of writing, two Algerian armies are waiting, ready to march against each other, one in support of Ben Bella (the would-be Nasser of the new independent State), the other in support of other would-be dictators. The present confusion looks all very simple to an anarchist observer; no principles, no programmes, no classes are involved in the conflict, only a handful of ambitious politicians and colonels scrambling for power without a thought for the millions of people whom they are thus keeping in a state of continued insecurity and starvation.

Though the feud was to be expected, it seems to have taken almost everybody by surprise, both in Algeria and in France, for the show of unanimity had been more or less kept up to the last by the leaders concerned. The left-wing papers in France, after having supported the F.L.N. unquestioningly for the duration of the war, are left in the dark as to whom they are now unquestioningly to support (all the more uncertain since all sides seem to agree to leaving the small Algerian Communist Party out of the game altogether; history has not yet decided which side it is on). The prevailing attitude here consists in bewailing the absence of a "much-needed strong centralized govern-

ment to restore peace and order", though the crocodile newspapers of the Right are hard put to it to repress a grin of malicious glee at "the Algerians' inability to govern themselves, now we have left them to their own fate . . ."

Frustration and bewilderment, however, are the dominant feelings among the Algerian people themselves. Crowds of hungry, workless and exasperated Moslems are reported to have flooded the streets these last few days, booing both government and army, lying down on the roads to prevent a military clash, and shouting: "Enough! Seven years is enough!"—"This," a young man commented to a reporter of *Le Monde*, "is the only way in which we can make ourselves heard."

And this, precisely, is the point. The Algerian people are not unable to govern themselves, to live, that is, peacefully and decently together and alongside with the European settlers; they have shown it well enough last Spring by their extra-

ordinary restraint and self-discipline in the face of the most murderous provocations by the O.A.S. They are showing it still today. But at no time was there any question of letting them have a say in the decisions that concerned them most directly. The French administration had to be replaced, everyone agreed on that, but no voice has ever been raised to question the necessity of replacing it by an Algerian state invested with an authority even more dictatorial than the French ever enjoyed. Independence, not freedom, was the aim. We are witnessing the logical results in the "absurdity" of the present deadlock.

There is nothing unreasonably utopian in thinking that the seven years' Algerian war might have been a social revolution. The prolonged chaos of a war-situation might have provided the Algerians with a unique opportunity for trying out new and freer forms of social organisation. The Liberation Army could then have been a truly liberating army, devoted to the practical apprenticeship of freedom as well as to the armed struggle against the French. The accession to independence might have brought about the setting up of workers' and peasants' councils, which could have been entrusted with the task of organising

Continued on page 4

## The Body has been Produced

DR. ROBERT SOBLEN finally eluded his persecutors. His writ of *habeas corpus* finally succeeded. It is not known whether President Kennedy will insist upon the body for the purpose of drawing and quartering.

## AUSTRALIA

### The Peter Tait Case

THE Victorian government's determination to hang Robert Peter Tait has been checked temporarily by public protests. The Government still refuses to reprieve Tait but has postponed his execution, originally set for August 22, and "allowed" Tait's solicitor to appeal to the Privy Council in London. The date of this hearing is not known.

Tait, a convicted murderer, is considered by most people to be insane. His would be the first execution in Victoria for 11 years. He is not the only man, however, condemned to remain indefinitely in the death cell.

Campaigners have just learned that another prisoner under sentence of death and also awaiting Privy Council hearing—Joseph Tikos—has been in the death cell for over 12 months. Like Tait he has to endure the State's grisly death cell ritual [a warder continually watching his every movement, a light burning in his cell day and night, visits from the prison chaplain, unable to discuss his chances of reprieve with anyone], whilst his fate is still to be decided over 12,000 miles away.

A last minute political move by the Labour opposition to introduce a Private Member's Bill for the Abolition of Capital Punishment seems doomed to failure. There are only 9 Labour members in the man Upper House.

Protests continue to pour in from all States. Meetings of protest are being held almost daily in Melbourne, the State capital.

In just over 7 days, students from Melbourne University have collected 10,000 signatures on their petition calling for a reprieve for Robert Peter Tait. This, in spite of a ban on their activities by the authorities in the streets of the city. A.A.G.

## SYDNEY, AUSTRALIA

Weekly Meetings, 72, Oxford Street, Darlington, Sydney, Thursday.

# ANARCHY 19 on theatre now on sale

ANARCHY is Published by  
Freedom Press at 1/6  
on the last Saturday of every month.

## Faith Rewarded?

While a crippled father was praying for a cure among pilgrims at Lourdes yesterday his three children and his mother-in-law died in a fire which destroyed his Cardiff home.

Four members of the family, including his wife, who is expecting another child, were injured in the blaze, which was noticed by a milkman at 7 a.m. The pilgrim, Mr. John Budd, aged 37, of North William Street, Cardiff, left for Lourdes on Friday.

Mr. Budd, who has a liver complaint, is a stretcher case and may not be able to return to Cardiff until the scheduled flight of a plane with special facilities on Friday.

(Guardian).

## Notes on the

## Social Anthropology of Max Gluckman

OVER the past ten or fifteen years Gluckman, now professor of social anthropology at Manchester University, and his students have been busily at work establishing a new dimension in British anthropology (nominally distinguished as 'the Manchester school'). In the volumes published by the Manchester University Press, whose number is now considerable and whose quality is generally high, a refreshing contrast is offered to the effiteness of Oxbridge and London in modern British anthropology. Apart from Manchester, we must now look to the United States for the more interesting trends in the subject.

Gluckman, himself, is a South African Jew whose fieldwork has been carried out in South and Central Africa. Although apparently of leftist/liberal views he is not in any sense an anarchist, either of the conscious or unconscious variety. Nor probably are his followers (these possibly impertinent remarks are based on the writings of the school, rather than on personal acquaintance).

Nevertheless, the Manchester school's achievements are worth drawing to anarchist attention for at least two reasons. The first is that anthropology in general in highly relevant to the anarchist imagination. The second is that the Manchester school has developed in directions which seem specifically of interest to anarchists for their own social analysis.

The aspects which help to distinguish Manchester anthropology from other traditions in the subject are its interest in history, its concern for the notion of conflict (perhaps the most interesting for the anarchist), the attention to ethnographic fact and the use of detailed case studies to document the more abstract analyses.

