

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

A new form of economical structure will necessarily require a new form of political structure

KROPOTKIN

The Moscow New Look Extends to Satellites

BRING OUT YOUR DEAD!

THE rehabilitation of Stalin's victims continues, now in the satellite states. For some this means release from prison and some slow return to a 'normal' life under Communist dictatorship, after years of torture and imprisonment.

For some, however, the great discovery about Stalin comes a little bit too late.

In the case of Laszlo Rajk, Hungarian Communist leader, about seven years too late. He was executed in October 1949, in the barbaric variation of hanging which the Hungarian Communists used on their own comrades. He stood on a low stool while the hangman placed a noose round his neck and pulled the rope taut round a hook overhead. Then the stool was kicked out from under him. At that precise moment, from a ladder behind, the executioner reached a hand round the victim's forehead and pulled backward, breaking his neck.

Laszlo Rajk was a faithful Communist who was wounded fighting in the Spanish civil war, worked in Hungary's underground movement during the war, and as Interior Minister in Hungary's post-war régime helped to prepare the Communist coup. Unfortunately for his ambitions, he was not one of the inner group of Moscow-trained Hungarian Communists. Less than a year after becoming Foreign Minister, he was arrested and accused of plotting to overthrow the government.

The usual interrogation and brainwashing ensued. The treatment Rajk had condoned when meting it out to others, was now applied to him—with the same good results. For after three months of the treatment, Rajk was prepared to stand in open court and swear that he had plotted with Communist Renegade Tito "to

lead and organize an anti-Soviet movement in every people's democracy." When the prosecutor asked for the death sentence, Laszlo Rajk said: "I fully agree with your statements, Mr. Prosecutor, and want to state in advance that I will consider the verdict of the court justified." He died a self-confessed spy and traitor.

All good Stalinists accepted this new example of the old practice. Nothing could be wrong with Soviet justice.

Now, however, the great discovery about Stalin has led to a re-examination of the case of the Titoist beast Rajk. The rewriting of the Stalin period and Moscow's wooing of Tito—top projects of the Great Reviser Nikita Khrushchev—require a new version wherever Communists read of the past. Last week the same Moscow-trained Party leader, Premier Matyas Rakosi, who sent Rajk to his death, announced in a speech at Eger that Laszlo Rajk and four fellow defendants had been posthumously cleared of the charges against them.

"After the exposure of the imperialist agent Beria," intoned Rakosi, "our party leadership revised the Rajk trial. It established that the trial had been based on provocation. For this reason the Supreme Court

rehabilitated Comrade Rajk and other comrades."

It's as simple as that. Individuals who have served the Party faithfully and well for years can be assassinated—after their characters have been destroyed first. And, then, their names can be resurrected, when it is necessary to destroy someone else's name.

Can anyone believe that out of this sort of behaviour can come a society based on brotherhood—when there is no brotherhood among the Communists themselves? Based on justice—when their concept of it is simply torture, death and degradation?

The new line may win the woolly-minded. But it is as hypocritical as ever. 'Rehabilitation' may seem an act of 'justice', of righting wrongs. But the wrongs the Communists have done to the revolutionary movements of the peoples of the world can never be righted by their slimy methods.

Khrushchev and Bulganin are Stalin's successors. Rakosi, Ulbricht, Pollitt and the like are the cheap yes-men who lie and twist and turn and will murder their own comrades again and again if their interests so demand. In seeking to rehabilitate the dead they only remind us of their vile misdeeds.

Letter from America

PART TIME CANDIDATE

ONE does not ordinarily think of Ernest Hemingway as a profound political thinker. Yet in an article he wrote for *Esquire* in 1935 apropos of the Spanish war, Hemingway made several observations which apply to to-day's political situation. One of these runs as follows:

"The first panacea for a mismanaged nation is inflation of the currency; the second is war. Both bring temporary prosperity; both bring permanent ruin. But both are the refuge of political and economic opportunists."

It is doubtful if Papa Hemingway thought all this up for himself. He mixed in the best circles over in Spain and may have absorbed a little diluted Lenin. However, he has been on the spot in numerous blood-lettings of political inspiration and it is barely possible that his remarks about inflation and war are the result of his own personal research. At any rate there are few reasonable observers who will contradict them.

I happened to be re-reading Mr. Hemingway on the day the Los Angeles newspapers proclaimed that "Ike Wants Nixon". My own reaction, one that prevails among many of those who own no aircraft factories, guided missile plants or steel mills, is that he can have him and may they both be very happy next year on the farm in Gettysburg, Pa.

Ike wants Nixon for the same reason the industrialists want Ike. Both have the military cast of mind. Nixon held down some kind of sinecure in the Navy during the war. As Commander-in-Chief of the American Expeditionary Forces, General Eisenhower has the deaths of hundreds of thousands on his conscience. Yet with proper medication he sleeps peacefully, particularly during his afternoon nap period when the President of a great nation might judiciously be expected to be on the job. The mounds of mangled bodies that resulted from the General's saying "Bomb!" or "Use tanks!" or "Take Hill 619 at any cost!" presumably do not haunt his dreams; at least he never refers to them when speaking on television, which is my closest contact with him.

Not that I want to make out Ike as an inhuman monster. He is the product of a special environment, an example of what happens to a gifted boy given

rigorous indoctrination and training in a particular direction. A proud grandfather, a conscientious church-goer, a motorized golfer and buggy-riding pheasant shooter, Ike probably does the best he can according to his lights, limited by the blinkers provided him by his advisors.

During his three years in office Ike delegated authority so blithely that the American public tends to blame his underlings for anything that goes wrong, giving Eisenhower credit for the meagre successes of his administration. He seems to rely completely upon compressed briefings by his staff, so compressed that on one recent occasion he didn't know France had acquired a new Premier. He has never been caught reading a newspaper or magazine though it is rumoured he does glance at the heading and final sentence of the documents to which he affixes his signature.

The newspapers, mostly owned by Republicans, treat Eisenhower with extreme tenderness. Yet one learns from these same papers that at his press conferences

Continued on p. 3

Readers Please Note

Spring-Cleaning Our Files

DURING the past week we have gone through our subscribers' lists and have sent out no less than 530 renewal notices to readers where subscriptions are anything from one week to three years overdue. We would point out that the latter are only among our readers outside these islands, who have escaped our attention on the various occasions when we have sent out renewal notices, due to the physical impossibility of combing all our address cards. But this time we have done the job thoroughly (realising, incidentally, that we have readers in most countries of the world).

By return of post some 10 per cent. of our reminders to readers in this country have been answered with renewals, a number of orders for our literature and some contributions to the Deficit Fund. The promptness with which this 10 per cent. replied (and it

International Notes

The French 'Secrets' Case

THE French have, in the course of time, become used to the cynical misbehaviour of their politicians; but the sensational trial in Paris, of Jean Mons, secretary general of the Defence Committee, two of his assistants, and a Tunisian journalist André Baranès, has shocked even the more hardened cynics. The disclosures which have poured forth at the trial, appear to have implicated half the politicians of France, and have indicated more plainly than usual, that it is standard practice to attempt to gain political and personal advantage at the expense of the nation's safety—or for that matter at any expense whatsoever. Needless to say this is no surprise to anarchists!

