

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

Never in Custom's oiled grooves the world to a higher level moves.
 WHITTIER

THE A.E.U. MERGER PLAN

Another Union Monstrosity?

ARRANGEMENTS are going ahead for a conference to be held on February 29 (this being leap year), to discuss the merger of all engineering workers into one big union.

This is being pushed by the Amalgamated Engineering Union, already, with 950,000 members, one of the biggest in the country. 31 unions have been invited to the conference and so far it is reported that 20 have accepted.

The merger would bring the membership of the AEU—which is itself an amalgamation of 10 unions—up to nearly 1,500,000, bigger than the monstrous Transport & General Workers' Union.

Mr. Robert Openshaw, president of the AEU, said when announcing the conference that 'We feel that there are far too many unions catering for the same class of work-people.' Which is of course always the attitude of big organisations towards smaller ones.

Small Unions Swamped

Many of the small craft unions in the engineering industries fear being swamped in such a huge conglomeration as the merge will create, but at the same time it is being increasingly recognised that the splitting up of workers into a multitude of small, unconnected unions is out-moded.

This is what anarcho-syndicalists have been saying for many years, but that does not mean we unreservedly welcome the AEU proposals, for what will be created will not be live industrial organisations based upon workshop committees, but will be a huge centralised bureaucracy with monopolistic powers over all the workers in engineering crafts throughout the country—and even

beyond, for there are AEU members in Australia, S. Africa, Malta and Gibraltar.

When anarcho-syndicalists urge industrial organisation as opposed to craft, we do so in order to bring together all the workers in an industry irrespective of their trade. But this is not for the purpose of getting them all together under one administrative umbrella, the better to use and control them; it is in order to supply the strength whereby they can apply themselves to the task of coming into control of their industry themselves.

It is in order that all the workers in, say, the car industry shall cease to think of themselves as craft-workers who just happen to be making parts of motor-cars, but shall become integrated with all the workers in the industry the better to fight their battles at the point of production and to organise themselves to take over the running of the car industry.

There is not the slightest reason to suppose that the new AEU would not develop into another dictatorial monolith like the T & GWU. Already there are 2,200 branches in Britain and Ireland; the new merger would bring in many more. It will be the aim of the leadership to control all these branches from head office, and whoever gets into the jobs

at head office will be very powerful indeed.

Move to Control

That is precisely why there is considerable fear at the moment that the Communists may get more influence at the top, and why the Party is urging its members to support amalgamation (and use it for their own ends). In this they are helped as usual by the apathy of the members.

At the last ballot for the executive only 10 per cent. of the members voted, with the result that the Commies captured another seat on the executive of seven—making two in the bag. There is another battle outstanding which may give them a third seat. A merger would strengthen this situation for the C.P. by adding the ETU, the Foundry Workers and the Constructional Engineers to their strength, for these three unions, one large and two small are already Commie-dominated.

Whether bossed by the Communists or Labour fakirs, however, the engineering workers in the workshops will not be strengthening themselves by coming under this amalgamation. They will be strengthening their bosses, and making of their unions a happy hunting ground for careerists and a ripe plum for political tricksters to pluck.

THE 'SURPLUS' PROBLEM

WITH large numbers of the world's population living below subsistence level one would have thought that the surplus farm produce reported from the U.S.A. would have been welcomed joyously as a means of alleviating the misery of millions. But no, the needs of capitalism—profit and high prices—have to be met whatever the cost in human privation.

Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson, before the Senate Committee on Agriculture last week declared that surpluses lay at the heart of the farm problem:—

"Our surpluses must be reduced as the essential pre-condition for the success of a sound farm programme . . ."

"Storage costs run about a million dollars a day." Worse, the surpluses, which were largely created by high price supports, depress the market; the high supports thus have the opposite effect to that intended. Benson told the Senators: "The huge surpluses reduced farm income in 1955 by the staggering sum of more than \$2 billion. What the President proposed is a direct and effective attack on the surpluses themselves."

The heart of the President's programme, Benson testified, is the "soil-bank" plan, designed to cut plantings of wheat and cotton by perhaps 20%. The bank would consist of an "acreage reserve" and a "conservation reserve", which would cost the taxpayers \$1 billion over the next three years. Farmers choosing to join the acreage reserve would take specific acres temporarily out of production, receiving compensation based on a percentage of the normal yield. Compensation would be paid, Benson testified, in a novel way: the farmers would get certificates redeemable by the Commodity Credit Corp. in cash or in surplus. Farmers who joined the conservation reserve would get compensation for taking acres out of production for five to ten years and for planting grass or trees; these farmers would have to guarantee not to graze livestock on their conservation reserve for a specified period, so as not to add to the surplus of livestock.

