

AS LONG AS CAPITALISM LASTS

## NO END TO INDUSTRIAL STRIFE

AS we go to press, one and a half million workers in shipbuilding and engineering are still on strike. The situation between the unions and the employers is one of deadlock, although the reality of the strike has forced the employers to shift from their original blank refusal to an offer of 3 per cent. increase—with strings. The unions, quite rightly, will not accept this; there is deadlock, and the Government has decided to set up courts of enquiry—one for the shipbuilders, one for the engineers.

This strike, on a larger scale than anything this country has known since 1926, has shaken the whole community. The national Press, of course, is raving, but behind all the hysteria one senses one basic fear—of the strength of organised labour, and of the danger of the workers realising it.

Although, this being an official strike, the union leaders are the bogeymen at present, Fleet Street's guardians of the public good would rather see a strike led by those leaders than one where the rank and file organise themselves unofficially. While the leaders are in control, discipline can still be maintained from above and there is more than hope that 'statesmanship' will prevail.

### A Lasting Change?

Some of the papers, of course, are hoping for more than that. In the *Evening Standard* for April 1st (*sic*) for example, the following pious hope was expressed:

... a clear understanding must be reached with the dissidents. A settlement must be negotiated which will both end the present dispute and produce a lasting change in industrial relations.

The Beaverbrook organ did not specify exactly what form the 'clear understanding' should take, but knowing its attitude it is safe to guess that, although the right to withdraw labour is inalienable in a free country and only made illegal

in a slave (*i.e.* Communist) state, still some democratic means should be found to prevent workers from going on strike and thereby upsetting the even tenor of capitalist endeavour.

The last phrase in the above quote is, however, the most idealistic. The *Standard* hopes for 'a lasting change in industrial relations'. So do we, of course, but we are usually dismissed as idle dreamers when we point out what is involved in seeking changes in industrial relations.

We pointed out a fortnight ago that those who support a competitive economy (and Lord Beaverbrook's papers are loud in their praise of the virtues of competition) can have no complaint when the workers begin to act upon their advice—when they begin to compete with the employers for the wealth they produce. Neither can they expect competition to bring anything but conflict. How can it? Competition is conflict, and all that the capitalists and their journalistic apologists desire is that the conflict

be joined on their terms and in fields where they are bound to win.

When the workers join in and, because their very lives are at stake, play a little rough, the capitalists cry 'Foul'. Free competition is one thing, class war another altogether.

The *Standard* continues (and we use this article as typical of Fleet Street) thus:

'Clearly this [*i.e.* the 'lasting change'] will only be achieved if the Government can intervene with authority. At present it cannot do so. Its self-imposed role has been that of neutral umpire.

But the Government may have to change the rules of the game, as well as interpret them. If the crisis is not soon resolved, the Government will have to get a clear ruling from the country on this issue. Either the Tories will emerge victorious from the polls—with a mandate to rule the land and deal with industrial strife. Or the Socialists will be returned to power—and give the strikers a free rein.'

We can ignore the stupidity of the last sentence. The Labour Government showed itself as authoritarian (if not more) in dealing with strikers as the Conservatives. What is significant in this passage are the phrases 'change the rules', and 'rule the land and deal with industrial strife'.

These are veiled threats—hints of anti-strike legislation which would place the workers of this country in the same position as those in Communist and Fascist states. The champions of free enterprise are very much opposed to state interference with the profit end of capitalism, to nationalisation or trade controls. They haven't the same dislike for controls over the workers.

Similarly they pride themselves upon their sportsmanship and loyalty to the rules of the game—but if they look like losing anything serious (like money) they are quite unashamed in suggesting changing the rules to suit themselves!

But even this will not produce the 'lasting change in industrial relations.' These relations are to-day

the result of the inescapable conflict between two sets of people with opposing interests—the owners or controllers of industrial capital and the workers.

The former desire to pay the workers as little as possible for as much work as possible; the latter want to get as much pay as possible for no more work than gives them satisfaction. Change the free enterprise into state boards and the position is exactly the same.

The lasting change is going to come only when production and administration are carried on by the same people and when exploitation of the producers by the administrators has therefore ended. In a word, that which is going to end industrial strife is the supersession of boss control and state control by workers' control, when class conflict cannot arise because there are no conflicting classes.

While capitalism exists this is an impossibility. Its attainment means the end of capitalism in any of its forms. Will Lord Beaverbrook face up to that in the interests of the community as a whole?

### IN BRIEF

#### KEEPING RHODESIA PURE WHITE

SALISBURY (SN. RHOD.), MARCH 28.  
The Southern Rhodesian Government is considering introducing legislation to prevent illicit sexual relations between people of different races, according to the Minister of Justice and Internal Affairs, Mr. A. R. W. Stumbles, but no decision had been made yet.

The present position is governed by the Immorality and Indecency Suppression Ordinance of 1903, which makes it illegal for an African male to consort with a white woman outside marriage. It is not an offence for a European male to have illicit relations with an African female. If the law is amended it will probably be in the direction of the South African position, where sexual relations between members of different races is a punishable offence.