The trial mainly concerns the leakage of vital information from the department of Defence to a Communist newspaper publisher. However, on many occasions the proceedings have strayed well away from the case in question, and the impression has been created that the wrong people are on trial. In reality the case is being used as a means for the main political parties of the Right and Left to

discredit each other—and it would seem that neither side is having much difficulty.

The most interesting revelation so far, has been perhaps that made by General Navarre, who told the court that a plan which he outlined to the Defence Committee in July, 1953 during the Indo-China war was published in the Left-wing weekly *L'Observateur* four days later. Amongst other things he reported that he did not have enough troops to defend Laos. The Viet Minh duly invaded Laos. The result of this was that Navarre laid down that on no account was Paris to be informed. At the trial he said: "We knew in fact that any military operation known in Paris would not be a surprise to the enemy."

We can only be surprised that the people of the world put their lives in the hands of politicians, under the impression that the man in power has their interests at heart. Time after time the politicians demonstrate that their real interests lie with themselves, regardless of anything else, and yet time after time they are voted back into power.

Viewpoint on

Issues in the Middle East

THE recent clash between the Israeli and Egyptian troops along the Gaza border has decided the United Nations Security Council to send its Secretary General, Mr. Dag Hammarskjöld on a 'peace mission to the Middle East'.

While it is readily recognised that an independent arbitrator can sometimes help conflicting groups to resolve their differences it is not easy to accept the independent nature of the United Nations Security Council. Whatever Mr. Dag Hammarskjöld can achieve on a personal basis in lessening 'tension' between Israel and Egypt, the final decision lies with the United Nations within which is grouped powerful nations with conflicting interests and the power of veto. In addition 'differences' of the kind which exist between the Jewish State and the Arab States are unlikely to be resolved by diplomatic methods. For the Jews the struggle is a question of survival; for the Egyptians the destruction of the Jewish State, and for the thousands of Palestinian refugees they can only see hope for the future in the total elimination of the State of Israel. For the Western Powers the Middle East is viewed in terms of economic and strategic interests, and as James Cameron points out this morning (*News Chronicle*, April 9th):

"The West has not got clean hands in the Middle East; the Anglo-U.S. interests have always been selfish, an inextricable tangle of commercial and strategic propositions which sometimes interlock and occasionally—as to-day in the Persian Gulf—meet in rivalry."

The Russian concern for the sovereign rights of the Arabs which was expressed recently by Mr. Sobolev in the U.N. when he said that the West was "planning to violate sovereign Arab rights", can be taken as another attempt to consolidate Russian influence in the Middle East.

Israel views the matter differently and think that nothing would suit the West more than "the elimination of that embarrassing anomaly, the Jewish State", and certainly the West's indecision on defensive weapons for Israel would indicate that either they consider such a step to be unsafe at this time in terms of Egypt's reaction or, they would be happy to see the elimination of that "embarrassing anomaly".

As we see it, unless the West has an alternative hold on the Arab States thus safeguarding Anglo-U.S. interests Israel represents at the moment an important foothold in the Middle East, and if it becomes necessary for British interests she will supply all the arms that are necessary.

When viewed as a State, Israel displays all the manifestations of any other state and for this reason we cannot support its actions. But we would fall short of human understanding if we failed to recognise that a people who have a history of persecution might feel it necessary to take extreme measures to prevent history repeating itself.

U.S. Communist's Extra Prison Sentence

NEW YORK, MARCH 26.

Gilbert Green, an American Communist leader who was sentenced to five years' imprisonment for conspiring to teach and advocate violent overthrow of the Government, was given an additional three years on contempt of court charges to-day.

Green, a fugitive for five years until he surrendered here recently, was convicted of contempt for jumping bail and failing to surrender in 1951 on the original conviction. Green said he became a fugitive in a "patriotic effort to protect the people of the United States."

Reuter.

THEATRE

LIFE IN THE RAW

"THE WALTZ OF THE TOREADORS" by JEAN ANOUILH at the CRITERION THEATRE is one of Mr. Anouilh's supreme 'Pièces Noires', though, with exquisite mastery, he has turned his glaring searchlight on MARRIAGE into a farce, which, though always bitter, manages to be extremely funny throughout most of the evening. At moments he is brazenly macabre, 'Strindbergian', in a savage wild 'Dance of Death'—but most of the play is wrapped up in laughter, even if it is sometimes hollow. The success of the present production (richly deserved), proves again what Shaw knew so well in handling an audience; that you can expose any truth however unpleasant, so long as you can throw it away with a laugh. A laugh at our own expense perhaps? But take that as we will.

"The Waltz of the Toreadors" is an offshoot, or rather a healthy branch, of the author's earlier "Ardèle", which I have only read, but I understand that the London production was seriously mis-handled. We meet the same General St. Pé, from whom no housemaid is safe, a successful campaigner, an esteemed soldier. He is tied to the same bed-ridden wife, who is jealous of his every moment, of his innermost thoughts, of his secret desires which she cannot blot out.

Seventeen years earlier, at a ball, at Saumur, while the band played The Waltz of the Toreadors, he had met his ideal love. He was then a handsome, dashing young major. He was of course in love with her, but even more with his youth, and this is the dream he tries to keep forever young, unchanged, and unfulfilled, because in the case of this one young woman, he neither made her his wife or his mistress, he could not bear to hurt the woman he had married already, perhaps he could not bear to turn one more dream into reality and subsequent disillusion. So he fed both himself and his sweetheart on the dream of their love.

After seventeen years the object of this youthful passion turns up at his house. She has kept herself chaste for him, waited and waited foregoing life till it is almost too late. The general still cannot bear to break it with his wife, he delays to take action and the inevitable happens.

Mr. Anouilh with the brazen theatricality of which he is master pursues the farce to its bitter and conventionally

theatrical ending to the extent of making the general's young secretary, a hitherto pure and virginal young man, whom he has lectured on the art of living, turn out to be, not only the seducer at the eleventh hour of his ideal love, but also his own son, the result of one of his early indiscretions.

The play bears the same stamp as "Ardèle" and has one or two parallels but the core of it, in contrast to the earlier play, is compassion, sympathy, and not merely contempt for his fellow sufferers. In this tragi-comedy he has discarded anything that flavours of the fantastic and gets down to the bare knuckle-bone. It has a disquieting undertone, which echoes back at us through our own lives.

The general's life is a farcical guilt-ridden round of delusion. A fight, a fight for possession, a burying alive of the individual and with it the joy of life. Its moral; that it is a mistaken notion to be afraid of hurting, as the doctor remarks: "never understand your enemies". "Never even want to understand the other fellow", it is fatal in the dash for happiness, fulfilment, lust or what you will. It is his failure to be able to hurt that makes the general a slave. And above all he is a slave to his own foolish incurably romantic heart which refuses to grow up along with his paunch and his grey whiskers.

The wife, who, in "Ardèle" was so obsessed by the sex urge all round her as to get distorted as a character, here becomes a terrifying symbol of marriage in all its power and possessiveness, power over another human being, horrifying in her awareness.

