

In this Issue:

- The Emotive Use of Political Terms - p. 2
- The Anarchist Revolution - p. 2
- In Search of a Policy - p. 3
- Workers' Control in Producers Co-operatives p. 4

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

There is one thing in the world more wicked than the desire to command, and that is the will to obey.

WILLIAM KINGDON CLIFFORD

Vol. 14, No. 8

February 21st, 1953

Threepence

SECRET AGREEMENTS AT YALTA

THE Republican Party in America are obviously determined to wring a maximum amount of propaganda value out of the success of General Eisenhower in the Presidential elections—even if the propaganda is of the flimsiest material. Eisenhower's progress down the politician's path, which FREEDOM has already drawn passing attention to, is now further illustrated by the "repudiation" of the Yalta agreements made between President Roosevelt of the Democratic Party, Winston Churchill and Joseph Stalin during the closing stages of the war.

In repudiating Yalta, the Eisenhower administration denounces secret treaties. Ironical folk with long memories will recall that one of President Wilson's "Fourteen Points" (advanced as a basis for peace during the war of 1914) denounced all secret treaties and agreements. This mode of diplomacy, however, is surprisingly long-lived, as Yalta shows, and it is possible that the talks between Churchill and Eisenhower, which the former has refused to discuss on rather technical grounds, could also be classed as "secret agreements".

The Substance of Yalta

What was the Yalta agreement all about? The secret clauses mainly concerned the concessions which the Western Powers agreed to in return for Russia entering into the war against Japan. In view of the fact that Stalin came in on the Japanese war almost with only a few hours to go, and hardly fired a shot in anger, these concessions seem astonishingly favourable to the Russians.

The Western Powers agreed that (1) the *status quo* should be maintained in Outer Mongolia; (2) Russia should have restored to her Northern Sakhalin and the adjacent islands; (3) the port of Daren should be internationalised and Port Arthur leased to Russia; (4) the Manchurian Railway should be run by a joint Sino-Soviet Company; and (5) that the Kurile Islands should go to Russia.

These agreements in effect reversed the Japanese gains of the Russo-Japanese War of 1904. Yalta distributed whole territories in Asia to Russia, just as the Potsdam agreement did in Europe. Hard bargaining of this kind is the reality behind the "comrades-in-arms" talk which politicians serve out in time of war. It is all very well for Eisenhower to repudiate agreements made by Roosevelt, but that is how policy between "allies" is worked out.

S. AFRICAN BILLS CONDEMNED "Martial Law"

CAPETOWN, Feb. 15.

NINE well-known South Africans, including the Bishop of Johannesburg, to-day issued a statement condemning South Africa's Public Safety Bill and Criminal Law Amendment Bill as "martial law bills... These laws will not protect civilisation. They will destroy it."

The statement, which was also signed by Mr. F. A. W. Lucas, former South African Supreme Court Justice, called upon the people of South Africa "to do everything in their power to avert disaster". The Bills, it said, had the effect of stifling criticism in regard to the basic issues confronting the country, and to grant such powers to any Government, however democratic, would be intolerable.

Meetings in Johannesburg and Durban also condemned the Bills. The Johannesburg meeting convened by the Transvaal African National Congress and the Transvaal Indian Congress, adopted a resolution saying that a national stoppage of work was the only method of fighting the Bills.—(Reuter).

What Repudiation Means

Repudiation is a strong word beloved of propaganda merchants. In this context it means very little. Clauses (2) and (5) above—relating to Northern Sakhalin and the Kurile Islands—have already been accepted in that the Japanese Government renounced all claim to them under the Peace Treaty signed last year at San Francisco (the Russians, ironically enough, objecting). Now the Japanese Government are laying claim once more to these territories and are hoping since Eisenhower's statement, that their aspirations will receive American support. It is also an irony that the Peace Treaty was drafted by John Foster Dulles, Eisenhower's Foreign Secretary.

Repudiation will not alter the actual state of affairs created by any of the five points above. It would be surprising if it did. For states do not keep their words nor trust each other. Russia must have proceeded to act on the Yalta agreement at the earliest possible moment. Once in Sakhalin and the Kurile Islands, it would require an act of war to get them out again. "Repudiation" will not alter Manchuria or Outer Mongolia, or Port Arthur.

Mere Propaganda

Its effect therefore is mere propaganda, a kind of pious divesting, by the Republicans, of their Democratic heritage. Eisenhower foreshadowed the announcement of repudiation in a recent speech in which he said, "We shall never acquiesce in the enslavement of any people in order to purchase fancied gain for ourselves. I shall ask Congress at a later date to join in an appropriate resolution making

clear that this government recognises no kind of commitments contained in secret understandings of the past with foreign governments which permit this kind of enslavement."

Was Mr. Eisenhower thinking about recent negotiations between the U.S. Government and General Franco's Government?

The "repudiation" declaration therefore means very little. Its function, like that of last week on Chiang Kai-Shek, is for internal propaganda, and the appearance of keeping election promises. It is so much lip-service to the actualities of the enslavement of peoples with absolutely no sincerity behind it.

Stalin, as we have seen, got his secret share very cheaply—in return for a mere declaration of war on an already defeated enemy. Communists everywhere may be expected to break into an indignant chorus about breaking the pledged word given at Yalta and so on. Just at the moment a great deal of propaganda play is being extracted from the fact that Congress voted a hundred million dollars for financing "selected persons living in... or persons who have fled from Communist countries", and they will doubtless seek similar capital from Eisenhower's concern for "the liberation of enslaved peoples".

Stalin knows all about that sort of thing, since he promised the foreign Communist Parties recently all help "in their fight for liberation."

Elimination of Secret Treaties

Both the making and the repudiation of secret treaties are inseparable ingredients of political diplomacy. It is necessary to point out what a mockery they make of the idea of the people controlling the government, the idea of democracy itself. For how can "the people" judge of treaties which are secret? Repudiation of such treaties can never amount to abolition while the State takes decisions in the name of the people without either power or knowledge residing in the latter.

UNREPENTANT ROME

DESPITE all the political intrigues besetting every Presidential campaign, Eisenhower has up to the present remained aloof from the preposterous suggestion that the United States should send an Ambassador to the Vatican. Political considerations have kept successive Presidents firm on this, for the American Constitution separates Church and State, and Protestants would not yield on this point, at least. Catholic diplomacy has secured that the Ambassador in Rome must be a Catholic, and this glittering prize goes to converted Claire Boothe Luce, an attractive, sophisticated socialite whose reputation rests primarily on a reputation for upper class cattiness, as portrayed in her own plays, but whose political gambits now lift her to the heights.

It is long since a Protestant prince decided that if only conversion to Rome could get him the French crown, then at least "Paris was worth a Mass". This might well be framed in letters of stone over the portico of the Foreign Office. But not only has Whitlhal long since yielded to the persuasive arts of dominating Catholic diplomacy, but among other wasted fortunes piled up by the P.A.Y.E. racket, we keep an Embassy going in the non-existent state of the Vatican. It may be true that the Pope has a vast spiritual kingdom, but even with the advance in space-travel, it will be a long time before it can be

reached. While the Church and State are not divided in England (unfortunately), it is at least a different Church that receives State patronage, and while our Vatican Embassy is only a drop in all that is lost in the rushing flood of diplomatic expenditure, it is a direct link by which Catholic diplomacy dominates the foreign policy of one of the few Western European countries not tied to Rome by Catholic Conservatism. It is interesting how the most anti-Catholic Tories, even those who owe their seats to bitter anti-Roman Orange support, blithely acquiesce in a Vatican foreign policy, which can exist only by accredited representation in the phoney kingdom.

