Industry and the Managerial Society - p. 2

Bigness in Industry

Round the Bend - 1

ANARCHIST

"The three great causes of human immorality are inequality, whether political, economic or social, ignorance, its natural result, and slavery, its inevitable consequence."

—BAKUNIN.

Vol. 18, No. 32

August 10th, 1957

Threepence

THE INSANE SOCIETY

THE London Anarchist Group's Summer School this year discussed around the theme 'Blueprints for Sanity". The title could only have been chosen for one reason: that the world in the middle of the 20th century presents the appearance of a lunatic asylum, an insane society.

The analogy is good but for one thing: that in a lunatic asylum it is the general population who are mad and the guardians who are sane.. In the world at large, the reverse seems nearer the truth—it is the guardians, the leaders, the governing bodies who are going round the bend and the mental deficiency of the populations expresses itself mainly in their dull apathetic acquiescence in the organised lunacy of their governments.

Weapons For & Against

Unfortunately this acquiescence leads the governed into the same forms of insanity as the governors. In fact, in every authoritarian form of society it is always the governed, the led, who have to carry out the policies and programmes of the psychopaths in power. And the fact that they do so to their own detriment-often to their own destruction—points to the extent to which madness grips our world.

It is not difficult to expose the pathological nature of those who arrive at positions of supreme power

A Bounder Hits the Headlines

TORD ALTRINCHAM'S attack on the Queen and her lackeys has been a boon to the newspaper world, and we suspect that hopes for increased circulation of the National Review lies behind this outspoken commentary on the monarchy. In Europe and America the attack made front page news, and the verbal reaction from the gentry is reminiscent of Boy's Own Paper; examples from the Earl of Strathmore and the Duke of Argyll: The Duke of Argyll (Master of the Queen's Household in Scotland. Motto: Forget Not): "This article was disgraceful and inexcusable. would like to see that man hanged, drawn and quartered."

The Earl of Strathmore (Cousin of the Queen. Motto: In Thee, O Lord, I Put My Trust): "Young Altrincham is a bounder. He should be shot. I would even do the job myself, but he's not worth it."

We feel that Lord Altrincham is a secret reader of FREEDOM and is not going to be outdone by Tony Gibson's original article on The Monarchy & Bad Taste. We suspect too that the angry defence of the Queen's virtues has as much to do with the attack on the courtiers as on herself:

Lord Altrincham has branded some courtiers as "unimaginative". He had declared: "They aren't capable of pressing a point against the wishes of their employer, the Queen. I think they are rather a second-rate lot-simply lacking in gumption." And of the Queen he says:

. . . the personality conveyed by utterances which are put into her mouth is that of a priggish schoolgirl, captain of the hockey team, a prefect, and a recent candidate for

Confirmation." We could not have put it any better ourselves.

in national life. The development of psychology—one of the newest of the social sciences and still in its infancy—has certainly placed in the hands of governments most powerful weapons for the control of their populations. But it has also placed in the hands of all those with eyes to see the means by which they too can analyse the behaviour of their leaders—not perhaps to control them, since the leaders do the controlling—but to wise themselves up to the dangers of following leaders,

In this field the anarchists can pat themselves on the back for being among the first to recognise its value. In Britain we were foremost in bringing the work of the early Wilhelm Reich (with books like 'The Mass Psychology of Fascism') before the public and have introduced writing by Dr. Alex Comfort (the Freedom Press pamphlet 'Delinquency') to popularise these ideas in circles where they might not otherwise have penetrated.

In doing this we have faced much criticism from revolutionaries who are convinced that the social revolution is a matter of economic patterns, historical processes and political conquest. Although they have seen workers rise to dizzy heights in the hierarchies of states, only to be corrupted by power, and although a planned capitalism has eliminated most of the worse anomalies of its chaotic 19th century parent, still they have to cling rigidly to modes of thought dogmatized a hundred years ago to explain and fight a stage in social development which no longer exists.

As the managerial society replaces 19th century catch-as-catch-can in-

dividualism, many of the arguments against the latter fall to the ground. In fact it is precisely the actions of its opponents which are replacing individualistic capitalism with State capitalism-only to create deeper human problems than the ones they tried to solve.