Miss Beatrix Lehmann in one tremendous scene manages to repel us and at

the same time enlist our sympathy in spite of her ogreish manifestations. We identify ourselves with the husband, covering appalled but fascinated in a corner. Miss Lehmann has never been better. She is frightening, pathetic, tragic, and ludicrously comic. She never overstresses or overtips into mawkishness or grand guignol. She unveils her innermost greed and devouring passion with true abandon. Here, in fact we have 'les secrets de la vie privées', or marriage with the lid off. A microscopic peep into the endless years that passed between them.

Mr. Hugh Griffiths sustains the long part of the general with admirable sureness and variety, a life-size performance, rich in understanding. The entire cast act well, but particular mention should be made of Walter Hudd as the family doctor and Brenda Bruce as the general's only love.

I was just a little too aware, and became dubious about the general's numerous explosions on the lines of: "suffering catfish", or "thundering cannonballs!" or words to that effect. I rather feel that Mr. Anouilh's explosives must be of a more virulent nature. This sort of wording may of course have been necessitated by the censor (as I did not see the play at the Arts Theatre Club I cannot be sure of this). It may also have been intended to lend a sort of period quality to an otherwise quite admirable translation by Lucienne Hill.

The production, by Peter Hall, is subtle and faultless.

"Will this farce never end?" asks the general. But there is always the consolation of the housemaid, round and soft and accommodating, to foster the illusion that he is not alone. As the darkness gathers he puts his arm round her and disappears into the shadows of his garden. D.

EXHIBITION

L. S. LOWRY, PAINTER

MOST people interested in pictures are familiar with the paintings of L. S. Lowry. His current exhibition at the Lefevre Gallery in Bruton Street is wholly enjoyable and interesting. The world he paints—the industrial work-a-day wilderness of anywhere where there are factories, dumps, desolated plots, narrow streets and alleys—the kind of dreary scene which confronts millions of workers each morning of their lives—is Lowry's chosen locality, and within these limits he creates his quietly expressed love of the people, their homes, their lives and work places. Lowry is the kind of painter who is naturally in love with his subject, sees its essential simplicity and states its typical aspects with as little special pleading as possible. Among the painters who by their subject matter could be called "painters of the people" (artists who have lived and worked in heavily industrialised communities and who have developed special characteristics and sympathies arising out of that experience and the attempt to understand it), Lowry must stand supreme. In each of these pictures a deep sense of identity exists between the painter and his subject; never forced, nor self-conscious but always unmistakably there.

It is this sense of common origin expressed without sentimentality—without the dramatic overtones and theatrical gloom so usual in paintings to-day, depicting "the people" and their lugubrious part in the primordial obscurity of heavy industry—that distinguishes Lowry's work so plainly and so inevitably from others in this particular field, and gives to his pictures the mark of genius.

Lowry's view of the Black Country is paradoxically, a white one. His streets are forever agleam with light, his buildings break their bleak geometrical silhouettes upon a white skyline, and the figures of the work people that inhabit these streets are stark and uncompromising, yet intensely human. They come alive with a bright vividness, a manifest rightness in an atmosphere peculiarly theirs. There is a small picture in which a procession winds its way around a street corner—it is so typical of the kind of unannounced happening that one does see in these localities where the Salvation Army marches down the same road as the striker and the football fan. The variety of scene is part of the immense charm and delight of Lowry's paintings. The gaiety of the promenading holiday-makers, of the dog-track habitue, the narrow haunting desolate alleyway, and the grim yet brightly coloured little buildings and shops against a background of stark, huge factory roofs and chimneys.

Lowry is a painter whose special achievement has been to become the master of a kind of painting that tells us more about the lives and the environment of working people in industrial towns than any other artist at work to-day, and to tell it without once causing us to feel that we are being emotionally coerced. R.S.

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

OPEN DAILY

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

New Books . . .

The Permanent Purge: Politics in Soviet Totalitarianism
Z. K. Brzezinski 38/-
The Russian Marxists and the Origins of Bolshevism
L. H. Haimson 45/-
Birdman of Alcatraz
T. E. Gaddis 16/-
The Second International
G. D. H. Cole (2 vols.) set 70/-
Ideas and Opinions
Albert Einstein 25/-
The Englishness of English Art
Nikolaus Pevsner 16/-

Reprints and Cheap Editions . . .

Metaphysics Aristotle 7/-
The Betrothed A. Manzoni 7/-
The Normal Child
C. W. Valentine 3/6
Second-Hand . . .
Conspiracy of Silence
Alex Weissberg 4/6
Dynamite
Louis Adamic 15/-
Decentralize for Liberty
Thomas Newes 2/6
Leon Blum before his Judges 2/6
Mankind in the Making
M. Cathcart Borer 2/6
The Preacher and the Slave
Wallace Stegner 4/-
Germany in Revolution
L. E. Matthaei 2/6
The Game
Jack London 4/-
Whither Mankind?
Beard,
Russell, Mumford 3/6
Vain Victory Stefan Schimansky 3/-
Verdict of Three Decades
Berkman, Goldman, Serge, etc. 32/6
God and my Neighbour
Robert Blatchford 5/-
Spanish Treatment
Arthur Koestler 5/6

Postage free on all items

Obtainable from

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

PROGRESS OF DEFICIT

(see page 4)

Review

SOCIALISM & THE CHURCHES*

THIS essay by one of the dramatic figures of the struggling days of the Marxist revolutionary movement was written in 1905. Its publication by the group of left-wing Labour Party members who organize "Vanguard Publications" is intended as the first of a series of socialist classics, which are being reprinted apparently with the two-fold purpose of helping to spread knowledge of the early days of the socialist movement, and also of making use of their relevance to the changed situation facing progressive movements in 1956.

It contains a brief but illuminating survey of the development of the Christian movement from a grouping of communities practicing communal ownership of goods into a massive organisation reflecting the class structure and inequality of the society of which it formed part, and which now gave it official recognition and protection. Extracts are given from the writings of two of the Church fathers who preached against this, calling for an internal change of heart from the Christians themselves, and a return to their former habits of communal life and collective ownership, which had characterized the early days. Needless to say the rich and influential members of the church took no notice of this, and the wealth and power of the hierarchy was firmly established and developed to the position in which in several countries the church is the most powerful landowner.

Rosa Luxemburg attributes this development partly to the actual theories of the Christians, who were only interested in sharing the goods they possessed, the products of their labour, and not in the socialization of the means of production, and accounts for it partly by the theory that a free society could not develop out of a slave society, but had to wait for an appropriate stage of historical development.

In commenting on the actual rôle of the church in her time, she remarks on the greater prevalence of violent crimes in Catholic areas. It might be true to say that this kind of direct social consequence of religion is more important than the aspect of providing a myth to opiate the workers, a narrower ground of criticism on which Marxists usually concentrate.

The essay ends with a warning against two methods which the church used against revolutionary activity. The first

is the doctrine that people should accept a hard lot on earth in the hope of a future paradise, and the second the formation of organizations to deflect the workers from a militant path.