For the moment this foreign policy may be anti-Stalinist. It was not always so, and it may at any time cease to be, when it suits the Pope's purpose to conclude a Concordat with Communism, as he did with Fascism. But in any case it has other, quite different, aspects. These were stressed by the writer, when in FREEDOM he showed how Catholic foreign policy dominated the Bertha Hertogh case. Here was a Catholic girl brought into the Moslem faith by her nurse, against the imprisoned parents' wishes. The girl was married to a Moslem and having been brought up in that faith, would have preferred to have remained so. But the law was adamant that the Catholic baptism stood, and she was returned to the parents. It may have

'Third Degree' in Kenya

EMBARRASSING accusations of the use of collective punishment, violence towards suspected persons, and third degree methods by the police in Kenya (both native and European) have been made to the Governor of Kenya recently by Canon T. C. F. Bewes, Africa Secretary of the Church Missionary Society.

At a Press conference given on his return from a special mission to the Mau Mau areas of Kenya he was unwilling to go into details of the charges he had made, on the grounds that he had been given assurances by the Governor that "the situation was being taken care of".

In Kenya, apparently, Canon Bewes' protests about mass punishment were answered by the authorities stating that they now recognised that mass punishment was not producing results. The Governor, Sir Evelyn Baring, agreed to give Canon Bewes specific assurances that the use of excessive force by settlers, military forces, or police would be dealt with, and the inference was that a directive to this effect has already been issued.

One of Canon Bewes' stories ran as follows:—A few days ago, a police informer told the police that a certain Kikuyu was hiding a cache of arms. A police posse made up of Africans and probably including one European went out to look for the man. He was an adherent of a local Christian mission. He was suffering from tuberculosis of the spine and

he was not fit to work. When he was found he was questioned and yielded no evidence or any knowledge of a store of arms. He was taken away and beaten. Questioning continued. Beating continued, to make him confess, and he died under beating. A missionary, reported the case to the local administrative officer and the inquest was held last Monday. Canon Bewes had not heard its result. But this, he said, "is not an isolated incident."

Canon Bewes would not give further details about the use of such "third-degree" methods, but he used the word and said he had evidence of its widespread incidence. He also roundly condemned mass punishment methods. He illustrated how bad and ineffective such methods were. The Mau Mau in one area decided that a man should be murdered. A man was sent to Nairobi where he hired a band of assassins and told them how to get to the victim's village and how he was to be identified.

When the murder was due to occur Mau Mau adherents in the locality moved away from the district. The police arrived a few hours after the murder and arrested all the people in the district they could find. Most of these people knew nothing about the murder or about the local Mau Mau organisation. If they had they would not have been there. Yet if they could not answer the questions they were asked their cattle and goods were seized. Canon Bewes one day met some women carrying heavy bags. "Is this forced labour?" he asked. "No," they replied. "Punishment."

"What for?"
"We don't know."

DEBATE

"SOCIALISM OR ANARCHISM"

Speakers:

Tony Turner
(Socialist Party of Great Britain)
Philip Sansom
(London Anarchist Group)

DENISON HOUSE
296 Vauxhall Bridge Road,
London, S.W.1
2 minutes Victoria Station

SUNDAY, MARCH 1 at 7 p.m.

Needless to say in law she could not sustain her claim, but the Catholic Church did not say that the family wishes should be respected, as they did in the Bertha Hertogh case. Once again—they asserted the superior rights of the baptismal ceremony, and though the Courts ordered the clergy to hand over the children to their aunt, Mrs. Rosener, of Israel, she arrived at the monastery a few weeks ago to find them kidnapped. A woman teacher has been arrested in connection with the abduction, but it appears that the abduction could only have taken place with the connivance of high ecclesiastical authorities. It is believed the children have been spirited over the French border to Spain where, despite Jewish protests to State and Catholic authorities, they are to be brought up as priests. (As in the case of Edgar Mortara—to be priests, and probably monks—in other words, to be secluded from the world so that they will never be able to judge the rights and wrongs of the case, or anything save Papal doctrine.)

The conflict between State and Church in Yugoslavia is due solely to forcible conversion of Orthodox Catholics by Roman Catholics during the war. Tito would have compromised in this as in so much else, had it not been for the possible fury of the Greek Church at such a condonation of the Latin Church's crimes. It seems what is tantamount to forcible conversion can also exist in France, and if to one denomination, then why not to any other? We were led into a minor military adventure in Singapore against the forcible conversion in which Rome was the loser, but like the new Pontiff in Moscow, its anxiety over civil rights is only concerned when it is the loser. When it has the power, intolerance cannot be ameliorated in any way whatsoever. And nobody knows where Rome—like Moscow—may strike next.

INTERNATIONALIST.

The Emotive Use of Political Terms

I

MANY modern philosophers¹ argue that ethical words, such as "good", "bad", "right" and "wrong", function as expressors of emotion (either positive or negative) on the part of their user, and as instigators to action. Some argue that this expressive-hortatory function is their only function and that these words have no descriptive function. By "descriptive" is meant the use of a word to refer to some object, quality or fact in the world. I believe that political terms, such as "democracy", "patriotism", "justice", "freedom", "government", etc., are also used emotively by many people—including anarchists. I do not believe that such political words have no descriptive functions; however, I shall argue that their descriptive functions are ambiguous—if not self-contradictory, vague, and seldom understood by the people who use them. I further believe that it is their emotive function which keeps them in use while it would be better to use different words having precise descriptive functions. In other words, many people do not know what they are talking about when they talk politics—or "no-politics", as the case may be.

I shall briefly outline what I mean by taking two examples from my far from complete list. First, there are words which are inappropriate to their descriptive meanings, such as "democracy". If we look in the dictionary we find that it means "government by the people". But what does "by the people" mean descriptively? As it stands the word seems to mean "government by the unanimous consent of those governed". But this is still a vague formulation. Young people, the senile, and idiots are governed in most communities. Does democracy require their unanimous consent? And what of those countries where women are denied the vote, as was the case in England and the United States a short time ago?

But, of course, a good democrat will brush away such hair splitting and say that democracy means government by the majority or by the plurality of legal voters who actually cast ballots. We have to ask him then whether he means direct (or pure) democracy, or indirect (or representative) democracy. Since the first type is inappropriate in all but the smallest groups, our democrat will probably agree that he means the second type whenever he uses the word. But "representative democracy" is a vague and, *prima facie* at least, untenable notion, as most anarchists already know. How often are the "representatives" to be selected? Every year? Every day? Every four, six, fifty years? In what sense do they "represent" the majority or plurality of legal voters? Do they represent this group negatively (being chosen as lesser evils) or positively? And do we have democracy when the legally chosen representatives go back on their campaign promises? Was Nazi Germany a democracy, in view of the fact that Hitler was legally elected?

My hypothetical democrat will again brush these questions aside and say that they are legal and practical questions.

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP OPEN DAILY

A. S. Neill:

The Problem Family 7/6
Hearts not Heads 7/6
That Dreadful School (new) 7/6

● Second-Hand

The Problem Teacher 5/-
The Problem Child 5/-
A Dominie's Log 3/6
A Dominie in Doubt 4/6
Hearts not Heads 3/6
The Problem Family 4/-

George Orwell:

Homage to Catalonia 10/6
Nineteen Eighty-four 12/6
Animal Farm (Penguin) (new) 2/-
● Second-Hand
The Road to Wigan Pier 6/-
Burmese Days 5/-
Shooting an Elephant 4/6
Nineteen Eighty Four 5/-
Animal Farm 4/6

Now on sale: January Port-Workers' Clerion 2d.; also Prometheus 6d.

