

Comments on the Khrushchev Private Report

BACK TO THE LENINIST MYTH?

THE text of the private report by Khrushchev to the 20th Congress of the Communist Party in Moscow published last week in the *New York Times*, last Sunday in the *Observer* and issued as a pamphlet last Wednesday by the *Manchester Guardian* received the blessing of authenticity last Monday in a *Daily Worker* editorial which wriggles its way down the full length of the first column of the first page in typical *Daily Worker* style. Obviously the mouthpiece of the Kremlin could not ignore the fact that last Sunday's *Observer* used "eight of its 14 pages" for the publication of the "version . . . put out by the U.S. State Department" even if it could delay commenting on that version when it was published by the *New York Times* several days before. Presumably it knows (as the *New Statesman & Nation* discovered from its recent "gallup poll") that the *Observer* is the Sunday reading for a large number of its readers. (If only they had felt with Mr. Khrushchev, who declared, "I am with the Conservatives", they would have read the *Sunday Times* or the *Sunday Express* and missed all the gory details. They therefore felt obliged to give a lead to their faithful followers who had patiently read their way through the 30,000 words of denunciation of their erstwhile hero (avoiding the temptations of lovely legs displaying Ballito stockings and casserole-hatted minxes sporting the Summer Straws—flanking this "historic document"). Incidentally could not the Astor Trust have sacrificed its advertisement revenue for once and followed the *N.Y. Times* and given us the document neat?). And in so doing confirmed, so far as we are concerned, the authenticity of the document. When they write:

"It is a great pity, too, that the *Observer*, in rendering a useful service yesterday, could not have rendered an equally useful service by publishing Khrushchev's main report to the 20th Congress" they both reveal the authenticity of the document and the weakness of their position.

Mr. K's revelations confirm what

Oxford Students Fight Apartheid

OXFORD undergraduates have formed a committee for a campaign against apartheid. It is hoped that the campaign will be supported not only by all universities in England but also by students in South Africa. The organisation will work through existing societies, which include the Oxford University Conservative, Liberal, and Labour clubs, the Student Christian Movement, the Oxford University Church Union, and the Majlis Asian Club.

Mr. W. Brogden (of Exeter College), a first-year Canadian-born student from Blackburn, founded the organisation in the belief that there was a great deal of latent feeling against racial segregation among students. The reaction in Oxford to Father Huddleston, who recently visited the town and thoroughly approved the plan, justified this belief, and Mr. Brogden invited the leaders of various clubs to consider what could be done.

The individual clubs will hold meetings and research groups already in existence will turn their attention not only to South African policies but also those of the British Government in the protectorates. Letters will be sent to students in South Africa and people will be encouraged to go out to that country.

Manchester Guardian 4/6/56.

we have known for many years (if not in the sordid details, such as those of old Joe re-writing his own biographies, though even a mere liberal like Lord Acton knew all about the diseases of power, without being an anarchist!). The trouble however is that when Mr. K. was delivering his courageous post-mortem on Stalin he was faced with a microphone instead of a mirror. That he destroys the Stalin myth and in its place offers us the Lenin (or Leninist) myth hardly convinces us that the leopard has changed its spots. The only difference between Lenin and Stalin is a difference of time. If Lenin had lived, and ruled as long as did Stalin he might well have become a greater megalomaniac than his successor. Certainly terrorism was as much the principal weapon in his armoury as it was for Stalin.

★

THE denunciation of Stalin is welcome to us anarchists in that it confirms both our theoretical arguments as well as our criticisms of the régime in Russia which dates back to the first days of the Bolshevik seizure of power and not to 1939 (Hitler-Stalin pact), or 1945 (defeat of Hitler, rise of Stalin), when the present, most rabid anti-Stalinist propagandists, deserted the Stalinist band-waggon.

(Were these present fanatic-democrats aware of the fact that most of Stalin's crimes were committed before 1939? We were, without being in the party. They who were, should have known better than us! After all Mr. K's 1956

*The reader is invited to study the documentary evidence offered by Maximoff in the first 250 pages of his *Guillotine at Work* (Chicago, 1940).

revelations were, as the *Daily Worker* told us last Monday, meant only for the Party, and that in his words "we should not wash our dirty linen before their [the foreign Pres'] eyes" Yet it leaked out—from Communist sources just as all the terrorism, the phoney trials, the concentration camps and the rest leaked out in the '30's. The ex-Communists in the '30's knew more than we did of what was happening in Russia. The Khrushchev denunciations of Stalin are at the same time a denunciation of the present rulers of Russia as well as of the most rabid supporters of Western Democracy and Culture to-day who were yesterday the Stalinist sycophants, mouthpieces of the now exorcised myth of the infallibility of Stalin and the inevitability of Marxist infallibility. Left Book Clubism has dissolved into pious Christianity, and an arrogant "Culture and Liberty" (subsidised by the dollar millions of American Unionism sold to politics, Wall Street and American capitalism's "American Way of Life").

★

MR. K's denunciation of Stalinism not only convinces American officialdom that the régime in Russia has not changed. It also confirms our view that what has taken place is a palace revolution (with the difference that they allowed the ogre to die in his bed—or will Mr. K's successors inform us that Mr. S. was in fact poisoned?). The denunciation, coming from men who are directly implicated in the régime which they denounce, is an affirmation of their feeling of their own security and power, and a reflection on the weakness and "bourgeoisification" and division of the Russian people. Far from revealing, as the

A New Peronist Coup Defeated

WHEN the Argentine Dictator, Peron, was deposed and replaced by yet another set of rulers, this was hailed in the West last year as a move towards a more democratic form of rule, in spite of the evidence, particularly when dealing with opposition, that the new bunch were just as ruthless.

The powers behind the present rulers are the land-owning class, the Church militants and the Navy. It is easy to see therefore, why countries like Britain and America view such a trinity in a more sympathetic light; a land-owning aristocracy and Church, backed by the traditionalist Navy, is easier to negotiate with than a dictatorship whose sustenance came from a powerful industrial class.

We can discount the talk about 'democracy' as a factor in support of the present set-up in Argentina. We remember the part played by the 'democracies' when Franco rose up against the Republican Government in Spain in 1936. Here was a Government democratically elected when an army despot, supported materially and morally by Fascist Italy and Germany, ruthlessly bombed and murdered in a successful *coup d'état*. The answer by the democracies was *non-intervention*. Why? Because Spain was in the throes of a revolution, and aid for the Republican Government might well have meant success for the revolutionary forces.

Another Dictator, Vice-President Isaac Rojas of Argentina has just made history by being the second man to bomb his own people into submission. Yesterday (June 10th), a revolt was planned, and eventually crushed, co-ordinating army units, civilian groups of "fanatical Peron men" and industrial workers, the main centres of the revolt being in Santa Rosa in the Pampa (where a wireless station called on the people to overthrow the Government), and in La Plata, capital of Buenos Aires province.

Lincoln bombers immediately flew into action and it is reported that 50 bombs were dropped at La Plata.

The *News Chronicle* reports that: "The two principal rebel leaders, General Juan Jose Valle, who was Peron's commander-in-chief, and General Raul Tanco, former head of the War College, escaped.