Gluckman's views on history were forcibly expressed in his polemic against Malinowski (*Malinowski's Sociological Theories*, Rhodes-Livingston Paper No. 16, 1949), one of the more entertaining pieces of anthropological writing to ap-

pear since the war. History, he maintains, contributes to our understanding of a society. Every event is the product of a unique history; to know why an event is as it is and not something else we must know its history. In this way we can gain clues as to the direction and rate of social change. Historical data can also indicate whether processes observable today were operative in the past and, if so, obviously extends our knowledge of such processes.

If this seems little more than commonsense the reader must be referred back to the history (appropriately enough!) of anthropology. In reaction against the reconstructions of evolutionist and diffusionist anthropologists, Malinowski championed the study of societies as they appeared in the here and now. This was a valuable emphasis. It was also sensible, because reliable data concerning the past is scanty for the majority of primitive societies (written records are often lacking; little archaeological work has been carried out; even the memories of old folk only give a pretty shallow time depth). Nevertheless, the irrelevance of historical data has been exaggerated, and Gluckman and his followers have performed a useful task on showing that something of interest about the past can usually be gleaned from available sources.

The most important theoretical excursion of the Manchester anthropologists, and the aspect of their work which is perhaps most likely to catch anarchist attention, is the development of the concept of conflict. Just as societies are by no means static or unchanging (hence the relevance of history), so, too, they are by no means harmonious. Hence the relevance of the notion of conflict. V. W. Turner, in his *Schism and Continuity in an African Society*

(M.U.P. 1957), quotes from Gluckman, a social system is a 'field of tension, full of ambivalence, of co-operation and contrasting struggle'. Indeed, the theme common to the school's writings is conflict and the resolution of conflict.

Neither of the two towering figures of the last generation in British anthropology, Malinowski and Radcliffe-Brown, grasped the significance of conflict in social life. Malinowski stressed the significance of integration, which he seems to have thought of as the absence of conflict. For this, as for his disparagement of history, he was attacked by Gluckman. Radcliffe-Brown recognized the social function of 'organized and regulated antagonism' (exemplified by joking and avoidance relationships), but fails to push the insight deeper. Probably he would have regarded the kind of conflicts Gluckman and his students study as a threat to social *eunomia* or *euphoria*. It has thus been left to the Manchester school to develop for British anthropology the insight that conflicts actually contribute to the cohesion of the societies in which they occur and are, moreover, an inherent attribute to social life.

In America, Lewis Coser, a sociologist, has also grasped the value of the concept of conflict for the understanding of social systems—*The Functions of Social Conflict* (Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1956)—but he has been concerned to develop the notion as found in the writings of Georg Simmel, the nineteenth century German sociologist. It seems significant that he should come to much the same conclusions as Gluckman and his followers; significant because they have been working independently. Last century, Marx, as well as Simmel, wrote on conflict but the concept seems to have fallen out of favour by the beginning

of this century. Among pre-Gluckman British anthropologists Evans-Pritchard, in his study of the Nuer, showed how a segmented structure was maintained by a balance of oppositions and alliances between the parts, and how conflicting loyalties functioned to help settle feuds.

Neither Gluckman nor Turner define the term 'conflict'. Coser does, however, and his definition seems to fit the use made of the term by the Manchester anthropologists; conflict is 'a struggle over values and claims to scarce status, power and resources in which the aims of the opponents are to neutralize, injure or eliminate their rivals.' As used by Gluckman, at least in his stimulating *Custom and Conflict in Africa* (Blackwell, 1956), the term seems to vary in precise meaning, which detracts from the ideal of any social analysis: the attainment of a sharp clarity. I understand that another Manchester anthropologist, F. G. Bailey, has done something to refine the theory of conflict by distinguishing between 'contradiction' and 'conflict'. Certainly a refinement is desirable.

The other two aspects of Manchester anthropology can be briefly disposed of. Turner begins the preface to his book with a quotation from William Blake: "General Forms have their vitality in Particulars, & every Particular is a Man." Gluckman, in his foreword to the book, states that Turner is using a new method of analysis: the use of detailed case studies showing the empirical values in one Ndembu village over a period of twenty years. The case study occupies the foreground; a systematic outline of Ndembu principles and values is in the background. In this way an escape is effected from mere chance illustration of social regularities. The

case study is also a feature of Gluckman's *The Judicial Process Among the Barotse of Northern Rhodesia* (M.U.P., 1955). The method enables the demonstration of systematic interconnections and interdependencies without sacrificing the living reality in whose Particulars the General Forms are manifested.

The abundance of ethnographic data contained in the Manchester volumes is obviously related to the use of the case study as a technique of exposition. It thoroughly accords with A. C. Haddon's dictum, 'A fact's a fact for all that', and is a welcome change after the unrelieved abstraction of many structural studies (of which Evans-Pritchard's *The Nuer* is probably the earliest and most elegant example).

In these notes, which are of a preliminary character only, I have attempted to draw anarchist attention to one of the more significant developments in modern anthropology. Anarchists who follow up some of the leads which the Manchester school's writings offer might deepen and sharpen their own understanding of a social phenomena; if so these notes will have served their purpose (*Custom and Conflict in Africa*, based on Third Programme talks, is the best introduction). The only danger I can see is that emphasis on conflict may lead to the obscuring of the significance of co-operation, and a forgetting of the fact that social relations can be and often are harmonious (it will be remembered that Kropotkin's *Mutual Aid* was designed to correct just such an over-emphasis on the part of survival-of-the-fittest enthusiasts). A re-reading of Malinowski or of his most eminent present-day follower, Raymond Firth, should hold this danger in check.

K.J.M.

## BOOKS?

## We can supply

ANY book in print. Also out-of-print books searched for—and frequently found! This includes paper-backs, children's books and text books. (Please supply publisher's name if possible).