Postage extra on all items

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

Just as the law decides who is a legal voter, so it will decide how long representatives are to hold office. He will argue that a government is democratic in virtue of its form alone and that *who* the particular individuals are who are in power is irrelevant to a country's democratic status.

Now, compare the statements:

(1) "I am against the purely formal system of government where a majority or plurality of legally determined voters select certain individuals to act as representatives for them."

(2) "I am against democracy."

(1) is a perfectly respectable kind of statement while (2) is the kind of thing which most people would hesitate to utter except among close friends. The reason for this should be obvious. In (1) you are criticising democracy *qua* its descriptive meaning. In (2) you are setting yourself against democracy *qua* its emotive meaning. In effect, in criticising democracy, you are attacking, for many people, the fondest associations of childhood and youth: marching brass bands, "mom", and the girl next door.

Next, there are words for which it is impossible to give adequate and clear descriptive definitions, such as "freedom". This is a word dear to anarchists, Republicans, Labourites, Nazis and Communists alike. The word has such a positive emotional charge that no would-be enslaver would dare fail to claim himself to be the bestower of "true freedom". (A related word, "liberal", has recently come in for similar treatment in the United States.)

What is the descriptive meaning of "freedom"? I am here speaking of *social* or *political* freedom. This is not the same question as the one concerning free will, though it is related. With regard to free will there are ample confusions. Rudolph Rocker and, recently, George Woodcock mistakenly think that free will means indeterminism. However, Spinoza and later philosophers have more correctly defined it as the ability to act according to one's intentions free from external constraint, and that is the meaning I shall give it.

The descriptive meaning of social freedom is more difficult to pin down. Absolute freedom would mean that every individual would be allowed to act according to every one of his intentions. But I feel that this is an untenable notion, for it would require the most total kind of democracy. And unanimous democracy is impossible in society. Only a hermit could conceivably have absolute "social" freedom and "unanimous" democracy. Social freedom must admit of degrees. But here we run into difficulties once more: where should the line be drawn once we begin admitting degrees of social freedom? Should lunatics be allowed to terrorize communities? Should infants and children always be allowed to follow all their intentions? Where does conditioning and suggestion leave off and coercion begin? Does *Walden Two*² describe an anarchist community?

These are difficult questions, and their difficulty should make any anarchist hesitate before shouting "Hurray for freedom." Thus, the descriptive meaning of a term can be elusive, although its emotional connotations make us feel certain we are for whatever it stands for.

One objection to what I have been saying would be to claim that such words as "democracy" and "freedom" designate *ideals*, and that their failure to be clearly definable in practical affairs does not have any bearing on their suitability in political—or apolitical—discussions. I confess I fail to understand the supposed force of such an objection. What does it mean, to "designate an ideal"? In mathematics and physics this would be a relevant objection, however in political or social matters I can find no meaning for the phrase "designate an ideal", other than a purely emotive one. It is merely giving a misleading but pleasant name to our perplexity, to call such nebulous terms as "social freedom" ideals.

II

In view of what has been said already, I would like to advance two positive proposals. (1) Because of the heavy emotional load carried by certain abstract political terms and because of the vagueness and ambiguity of their des-

criptive meanings it would be advisable to do away with such terms altogether. (2) We should replace the terms done away with by sets of new terms, or term combinations, which have specific descriptive meanings and which have emotive meanings only by virtue of those specific descriptive meanings.

This would be in accordance with the aims of anarchism as I understand them. A self-reliant, mentally and physically sound human being does not need any comforting or inspiring words like "freedom" or "anarchy". (How emotionally loaded that word has been for friend and foe alike!) The emotional "kick" people get out of them, while not necessarily a pathological symptom, should be eliminated. Rather, one should live emotional life by contact with the *objects* and the persons he meets—and not by contact with ambiguous or meaningless words. If we take these irrational props from people's prejudices it might be less easy to get them to form the mobs *some* revolutionists wish they would. But it would also be difficult to get them to form armies or get them to vote *en masse* for leaders who trade on their petty party affiliations, "sacred moral principles" and other irrational things. And this result should not be unwelcome to anarchists.

However, the chances of changing the language habits of our society are very slight. Indeed, the changes themselves presuppose other profound social changes.³ Probably the best we can do is to be on our guard when we use such general emotive terms ourselves. For example, besides "freedom", such words as "government", "coercion", "the state", "statism", "centralisation", etc. We should make clear the descriptive meanings, or factual "cash value", of these terms and not employ them primarily for their emotive connotation. The facts they refer to should be sufficient to trigger off negative reactions. If appropriate, we should pin down their meanings by giving them operational definitions. For example: "Social freedom implies academic freedom, and if there is academic freedom then Professor X (a concrete example) who is competent but a Communist must be allowed to teach."

THE ANARCHIST REVOLUTION

(Continued from our last issue)

THE apostles of peaceful "revolution", whose programme is, in Bob Green's words, "to press for progressive reforms in a hundred different directions," apparently believe that as soon as Anarchists are in a majority all they will have to do is to wish very hard for the new society for all the old repressive institutions to crumble away. It is true that there must be a revolution in the minds of a great many people before a libertarian society is possible, but surely the reformists cannot believe that they or their successors among Anarchist propagandists will ever effect a revolution in the minds of politicians, generals, lawyers, judges, industrialists, and high state officials! As the editors of *FREEDOM* have said: "We must face this fact that the ruling classes which maintain their position not through persuasion but by force will not consent to step down without attempting to defend their privileges by having recourse to violence. That this violence is answered with violence is inevitable, whether we like it or not." Such men as these will never voluntarily renounce their sinecures in the name of liberty, equality, justice, humanity, or anything else. Even after the libertarian society has been established, such men will remain to plot and if necessary to kill in order to regain their power and privileges."

In view of all this it is possible to create and to defend a libertarian society without some coercion and bloodshed? I will say at once that in my opinion it is not. Suffering is the inevitable consequence of action—if not of each and every action, at least of a very large proportion. We cannot possibly know the outcome of our action, and however well-meaning and well-considered an action may be, there can be no guarantee that it will have the desired effects. Hence the inadequacy of utilitarian theories of ethics, though to consider actions independently of their possible and probable effects is clearly equally misguided. But suffering is not evaded by inaction, it is condoned. I do not believe that we can abolish suffering by action, but I do believe that there is a reasonable chance of mitigating it provided that we have first considered with a passionate concern for the truth

both the fundamental principles involved and the particular issues at stake, whereas by refusing to act at all for reasons of fear or conscience we become as fully responsible for the misguided or criminal actions of others as if we had committed them ourselves.

But although I am convinced that a libertarian society will never be created by men who refuse to countenance violence and coercion under any circumstances, I believe that it is possible to formulate principles of action which will be acceptable to Anarchists who abhor such evils as much as—perhaps more than—the ultra-pacifists. The more so as I am convinced that the rejection of all principles of revolutionary action will involve far greater violence and far greater suffering for mankind, with no hope of release except in the self-annihilation of the last man.