Many of their followers were less fortunate. For the first time in modern Argentine history, death became the penalty of failure in revolt.

Three colonels were captured and promptly executed by firing squads. A number of civilians and N.C.O.s—the spearhead of the risings—also died before dawn.

Unofficially, it is reported that 40 were executed. The number of casualties in the fighting and bombing is much higher.

The immediate executions were ordered by Admiral Rojas. His ruthless action to crush the revolt has considerably enhanced his prestige throughout the Republic."

Quiet Interlude

ONE'S interest in the affairs of the House of Commons is necessarily slight, for one is always aware of the gulf which exists between the action and the word, the chasm which separates rhetoric from results. What is far more interesting is that which actually happens, to whom, and for what reason. But in spite of this general state of affairs, there occurs now and again, what one may call an episode, which is of interest to us all.

Last week Mr. Wedgwood Benn, M.P. won the ballot for private members' motions and announced that he would raise the question of "The public relations of public authorities". It was not fully understood what he intended by this at first, but when he commenced to address the House, everyone became immediately aware of exactly what he meant. He made a plea for most of us, by putting forward a factual and very depressing account of the relations between officialdom in all its forms, and the man in the street—he painted a dismally grim picture of the way in which we are all dealt with by Government departments, in personal contact and by official communications.

Mr. Benn (who is a member of the Labour Party) informed the House of

what some of them must have known already, the appalling treatment which is given to out-patients in hospitals. Everyone, he said, was told to come at the same time and had to wait two, three or four hours. He might well have added that as often as not when one finally arrived in the presence of the doctor, one was treated with an air of being rather fortunate in being able to get something for nothing, and—as Mr. J. E. MacColl (Labour, Widnes) said later—the attitude which assumed that the sick were not capable of making intelligent judgments or having an opinion of their own.

Mr. Benn had also taken the trouble to write to 28 public authorities. In the letters, written on plain paper, he had asked simple questions to which he already knew the answers. Of the fourteen Government departments only 8 had bothered to acknowledge his letter, and those replies contained typical jargon, "I am directed to reply" and "Further to your communication of the 20th prox." His prize exhibit was from the Home Office—his original letter was returned with tea-stains on it, and a scruffy bit of duplicating stuff saying: "With reference to the attached letter it is requested that the information overleaf be given."

The only exception to the general run was a letter from the Ministry of Labour on how to become a miner. This was exactly what an official letter should be

Continued on p. 3

Tonbridge By-Election Courage, Perseverance and All That

THERE is a lesson to be learned by all political parties in the results revealed in the Tonbridge by-election, which showed the Tory vote to have dropped by eight thousand since the General Election. That is the fickleness of the electorate. There is usually a solid core on either side which supports their chosen party whatever its shortcomings, but there is a far larger group motivated wholly by materialistic considerations rather than ideological ones.

Not that the fearful Tonbridge Tories are necessarily going to vote Labour in the future, but their rebellion against their representatives because of the rising cost of living and credit squeezes, is serious for the Conservative Party, as such actions have a tendency to snowball, and bodes ill for Tory chances in the next General Election.

Mr. R. A. Butler told the Association of Conservative Clubs in London last Saturday, that the lesson of Tonbridge meant that the Conservative Party "had got to pull together now". His words are empty and rhetorical and are reminiscent of the Labour Party apologists after they assumed power in 1945.

He said: "If you look back to the much greater difficulties we faced in 1952 (1945) which were bequeathed to us by a Socialist Government (Conservative Government), and see the manner in which we got through them by courage, action and above all, perseverance, you will realise there is one hope ahead, providing we work together and pull together, and combine hard work and thinking with play and recreation".

This speech, with a change of dates and names, could have been heard at any political meeting at any General Election. It is all considered jolly and healthy and part of the democratic way of life, but how much more honest it would be if every party admitted frankly that policies were subject to economic and political change. If they did this, however, the farce of the political 'battles' would be exposed and the rôle of politics as a necessary condition for an orderly society might be questioned.

The results of Tonbridge show once again that if any worthwhile change in the social order is to be made, it can only be brought about by people who have a much more solid foundation for their views than merely day-to-day expediencies.

Daily Worker would have us believe that the Soviet Union is "the most advanced form of society yet reached by man", we believe, without surprise, that nearly forty years of Marxist-Leninist-Stalinism has reduced the Russian people to a state of soft-headedness, sport-craziness and dull-wittedness on a par with any so-called capitalist nation of the West. We are, if anything, surprised that the brain-washing has overlooked (or been avoided) by a minority which still aspires to real freedom and human happiness. A phenomenon common to a refrigerated United States and a Test-Matched Britain . . . and the guarantee that mankind will survive and progress in spite of its economic crises, its political superficialities . . . and its lesser and greater Stalins!

PEOPLE AND IDEAS

Captain Gardiner's Choice

"As for me, I don't believe there is any one solution to the social problem, but rather a thousand diverse and changing solutions, as social life, in time and space, is diverse and changing."

—ERRICO MALATESTA.

WRITING lately about Martin Buber and Alexander Herzen, I have been pondering on the implications of a remark of each of these dissimilar thinkers. Buber speaks of fashioning a new community "wholly in the present, out of the recalcitrant material of our own day". Herzen on the other hand declares, "It is not possible to build houses for free men out of materials designed for prisons". Taken thus, out of context, these two aphorisms contradict each other, and raise questions of great importance for people who want to change the basis of society. It isn't an academic point because it vitally affects our daily attitudes. Can we subvert the authoritarian institutions of our own day into free institutions?

Take the case of Captain Gardiner, an army quartermaster who was put in charge of one of the work camps for Mau Mau detainees in Kenya. The nature of these camps, and the condition of the 46,000 Kenya Africans in detention, has been described lately by Miss Eileen Fletcher, a former rehabilitation officer, whose articles in *Peace News* gave rise to the allegations in parliament last week of Mr. Creech Jones and Mr. Fenner Brockway, who, when the Minister of State appeared to deny the allegation that girls of twelve were being detained, waved their prison documents at him. Miss Fletcher mentioned a camp at Nairobi of 75 male juveniles under 17 years of age.

"The Commissioner for Community Development and Rehabilitation came with us and said to me, 'It will break your heart to see them, shackled, nothing to do, in a very small dormitory and with a very small space for exercise. They have been there a year and are just rotting.' Later they were moved to Kamiti prison where they were given longer shackles and put to work in the quarry."

Now Captain Gardiner was given charge of a similar camp for "male

juveniles ranging from 12 to 16". This is what, according to Mr. R. T. Paget, Captain Gardiner did:

"He had taken his camp and converted it into a public school. The boys were in houses. He had dug up craft instructors, and each boy was learning a craft. He had got himself teachers from other detention camps and built his own classrooms. He had built fourteen football pitches and had 'organised' the requisite sports equipment. It was quite obvious that the boys were keen as mustard and enjoying it. Indeed, the District Commissioner told me that he was having trouble from the loyalists, who were complaining that their sons were not allowed to go. This, I understand, is being corrected in the autumn; and what began as a security detention camp is now looking to a permanent future as a voluntary boarding school on British lines."

