

GOTTWALD & CZECHOSLOVAKIA

THE readiness of Communist leaders to die at critical moments is really remarkable. Zhdanov died in his fifties mysteriously just after the Titoist breakaway, as did also Dimitrov. Suspicious and untrusting anarchists thought that they might have been "destroyed" as one says of the unwanted pups in a litter, only to learn later that it was the wicked Zionist doctors who done it.

Now Gottwald—also in his fifties—has succumbed to pneumonia and perhaps a broken heart contracted at the funeral of his great comrade-in-arms (to quote the sedate official phraseology of the Soviet Empire) J. V. Stalin.

Gottwald played the usual unattractive rôle of intrigue and deception without which influence in the Bolshevik hierarchy since 1917 was impossible. He has been represented on the one hand as a Titoist, because of his readiness to bring Czechoslovakia into the Marshall Plan, vetoed by Russia, and because he was supposed to be a Czech patriot. On the other he is represented—more plausibly, perhaps—as the faithful henchman of Moscow. His elimination of Slansky and Clementis and others is interpreted according to which viewpoint is adopted. It seems

likely, however, that all these struggles within the leadership of the satellite parties are simply struggles for survival, each man being animated by the determination, successful or not, in the event, to avoid being the scapegoat either for official failures or for the unpopularity of Soviet colonial pillaging.

It is through this mutual tension and fear and distrust that Moscow rules just as the same tension in the Russian party allowed Stalin to retain the effective control and make the decisions. The possible results of Stalin's death have been discussed in FREEDOM. The situation in Czechoslovakia is not dissimilar, for the death of Gottwald whether natural or contrived will release forces inside the country which may not be so tightly controlled from a Moscow still settling down after Stalin's death.

Czechoslovakia is in some ways the most precarious of the satellite states. It is the most westernized and the most industrialised. It has an exaggerated patriotism engendered by the Versailles Treaty and fanned by the Nazi annexation. It has a higher standard of living and a proportionately greater reason for resentment against the Russian

plundering policy. Finally, for what they are worth, it has traditional ties with the West. Perhaps more important than all these generalities there have recently been strikes and demonstrations, so well founded in the Czech workers indignation that the local Communist Parties have seen fit in many instances to be openly associated with them—presumably to avoid complete loss of face in the country.

Unfortunately unrest in Communist countries is by no means automatically welcome to the Anglo-American bloc who much prefer palace revolutions engineered by their own nominees. An outbreak of popular feeling in Czechoslovakia would not therefore receive support from the West who may well talk of the constituted authority and the need to support it—just as they do with General Franco.

The situation in Russia and its satellites remains nevertheless, more critical and contains more potentialities than ever before. If the workers and peasants can seize the initiative they may start a movement which could break up the existing power-political alignments like a pack of cards.

Our Conservative Unions

WHEN the Conservatives won the last election, we pointed out that they would see it very much in their interests to woo the Trade Union movement—to make sure the workers were kept quiet.

In fact, the Tories did not have to do much worrying, for the Trades Union Congress met them more than half-way, announcing within a week of the Tories' electoral victory that they were happy to work in harmony with the new Government.

Having been out of power unhampered by coalition for so long, the Conservatives, although paying lip-service to collaboration with the Unions, were a little slow in adjusting themselves to the changed, post-war, circumstances. R. A. Butler, for example, omitted to consult the T.U.C. before framing his 1952 Budget (we bet he consulted the Permanent Under-Secretary of State for the Treasury, however), but, as was discussed in FREEDOM (7/3/53), the T.U.C. is preparing its "advice" for him this year. And Mr. Butler will no doubt consider it carefully, even if he does not act upon it.

The T.U.C. were a little hurt by Mr. Butler's indifference last year, but that in no way affected the dog-like servility with which they accepted the Government's decisions for the workers. Indeed, so ably did the T.U.C. conform to the pattern necessary for the Conservatives' adjustment of the nation's economy that Mr. Churchill himself was constrained to praise the work they were doing, after the Margate Conference last year.

There is nothing very surprising about this. The Unions have always been, in fact if not in name, conservative. They

have been consistently reactionary and have never wanted to do anything but defend their power and sectional interests within the society in which they have been created. The Conservative Party seeks neither more nor less, wanting only to go as far as to become the ruling political party so as to be able to control the nation's economy in its own interest.

It was for this purpose, too, that the Trade Union movement created its political wing, the Labour Party, the function of which was originally to make the work of the Trades Unions easier by ironing out the worst anomalies of capitalism and eventually by nationalising the key industries and reducing the worker-versus-boss struggle to a minimum—i.e., reducing the need for trade union activity to a minimum.

This has been largely done over the last thirteen years. The Conservatives realised that they could not wage a war without the active co-operation of the Trade Union movement, and had no difficulty, after all the years of anti-war propaganda among the Labour Party and Trade Union branches, of swinging the "Labour Movement", as it is called, on to the war machine by the simple expedient of giving the key jobs of Minister of Labour to the best-known and most powerful T.U. leader, Ernest Bevin, who proceeded to rule the workers with a rod of iron.

Incidentally, it is interesting to note that the job of Home Secretary in the war-time coalition went to another Labour man, Herbert Morrison. These two appointments, paradoxical as it may seem in view of the fact that both men

Continued on p. 4

THE constant quarrels over the interpretation of Karl Marx's teachings to the accompaniment of charges of "deviation" and "treason", have always been one of the characteristics of the Marxist movement. Its latest offspring, the renegade Yugoslav Stalinists, better known to-day as Titoists, joined the fray after Moscow expelled them from the Cominform in spite of many years of faithful service. This quarrel forced the Titoists to pursue policies which when examined more closely show an ever-widening gap between words and deeds. On the one hand they tightened even further their control of the State and C.P. machine to prevent Stalinist infiltration which if successful would lead to their political overthrow and physical liquidation. On the other they evolved an "ideology" which while keeping many links with their Marxist-Stalinist past was intended to win the support of those in the West and in Asia who distrusting either Washington or Moscow or both want something "progressive" and "socialist". To them the Titoists whether of Yugoslav origin or just professional friends of the régime, presented with a great flourish Tito's speech announcing "workers' control" and the progressive withering away of the Yugoslav State.

The purpose of this article is to find out how much truth there is in the Titoist claim that Yugoslavia is the only country in the world in which the workers run their own factories. All the quotations below are extracts from the official Belgrade press. The following facts—which the Titoists have never challenged—should also be borne in mind:

- (1) The majority of the population in Yugoslavia is engaged in agriculture and consists of peasants 80% of whom own their own land while 20% belong to collective farms.
- (2) No opposition organisation or anti-Tito newspaper exists since 1945.
- (3) There is only one trade union organisation led by Communists. Before the war there were Socialist, Communist, Catholic, nationalist and independent syndicates. There are, of course, no strikes.
- (4) The secret police (UDBA) is very powerful and its upper ranks play an important rôle in all walks of life, i.e., its head is also organisational secretary of the C.P. while one of his intimate

colleagues is now at the same time the supreme public prosecutor and chairman of the "Council of the societies and organisation for the education and welfare of children!"