The perfect society would be one in which there was absolute liberty to commit the most heinous crimes but in which no one would dream of doing anything but good. Not many of us will be unrealistic enough to expect that, but the point is that even absolute principles must be reconciled. Justice, for example, might be sacrificed on the altar of Liberty, or both traded for Peace. Good is a sum of all these—as well as other things, and does not reside on one alone, and although, we must freely will the Good before we can do it, what we freely will is not *ipso facto* good. Unless we have a less vague, a more concrete idea of what we mean by such words as "liberty" and "justice"—and in this respect most Anarchists are probably no better than most liberals—we shall be as easily misled by our emotional reactions on hearing them as are so many men by the word "patriotism", and we shall not recognise the libertarian society if we see it.

Liberty, considered in its positive sense and not merely as immunity from interference (which is the dominant sense in which it is conceived by the liberals), is identical with power. This sort of liberty is more correctly called "freedom", for as Herbert Read has pointed out, "freedom... is a positive condition—specifically, freedom to create, freedom to become what one is," while liberty is more akin to licence and implies per-

mission from some other party to do certain specific things, with the implication that all other things are forbidden. Liberty has limits, freedom is limitless. It is of vital importance to recognise this difference between freedom and liberty and one can hardly be an Anarchist without doing so. Nevertheless, the two meanings are in many instances so inextricably interwoven—the correct usage depending entirely upon the aspect under consideration—that I shall not attempt to be consistent in my use of them.

There is no Freedom without Power: power to think, power to speak, and power to act. Equally, there is no Power without Freedom. Freedom is Power, Power is Freedom. The freedom enjoyed by an individual is equivalent to the power which he wields—over himself, over other people, and over purely material objects and circumstances. It is not possible to compare the power of an artist *qua* artist with the power of a general *qua* general, and if it be acknowledged that there is a distinction between self-expression and self-indulgence, there is certainly no clear dividing line; but considering the question from a more-or-less materialist point of view we can say that the more things a man is able to do the greater is his liberty. But it follows in by far the greater number of cases that the greater is the power or liberty of action and expression of one man, the less will be that of another or perhaps of many others. Thus the greatest liberty conceivable for man on this planet would be found under a world-dictatorship in which the power of the dictator was virtually absolute; but it would be the liberty of one man only, achieved at the expense of the liberty of all other men. In this perhaps unusual sense there would be less *potential* liberty for the individual in a libertarian society than in a so-called democracy or in a frankly avowed oligarchy. On the other hand, the *actual* power or liberty of the average man would be greatly increased, whereas that of the exceptionally privileged man would be proportionately decreased until he was no longer exceptionally privileged.

I have no desire to circumscribe "creative" freedom with definitions. Indeed, I do not think it is possible to do so. But in order to secure and

The positive concepts of anarchism must be spelled out in terms of actual operations and goals. In the long run I believe that this approach will prove sound propaganda policy. It is true that psychological experiments show that in the past vague emotive appeals have been more successful than factual appeals in swaying people to action. However, I believe that if people are shown what anarchism can mean in *their* lives, if it is explained in terms immediately relevant to them, then we can overcome the appeals to "God", "basic moral truths", "the flag", "ancestors", etc., which our enemies use. If we fail, at least we shall have been faithful to factual truth. (Not the "Truth" with a capital "T" which the obscurantists like to use.) And that, in itself is a good deal.

This is to advocate neither the abolition of abstract terms nor of emotional fervor from anarchism. Only those terms whose strong emotive functions are combined with vague descriptive functions are to be weeded out. If anything, abstract thought would be enriched by freeing from prejudice and fear so many subjects which to-day cannot be intelligently approached at all.

Granting neither that facts alone nor considerations of egocentric pleasure alone stimulate men to change the world, it is also true that the vague but potent ideals of "freedom" or "justice" are *not necessary* to stimulate a man to devote his life to better the lives of others.

Indeed, being obsessed with such abstract concepts may hinder his effectiveness. Camillo Berneri, on the night he was murdered, wrote:

"Whenever conscience is involved, reason leads me to no decision. The *ultima ratio*, what really decides the issue, is style."

M. G. ANDERSON.

¹ For example: A. J. Ayer, C. L. Stevenson, and Richard Robinson.
² The title of a fantasy by B. F. Skinner, the psychologist. It is about a society in which no physical coercion whatever is used. Children are conditioned rigidly from birth to live gregarious, virtuous lives.
³ Some language faddists in this country apparently believe that language misuse is at the root of most of our society's difficulties. They go by the name of "general semanticists". Language is only one element in our society. An important one, admittedly, but its misuse is much more an effect than a cause of our difficulties.

preserve liberty—the sort of liberty of which I have been speaking—it is necessary to limit it. This is no democrat's apology for the state. The state does not safeguard liberty, it violates it. "We can imagine a perfect liberty," says Sir Ernest Barker, "only in a world society and a world State." This absurd travesty of the truth would be merely laughable if it were not for the fact that so many men were prepared to take it seriously. Not only is perfect liberty impossible for man, but such a statement could only be true of the highest conceivable form of liberty if that liberty were the liberty of one man only, as I have already said. The state is a stronghold of privilege and discrimination. I am concerned with safeguarding the liberty of all equally (as the democrats are not, despite their either intentionally fraudulent or self-deluding protestations that that is their object) in the only way possible, that is by prescribing limits to the liberty of each individually. The point I wish to emphasize is that as Anarchists we are as much committed to the doctrine of equality as to that of liberty, and that the one is not possible unless the other is acknowledged to have certain definite limits. The alternatives to recognition of this truth are "electism" of the Nietzschean variety, a Rousseauesque deification of "general will" (a hypothetical good of which no individual—

Continued on p. 3

WORTH A SECOND THOUGHT

One of the most interesting ventures in present-day Cuba is that of the Union of Telephone Workers who in co-operation with *Editorial Unidad* are taking responsibility for the publication of books of merit, especially in the field of biography and history, and are supplying its members, some 7,000 people, with copies. Considering that most Latin American authors have to pay to have their books printed and then to distribute them themselves, this new version of the book club idea is a long step in the right direction, which might very well be followed in other countries.

—International P.E.N. Bulletin.

FLOGGING REJECTED

PARLIAMENT last week rejected the Bill to reintroduce flogging by 159 votes to 63. Such a result can only give satisfaction to progressive-minded people, even though—one was informed—"public opinion" demanded the return of the cat and the birch. But it must also give pause to those who believe that what the public wants is right. Newspaper after newspaper flogged the flogging issue for months, always with a majority clamorously eager to have it restored. Not one but many judges have offered their opinion that corporal punishment is a good thing.

Yet Parliament, to its credit, after hearing the not very convincing presentation of the Bill by Wing-Commander Bullus and the very simple arguments against it of Sir Donald Maxwell Fyfe, the Home Secretary, turned it down. Does this outrage the principle of democracy? We are not sure how to answer this for the principles of democracy are fairly vague. But we are certain that one does not reach the right result by counting noses. If the fate of this Bill shows anything it is that emotional arguments (often enough concealing not very creditable motives, as a recent article in FREEDOM pointed out) are more impressive from the Bench or in a newspaper where there is no immediate challenge, but seem feeble enough when they are subjected to debate. One does not discover the "opinion of the people" by the method of the Gallup poll, but by prolonged and practical discussion.

The actual debate was very interesting. Wing-Commander Bullus cast doubt on the official statistics which show that crimes for which flogging could formerly have been imposed had declined in number since abolition; but he was not convincing about this. He proposed that Judges be given "the power to exercise discretion and to order whipping for crimes of violence. Our judges were unequalled, and could be trusted".