Attention has been focused on this matter by the recent marriage of a Southern Rhodesian African, Mr. Patrick Matimba, to a Dutch woman.  
(*Manchester Guardian*).

#### MONEY WELL-SPENT

ROME, MARCH 9.  
The Government has decided to spend 20,000,000,000 lire (\$32,000,000) to save Italian artistic and archaeological treasures that are in imminent danger of ruin.

A committee of experts and members of Parliament, after exhaustive research, called the Government's attention to the fact that many historical buildings famed throughout the world were in danger of collapse. Many historical paintings are in need of restoration and a great number of ancient manuscripts will be ruined within a comparatively few years unless something is done about them immediately, it was said.

The committee said, \$85,600,000 needed to be spent, with \$28,800,000 wanted for repairs that cannot be deferred, \$36,000,000 for work described as urgent and \$20,800,000 for work of a less urgent character.

(*N. York Times*).  
It is a pleasant task to record when money is spent on saving Man's cultural heritage and not for destroying it as is more often the case.

#### QUOTATION CORNER

**Another Voice in the Wilderness**  
"Those in power brook no opposition from the common man, but cleverly allow those activities which give the illusion of democracy. They will explode their bomb whether we like it or not, but not over the North Sea or the Atlantic, although they assert its harmlessness."  
"We spend money we can't afford producing a weapon we aren't use in order to demonstrate our greatness to a world that knows otherwise."  
—From a letter in the *Observer*.

## Makarios Free - But not in Cyprus

WITH a suitable display of determination on both sides not to yield to threats or swerve from justice, Archbishop Makarios has been granted, and has accepted, permission by the British Government to leave the Seychelles. The Archbishop will be entirely free to go where he likes—except to Cyprus, and "naturally when he is a free man anyone can get into touch with him anywhere they like—except in Cyprus" (Lennox Boyd, House of Commons).

The United Nations Resolution calling for a resumption of negotiations for a "peaceful, democratic and just solution" of the Cyprus problem, has according to Makarios: created a new situation opening the way for the restoration of peace on the island.

The British Government has accepted the offer made by NATO to undertake conciliation between

Greece, Turkey and Britain, claiming that the "international aspect" of the problem must be settled before getting down to internal affairs. This can be regarded as another excuse to postpone the question of self-determination until such a time as Britain feels her own demands on Cyprus will be assured. Makarios's claim that a new situation had been created convinces us just as little. Both sides are anxious to adopt 'face saving' tactics so familiar in power politics when changes take place and there is call for the opposing factions to come to terms, but the problems in Cyprus remain fundamentally the same as they were at the beginning of the struggle.

Why has it been necessary therefore for so many lives to be lost before deciding that the time is ripe for "peaceful negotiations"? The truth is that both sides thought that a military struggle would be decisive. At the time of Makarios's exile EOKA was strong, and it seems likely that the leaders though they could harass the British sufficiently to force them into at least discussing demands on its terms. The British military forces have proved superior in strength while their moral position has been weakened.

Clearly, however, both the British Government and Makarios are now anxious to make a display of conciliation. We never thought otherwise than that Makarios would eventually agree to discuss the future of Cyprus on terms acceptable to both sides.

The Government in this country is being criticised on all sides for its continued intransigence, and in recent months has taken more jolts than is good for a political party with an eye on the next election. By conditionally releasing Makarios, thus opening the way for "negotiations", they hope to hold off their critics as well as the "tough" men in their own party who are always in favour of force. But aside from the party political trickery, Cyprus is much too important to Britain to allow the unsettled state to continue much longer, if it can be avoided

even by means which are difficult for the Government to swallow.

The Greek Government has expressed disapproval of the interference by NATO, but neither Greece nor Turkey are anxious to see Communism flourishing, and we suggested at the time of the Suez crisis, when Tito was hastily making plans to receive representatives from Turkey and Greece, that some kind of agreement would be reached by all interested groups if only through fear of the Kremlin.

In the meantime the ordinary people go uneasily about their day-to-day tasks. We do not consider that under the spiritual and political guidance of Makarios their lot will be very much improved, but the problems of trying to tell them this are as difficult as attempting to prove to the British people that whichever Government they have society will remain very much the same. We can only hope that experience will teach them all, and like us they will act upon it.

#### Historical Note

ON the outbreak of war with Turkey, November 5th, 1914, Cyprus was annexed to the British Crown. The British Government offered the island to Greece twelve months later, conditionally upon the latter aiding Serbia, then invaded by Bulgaria. The offer lapsed when Greece declined it. British annexation was formally recognised by Turkey under the Treaty of Lausanne, ratified in 1924.

#### 23 HANGED IN A DAY IN SOUTH AFRICA

PRETORIA, MARCH 21.  
Twenty-two Africans and three other non-whites were hanged to-day in the Central Prison here for the murder of five policemen. This is the largest number to be hanged in South Africa in one day.  
They had been found guilty of the murder of two European and three African policemen during a routine search for drugs in the Berville district of Natal in February, 1956.—*Reuter*.

## Passports Threat?

The *Manchester Guardian* publishes the following letter from a reader on the subject of passports:

Sir,—I have recently had a new passport and on reading the notes at the end I see that these differ from the Regulations on my previous passport.