BEFORE 1950

When the Yugoslav Communists came to power in 1945 with the help of the Red Army and the full support of Mr. Churchill, they placed under State ownership, all the factories, banks and mines. Later on, came the turn of the retail trade (including lemonade kiosks) and of a part of agriculture. The resulting fall in output of food forced the government to postpone further collectivisation but not before much damage was done. A fairly large section of the rural labour force was induced by threats and promises to come to the towns where these peasants were given the most difficult jobs in the factories, building trade and the mines. Badly fed and clothed, and housed under appalling conditions this new urban proletariat failed to carry out the Five Year Plan in return for the title of "shock worker" and the right to participate in "socialist competitions" and "voluntary" work. All the more as they witnessed enormous waste and many cases of corruption and theft among the Communist leaders. Apart from the failure of "socialist planning" and the costs of a growing bureaucracy.

By 1950 the apathy among the workers and the crisis on all the fields of the Yugoslav economy convinced the Titoist leadership that the old slogans had lost their usefulness. Besides they wanted to show to the public abroad that in theory at least Yugoslavia was not a pocket edition of the U.S.S.R. but an "independent socialist country" worthy of support from the West. The fruit of these observations and wishes was the Law about the Workers' Councils expressed in the slogan "factories to the workers" and passed by Tito's parliament in June 1950.

IN THEORY . . .

By the law of 1950 the State handed over to the workers the factories, mines and businesses in which they worked. Together with all the debts which these enterprises made under State ownership between 1945 and 1950. (Needless to say, the UDBA did not hand over to its prisoners the numerous workshops and building sites although the inmates are

proletarians in the proper meaning of the word.)

According to the new system, the workers of each enterprise elect a Workers' Council which chooses a Managing Committee among its members. The latter's main duty is to look after working conditions in the factory while the manager of the firm, nearly always a party member, has the biggest

POLICE PRECAUTIONS FOR TITO

THE precautions taken by the police on the occasion of Tito's arrival last Monday were on a scale and of a type familiar enough to continental dictatorships, but hitherto not seen in this country.

In the last issue of FREEDOM appeared an account of the screening of Yugoslav refugees in this country by the Special Branch (as the political police are called). The questions explicitly related to the possibility of plans to assassinate Tito. Such a possibility seems to have been in the mind of the Yugoslav dictator himself, for he asked that the precise timetable of his movements should not be published. Furthermore, he has been lent a bullet-proof car, a luxury, we believe, that no British politician allows himself.

The police were ready to clear the routes which commanded a view of the Thames whenever Tito's gunboat could be seen. When it came in sight police cleared the bridges. Is it surprising that he received a very tepid welcome?

The bullet-proof car was ready for him at his disembarkation at the Westminster Pier to drive him the odd 200 yards to No. 10 Downing Street, and it was flanked by four armed police motor cyclists.

A crowd of a few hundred watched him almost in silence as he laid a wreath on the Cenotaph.

powers. He is not chosen by the workers of the enterprise but by a higher economic body, in other words, the C.P. just as it was done before 1950. The workers have not the right to dismiss him but can complain to a higher authority, in practice the C.P. The manager is responsible for the factory, its output, the signing of agreements, the choosing and dismissal of workers, etc.

. . . AND PRACTICE

As in the case of every other law, its beneficiaries are those who proposed it and voted for it. In this case it was Tito's régime. The effective power remains in the hands of the manager while certain functions like labour conditions in the factory and the share-out of the "surplus of the wages bill" (to which we shall return later on) is left to the workers, that is to say, the party members among them. This was done largely for two reasons.

The efforts of the Communist trade unions to exploit the workers made them very unpopular in Yugoslavia between 1945 and 1950. By handing some of their duties to the Workers Councils the Titoists thought they would get more response from the workers if they appeared under a new name.

Secondly, the Yugoslav Communists know better than anyone else that they cannot raise at present the workers' standard of living. By creating "Workers Councils" and "Managing Committees" in which not even ten per cent. of the total working-class sits, the Communists hope to divide the workers among themselves and force them to spend their energy in never-ending discussions about everyday problems, the solution of which does not under present circumstances depend on the workers or even on the "Councils" but on the rulers at Belgrade and on the relations between the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. In this way, the Titoists prevent the building of a common front against the real enemy.

ELECTIONS

Even the Yugoslav Communist press admits that the elections for the various bodies in the factories are purely formal. According to the trade union paper for Serbia (27/11/52), delegates themselves did not know much about the recent elections. The following answers (all taken from the same number) were received at Belgrade:

(1) "I have been chosen as a candidate for the elections of the Producers' Council but I am not clear how these elections will be organised nor what the Producer's Councils are supposed to do."

(2) "I have been chosen as a delegate by the Workers Council of our enterprise. I know that the elections for the Producers' Councils are important. But to tell you frankly I do not know what they will discuss and decide when they are elected."

(3) "Don't you know that your enterprise is sending a delegate for the 62nd electoral district?" "No, I did not know it at all. To tell you the truth, I hear this from you for the first time. Our trade union branch is completely inactive."

(4) "And what about the other workers, do they know how the elections will be carried out?" "I don't think so . . ."

The places on these Councils are filled by party members and a few other workers whom the régime wants to compromise in the eyes of their comrades by giving them tasks which will bring them sooner or later into conflict with the rest of the workers.

THE MANAGERS

In between "elections" the managers run the enterprises in full co-operation with the UDBA representative who is also on the firm's pay-roll. The latter decides all the important questions with the help of his subordinates, among whom is the factory police called the "militia". He vetoes or approves the signing of trade agreements, the dismissal of workers and decides the amount of money to be handed over to the UDBA headquarters. In this way the most important institution in Tito's Yugoslavia finances a large part of its expenses both in the country and abroad.

THE CONSEQUENCES

Numerous are the consequences of this kind of "workers' control". On the top its main characteristics are waste which often goes hand in hand with theft and malversations, together with very heavy administrative expenses. Only one number of a Belgrade periodical (26/6/1952) reported thefts and malversations to the amount of over 420 million dinars, a sum equivalent to over 40,000 monthly wages in industry.

Continued on p. 3

Workers' Management in Practice

The Co-operative Plywood Factories of N.W. Pacific

THE timber industry which plays a major part in the economy of the Pacific Coast from Northern California up through Oregon, Washington and British Columbia to the Alaskan panhandle is in general a chaotic economic entity, in which a few large capitalists lord it over a mass of small private logging operators. Conditions are extremely fluid, and workmen will often emerge from the mass to flourish for a while as small proprietors and then sink back, through some trade setback which hits the small man first, into the status of an employed worker. Only the really large operators are secure, and their position is made all the more safe by the spirit of unquenched individualism and competition which exists among the smaller men and even among the ordinary workers in the industry. Loggers are almost proverbially difficult to persuade into any form of co-operative action, and I know of only one instance, among the Norwegians of the Bella Coola valley in British Columbia, where a co-operative operation in tree-felling has been carried out successfully.