Such an opinion exposed the weakness of the Bill and would have made it unworkable, for however inhuman extreme codification of the law in its working, it is still less satisfactory for "discretion" to be given to judges. In this context it was interesting to hear Mr. Chuter Ede, a former Home Secretary, say that "he was not impressed by the opinions of the Judges"—a remark that was received with Opposition cheers!

Paradoxically, the Home Secretary, so recently adamant about a seemingly cruel sentence in the case of Derek Bentley, was the most convincing opponent of reintroducing flogging. He based his arguments mainly on the fact that it was too soon after only 4½ years to try and assess, let alone, reverse the Criminal Justice Act of 1948, and urged that progressive ways of dealing with crime were a better solution than bringing back corporal punishment.

Mr. Ellis Smith (Labour) argued that "whipping, the stocks, and the birch were all relics of barbarism", and attacked the newspaper campaign, accusing *Picture Post* by name of making flogging a circulation stunt. He also reprimanded the Lord Chief Justice for the part he had played and for using "the dignity of his high office" for "constant controversial observations".

Mr. Chuter Ede pointed out that inflation of the figures for violence "generally arose from a phenomenal increase in sexual crimes. Flogging was no remedy for them, neither was it a deterrent. In certain circumstances it was an incentive. He

was not impressed by the opinions of the Judges. They had never been in favour of the reforms which had been "the glory of the penal system of this country for the last 150 years".

A Conservative opponent of the Bill, Mr. Hyton-Foster described the environment of the young criminals, and the drabness and sordidness of their lives. It is understanding of the problem that is required. Obviously, flogging is the opposite of the attempt to understand.

So much for what was said. Mr. Ede's remarks about "the glory of the penal system" seem rather extravagantly worded, and remarks about barbaric punishment seem to overlook the most barbaric of all—the death penalty. Why was Parliament so relatively sensible (though 63 in favour is no small number) and so emotional and reactionary about the death penalty only a year or so ago?

Furthermore, the official position is that long sentences are better than flogging. Yet their disadvantages are obvious enough though not so emotionally charged. A supporter of the Bill who wanted boys to be caned by "a good stout policeman" (!) nevertheless made a valid point when he said that "the worst thing in general was to send children to homes or Borstal. The more children could be kept out of incarceration the better".

The fact is that the Parliamentary debate merely skimmed the surface. The practical approach to the problem of crime must take full account of "poverty, of sexual suppression and misery, of the general incitement to violence inherent in a war-like society, and of the general business morality of capitalism which is more like criminal morality than it is to any morality of "the good life". It must have some analytical understanding of the relationships within a family, and between a family and society in general, and between an individual and his work processes.

These are problems which pre-occupy any revolutionary thinking, but they are "too big", they "carry one too far" for the "practical" administrators of to-day.

THE ANARCHIST REVOLUTION

Continued from p. 2

except Rousseau can be aware) which in practice can only be personified in the state, or sheer self-contradiction. The last of these—the product of passionate but vague declarations—is almost more damaging to the cause of liberty than the other two, for it either leads to a well-grounded charge of utopianism, or to the alternative charge of "Licence they mean when they cry Liberty," and it is vitally important to make it clearly

understood that neither charge can be substantiated against Anarchists.

The problem is one of equality of power, and the only possible solution is through the realisation of absolute self-power, or rather of self-sovereignty. "Power corrupts, absolute power corrupts absolutely," said Lord Acton. Self-power is one—and the only—kind of power of which this is not true, and it is only in and through this power that the living, creative personality of man can be fully realised. Self-power is "freedom to become what one is." It is chiefly by the usurpation of this "natural" right of each and every individual to exercise full and undisputed authority over himself that princes and politicians have sinned against humanity. It is our determination to restore self-sovereignty to Man, and it is in this doctrine of self-sovereignty that we will find the solution to the problem of revolutionary action. Freedom will not come from dreaming, nor from supplications; it must be seized. In defending this self-sovereignty we are only defending our birthright, and if in doing so coercion cannot be avoided, that is extremely regrettable, but the responsibility for violence lies on the heads of those who refuse to recognise this right and who do not scruple to employ violent methods to gain domination over others. For this is what the so-called "servants" of the state do and it should be clearly understood that to give moral sanction to the state law and to its strong right arm, the police force (or even to countenance it by a peace-at-all-costs attitude) is to sanction the use of coercion and violence for the most iniquitous of ends. To sacrifice one's own liberty in the interests of peace is honourable, if ill-advised, to sacrifice the liberty of others is dishonourable. I wish to make it quite clear that coercion for punitive reasons or to compel adoption of one's own views can never be justified. I do not challenge the right of those who wish to govern or to be governed, to kill or to be killed, to live in a society (such as our own) where these things are amply provided for; but I do not wish to live in such a society and I do challenge the right of others to force me to do so. Furthermore, I affirm my right to try to persuade others to accept my belief that to give or to accept orders is equally degrading. The conviction that a man's power should be limited to himself must be the basis of any genuinely libertarian philosophy, and those who truly love liberty will not wish to have power over their fellow men. The revolution we are working for is not a revolution to get into power but to give it back to those to whom it belongs, to each and every one of us. We must affirm the absolute equality of liberty and of power.

The implications of this affirmation would apply no less within the libertarian society if and when it is at last realised than they do now in an authoritarian society. This is the answer to those who believe that the fulfilment of our aspirations would mean a reversion to barbarism. The casual dismissal of all regulations and restraints is an absurdity. In a libertarian society it will, for example, still be necessary for all motorists travelling in the same direction to drive their cars on the same side of the road, and those who, by refusing to do so, become a menace to life and limb, will have to be restrained from driving at all; some form of detention will still be necessary for those who assault others; and so on. But such crimes as these are offences against the self-sovereignty of other individuals. There is, indeed, no such thing as a crime against an institution, because an institution has no rights. Recognition of this truth would automatically abolish half the laws of the land, equitable distribution of the common wealth would remove the need for many others, and the remainder would be reduced to the minimum necessary to ensure the equal rights and liberty of all. Some form of machinery would have to be devised to decide what regulations were indispensable to self-sovereignty and the agreed common interest, but it would be a machinery run by all equally in the interests of all equally. Men would not need to cooperate less, but more; but there would be plenty of encouragement for doing so in that they would, for the first time in history, be taking an equal share in making those decisions which would vitally affect their lives, instead of leaving it to others to do so in a so-called representative democracy. No one is competent to take decisions in another's name, and parliamentary representatives never know and seldom care what is in the best interests of their electors. It is only a preposterous arrogance that makes them think otherwise.

If, then, the right of the individual to absolute self-sovereignty is violated—as it is everywhere to-day—he may reasonably reply by force. If necessary, he may—indeed, if a libertarian society is ever to be achieved and defended from its enemies within and without, must—kill those who refuse to recognise his right to personal liberty. Liberty is not served by acquiescence, and unless we are willing to defend it actively we are unworthy of it. The lust for power which disfigures all history must find its answer in the will and the courage of ordinary men and women to resist. Force must be met by force, for only thus will Man be liberated.

ANDREAS.
[From the duplicated journal, "Prometheus".]

"PLAYERS, PLEASE"—RUSSIAN VERSION

THE power of large-scale advertising has obviously not been lost on Stalin, any more than on the capitalist concerns selling tobacco, petrol or soap flakes. He has seen to it that in the Soviet Calendar for 1953, his name occurs as often as possible; indeed, it appears no less than 367 times. His virtues are eulogised in twenty poems, and his picture appears on twelve different days. Even the dates of his newspaper articles are recorded as memorable dates of the year. And what is important about this state publishing house Gospolitizdat publication is that fifteen million copies are issued each year.