Under "Caution" are the words: "This passport remains the property of Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom and may be withdrawn at any time." This threat to our freedom of travel I find alarming.—Yours, &c.

Prompted by this correspondent's discovery we examined our own passport issued in 1946 and under "Caution" we are told that our passport is a valuable document and should not be altered or allowed to pass into the possession of an unauthorised person. This warning is followed by instructions as to what one should do if one loses it. In our passport issued in 1950, still under the Bevin régime the previous warnings and advice are now preceded by the following: "This passport remains the property of His Majesty's Government and may be withdrawn if the holder ceases to be entitled to the protection of His Majesty's Government". In 1957 it would appear from the *M.G.'s* correspondent this has been further modified to "... and may be withdrawn at any time", for no particular reason, presumably? Who is the civil servant who is responsible for these cunning alterations, and on what grounds were the modifications made in the wording?

### 'KING MAKER' ABDICATES

LORD SALISBURY who has grandiose ideas about Britain, which he sees as a mighty power, has resigned from the Government because he disapproves of Makarios' release. As far as one can gather, Lord Salisbury is not squeamish about coming to terms with a 'terrorist' but is primarily worried about the bad effect it might have on Turkey—"our friends".

It is unlikely that his gesture will affect the Cyprus issue very much. In fact, according to an *Observer* report, there is a section in the Tory party who are pleased to see him go.

It is feared however, that the effect of his resignation on Turkey and Greece will be for them to keep up the pressure for their demands to be met. We doubt it; pressure will be increased or released according to the benefits likely to ensue. We have suggested elsewhere that it is in the interests of Britain, Greece and Turkey to come to terms before very long.

**THE CASE FOR INDUSTRIAL PARTNERSHIP** by G. D. H. Cole, Macmillan, 1957, 7/6d.

FORTY-FIVE years ago a young Oxford graduate created a local sensation in that "city of dreaming spires" when he paraded down The High advertising a paper he and his friends had just produced. The paper was *The Oxford Syndicalist* and the young man was G. D. H. Cole. Like many other student journals, *The Oxford Syndicalist* enjoyed only an ephemeral existence but its editor proved to be made of more viable material. In the intervening years he has established himself as the doyen of British socialism, the acknowledged authority on

working-class movements, and the most influential representative of the radical non-Marxist Left in this country.

Whether Cole was ever a 'syndicalist' may be doubted. Syndicalism—the socialism of the proletariat—neither expected nor looked for help from bourgeois 'theoreticians'. But his role in that peculiarly English, not to say middle-class, variant of syndicalism, Guild Socialism, is well known. During and immediately after the First World War, he became the leading theorist of the (then) new socialism and, since the disintegration of the movement in the mid-'twenties, he has remained the faithful champion of the cause of industrial democracy.

Although Guild Socialism passed away, it left as its principal legacy to British socialists the idea of industrial democracy. The concept itself is vague and ambiguous and the methods suggested for implementing it have varied but, since the hey-day of the movement, no socialist blueprint has been able to avoid at least paying lip-service to the ideal. Industrial democracy as the necessary compliment of political democracy remains an axiom of socialist thought.

However, reality resides not in axioms or slogans but in concrete proposals and actions. And from this point of view, it is undeniable that the last thirty years has seen the eclipse of syndicalist and guild socialist aspirations. Managerial socialism and not the socialism of a brotherhood of producers has been the dominant practical force. 'Has been' and remains, for the latest socialist revisionists offer no challenge to past modes of thought on this front. It is true, of course, that there is a new-found emphasis on the problem of industrial relations and a widespread recognition that, as Crosland puts it, 'nationalisation is no panacea for bad relations' and even creates problems of its own. (NOTE. See C. A. R. Crosland: *The Future of Socialism*, Cape, 1956, ch. XVI). But the practical proposals of 'the new socialists' amount to little more than a rationalisation of existing practices and the advocacy of a more perfect joint consultation. The two sides of industry—employer and employed, management and labour—are to remain as permanent, inescapable features of industrial organisation. Until eternity, it seems, the role of the trade unions is to oppose management in the interests of the workers, while at the same time supporting, wherever possible, co-operation between management and men in the form of joint consultation.

In the context of contemporary discussion, therefore, Cole's new book appears in welcome relief. In the eyes of its author, it marks an attempt to revive Guild Socialist ideas, or rather, such of those ideas as he considers most relevant and important under the greatly changed economic conditions of to-day. Such a revival, we know, has been long awaited by its author and it is perhaps both a sign of his impatience and of the sterility of the socialist intelligentsia that he has had to take the initiative himself.

**BOOK REVIEW**

**GUILD SOCIALISM RE-STATED**

Whether or not Cole succeeds in his object—the tone of the book is sweetly reasonable and in marked contrast with the polemical character one associates with revivals and with his earlier propagandist works for Guild Socialism—it is to be hoped that it will serve to lift contemporary discussions on to a higher plane and to direct Guild Socialist sympathisers away from the blind alley in which they at present find themselves. This blind alley is the notion of workers' or trade union representation which, since the 1920's, has been regarded as the first step towards workers' control or, at least, as a satisfactory compromise between workers' control and the existing pattern of organisation.