Creating More Problems

The Marxists have analysed capitalism to its last lunatic gimmick, and its more faithful adherents stubbornly assert that it is not until every worker understands capitalism in terms of grasping the difference between labour and labour power, value, price and profit and the ramifications of dialectical materialism, that the enlightened industrial proletariat will be able to make the social revolution.

The Marxists have brilliantly analyzed economic systems only to overlook completely that which makes them tick-people. And as capitalism moves towards State socialism and the socialists move towards capitalism, they meet in the middle in the managerial society which reduces man to a nonentity, a commodity—a 'means to somebody else's ends.'

This depersonalisation cannot produce happy human beings. Instead it fills the mental hospitals and the prisons. Over half the hospital beds in Britain are filled with mental patients. As material wealth increases, mental health suffers.

Must this be so? We don't think so. What we will maintain is that you cannot expand man's freedom in any one sphere of his existence and at the same time restrict him more than ever in other spheres

without creating conflicts that can only find expression in mental derangement.

Conflicting Demands

Both the physical sciences and the social sciences are extending man's horizons in terms of his control of his environment and his understanding of himself and his needs. But the demands of authority (the nature and the menace of which have been overlooked by Marxists, themselves authoritarians), create barriers against the full enjoyment and utilization of our accumulating know-

Science in the service of humanity is providing us with the means of abundance and a longer life in which to enjoy it. But government organises the destruction of abundance and science in the service of government is providing the means to destroy the world. Science is providing us with the means to achieve sexual satisfaction without fear. But the population demands of powerhungry states and the shibboleths of religion seek to withhold the knowledge and maintain that fear. Our ability to organise society falls behind our knowledge of the organisation of the atom.

If this is not insanity on the grand scale the word has lost its meaning. The division between what is possible, and desirable and what is real is too much for human reason to rationalise away. The conflicts between the demands of the modern State and the human personality cannot be reconciled.

If mental sickness is on the increase it points inescapably to the sickness in our environment. We are indeed living in an insane society.

IN BRIEF LEARNING FAST

KWAME Prime Minister of Ghana, has learned quickly the ways of those in power, and has demonstrated his contempt for freedom af expression by deporting Mr. Bankole Timothy. of Accra, who dared to criticise some aspects of the government.

Mr. Timothy, who is correspondent in Ghana of the News Chronicle and the Observer, wrote the first biography of Dr. Nkrumah. He has been told by the Minister of Justice that his presence "is not conducive to the public good".

The statement, which is a copy of the reply the Minister sent to the Commonwealth Press Union, added that the Government of Ghana would not tolerate subversive activities by anyone, no matter what his profession. The Minister linked the deportation of Mr. Bankole Timothy to that of Archbishop Makarios from Cyprus, and asked, "Would anyone be right to say that the deportation of the Archbishop was the suppression of religious freedom?"

This is yet another example to show that wherever white domination is replaced by black rule this merely constitutes a change in the colour of the faces and not of the principles which govern all those in a position of power.

ARMS BEFORE PENSIONS

THE meagre sum dished out by the Government to old age pensioners is totally inadequate to provide the basic essentials of life. But a demand by the Opposition to increase the sum to £3 a week was defeated in the House of Commons by a majority of 56.

Mr. Tom Brown said the Government had no difficulty in finding the money for "redundant officers", and also pointed out that money had been found for the increase in

M.P.'s pay.

John Boyd-Carpenter, Minister of pensions, replied that increases in benefits when they were made would have to be at a serious cost to the present working population. He said he was not in a position to announce the Government's proposals but, when they appear "they will be in accord with our long record of sound and humane social legislation." How meaningless can words become?

We might ask why it is necessary for the working population to make further contributions to old age pensions when £1,500,000,000 per year which could be put to the social services is being absorbed in the production of armaments.