As the editors point out, although Rosa Luxemburg could not have foreseen it, this has relevance to the development of the Labour and Trade Union movements. From being small revolutionary-minded communities they have become one of the great obstacles in the way of social freedom. Is this due to the fact that their ideology was also wrong, to objective conditions beyond their control, or is it an inevitable development of all movements?

The pamphlet is well worth reading as a reminder of the early days of the Marxist movement, as a concise summary of the development of the Christian Church, and for its presentation in a different setting of the problem of the regression of idealistic movements. And because, although in a slightly different context and a slightly different form, the church is doing the same kind of dirty work to-day. P.H.

*Socialism & the Churches, Rosa Luxemburg, 6d.

The Awkward Deputy

IT has been a sadly spoilt Easter for many French politicians. Gnawing at them during the holidays in their constituencies was the astonishing example set by an obscure young fellow M.P.

His name is Constant Lecœur, a newly-elected Radical who upset peaceful parliamentary routine with his decision to volunteer to fight in Algeria. Such patriotic zeal seemed almost quixotic. After all, not a single M.P. went to fight in Indo-China.

The intriguing fact is that M. Lecœur, a 32-year-old farmer, is not a firebrand Nationalist who wants to put Algerians in their place. On the contrary, he rashly promised his electors peace in Algeria and the return home of the Reservists.

There is no sign of peace and a new call-up is imminent. M. Lecœur considers it only logical that he should share the fate of the young men who elected him.

News Chronicle, 4/4/56.

Reflections on Anarchism, 'Facilism' & Motives

WE return to the subject of what our Paris comrade, A. Prunier, described last week, and develops in the present issue, as our "facilism", not because we have been "nettled" by his strictures and seek to defend a position which in fact we cannot recognise as ours, but, instead, to examine what are the possibilities for anarchists and libertarian socialists to translate a part of their "utopian" future society into the practical language of the present. We think this a subject deserving of wide discussion among anarchists as well as among other sympathetic readers of FREEDOM, and what we have to say now is meant more as an incitement to such a discussion than as an exhaustive exposé of what the present editorial writer has to say, or what anarchists have been writing and saying on the subject over the years.

WE believe that comrade Prunier in comparing our views with that "facilism" against which Malatesta "lashed out more than once" reveals that he has a confused view both of Malatesta's ideas and our realism. The key sentence in Prunier's criticism of our editorial on Motor Car Tests (FREEDOM, March 10) reads:

"Malatesta lashed out more than once against our proneness to facilism. Well, comrades, to cause or to allow anyone to believe that the disappearance of government and money (which at the present time control very many human actions) will be enough to cause the disappearance for ever of all those problems that this control raises appears to me to be a very dangerous "facilism".

What we in fact wrote was:

In the anarchist society—that is the society in which government no longer

functions, because initiative and responsibility have passed to the people; in which the money system has ceased to exist, because competition, production for profit and privileges have disappeared; where status is no longer measured by wage packets, and success by the bank balance—in the anarchist society, we were saying, there will be no problem of "dangerous" cars.

Perhaps the passages here italicised were missed by comrade Prunier, but for us, at least, they have importance and were not written into that long sentence simply as padding. Indeed some readers may recall that we set off another controversy a year ago when we refused to be drawn into supporting the Poujadiste movement simply because it was ostensibly created to fight the tax-collector. For the same reason obviously we do not believe that the abolition of government and money *per se* means the social revolution or the achievement of anarchy. Therefore the example Prunier gives, elsewhere, of the fate of Hispano-Suizas and Cadillacs in Barcelona, far from invalidating our arguments seems to us a confirmation of our "realism". For us road safety is as much a question of social responsibility and a revolution in values as is the equitable and ethical solution of the economic problems of the world. Underlying both is individual relationships and motives, and not the magnitude of the problem.

IF some readers are puzzled by our concern for motives even in matters concerning cars, let us quote from an advertisement which appeared in a recent issue of *The Autocar*, by way of illustration.

"There's always a good selection of Used Cars you can trust—All of them

EXAMINED AND TESTED by the Ministry of Transport VEHICLE INSPECTION STATION, HENDON.

As "realists" we welcome this move (and in saying so we are unconcerned that the Ministry spokesman's comment was almost identical: "We are pleased to note this development"). Using Prunier's arguments (apart from awarding them emblems and other distinctions—as he proposes in the first part of his letter) one should view this move* as an example of voluntary co-operation and "fair-play" and a small practical example of what we anarchists preach. Not being in fact *facilists* we look under the surface of such actions for motives, and find, according to the *News Chronicle's* motoring correspondent that: "The second-hand car trade is getting a boost because some dealers are sending their cars to the government testing station at Hendon" . . . that "most customers seem to think it will save money later on" and, say the dealers, "it has helped us too". In weighing up the evidence two more points should be taken into account: (1) that the test is only roadworthiness and not a mechanical inspection of engine and transmission, (2) the pre-sale check-up applies only to post-war cars.

Even accepting that from the point of view of road safety the move made by some second-hand dealers is in the right direction, what relation has it to, what practical step is it towards, the achievement of the free society? The dealers foreseeing a slump in the second-hand car

*Or at least some of his arguments, for if one reads the whole of this article one finds that he argues both ways.

Continued on p. 3

Anarchism, 'Facilism' & Motives

Continued from p. 2

market following the introduction of compulsory tests, take the necessary steps to comply with the official standards (that there has been no change of heart is evidenced by the fact that while they guarantee that the brakes and windscreen wipers conform they give no guarantee as to the conditions of the engine, with which the forthcoming legislation is not concerned!) The purchaser, so we are told, is less concerned with his responsibility to his fellow beings than with buying a car which will pass the official test and which "will save money later on". We can foresee a situation where, through government legislation and the various processes of the money system, there will be no dangerous cars on the roads of this country without any change in the thinking processes of car dealers or motorists!

BUT it does not apply to motor cars alone. Never has the working class been more organised than to-day. Yet who would say that we are nearer the free society than when the pioneers of Trade Unionism were struggling, at great sacrifice to themselves and their dependents, to obtain recognition of their right to organise for the improvement of their conditions? Who can say that the vast Co-operative movement to-day is any nearer to representing the needs of the consumer than it was when the first co-operative shop was established in Rochdale (why, even the miserable assistants in these shops are no better off economically or socially than their counterparts in the "Home and Colonial" or any other chain store).

THERE is no shortage of organisation to-day. Everything and everybody is organised. But the idea behind all organisation is that those who are organised, and the public which is served by them, shall have no ideas (other than that of material improvement and "keeping up with the Jones'") Organisation is as essential to life as bread and television.

For this reason whilst we agree with those who declare that what is wrong with the world is that it is organised to serve the wrong interests, we believe they put the cart before the horse when they concentrate their attack on organisation, believing that they can by-pass the development and consolidation of thought processes, the building-up of human values and individual and collective ethics without which no organisation can grow which is not doomed to stagnation and centralisation, apathy and executive control, long before it has acquired a mass following.

We believe this approach as unrealistic as that of comrades who, as one of FREEDOM's editors put it, † in stressing the need for social change to begin with the individual develop an attitude of "rejection of—even hostility towards—the belief in social forms of struggle and of organisation".