Surpluses already held must be disposed of somehow, "even by selling or

bartering in the grain-short Communist colonies of Eastern Europe". So the hungry peoples of Eastern Europe will be able to eat if their Governments are in a strong bargaining position. No ideological differences will interfere in this deal if the conditions of the U.S. Government can be met. If the Communist authorities don't consider it worth while, however, the people of Eastern Europe will continue to be deprived.

Benson's programme also includes a proposal to help 1.5 million low-income farmers to improve their farming efficiency, or failing that to aid them in their transition to non-farm employment. Those who are unable to get a living from the land will now be thrown on the labour market and thus increase the competition between workers for jobs.

But it is the support of the prosperous farmers that is important for the politicians. Asked whether any of the new benefits would get through to the farmers before the presidential election, Benson said that the programme if put into force would provide "immediate buoyancy".

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT!

WEEK 3	
Deficit on Freedom	£60
Contributions received	£73
SURPLUS	£13
January 13 to January 19	
Birmingham: A.R.L. £4/3/0; Eccles: P.H. 5/4; Birmingham: A.W.H. 8/-; London: I.P. 5/6; London: N.B.T.* 9d.; Oxford: M.T. 12/6; Cleveland: T.H. £2/19/3; London: K.M. 8/-; Sheffield: H.W. £1/0/3; Dublin: J.F.L.O. £1/9/6; London: P.S.B. 8/6; Hyde Park: (per R.M.) Sympathiser 10/-; London: J.S.* 4/-; London: S.B. 4/-; Esher: J.C.S.* 5/-; Martinez, Cal.: F.E.C. £3/10/0; Sidney: D.G.E. £2/13/0; Mr. S., per V.R. £2; Wigan: E.H. 3/-; London: J.S.* 4/-; London: N.B.T.* 6d.	
Total	21 14 1
Previously acknowledged	52 0 6
1956 TOTAL TO DATE	£73 14 7

GIFT OF BOOKS: Esher: J.C.S.

*Indicates regular contributors.

SYNDICALIST NOTEBOOK

A MIXED BAG OF INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES

THIS was the title which the *Manchester Guardian* gave to its summary of half-a-dozen cases where workers were either taking direct action to defend their interests or were threatening to do so. This, together with the matter-of-fact way in which strikes are reported in the national press, and sometimes, unfortunately even in the left-wing press, presents an industrial dispute as if it were quite an impersonal affair, either calling for the application of economic measures, or illustrating tendencies among "the workers".

Each dispute, in fact, involves a larger or smaller group of individuals whose standards of economic life are unsatisfactory, or being threatened, and who after usually a prolonged attempt to solve their problems through constitutional channels, resort to a withdrawal of labour, involving acute temporary hardship.

MINERS

At Townley Rift colliery in County Durham, coal face workers have imposed a ban on overtime as a protest against the quality of coal supplied to the men at the pit. The supply of cheap coal to miners has become a well-established custom, and the money saved thereby is an effective addition to the wage packet, and a decrease in its quality represents a reduction in this. The Division of the N.C.B. has declined to intervene in the dispute, on the grounds that it is a matter to be settled at pit level. Since the miners also seem to be of that opinion, we may see their case succeeding.

AMBULANCE DRIVERS

A very difficult type of dispute has arisen between the Middlesex County Council and members of the National Ambulance Services Association working under it. They claim that extra duties and overtime are being imposed on them contrary to conditions of work. This is quite a common occurrence in the type of work where "vocational sense of duty" is used as a catchphrase to persuade people to accept poor conditions, and a stand against it often has to be taken by a minority union organisation. A complete strike is hardly a good way of backing up action of this type, and

at first the N.A.S.A. drivers simply refused to transport out-patients to hospitals, but have now extended their action by not returning discharged patients to their homes.

WOODWORKERS

The Amalgamated Society of Wood-cutting Machinists are planning a series of strikes to begin on May 1st if wage negotiations were unsuccessful. Although it is not made quite clear in the report, it seems likely that the kind of action involved will be of the guerrilla type, where vital skilled workers disrupt production for short periods in various selected places; a method of struggle used very effectively by the E.T.U.