IS this not literally building houses for free men out of materials designed for prisons? You may not think much of the British public school system, but in the context of Kenya to-day Captain Gardiner's act must shine like a green leaf on a dead tree. One of the first things done by the Kenya government in the Mau Mau emergency was to close the independent schools associated with Jomo Kenyatta. (Some people think that the real reason for Jomo Kenyatta's imprisonment was his founding of these schools which taught neither the Christian religion nor the supremacy of the white man). No steps were taken to replace the independent schools, and according to Dr. Gregory of the 'Save the Children Fund', there are to-day in Kenya 870,000 children without education.

I don't know what Captain Gardiner's view of life is, but he has applied to his unpromising job, an energy, humanity and common sense, which against the background of contempt, indifference and brutality, becomes both creative and subversive. Turning his prison into a

school he has made the policy of detention ridiculous. A prison is no longer a prison, nor even a reformatory, when people on the outside clamour to come in. Getting his teachers out of other detention camps, he has made, probably unconsciously, a gesture against the government's school-closing policy. I don't suppose he looks at it in that light. Faced with a choice as to how to deal with the detained boys put in his charge, he has simply chosen the libertarian solution, whereas most people in Kenya have chosen the authoritarian one.

THE lives of men and communities are a series of such choices. All through history, as Kropotkin says, two traditions face one another, that of power, the state, authority, and that of community, society and mutual aid. The ascendancy of one or the other of these traditions is the degree of freedom or servitude in a nation. Buber calls the degree in which the social principle predominates the *community content* of a

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT!
WEEK 23

Deficit on Freedom	£460
Contributions received	£488
SURPLUS	£28

June 1 to June 7

Minneapolis: M.G.A. 15/1; London: E.T. 4/-; London: H.M.* 1/3; Sheffield: G.P.* 5/-; Sheffield: H.W. 6/6; London: Hyde Park Sympathisers 6/6; Cape Town: P.K. 8/-; Hoddesdon: A.R. 11/6; Whitehead: D.F.M. 8/-; Double Bay: E.A.L. 16/-; London: per S.E.P. 5/-; London: G.O. 3/6; Peterborough: A.W. 10/-; Liverpool: R.E. 10/-; Bolton: W.H.B. 2/6; Oxford: Anon.* 5/-; London: D.C.M. 2/6.	
Total	6 0 4
Previously acknowledged	482 7 0

1956 TOTAL TO DATE ... £488 7 4

*Indicates regular contributors.

society. As an example of the day-to-day choice between the two principles take the case of a local council which plants trees in its streets. Children uproot the trees. The council has the choice between abandoning trees and bringing the children before the juvenile court, or getting more trees and giving the children the task of planting them and looking after them. The first solution is no solution, it just means no trees and an increase in juvenile delinquency statistics. The second solution means safeguarding trees and responsible children who have learnt firstly that the physical environment of life is important and secondly that it belongs to them.

Or, in a wider field, take the case of the miners of Gwaun-cae-Gurwen in Wales, discussed in recent issues of FREEDOM. The National Coal Board proposed to close the pits because of low production, continual disputes, and heavy financial losses. At the moment an uneasy compromise has been agreed for a conditional reopening. The libertarian solution would be for the Board to hand the Gwaun-cae-Gurwen pits over to the miners and to tell them to get on with the job of running them themselves. This would be a perfectly feasible proposal, for both the miners and the Coal Board have nothing to lose and everything to gain by it. If it failed nothing would be lost. If it succeeded it would have a revolutionary effect on the whole mining industry, indeed on the very structure of the industrial system. Simply by treating the miners as responsible adults, a libertarian solution would have been found.

Out of the recalcitrant material of our own day we have to fashion social changes, for there is nothing else to build with. Insofar as we abjure authoritarian solutions of our social and personal problems, we make possible the unfolding of wider and more profound social changes. But this is not done by seeking to use for libertarian purposes the existing coercive institutions (in this sense it is certainly not possible to build houses for free men out of materials designed for prisons), it is done by seek-

ing to subvert or by-pass them. In Captain Gardiner the camp commander has abdicated to make way for the teacher; in the tree planting incident the council has transferred its responsibility to the children; at Gwaun-cae-Gurwen the Coal Board, if it had the wit to grasp the sensible solution, would abdicate in favour of the miners.

But authority does not normally abdicate except under pressure of circumstances. Those who are looking for libertarian solutions have to create those circumstances.

1 Miss Fletcher's articles have been printed as a pamphlet, *The Truth about Kenya* ("Peace News" 1s.).

2 "New Statesman" 31/3/56.

FREEDOM PRESS

VOLINE :

Nineteen-Seventeen (The Russian Revolution Betrayed) cloth 12s. 6d.
The Unknown Revolution (Kronstadt 1921, Ukraine 1918-21) cloth 12s. 6d.

E. A. GUTKIND :
The Expanding Environment 8s. 6d.

V. RICHARDS :
Lessons of the Spanish Revolution 6s.

MARIE-LOUISE BERNERI :
Neither East nor West cloth 10s. 6d., paper 7s. 6d.
Workers in Stalin's Russia 1s.

PHILIP SANSOM :
Syndicalism—The Workers' Next Step 1s.

K. J. KENAFICK :
Michael Bakunin and Karl Marx paper 6s.

Marie-Louise Berneri Memorial Committee publications :
Marie-Louise Berneri, 1918-1949: A Tribute cloth 5s.
Journey Through Utopia cloth 16s. (U.S.A. \$2.50)

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

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

OPEN DAILY

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

New Books . . .

Portrait in Grey N. H. Hignett 18/-

Reprints . . .

Outline of History H. G. Wells 30/-
The Martyrdom of Man Winwood Reade 3/6

The Story of San Michele Axel Munthe 3/6

Second-Hand . . .

Wind, Sand and Stars Antoine de Saint-Exupéry 4/-
The Lieutenant Must be Mad Hellmut Kirst 3/-

Grierson on Documentary (ed.) Forsyth Hardy 4/-
Stranger in the Land Ward Thomas 4/-

Good and Bad Manners in Architecture Trystan Edwards 5/-
The Blood of Others Simone de Beauvoir 3/-

The Proletarian Revolution N. Lenin 2/6

Bashan and I Thomas Mann 3/6

Tito's Plot Against Europe Derek Kartun 1/6

From Trotsky to Tito James Klugman 3/-

Assassins at Large Hugo Dewar 5/-
Condemned to Live Johann Rabener 4/-

The Evolution of Revolution H. M. Hyndman 8/6

The Yogi and the Commissar Arthur Koestler 6/6

Resist Not Evil Clarence Darrow 5/-

The Common People G. D. H. Cole and Raymond Postgate 7/6

Memoirs of Mary Wollstonecraft William Godwin 4/-

War, Sadism and Pacifism Edward Glover 3/-

The Coming Race Lord Lytton 2/6

Eric Gill: Workman Donald Attwater 2/6

For Peace and Truth Pierre Ceresole 3/6

Pamphlets . . .
Truth About Kenya Eileen Fletcher 1/-

Postage free on all items

Obtainable from

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

The Tradition of Workers' Control - 8

Guild Socialism

(Continued from last week)

A Brotherhood of Producers

Turning to his constructive proposals, Hobson rejected Orage's idea of a "co-partnership" between the employers and the unions. By a series of steps—making themselves black-leg proof, striking not for higher wages but for superior status, and amalgamating and federating on an industrial basis—the trade unions, argued Hobson, could abolish the wage system completely and effect a total social reconstruction. Under the new system that could succeed the wage-system, producers would be recognised and paid as human beings, receiving payment in and out of employment, in sickness and in health; would share co-operatively in the organisation of production; and together would exercise a claim on the product of their work. Such a system could best be organised under modern industrial conditions if producers were banded together in National Guilds. A National Guild would be "a self-governing brotherhood of producers", possessing a monopoly of labour in its particular industry. It would embrace all grades of workers, manual, technical and managerial, i.e. "the salariat" as well as the proletariat. Assuming complete responsibility for the material welfare of its members, it would become a fellowship as well as an economic organisation.