FAITH AND MORALS PURGE

Communist authorities in East Germany began a "faith and morals" purge of the two-million-strong "Free German Youth" movement this weekend.

The young blueshirts must hand in their membership cards. If they pass checks for "pacifist tendencies, ignorance and bad discipline" they will get new ones.

—News Chronicle, 2/2/53.

TRIALS IN SPAIN

SENTENCES ranging from four to 20 years' jail were demanded in Barcelona on two brothers and a girl accused of forming an anti-Franco youth liberation movement.

The prosecution claimed Antonio and Joaquin Sargau, and Joaquina Dorado, girl friend of Antonio, had arms and ammunition and printed anti-Government pamphlets.

—News Chronicle, 10/2/53.

COMMENT ON COAL IN SEARCH OF A POLICY

But you cannot do without the miners. They are more important to your material well-being than the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Lord Chief Justice, and the lords of industry. Without the miners, they would not exist, and nor would you. For this reason alone, the miners are worth a visit. Through their courtesy, we eat our breakfasts, catch our trains, go to our theatres and cinemas, sit in our offices, stand at our lathes. Our debt to them is incalculable. Their debt to many of us is infinitesimal.

—ROBERT J. EDWARDS: Dirty Coal.

In a rational society, free men and women would not be able to use the threat of economic want to drive their fellows in the coal areas down the shafts. Would they then dare to ask others to do this work—"for the sake of society"? We do not doubt that miners would be found to volunteer for such work if they felt that the welfare of society depended on them. But what should we think of those who asked them to do it, without straining every effort to develop other means?

FREEDOM, 9/6/51.

DURING the whole period between the two world wars, an average of 14 per cent. of miners were unemployed; in 1934 the number reached 34 per cent. Throughout the period miners' wages were extremely low by comparison with other industries. Why did they stay, or attempt to stay in the industry. The answer is, of course, as Mr. Harold Wilson says, "The general level of unemployment in other industries, particularly in the depressed basic trades in and near the coal areas, such as shipbuilding and the metal trades, was such that there was nowhere for unemployed or dissatisfied miners to go... Thus unemployment and low wages in coal did not lead to the exodus to other industries which classical economic theory might have led one to expect. A large reserve of unemployed was always standing by in the industry."

The coming of the war changed the position dramatically. Professor W. H. B. Court's official history of coal-mining during the war describes the industry as a sick industry and its workers as a sick society and calls his history a record of "administrative shifts and devices,"² accompanied by a dramatic fall in the number of miners. When his account was issued, *The Times* commented: "After reading Mr. Court's unemotional account of the mining communities once isolated and tied to the

pits, but now liberated, first by the war-time call-up of the younger men, then by full employment, and with motor-bus and wireless drawing them into other and gentler spheres of life and livelihood, one is surprised, not that 47 per cent. of miners should have declined to allow their sons to go down the pit but that any miner at all should have permitted his children to follow his own occupation."

So it is not surprising that while there were 1,200,000 miners in 1920, to-day there are not 700,000. The miners were "forgotten men" and the miners were neglected. As Robert J. Edwards says, "A little late, we are paying our small part of the price the miners paid in the depression. The fuel crisis began thirty years ago."

Towards the end of the war, the government appointed a committee of mining engineers to report on the technical efficiency of the mining industry. Their report (known as the Reid report), when issued,³ showed that the British coal-mining industry compared with mines in Holland under similar mining conditions but with modern equipment and better working conditions resulted in a man-shift production of 23½ cwt. of coal as against 36 cwt. in Holland. And it declared that between 1925 and 1936 the man-shift production in Holland increased by 118 per cent. while in Britain it increased by 14 per cent.

In 1950 the National Coal Board issued its development plan,⁴ based upon the recommendations of the Reid Committee. The plan covers ten to fifteen years and estimated a demand for coal, home and abroad averaging about 240,000,000 tons a year. (Production in 1949 was about 204,000,000 tons from collieries and about 12,000,000 tons from open-cast sites.) As it was anticipated that open-cast mining would have ceased by the end of the period, the Board's plan was for an expansion of production by one-fifth. The plan provided for capital investment in the industry of £635,000,000 at 1949 prices, and following the Reid Report's recommendations; for reconstruction of 250 of the 900 collieries now in production, these reconstructed pits producing about two-thirds of the coal; for the opening of 20 new large collieries, and for the closing of between 350 and 400 pits now nearing exhaustion or unlikely to produce economically.

The Board estimated that at the end of the period, the mines will need 80,000 fewer men, but did not think that this implied widespread unemployment since at the

present rate of men leaving the industry the number of men would contract far beyond the "labour-force" which the plan requires.

Even if the mining industry reaches the output for which the Coal Board plans, there is considerable doubt whether there will be enough coal to meet anticipated demands. Mr. Oliver Lyle told the Combustion-Engineering Association that, "With the British Electricity Authority going to use thirty million tons more coal and the iron and steel industry going to use ten million tons more of coal and coke and other users increasing their demands, there would be a shortage of eighty millions tons in ten years. The Coal Board plan for thirty million tons more in ten to fifteen years; but I believe we shall be forty million tons short."⁵ The Ridley Committee declares that "we think that inland demand ten years hence may be 15–25 millions tons above the Board's estimate."⁶ On the other hand, the Federation of British Industries in a memorandum to the Ridley Committee says, "We have drawn upon several sources of information on the probable trend of future demand to assist us in arriving at the estimate that by 1960-65 the total demand will have increased by 73.5 million tons over present consumption." The T.U.C. in another memorandum declared that the Coal Board's estimates were inadequate, and underestimated potential demand.

It will thus be seen that nobody seems able to forecast accurately the quantity of coal which this country's economy will need ten years hence, but that everyone thinks it will be much more than present-day production and that it will need a labour force of over 600,000 men. If we take the view that society should not condemn so large a part of its working population to so arduous, unpleasant and dangerous an occupation as coal-mining, we have to ask three questions:

Is our present, let alone our proposed consumption of coal necessary? To what extent has it been used for purposes which are not essential to our wealth, health and comfort?

Is it being used efficiently, and for the purposes for which it is most suitable?

Are there other sources of power which could be used instead?

These are the questions for which we will have to look for answers in a later article.

C.W.

1 Harold Wilson: *New Deal for Coal* (Contact Books, 1945).

2 W. H. B. Court: *Coal: Official Civil History of the Second World War*, Vol. 3 (H.M.S.O., 1951).

3 *Coal Mining: Report of the Technical Advisory Committee* (H.M.S.O., 1945).

4 *Plan for Coal* (N.C.B., 1950).

5 Combustion Engineering Association Conference, 10/10/51.

6 Ridley Report, p. 12.—*Report of the Committee on National Policy for the Use of Fuel and Power Resources* (H.M.S.O., 1952).

"YEAR after year, trade unionists, Labour and Co-operative parties pass resolutions demanding workers' participation in the management and ownership of the means of production. No precise details are given, and for all practical purposes it is assumed that as yet no examples exist."

So writes Alfred Perkins of the Co-operative Productive Federation in his brochure on "the Principles and Organisation of Workers' Co-operative Productive Societies," and he goes on: "Frankly, it must be admitted there are not a lot of people who realise that in the existing Workers' Co-operative Productive Societies these are the basic principles—workers' participation in the management and ownership. Perhaps it is profit-sharing which frightens some, for it must be said that in industrial co-partnerships not connected with the Co-operative Movement, the only practical aspect of the partnership is that of a bonus on wages. It is true this is a principle of Workers' Co-operative Productive Societies, but the emphasis is placed on participation in management and ownership."