It is fitting that Cole should repudiate this approach since he and the Guild Socialists generally were largely responsible for fostering it. In the days when the guildsmen were making the running in the Labour Movement, the notion of joint-control was put forward as an acceptable first step towards the Guild Commonwealth. By joint-control the guildsmen meant a system under which the workers through their trade unions appointed half the members of the boards set up to run publicly-owned industries, while the State appointed the other half. It was this compromise that the miners proposed to the Sankey Commission in 1919 as a step towards a fully self-governing Mining Guild. The syndicalists of that time expressly repudiated this solution and the guildsmen always insisted that anything less than a *half* share in control would be unacceptable. But it was perhaps inevitable that, once the guild movement collapsed, the protagonists of workers' control within the Labour Party and the T.U.C. should find themselves committed to the view that any representation of the workers was better than none.

The result has been intellectually disastrous for the cause of real industrial democracy. For it has been only too easy for opponents to point to the weakness of the idea of workers' representation. Once it has been admitted, for whatever reason, that the unions are unfitted to act as trustees on behalf of the community and thus to constitute themselves as the units of industrial management in a socialist society, it becomes implausible to argue that they should share control through appointing representatives to serve on management boards. For to argue so is to assert that the unions should be both *in* the government of industry and *outside* it. If the unions are to remain partly outside industrial government, it must be because they have a function to perform: to defend their members' interests *vis-à-vis* those of the management. But how can they perform this role satisfactorily if, at the same time, they are partly responsible, through their representatives, for managerial decisions? The two roles inevitably conflict.

Confronted with this logic the advocates of workers' representation have faltered and floundered. The idea of workers' representation has been success-

fully whittled away. If not half the seats on management boards, then less than half; if such members are not to be appointed by the trade unions, then at least nominated by the trade unions; if not nominated by the trade unions, then at least one trade union leader to be appointed by the government; until finally we reach the feeble demand for 'more trade unionists', meaning 'more extra-trade unionists', on the boards.

Now, somewhat belatedly, Cole concedes the point. No trade union representatives at all. The trade unions are to remain wholly outside industrial government; they are to continue as essentially protective organisations defending the interests of their members and free from the responsibilities of management. The concession is apparently a large one, for it involves relinquishing one of the central tenets of traditional syndicalist and guild socialist orthodoxy, that the organisations established by the workers to defend their interests in existing society can become the nuclei of the future industrial society. But it is a concession that does not involve relinquishing the major tenet of the old faith: workers' control. On the contrary, it clears the way for a re-affirmation of this doctrine. The advocates of workers' control can now seize the initiative; the ball can be kicked into the other half. Previously, the opponents of workers' representation could with some justice put themselves forward as *defenders* of industrial freedom. In stressing the opposition role of the unions, they could claim that they were preserving the rights of the workers *vis-à-vis* management which the advocates of workers' representation were in danger of conceding in return for a dubious share in control. Unburdened by this ill-fated dogma, the advocates of workers' control can re-shape their forces and at the same time test the genuineness of their opponents' faith in industrial freedom.

The ground on which Cole now chooses to renege the fight is that of status. In concentrating on this field, he is not developing any new doctrine. Indeed, it was the classical guildsmen who first popularised the notion of status. (NOTE: The Guild Socialist emphasis on status perhaps partly explains why the postal workers responded so readily to the doctrine and why the U.P.W. still officially adheres to the objective of a self-governing postal service. As white-collar workers who set the pace for unionisation among non-manual workers they were most conscious of their ambiguous social status *vis-à-vis* the rest of the working class.) The gravamen of their theory of wage-slavery, which bright young socialists like Crosland now dismiss so cavalierly, was that the status of the worker would in no way, except possibly for the worse, be altered by bureaucratic State Socialism: the worker would remain essentially a commodity, a thing, a factor of production rather than a human being with inalienable rights. State Socialism was only another name for State Capitalism.

**FREEDOM**

No doubt the guild socialist point was exaggerated and no doubt the situation has improved since it was first made. All the fashionable talk of human relations in industry is at least a sign that employers are beginning to recognise the man in the worker and not merely the worker in the man. Both Cole and Crosland agree—and who would deny it?—that over the last twenty years the position of the workers as a class has greatly improved; mainly, be it said, as a consequence of full-employment but no doubt partly in response to humanitarian ideas. But it is equally undeniable—and recent strikes serve only to underline it—that the status of the worker remains essentially inferior. Power is only one of the determinants of status and the fact that to-day the workers are collectively more powerful than ever before and perhaps even on occasions able to dictate to management, does not alter that truth. The difference between Cole and Crosland lies in the fact that, whereas the latter—contrary to the general tenor of his thought, which emphasises the ideal of social equality—is broadly satisfied with the *status quo*, Cole remains resolutely opposed to the insufferable hypothesis that industrial organisation must for ever be conceived in stratified terms.