## NEW BOOKS

Mutiny 1917 John Williams 25/-  
Crowds and Power Elias Canetti 42/-  
Man and Evolution John Lewis 12/6  
More Poetic Gems  
William McGonagall 12/6

## REPRINTS AND CHEAP EDITIONS

Memoirs of a Revolutionist  
Peter Kropotkin (edited by  
James Allen Rogers) 10/-  
The House of the Dead  
Fyodor Dostoevsky 12/6  
The Hosts of Rebecca  
Alexander Cordell 3/6  
Stand on Me Frank Norman 2/6

## SECOND-HAND

A Hundred Commoners James Johnston 6/-; The Triumph of Barabbas Giovanni Gliglio 6/-; The Unpublished Diary of Pierre Laval 3/6; Geography of Hunger Josué de Castro 8/6; The High Cost of Vengeance Freda Utley 15/-; The Press the Public Wants Kingsley Martin 3/6; My Days and Dreams Edward Carpenter 12/6; The Last Optimist J. Alvarez del Vayo 5/-; First Encounter John Dos Passos (soiled) 4/-; War and Peace and the Soviet Union Gore Graham (1934) 4/-; Virgin Soil Upturned Mikhail Shokolov 4/-; Economic Liberty Harold Cox 3/-; The Great French Revolution (in Russian) P. Kropotkin (1914) 6/-; Science, Liberty and Peace Aldous Huxley 3/-; Tory Heaven Marghanita Laski 3/-; Industries of Animals Frédéric Houssay 4/-; Russia in the Shadows (1920) H. G. Wells 4/-; The Liberal Way (1934) foreword by Ramsay Muir 3/-; My Days of Anger James T. Farrell 5/-; The Future of Morals (defective) C. E. M. Joad 2/6; Postscripts J. B. Priestley 3/-; Advice to a Young Poet Llewellyn Powys 3/6; Who Once Eats out of the Tin Bowl Hans Fallada 4/6; Revolution and Recovery R. B. Mowat 5/-; Looking Before and After John Middleton Murry 3/6; Christianity and the Crisis (1933) Nicholas Berdiaeff, etc. 3/6.

## Freedom Bookshop

(Open 2 p.m.—5.30 p.m. daily;  
10 a.m.—1 p.m. Thursdays;  
10 a.m.—5 p.m. Saturdays).

17a MAXWELL ROAD

FULHAM SW6 Tel: REN 3736

## Anarchist-Communism?

DEAR SIR,

Carefully reading FREEDOM here in intervals between following new clues to the whereabouts of an illusive Anarchist library in Geneva, I am moved to reflect that one right word may sometimes save the use of a thousand less adequate ones. In a way I suppose it is desirable to spread the propagandist net as wide as possible, and invite every bird caught to sing its own song. The dawn chorus of Anarchism thus continues to be surprisingly fresh and varied. But now of course we no longer believe that the dear little things sing of feathered love and brotherhood; the arrogant little bastards are really defying one another to come into Tom Tiddler's ground, just like the delegates of the established gangs who gather here, trumpeting universal peace and laying death-traps for pacifists. Just, I'm afraid, like some of our disputatious propagandists. They all want to use the editorial we, which our editors use with perfect grammarian correctness and literary discretion. We Anarchists!

Anarchist—a fine brave word in the days when it meant you believed you could improve the world by throwing a bomb and were ready to do so. Now it is only these bloody agents of established gangsters who believe such rubbish. We Anarchists of fifty years ago—a permissible use of the we, I think—we had the mortification of learning that utopia is not so easily won; we went under for a time, until a new generation rose out of our hell, stronger for our disillusionment. But rose one word short—one important word had been left behind. I know there was discussion at one time, whether to fish it out again—but it has been left in hell, in the hell of authoritarianism. The word—wedded to ANARCHIST in those days—was COMMUNISM, ANARCHIST-COMMUNISM. That was Peter Kropotkin's word; and that was Tom Keell's word when he had to stand up against Peter and save FREEDOM from becoming an open forum for political discussion, instead of maintaining its Anarchist-Communist character.

Well, you widen your net, certainly, using the single word; but you catch a lot of strange fowl that squawk as wildly as irrelevantly—Christians, for instance, cannibal or otherwise. Anarchism, an abstract entity, challenges the definitive and possessive instinct—it

LETTERS  
TO THE  
EDITORS

seems to have being in itself, essence—a centre and frontiers, like a state. Whereas Anarchist-Communism is a paradox has no existence of its own—it is a double curtain which reveals reality as the two curtains are drawn apart. Useless to dwell on one side or the other, to draw one curtain aside alone. Or, to take a human comparison: any one person is vulnerable and limited, but the relations between two persons reveal the reality of both—in fact it is only the relations that matter; their single existence is insignificant. Communism without the prefix is demonstrably of zero value, and I suspect that Anarchist is also essentially vulnerable and limited; either without the other is lacking in lasting significance. Marx had an inkling of this, with his fading away of the state, but thought you could take the paradox sideways. Roundabout, said the Boys. Those who taught me the little I know about such matters, faced the paradox squarely. The effect of it on the commonly inquisitive mind is also an observation of many years. When people ask me what I am and I say Anarchist, they shrug or smile it off; when I add Anarchist-Communist, if they have just a bit of brain alive they aren't happy until they've had a peep through the paradox curtains one again.

One could write a whole chapter of probable consequences of advancing the definition to what I know is in the minds of most comrades when they say Anarchism. For instance, the edge it gives to contrasting both American and Russian ideas, a better balance than the

single word, which might well be claimed by many a tycoon in America. A few minutes meditation on the paradox before writing to FREEDOM might save many words.  
Geneva.

K.W.

Question of  
Priorities

DEAR SIR,

While the language of correspondent W. H. Moor, printed under the above heading (FREEDOM 8/9/62) may be felt by the editor to be intemperate, as words coming from the heart often are, his suggestion that FREEDOM put its own house in order underlines the question: If "we publish a paper in order to reach people with ideas which we hope they will accept and adopt as part of their lives" (*ibid*, editorial reply) does this leave room in a four-page paper (FREEDOM 11/8/62: *Propaganda and Everyman III*) for just under a page and a half being so largely devoted to criticism of other organizations, and in particular of one act of propaganda which is being undertaken by a non-anarchist body and not for the purpose of propagating anarchist ideas?

Certainly, the need to avoid being annihilated and/or being unwillingly instrumental in annihilating several millions of our fellows, makes it reasonable and necessary to examine and discuss the ways in which action to this end does and shall take place. And if as anarchists we believe that nothing less than the social revolution will ensure this, then, agreed, it is the function of an anarchist journal to put this argument to people engaged in combatting the threat. But, as the editor says, "Our view is that there are hundreds of ways of propagating ideas, all of them valid and valuable." Is not sailing a boat to Leningrad one of them? The editor may be right in his hypothesis that the results to be achieved by three months full-time propaganda work "in say Birmingham" would be more solid—but they would be in Birmingham. Can the editor suggest a means of installing 15 full-time propagandists in Leningrad? Should no attempt be made to take any propaganda to the Soviet Union for the reason that the less expensive channels of day-to-day communication are closed? It is this last point which makes the singling out of this venture for attack seem particularly unjust.

Yours sincerely,

MARY CANIPA.