One section of the timber industry has, however, shown in recent years an unusual example of the success of co-operative production. Between twenty and thirty plywood mills of various sizes in the North-Western United States, operated by about 4,000 workers, and producing approximately 15 per cent. of the fir plywood used in the whole country, are run by the workers themselves on a co-operative basis.

Some of the mills were former capitalist concerns which were about to close down and were bought out by the workers in order to keep themselves in employment. Others were actually built by groups of workers who pooled or borrowed the capital necessary in order to build and equip their own mills.

The first of these mills was built by a group of workers in Olympia, Washington, in the early 1920s. 125 of them contributed \$500 each in order to start the construction of the mill, and then, for six months, they worked for virtually no wages in order to get the concern into going order. If a man was on the verge of starvation, his fellows would give him enough to keep going, but otherwise everything was kept to get the mill into operation. Within a year the money began to return, and wages to be paid.

The Olympia mill, however, was not constituted on a truly co-operative basis, in that the original men who gathered to erect it did not specify that it could only be owned by the actual workers. And the consequence has been that in the process of the years the working owners of shares have dwindled into a small élite, of about 50 men, employing 1,000 other men who are merely wage-earners, and also supporting a considerable number of individuals who have left the plant but still retain their share of ownership.

To-day such a co-operative differs very little from an ordinary joint stock company, and the lesson has not been lost on later co-operative groups, so that in the majority of the mills built or taken over by the workers since those early days, steps have been taken to ensure that the control does not actually pass out of the hands of the workers themselves.

A mill at Tacoma, one of those taken over by the workers to prevent its being closed down, can serve as an example of this newer, more numerous and more genuinely co-operative type of mill.

Two hundred men and women work there, and they have delegated their affairs to six of their number who continue to work at the bench. There are no paid executive officers, no managers sitting in offices and thinking about their expense accounts. Instead, all the members of the executive do a six-day week in overalls, carry on what managerial work is necessary in their spare time, and only leave the bench if any urgent administrative matter should crop up during working hours. In order to keep a constant check on these executive delegates, the membership meets once every three months, while decisions relating to the workers themselves are subject to the whole membership. That is to say, if a worker wishes to sell his share in the concern, he can only do so to a man who is fit and willing to work in the plant and who is acceptable to the whole of the existing membership. Furthermore, if a man is regarded as undesirable, he can only be asked to go by the whole of the membership. No individual can own any large share of capital, and in no circumstances can he get more than one voice in the affairs of the plant.

In other respects, the newer co-operatives adhere to strictly egalitarian principles. Dividends on shares are only nominal, and the profits are shared out to the members in the form of wages.

While the average wages in the plywood industry in capitalist-run factories is less than two dollars an hour, in the co-operative factories it is between three and three and a half dollars an hour. At the same time, it is flexible, and it has been discovered by practice that in hard times the members of co-operatives are willing to accept relatively small pay in order to keep their own factory in operation. These wages are paid on a strictly equal basis, so that the sweeper and the most highly skilled mechanic get exactly the same wages. And, contrary to the usual arguments in favour of differentiated wages, this fact has not yet been the cause of any trouble whatsoever.

In spite of—or perhaps because of—the lack of “trained executives” and capitalist supervision, the co-operatives in general operate more efficiently than the capitalist concerns about them, and on an average can manufacture a given amount of plywood with between 10 and 20 per cent. less labour than the capitalist concern. A writer for the *Saturday Evening Post* who investigated these co-operative mills gave two reasons for this higher productivity. One was that the restrictive mentality produced by generations of hard times and orthodox union policy had disappeared. Where a worker in a capitalist concern kept to the strict letter of his job and stood back when there was nothing for him to do, the worker in a co-operative concern is ready to keep working at any job that offers itself so that the general interest, which is also his own particular interest, may be furthered. Furthermore, while in a private concern the lazy man is a foreman's problem, and continues to be lazy while the foreman does not notice him, in a co-operative he quickly draws upon himself the attention and, before long, the criticism of his fellow workers, which is usually sufficient to induce him to work his share.

The following paragraph from the same writer, describing a visit to one of

the plants, shows adequately enough the spirit which prevails in such factories:

“Another incontrovertible fact is beautifully illustrated at Anacortes. The worker-owned plant there sprawls between a railroad and Puget Sound. This writer and his ten-year-old son strolled through that plant recently. There was no gateman and no one interfered with that casual inspection tour. Nobody was loafing, not even in the dim recesses of the plant where an office man would be unlikely to come once a day. Almost every worker looked up. One man carefully sorted out a half-dozen oddly shaped veneer patches as souvenirs for the youngster, and another worker invited the boy to try his hand at operating an old automatic elevator which served as a feeding platform for veneer driers. The gifts and the favour were given with pride. But in that entire plant nobody asked to see a pass from the manager, nobody looked around to see whether the foreman was watching, and nobody appeared either shirking or in the least afraid of the boss. And why should they be? They are the bosses.”

The main criticism of these co-operative plants which will be made is one that is expressed in terms of praise by the ordinary American press when they say that the co-operatives are creating thousands of small capitalists. To an extent this is true, and particularly in plants where the shares are saleable and where they have grown to several times their original value. This criticism is met in some plants where shares are not only saleable only to men willing to work in the plant, but must also be sold only at par. At the same time, the criticism still holds to the extent that one of the incentives which propels the men in their work is the fact that they increase their own earnings by so doing, and that their being able to own a share in the factory in fact places them in a higher economic bracket than other workers in the same industry.

Yet are we to condemn men because, having used rational methods of organisation, they have naturally attained a mental and physical well-being greater than those who have not used such methods? The gaining of more money is in fact an adventitious result of the use of such methods in a money society. What we should do is to consider, not those defects of these producers' co-operatives which are the result of the negative society in which they are forced to operate, but rather the positive lessons which point towards the success of a generally co-operative society.

And here we have, despite all the Tory industrialists and the Socialist state-planners, workers from the bench who are managing their factories, not only as well, but even better than their private competitors. We have a demonstration that a voluntary incentive will make men produce more in less time. We have a partial answer to the old question of the lazy man in the proof which is given us here that, where men can identify their own good with the general good, they will work without the threat of physical or economic sanctions. And we have in practice—and in efficient practice—a system in which no man received more than any other man, no matter how skilled his job; in this case the fact that wages are paid seem accidental since the lesson would clearly hold just as good in a society where they had been abolished and replaced by directly distributed goods and services. Finally, we have a system of worker delegates carrying out administrative functions for the general good and not for high salaries, and responsible constantly and directly to the general membership.

The members of the co-operative plywood mills are not anarchists, and, except for a few ex-wobblies, they would probably be shocked if anybody suggested they were. But more than many a spinner of abstractions, they have underlined in concrete fact and action the lessons we have long been teaching, and in the respects I have indicated they have shown, not a blue-print, but a living model of a co-operative society.

GEORGE WOODCOCK.

VIEWPOINT

The Truth About the W.E.A.