About fourteen National Guilds were envisaged, each of which would receive from the State a charter giving it responsibility for the management of its particular industry. Ownership would be formally vested in the State but all property would be held "in trust" by the Guilds. In return for their charters, the Guilds would pay to the State "a substitute for economic rent". The Guilds would not act independently of each other but would all be represented on a Guilds Congress, the successor of the T.U.C. This Congress would sit in permanent session and would become "the directorate of industry". Any negotiations with the State would be conducted through the officers of the Congress. In the new society, the State would take on its true rôle as representative of the whole community: State control of the Guilds would operate in a manner similar to the control exercised by shareholders at present; and the political system, purified of all economic responsibility, could henceforth concern itself with "the national soul".

The Greater Unionism

The publication of the National Guilds articles aroused considerable discussion in intellectual and socialist circles and the movement began to win adherents, particularly among the younger socialists. The most important of these was G. D. H.

Cole in whose hands guild theories were to be considerably elaborated and in some important respects transformed. His position in the Labour movement made him an admirable vehicle for the propagation of guild views. In collaboration with William Mellor of the Fabian Research Department, he began to develop in *The Daily Herald* and other Labour papers the idea of the Greater Unionism, the chief principles of which were: the sinking of craft and sectional interests; organisation on a workshop and industrial basis; the inclusion of brain workers in the ranks of the unions; the achievement of a black-leg-proof and united Labour Movement; and a change in trade union policy in preparation for the future task of administering national industries in conjunction with the State.³⁶

In 1915 a new phase of the movement began with the establishment by Cole and his friends of The National Guilds League. Like the Fabian Society, the League did not attempt to become a

Industrial Democracy & Management

ONE problem which much pre-occupied the theorists of the movement was the application of democratic principles to management. In *National Guilds* Hobson assumed that workmen could be trusted to elect the best people as managers and that, since the basis of choice would be widened, there would be no danger of inefficient management. As the guildsmen came to grips with this subject the question of democratic management was dismissed in a less cavalier fashion. There remained, however, among many a tendency to regard the function of management as one not so difficult as sometimes alleged: "With but a little extra training many of the rank and file could become technicians capable of filling any of the administrative and scientific posts."³⁷ This optimism was not shared by all. Some thought that democratic election was suitable for the lower grades but that for the higher grades the principle of elevation by one's peers or even appointment from above should be employed. Others considered that every official in the main framework of the Guilds should be chosen, not by general election, but by men best qualified to judge of their ability for the position, provided that every such choice was ratified by the men affected by it. "The Guild would build up in this way a pyramid of officers, each chosen by the grade immediately below that which (the officer) is to occupy."³⁸ Yet another suggestion was that there should be a panel of managers from which

mass organisation and its membership never exceeded 600, the majority of whom were middle class professional people with a sprinkling of trade unionists. It soon included in its ranks, however, some of the ablest writers of the day such as Bertrand Russell, R. H. Tawney, H. N. Brailsford, George Lansbury and Norman Angell. The activities of the League, which included after December 1916, the publication of a journal, *The Guildsman*, later *The Guild Socialist*, were inevitably hampered by wartime conditions but, on the other hand, the war also created conditions favourable to the reception of its propaganda by the younger trade union elements and by those active in the Shop Stewards' Movement. Most of the leaflets and pamphlets of the N.G.L. were directed to trade unionists and elaborated the steps whereby Guilds might be formed in particular industries. This translation of Guild ideas into an effective movement did not, however, prevent the guildsmen examining more thoroughly their theoretical concepts and attempting to draw a more detailed picture of the working of the future Guild Commonwealth.

the National Guild Executive would allocate individuals to particular works, again subject to the approval of the workers there. A similar panel of foremen would be selected by the works committee.³⁹

It remained for Cole, however, to attempt an analysis of the function of management and on the basis of that analysis to work out a detailed scheme of industrial democracy. A suitable text for discussion was provided by the arch-priest of Fabian Collectivism, Sidney Webb, in his *The Works Manager To-day*, 1917. Webb was concerned to argue that management was, or was becoming, a specialist technique:

"What we are concerned with here, whether we are considering any grade of managers or superintendents, is the quite distinct profession of organising men—of so arranging and dictating the activities of a band of producers, including both brain and manual workers, and to create amongst them the most effective co-operation of their energies. What the manager has principally to handle, therefore, is not wood or metal but human nature not machinery but will . . . In my opinion, the profession of manager, under whatever designation . . . is destined, with the ever increasing complication of man's enterprises, to develop a steadily increasing technique and a more and more specialised training of its own; and to secure, like the vocation of the engineer, the architect, or the chemist, universal recognition as a specialised brainworking occupation."⁴⁰

The Manipulation of Men

Cole denied that "the manipulation of men" was a science to be learned and controlled by

Continued on p. 4

REFLECTIONS ON THE LADY GARBETT DISPOSSESSION CASE

HOW many thinking members of the public, we wonder, have more than a passing thought to the issues that arise from the Government's statement in the House last week of its powers, and the steps it took, to dispossess one Lady Garbett from her farm in Sussex earlier this year? If we are to judge by the editorial comments of such "serious" sections of the Press as the *Observer* and the *Manchester Guardian* or Mr. Ralph Wightman in last Sunday's *News of the World* then few will have done more than skate on the surface of the problem. And it is a pity, for the implications of the Agriculture Act of 1947 go much deeper than perhaps even the government are aware.