Are we Unfair  
to Marx?

DEAR SIRS,

The pot shots which your contributors take from time to time at that revered figure of the Revolution, Karl Marx, irritate me to no end. Mind you, a genuine shot at Marx I appreciate, but this continual scattered fire at straw Marxes I detest.

The latest assertion by a contributor (Land and Liberty, 1/9/62) that Marx 'predicted' that social revolutions occur only in the most advanced countries is rubbish. True, Marx held that advanced industrial countries were most prone to revolution, particularly in the century in which he lived and worked for revolution. Was not this true?

England had her revolution in the 17th century, France in the late 18th century, Germany and Italy in the 19th, and Russia in the 20th. To deny that there is a relationship between these developments and the industrial developments in those States is to ignore the obvious. To say that revolutions occur in the most industrially advanced countries is not to say that they do not occur in industrially backward countries. Russia in 1917, industrially speaking, was backward relative to Western Europe. But, her industry, however, was developed sufficiently to make the Czarist feudalism inoperable, particularly when that creaky system was poised in conflict with the most ruthlessly efficient industrial economy of the day—German Capitalism.

The social revolution which Marx spoke of could not be achieved without a massive industrial dynamic, off-course, is the *socialist revolution*—the only object worthy of the support of revolutionaries. This was true in Marx's day and is still true. Can your contributor show me a revolution which has occurred in any backward country which has produced socialism? Certainly neither Mexico, the subject of your contributor's essay, nor Russia are examples of socialism. I take it he knows Marx's definition of Socialism, but for the benefit of readers, who may not, and lest your contributor's ignorance of Marx in this respect matches his ignorance of him when he misquoted him, I'll inform him: a moneyless, classless, wageless, society.

For the advancement of Socialism.

P. TENNYSON.

Amargh City, N. Ireland, Sept. 3.

# FREEDOM

September 15 1962 Vol 23 No 29

## PEACE WITHOUT FREEDOM?

IN an article in *The Observer* 9/10/62, Edward Crankshaw discusses "the Changing Face of Communism". Significantly, it is illustrated by superimposed photographs of the successive dictators of Russia, in which Stalin is dominant.

The theme of the article is that while we can all see that military stalemate has arisen through the manoeuvres of the Cold War, it is important to realise that its ideological basis is changing too. "We know that 'the West' is neither purely capitalist nor everywhere wholly democratic" says Crankshaw, a rather weak way of describing the governments of Spain, Portugal, South Africa and the Central African States, not to mention the totalitarian aspects of the French, German and American governments or even our own. He agrees that similarly, the Soviet Union is no longer an advocate of Revolutionary Communism.

The only trouble with that argument, is that it assumes that some time in the past, the government of the USSR was a Communist one, in some sense of the word, and that it tried to export its communism to the rest of the world, and further that any easing up of the power struggle is due to the abandonment of this communism.

This concept of Russia as the power house of world revolution is obviously untrue. A catalogue of the occasions on which Stalin actively betrayed revolutionary movements outside Russia was given in M. L. Berneri's articles "Record of the Third International" and "Stalinist Offensive against Revolutionary Militants" reprinted in *Neither East nor West*. Since then, under Krushchev as well as Stalin, the Russian government's policy has remained similar: use revolutionary movements if they look as if they might be useful, but don't give them any chance of independence, and always put the diplomatic needs of the Russian government first.

Now it is one if the basic principles of Marxism that political ideology is merely part of a superstructure determined by the prevailing economic relations in a society, and anarchists maintain a parallel point of view, that the ideals and principles expressed by a state, as being the reasons for which it maintains power, suppresses opposition, and fights wars are no more than a gloss on the reality behind the actions of every state and privileged group; the maintenance of power and all its fruits.

From time to time this idea shows through in Crankshaw's article. He quotes with approval a saying of Krushchev, "We are getting richer, and when a person has more to eat he gets more democratic". However, if one accepts this position, one should not be asking primarily about the ideological changes in Russia, but about the changes in the power and economic structure of the society. Or would that be too revealing in demonstrating how similar this structure is in both the East and West, the homes of Communism and Capitalism?

Sometimes a state may feel that its interests are served by supporting an opposition movement in another state, at other times by betraying it. Sometimes it may be advantageous to portray other states as enemies awaiting the chance to overrun the country, and at other times by encouraging friendship

with them, but this has nothing to do with ideology, it is purely a question of power. It would be easy to quote several examples from the cold war period, but perhaps more striking, let readers reflect that from 1941-45, the Russian, British and American states were united in hot war, declaring themselves united to defend freedom, peace and democracy, and then carving up the world into spheres of usually totalitarian influence. During that period it was considered rather unpatriotic to draw too much attention to the internal tyranny of Stalin and his government.

The most important point raised by Edward Crankshaw's article is, however, just what does he want. A world in which we accept that control over the lives of all the workers is exercised by a handful of government leaders and industrialists, in which they comfort themselves by considering that that system has evolved from different starting points in both Russia and the West? Are we supposed to accept denial of personal freedom in the East with the realisation that the West is not so democratic as we used to think, either? Or to accept the fact that since Bulgaria is surrounded by enemies they have to shoot and imprison a few opposition propagandists, just like the Portuguese do on "our" side?

As the Russian people become better fed, clothed and equipped, the state will not need such a vicious police system to keep them in order, nor will it need to maintain such a strong fear of the outside world. These are developments which make life more bearable for the Russians, and we welcome them wholeheartedly because of that. They are however, the results of the toil and scientific skill of the workers, and not presents from the state. In fact, just as in the West, the state has diverted the benefits of scientific progress from the people by its choice of "sputniks instead of butter", to quote the leaflet which so upset the Soviet government and its apologists.

These developments in Russia may call for a response in the tactics of the Western governments, and perhaps Crankshaw is calling on them to lay off the "Red tyranny" line because it won't hold water much longer, but the indications for the people of both East and West is surely that while the differences between the two systems are rapidly disappearing, revealing that the supposed ideological conflict in pursuit of which so much effort, freedom and life has been sacrificed was a sham, the system which both of them represent is a thoroughly bad one, which should be resisted by people everywhere. P.H.

**Are YOU  
introducing  
FREEDOM to  
new readers?**

## E. E. CUMMINGS 1894-1962

LONDON, where I received the heart-breaking, unbelievable news, is having its first few, consecutive days of sunny, gay weather, and I find it infuriatingly inappropriate. If ever the skies should rage and storm, this is the time, for one of the greatest poets of the English language—Edward Estlin Cummings—is dead. Those of us who knew and loved him and who honoured his achievement above that of any American artist, find it hardly conceivable that death—death in every form, which was his adversary in so much of his writing—should have managed to overcome so brave, exhilarating and determined an opponent.