AS a working man and an old member of the Workers Educational Association, I fully agree with the 10 per cent. cut in the Treasury grant which the Minister of Education has made in connection with the W.E.A. for this reason.

The W.E.A. first showed signs of decay in 1925 for after that date it was invaded by middle-class people generally of Secondary School education, and when these began to form the Committees of local branches and became delegates to National Conferences, the whole nature of the movement changed. The influx of these people meant that the intellectual level of the new classes started on a plane above the head of the genuine artisan worker. This elemental plane was further upheld by the “regulars” of the W.E.A. Movement often in their fifties, who had reached the “sixth form” but who refused to “leave school” and consequently wanted new subjects each session of an advanced nature (for example, French literature), when the genuine artisan working-class newcomer did not know the first thing about the literature of his own country. Naturally, the “old boys” and the new middle-class with their higher educational background joined hands for they had much in common, but the whole nature of the W.E.A. class changed in the union and really became a class of university level. Added to these were ex-undergraduates and student-teachers anxious to “refresh”. Strangely enough University Extension Classes seemed to drop in scholastic level and in our town a U.E. class became popular and its students outnumbered those of all the W.E.A. classes put together. This was a pointer.

Also added to the above was the new type of lecturer. These were often Secondary School teachers who wanted to move on to universities and having had only adolescent minds before them for a number of years wanted to feel the atmosphere and assess the mental level of an adult class. Undergraduates also pushed themselves forward in W.E.A. lectures, but these, to their credit, frankly admitted that they wanted to gain experience, but both of these types differed from the old type of tutor and were out of sympathy with their class and this eventually suffered.

At this point a great question arose from the above alien types and which many consider has never been answered—“What is a worker?”—and it was

pointed out that “all people work, including the king; and some manual workers take home more each week than many managing directors, etc.” and the Executive at St. George's Drive pretended not to know and added fuel to the fire.

But any intelligent fourth-form school-boy knows that it was the educational background that should give entrance to a Workers Educational Association class, and that many of the high wages were only temporary. Recognition should only be given to the prospective working-class student of Board School education.

Another fatal step was that of linking up with the Trade Unions. Old-type working-class students with vision said, “The Labour Party has gone in with the bosses before, if they do so again we shall all sink together in working-class estimation.” To-day that is almost a reality, and many people of an independent political mind left the W.E.A. at this point on ethical grounds, holding that real education is above party politics, which it is. With the rise of the Labour Party in 1945 many trade unionists in the W.E.A. movement openly emerged and asserted themselves. Men who at one time wore cloth caps and had some of the ingrained commonsense and direct homespun language generally associated with that useful article, suddenly sported black Office of Works Homburgs in imitation of popular leaders together with the inevitable empty briefcase. A weakness for an audience was noted and “speechifying” was rife, and many began to affect the heavy long-drawn face by which the gullible are led to believe that the burden and care of State lies heavily upon the wearer. This caused some friction amongst workers who were drawn from all creeds. The constitution of the W.E.A. states that the Association is non-political.

By this time most of the progressively-minded members had left. A minority on committees, they saw the way things were going and realised that they would fulfil their instinct for social work in other directions. The average age of classes by 1948, by which time the W.E.A. was in financial difficulties, was between 50 and 60. One characteristic of our grey-haired leaders by this time was that they never lacked academic phrases often at the expense of common sense. Underneath the high roof of the

historic St. George's Hall, Westminster, we were told that the movement was merely “entering a New Phase”. It was.

Another menace arose at this time which further isolated the genuine working-class student of low educational background. There has always been a tendency for the Church to dominate the W.E.A. and many people only four years after the formation of the Association in 1908 questioned the wisdom of this. During 1949-50, the religionists in the movement, and there were many, for the average age of members was over 50, began to quietly come to the front as is their wont and form a majority on committees. I know of one large working-class town in the vicinity of one of our largest railway works employing thousands, whose W.E.A. branch definitely introduced a religious note into their meetings. Their membership was only about 70. Summer rambles to neighbouring villages always ended with a church service. I am not religious, and I do not decry it as such, but in these times surely this would limit membership?

But the thing which hit the W.E.A. hardest was the Music Class. True, like the Irishman's pig, it paid the rent, but it gave the last push to a dying Association. The fervour and clannishness of “music-lovers” is an institution. The W.E.A. music classes certainly thrived, and again the middle-class poured into the W.E.A. afresh, and most of them had “done” music at school. I once went to an opening music class of 40, of which 7 were shop girls, or as they will be called to-day, female shop assistants, of Board School education, and of course they had every right to be there. The remainder were well-tweed middle-class office workers, secretaries, etc., or “home duties” according to the register. “Of course, you can all read music?” said the new lecturer (from quite a well-known London college). All the hands went up except those of the seven shop girls and mine. “How many can read an orchestral score?” was the next question, and of the 32 remaining, 27 put their hands up! After the first trial class the seven shop girls left—and I left with them.

Our presence would have embarrassed both class and tutor, but that is how it has been in other classes, for instance Literature and Psychology. Music classes are now one in five of every successful

class held, but it would be wrong to say that they form 20 per cent. of W.E.A. students because their class numbers in a district often outnumber all the students of the other class put together. If a nation-wide count of W.E.A. students was taken, the Music Classes would represent nearly 70 per cent. of all W.E.A. students. Another drawback to this class to W.E.A. tradition was the emotional element it introduced into the movement and the emotional type of person, i.e. the “music-cissies” who found themselves in a majority on committees to the detriment of the whole movement, and this further isolated the genuine uneducated manual worker from the W.E.A.

In these careful times why should the State subsidise middle-class music-lovers who can well afford to pay full fees for their tuition? I can well understand the Minister concerned in her endeavour to do her duty to the taxpayer by making the 10 per cent. cut in the Treasury grant to the W.E.A. Under the circumstances I think it is moderate. The W.E.A. has become removed from its original aim and purpose. Why should area organisers and their unwanted secretaries draw comfortable salaries for empty classrooms in essential subjects? Those who want group adult education should hire their own premises and provide their own tutors. There is no educational apathy amongst the people for whom the W.E.A. originally set out to cater, for the visitor to the Public Library can see this for himself, and from my experience I think the Public Libraries are the best way of spending money granted to Adult Education. The man who wants to learn will, and a Public Library allows no dead pockets as is found in the W.E.A. for its staff is adjusted to the flow of demand and there is no wastage. The W.E.A. has been dying since 1925 and those of us who have worked and felt for it have often wondered how it would make its exit gracefully. The Old Lady has been on her back for a long time now, and the Minister's 10 per cent. is a happy solution to our problem, so let her slip quietly away.

E. J. ROGERS.
[We publish this controversial article, without editorial comment, but in the hope that comments will be forthcoming from other readers, particularly those with experience of the W.E.A., of whom we are sure there must be a number amongst FREEDOM readers.—Eds.]

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

OPEN DAILY

Books on Syndicalism, etc.