The powers granted to the Minister of Agriculture to dispossess anyone for bad farming date back to the last war when the problems of feeding the nation became, for military reasons, more important than considerations of exports, foreign investment and the like. (One need not point out of course that there was little choice open to the government since the normal channels of world trade had been blocked by a fleet of U-boats, and existing foreign investments were being gobbled-up by our closest of allies, the United States). We had to rehabilitate our land or die of starvation before the enemy had a chance of bombing the daylight out of us. At it happened, and for reasons that some call the 'fortunes' (others, the misfortunes) of war, we lived to bomb the daylight out of the enemy! But the fact remains that during this period it became possible to grow enough food in this country to feed more than half the population, an achievement which for decades we had been assured was beyond the resources of this overcrowded island. These results were achieved because the government, with the overwhelming support of the urban population threatened with possible starvation, and without legally expropriating the land, nevertheless made it clear that it would be used for growing the bread grains and other basic food-stuffs that were needed to feed the population. Through generous subsidies, farmers were encouraged to farm even the poorest land, pasture was ploughed-up and labour, forced and voluntary, was forthcoming to make fruitful the land of Britain. What the farmers may have lost in initiative was made up by fat returns: guaranteed markets and prices! Gone were the days of having to plough-in fields of lettuces, of orchards of apples rotting on the ground, of glutted markets and delict farms . . . and of vast estates providing nothing more than a good bit of huntin' and shootin' for the titled gentry.

★

THE years of cold peace that followed World War II have resulted in a partial relaxation of the government's interest in the land. From the point of view of capitalist economics we live by our industries—we are led to believe that we can achieve higher standards by subsidising coal at the expense of food—and it is only from military considerations that the land of this country is not completely allowed to return to its pre-war dereliction (*Exports* is the magic word of 1956—just as *Food* was the watchword of 1940—and who has heard of Britain exporting food, apart from Whisky?). But the government has retained some of the powers which it took during the war and since passing the

1947 Act, there have been 376 cases of dispossession for bad husbandry but it is significant, as the *Observer* points out, that they have become increasingly rare and that in the past eighteen months only six evictions have occurred. And we would hazard a guess that in the event that the government succeeded in eliminating the remaining food subsidies the dispossession clause in the 1947 Act would simply die from neglect.

But the Minister of Agriculture, in defending his department's action in the case of Lady Garbett's farm used quite different arguments. The condition of her farm was the worst the County Agricultural Committee had experienced, it had greatly deteriorated during the five years it had been under inspection and

"the cereal crop from the 1954 harvest had been wasted; the land was foul and the farm understocked".

"Production"—that magic word—"had been extremely small, and with a decreasing trend. And production during the last twelve months was at a very, very low level indeed. I am satisfied that I should be failing in my responsibilities under the Agriculture Act if I permit her to resume occupation".

According to press reports the Minister carried the House with him and only a few diehards, such as Mr. John Eden (nephew of the Prime Minister) still prepared to be aggressive and their questions "were drowned several times in uproar". Yet Mr. Eden was seeking to express his concern "about the wide power departmental officials have, not only for entering private property but for turning people out of their homes". We should feel much more sympathy for Mr. Eden's plea for the individual if we could recall any similar campaign on his part in the Kenya debates on behalf of the tens of thousands of Kikuyu who were forcibly evicted from their villages (which were then burned to the ground) and resettled in compounds (or concentration camps, with the womenfolk separated from their men). We also find little to be enthusiastic about in the government's position—and the opposition support—in the Lady Garbett case, when we take into account that the Conservative Party stand for a "property-owning democracy" and the Labour Party for something hardly less contradictory which might be described as "a State-controlled democracy".

The conservative *Observer* describes the dispossession in the Garbett affair as savouring of "bureaucratic tyranny". The half-hearted liberal *Manchester Guardian* looks upon it as a question of principle by "people who care about freedom" (not so much by farmers since "very few of them can feel threatened"). We cannot be expected to unravel the product of this twisted thinking in one sentence, even if we assume, which obviously we cannot, that we are all agreed that we mean the same thing when we talk of "bureaucratic tyranny" or "principle" or of "freedom". The "people who care about freedom", for Lady Garbett for instance, are those who believe that the natural resources of the soil and the sub-soil are not the heritage of Man but of some men (or women) who by the possession of the existing coin of privilege—money—can deny access to, can waste, misuse or exploit to their personal advantage that which belongs by right to the people as a whole. The Socialists, it will be argued by their supporters, seek to abolish individual monopoly of the sources of production. But in so doing they have only changed masters: the State has replaced the individual landowner and the industrialist. The authoritarian structure remains unchanged; the power structure has been changed, not destroyed. The producer, that is the humble individual whose work on the soil provides our daily bread and in the factories the needful, and artificial "essentials" of daily existence, has no voice in the management of production whether it is organised for profits or for needs (as determined by the State).

★

The Unhealthy Society

TO-DAY anyone who chooses can cause your phone to ring and invade your privacy whether you like it or not. Whether you like it or not anyone who chooses to do so can know everything—both true and false—that it is possible to know about you, in fact, more than you know about yourself.

In this, our [U.S.A.] Government sets the example, for the Federal Bureau of Investigation has millions of such records on file in Washington. The files of the Congressional Committee on Un-American Activities are open to anyone who cares to use them. Then there are the manpower lists, the biographical reference works, speciality list, credit ratings, telephone books, Black Books, Red Books, Who Knows What Books, the scandalmongering yellow press, private eyes, public eyes, FBI's, wire-tapping, TV and radio brainwashing, and so on. Privacy has gone with the waves."

These words are taken from an article in *The Saturday Review* (31/3/56) by Professor Ashley Montague (of Rutgers University's Anthropology department) entitled "The Annihilation of Privacy". The Professor is not mealy-mouthed about explaining the facts of life to his readers; he draws attention to the unprecedented scale of the invasion of individual privacy to suggest that it is at least one cause of the unhealthiness of American society.

"A genuinely healthy society," the author says "holds together by the respect which men give to men, by the recognition of the biosocial needs of man for relatedness, and the making available of the means by which that relatedness can be achieved. Such a society, instead of providing men with instruments that make them less than themselves, affords them the means of becoming instruments of something greater than themselves. In spite of the superficial appearances our society lamentably fails to afford such opportunities to the majority of individuals.

"We teach the three 'Rs', but we teach them as techniques for the achievement of limited objectives. Our educational attitudes are not directed towards 'draw-

THE *Observer* arguing against the government's use of its powers under the Act of 1947 puts forward the view that

Experience has shown that economic pressure, widely tempered with financial and technical assistance, is a more effective spur to increased farming efficiency than threats of dispossession.

The *Observer* has obviously missed the point. The man who takes up farming as a livelihood and has no private income or another home (as in Lady Garbett's case), does so after having acquired the necessary experience from working on another man's land. It is imperative in his own interests that the land he owns, or rents, should be used to the best economic advantage (not only for his immediate profit but as a source of livelihood for many years to come). The potentially bad farmers are in fact just those for whom "economic pressures" mean nothing, for whom the ownership of land is just another way of avoiding tax at the surtax level. A few get caught in the net of dispossession. But we refuse to join Mr. John Eden in looking upon them as our displaced persons of the land!

The determination of the government in such isolated cases as that of Lady Garbett only underlines the real issues: that the land of Britain will only begin to "produce efficiently" when its development will be a communal interest; when production will be, as it were, an agreement between producer and consumer, and, to our minds, when the relationship, the feeling, of the producer to the land he tills is greater than that of ownership. We believe that the artificial pleasures derived from possession have been confused with the real joys that man experiences from his sympathy and skill in manipulating the things that surround him. His interest in a piece of clay is not in its possession but in what he can create out of it; his excitement in the slummy back yard is not the desire to be its landlord but to transform it into a garden of his fantasy, a source of smiles and perfumes for too long inhabited by frowns and smells!

ing out' but towards 'pumping in'. Our value system is a conflicting one, in which the worship of God is taught on the one hand and of Mammon on the other. The pursuit of life in reality reduces itself to the pursuit of a living, 'liberty' assumes the form of economic liberty, and 'happiness' resolves itself into getting whatever one can out of life by whatever means one can."