Cummings was against all literary, political and social chicanery. He was on the side of life, and that is a perilous and extravagant position to have maintained with unswerving consistency for nearly fifty years, particularly when those years occur in the Twentieth Century, and in the United States.\* His integrity cost him his career, and all possibility of achieving material affluence, but he never would have exchanged one syllable of one word for all the approval of his contemptible critics or for the plodding acceptance of the mediocrities and the demagogues. With the result that, having died a man in modest circumstance, his audience until recent years, negligible, his work alternately suppressed or scurrilously treated, he has left us, among much else, sonnets that rank with Shakespeare's, and satire the

equal of Swift. He was, one must add, without the opportunism of the former, or the annihilatory cynicism of the latter. I never knew a man who, as we say in the States, more "knew the score"; and surely no one of his astounding intelligence and shrewd appreciation of the foibles of mankind who could still go on believing with the humour, gaiety of verve of youth, in man. "The single answer still is man".

Besides more than a dozen volumes of poetry, Cummings wrote essays, fairy tales (unpublished), political memoir and plays. One of these last—*HIM*—is certainly a masterpiece. It is an hilarious fantasy, combining the sensuality, bawdy humour and gaiety of Joyce with the mordant social realism of Brecht. Both as lyric drama and social criticism, it makes the new maddened playwrights on both sides of the Atlantic seem rather amateurish. It was produced in 1928, but only twice, I believe, since then. The most recent production Cummings was obliged to halt on the grounds of the most extraordinary bawdlerization.

In 1933, after a trip to Russia, came *Eimi*, the first exposé of the socialist utopia by a literary figure, and the most succinct expression in the form of personal memoir, of individualist anarchism. This was the book that cost him, beyond all possibility of redemption, his career. The New York literary scene, dominated by the Communists, never forgave him, and when these very same people, still running the show, became within the decade, professional anti-Communists, they somehow forgot what it was they weren't to forgive him about.

Cummings was a superlative essayist. One scarcely knows in which field of letters he excelled. In 1955 his *Non-Lectures* were published (originally delivered at Harvard University) and these establish his kinship with the nineteenth century New England Transcendentalist movement—which also fathered Thoreau—and from which his individualist convictions probably derive.

Cummings was born in Cambridge, Massachusetts, of a New England family centuries old; and he looked it. He was above medium height, but seemed taller, and he was very thin—at least during this last decade of his life, when I knew him. He was nearly bald and his face might be described as gaunt, but perhaps because of its sensual beauty—he had expressive eyes and very full lips—it caused one to imagine a Chaucerian monk; he had a rather precise combination of animal magnetism and spiritual exhalation.

I see that I have neglected to mention his best known work, *The Enormous Room*, which was written when he was just out of his teens. It is certainly the best book by an American to have come out of the First World War, and I think little more need be said about it here than that. I might add, however, that it was required reading, whenever a

copy could be procured, by American pacifists in prison during the Second World War. (History has some continuity.)

Cummings was plagued by outright crooks of the literary world as well as its hirelings. Only this month, had he lived, would have found him engaged in a *contretemps* with the University of Virginia which had recently acquired the stolen manuscript of *The Enormous Room*. More than \$100,000, in true American style, had exchanged hands over this manuscript, not one penny of which had gone to its author.

Perhaps one-third of his time was devoted to painting—his work is represented in museums and private collections—and some estimate must be made of his very considerable achievement in the plastic arts.

Something occurs to me that a greater writer than myself, Rebecca West, said, in paying tribute, in my non-humble opinion to a lesser artist—D. H. Lawrence—than Cummings: "We must ourselves be grievously defeated if we do not regard (his life) as a spiritual victory." Even though death has done his dirty trick again, nothing, not even death, can destroy a man like Edward Estlin Cummings.

DACHINE RAINER.

(A fuller portrait of the man and his achievement will appear in the next issue of ANARCHY.)

### THEATRE

## The Play's the Thing

SEAN O'CASEY fans will be glad to know that The Mermaid Theatre is currently presenting the second production in their O'Casey Festival. *Red Roses for Me* is a better evening at the theatre than was its predecessor *Purple Dust*, chiefly because *Red Roses for Me* is a better play, and it is a better play because it deals with things O'Casey cares about; suffering people, oppressed physically by poverty, spiritually by ignorance, nationally by an alien power: divided by class conflict, religious inheritance, political adherence. Thank God the human spirit rises against oppression, the human heart seeks fellowship, the human mind brightens its wit in exchanges with different concepts—and O'Casey knows it. So he gives us a play as warm and varied as life. The issues are direct rather than subtle, the desires and ambitions of the protagonists uncomplicated and modest, the intellectual conflict of rationalism versus religion perhaps no longer as vital and important from our vantage point as when the play was written. These things make, not a weakness, but the strength of the play. It is the artist's communication to "ordinary people" that their own experiences and wisdom are rich and valuable, and their aspirations achievable from their own capacities.

O'Casey saves his plot from a rigid and too black-and-white platter by splitting the warp of "English oppressor=Protestant religion" and the woof of "Oppressed worker=Irish Catholic". His hero, the strike-leading railwayman, is a Protestant; the hero's desired bride a bourgeois Catholic, daughter of a Catholic member of the Royal Irish Constabulary.

O'Casey's plays seem to me to need the backing of a conventional closed stage and "realist" set. But the Mermaid production is robust, and the cast in general does justice to the play's demands for compassion, for revulsion from hypocrisy and intolerance, and not least for laughter, whether occasioned by absurd credulity or pompous "scientism". Particularly outstanding is the performance of Leonard Rossiter as Brennan o' the Moor, the fantastic, ragged owner of doubtless equally broken-down property, comically shivering over the safety of his few pounds rent in the Bank of Ireland, doing his good deed under cover and with impish glee putting a sly spoke into the general mischief. A minor role I cannot fail to mention is that of Captain Finglass, the shiny-booted, braided, red-plumed officer of the Constabulary from whose person all the violence beneath the dandy exterior is conveyed in John McCarthy's terrifyingly brutal voice.

The play runs until September 22nd. M.C.

## 'Streamlining' the Unions?

Continued from page 1

wages policy. At the most one could induce a mood of a sense of responsibility.