RAILWAYMEN

Railway men are concerned over the practice of employing private contractors on permanent way repairs. The reasons for this are mixed, and are probably due to the zeal of Labour supporters to prevent the Conservative government from encroaching on the monopoly of nationalization. A direct grievance is that private contractors are paying more than the railway authorities, which would indicate that to take action in defence of a nationalized authority is hardly worth the trouble.

ENGINEERS

A proposal has been made by the Amalgamated Engineering Union to extend the unity of workers in the engineering industry by a further series of amalgamations. Thirteen other unions are sending delegates to a preliminary conference; the total membership of those concerned being a million and a half. Although the A.E.U. sometimes claims to be an industrial union, and the principles behind its desire to form a new and larger organization are the elimination of a situation of inter-union competition, craft organization and disunity, it will still confine itself to skilled workers. If such a merger is carried through it will increase the reformist efficiency of the engineers in matters of bargaining, but it will not come very close to the anarchist idea of an industrial syndicate.

ANARCHO-SYNDICALIST.

Reflections on Big Three Economic Plans Production: A Political Weapon

MR. IAN MIKARDO, M.P. in his column in *Tribune* last week observes that "To an ever-increasing extent the relative strengths of nations and power-blocs are measured by their economic, and especially their industrial, resources". A somewhat naive remark we thought, especially coming from an old hand in the political game! By what other yard-stick do nations in fact measure strength? By their armed forces, did someone suggest? But armies in the twentieth century are ornaments if they are not backed by complicated equipment which only nations with heavy industries can produce. Much more up-to-date is the *New York Times* which opens its editorial comment on Russia's approaches to Latin America with the following: "The question to be asked about the Soviet bid for closer economic (and hence political) ties in Latin America is . . ." For the *N.Y. Times* "economics" and "politics" are inseparable, twin brothers, a view with which any open-minded observer of the socio-economic system under which the world in general at present labours must surely agree. And this is the real tragedy which tends to nullify the giant strides that have been made in the past fifty years by science and its application to industry and agriculture.

★
 WITH Man's present knowledge of the uses of raw materials which are available to him; the techniques which he has developed for the mass production of the necessities of life (which for the vast majority of mankind are still food, clothing and shelter—only a very small minority as yet consider that life would be intolerable without an ice-box, Coca-Cola or T.V.); his growing mastery over the problems of communications, both in the exchange of ideas as well as in the means of transporting the raw materials and finished products of his labour . . . with our present knowledge, we say, mankind already possesses all the ingredients for ensuring a world of plenty in which no human being need starve, nor millions perish when, through no fault of their own, normally self-sufficient communities are faced with crop failures as a result of exceptional droughts, floods, or earthquakes. Instead we are told by the official statisticians of the United Nations that something like half of the world's people are still living in conditions of near- or actual-starvation.

It is with the knowledge of these facts that we must consider the announcements by the leaders of the

Continued on p. 3

Production:

A Political Weapon

Continued from p. 1

Big Three as to their governments' programmes for industrial development. For though they have not solved the problem of how to dispose of what is produced in the factories and from the land, they put forward five-year plans (and their equivalents in the West), which aim at more and more production! It is important to bear in mind that the failure of capitalist distribution must not only be measured by its unsaleable surpluses but by its unsaleable production! Vast resources of raw materials, man-power and industrial equipment are at present swallowed-up in the production of war-material and the maintenance of millions of men in unproductive armies (the United States alone, according to Mr. Eisenhower's recent budget speech will spend more than \$39,000 million—i.e. £14,000 million—on "major national security" in 1956, or 61% of the national revenue). To these must be added the armies of civilians who are to-day employed in unproductive jobs — unproductive not because they do not actually produce something which can be consumed but because the work they do does not even indirectly benefit the community (unless one believes that the capitalist system is the saviour and benefactor of mankind!)

Is it not obvious that what is needed now is not more scientists, industrial experts with their time-and-motion stopwatches, industrial psychologists who can marry the worker to his job with boisterous music and smooth talk BUT a revolution of thinking, a revolt of the slaves, a tearing away of the cobwebs of tradition which have clothed with respectability that skeleton of a system based on privilege (hence, power), inequality and injustice?

★

THE *New York Times* in equating economics with politics—"the Soviet bid for closer economic (and hence political) ties . . ."—will not, we are sure, cause many raised eyebrows among its readers for these two "sciences" are mutually dependent outside Russia as well! It is only for people with a questioning mind and who do not lap up editorial comments with their morning porridge who may question that parenthetic "and hence political"!