It is, then, not altogether surprising that the U.S.A. has the highest rates in the world for mental breakdowns, homicide, violent crime, juvenile delinquency, alcoholism and drug addiction.

★

ANOTHER aspect of the omnipresent invading forces which Professor Montague surveys is advertising. He objects to being thwarted in trying to view the beauties of the landscape by "the impertinence of the huckster's misshapen and misplaced art which, like some pathological sequestrum, too often suggests that it would be better for not being at all".

"One of the most insidious forms which the depletion of privacy takes is mail advertising. I am not for a moment suggesting that large numbers of individuals do not like receiving advertising in their mail. On the contrary, it is clear that innumerable persons do enjoy receiving this kind of mail, especially where the other kind is likely to be somewhat thin. For the advertising people such persons become like so many puppets who can, in certain numbers, be moved in the desired direction". One of the consequences of this flood of

printed matter is that the reading of many people is restricted to this mail advertising. It provides a complement to the distracting entertainments (also not unconnected with advertising) of radio, movies, and TV.

In conclusion—"with the toleration which is increasingly exhibited towards these encroachments upon our privacy goes an increasing callousness to them. We grow accustomed to the transgressions upon our being, the violations of our privacy, and the infringement of our right to be alone with ourselves whenever we choose . . .

"The unsatisfied desire, the longing, for social participation leads to the fear of being alone, and the desire for occasional solitude tends to be overcome by the fear of being alone. In this manner the need for privacy may eventually be completely submerged in the overpowering need to be with—overpowering because it has been so inadequately satisfied by normal means. When such an annihilation of privacy is achieved man is indeed in danger—he is in danger of self-annihilation, of becoming a living automaton at the mercy of anyone who knows how to make him tick.

"In such a society one becomes grateful to 'Big Brother' for assuming the task of directing the life one is no longer capable of directing oneself. In this way does the annihilation of privacy lead to the annihilation of the person, and of society, for the healthy society depends upon the ability of man to reflect upon what a true society is—and without the privacy to reflect man and society are lost."

SACKINGS AT STANDARD'S, FEARS AT AUSTIN'S

DECLARED redundant by the management, 2,640 men have been sacked from the Standard motor works at Coventry.

This is the answer of the firm's managing director, Mr. Alick Dick, to the attempts by the trade unions involved to establish a system of part-time work all round rather than see some stood off altogether. It was in order that some such scheme should be discussed that the men went back to work after the recent strike. We can see with what good faith Smart Alick promised to discuss—and with what determination the unions were prepared to defend their point of view, for they have accepted the decision, being more concerned to keep the men at work now they are back.

The only actions taken by the unions have been the paying of a 'redundancy pay-out' by the Transport and General Workers' Union, and an appeal by all unions concerned to the Ministry of Labour to please get the Standard management to re-open discussions. In a meeting between the latter and the Minister of Labour, Standards promised that they would let the Minister know 'at the

earliest possible moment' if they are prepared to re-open discussions with the unions.

Meanwhile, fear of the sack is haunting between 5,000 and 7,000 Austin car workers. Rumours are sweeping the great plant at Longbridge, Birmingham, where 21,000 work, that those who have been on a four-day week since January will soon get their cards.

They fear, too, that every man on the production lines will have his two weeks annual holiday at the end of July extended to a month—a fortnight of it without pay.

The reasons? The expected rush in spring and summer sales has not materialised.

Mr. George Varnom, chairman of Austin's shop stewards and president of Birmingham's trade council, said last Sunday: "We are very, very concerned. Now that Standard's have won the right of hire and fire a similar situation could spread throughout the industry".

He added: "There is now a fear that automation will be extended at Longbridge".

Quiet Interlude

Continued from p. 1

like; helpful, informative and not too official-sounding. It had even deigned to call him 'Dear Mr. Benn'. Probably of course, this was the only department which stood to gain anything by a courteous reply, and acted accordingly.

Mr. Benn finally uttered sentiments with which all will agree. He said that the Law had created what is known as the 'reasonable' man, the Treasury the 'economic' man, the Ministry of Health the 'normal' man. It was in fact much more necessary to create the 'human man'. In our opinion under present circumstances this can be done by impressing upon officials, that they are not superior beings but servants of the public (civil, not uncivil), whose job it is to assist other human beings in their daily affairs.

It was Mr. Richard Crossman's job to second the motion put forward by Mr. Benn, and in doing so he stated that his intention was to defend the individual citizen against excessive power. He said that long before he arrived at Westminster in 1945, Parliament had resigned that power to the executive. "Power is passing from this place year by year to irresponsible people either in private or public industry, and thereby the people's control of public institutions is steadily decreasing year by year".

This is what anarchists have been saying decade by decade—that power is in the hands of a permanent executive, regardless of which Party has most votes in Parliament. Anarchists however, are

under no delusions, even were the power to be returned to 'another place', that this would bring the control of public institutions or anything else, within the grasp of the people.

Mr. Henry Brooke replied to the motion on behalf of the Government, and said that he attached high importance to good public relations—he is Financial Secretary to the Treasury, and his particular Government department rules the country anyway—but he insisted that the Government could not allow anything so drastic as a committee of enquiry. Sir Beverley Baxter (Conservative, Southgate) eventually moved an amendment which was accepted.

The final amended motion was approved and no doubt received a deafening silence:

That the Government acknowledge the importance of the relationship between the public authorities and private individuals in a free democratic society, and should take such measures to study and improve such relationships as might from time to time prove necessary.

Since the answer is in effect the well-known lemon, why then do we consider that this piece of House of Commons business was worthy of note? Because it illustrates that even a motion which cannot be regarded as having any inherent dangers for the Government has to be rendered meaningless lest it should in some extraordinary way alter the *status quo* or be used in evidence at some future date. S.W.

SUSPECTED GUILT BY ASSOCIATION OR THE BITER BIT

MANY a superior eyebrow was raised in this country last year when an American naval cadet (top of his class) was refused a commission because his mother had once been associated with Communists.

It was felt, although perhaps not expressed, that the kind of security hysteria betrayed by this action was possible in the United States, but not very likely in Britain, where a calmer attitude prevails.

This illusion, however, has been shaken by the sacking of Mr. John Lang, a £5,000 a year assistant solicitor, employed by the Imperial Chemical Industries. Mr. Lang was so indiscreet as to marry a woman who had once been a member of the Communist Party.

His wife had left the CP a year before their marriage in 1951, and Mr. Lang told reporters that he had had a considerable effect in persuading her to "discard her political beliefs".

This murky past of Mrs. Lang's is apparently sufficient to persuade the Government that he is a security risk, and ICI were informed that they would get no more secret work to do for Government departments if there was the slightest danger of Mr. Lang having contact with it.