"Our problem is the same as the Government's. We have no power to direct our affiliated unions as the Government has tried to direct us. We must move with the only instruments we have—reason, argument, and an appeal to the solidarity of the working people."

Thus, the Government had two theoretical alternatives: "It could try to impose restraint on working people by law and force—although he doubted if it would succeed in this—or, it could seek to create responsible attitudes which would respond to sensible, fair, reasonable and responsible stimuli.

Maybe Mr. Woodcock's and the General Council's problems are "the same as the government's" and the sooner the workers wake up to the fact the sooner will they themselves decide to reorganise their unions to serve their real interests. Common Markets, Wages Policies, are all concerned with maintaining financial stability, balancing budgets, and preserving the unequal society. "Organised Labour" today should be thinking of how to reorganise production and distribution to satisfy the needs of everybody. The

means of production exist, the technical know-how too; the needs of the people could easily be ascertained and we have the "labour power" to produce these needs. That is the task of the people in our "modern society"! And there is no excuse that there isn't enough to go round. If we stop producing useless things like armaments, and discourage waste, there is not only enough for everybody in the developed countries, but we should be making a start in helping the people of the under-developed countries to enjoy similar prosperity. But the Trade Union Congress at Blackpool last week, however it proposes to reorganise, and streamline; whatever it has done about its "image" and its votecatching potential for the Labour Party, made it quite clear that it remains a pillar of capitalism. "The Tewson epoch has ended" but to our minds the "Woodcock epoch" which has begun is if anything more dangerous. Mr. Woodcock as well as being an ambitious politician is also an intelligent one. Under those black eyebrows lurks a determined bureaucrat, behind the quiet, unemotional voice, a mind made-up. Workers beware!

THE COMMONWEALTH Ministers minus Tunku Abdul Rahman (Malaya), Mrs. Sirima Bandaranaike (Ceylon) and Dr. Nkrumah of Ghana are meeting; the T.U.C. under the other George Woodcock have met and avoided a decision on the Common Market; the British Association have met; and General de Gaulle and Doctor Adenauer have met with food-tasters, blood-plasma banks and two helicopters carrying police and a surgeon accompanying the General. . .

ABOUT 20,000 PEOPLE were killed in an earthquake in Persia which had no connection with a Russian underground explosion in the Caucasus of 2,600 kilograms which took place at about the same time. The report emanating from the United States Forces television network two days later that an earthquake would occur about midnight, which report sent families streaming out of Tehran had likewise no foundation in fact. The Shah of Persia visited the earthquake areas. He spoke to an elderly woman who was weeping, as he entered Boen on foot. "What is the matter," he asked. The woman fell to her knees and kissed the Shah's feet. He helped her up. "I have lost all I had, O Father of the Nation," the woman said. "My husband, two sons and five daughters and my two brothers with all their nine children. This is my home," she added, pointing to a heap of rubble. "I have nothing but you," she said, clinging to the Shah's clothes. The Shah told her, "You do not have to worry. We will build a home for you and do all we can." Princess Soraya, divorced wife of the Shah, postponed the announcement of her engagement to Gunther Sachs von Opel, owing to the earthquake. The Pope sent a telegram expressing his grief at the earthquake. The Pontifical Relief Organization sent prefabricated churches and mobile altars together with emergency food supplies, bedding and other relief to earthquake victims in southern Italy. . .

2,500 BABIES DEFORMED by thalidomide have died in West Germany. Alberta (Canada) doctors suggest that an increase in birth deformities from 5.9 per thousand live births in 1959 to 14.1 in 1961, is abnormal compared with the usual

one to two per thousand in North America. These are not all attributable to thalidomide since the high figure occurred before it was on the market, but since the doctor said he "did not belong to any of those groups that stage sit-down-ban-the-bomb strikes" he did not mention the bomb. He merely mentioned there had been an increase in radiation activity. Farmers in Minnesota were advised to take their herds off pasture and give them stored feed to prevent the level of radio-activity in milk from rising further. The Minnesota Department of Health has disclosed that the radiation level is close to the hazardous range. The Central Electricity Generating Board is considering issuing pills to inhabitants of towns near nuclear power stations to guard them against radiation in case of an accident at the power station. Dr. Michael Ash of Bexhill has developed a strontium-87 lollipop as an antidote to radioactive fall-out. A Finnish professor has discovered what he thinks is an antidote to radioactive fall-out, he removes strontium-90 from saliva and sweat, using special toothpaste and ointment. The Russians exploded an eight megaton nuclear device in the Novaya Zemlya test area. It was the seventh in the present series. U Thant acting Secretary-General of the United Nations criticised the "hair-splitting" that prevented agreement on a halt to nuclear testing. The greatest risk, he said, lay in doing nothing. A drunken American soldier in charge of a truck loaded with explosives rammed a police car, four private cars and a road block before he was halted in Waiblingen, West Germany. . .

A FAMILY OF FIVE was killed in a fire whilst their father was on a trip to Lourdes. A mother on her way to Lourdes to pray for her son's return, had her handbag stolen, and during enquiries at the Turin police station mentioned that her son was missing from home. The police knew they had had him through their hands. They traced the man who at first refused to return home until he heard why his mother was in Turin. When he was told he burst into tears and agreed to return (Catholic Herald, 7/9/62). Five tourist companies advertise trips to Lourdes in the same paper. . .

AN UNEMPLOYED man accused at Richmond of posing as a doctor did so well

that the consultant with whom he worked gave him a testimonial. Mr. Jacob Bar-Or, Tel Aviv District Attorney and one of the prosecutors in the Eichmann trial was sentenced to three months for obtaining a lawyer's licence under false pretences. He has been described by his colleagues as a brilliant jurist but he never completed law school. In the September issue of the Director, it is alleged that executives applying to a firm which helps to fill top-level posts in industry are claiming qualifications which they do not possess or are making false statements on application forms. Six birds were recommended to be struck off the official British list as the



result of the discovery of a hoax. The British Records Committee of the British Ornithologists Union has not authority to remove the birds from the list. . .

PROFESSOR A. J. BIRCH of Manchester University stated that the scientists had "to keep running very hard to stay in the same place" in the search for new drugs. Antibiotics could only hope to keep one step ahead of bacteria. Quarantine restrictions were imposed in Hong Kong after a case of cholera was diagnosed. The disease has been widespread in the Philippines and Formosa for two months. At the International Conference on Water Pollution it was stated that the intense competition for water in the new industrial revolution had made water pollution widespread and it was possible that the Great Lakes could become extinct. Bubonic plague has broken out in Angola, thirteen cases have been reported. A one-year medical study of cigarettes disclosed that filter tips do not entirely eliminate cancer-causing tobacco tars. The smoke proved

capable of causing cancer in mice but the incidence of tumours from mice exposed to filter brands fell. . .