The truth is that governments put power before people, and consider cannon fodder more valuable than a number of old age pensioners who are not a very strong voting force

The second lecture was a discussion of the wages system and the proposal that the collective contract could be used by workers as a means of undermining their

Geoffrey Ostergaard showed how the industrial revolution may have increased standards of living, but in destroying existing modes of production—the individual ownership of craft tools-had ties and undermined craftsmanship

The introduction of the wages system had corrupted work from a vocational, creative part of life into a bartered commodity, and wage slavery differed from chattel slavery in that the employer bought a worker's labour without buying him and paid wages only when profitable (and got rid of the worker when not). Through wages the worker surrenders control over production and all claim on the product.

In fact, however, it is absurd to abstract labour power from the labourer-

Continued on p. 4

THE HYPOCRITICAL ARCHBISHOP

THE World Council of Churches have made a sufficiently vague and compromising statement about H-bomb tests to suit the Archbishop of Canterbury, who only a few months ago, opposed the Bishop of Chichester's resolution to condemn outright the development of atomic weapons. His observations on the conclusions of The World Council of Churches are characteristically hypocritical, after the Council pass-

Continued on p. 4

THE SUMMER SCHOOL Blueprints for Sanity

AST week-end the London Anarchist Group organised the twelfth annual Summer School for the anarchists of this country. The tenuous and often temporary nature of anarchist groups makes the achievement of a run of twelve successive annual functions such as this quite an achievement. Not that every Summer School has been an unqualified success, of course. This writer can remember some of which the less said the better.

Some years the lectures have been only moderately good, but the 'gettogether' particularly enjoyable. This year the lectures were all of a very high quality, but the London Group felt the lack of any large or vocal contingent from the rest of the country. In the early post-war years, of course, the lively Glasgow group would turn up in force and invigorate the gathering with their heretical ideas. We live in hopes that such a group may emerge once again in Auld Reekie before very long.

Nevertheless the social function of the Summer School was fulfilled, and the London comrades were glad to welcome visitors from Bath, Cambridge, Gosport, Hoddesdon, Leicester and Letchworth.

The Lectures The theme chosen for the Summer School lecture-discussions was "Blueprint for Sanity', and the three lecturers tackled the subjects of health, wage system and the social sciences and related them to the anarchist conception of a sane society, or at least to the anarchist attitude.

All three lectures will be published more or less in full in FREEDOM, for the benefit of those unable to hear them, and we hope the discussion which may be stimulated in print will be at least as valuable as that at the Summer School.

The first lecture was that given by Morris Simon on 'Health in a Sane Society'. He dealt with the two parts of man, the mind and the body (the 'psyche' and the 'soma') but showed the interaction and interdependence of these parts to make the whole man, and how he was affected by his social environments and the degree to which his physical and psychological needs were satis-

Morris Simon demonstrated how authorities welcome the means of creating servile subjects, and how these means include interference with the satisfaction of man's basic needs. Capitalist and older forms of exploitation have practiced crude interference with food supplies, and have used violence or threats of it, and practiced repressive sexual codes. More modern authoritarian régimes have developed deprivation on sexual and psychological levels (through their control of mass media of communication) and thought control.

The speaker quoted an impressive array of statistics to show the prevalence of physical ill health in society to-day (where preventive medicine is practiced) and traced the bulk of it to malnutrition. In this country, however, this was tending to decline in the post-war periodonly to be replaced by mental illness! Over half the hospital beds in Britain are now occupied by mental patients. In other words, as standards of living rise, the control of the population by physical deprivations have begun to give way to control by psychological pressures to conform. If we accept the concept that

authoritarian society needs deprivations of one kind or another, then reforms must fail. In a sane order promotive medicine, aimed at promoting good health not merely preventing bad, would be only supported by preventive medi-

The speaker's basic hypothesis was that everybody has a right to the satisfaction of his basic needs, physical and mental, and none has the right to deprive others of that. A sane society would provide good social planning where the free development of man's natural appetites and needs was assured.

The Wage System

subjugation to wages.

created the industrial proletariat, destroyed collective village and town activithrough the division of labour.

he became himself a commodity, a thing.