Mr. Perkins in his pamphlet claims that "co-operative co-partnership points the way to a new social and economic order in which the workers shall have their proper place as human beings," and he declares: "They are the present-day pioneers of Workers' Control."

As advocates of workers' control we are naturally interested in such ventures and we were intrigued to see in this month's issue of *Fact*, the Labour Party magazine, an article on producer co-operatives (which are usually left out in the cold by the Party) with the title, "Alternative to Nationalisation." The Labour correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian* was surprised too, and remarks, "This does not, of course, mean that the Labour Party has now embraced syndicalism, but it is interesting that its official monthly should have praised the work of Co-operatives at a time when the National Executive is wondering which industry should be nationalised next."

Be that as it may, there is much of interest to every advocate of workers' control in the article from

Workers' Control in Producers Co-operatives

Fact, the substance of which we reprint below:

ONE hundred and five years ago, there was a second revolution in France. The year 1848 saw the establishment of the First Republic. It also saw the establishment of more than three hundred workers' co-operatives, three hundred small industrial concerns owned and controlled by Frenchmen who worked in them and by others who bought the goods or services which the concerns produced.

To-day, workers' co-operatives are in the news again. Socialists are asking if this is an alternative to Nationalisation in "ensuring for the workers by hand or by brain the full fruits of their industry."

The answer of the Co-operative Productive Federation is "Yes". The organisation envisages the spreading of the idea especially in light industries and in building.

The Federation claims that its belief is supported by a number of Labour and Trade Union leaders who from time to time have advocated development of workers' co-operatives—particularly in industries where the optimum working unit is not too large.

The first French experiment was not long-lived. After the coup d'état of Napoleon in 1851 the workers' productive societies were persecuted, because they were democratic. They had to give way to capitalist expansion and the workers found themselves once more the playthings of finance and speculative industrialists.

With the return of the Third Republic in 1875, the French workers' co-operatives made a new start. By this time there were similar co-operatives in Britain, too. In 1882 the Co-operative Productive Federation was established. Two years later the Confédération des Sociétés Coopératives Ouvrières de Production was formed in France.

Today in France there are 720 workers' productive societies in which 35,000 men and women work. In Britain just over six thousand workers are co-operating in the management of 42 workers' co-operatives.

The photographs accompanying this article were taken at the home of one of the 42 societies, the Kettering Boot and Shoe Society. Here 170 workers take part in the running of the Havelock Factory where Holyoake shoes are manufactured.

The factory is typical of most of the British productive societies. It is administered by a board of eight plus the society president, the manager and the secretary.

The Board is elected at a meeting of shareholders. All workers over the age

of 18 hold shares and vote at the meetings, so too, do some of the retail Co-operative Societies and Trade Unions who have helped to finance the business. The retail societies could, of course, nominate and vote for some of their own representatives as board members, but at Kettering, as in at least five other similar concerns, they are satisfied that the workers are well qualified to control the destiny of their own plant, and in these six concerns there is 100 per cent. workers' representation on the board.

BOARD MEETINGS WITH A DIFFERENCE

STATEMENTS of accounts, agenda and all the usual paraphernalia of a high-powered executive meeting are laid out neatly opposite the cafe and tumbler as each member takes his seat. No cigars about, but perhaps that's an oversight. Let's listen to 63-year-old President F. J. Perkins addressing the meeting.

But if you're anticipating the usual managerial platitudes you're guessing badly. No, he's discussing a production problem, and, what's more, he seems to know what he's talking about. Well, well, perhaps he's one of those chaps who have "risen from the ranks", wonder how long it is since he's worked with his hands? "Now, only this afternoon on the machine," he is saying... Well, the cat's out of the bag.

Only this afternoon? Yes, only that afternoon President Perkins was working at his machine trimming edges of the boots and shoes he knows so well.

That's where I met him and he's done this job most of his life and will probably continue to work at it until he retires. In short, the type of man who is entitled, but so rarely gets the chance, to raise his voice in the board rooms of industry.

If a half-a-bitter or any saloon bar politician dares tell me again that the Worker is not Fit to Govern, I'm going to send him along to President Perkins.

And so, friend, perhaps without knowing it, you have been introduced to a General Management Committee meeting of one of the few factories in this country which the workers control, manage and largely own themselves.

The ten men and one woman we're watching, concisely discussing policy, production and programme, are the management committee of the Kettering Co-operative Boot and Shoe Manufacturing Society Ltd., makers of Holyoake footwear. They are all full-time employees, which explains the absence of cigar smoke and pomp, explains the atmosphere of knowledge and efficiency which permeates this room where the men who work are the men who matter.

—From "Workers Control in the Footwear Industry," by Philip H. Saint (Co-operative Production Federation).

The members work in different departments, are daily in touch with all their co-partners and the board meets weekly. Even the smallest complaints are brought to light and ventilated at board meetings. As all workers at the factory belong to their Trade Union, it follows that the board is a 100 per cent. trade union organisation, too.

At Kettering the workers pride themselves on their excellent record—there has never been a strike in the sixty years of the factory's history. The C.P.F. adds to this that since the Federation was founded in 1882 there has never been a strike at any workers' co-operative—an outstanding tribute, they say, to this method of organising workers' control.

Throughout the country the workers have an average majority of almost two-thirds on the various management boards. Of 314 seats they hold 198, the other seats are held by 42 representatives of retail societies, and 70 representatives of Trade Unions, or individual members (usually retired ex-employees who still take an interest in the welfare of the "old firm").

Profits are divided among workers and shareholders. A bonus on wages is paid when the result of the year's working is known. More than half the shares of the productives in Britain are held directly by workers and ex-workers (£390,807 out of £649,587) so by far the larger proportion of profits go to the workers. Except for a very small proportion (about 1 per cent.) to Trade Unions, the remainder of the profits go to the retail societies and is, in the end, passed on in the form of dividend to the people who buy shoes.

In Britain the work of the workers' co-operatives has been concentrated mainly in the footwear and clothing industries. The footwear societies sell £2,878,600 worth of boots and shoes each year, the clothing societies earn £2,750,856, the printing societies £273,513, and the miscellaneous trades which include such varied activities as house building, wagon building, and art and design services £483,353.

In France the emphasis is entirely different—and many advocates of workers' productive co-operation regard this as a significant pointer to the shape of possible expansion in Britain. Of the 720 French Societies no less than 387 are engaged in the building trade.

These concerns are extensively engaged by the French Government on Government work, the rebuilding of bridges, construction of Government offices, etc., and by municipalities upon the building of houses and blocks of flats.

This might well prove an opening for extension of workers' ownership and control in Britain. Already there are two worker-owned Co-operatives in the building trade. They compete successfully with private enterprise building concerns in an industry which has more private enterprise bosses than it has bricklayers.

In France there are 45 societies en-

THE GREAT CRUSADER

The idea of a crusade lies at the bottom of the new President's emotion and thought. *Crusade in Europe* is the title he chose for his account of the war, and the word 'crusade' occurs in almost every speech he made.

—Observer, 18/1/53.

YOUR LOYALTY OR YOUR HOME

Your home may be at stake if you live in a public housing project and are a member of any one of some 200 or more organisations which have been labelled "subversive". Under a federal law passed last July, the New York City Housing Authority is beginning a drive in its 11 projects to evict the "witches". Other cities will follow the pattern.