As an alternative to the present position, Cole advocates the explicit recognition, in both public and private enterprise, of the worker as a partner. "I mean by partnership," he says, "a status in the enterprise which protects the worker from being dismissed, except on account of some fault of his own sufficient to merit dismissal, without being at the same time transferred to a partnership in some other enterprise in which his services can be appropriately used or, in default of such immediate transfer, being maintained on the strength of the enterprise he is leaving until an appropriate transfer can be arranged and, in the meantime, receiving any training that may be needed to fit him for his new employment". The idea, it will be seen, is by no means novel. It is one which is implicitly recognised at present in several spheres of employment—middle class employment. No University teacher or Civil Servant, for example, is subject to the law of supply and demand as far as his labour is concerned. What is novel is the idea that this status should be universalised and applied to all. And the effect of the universalisation of this status would be a significant revolution in social relations.

Nor is this all. For, as Cole points out, the changed status of the worker which he envisages would call for a re-consideration of the entire structure of working relations inside the workplace, especially with regard to discipline and promotion. The latter are to-day generally recognised as within the province

Continued on p. 3

**DON'T FORGET THE FPFF★!**

★Freedom Press Fire Fund

**Some Factors Affecting Emotional Development in Children—8**

(Continued from previous issue)

It might be mentioned at this point that there is no foundation for the belief (which appears to date from Victorian times) that active participation in sporting activities has a sublimating effect on sexual tension. This is not suggesting that sports and games do not have an important place in physical development but there is no justification for the compulsory participation prevalent in some schools. To force a child whose interests lie elsewhere into an activity which he or she hates can do great psychological harm. The youngster should be reassured that he or she is not in any way inferior to his or her contemporaries who have been conditioned to regard prowess at games as the most desirable aim in life. The normal child with unimpaired emotional stability will be found to obtain sufficient bodily exercise by non-sporting activities provided circumstances are favourable. Compulsory games can also be objected to on social grounds in that they encourage the undesirable quality of conformity and tend to lead to antagonism towards the expression of individuality.

Particularly barbaric is the practice, once common, and possibly still to be found, in institutions, of attempting to deaden the sex urge of male adolescents by the administration of anaphrodisiacs such as potassium bromide. This is not only barbaric but physically dangerous<sup>31</sup>.

Again it should be emphasized that the acceptance of masturbation as a normal occurrence in the adolescent does not in any way mean that it is a practice which should be actively encouraged—although in permissive societies such as, for example, the Hopi Indians<sup>32</sup>, where parents actually masturbate their children no harm seems to result. But in such communities the whole structure of society is different and too great a departure from the environmental norm may

have as deleterious an effect as the rigid adherence to anti-sexual obscurantism. As with the young child, circumstances should be avoided which might result in undue genital fixation. Genital cleanliness in particular, a hygienic necessity at any age, is of very great importance at adolescence because of the increase in the production of smegma during this period.

But again parents should be reminded that variations of individual constitution prevent any hard and fast rule for normal indulgence in masturbation to be laid down. As was mentioned in discussing infantile masturbation, the parent who suspects emotional trouble in his child and who has no cause to attribute it to outside factors should consider his own parent-child relationship.

Very many parents seem unaware of the dangers of corporal punishment to the normal sexual development of the child<sup>33</sup>. Spanking, caning and the like very frequently produce erections in a boy or similar erotic sensations in a girl and may not only unduly encourage masturbation but, by associating pain with sexual pleasure, result, in extreme cases, in such sexual deviations as *sadism*, *masochism* or *flagellomania*. Even if there is no such end-product the custom of correcting children in this way can never be justified. The practice has a general brutalizing effect on the child (not to mention the parent or teacher utilizing such methods of correction) and unnecessarily aggravates aggressive tendencies. The bully at school is often the child harshly treated at home. Corporal punishment administered to a nervous child can be particularly disastrous. The adult who resorts to such corrective measures is not only displaying defeat but showing, possibly subconscious, sadistic tendencies and hatred of the child. It is a form of punishment which seems most prevalent among Anglo-Saxons (on the Continent flagellation is known as *le vice anglais*)<sup>34 35</sup>.

The law of this country unfortunately permits "reasonable" parental chastisement of the child but as no two people will agree as to what constitutes "reasonable" punishment and because, as mentioned above, the effects of such actions on the child can be far more disastrous psychologically than a similar assault (which is illegal) would be upon an adult, it would be better if all such behaviour towards a child (who is powerless against aggression) was covered by the law protecting the individual against assault.

Masturbation as a relief from sexual tension is, of course, much more widespread than it need be in our society because of the present-day tendency to artificially increase the duration of adolescence. The law and social conventions tend to delay—in the conforming individual—normal sexual intercourse until an unnaturally late age—indeed well into, or beyond, the period of optimum desire. Here again we see the irrationality of the sex-armoured adults who deny mature youngsters a normal sex outlet and at the same time endeavour to prevent them seeking relief from tension by other means. Perhaps the sanest attitude towards adolescent sexual activity is that to be found in Sweden or in the Kibbutzim in Israel.

(To be continued)

A.C.F.C.