No Alternative

So Mr. Lang was first suspended and has now been definitely sacked. A letter, signed by Mr. Richard Banks, the firm's personnel director, told him that ICI had no alternative but to bring his employment to an end.

The Government, went on the letter, regarded it as essential that Mr. Lang should not have access to information in connection with secret contracts.

He was told: "Obviously it would be neither in the national interest, nor in our own, to decline to undertake further secret work for the Government."

The interesting feature of this business is that neither Mr. Lang nor his wife have had any opportunity to openly state their case before an accusing authority.

At Mr. Lang's insistence, Mrs. Lang did have an interview with Sir Cyril Musgrave, Second Permanent Secretary to the Ministry of Supply, who disclosed that he had, in Mr. Lang's words, an 'enormous dossier' on her. And Mr. Lang himself has called a press conference, where it was discovered that he had been treasurer of the Haldane Society (of 'socialist' lawyers) after Labour Party members had walked out in protest against Communist influence in the Society. Mr. Lang says that he remained in his office of treasurer because he was 'in strong opposition to the Communists and wished to prevent them having complete control'.

'Funny Little Things'

There is a certain irony in this situation in that Mr. Lang has also informed us that he has himself worked in 'intelligence' in the past. He explained to reporters how a dossier is built up, saying that in his wife's dossier was 'packets of stuff'.

He went on: 'Having been in this business myself—intelligence—I know.

'You get a name and then you open a dossier and you find all sorts of funny little things—when a person attended a meeting... that somebody in a pub had said something...'

It seems in this particular instance that here is the biter bit. Mr. Lang accumulated all sorts of 'funny' little bits of information to incriminate others. Now someone has done it on him!

It would also appear that Mr. Lang is not the political innocent he would try to make out. But even so the main evidence against him seems to be his wife's erstwhile membership of the CP and that hardly seems to add up to a security risk on his part.

In point of fact, the Ministry of Works did not ask for his dismissal. They only want assurance that he would have no access to secret information. But ICI have preferred to sling him out

altogether—promising him compensation.

Deserted by All

The Law Society (the lawyers' trade union) has refused even to see Mr. Lang, although he has been associated with it for 26 years. After he had waited for four and a half hours for the Society's Council to see him, and then sent away without even an interview, Mr. Lang plaintively said 'These people are supposed to represent justice!' He is clearly learning just what they do represent—the professional interest of lawyers as a class, and they very clearly don't want to get tangled up with anything which has a political smear about it. Neither of course would the Law Society be very sympathetic to any lawyer who had been active in the Haldane Society, which no doubt criticises the Law Society for its Right-wing views. The officers of the Law Society probably take the line that if Mr. Lang has got himself into trouble through Socialist associations, he can get himself out of it.

Similarly the Haldane Society will have no time for him, either, for how do they know he was not passing information to M.I.5 while he was their Treasurer? And naturally even the CP won't support his protests. Mr. Lang seems to have balled things up all round.

The Way of the State

This however does not detract from the real point—that the Ministry of Works can issue directions to private firms which lead to individuals losing their jobs. And these directives are based upon suspicions of security risks which in turn are based upon spying, public-house tittle-tattle and family relationships.

The State is now, in small ways, beginning to attempt to control the family relationships of its own employees, in the sacred name of 'security'. The extent to which this is being applied was expressed last week by the criticism of "the security bug" contained in the current

ANARCHIST SUMMER SCHOOL 1956

It is now possible to make some kind of announcement about the programme and the costs of the 1956 Anarchist Summer School.

The place of meeting will be the new premises of the Malatesta Club in Percy Street, where it is hoped that an exhibition of anarchist prints will be on show at the time. The theme of all the lectures will be "Is History on Our Side?"

PROGRAMME

The following programme of events is still subject to confirmation, but little change is expected. Times are approximate.

Saturday, August 4.

- 2.00 p.m. Informal gathering.
- 2.30 p.m. Lecture: F. A. RIDLEY
- 5.30 p.m. High tea
- Social evening
- 8.00 p.m. Lunitas presents:
The Tuppenny Ha'penny Opera

issue of *State Service*—the Civil Servants' journal.

The article attacks security measures published recently by the Atomic Energy Authority.

The main complaint is over the A.E.A.'s circular that requires members of the staff, male or female, who are about to marry or re-marry, to notify the Authority of their intention without delay.

"There is no end to the pursuing of these inquiries once people get bitten with the security bug," says the article.

But Civil Servants and lawyers like Mr. Lang should realise that this is the way of the State. And they live, either directly or indirectly, through the legal and bureaucratic machinery of the State. They accept it as long as it pays off for them, but don't like it when the 'needs' of the State begins to conflict with their own interests and liberties.

You can't have your cake and eat it, too. Those who serve repressive institutions must be prepared to take their own medicine.

Sunday, August 5.

- 11.00 a.m. Lecture:
ALEX COMFORT
- 1.30 p.m. Lunch
- 3.00 Open-air meeting in Hyde Park
- 7.30 p.m. Lecture:
JACK ROBINSON

Monday, August 6.

- 11.00 a.m. Lecture:
PHILIP SANSOM
- 1.30 p.m. Lunch

COSTS

LECTURES. The charge for admission to the four lectures will be two shillings and sixpence, payable in advance. Admission to each lecture separately, one shilling.

MEALS. The price of each meal mentioned in the programme will be two shillings and sixpence. It will be necessary, of course, for meals to be ordered sufficiently in advance for food to be bought. On Saturday and Sunday evening, refreshments will be available from the Malatesta Club at their usual prices.

ACCOMMODATION. It is hoped that provincial and foreign comrades coming to the Summer School can all be accommodated in the homes of London comrades, and therefore no separate charge will be made for accommodation. But if, after all, it is necessary to put some comrades into hotels, all those attending the Summer School will be asked to contribute voluntarily.

Bookings for places in the Summer School (total amount payable in advance 10/-), offers of accommodation, and enquiries, should all be sent as soon as possible to Joan Sculthorpe, c/o Freedom Press. Donations will also be welcome. All cheques and postal orders should be made payable to Joan Sculthorpe.

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

LECTURE-DISCUSSIONS

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

JUNE 17—Alfred Reynolds on
THE BRIDGE: A WAY TO
ANARCHISM?

JUNE 24.—Kapilavaddho Bukkhi on
ANARCHISM AND BUDDHISM

INFORMAL DISCUSSIONS

Every Thursday at 8.15.

OPEN AIR MEETINGS

Weather Permitting
HYDE PARK
Sundays at 3.30 p.m.

MANETTE STREET
(Charing X Road)
Saturdays at 5.30 p.m.

GLASGOW

At 200 BUCHANAN STREET,
GLASGOW
OUTDOOR meetings at Maxwell Street,
every Sunday, commencing April 1st at
7.30 p.m.

LIBERTARIAN FORUM

813 BROADWAY,
(Bet. 11 & 12 Sts.)
NEW YORK CITY
Round-Table Youth Discussions
Friday Evenings at 8.30

June 22—The Relationship of the Family
to Society.