—Industrial Worker (Chicago), 26/12/52.

FROM THE BOTTOM UP?

The early struggles and entry into labour reform and organisation of the man who fled from Russia, became a pants cutter, and formed the great garment workers' union on a constructive basis.

—Advert. for Sidney Hillman, Statesman of American Labour.

Have you renewed your Subscription to FREEDOM?

MONDAY MORNING COMMENTARY

This Age of Speed and Violence

WHAT curious and depressing reading the issue of the *New York Herald Tribune* for Monday, February 16th makes! On the front page one learns of an air disaster off the coast of America in which 46 people have been killed. Coastguards report "that bodies of occupants of a missing National Airlines plane were coming to the surface in the Gulf of Mexico, off the Alabarca coast." Immediately below this item, the headlines inform us that "21 Die When Italy Train Rams Closed Switch, Jumps Track." "80 Hurt when 9 cars of Speeding Naples-Bari Express Turn Over, Smashing Station Shed." Witnesses are reported as saying that "the ten-coach train with about 300 passengers aboard, raced into Benevento at a hair-raising speed despite a slanting rain which cut visibility in the darkness to nothing. The speeding engine rammied into a closed switch, apparently without seeing signal warnings." The injured driver and fireman were under police guard at the crowded local hospital.

Alongside this gruesome story is a report from Tokyo which states that "A fireworks factory in suburban Tokyo exploded... killing at least 22 persons, injuring scores and damaging 150 houses. Most of the victims were women and girls." On another page, one reads of two bus accidents which occurred on Luzon Island in the Philippines. The report states that—

"Twenty-five persons were killed and 20 injured, most of them seriously, when a bus crashed off the road into a 10-foot ravine. The accident occurred near Sison, in the Pangasinan Province of central Luzon. Eleven others were killed and 35 injured when another bus plunged into a ravine near Tabuk Mountain

about 200 kilometres north of Baguio yesterday."

And among the small news items one learns of Austrian tourists killed by avalanches; of the American Freighter *China Bear* ramming and sinking a Japanese fishing boat in dense fog off the coast of Japan. 11 of the crew of 23 are reported missing. In Korea, "Allied fighter bombers knocked out two generators at Souiho reservoir on the Manchurian border" besides shooting down enemy MiGs with their Sabre jet fighters.

The above were all previously unreported disasters. But the Monday morning paper also gives one further news of other disasters, such as the earthquake in Persia, 300 miles north-east of Teheran in which 1,400 people are believed to have been killed; that the "Chiang Forces in Burma Fight Chinese Reds". The Nationalist losses are reported at 50 dead and 50 injured, "The Communists eventually withdrew leaving 20 dead"; of "Mau Mau Terrorists" killing "2 Natives, Slash 2 Others"; of "18 Israelis Held in Bombing of Soviet Legation".

Elsewhere we can read of Berlin Refugees seeking asylum in Western Germany; more accusations about spying in Czechoslovakia; the announcement that "U.S. is planning to strengthen Chiang's Navy"; grim details of the meeting arranged between the Rosenbergs in the death house of Sing Sing prison and their two young children; of a day of mourning in Alsace for those of its countrymen imprisoned for their complicity in the Oradour massacres.

We are also told of the lunatic Korean soldier who has invented a "jiffy loader" which speeds up the loading and firing of 105 millimetre howitzers; and the horri-

fying news that motor car production in America is expected to jump by 40% this year as a result of the release of controls on metals which takes place in June. Total car production this year will be in the region of 6 million!

There was only one "human" item in my paper this morning, and then it was about elephants: the announcement that Romeo and Juliet of the Rome Zoo were shortly expecting a baby elephant. But even this story of true love was short-lived when out of the corner of my roving eye, I read that the Russian Government had the previous evening awarded titles of "mother heroine" and "considerable monetary grants" to a large group of women who have given birth to ten or more children each. Moscow radio said in a broadcast that during the first six weeks of 1953, the awards have been given to more than 400 Russian mothers.

What a Monday morning! Yet it is only a small part of the full story; and there are fifty-two Mondays in the year; and, after all, we are living in a world at peace, even in Korea apparently, according to a report in my Monday morning newspaper of a ruling by the Pennsylvania State Supreme Court.*

LIBERTARIAN.

* "The Pennsylvania State Supreme Court ruled yesterday that the Korea fighting is not a war, as it upheld the insurance claims of two soldiers who died in service. "The court ruled that double-indemnity clauses in the policies of Andrew Beley, of Pittsburgh, and Clewde Harding, of Luzerne County, Pa., be honoured. Mr. Beley was killed in Korea on March 9, 1951. Mr. Harding was a Pennsylvania National Guardsman killed in a train wreck in Ohio, Sept. 11, 1950. "The contesting insurance companies claimed that only premiums paid should be honoured because of war clauses in the policies. "Chief Justice Horace Stern, who wrote the majority opinion, said only Congress has the power to declare war, and despite the scope of the fighting in Korea no war had been declared." —(A.P.)

gaged in the metal and light engineering industries, 15 in quarrying. Is this another pointer in possible workers' co-operative extensions in Britain?

It is claimed by the C.P.F. that worker co-operatives really raise the status of the worker, create a new sense of craftsmanship by developing an esprit de corps in the workshop—it destroys the boss complex—because the workers always have the right to change their directors if they wish.

At Kettering, workers who were seen by *Fact* corroborate these claims.

The Co-operative Productive Federation at 138 Charles Street, Leicester, exists to spread the idea and to provide continuous help and assistance to existing societies. Groups of workers interested in forming their own co-operatives are always able to obtain first class (free) advice from the C.P.F. Secretary, Mr. Arthur Hemstock.

NOTE.—The Co-operative Productive Federation specifically denies any syndicalist motivation. Its secretary writes to say that the *Manchester Guardian's* comment "implies that the societies are organised on pure syndicalist lines. This is not the case, for, in all societies associated with the Co-operative Productive Federation, only part of the capital is subscribed by the workers engaged in those societies. Much of the share capital is subscribed by retail co-operative societies, a small amount by trade union branches, and the remainder by individual supporters. The Co-operative Productive Federation insists on the threefold right of the workers engaged in the society to participate in shareholding, management and surplus. While the committees of management, in some of the societies, are entirely composed of workers this arises from the operation of the democratic processes of election, as in every case, provision does exist for the election of other shareholders to the controlling committee."

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP OPEN AIR MEETINGS

Weather Permitting
HYDE PARK
Every Sunday at 4.30 p.m.

INDOOR MEETINGS

NOTICE

London Comrades are requested to note that the London Anarchist Group's Tuesday evening meetings will be held in future at:

GARIBALDI RESTAURANT,
10 LAYSTALL STREET, E.C.1
(3 mins. Holborn Hall)

The meetings will be held on TUESDAYS at 7.30 p.m.

FEB. 24—Edgar Priddy on
DE SADE, THE MAN AND THE MYTH

NORTH-EAST LONDON DISCUSSION MEETINGS IN EAST HAM

Alternate Wednesdays
at 7.30 p.m.

FEB. 25—S. E. Parker on
ANARCHISTS AND ASSASSINS

LIVERPOOL

DISCUSSION MEETINGS at
101 Upper Parliament Street,
Liverpool, 8.
Every Sunday at 8 p.m.

GLASGOW

INDOOR MEETINGS
at
CENTRAL HALLS, 25 Bath Street
Every Sunday at 7 p.m.
With John Gaffney, Frank Carlin
Jane Strachan, Eddie Shaw,

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