Economics is defined in the dictionary as the "practical science of the production and distribution of wealth"; *Politics* as the "science and art of government, political affairs or life". By definition *Economics* can operate without *Politics*, but can *Politics* exist, or exist without vitiating ("influencing" would be a much too polite and positive term), *Economics*? The answer of course is that it cannot. It must follow therefore that *economic* programmes put forward by *politicians* are not concerned primarily with economics but with politics. This was made patently clear by Eden in his television broadcast last Saturday in which he portrayed himself as the champion of scientific discovery as applied to the development of industry. "New machines, new methods, automation" is the watchword with more "men, scientists and technicians with wide varieties of knowledge to carry forward that work". For what purpose? Not because all this would result in more leisure, more happiness, equity or equality, but in an attempt to be "in the forefront" so far as the other nations of the world are concerned; because it had recently been revealed that Russia had more scientists and technicians than the Western

American Letter

THE EISENHOWER HEART

NEW YORK, JANUARY.

MR. DWIGHT EISENHOWER, the bashful bride of American politics, is expected any day now to announce his decision. If the man has any sense he has made it already but the point is he has not announced it. This comedy played against the gloomy background of a heart attack has been running since the day four months ago that ended the era known in the characteristically unpleasant manner of political journalists as Before Coronary. Eisenhower's heart attack was managed not with considerations of his personal well-being but of publicity and political manoeuvring, and the whole country was involved in it.

The day after the news came out the first services were held in the New York Stock Exchange where a record number

of securities were sold and no doubt a few tidy fortunes made. Music was provided by the government declaring (in case the word had not occurred to anyone), that there was no "emergency" and that the reins of government would continue to be held as before.

Then came the battle of the doctors. Certain people criticized the doctor on the spot for having allowed his patient to walk with assistance down to his waiting car. The President, it was said in defence, preferred it that way, and one can't but wonder if his preference was not established by the possibility of photographs appearing of the President of the U.S. resting on a stretcher. Dr. Paul White then took over command and issued the famous bulletins describing the President's daily progress. The easier breathing, the soup he had for supper,

the music he listened to and the state of his bowels. "The President had a good bowel movement this morning", though not if you got your news from television or radio.

Bit by bit it became alright to wonder whether he would perhaps be retiring from active political work. We read how the onerous duties—and certainly they must be—had made a little vein pulsate on his temple, a danger signal to those who knew his temper. He had himself said that no one should think of doing the job unless he was absolutely physically fit. Long before his attack it was thought that his health would determine his plans. Now here he was with a severe illness. What should he do?

Advice was free. From Republican party sources it came with encouragement. Several party officials including

one state governor were there at hand to prove what could be done by people who had suffered the same disease but had gone right on working. Mr. Hall, the Party Chairman, knew Eisenhower of old to be too good a soldier not to want to "die in harness" and he advanced the theory that it was actually safer for the patient to work in the White House than to do dangerous farming work on the farm he might retire to in Gettysburg.

The Democrats gave advice with sympathy. Very unfortunate, but make the best of it and retire to your well-deserved rest. For a while it was taken for granted that Eisenhower would retire. He had always been so insistent on good health. But supposing Mr. Hall's crowd managed to be convincing enough? Now the Democrats excelled in sympathy. Poor Eisenhower in the hands of those selfish party politicians. Besides . . .

A Besides had to be added for weight. What if Eisenhower should be tricked into running? Who would be his running mate for the Vice Presidency? Nixon. Nixon the smoothie who told the dog story over television. Nixon the poor dope who had tried to get along with everybody including McCarthy. If Eisenhower runs for election he is bound to choose Nixon because he is always so faithful to his friends. The Perils of Nixon thrived for a month or two but have faded out now because Nixon himself has taken peculiar pains to make himself unseen, unheard and unsought.

Meanwhile Dr. White went on issuing his bulletins, and was in turn criticised. His reply was short, "The country is so damn bowel-conscious anyway." He however took the chance to encourage donations to the American Heart Foundation for research on coronary heart disease, a laudable aim no one would dispute, but all the same expressed in an opportunist fashion not calculated to allay the general anxiety. It became mandatory for large circulation magazines to switch from the romance of Princess Margaret to the romance of the arteries that can suddenly block up inside your heart.

One day the President was able to be photographed and a poor sick-looking man bearing the obligatory grin was used to illustrate the front pages. Eisenhower was paying for the popularity he had walked into. The other day he went to Florida for a holiday. The photograph showed twenty reporters and photographers trailing behind him, all taking a stroll in the sun.