A PATENT has been applied for a pair of shoes that are cooled by an electric fan with a battery and motor under the heel. Also noted at the Convention of Inventions in Los Angeles, a combination knife-and-fork, a dimple-maker, an automatic dog-exerciser, a gliding garter, a pipe-rest for relief of teeth, a sponge with a hole for a cake of soap in the middle, and an electric chair for mice. Girls on Long Island's smartest beach are wearing blue, pink, and pearl-tinted teeth this season. Over sixty individual national promotional schemes are currently being operated ranging from an aluminium chair for 29/- and a coffee label; a mini-car for a breakfast-food competition, free meal-vouchers for stray dogs with tins of dog-food, and free watches to shopkeepers giving high standard window displays of canned-fruit. Sir Alec Guinness has been allocated an 18-room miniature castle outside Madrid completely staffed from chauffeur to scullery maids, whilst he is playing the stoic Emperor Marcus Aurelius in "The Fall of the Roman Empire". He has just returned to the world after two weeks retreat in a 300-year-old monastery at Subiaco—better known to the Express as "the birthplace of Gina Lollobrigida. Readers' Digest claims a circulation of 13½ million and its advertising rate is \$50,800 for a colour page, and \$46,000 for black and white. Total stakes in football pools in the year ending July 31 were £48,401,212 for Littlewoods and £21,891,303 for Vernons. This was a drop of five-and-a-half million on previous years due to bad weather and postal 'go-slow'. A writer in the Guardian, commenting on "built-in obsolescence" and the packaging craze says, "Clearly no country's economy can afford the luxury of the everlasting commodity". . .

THE CHIEF CONSTABLE of Leicester has commented in the Criminal Law Review that meter zone regulations cannot be enforced uniformly and fairly for "where enforcement is strict, meters will produce good traffic conditions at the cost of a very high incidence of offences, a high proportion of non-payment of fixed penalties, a need for considerable administrative staff, a lengthy delay in court proceedings, and bad public relations. Where enforcement is more

lenient, traffic conditions will deteriorate until they are little better than before meters were installed." In South Kensington the police towed away the council dustcart while the crew were having a tea-break. . .

PARENTS in Kentish Town staged a demonstration at a "black spot" road junction where the Ministry of Transport have refused to put a zebra-crossing and one boy was killed and one seriously injured. Teenagers marched through Chesham to protest against lack of youth club facilities. . .

EZZARD PAULUS, a Jamaican decided that life in Britain was too much for him. He was found clinging to a plank of wood in the river at Putney, he said, "I just wanted to stay in the river till I got to the sea—or to Jamaica." JON QUIXOTE.

## LONDON FEDERATION OF ANARCHISTS

### CENTRAL MEETINGS

meetings to be held at The Two Brewers, 40 Monmouth Street, WC2 (Leicester Square Tube) Sundays at 7.30 p.m.  
SEP 16th Brian Leslie An Anarchist's View of Social Credit.  
SEPT. 23 Bonar Thompson (Benefit Lecture) Round the World in Eighty Day; or Jane Eyre.  
SEPT 30 Jack Robinson What is Anarchism?

### Hyde Park Meetings

Sundays at 4 p.m. onwards (Anarchist time) (Weather permitting)

### OFF-CENTRE DISCUSSION MEETINGS

1st Thursday of each month at 8 p.m. at Jack and Mary Stevenson's, 6 Stainton Road, Enfield, Middx.

1st Wednesday of each month at 8 p.m. at Colin Ward's, 33 Ellerby Street, Fulham, S.W.6.

2nd Wednesday of each month at 8 p.m. at Morris Bradley's, 15 Pyrland Road, Newington Green, N.5.

3rd Wednesday of each month at 8 p.m. at Donald Room's, 148a Fellows Road, Swiss Cottage, N.W.3.

Tom Barnes', Albion Cottage, Fortis Green, N.2. (3rd door past Tudor Hotel). Last Wednesday of each month at 8 p.m.

3rd Tuesday at Brian and Doris Lellie's, 242 Amesbury Avenue, S.W.2 (Streatham Hill, Nr. Station).

Notting Hill Anarchist Group (Discussion Group) Last Friday of the month, at Brian and Margaret Hart's, 57 Ladbrooke Road, (near Notting Hill Station), W.11.

## ANARCHY Nos 1-18

Still Available 1/9 Post Free

## Freedom

### The Anarchist Weekly

FREEDOM is published 40 times a year, on every Saturday except the last in each month. ANARCHY (1/8 or 25 cents post free), a 32-page journal of anarchist ideas, is published 12 times a year on the 1st of each month.

### Postal Subscription Rates to FREEDOM and ANARCHY

12 months 32/- (U.S. & Canada \$5.00)  
6 months 16/- (2.50)  
3 months 8/6 (\$1.25)

### Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies

12 months 47/- (U.S. & Canada \$7.50)  
6 months 23/6 (\$3.75)

### AIR MAIL Subscription Rates (FREEDOM by Air Mail, ANARCHY by Surface Mail)

12 months 52/- (U.S. & Canada \$8.00)

### Postal Subscription Rates to FREEDOM only

1 year (40 issues) 20/- (U.S. & Canada \$3)  
6 months (20 issues) 10/- (\$1.50)  
3 months (10 issues) 5/- (\$0.75)

### Air Mail Subscription Rates to FREEDOM only

1 year (40 issues) 40/- (\$6.00)

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

17a MAXWELL ROAD, LONDON, S.W.6, ENGLAND  
Tel: RENOWN 3736.

## FREEDOM PRESS PUBLICATIONS

### SELECTIONS FROM 'FREEDOM'

Vol 1 1951: Mankind is One  
Vol 2 1952: Postscript to Posterity  
Vol 3 1953: Colonialism on Trial  
Vol 4 1954: Living on a Volcano  
Vol 5 1955: The Immoral Moralists  
Vol 6 1956: Oil and Troubled Waters  
Vol 7 1957: Year One—Sputnik Era  
Vol 8 1958: Socialism in a Wheelchair  
Vol 9 1959: Print, Press & Public  
Vol 10 1960: The Tragedy of Africa  
Each volume: paper 7/6 cloth 10/6  
The paper edition of the Selections is available to readers of FREEDOM at 5/6 post free.