Both these extremes have in common the fault of converting the means into ends. The "one-man revolution" when it ceases to be a stepping-stone, a social apprenticeship, leading to something bigger and reaching for wider horizons than the eye and the ego can encompass, becomes exhibitionistic and cranky, admired perhaps, but rarely accepted as a position to be followed and adopted. Organisation which believes that a Constitution as a substitute for a human conscience, and, as in the revolutionary C.N.T. in Spain, is to be regarded as supra-

†P.S. in Anarchism & Gradualism, FREEDOM, Jan. 14, 21, 28, 1956.

BOOK REVIEW

A Study in Comic Intolerance

THE news, that clergy throughout Britain had been invited to make Lord's Day Observance the subject of their sermons on April 8, prompts me to write a note on the extremely odd society which has issued the invitation.

An elderly acquaintance of mine is fond of telling a story (which he thinks is amusing), about when he was eight years old and sold newspapers in the street. One bright, cheerful Sunday, when business was good and the world was at peace, he spotted a paperless gentleman passing his pitch, and called a polite "Paper, Sir?"

The gentleman approached with a frown like thunder, used a matching voice to ask "WILT THA SELL ME A PAPER ON T' LORD'S DAY?" and without waiting for an answer hit the lad's face with his walking stick. It transpired later that he was a member of the Lord's Day Observance Society.

Of course, I tell that story only for its entertainment value, and not because I think it says anything about the Society or its members generally. If fair generalisations about movements could be based on the behaviour of bad-tempered adherents in the 1880's, it would be fair to say "anarchists are bomb-throwers". For fair evidence about the ideology and activities of the LDOS, I refer to a six-penny pamphlet issued by the society itself this year, to commemorate its hundred and twenty-fifth anniversary,* and there I find, not, indeed, the same physical brutality, but the same incredible intolerance as was apparent in the Victorian worthy.

*For Christ and His Day: The Story of the 125 years' work of The Lord's Day Observance Society.

human, is doomed to stagnation, and the fate of French and Italian Syndicalism and British Trade Unionism. Organisation, as we see it is the expression of the common purpose and aspirations of individuals. Revolutionary organisation is the symbol as well as the expression of successful "one-man revolutions".

THE rôle of anarchist propagandists (in the view of the present writer, for we can commit neither our fellow editors nor our anarchist comrades) is, at least, in this country and in America, what some (including some anarchists) may call the "negative" approach of anarchism. That is, to direct our attack at the very foundations of existing society with factual and ethical argument; to expose the duplicity of politics and the code of values on which present society is founded; to sow the seed of doubt and use all our own experiences to stimulate curiosity.

To our minds significant cracks in present society will be visible when for many men and women "freedom" will become a yearning for the leisure to pursue an occupation which produces neither power nor idleness-with-an-income; when time is not money but a pleasant struggle to do all the creative or socially (or even personally) useful things one wants to do in one's short span of life; when one judges the value of the Jones' by other yardsticks than external appearances such as their home, their dual T.V. aerials or Mrs. Jones' headgear.

Without decrying Community experiments, co-operative ventures... or even attempts to organise motor-car drivers (assuming that we have drawn no conclusions from the fate of the A.A.) we question the revolutionary significance (as opposed to the personal) of such activity. As a matter of fact, the world is full of people who live useful, humble but socially significant lives though few of them may reach the newspaper headlines. Some are religious people others are atheists, some have what appear to us backward political ideas others are anarchists or socialists. Their lives however only have meaning and a deep impact on their surroundings when the "ordinary folk" can understand their values. This is the problem, and until we solve it, we are virtually speaking a different language whether in words or by example.

My elderly acquaintance thinks his story is funny; I don't. The pamphlet, however, I find uproarious. I see nothing comic in intolerance itself, however extreme, but I always enjoy the stock comic character of the ineffective authoritarian, the humourless bully who tries to impose his will on others, and fails. Let me hasten to add I have seen the joke done better. A circus clown I saw, for instance, was shouting orders up a ladder when the clown on top upset a bucket of whitewash on him; the pompous snob in one of Evelyn Waugh's novels has his chemical closet exploded under him. The Lord's Day Observance Society is merely ignored.

But the LDOS is historical fact, not comic invention, and the pamphlet is the seriously-intended work of the ineffective authoritarians themselves, pompously denouncing the wickedness of those who ignore them. It is a veritable gem of authentic unconscious humour, even though (like some literal gems) it is not worth a tanner.

IT appears that the LDOS was founded on the 8th of February, 1831. The pamphlet tells us that in that year William IV was crowned, Michael Faraday built a dynamo, Exeter Hall was opened in the Strand, Poland was at war with Russia, and Britain was at peace. Strangely enough, it omits the information, more relevant (one might suppose), to its subject, that at that time most people worked a six-day week and a twelve-, fourteen- or sixteen-hour day.

The then Bishop of London had written a pastoral letter regretting that people were enjoying themselves on Sundays, which moved the Rev. Daniel Wilson to preach seven sermons and found a society. If the object of this society had been merely to "Observe the Lord's Day", with whatever ceremonies, etc., and on whatever days, the members chose, it would have been quite innocuous. If it had restricted itself to propaganda, it could have been no worse than a nuisance. But from its very inception, the object to which it has devoted most of its energy has been

"5. To promote... Petitions to the Legislature... for the enactment of such laws as may be necessary for repressing the open violation of the Lord's Day... with the result that it has been a failure.

There were, in 1831, a multitude of laws forbidding pleasurable or useful activity on Sunday, to which the early LDOS intended to add. But there was also an expanding economy, and a strong movement for reform. "Every liberal law", as Kropotkin has it, "may be summed up in these words, abolition of laws grown irksome to the middle class itself..." and among the first laws to grow irksome were those prohibiting commercial activity on Sundays.

So the first battle the LDOS had was, not to promote legislation to forbid breathing hard on the Lord's Day, or what have you, but to prevent legislation permitting the carriage of mail by rail on Sunday. They lost.

"This was followed by applications for power to run passenger trains on Sundays from company after company. The Society used every endeavour to prevent such desecration... until 1956 witnesses not only regular services on Sundays, but unbridled (sic) cheap Excursions on that day."

FREEDOM PRESS

- VOLINE :**
Nineteen-Seventeen (The Russian Revolution Betrayed) cloth 12s. 6d
The Unknown Revolution (Kronstadt 1921, Ukraine 1918-21) cloth 12s. 6d.
- E. A. GUTKIND :**
The Expanding Environment 8s. 6d
- V. RICHARDS :**
Lessons of the Spanish Revolution 6s
- MARIE-LOUISE BERNERI :**
Neither East nor West cloth 10s. 6d., paper 7s. 6d
Workers in Stalin's Russia 1s
- ALEX COMFORT :**
Delinquency 6d
Barbarism & Sexual Freedom boards 3s. 6d
- PETER KROPOTKIN :**
The State: Its Historic Rôle 1s
The Wage System 3d
Revolutionary Government 3d
Organised Vengeance Called Justice 2d

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

Autobiography of an Ex-Leftist

IN TIME OF TROUBLE by Claud Cockburn. Hart-Davis, 16s.