What has happened to the parties now? Every day passed is one more wasted in the so far abortive fight for the November. Eisenhower's doctors were under pressure to say when it would be possible to tell "whether he is well enough to run if he wants to". At first it was going to be the middle of January, then the end of January, then not until February that he would be able to make up his mind. Many factions had something to gain; some did not. The Democrats have lost because they are not yet able to use Eisenhower to build up a campaign against.

Eisenhower may have lost too. His latest statement was that Duty would determine his course, though he did not say who or what his duty was to.

"INDIA IS UNIQUE"

The following are excerpts from a talk given by Francis Watson, printed in *The Listener* for Jan. 12th.

THE India of to-day, and whatever is Indian and unique about it, is presented to us in terms that are largely political, and political with a new sort of urgency . . . It is true that Indian politics have been impressing themselves upon us during a whole generation: but there has been an important change. India may have been a problem: she is now a force.

It was never accurate to imagine India as a land peopled mainly by sages, delivering from beneath the shade of great trees pronouncements as important as they were obscure. Nor is it wise now to go to the other extreme and ignore the religious and philosophical elements in the Indian cast of mind.

Let me try to illustrate this by talking about . . . [Jiddu Krishnamurti].

He demolishes the law and the prophets. His teaching is not that all religions are paths to God, but rather that they are all, if we adhere to them, paths away from the supreme goal of self-knowledge and that attainable spontaneity of existence which he calls "creative reality". He will not quote the *Bhagavad Gita*, or appeal to any established Hindu idea. Yet of Krishnamurti, and of the circle of hearers sitting round him at any time, I can use the phrase which is so often heard about one pheno-

menon or another, and so seldom examined: "It could only happen in India".

There is the other example of the celebrated movement for voluntary land reform led by Vinoba Bhave . . . It is happening in India and India is peculiar. In the case of Vinoba Bhave, as of his master, Mahatma Gandhi, it will be said that one such peculiarity is the popular reverence for the holy man, the saint. This is not just a picturesque village superstition. It has its application at many different levels, even among the sophisticated, the secularised, the "westernised", if you like. They, too, are open to conviction that sainthood 'works'—at least in their own country . . .

Those who pay attention to Krishnamurti in Europe or America . . . are not regarded either as an intellectual élite or, on the other hand, as a representative cross-section of the community. We tolerate the whole business as we tolerate other eccentricities. It is one of our conventions to associate any overt interest in transcendental matters with other small quaintnesses of behaviour . . . The audience that Krishnamurti has in India may not be numerically large in proportion to that vast population. But it is representative; and the mere fact that he should be talking and people should be listening is not something odd, but something ordinary and accepted . . .

I am not at all concerned to enlarge upon doctrine or to give a testimonial to any one exponent, only to emphasise that these human power-houses exist and are taken for granted and are used.

But what sort of power? If there is a common factor to be found, I think I should call it the tendency to identify the outside questions with the inside questions. To say that all such teachers in their different ways turn the seeker in upon himself might be misleading, because it suggests a separation, a retirement from the temporal world: whereas the object is not separation but integration. It begins with the individual but it does not end with the individual: it enables him, or should enable him, to

bloc combined, and this might affect the balance in the struggle for power.

★

LET there be no illusions, among the victims, as to the intentions of the politicians. Politics is the "science of government". Health Services, full employment and all the trappings of the Welfare State are only by-products, means to the end which is to maintain the principle of government, power, privilege, and Orwell's proles in perpetuity. We are not purists who denounce any ameliorations of workers' conditions because they are the result of legislation (in any case often forced by agitation). Indeed we should welcome it if under the existing system no one in the world went hungry, but it would not convert us into becoming supporters of the capitalist system (State-controlled or free-for-all varieties). For we believe that the prerequisites for happiness are not only a full belly but a free mind functioning in an environment of freedom. (In writing this we neither under-estimate the importance of material security, without which the things of the mind have little meaning, nor do we confuse a free mind with the concept that in a free society we shall all be intellectuals. (Save us from such a calamity!)) Governments cannot function, however, in a world in which the people are free, spiritually and materially. For this reason are anarchists opposed to all authoritarian systems, democratic or dictatorial, womb-to-the-tomb, tooth and nail, or the sublimation and emulation varieties, for no government can uphold the freedom of the individual and not be overthrown!

meet the demands of the world at large from his own resources. Such teaching-deals naturally in universal concepts, and it is unfortunately true that the universal is first cousin to the platitude. It is perhaps only too easy, with a few steps, to catch up with those monks pacing the cloister. "But I am holier than thou!"