Labour's New Policy Statements on Industry

Industry and the Managerial Society-2

LARGE part of Industry and Society is devoted to an analysis of recent changes in the structure of industry. In the last forty years the pace of technological change has quickened, a new pattern of production has emerged, mass production has increased, and the tendency towards amalgamation has continued. As a consequence we have witnessed the emergence of the large firm to a position of dominance in the economy. The number of joint stock companies-now some 291,000-has increased but the great bulk of these are small 'private companies' with 50 or less shareholders. The number of 'public companies'-those permitted to raise money on the capital market-has however declined to a figure of just over 11.000. It is these public companies which really count. Their total paid up capital of £4,340 million is nearly twice that of all private companies and, measured in terms of the value of their shares, public companies account for 80% and private companies 20% of total company wealth. Within the class of public companies a further group can be distinguished: that of some 500 firms, each with assets in excess of £24 million. It is this group of super-firms which accounts for nearly 50% of the total profits made by private industry. As Peter Drucker noted in The New Society, it is the super-firm which is the decisive institution in our economy: "The great majority of people do not work for the large industrial enterprises yet their livelihood is directly dependent upon them . . . The enterprise determines economic policies and makes economic decisions.

policies and makes economic decisions.

A small number of big enterprises sets
the wage pattern and establishes the
'going wage' of the economy."

Different Incentives

The super-firm is ostensibly a capitalist institution: it is owned by private individuals and corporate shareholders. But —and this is the point—it is run by its managers. In the words of the policy statement: "As companies grow larger and their affairs more complex, management becomes increasingly important, increasingly specialist and increasingly professional. More and more it assumes a life of its own. In the large companies, it is the managers who now undertake the functions once performed by capitalist owners." It is an exaggera-

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

OPEN DAILY (Open 10 a.m.-6.30 p.m., 5 p.m. Sats:) New Books . . . Bitter Lemons Laurence Durrell 16%-The Country of the Sea Ethel Mannin 18/-Fall-Out: Radiations Hazards from Nuclear Explosion Ed.) A. Pirie 12/6 not 15/- as previously advertised The Art of Loving Erich Fromm 9/6 Indigo Days Julian Trevelyan 18/-Preliminary Essays John Wain 15/-Reprints . . . Selected Philosophical Works Alexander Herzen (F.L.P.H. Moscow) 12/6 The Kon-Tiki Expedition T. Heyerdahl 2/6 No Mean City A. McArthur and H. Kingsley Long 2/6 Stories of Famous Operas H. V. Milligan 4/-Edith Hamilton 4/-Mythology Limitations of Science J. W. N. Sullivan 4/-Age of Analysis Whitehead, Russell, Sartre, etc. 4/-

Second-Hand . . .

History of Anarchism in Russia

E. Yaroslavsky 6/
Rationalism in Europe

W. E. H. Lecky 5/
Capital: Capitalist Production

Karl Marx 8/-

High Horse Riderless

L. T. C. Rolt 4/
Tory M.P. Simon Haxey 2/6

Road to Survival

William Vogt 4/6

The East German Rising

Jail Journal John Mitchel 6/T.V.A.: an Adventure in Planning
Julian Huxley 3/6

Broad and Alien is the World
Ciro Alegria 4/-

Dissent Summer, 1957 3/6

Summer, 1957 3/6

We can supply ANY book required, including text-books. Please supply

Universities and Left Review

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—and frequently found!

Postage free on all items

Obtainable from

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

tion to say that the functions of management are completely divorced from the functions of ownership or that the interests of the managers and those of the shareholders are necessarily conflicting. But undoubtedly the managers do think and behave differently from the capitalists. "The world of the managers is not the world of the shareholders. Their concern is with production as much as with profits and with expansion far more than with dividends. Salaries, pensions, status, power and promotion-these rather than wealth are their operating incentives." The tensions reflected in the formation of shareholders' associations and the recent 'take-over' bids serve only to underline these truths. The fragmentation of ownership—the progressive reduction in size and the increase in the number of shareholdingscontributes to building up the effective power of the controlling managers vis-à-vis the capitalist owners. By and large the managers are not themselves substantial shareholders in the concerns they control and to an increasing extent these firms are self-financing. The capital required for further expansion is provided from profits rather than distributed in the form of larger dividends, with the result that dependence on the shareholder is further reduced. 'The profit motive' still operates, of course, but the dividend is not the dominant impulse. "Company aggrandisement, conceptions of the national interest, prestige and power, pensions and pay for chief executives-these are now the main incentives for those on their way up and for those who have arrived in the Board Room,"