<sup>31</sup> See: Oliven: "Sexual Hygiene and Pathology".  
<sup>32</sup> See: Ford & Beach: "Patterns of Sexual Behaviour".  
<sup>33</sup> See any modern book on the sexual perversions; also Beigel: "Encyclopedia of Sex Education"; Oliven: "Sexual Hygiene and Pathology".  
<sup>34</sup> The English adherence to this form of punishment is amply demonstrated in Gorer: "Exploring English Character".  
<sup>35</sup> Excellent discussions of the problem of punishment can be found in: Ellis (ed.): "Child Health and Development"; Burns: "Mal-adjusted Children"; see also Allendy & Lobstein: "Sex Problems in School". Attitudes towards punishment are discussed in Mead & Wolfenstein: "Childhood in Contemporary Cultures".

## Reflections on Human Problems and Political 'Crises'

A SOCIETY in which there were no problems would hardly be human in the most positive sense of that word. It would be no more than a robot society in which stability could be guaranteed simply by tightening a nut here or by replacing a worn part there. But for human beings it is not so simple as that. We do not start life in a lifeless desert or on virgin soil. Unequipped intellectually, physically and materially, we enter a society in which thought has been hardened into dogma; we are naked and weak in a world of adults; and powerless to sustain life without a provider in constant attendance. Unlike those packets of tested flower seeds, each one of which is guaranteed to produce a flower identical with the illustration on the packet, human seeds are unpredictable, everyone is different, each is itself, with its own potentialities for growth and development. The new-born inherits the good and the bad of the past but theoretically to him belongs the future. For he enters the world with an open mind!

But, not content with having passed on to him the physical traits of his forefathers, society proceeds to stuff that open mind with all its prejudices as well, so that by the time our young person has reached an age where his intellectual faculties would at last allow him to be himself, he has more likely than not become a carbon copy of his immediate environment, quite unable to break away from the patterns of thought and behaviour which were mixed in with his mother's milk.

★

EDUCATION, that is, the compulsory inculcation of the Three R's, far from cultivating the potentialities of the human imagination and liberating the mind from the dead weight of traditional thought, has been devised so as to fit the young person to take his or her place as an efficient cog in the wheel of industrial society, and to this end killing all imagination and fantasy. (Even at University level it is notorious that honours degrees are more often awarded to those students who play-up to the examining professors' theories and *bêtes-noires* than to those whose critical faculties and imagination lead them along unconformist paths).

From our reading of biographies and autobiographies we have come to the conclusion that education it would seem serves really positive ends only where it springs from a desire for knowledge or where it has been used to awaken intellectual curiosity.

Two extreme examples which come to mind are of Kropotkin and Keir Hardie. The former, born into an aristocratic family compensated for a ghastly father with teachers who stimulated his youthful interests in literary and scientific subjects. Thus one reads in his unforgettable *Memoirs* of Professor Klasovsky's first lesson which "was a revelation to us":

He was to teach us Russian grammar; but instead of the dull grammar lesson, we heard something quite different from what we expected. It was grammar; but here came in a comparison of an old Russian folk-lore expression with a line from Homer or from the Sanskrit Mahabharata, the beauty of which was rendered in Russian words; there, a verse from Schiller was introduced, and was followed by a sarcastic remark about some modern society prejudice; then solid grammar again, and then some wide poetical or philosophical generalization.

## THE AUTHOR AND THE PUBLIC. P.E.N. Congress Report. (Hutchinson, 15s.).

PEOPLE who attend congresses do so for a variety of reasons. There are those motivated by self-interest, others passing time, others curious or fulfilling a duty, others forming an unsociable minority devoted to the purpose of the particular congress.

International congresses of writers are distinguished by the number of middle-aged ladies who wear different fashions every day, elderly ladies famous for writing thrillers, virgins—male and female—who in their works examine intimate emotional relationships, foreigners who have no knowledge of the one or two languages to be used, and very important people whose names are down to appear and whose telegrams of good wishes are read out on the first morning. There is also an abundance of politeness and a warm readiness to pass plates of sandwiches.

The pretence that congresses are of outstanding importance is naturally fostered by those taking part, particularly in the atmosphere of the conference hall, and the occasion can usually be shown to have been fruitful in one way or another, even if this is limited to a resolution or the venue of the next congress. Last summer the international P.E.N. Congress took place in London and an attempt to give it more than usual significance has been made with the publication of the various speeches.

The theme of the congress was *The Author and the Public—Problems of Communication*—and as the report shows, it was divided into sections on Criticism, the Technique of the New Mass-Communication Media, Contemporary Technique in Fiction, and so on. Reading this report one is immediately aware of the disadvantage of such a step. The contributions were prepared as speeches and, as such, relied on a looser, even intimate, approach which cannot be carried into print. A play is not the same in book form and there is always a theatrical element about the assembly of people.

Despite this, however, and as was evident at the congress, the report reveals a distinct division between professionals and amateurs. The professional—to define him—is one who is aware of his public, creates to please them, is usually successful in the worldly sense, is essentially a craftsman, and at congresses of this nature is self-consciously on the defensive. An example of this came in J. B. Priestley's statement of the theme, which opened the discussion—"I believe

Of course, there was much in it that we did not understand, or of which we missed the deeper sense. But do not the bewitching powers of all studies lie in that they continually open up to us new and unsuspected horizons, not yet understood which entice us to proceed farther and farther in the penetration of what appears at first sight only in vague outline? . . . Upon me Klasovsky had an immense influence, which only grew with the years.