THIS is Cockburn's autobiography. A grandson of the (in)famous judge, he became a successful correspondent of *The Times*, developed left-wing views and resigned soon after the American depression of 1929 set in. He decided to start a duplicated weekly newsletter called *The Week* which, since it would be quite independent of financial and other influences, could give the sort of news and comment that Fleet Street would not publish.

He succeeded sufficiently well to be fiercely denounced by Ramsay MacDonald, and described as "the root of all anti-Nazi evil" by Ribbentrop. Later he joined the staff of the *Daily Worker*, where, he says, he was usually regarded as some sort of spy but was tolerated because he wrote so well.

Unfortunately this does not wholly apply to the latter part of the book and there is little attempt at a continuous narrative; instead we have some very good stories.

Amongst others we find the austere neighbour who wore a tea-cosy on his head when Queen Victoria came to tea; his Oxford tutor saying goodbye—"Hitherto your life has been neatly criss-crossed by school terms and holidays, university terms and vacations. Now you are going down from Oxford and you have—well one may say that you have a straight run to the grave"; the remarks of Wilmott Lewis, a Washington correspondent of *The Times*—"one should perhaps avoid being hypercritical of acts of high policy. Take the charitable view, bearing in mind that every government will do as much harm as it can and as much good as it must"; "do not underestimate his capacity for snatching defeat from the very jaws of victory"; and "you may rely upon him to maintain a firm grip on the obvious".

Good, clean, intellectual fun spiced with Marxism. M.G.W.

AFTER that early defeat came defeat after defeat: Sunday opening of museums, Sunday trams and buses, Sunday papers, Sunday papers with pictures, and finally Sunday games and cinemas. The two small victories it boasts are both recent, and consist merely in postponing of liberal legislation: rejection of a Bill to permit Sunday theatres in wartime, and rejection of the "Sunday Observance Bill", which sought to put Common Informers out of business. The Society, however, makes it quite clear that, if only it could, it would re-impose every Sunday restriction that was current in 1831, and then invent some more. And as for the Atheists, Jews, Catholics, tolerant persons and others who would object to such restrictions, serve them right for not having the same beliefs as LDOS members.

Students of idea-clusters will be interested to know that the LDOS is one of the few organisations in Britain, and probably the only avowedly religious organisation, which still thinks of "the Empire". The photograph of their dismal Fleet Street office is captioned *Witnessing in the Heart of the Empire*, and one of the emblems they publish depicts a globe with a big Union Jack sticking out of it, surrounded by the slogan: "AN HONOURED SUNDAY MEANS AN EXALTED EMPIRE". One wonders whether LDOS membership overlaps that of that other, more recent, gathering of ineffective authoritarians, the British Empire Loyalist League.

"Greetings", says the pamphlet as it nears its end, "from our President, Sir Cecil P. G. Wakeley, Bart., K.B.E., C.B., F.R.C.S., D.Sc.:

"One hundred and twenty-five years is a long time and we thank Almighty God that our Society has been blessed throughout these years... Never before in the history of Britain has the Lord's Day been so desecrated as it is to-day..."

I have nothing to add.

D.R.

Letter from America

Continued from p. 1

the reporters who question Ike are first careful to include background information in their questions. This is to make sure that Ike has some vague idea of what is going on before he puts his foot into it.

If Ike had ever read Hemingway he would have had to wade through a lot of bull-fighting, fishing and hunting before he learned that inflation and war are the disastrous expedients of political opportunists. Under the Republican administration we already have something like inflation. The stock market has been spiralling upward since Ike took office and the announcement of his availability for another four years sparked a further leap into the blue. The price index goes up a fractional point each week and the buying power of the dollar steadily drops. Ike promises more of the same if re-elected. He calls it prosperity.

Here in Los Angeles the plane factories are humming, the guided missile manufacturers are expanding, the want ad columns are full of calls for engineers and draftsmen, machine workers and electronic technicians. All this activity is predicated upon the theory that the Russians are deep dark untrustworthy villains whom we must be prepared to exterminate. The Civil Defence Administration makes periodic calls for airplane spotters and transportation experts to prepare evacuation of cities. Groups of housewives who have been mechanised into idleness are quick to volunteer so they can sit out on hillside and look for imaginary enemies, at the same time holding hands and flirting with clerks and minor bureaucrats of the opposite sex who are pressured into volunteering in order to keep their jobs.

The present "prosperity" is based upon fear of attack and preparation for war. Most of the Republicans want Ike because he can be controlled like a puppet on a string. If the Russians make friendly overtures they can whisper to Ike that it is a trick and depend upon the President to read with conviction the speech written for him by those who have a vested interest in avoiding international harmony. The extreme right wing of the Republicans, led by Senator Knowland from my state, think Ike is a little soft. But they haven't a Chinaman's chance of getting one of their own in the White House. Speaking of Chinamen, Knowland is usually referred to among liberals as "The Senator from Formosa", since his chief concern seems to be for the welfare of Chiang Kai Shek.

Ike wants Nixon for the same reason the warlords want Ike. He is dependable, reliable and gifted with the ability to rationalize any course of action he is called upon to espouse. Nixon's one drawback is that he sometimes upsets the applecart by going too far. Last year he confided to a group of editors that American boys would soon be fighting in Indo-China. The resulting uproar when his prophecy leaked out was enough to postpone American intervention in that sector.

To end this communicate on a note of cheer, it is quite possible that Ike and Nixon will be rejected next November by American voters. The Vice President has never really lived down the scandal that resulted when his private slush fund from California bankers and industrialists was exposed during the last campaign. True he confused the issue somewhat by putting a little dog on television while he tried to explain and by complaining of his wife's lack of a mink coat. But he rode into office on Ike's coat-tails and couldn't be elected a dog-catcher on his own.

Eisenhower himself is extremely vulnerable on the health front. The Democrats will make a strong issue of the dangers in electing a part-time President. And Ike with his numerous vacations, his naps and rest periods, his failure to meet Ambassadors and otherwise fulfil the constitutional duties of his office, and continued absorption of large amounts of medicine, including a daily blood thinner, is providing the opposition with more and more ammunition.

If Eisenhower sticks to his announced intention to campaign only by radio and television, with no campaign swings around the country to meet the voters, he can be licked.

What the Democrats lack is a popular figure to capture the public imagination and focus it on the future. Kefauver with his coon-skin cap and his television smirk is a second-rate competitor. Governor Harriman of New York has a Wall Street background and too much money. Adlai Stevenson seems to be a sound figure with plenty of intelligence and a large fund of courage and integrity. His principal drawbacks are one, that he is so clever the numbskulls distrust him and two, he has lost once before.

Perhaps someone like "Soapy" Williams, Governor of Michigan, will emerge as the fair-haired boy who can do a day's work without a shot of digitalis and beat the pants off Ike. I devoutly hope so.

RIDGELY CUMMINGS.