(SECOND-HAND)	
J. H. Harley Syndicalism	2/6
Adam W. Kirkaldy Economics and Syndicalism	2/6
Philip Snowden Socialism and Syndicalism	3/-
G. D. H. Cole The World of Labour (1917)	4/-
Sir Arthur Clay Syndicalism and Labour	6/6
J. A. Estey Revolutionary Syndicalism	10/-
“G. T. 99” Labour Spy	3/6
(REMAINDER)	
James J. Gillespie Free Expression in Industry	3/-
(PAMPHLET)	
Philip Sansom Syndicalism: the Workers' Next Step	1/-
(PERIODICALS)	
The Industrial Worker (U.S.A.) weekly	3d.
and The Syndicalist monthly (2/- a year if posted with “Freedom”) Postage extra in all cases (Open 9—6.30, 5.30 on Saturdays.)	2d.

Obtainable from

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

ETHICS OF POLITICAL JUDGMENT

IT is nearly five years since Stalin excommunicated Tito. Up till that time Yugoslavia had been a model Communist State and Belgrade had been the headquarters of the Cominform. Tito had exchanged the usual incivilities with the West and had shot down American aeroplanes. Western newspapers knew all about the brutality of the police régime in Yugoslavia and had no difficulty in relating it to the Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist theoretical foundation of this most promising of Moscow's satellites.

If Stalin's propaganda machine went into reverse overnight regarding Tito, FREEDOM foresaw and forecast at the time a similar about-face in the West, though it could be allowed more time and so appear more seemly.

The case of Tito illustrates in the clearest manner that it is the exigencies of power politics which determines a government's attitude towards another government. Till June 22nd, 1941 Stalin was utterly black, the devourer of gallant Finland; overnight almost he became our powerful ally and his benefits to the Russian people (for example, his foresight in liquidating the potential Trotskyite traitors, as his new British apologists for the purges readily represented it) were extolled. More gradually after 1946 he reverted to his former ogre-like presentation.

When Tito survived the Russian propaganda war, he immediately became a potential ally of the West and so the spotlight was gradually shifted from his vices to his virtues, or more simply the former were now called by the latter name. Such a reversal of policy comes easily to a government. What is rather less pleasant in that it may be acceptable to the public, the consumers of propaganda. It is gratifying to be able to detect that once again in this respect, people in general are so much more ethical in their outlook than governments are; for the British public have been singularly unenthusiastic about Tito's visit, and the tone of the official propagandists has been of necessity shrill and unconvincing.

Brigadier Fitzroy Maclean illustrated this — involuntarily — in a broadcast when he said that the great thing about Tito was that he was a rebel, and that in these times of the police state and totalitarianism that was quite something. Almost the next day the *Observer's* profile of Tito remarks: "Comrade Walter" (i.e. Tito) seems the model of a safe Comintern functionary. How very safe is shown in 1937 when the whole leadership of the Yugoslav Party is purged with one exception—Comrade Walter, who is dispatched from the inner sanctum of Moscow to go with full powers . . ." All this in the course of an account of the dictator's life which strives hard throughout to be favourable: here is the nearest it gets to realism: "Not even the greatest admirer of Tito can maintain that he is an entirely amiable character. He has humour, charm, and a certain bonhomie. But he has shown himself capable of utter ruthlessness; and, as his execution of the vanquished and captured Mihailovitch shows, incapable of magnanimity in victory. On the other hand, not even the bitterest enemy of Tito can deny that he is a great man . . ."

The italics here are ours. Surely this estimate epitomizes the whole falsity of political judgment. After a lifetime of the petty, but none the less ruthless and brutal backstage intrigues which characterizes the Com-

munist of Lenin and Stalin's followers, Tito succeeds to power. His success is achieved by pitiless extinction of rivals and through the deaths of hundreds of thousands of Yugoslav workers, to say nothing of the backing of the Stalinist machine. His régime can only maintain itself through a police force of the usual totalitarian proportions. But, in politics, success wipes the slate clean and Tito is a great man, extolled, on the one hand, by the Tory Eden, and on the other by the Socialist, Bevan and the *Tribune*.

Nothing could more clearly illustrate the confusion of judgment, the moral obliquity, and the jesuitism of the political outlook than these opening words of the *Times* leading article for 16th March, the day of Tito's arrival in Britain:

"Marshal Tito will be made welcome in London as head of a State with which Great Britain has close ties of interest. Yugoslavia's decision in 1941 to prefer certain suffering to a dishonourable peace earned the admiration of the British people, who had themselves made the same choice a year earlier. But the decision to break with Moscow which Marshall Tito made in 1948 required courage and intelligence of an equally high order. It offered the certainty of economic hardship and the risk of war. Only a ruler who had supreme confidence in his own judgment and in the innate patriotism of his fellow countrymen could have risked such a throw."

It is worth examining point by point. Tito's decision in 1941 was determined by Moscow's current line. He had acquiesced up to then in the Soviet-Hitler pact. The Yugoslav people spontaneously revolted against the Nazi occupying forces: but Tito was the Comintern functionary obediently sent from Moscow. His 1948 decision was also one of necessity rather than courage. His unpopularity in his own country made necessary the resistance to Russian orders, for his self interest made him unwilling to be sacrificed as the scapegoat for Soviet colonial rapacity. The economic hardship would not be borne by Tito but by the long suffering Yugoslavs—as would also the sufferings of the war he risked. Finally, the confidence of dictators rests in their police force, in their economic stranglehold over their subjects: it certainly has nothing in common with the "comradeship with fellow countrymen" implied by the *Times*.

The above does not seem a capacious analysis. The phraseology of the *Times* is absolutely insincere and superficial. Anarchists do not believe that success in the more brutal political struggles constitutes greatness. The cruder and more patriotic type of school history book may perpetuate these myths in regard to the public figures of one's own country, but serious history does not, and men like Tito or Gottwald, or, indeed, Stalin himself, are not finally judged in this adulatory manner. If official history redresses the time lag of confusion created by responsible organs of public opinion like the *Times* and the *Sunday Pictorial*, the straightforward judgment of ordinary men and women is more direct and more simple. By such judgment men like Tito remain in dislike and contempt even if they achieve respect because they are a force to be reckoned with like the police or the mad dog.

More than Tito himself, however, what stands condemned is the whole falsity of political judgment itself with its time saving, its shameless shifts, its substitution of patriotism for ethics.

KIKUYU CHILDREN

THE Secretary of State for the Colonies, Mr. Lyttelton, was asked in parliament how many children of the Kikuyu tribe had been deprived of schooling through the closing of independent schools. He replied that the number was about 13,000, and said that arrangements had been made by which all these children would be in State-aided or State-controlled schools within the next four months.

History of the Krupps

The Agreement with Alfred Krupp, giving him the green light to begin again organising his vast industrial empire of munition works, has just been signed with the blessing of the British Government. We publish below a brief history of the Krupp family and its works by a German comrade who has had the opportunity of closely watching them and their constant identification with the German ruling class.