Could Not Fail

Historically, the 'justification' of the capitalist's existence has been couched in terms of his risk-bearing function—he risks his capital in return for a chancy dividend. This 'justification' still applies in the small firm and in a competitive industry the risks to capital may be quite high. But it no longer applies to the thousands of owners of the large firm. The I.C.I.s and Unilevers of this world never find themselves in Carey Street. Such firms never go bankrupt, they could not be allowed to fail: their prosperity in fact is "now substantially underwritten by the State". With the decline in the capitalist's risk-bearing function, with the possibility of accumulating capital within the company itself, and with the emergence of a professional class of managers, any case for retaining the capitalist goes by the board. These super-firms could be run without owners and one notable German firm-the Volkswagen company—is in fact so run, as was the Steel Company of Wales during its period of 'suspended ownership', following de-nationalisation.

The shareholders of the super-firms, of course, retain certain 'rights', above all the 'right' to receive the greater part of the new wealth created by economic expansion: their shares increase in value as the firms grow and more than keep pace with increases in the cost of living. But, with the whittling away of his social functions, this 'right' becomes increasingly merely a bare-faced privilege—a parasitic claim on the efforts of the producers, a claim that could be rejected without leading to any problem of operation and management.

All this is familiar to the student of industrial organisation, although many socialists—and anarchists—still talk as if we were living in a 19th century capitalist economy. What, then, does the Labour Party propose to do with these 500 super-firms?

How? Or When?

It is at this point that the conservatism of the authors asserts itself. If control is now largely in the hands of the managers, one might expect the socialists to transform them into real public companies, i.e. the State would take over both the ownership and control of their assets. But nothing so simple or straightforward emerges. Instead, 'the community' is invited to become the owners of industrial shares. How? Through the investment in equity shares of the fund to be established as a consequence of the party's National Superannuation proposals; through death duties being paid in shares and land as well as in cash; and (to be more precise!) through "other methods and other agencies". When? The reader may fix his own date because the authors studiously avoid giving any. There is only the broad hint that "it is not our intention that the Government should indulge in a wildly inflationary scramble for shares: both the timing and occasion for acquiring shares will need careful consideration." This is Sidney Webb's 'inevitability of gradualness' with a vengeance!

Through its participation in share-holding, 'the community', i.e. the State (our authors, of course, equate the two) secures for itself the rewards hitherto claimed by the private capitalist. Thereby "a fairer distribution of income and wealth" is achieved—provided that the controllers of the State see fit.

The Managers Stay

So, the State becomes (gradually) the owner or part-owner of public companies. But our analysis has already shown that ownership is virtually divorced from control. What happens under the new dispensation to the controlling power of the managers? Answer: it stays, more or less, where it is. The case for control is, we are told, quite distinct from the case for ownership. General controls over the super-firms and industry generally there will be, for the sake of securing a measure of central planning. Just what these controls will mean in practice we are not told but are referred to a future policy statement on the subject to be published next year. We may safely assume, however, that they will be similar to the general controls exercised by the Government in war-time and by the post-war Labour Government, with perhaps less emphasis on direct controls and more inducement controls-financial baits and the like. What such general controls will not mean is close supervision of the managers: "The Labour Party recognises that, under increasingly professional managements, large firms are as a whole serving the nation well ... No organisation, public or private, can operate effectively if it is subjected to persistent and detailed interventions from above. We have, therefore, no intention of intervening in the management of any firm which is doing a good job."