London Anarchist Group Sunday Meeting

Workers' Control in Co-Operative Co-Partnerships

ANARCHISM is the philosophy of society without authority. It affirms the supremacy of the social principle over the political principle, and seeks, in Kropotkin's words, "the most complete development of individuality combined with the highest development of voluntary association in all its aspects... ever changing, ever modified associations which carry in themselves the elements of their durability and constantly assume new forms, which answer best to the multiple aspirations of all". It follows that the form of industrial organisation which anarchists advocate is workers' control, and since the 'Co-operative Co-partnerships' allied together in the Co-operative Production Federation are the nearest thing to workers' control in this country, it is appropriate that last Sunday's lecture on them by Mr. Norman Carr of the CPF should open the Malatesta Club's series on *Workers' Control in Practice*.

These societies have been described before in FREEDOM (21/2/1953), but they are so little known that it is worth reporting Mr. Carr's lecture at length.

★

THE problem of industrial relations, he declared, is the second biggest problem in the world to-day. Only in the most superficial sense is there an identity of interest between owners, management and workers. There is no real industrial democracy, the worker has no sense of participation. The dominant party in private enterprises is the owners of capital and when there are attempts at joint consultation, the point is always reached when the real holders of power say, "Gentlemen, that is a function of management and therefore this committee is not competent to discuss it."

Disappointment in Nationalisation and Consumer Co-ops.

THOSE who had advocated nationalisation as a means to industrial democracy must have been bitterly disillusioned with the result in the nationalised industries where consultative committees are a farce which removes any possibility of participation. The consumer co-operative movement has become powerful and wealthy with its £680,000,000 turnover, but ask any co-op employee if he feels he has any share in the running of his society. There is nothing unusual in a strike of employees in the factories of the C.W.S. or in the retail societies.

Thus, said Mr. Carr, there is no section of British industry with anything approaching workers' control—except one small and statistically unimportant

section, the Co-operative Co-partnership Societies. Robert Owen who is regarded as the father of the Co-operative movement was not concerned with consumer co-operation—customers buying co-operatively, he thought in terms of co-operative production. Unfortunately the consumer co-operative movement became dominant and producer co-operation had to modify its form. In 1882 producers' societies allied together in the Co-operative Productive Federation. There are to-day about 40 societies belonging to the CPF, with 8,000 members and an annual turnover of about £6,000,000. At this stage Mr. Carr emphasised that co-operative co-partnership is a very different thing from 'co-partnership' profit-sharing schemes which, he said, "are more to be deplored than applauded, since they are no approach to industrial democracy, but are merely a way of buying-off the worker."

The principal manufactures of co-operative co-partnerships are clothing, and boots and shoes and there are also societies engaged in printing, toy-making, and building, a society of designers and one of architects, and strenuous efforts have been made to start a dockers' co-partnership. Mr. Carr for the purposes of his talk confined himself to the manufacturing societies, with their 32 factories.

One Shareholder, One Vote

IN co-operative co-partnerships the capital is subscribed by workers, retail co-operatives, trade unions and interested individuals. The largest shareholders are the retail co-operative societies who are also the purchasers of the goods produced. The great difference from ordinary capitalist joint-stock companies is that no-one has more than one vote. The general co-operative principle of *One vote per shareholder, not one vote per share* is followed. Thus while the London Co-operative Society may have £15,000 worth of shares in the Kettering Boot and Shoe Society, it has only one vote.

The producer societies each have a Board of Managers elected by and from the members annually or every six months. The one-shareholder-one-vote principle always results in a majority of worker members on the Board since they far outnumber non-worker members. Some societies allocate seats on the Board for non-worker shareholders. When they don't, the Board is entirely of workers. The day-to-day business of the

society is conducted by a Manager paid by and answerable to the Board. The Manager and the Board are answerable to the members and the supreme authority is the General Meeting.

At the end of the year the trading surplus is divided and half is paid as a bonus on wages to worker members. Wages are governed by ordinary Trade Union practice and are never the minimum, generally there is a high level of wages (which are differential). From the remainder of the surplus a dividend is paid to customers—the retail societies, and by decision of the general meeting a percentage to pensions, welfare, etc.

Crucial Questions

MR. CARR concluded his lecture by raising three crucial questions. *Are co-operative co-partnerships a real working democracy, is there a real sense of participation?* He thought there was, though the only way for his audience to convince themselves was to arrange to

Proposed Visit to Co-Partnership Factory

IT has been proposed that a party should be organised to pay a visit to a Co-operative Co-partnership factory.

The factory chosen will probably be either in Kettering or Leicester and if enough London comrades are interested, a coach will be hired, which could pick up other visitors *en route*.

The snag for most people will be that the trip will have to be made mid-week in order to see the factory working. This will presumably entail an inexplicable epidemic of bad colds, mild influenza, ear-ache, tooth-ache or back-ache among certain of our comrades.

It is recognised, however, that a short journey by road, plus an interesting experience, is a fine cure for minor complaints—as well as for 'it-can't-be-done-itis'.

The hire of the coach should work out at a maximum of £1 per head, less if more comrades come along. Expenditure on refreshments and meals will be individual concern. The best time, to allow for arrangements to be made, will probably be the last week in April or first in May.

Will all readers interested please write to:
PHILIP SANSON,
c/o Freedom Press.

A Comment continued

Anarchists and Anarchism

(Continued from last week)

IT is scarcely necessary to point out that if, to secure agreement of the interested parties on the question of "non-state control of the roadworthiness of motor vehicles", it were first necessary to secure the parties' agreement concerning the suppression of the state, private property, money, trade, competition, etc., not only in England but in the rest of the world as well, the question would get no further but would be postponed indefinitely.

FREEDOM's editorial sets out in all seriousness a series of preliminary conditions for *improving traffic conditions and the roadworthiness of vehicles*, prerequisites that require, among other things, the abolition of all distinction between yours and mine. In substance it asserts that, thanks to this abolition, the number of vehicles in use and the extent to which they are used would diminish and that, on the other hand, their working condition and roadworthiness could not fail to be excellent. A contradictor might dare to claim that, on the contrary, if cars were distributed free by the factories as liberally as the catalogues at the Motor Show, if petrol was poured out by pump attendants like water from a river, and if, moreover, everyone could take possession of the first vehicle he came across as the fancy took him, traffic would be excessive and disordered, maintenance nil, and accidents numerous. We have really no experimental means at all of deciding which of the two hypotheses is right; at least, for my part, I can think of no historical society where the cars, motorcycles, and bicycles (and the totality of objects technically susceptible of appropriation) were owned collectively by the totality of human beings. Nevertheless, the nearest situation to this, to my knowledge, was produced in Barcelona in the summer of 1936. There vehicles had in principle ceased to be private property and become instruments of struggle in the hands of the anti-fascist militias; even petrol was for some time supplied on a requisition or simply

on sight of the revolutionary inscriptions painted on the bodywork. In fact each militiaman exercised his right of use in his own way on every vehicle (not defended by force or arms) belonging to some other centre or unit than his own, so that Hispano-Suizas and Cadillacs changed hands several times a day and ended their short careers in the hands of intrepid, but dangerous, drivers in impressive collisions or irreparable breakdowns.

I do not think I have seen anywhere a cemetery for luxury cars comparable to the streets of Barcelona after a month or so of the revolutionary régime; moreover this tends to confirm the opinion expressed by FREEDOM to the effect that the citizens of the New World, after a few weeks or months, would soon come to ignore the streamlined racing cars of the defunct bourgeoisie so as to go more democratically on foot.