Keir Hardy, on the other hand did not go to school. At the age of eight he was sent out to work as a message boy, then he got a job heating rivets in a Glasgow shipyard and when he was ten years old he was down in the pits, from six in the morning until half-past five at night. Even on Sundays he had to work four hours in the pit. Yet such was his thirst for knowledge that he taught himself to read and write. His biographer, Emrys Hughes, describes his efforts in these terms\*:

Slowly, laboriously, patiently, the young miner had learned to read and to write. He had first learned to spell by looking at the opened-out picture books in the stationers' shops in Glasgow. His mother had taught him to read but he was fifteen before he could write.

He went to Fraser's night school in Holytown and shortly afterwards began to learn shorthand, practising writing the characters at spare moments in the pit on a slate smoked from his miner's lamp. He spent his spare money on books and was desperately anxious to learn.

Literacy was a means to an end. It introduced him to the poetry of Burns to whom, he wrote in later

\*Keir Hardie by Emrys Hughes, (Allen & Unwin, 15s.).

## BOOK REVIEW AN ABSENCE OF PURPOSE

that the writer should go after his audience wherever that audience may be. That he or she should try not to limit his or her work to the printed word. And, 'Therefore, if we think of ourselves not simply as exponents of the printed word, but as creators, as makers, as inventors; as belonging to one of those eternal types I mentioned earlier, we should go for the audience wherever it may be found and try to learn those new techniques demanded by the new media.'

This attack on literature and literary values was followed by Mr. Priestley's immediate departure from the conference hall, and he was not seen again.

★

THE amateurs—to return to definition and therefore the more militant, are those still involved in a struggle with their chosen medium, make fewer concessions to their public, have not forgotten their earlier idealism and, as Angus Wilson said: 'The value of the creative writer lies in the intensity and individuality of his personal vision . . . To keep his vision alive, then, the writer, by whatever peculiar and personal pattern he chooses, must be an involved person. This is the first and absolute necessity.'

A second division that was apparent concerned the impact of television,

whether it had achieved respectability and so deserved a writer's full-time devotion or whether it was alien to literary creativity. A few writers had clearly, and profitably, come to terms with the new medium, many revealed that they were weakening to temptation, a number of die-hards resolutely echoed Denis Saurat: 'There is a public lying in wait for good things and that is the real public. I estimated that as two to three thousand, both in France and in England . . . I submit that that is the real element of lasting value in the public which we have to reach.'

Elmer Rice fairly summarized the situation with American directness: 'We are witnessing a phenomenon which is entirely new, and which I have called the industrialisation of the writer. In other words, where formerly the writer was a creative individual who thought up his poems or his play or his novel or his essay, whatever it may have been, and then found a theatre manager, or a publisher, or an editor, we now have an almost complete reversal of the process. We have a great industry set up which is basically technological, whose basis is not creativeness but gimmicks and technological gadgets that make it possible for this universal distribution of material . . . the writer is a cog in a vast industrial

## Guild Socialism Re-stated Continued from p. 2

of managerial prerogatives, although the organised workers may on occasions exert some influence on decisions in this sphere.

In outlining his proposals, Cole draws a distinction between lower management, on the one hand, and higher and technical management, on the other. The function of the former is primarily supervision of workers at the point of production, the management of men in face-to-face groups. The function of the latter is primarily the administration of things—the co-ordination of all the factors of production, the planning and execution of the processes of production and marketing, and so on—not involving direct contact with rank-and-file workers.

The status of partnership implies that rank-and-file workers must be allowed a share in deciding under whose orders and supervision their daily work is done. Foremen and supervisors, therefore, should normally be elected by the groups they work with and removable by them, with the proviso that, where necessary, the choice in election should be limited

to properly qualified candidates. "This choice of supervisors by the working group would deeply affect the character of the group itself by converting it into a team working under its own leaders and not under an externally imposed discipline." This change, moreover, could lead to further important changes in the relation of the working groups to the establishment as a whole. Where such a group was carrying out, co-operatively, a definite, identifiable task, instead of being paid individually the group could enter into a collective contract with the management. In return for a lump sum sufficient to cover at least the minimum trade union rate for each individual, the group would undertake to perform a specified amount of work, with the group itself allocating the various tasks among its members and arranging working conditions to suit its own convenience. Such an arrangement, which has long been advocated by Hyacinthe Dubreuil and adopted in a number of French factories, would have the effect of "linking the members of the working group together

machine and his status is closely related to that of the other technicians, the camera-man, the scene-shifter and so on'.