THE Krupps are a family that have been inextricably allied with German militarism for the last hundred years. The family is now in its fifth generation and every penny they own was made out of armaments and war. The founder of the family's arms works was a locksmith. He owned a small workshop and the power he used came from a big wheel turned by the waters of the River Ruhr. The business he started has grown steadily and proportionately with the growth of the German army, navy and imperialist ambitions. It now has huge gun and steel works, mines, shipyards, and so on.

Krupp, however, has not furnished the German Government alone with war materials; anyone was welcome to them provided they had the money. The fact that the German Government might possibly come into conflict with other governments to whom he had supplied war materials did not bother him. In this respect, at least, Krupp was an internationalist! It is not surprising therefore, that many German soldiers have been shot to pieces by guns supplied by Krupp.

There was, for instance, the agreement made between an English armament firm and Krupp, shortly before the 1914-18 war, concerning the patent of a shell-fuse. This was well-known to the German Government and Kaiser William II, the friend of Krupp. The patent was the property of Krupp and he sold it to the English firm on condition that for every shell fired with this fuse they had to pay Krupp one shilling. Krupp must have had a good information service during the war as to how many shells the British Army fired with the fuse, since after the war he sued the English firm for £6,000,000. The British had used 120,000,000 of Krupps' fuses, so Krupp not only profited from supplying the German Army, but also from the British one, too! This is only one example of Krupps benefiting from the death of German soldiers.

Krupp had an unquestionable arms monopoly in Germany, the government paying whatever he asked for his commodities. He was an unofficial but very

important part of the German war machine and the generals and admirals who inspected the guns and ships he supplied to the government did not find it necessary to question the prices he asked. It would have been very unwise for anyone to do so, because he would not only come into conflict with the government but also with the Kaiser or, later, Hitler—both of whom were friends of Krupp.

The Krupps always receive extraordinarily favourable treatment from the Kaisers of Germany. They were often guests of Krupp at his magnificent castle, "Villa Hügel," a few miles outside of Essen. Hitler, when he became ruler of Germany, carried on the custom.

This bestowal of favours commenced with the first German Kaiser, Wilhelm I.

Workers' Control in Yugoslavia

Continued from p. 1

The waste is largely responsible for the shortage of raw materials, badly built houses and low productivity. On what hard currency is spent can be seen from an article from the C.P. paper *Borba*, which complains on 11/11/52 of the import of "billiard tables, pianos, hoovers, refrigerators . . ." all, of course, for the families of Communist leaders at a time when Yugoslavia is facing grave food shortages.

UNEMPLOYMENT

While the upper ranks enjoy the fruits of power the workers live under poor conditions and are subject to unemployment if they belong to what the Titoists call the "surplus labour force". Dismissals have taken place affecting mostly women, apprentices and old workers. "It is not rare," reported a Belgrade paper (29/9/52), "that through protection, personal acquaintance and testimonials, workers are dismissed and others are given work."

Further, the very right to work is limited in many cases, largely for those who were sentenced for "political" reasons and the artisans who refused to join the Communist "co-operatives". According to Tito's press (9/12/52) in

Formerly King of Prussia, he was crowned Emperor of Germany after the German Army defeated the French in 1870 with the help of Krupp guns. In 1888, Kaiser Wilhelm II increased the royal favouritism towards Krupp, and he and Krupp (the Krupps were now in their third generation) became close friends.

The visits of the Kaiser to Villa Hügel were nothing out of the ordinary and no-one took any notice of them. But one day rumours spread throughout Germany concerning certain things which took place in the Villa Hügel between the Kaiser, Krupp, a prince Eulenburg and several young boys. After this affair became public Krupp suddenly died—so it was said. On the day of his funeral, the Kaiser arrived from Berlin to pay his last respects. That day also, a workers' paper in Essen offered a reward of 1,000 marks to anyone who could swear to having seen Krupp dead or being buried. The reward was never claimed. It was supposed that the "death" of Krupp was a fake designed to save his life and cover the Kaiser,

Continued on p. 4

Serbia alone "nearly thirty thousand" artisans have no right to work. In some towns there are more artisans without the permit than with it and "on the whole it is possible to say that this year (1952) there are more artisans without the permit than ever before".

WAGES

As in other countries, the wages system exists in Yugoslavia too. Real earnings are lower than in Western Europe and in many cases compare unfavourably with the ones earned by the same workers before the war. The wages fluctuate by as much as 20-30% from month to month, vary for the different categories of workers and depend on the profits their firm is making which in turn are dependent upon the production targets set by the government. The latter also decides the percentage of the firm's earnings which have to be handed over to the State either directly or indirectly to various institutions like the UDBA. All the transactions are carried out through the only existing bank in Yugoslavia, called the National Bank.

In this way the régime retains full control over the means of production and distribution. Profits or solvency at least, are the main objects of every enterprise in favour of which safety regulations, lighting and sanitation are sacrificed time after time. Workers with many children get dismissed because the children's allowances are paid by the enterprise in which they work. Their retention on the pay-roll thus tends to lower the total sum available for wages. Press advertisements brazenly announce that priority for jobs will be given to those with "no or few children". Elderly workers and those suffering from ill-health were dismissed more than once because their output did not reach the required target and thus caused a fall in efficiency and lower profits.

THE CARROT

Apart from the weekly wages and the monthly salaries each successful enterprise can, in theory at least, divide among the workers the so-called "surplus of the wages bill" at the end of the financial year. Provided, of course, it has fulfilled all its other obligations to the State. The actual sum varied but compared unfavourably with the bonuses given by the more prosperous firms in Western Europe. (A Belgrade firm boasted in October 1952 that thanks to an excellent business year its "surplus of the wages bill" averaged 28 shillings per month.)

In the past six months, however, the drought and the poor state of the Yugoslav economy provided a pretext for the Titoists to postpone the sharing out of this "surplus". The reason given is that it would cause an "inflation". The result was that one "workers' council" after another handed over the "surplus" to the government with messages of support to "Marshal" Tito. Needless to say, none of Tito's numerous ministers or generals made a similar gift.

Unlike many politicians in the West, the vast majority of workers in Yugoslavia is fully aware that between them and workers' control stands the régime of the UDBA. The conditions under which they live are not of their own making nor do they wish a similar fate to anybody else. Neither will their problems be solved by inviting to London their bloody oppressor and chief enemy, On the contrary.

TITO SPEAKS . . .

on Stalin . . .

" . . . the inspirator of all-Slav friendship, the organiser of the great victories in the Fatherland War, our beloved and dear Stalin . . ." (8/6/1946).

on Churchill . . .

" . . . Mr. Churchill has a heart of stone . . . he is only interested in his imperialist aims . . . Churchill hates our country . . . has shown himself the standard bearer of warmongers . . . Today all the warmongers see in Mr. Churchill their leader . . ." (4/11/1946).

on Soviet foreign policy . . .

" . . . Only the Soviet Union defends our interests resolutely, step by step . . ." (16/7/1946).

on his teacher . . .

" . . . We in Yugoslavia followed Stalin's teaching and thanks to it we achieved . . . great successes . . ." (8/6/1946).

on the Marshall Plan . . .