The problem of making people more careful and more responsible for their own safety is obviously a very little problem beside that of making them good stewards of the apparently free natural resources of their earthly habitat as well as the consumer goods that they

visit one. One test devised in America as a yardstick of "democracy" in any organisation is the percentage attendance of members at the Annual General Meeting. A 10% attendance was thought to be democratic. The average attendance at the AGMs of retail co-operative societies is 0.43%. In the productive co-operatives it is 78%.

Do they work? Some of the societies are over seventy years old. None of them has ever had a strike or a lock-out. *If so good, why had they not expanded?* Mr. Carr said that there were two answers to this question. Firstly, Co-operative Co-partnerships are part of the Co-operative movement as a whole which is dominated by the C.W.S. which nowadays regards co-partnerships as an enemy and has thrown up little Napoleons who have fought it tooth and nail as it represents a threat to their own managerial vested interests. But the second and more vital reason is this: Within the co-operative co-partnerships there is no incentive to expansion. Workers themselves have failed to think in terms of expansion and there has been no attempt at persuading other workers. As an example Mr. Carr said that one co-partnership in the shoe industry was asked to supply larger quantities of shoes and couldn't do it. The retail society suggested putting down more machines, but the workers said no, as it would mean that in that year there would have been no trading surplus, it would all have been ploughed back.

Among the points arising from questions was the fact that the co-operative co-partnerships are a 100% closed shop. Union membership is a condition of membership. And yet since there are no disputes there is never any union negotiation. Mr. Carr said that the unions had a new rôle: that of advising on production methods. The co-operative co-partnerships are a closed shop in another sense—there are virtually no opportunities for new members to join the existing societies, except on the retirement of members.

The discussion following Mr. Carr's lecture wandered into fields far removed from the subject and little attempt was made by subsequent speakers to relate the productive co-operatives to anarcho-syndicalist ideas. It would have been interesting to discuss the constitution of the societies and their relationship with the co-operative movement. Obviously a limiting factor is lack of capital since the usual sources of capital are unlikely

have an invincible tendency to waste once they are no longer reduced to scarcity and compelled to stint themselves. However, I do not believe that these problems are completely insoluble, and I think that what has failed, to a large extent at least, is the claim to be able to solve them massively, once for all, by means of a revolutionary decree. In this respect, the greater a population's direct domination over nature or acquired wealth, without any curb or balance, the greater is the danger that we shall witness a deadly and stupid muddle (with or without government, with or without money, with or without competition, trade, wage system, etc.). And the danger is very great, not only for the plundered environment, but for the isolated individual, crushed in an atmosphere where the party, the soviet, the syndicate, the tribe, the nation, the social group, whatever it may be, becomes immensely powerful and dynamic at the expense of anyone "unorganized".

Every libertarian "solution" or "attempt at solution" is doomed to failure if it ignores this fundamental fact: in a time like ours, when institutions are waning and changing, our concern should be to *preserve* in good repair and maintenance, not only humanity's motors, but also the means of steering and signalling, the headlamps, and the brakes. Yes, the brakes play a most important part.

Anarchy is not power without restraint: it is freedom made harmless by orderliness, by the development of fair play, tolerance, moderation, fairness—in short, the independence and self-responsibility, material, moral, and intellectual, of everyone; it is social balance being struck without violence.

I must ask you, dear comrades, to excuse the length of this letter. I was anxious to be well understood, and that is why I have not limited myself to a few remarks in passing as I had at first intended.

Yours fraternally,
A. PRUNIER.
Paris, March 21.

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT! WEEK 14

Deficit on Freedom	£280
Contributions received	£346
SURPLUS	£66
March 30th to April 6th	
London: J.W.A. 2/3; London: N.B.T. 4/6;	
London: J.S. 4/-; London: H.H.S. 10/-;	
Liverpool: R.E. 5/-; An Australian Swagman:	
£1/1/0; Welwyn Garden City: "Joker" 10/-;	
Sheffield: G.P. 5/-; Ellesmere Port: G.S.G.	
1/6; Glasgow: J.M. 7/6.	
Total	4 5 9
Previously acknowledged	341 14 4
1956 TOTAL TO DATE	£346 0 1

GIFTS OF BOOKS: Falmouth: R.W.; Mexico: A; London: C.W.
*Indicates regular contributors.

to invest money in an enterprise which they cannot control. Retail co-operative societies hold 42% of the share capital, private shareholders mostly retired worker-members and individual trade unionists hold 32%, worker members hold 25% and trade unions hold... one per cent!

Not Theorists or Revolutionaries

IN summing up, Mr. Carr pointed out that the members of the societies were not social theorists and were not revolutionaries. They had, perhaps by pure chance, joined co-operative co-partnerships and had found that they were on a very good thing. He had come to talk to us, not to ask us to help the co-operative co-partnerships, they did not need any help, not to ask us to join them, we probably couldn't anyway, not to ask us to buy their goods, and not to minimise their defects, but to show us an example of workers' control working, to ask us to ponder over the implications of the failure to expand, and to make use in our own efforts to change the industrial structure, of the experience of the co-operative co-partnership societies.

His lecture was a most useful opening to the London Anarchist Group's series.
C.W.

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

LECTURE-DISCUSSIONS

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

WORKERS' CONTROL IN PRACTICE

APRIL 15—Geoffrey Ostergaard on THE TRADITION OF WORKERS' CONTROL IN BRITAIN
APRIL 22—Speaker to be announced on The Community in Farmer & Son.

APRIL 29—Tony Gibson on SOME PROBLEMS OF COMMUNAL ORGANISATION

MAY 6—Carlo Doglio on THE SYSTEM OF JOINT CONSULTATION AT OLIVETTI'S

INFORMAL DISCUSSIONS

Every Thursday at 8.15.

OPEN AIR MEETINGS

Weather Permitting HYDE PARK, Sundays at 3.30 p.m. MANETTE STREET (Charing X Road) Saturdays at 5.30 p.m.

GLASGOW

At 200 BUCHANAN STREET, GLASGOW

OUTDOOR meetings at Maxwell Street, every Sunday, commencing April 1st at 7.30 p.m.

LIBERTARIAN FORUM

813 BROADWAY, (Bet. 11 & 12 Sts.) NEW YORK CITY

Round-Table Youth Discussions

Friday Evenings at 8.30

Apr. 27. Lecture by Joseph Spivak—The Social Health Plans of Britain and the U.S. Compared.

SPECIAL NOTICE

A MAY DAY MEETING WILL BE HELD IN THE EVENING OF TUESDAY, MAY FIRST, AT THE LIBERTARIAN CENTRE, 813 BROADWAY.

FREEDOM

The Anarchist Weekly

Postal Subscription Rates: 12 months 17/- (U.S.A. \$3.00) 6 months 8/6 (U.S.A. \$1.50) 3 months 4/6 (U.S.A. \$0.75)

Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies 12 months 27/- (U.S.A. \$4.50) 6 months 13/6 (U.S.A. \$2.25)

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

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