But what of 'the problem of public accountability'? Students of public administration, to say nothing of the general public, have been much concerned about the irresponsibility of the public corporations which run the nationalised industries. On this particular question another policy statement, Public Enterprise, recommends only a few minor changes which will leave the problem where it is. But the public corporations are statutory bodies over which the Government and Parliament have, in theory, considerable control. If there is a problem of public accountability in respect of public corporations, how much more will there be one in respect of the proposed semi-public forms. The authors of Industry and Society don't altogether ignore the problem. They recognise that "the Boards of large firms are almost wholly autonomous. They exercise enormous power without being responsible to anybody. They may exercise that power well, but it is hardly satisfactory that there should be no accountability whatever." At this point the reader should prepare himself for one of those asinine generalities which are a substitute for hard thinking in Labour circles. "It is possible," we are told, "that the best way of dealing with this situation is to review the Companies' Act and to develop more definite forms of public accountability. The essential point is that the Boards of these companies should conduct their affairs in a manner which coincides with the interests of the community."

Privileges?

Perhaps conscious that these supine observations will receive the scorn they merit, the authors have added another section dealing with this general problem of control of the managers. Its title is promising: The Problem of Social Power. Its third sentence even reads: "From existing Board Room policies it is not difficult to envisage a managerial caste taking on the former rôle of the

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT! WEEK 31

Deficit on Freedom £620
Contributions received £434
DEFICIT £186

July 25 to August 1

Shoreham: P.P. 1/6; Bletchley: R.S. 3/5; London: J.S.* 3/-; Philadelphia Group: £8/15/0; Welwyn: Mog* 10/-; Caddington: J.C. 1/-; London: L.A. 1/-; St. Paul, Minn.: C.C. 14/-; London: L.I. £1; London: D.R.*

Total ... 11 18 11
Previously acknowledged ... 422 8 2

1957 TOTAL TO DATE ... £434 7 1

*Indicates regular contributor.

Fire Fund

San Francisco: per Osman, In memory of FALSTAF

Previously received ... 35 0 0

TOTAL TO DATE ... £362 0 3

owners of wealth and using its economic power to buttress class privileges and institutions." Good! Nay, excellent! The possibility of the managerial revolution is acknowledged, even if Burnham isn't. Let us hear, and right soon, the answer we've all been waiting for!

We are informed, quite correctly, that in recent years privilege in its many forms has been financed increasingly from company resources and decreasingly from private savings. This follows naturally from the increase in personal taxation of the rich and the decrease in shareholders' unearned income, on the one hand, and from the ability of companies to accumulate financial resources and to secure favourable tax treatment of business expenditure, on the other. The managers to-day don't pay for their privileges like the capitalists did and do: they get their companies to pay for them. Expense accounts, cars, meals, travel, entertainment, holidays, 'top-hat' pension schemes, the provision of houses and servants, interest-free loans, help with school fees and the like-all these are ways in which the managers, as distinct from the capitalists, secure the rewards of being the men who control the instruments of production. These privileges are acquired by being a member of the managerial élite; they serve the dual function of being perks for the boys, for 'the top people', and also of being a handy method of controlling any individual manager or would-be manager who steps out of line. The managerial élite is self-recruited by the process of co-option in a way that the capitalist class never was and it controls the route to the top by methods which, in comparison, make 19th century capitalism look like a society where 'careers were open to talents'.

On Good Behaviour

And what is the Labour Party's answer? Why, a code of conduct for the managers! The Government in discussion with the Trade Unions and employers is to draw up a code of "desirable social practices" to which industry "will be expected to conform. If need be," (how daring can we get?) "this should be given the force of law." At the same time, we are told in Public Enterprise that the salaries of the managers of nationalised industries must not be "markedly less than those for similar jobs in private business." Apparently, it's not that the managers have superior rewards and privileges that the Labour Party objects to: only the way they secure them. These managers really

should be more discreet! I said earlier that our New Socialists had been reading Burnham. I should have added that they have not succeeded in understanding him. The sheer puerility of Labour's answer to The Problem of Social Power would be incredible if one was not prepared for it by the whole history of the party, both in office and out. A new ruling class is emerging and the party proposes to tame it by formulating (in discussion with the Trade Union bosses and the employers) a code of conduct! If the Labour Party had existed in 1800 no doubt it would have proposed a code of conduct to curb the exploitative powers of the capitalists!