PAUL ELTZBACHER  
Anarchism (Seven Exponents of the Anarchist Philosophy) cloth 21/-

CHARLES MARTIN  
Towards a Free Society 2/6

RUDOLF ROCKER  
Nationalism and Culture cloth 21/-

JOHN HEWETSON  
Ill-Health, Poverty and the State cloth 2/6 paper 1/-

VOLINE  
Nineteen-Seventeen (The Russian Revolution Betrayed) cloth 12/6  
The Unknown Revolution (Kronstadt 1921, Ukraine 1918-21) cloth 12/6

HERBERT READ  
Poetry and Anarchism cloth 5/-

TONY GIBSON  
Youth for Freedom 2/-  
Who will do the Dirty Work? 2d.  
Food Production & Population 6d.

E. A. GUTKIND  
The Expanding Environment (illustrated) boards 8/6

PETER KROPOTKIN  
Revolutionary Government 3d.  
Organised Vengeance Called Justice 2d.

Marie-Louise Berneri Memorial Committee publications:

Marie-Louise Berneri, 1918-1949: A tribute cloth 5/-  
Journey Through Utopia cloth 16/- paper 7/6

## Power Struggle in Algeria

Continued from page 1  
their own country along socialistic lines. A revolution of this kind would have avoided the present ignominious scumage for political supremacy, it would have been worthy of the Algerian people and would have at least compensated to some extent for the sufferings and bloodshed of the last seven years.

Instead, the war has been conducted, by the political and military leaders of the rebellion, along authoritarian lines from the very beginning. The F.L.N. was set up as a totalitarian party organisation, in the pure Leninist tradition, ruthlessly determined to extirpate all forms of political opposition to it among its own people, and bent on conquering power for its own ends, just as the Communists have been doing in Russia, Spain, Cuba, etc. The army has thus been used, quite logically, as a means of marshalling and moulding the masses into a docile tool for colonels and politicians to handle. True enough, the population will be given a say in the end: it will be called upon to say "yes" to the triumph of whoever comes on top of the current battle by unanimously electing the victor's candidates in a single-party election. Thus much for democracy, socialism and freedom. The people may have thought they were fighting for peace, bread and dignity, but power was the incentive behind their leaders' action. Now the French have gone, power is in F.L.N. hands—but whose hands? The politicians want it, the colonels have it; in good anarchist logic they intend to keep it. Hence the feud. Anarchists, once again, find themselves to be ruefully right.

We still hope that the opposing sides (there are in fact more than two, since Algeria is divided into military provinces or *willayas*, and

every commanding officer has his own "protégé" among the politicians—hence the confusion) will hesitate to launch upon a second civil war, not because we think they care a jot for the life and welfare of the bulk of Algerians, but because

## STILL IN THE RED!

| FINANCIAL STATEMENT AT SEPTEMBER 8, 1962 |       |                |
|--|-------|----------------|
| WEEKS 35, 36                             |       |                |
| EXPENSES: 36 weeks at £70                |       | £2,520         |
| INCOME:                                  |       |                |
| Sales & Sub. Renewals:                   | £     | £              |
| Weeks 1-34                               | 1,193 |                |
| Weeks 35, 36                             | 30    |                |
|  |       | 1,223          |
| New Subscriptions:                       |       |                |
| Weeks 1-34 (241)                         | 270   |                |
| Weeks 35, 36 (15)                        | 21    |                |
|  |       | 291            |
|  |       | 1,514          |
|  |       | DEFICIT £1,006 |

| DEFICIT FUND  |          |
|---|----------|
| Petaluma: A.M. £1/15/-; Oxford: Anon.* 5/-; Wolverhampton: J.L.* 2/6; Wolverhampton: J.K.W.* 2/-; London: J.R. 12/-; Hounslow: L.* 2/6; Birmingham: M.D. 4/6; Glasgow: J.H.* 10/-; Shoreham: M. & D.* 2/6; Belfast: D.M. 8/-; Berkeley: R.J. £1/15/-; Southend: P.O.* 5/-; Oxford: Anon.* 5/-; Nottingham: H.D. 11/3; London: M.C. 3/8; Alberta: B.G. 6/5; Leeds: G.H.L. 2/6; Latham, N.Y.: D.W. £5/5/-; Wolverhampton: J.L.* 2/6; Wolverhampton: J.K.W.* 2/-; Geneva: K.W. £2; Hounslow: L.* 2/6; Copenhagen: O.H. 2/3; Gateshead G.D. 2/6; Belfast: "Liam" 5/6; Wootton Waven: I.M.C. 2/6; Cheltenham: L.G.W.* £4; Oxford: Anon.* 5/-; Rugby: C.E.F. 4/-; Auckland: K.J.M. 2/-; Surrey: F.B.* 10/-. |          |
| TOTAL   | 20 8 1   |
| Previously acknowledged   | 866 15 7 |
| 1962 TOTAL TO DATE  | £887 3 8 |

GIFT OF BOOKS: Ilford: M.D.  
\*Indicates regular contributor.

they may fear that the situation created by the civil war should "degenerate" into a truly revolutionary situation, one in which the population might not only demonstrate violently against both politicians and colonels but also start organising itself spontaneously along libertarian lines. The growing influence of the hitherto neutral Trade Unions Federation is significant in this respect.

We must not delude ourselves, however. Though the man in the street and the Trade Unions are quite aware that the present conflict has nothing to do with the issues that matter to them (peace, security, work, social equality), and though "enough!" is their unanimous cry, what they mean by it, unfortunately, is not "Away with politicians and soldiers, let us take our lives into our own hands!", but "We have had enough of your personal quarrels: make up your minds as to who is going to govern us with a strong hand!" One is sadly reminded of the fable of the Frogs who clamoured to Jove for a King, and finally got one in the shape of a Stork. The harsh moral of the tale is that storks feed on frogs. We have no wish to make fun of the humiliated and suffering Algerians. But for an anarchist there is something bitterly ironical as well as pathetic in the news-report from Algiers describing how thousands of Algerians spent the night from Saturday to Sunday wandering from one official building to another in search of somebody—anybody—to take control and tell them at last what to do. Sooner or later they will get their government. But whatever satisfaction will then be felt by the Nationalist leaders in having done away with French rule and in being able now to bully their own subjects themselves, we may be sure there will be little comfort in it for the people of Algeria.

C.D.