" . . . What is the Marshall Plan? The Marshall Plan is a plan to safeguard the American financial oligarchy from the crisis which is coming inevitably . . . It is the worst kind of imperialist politics." (10/2/1948).

on the Right-Wing Socialists . . .

" . . . They are the traitors of the working-class. With the aid of these traitors the American financiers want to climb on the back of the European peoples and especially the European working people." (10/2/1948).

on the Constitution . . .

" . . . after the constitution of the Soviet Union, ours is the most democratic and the best . . ." (2/11/1946).

on the freedom of the press . . .

" . . . What is the 'full' freedom of the press and what does it consist of? It consists in that everyone is allowed to write even the greatest lies and slanders under the pretext that this is freedom and that it is moral. From our point of view this is amoral and this freedom is harmful . . ." (20/11/1946).

on production . . .

" . . . as regards production, we have quite a number of similarities with the system of work in the Soviet Union, this has already given great results . . ." (18/5/1946).

" . . . If we follow the teaching of our great teachers Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, if we follow and learn correctly from the experience of the most revolutionary and heroic Communist Party of the Soviet Union, our Party will be able to accomplish its historic mission . . ." (The *Communist*, No. 1, p. 89, organ of the Central Committee of the C.P. of Yugoslavia).

Tito's Secret Police (by its head)

(1) " . . . One of the most beautiful achievements of the great national liberation struggle of our peoples . . ." (25/3/1946).

(2) " . . . In the course of the year 1949 47% of the arrests which the UDBA made were irregular . . ." (4/6/1951).

Tito's "humanism"

" . . . The Supreme Court of the People's Republic of Serbia upheld the sentence of the District Court for Belgrade city, to a group of robbers of copper wire from the enterprise "Elektro-Srbija". By this sentence the first four robbers, D. Borisavljevic, A. Kijevcanin, M. Milijanovic and B. Milic were sentenced to death by shooting . . ." — *Politika* (Belgrade), 5/12/1952).

Tito's "internationalism"

" . . . The trial of Anton Vinkler, peasant from the village of Trnovo, district of Goritza, took place to-day at Nova Goritza. The accused Vinkler used his permit to cross the frontier . . . to smuggle . . . people who wanted to cross illegally into Italy. On the evidence and the admission of the accused, the District Court sentenced Anton Vinkler to five years and six months hard labour and to the confiscation of property on Yugoslav territory." — *Borba*, (C.P. organ), 16/1/1953.

The Anarchist Revolution

OBVIOUSLY I was not entirely successful in my attempt to give a more concrete expression to certain aspects of the concept of freedom, otherwise Bert Smith would not have so misunderstood me.

In the first place, the sort of freedom of which he is speaking is more correctly called liberty, or better still, immunity from interference, and far from ignoring the necessity for this it was the aspect with which I was most concerned, precisely because it is the most tangible form of freedom. But the positive or creative side of this 'liberty from' is 'power to', and this is in my opinion more correctly called freedom. Herbert Read's "freedom to become what one is" may have too much of a metaphysical flavour for Comrade Smith's palate, but as I interpret it, it simply means the power to develop one's own potentialities, or to become what one is capable of becoming. Liberty can be given by others, freedom can only be found by oneself within oneself.

Where I was mistaken in my article was in equating self-sovereignty with self-power, for the first is a negative term, comprehending all the freedoms for which Bert Smith pleads, and the second a positive term. And what I did not make clear was that according to my conception freedom may be looked upon as a sort of linear progression from absolute slavery through an ever greater degree of liberty to absolute self-sovereignty. It is only from this point that (given also an equal share of the common wealth) all other external, man-made restrictions to the development of self-power are removed.

My belief that suffering and action are inseparable is a personal opinion based on experience that has nothing to do with any theological doctrine, and in any case is not the reason for my conviction that the libertarian society will never be achieved without some violence. As for my critic's second point, I have never suggested that those who favour universal liberty are anything else but a tiny, "eccentric" minority.

Finally, the whole object of my article was to convince my fellow libertarians that however valuable propaganda and action in the fields of syndicalism, birth control, and so on may be in itself, it will finally come to nought unless we are prepared to seize and to defend that absolute self-sovereignty which is no more than our right.

London, March 8.

"ANDREAS".

Down With Education

EDWIN PEEKE's lecture, "Down with Education," which was printed in FREEDOM, deserves some commentary. He touches on the root of the authoritarian basis of society, the unhealthy relationship existing between adults and children, which is perpetuated by most adult institutions. I agree with him wholeheartedly that this question is of fundamental importance to anarchists. It has been said that two nations inhabit every country—the rich and the poor. It can be said with equal truth that another division cuts right across these two "nations"—the adult class and the child class, whose interests are maintained in sharp antagonism.

The basis from which Edwin Peeke attacks the problem, however, obscures the real points which he has to make. He starts off by quoting dictionary definitions of the real meaning of the word "education", and then goes on to attack "education" using the word in the sense in which it is vulgarly mis-applied. I would remind him that the word "anarchy" also has a vulgar mis-application. One would do the cause of clear thinking no service by writing an article entitled "Down with Anarchy," using the word in the sense of chaos or muddle. It is unfair to dismiss as mere "definition-mongers" those who would use such words as "anarchy" and "education" in their true sense. Words have a meaning, and using them in their debased sense too often serves as a means by which the true concepts are themselves unfairly attacked. It was Humpty Dumpty who declared "words mean just what I tell 'em to mean!" and he has had many imitators.

To cry "Down with Education" simply plays into the hands of the reactionary cynics, and does nothing to revolutionise the relations between the adult world and

THE reply by "Andreas" to my criticism of his article does underline the misconception of Anarchism on which he based his critique of the Anarchist movement.

When I stressed the fact that his idea of the Anarchist revolution took no account of the part which the workers as such would of necessity have to play in such a revolution, I was far from having any "bees in my bonnet" about the workers or bourgeoisie simply because of any inherent good or evil in either, as he so readily assumes.

He answers honestly enough that he is of bourgeois origin and can one help that? Assuredly not. He says, in effect, that he may live in bourgeois fashion, but what of it—what value is there in living otherwise? One may grant him that too. There is no more intrinsic value or sort of divine credit to be obtained by being a factory worker than a solicitor's clerk, but the latter can hardly say plaintively, "Am I therefore to be excluded from the industrial struggle?" The answer must perforce be "Yes" and what more can be done about it? A movement by solicitor's clerks against their employers is unlikely; one for control of their industry impossible. It is true that one can argue that they may well be paid less than many factory workers, etc., but nobody can do anything about it except they themselves.

It is not, as "Andreas" appears to think, that one is therefore condemning him. What I objected to was the assumption by "Andreas" that because he has this frustration, he should therefore condemn the Anarchist movement because it cannot do much to help him. And the effect of bourgeois near-Anarchists in the last decade has been, because the industrial struggle can have no great meaning to them, to prefer instead to discuss the secondary problem of whether a revolution need entail violence. This is something which cannot be decided upon if there is no occupation of places of work (which is the revolution). Pacifism or counter-pacifism means nothing beside that main question and a decision that resistance must never (or should only) be violent can only imply a bid for leadership of such a movement, but not the building of such a movement.