But let me tell you, instead, of a man who, to the best of my belief, know what Krishnamurti is talking about and has profited by it. I will call him Anand. Fifteen years ago he was a left-wing politician, a former member of the Congress Working Committee . . . I left India in 1946, and when I went back this year I found Anand again . . .

Like so many others to-day, he was doing village work. The days of excitement and violent action were over. Politics itself was put aside. Why? He made a chopping gesture with his hand. The day when that first atom bomb fell on Japan he had said to himself: "This is the political approach and it offers no solution". India was not yet independent when that happened. But even Anand's intense patriotism did not interfere with that broad conclusion, right or wrong, about politics as a human activity. "I was out," he said. "Finished!" And he seemed content to be finished; deeply content in himself, having at last found an individual instead of a mass approach; but not intellectually content with what he had to deal with. He said to me: "We all talk of spiritual values and India's heritage, but can I find enough spiritual value to make one decent man?" Evidently this cliché about India's spiritual values cannot be excluded from practical conversation: evidently, also, in someone like this man I have called Anand it is very much more than a cliché.

To-day, with hundreds of village development programmes and projects, official and unofficial, there are new opportunities for able people to fulfil themselves by effacing themselves. I went to see Jayaprakash Narayan, who has given up real political prospects to work for Vinoba Bhave's ideas—he was at one time spoken of as the obvious successor to Nehru. He was quite sure of himself, too.

A Study in Class, Status & Power

Continued from p. 2

society even in a condition of rationally organized anarchy? Will there not always be elites? Even though this may be so, it does not follow however, that differences in status must necessarily make for social ill-health or the neurotic striving after increased status which is a characteristic of contemporary society.

To those who have a healthy revulsion from snobbery, it is rather a bitter pill to have to swallow the fact that as far as we can see status stratification may persist even when class stratification has disappeared. But perhaps what is so obnoxious about contemporary snobbery is that it is allied to power and not to real merit. Where social honour is accorded to those whose contribution to society is of a genuinely high order we do not begrudge it; the snob accords social honour to those whose status derives from the institutions of coercive power. Among some primitive people status is accorded in proportion to a man's social virtues—the way in which he provides music, or good council, or food, or stories, or dancing for the enrichment of the lives of all. In such a system the striving for status is a striving to give of one's best to the community, and it can hardly be considered as other than a healthy impulse. It may be thought that such a status system has its possible misery for the weak, stupid and ungifted people, but such a judgment is

biased by the standards of our own society. Happiness and contentment is not necessarily a function of high status.

Political Parties

HAVING defined stratification in terms of class which is concerned with the economic order, and status which is concerned with the social order, Weber then turned to the study of political parties which, in his phrase, "live in the house of power". The main characteristic of political parties, according to Weber, is that their action is consciously planned, in contrast to the actions of classes and status groups which result from vaguer reactions to events. Political parties, in Weber's analysis, do not primarily represent the interest of either classes or status groups as such; their aim is simply the acquisition of power, and when they happen to champion the interests of a class or a status group this championship is simply a means to attain their goal. Weber recognized the greatly varied forms of procedure (from naked violence to vote-canvassing) which political parties adopt, and the different structures they might adopt according as to whether the community is stratified predominantly by class or by status, but he conceived of parties as being isolated social phenomena.

"By virtue of these structural differences of domination it is impossible

to say anything about the structure of parties without discussing the structural forms of social domination *per se*. Parties, which are always structures struggling for domination, are very frequently organised in a very strict authoritarian fashion . . . But their aim is not necessarily the establishment of new international political i.e. territorial dominion. In the main they seek to influence the existing dominion."

(Max Weber *op. cit.*)

Unfortunately the posthumously published text breaks off at this point. Weber might have carried the analysis further, although hardly to an anarchist conclusion. At most he was a liberal who had great insight into the workings of social structures, and in particular of power structures. In all his writings he showed deep understanding coupled with both hatred and reverence of political power. We are indebted to him for his analysis of class, status and political power which takes us a long way beyond that of Marx, from whom he derived his earliest theses. The conclusion implicit in his work is that the political party must evolve to take over both the economic power of the dominant economic class and the social honour of the uppermost status groups. Weber died before the development of the true totalitarian states which have so amply illustrated his concepts.

G.