The sad truth of the matter is that the Labour Party cannot be expected to formulate any measures to prevent the emergence of a managerial order. Of the two major political parties in this country, its attitude towards the managers is more ambivalent and on the whole more favourable than that of the Conservative party which, broadly speaking, still represents capitalist interests. In future historical perspective, the Labour Party will appear as the harbinger of the managerial order, while the Conservative Party, as ever, will in time adjust itself to the new social forces. I do not wish to deny that there are elements in the Labour Party opposed to managerialism. A party so broadly based in the working class could not fail to voice in some way opposition to the social revolution of our time. But this voice is muted and, unless a near miracle happens, will be lost in the thunder of approval of the new social order. There are too many men of power in the Labour Party and the Trade Union hierarchy with an actual or potential interest in managerialism to make any other outcome at all probable. If those in the Labour Party hostile to

the managers are to have any effect, they must start at once learning their political ABC. I do not say that they will have to come to school at the anarchists, although that would certainly be desirable. But the basic minimum they must learn is that "the State" and "the community" are not equivalent terms and that ownership and control by the State cannot automatically be translated into

ownership and control by the community. Moreover, all of Labour's proposals to control the managers are based on the naive assumption that the State and industry are in some way separate entities. The State is to control industry and, by implication, the managers by planning techniques and codes of conduct. But our society at its top levelsas distinct from the middle levels of power-is not a pluralist society and is rapidly becoming less so every year. The political élite and the industrial managerial élite are merging. The industrial bosses-the Bevins and the Lord Millses -become political bosses and to a lesser extent-significant in itself of the social forces at work—the political bosses become industrial bosses. When the merger is complete, State and industry will be simply different aspects of the same Establishment. The new power élite will then confront the powerless masses: the social revolution will be complete.

Industry and Society is indeed an important document: it points the way to the Managerial Society.

GEOFFREY OSTERGAARD.

The Proposed Anarchist International Congress

AS already reported in FREEDOM, the International Anarchist Conference which it was once hoped would be held this year, has been postponed until next Spring.

We have received a circular from the Commission for Anarchist International Relations (CRIA) which explains some of the reasons for the postponement, including the fact that they were waiting for the American Continent Conference to take place in order to ensure that delegates from there would be free to come to Europe.

Apart from these considerations, which are no longer relevant, the CRIA circular says:

Paris, 1 July, '57.

To all Anarchist Federations, Groups, Publications and individuals in the world.

On tackling the task of preparing the International Congress, militants from every country made us the following basic recommendations: that the participation of representatives from all the continents should be obtained; that as many countries as possible should be represented; that every authentic expression of anarchism and of the libertarian movement should be heard.

In consequence of all this, and in view of certain circumstances peculiar to Europe, we suggest the Congress should wisely be postponed, and that April 1958 should be given as the new probable date, and more precisely during the Easter holidays in order to make use of travelling facilities and to cause as little loss of working days as possible. It remains now to be seen if this date is convenient to comrades of other continents, especially of America and Asia. Some letters which we have received suggest 1958 without specifying the month. The Amsterdam Congress, which took place in April 1907, constitutes a precedent, and the next Congress could fall during its anniversary.

Under the circumstances attention could be paid to a suggestion made by the comrades of the R.I.A. from Buenos Aires, who have recently written to us: "We consider it important that the reports (i.e. the points of view of each organization, group or militant on each item of discussion) should be sent round first in writing so that they may be read and studied. They would thus be made known to the various delegations who could discuss them straightaway at the Congress without wasting time in reading them out".

We must say in this connection that the material we have received up to date is very scanty. The importance of discussion before the Congress or at least of getting acquainted with the point of view of each participant should be stressed. Time will be saved at the Congress by not having to read the texts, and the knowledge of the positions and criteria of each delegation would provide a friendly atmosphere and prevent fruitless discussions.

The function of the pre-Congress Bulletin and of the respective Commission is precisely that of reproducing the texts sent to the CRIA.