"Bourgeois" may well be an "emotive term"—but I wonder if in arguing along these lines, "Andreas" is not indeed adopting that very attitude of thought he labelled in his article "Kaffeehaus"? I used the term in order to put forward

the point that the frustration he himself laid claim to—the burning desire to do something as against the pacifist case—was based upon the economic circumstances which prevented him from that form of immediate action contained in the idea of Anarcho-Syndicalism. For what he terms "the non-professional workers in industry and suchlike" this action is one that can be adopted now, and while all his arguments may be true enough ("they are just as bourgeois," "after all, we're all workers," etc.), the non-productive person must seek other methods of approaching the social revolution.

This can sometimes be done—for instance, with regard to teachers and the Free School idea—but it cannot be the same thing as the movement for occupation of the places of work which in its successful conclusion means the Anarchist Revolution. In most cases it may well be only a plan for action rather than action.

In his sweeping condemnation of the Anarchist movement as "little more than a debating ground for dissatisfied intellectuals," "Andreas" was, I feel, looking very little farther than a narrow circle which included himself. (I wonder if "intellectual" is less "emotive" a term than bourgeois?) If he wants more than that, he must consider the Anarchist movement from its working-class angle, whether the "workers are just as bourgeois, etc., etc." or not.

A.M.

GODWIN

THE revival of interest in William Godwin continues to produce books. This summer Odhams Press are to publish *William Godwin and his World* by R. Glynn Grylls (21s.). Godwin is also one of the thinkers discussed in a new book by Prof. G. D. H. Cole, *Socialist Thought: the Forerunners, 1789-1850* (Macmillan, 25s.). This book is the first in a series planned to give a general history of the development of socialist ideas in Europe.

History of Krupp's Continued from p. 3

Krupp himself going abroad. The general opinion of the population was that Krupp's funeral was a sham and his coffin had been filled with stones instead of a dead body.

Wilhelm II had nothing but contempt for the common people and for the organized workers only hatred. Yet on that day in Essen he did what he had never done before and never did again, that is: he made a speech to the workers. Returning from the alleged burial of Krupp he unexpectedly turned up at the Central Railway Station in Essen, which at that time of the day was crowded with thousands of workers going to and from their working shifts. The Kaiser's speech was a defence of Krupp and an attack upon the workers' opinion of him. Amongst other things, the Kaiser stated that Krupp had been his friend and he shielded him with his imperial honour, etc. It is obvious that with such close relations existing between the imperial family and the house of Krupp, the latter could ask any price it liked from the German Government for its products. (The Krupp who had been "buried" died a number of years later on the beautiful island of Capri.)

With the abdication of Wilhelm II and the advent of the Weimar Republic, however, Krupp's fortunes suffered a decline. During the existence of the Republic, the German Army was very small and its expenditure was only a fraction of that of the imperial army. These were lean years for Krupp. Then his fortunes began to take a turn for the better. Hitler began to thunder against the "shameful peace" of Versailles. Of course, Krupp was careful as to which attitude to adopt, since in those early days of the reaction against the republic, it was difficult to see whether the future rulers of Germany would be the Monarchists or the Nazis.

ANTI-CAPITAL PUNISHMENT LEAGUE

A small meeting will be held at Conway Hall, Wednesday, 25th March, at 7.30 p.m. to consider setting up organisation. All interested are invited.

Our Conservative Unions

Continued from p. 1

proceeded to betray the principles they had each proclaimed, were compliments to the working class in that they showed with what respect the Tories held the economic power of the workers and they knew that the only hope they had of making sure of working-class support was to buy over "working-class" leaders. While the task of organising, planning and running the war was in the capable and experienced hands of Churchill and his class-mates, the job of keeping the workers quiet was in the equally capable hands of the Labour mis-leaders.

Thus Union-Tory collaboration was developed. What had been unthinkable during the 'thirties, with the 1926 General Strike still fresh in the workers' minds and the 1927 Trades Dispute Act still in force, became not only thinkable but workable under the stress of war. And the post-war political battles have, of course, left the position unchanged.

During their period of office, the Labour Party pushed the Unions, not to the Left, but to the Right. With their management-consultation committees (which grew out of the war-time Joint Production Committees), with their members enjoying inflated salaries on the Boards of State industries and passing into the House of Lords, with their "responsible, common-sense" approach to the Nation's economic situation—applauded by all the Tory Press. The Trade Union movement has stopped moving and has dug itself well into the foundations of capitalist society.

So it is of academic interest and amusing but no longer surprising to read the statements of Mr. Harold Watkinson, Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Labour (who is now a Tory lawyer, not a Trade Unionist!), when he told the Faculty of Commerce and Social Science at Birmingham University:

"The social historians of the future may stress the importance of the combination in this period, of the new form of Tory democracy and a forward-looking trade union movement facing together the most difficult economic problems ever to confront our country.

"The Conservative Party itself takes much the same kind of pragmatic approach to affairs of state as does the trade union movement.

"This sometimes results in our being accused of stealing our opponents' political clothes, I would only add that when we do this, we try to make them fit us better than they did their previous owners."

This speech speaks for itself, but one is tempted to ask just what is the "new form of Tory democracy" and in which way is the Trade Union movement "forward-looking"?

For an organisation of industrial workers to be so described truthfully it should be presenting a conception of living and working which is an improvement upon existing relationships. Are the Unions doing that? Are they looking forward to a progressive form of society, guiding and encouraging their members to think in terms of growing out of capitalism into a freer, less exploitative society?

Quite the reverse, of course, and to use Mr. Watkinson's little metaphor about stealing opponents' clothes, one must point out that the Trade Union leadership has not only stolen the Tories' clothing (see the pin-stripes, bowlers and Homburg's at Transport House!) but their ways of thought as well.

There remains only the Anarcho-Syndicalist approach to present the industrial workers with a vital alternative to the sterile and reactionary conservatism of the 20th Century Trade Union.

P.S.

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)

MARCH 24—DEBATE

Philip Sansom & Rita Milton
THE RELATIVE THREATS OF
COMMUNISM & CATHOLICISM

MARCH 31—Rashed Gool on

THE RISE OF THE BOLSHEVIK PARTY

APRIL 7—DEBATE

"THAT THE TRADE UNIONS NO LONGER REPRESENT THE INTERESTS OF THE WORKERS"

Proposers: Philip Sansom
Albert Meltzer

Opposers: E. J. Emden
Sidney Wright

At 9, Fitzroy Square, Warren Street,
London, W.1.
April 7th, at 7.30.

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

NORTH-EAST LONDON DISCUSSION MEETINGS IN EAST HAM

Alternate Wednesdays
at 7.30 p.m.

MARCH 25—Mary Canipa on
FIELDS OF LIBERTARIAN
INFLUENCE

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