The Tradition of Workers' Control - 8

Continued
from p. 2

experts. There was a fundamental difference, he argued, between such professions as medicine and architecture and the "profession" of manager in that the latter is primarily a disciplinarian, whereas the former professions are concerned to provide technical advice. The manager resembled more the professional politician or the administrative Civil Servant than either the doctor or architect. It would, therefore, be "as dangerous to endow him with the full status of a governing profession as it is to endow the politician or the bureaucrat with full authority". For this reason, "Just as the community ought to demand and maintain democratic control over its political administrators, so Industrial Labour will claim direct democratic control over those who seek to manipulate its industrial conditions."⁴¹

The distinction between the technician and the manipulator of men provided, in Coles' view, a rough guide in the method of appointment in an industrial democracy. The technical and commercial experts could not be chosen by democratic vote since the electors were not competent to judge the experts' qualifications. It would suffice that they should be the servants of a democratically elected authority such as the national executive committee of a Guild. In cases where managers were also required to be technicians, the possession of definite qualifications of skill and technique would be made a condition of their eligibility for managerial positions. "A ship-owner to-day can only appoint as captain of his ship a man who holds a master's certificate. The seamen of the future Guild will only be able to choose as their captain a man who is similarly equipped."⁴² As to the basis of election, Coles argued that the officials must, if freedom is to be a reality in the Guild, be under the control of those they direct.⁴³

Cole was hopeful that a democratic régime in industry would have a special appeal to managerial elements. The manager would not have the uncontrolled power to dismiss workers, nor would he be able to ignore public opinion either in the factory or in the Guild. On the other hand, when the rank and file secured not only a direct interest in production but also the means of making their wills effective, it was hoped that the manager would be faced not with apathy or hostility but with a co-operative attitude on the part of all workers. In any case, he would not be in the awkward position of being the nominee of a capitalist employer. "I strongly suspect," concluded Coles,

"that the managers in a Guild factory would have no cause to complain of lack of power. If they wanted authority, they would find ample scope for it; but I believe most of them would soon cease to think of their positions mainly in terms of power, and would come to think of them mainly in terms of function. Only under the free conditions of democratic industry would the

leader find real scope for leadership, and he would find it in a way that would enable him to concentrate all his faculties on the development of his factory as a communal service, instead of being, as now, constantly thwarted and restrained by considerations of shareholders' profits."⁴⁴

The Guilds and the State

One of the weakest points in the original formulation of National Guilds theory by Hobson was the definition of the relation between the Guilds and the State. The State was to be shorn of its economic and financial responsibilities while, at the same time, retaining in the interests of the community the ultimate right to control policy. The conclusion drawn by many critics was that in matters of dispute either the State would coerce the Guilds, which would bring us back to the Collectivist position, or the Guilds would overrule the State and we should be very near to syndicalism. The answer that this would be avoided because both State and Guilds were "necessary" to each other, or because the Guilds would differ among themselves, seemed more facile than substantial.

In Coles' original approach to this problem there is evidence both of his Fabian background and of the influence of the then current theory of political pluralism. The great virtue of National Guild theory in his eyes was that it reconciled the opposing claims of Collectivism and Syndicalism. The sin of the former was that it found room only for the interests of the consumer; the sin of the latter that it completely ignored the interests of the consumer on the ground that producer and consumer are, or should be in a socialist society, one and the same person. Guild Socialists, on the other hand, recognised and made provision for the interests of both producer and consumer: the producer through his Guild and the consumer through the State.

The Co-Sovereignty Theory

Rejecting the doctrine of State Sovereignty which implies that the State has the ultimate right to interfere in all spheres of human action because all associations within the State ultimately derive their right to exist from the State, Coles nevertheless accepted the current Fabian theory that the State was, potentially at least, the representative of men as consumers. In a Guild Society therefore there would be, on the one hand, the grouping of men in territorial associations, the chief organ of which was Parliament, and, on the other hand, the grouping of men in vocational associations, the chief organ of which would be a Central Guilds Congress. This Guild Congress would be the supreme industrial body standing in the same relation to men as producers, as Parliament stands to men as consumers. Since both the Guild Congress and Parliament represented different types of interest, ultimate sovereignty would reside in

neither body. In cases of dispute between them, however, settlement would have to be sought through a body more representative than either—a body representing every citizen in all his social aspects. The National Guild system was thus a system of co-sovereignty, resulting in a balance of powers, or, more strictly speaking, a division of powers. In the American political system, powers are divided horizontally and by stages: in the Guild system, the division would be on vertical and functional lines. The system would be one of decentralisation and dispersal of power and, in this "balancing (of) one social organism so nicely against another", the individual would find his freedom.⁴⁵

The Civic-Sovereignty Theory

This co-sovereignty theory was criticised by the older guildsmen who adhered to what they called the civic-sovereignty theory. Hobson, the chief protagonist of the latter, rejected the Fabian idea of the State as an association of consumers. The State, he claimed, represented the interests of the citizen as distinct from those either of the producer or of the consumer, and in such a capacity must always be allowed to have the final word in any dispute between the Guilds and the State. To Hobson, the basis of Guild organisation was the control of every economic process, productive and consumptive, so that in normal circumstances the Guilds would represent both producer and consumer. The latter he defined as "one who in his functional capacity makes an effective demand upon the producer."⁴⁶ Consumption, in his view, did not represent a homogeneous interest as Coles assumed. There was nothing between a consumer of whisky and a consumer—or "user" and "enjoyer"—of a municipal park which the State could represent. Production and consumption were not two distinct and equal processes but complementary stages of one economic transaction. A product was the result of co-operation between the producer and the consumer, and, once the profit motive was eliminated, there would be no divergence of interest. Provision would therefore be made inside the Guild organisation for effectual contact between producer and consumer through the establishment of a Distributive Guild to which all would belong and which would conduct negotiations, if necessary, with the manufacturing guilds.

G.N.O.

35 *The New Age*, 8/1/1912.
36 See: Cole & Mellor: *The Greater Unionism*, 1913
37 *Towards a Postal Guild*, 1919.
38 M. B. Reckitt & C. E. Bechhofer: *The Meaning of National Guilds*, 1920 ed. p. 190.
39 *The Guildsman*, March, 1920.
40 *Op. cit.* pp. 3-4, 6-7.
41 Cole: *Labour and the Commonwealth*, 1918, p. 32.
42 Cole: *Guild Socialism Restated*, 1920, p. 53.
43 Cole: *Self-Government in Industry*, 3rd ed. 1928, p. 216. For a more complete picture of the working of industrial democracy, see Cole's sketch of the constitution for an Engineering Guild, *ibid.* pp. 211-229.
44 *Guild Socialism Restated*, p. 57.
45 *Self-Government in Industry*, p. 145.
46 Hobson: *National Guilds and the State*, 1920, p. 25.

FREEDOM

The Anarchist Weekly

Postal Subscription Rates:
12 months 19/- (U.S.A. \$3.00)
6 months 9/6 (U.S.A. \$1.50)
3 months 5/- (U.S.A. \$0.75)

Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies
12 months 29/- (U.S.A. \$4.50)
6 months 14/6 (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