THE most interesting section of the book, however, deals with criticism and includes the speeches of Mario Praz, V. S. Pritchett, William Empson and Peter Green. Here there is—not surprisingly—a tendency to excuse their vocation and purpose, and an examination of elementary principles. However, it was Robert Henriques, on the same subject, who really overcame his inhibitions and said: 'In England the critic is the literary man, and the critic's world is the literary world of this metropolis. At the literary cocktail party in London you will find there everyone concerned with the production and distribution of books except the man who writes them. The writers who will normally be there are those who are also critics, and the only critics who are likely to be absent are those who are at another party or whose interests are primarily in other kinds of writing.'

Although one should not condemn publication of this report—an attempt to give immortality to the congress—one is at once conscious of its lack of authority and stature. This is the collected wisdom of many contemporary writers, this is where they stand, these are their ideals, this is their approach to their craft . . . And what is revealed is an affable mediocrity, an absence of passion and purpose, and the creative segment of something like the corporate soul of a fairly self-satisfied and prosperous society. C.H.

life, "I owe more than to any man living or dead":

Long ere Carlyle, or Emerson, or Whitman, or Morris had come into my ken, and ere their message would have any meaning to me even had I access to their writings, I had imbibed the liberty-loving spirit and humanitarianism of Burns. He expressed for me as a boy my better self and gave form and substance to my half-formed thoughts and vague feelings.

Most people in this country and America can read and write. That they are happier or intellectually richer than say the people of Spain and Italy, where there is much illiteracy, is difficult to state categorically. So many people are literate only because schooling is compulsory but the use of their literacy does not in fact go beyond reading the headlines of the national press, filling in time-sheets and marking crosses all over football-pool forms. They never read a book other than perhaps a thriller or a romance, because they lack imagination and curiosity.

★

WE have wandered a long way, not unprofitably, we hope, from our intended subject. Our opening sentence: "A society in which there were no problems would hardly be human in the most positive sense of that word", was to have been a qualifying remark to a brief survey of the "crises" which are at various stages of eruption all over the face of the world to-day. It was our intention to distinguish between these crises and the problems that will always exist in even the freest society. That whereas the problems

of such a society are productive and positive in the sense that their existence would be a clear sign of a life-force in society, and their solution proof of the reasonableness and sense of community uniting mankind, the crises of to-day are simply manifestations of power politics and class divided nations, for which there is no lasting solution within the existing social and economic framework. From the point of view of humanity such crises bring suffering, hardship, and even death without any positive advantage.

Cyprus, the Middle East and Algiers are purely political or economic crises in which the nationalist movements are no more than by-products. And the wage strikes at present sweeping Britain seek to stabilize the economic relationship between employers and employees but leave untouched the basic causes of disunity: the profit system and the unequal social relationships between men and men.

That most people suffer from *Angst* at the thought of the uncharted spaces of the free society but go on accepting insecurity from the womb to the tomb in this power-ridden, class-dominated money society of to-day with hardly a protest, this is a subject which should engage all the attention of anarchists and progressive educationists. If we are to make headway it is not the workers we must seek to "free from their chains" but their children, if possible with their parents' co-operation, but if necessary in spite of them!

As propagandists' how do we set about this task?

in a common enterprise under their joint auspices and control, and emancipating them from an externally imposed discipline in respect of their method of getting the work done."

The method of election from below, however, would not, argues Cole, be suitable for higher management or posts of a technical or administrative character. "Administration and management are special techniques or accomplishments, calling for special qualifications and forms of expertise; and so is the direction of industrial policy in such matters as investment and the planning of productive methods." For the performance of such tasks, therefore, men would have to be selected individually by persons or committees with an adequate understanding of what is needed.

In providing for selection rather than election of higher management, Cole is retreating somewhat from the early Guild Socialist position which, broadly speaking, envisaged the direct or indirect election of all managers by the workers themselves. It is not a retreat, however, which concedes any substantial point to the opponents of industrial democracy—provided that the arrangements for lower management and the institution of the collective contract system are carried out. The general effect of Cole's proposals would, in fact, be to destroy the hierarchical chain of authority that exists at present in most industrial organisations and to replace it by a system of functional and co-operative groups. 'Management' (at least higher management) would still be distinct from 'men' but the relationship between them would not be that of 'two sides' or one of superordination and subordination. The master-servant relationship inherent in the wage-system would have been destroyed.

Although in his positive proposals for the application of democracy to industry Cole says little that is new, his book provides the clearest statement to date of the case for workers' control in a form which could conceivably be adopted in the foreseeable future. (Incidentally, perhaps for tactical reasons, Cole studiously avoids the term 'workers' control'. From the anarchist point of view, it should be said that Cole remains a parliamentarian: the old Guild Socialist veiled hostility to political action finds no echo in this book. The new status of partnership he sees, apparently, as a possible plank in the programme of a future Labour Government, although he recognises the need for trade unions to enlarge the scope of existing collective bargaining agreements. Anarcho-syndicalists will no doubt find much to object to on this score but, if so, it is up to them to state their objections cogently in the light of Cole's arguments. *The Case for Industrial Partnership* may well stimulate a new debate on the subject of industrial democracy, a debate which may lead to concrete action in the near future. If it does, there will be an opportunity for the anarchist voice to be heard once again in the Labour Movement. Those who value industrial freedom cannot afford to allow such an opportunity to slip.