We are looking forward to a prompt reply in order to fix definitely the date of the Congress and to take steps to choose that city or town in France which offers the best possibilities. Vol. 18, No. 32 August 10, 1957

More Seasonable Reflections IN PRAISE OF LEISURE

HOWEVER disinclined people are in principle to thinking about the realities of the 50 weeks of the year as they seek to concentrate sun-bathing, sight-seeing, relaxation, gastronomy . . . and atmosphère in the remaining two, how many, in fact, as they roast and relax by the sea, can prevent the intrusion of even only vague thoughts on the futility of their jobs, the illussory advantages of wage-increases, and the fatuous way they spend or throw away those precious leisure hours, that oasis in a desert of unconsciousness and routine which makes life an end in itself rather than the instrument, the delicate antennae which man uses in the unending voyage of discovery of himself as well as of those near and dear to him?

To those who feel inclined to protest against our choice of adjectives we would suggest they first subject themselves to a test. Those who at the end of two weeks' holidaymaking have succeeded in shutting out the fifty weeks of the year, their jobs, their neighbours and their semi-detached brick boxes; whose dreams are centred on Messrs. Littlewood, Vernon and . . . (we cannot think of a third football philanthropist . . . ah yes, Mr. Cope) to prolong indefinitely this Riviera, or Costa Brava idyll: for them our objectives surely, are not misplaced. Those who, on the contrary, at the end of the two weeks feel an impatience to return to the fray, to their jobs, their friends, their converted brick boxes, (converted in the sense that instead of attempting to make them one better than the Jones', are workshops of life and leisure) to them to offer no apologies since they will not recognise themselves in our first paragraph and will therefore feel neither indignant nor itching to protest!

We hope that regular readers of FREEDOM are of the latter. For these reflections of ours are intended for those who chance on us as they would a message in an empty bottle washed up by the tide at their feet, momentarily liberated from the tortures of mass-produced shoes and the promiscuity of crowded buses and underground trains!

work interesting or dull? Is it the physical or psychological, financial or functional, or a combination of these which determine whether one loves or hates one's job?

We would maintain that no man, however interesting his job, positively enjoys working for a boss for the following reasons: (a) because however much one is conditioned into believing that bosses are necessary one feels (especially if one is a professional man) that given the same privileged position one could do better than one's boss who is always an "old muddler" and (b) that one's boss is enjoying a higher standard of living than oneself because he employs the services of others (oneself included). Hence the dissatisfaction which is born from the desire to be one's own boss (a desire which is often astutely stifled in the professional classes, by co-opting these dissatisfied employees into the board of directors, with or without capital).

Thus, however interesting and socially important a job may be, the positive satisfaction to be derived by the holder can be easily vitiated by rivalries over status and economic considerations. And in the case of workers in factories the monotony of their jobs is not compensated for by leisure hours which are as free and exciting as their working hours are circumscribed and dreary.

We may be uttering a heresy, even for some anarchists, when we declare that to our minds no job is per se interesting for more than a limited time unless it lends itself to variety and development or occupies but a small part of one's active life (assuming that one has "ideas" as to what one wants to do with one's "free" time*). For these same reasons all jobs have interest in so far as they serve some useful social purpose and do not sap the physical strength and mental versatility of the individual. The hack writer is as much a slave to the pen (or typewriter) as the factory worker is to the lathe; the craftsman who through pressure of "demand" spends his working hours producing a chair, albeit beautiful, is as much a potential victim to boredom as the gifted painter who, carried away by 'public" demand, works factory hours producing "pot boilers".

IN our society the purpose of automation is not to relieve mankind of boredom and hard labour but to increase industrial efficiency. Automation is industry's snub to human effort (as well as a tribute to modern Man's inventive genius). Man could use this "snub" for his own ends if only he could learn to desire leisure rather than fear it.

Leisure, as we understand it, is not escape from dreary toil, which is the dream of millions of our fellow beings at this very moment as they sun themselves on the beaches of Europe. Leisure is the freedom to pursue those activities and bents which give us satisfaction and purpose to our lives. Physically and mentally it may be more exhausting than any routine job; indeed, leisure is not synonymous with idleness though for some of us it may well be considered a happy state! It is significant that the leisure society is desired more by the "activists" among us—those for whom the day is too short to do all the things they would wish to do—than by the so-called shirkers who are as bored with their idleness as they are resistant to their jobs!

There is no infallible blue-print to leisure for all who seek it. Each individual has commitments and responsibilities in existing society which he may not easily be able to brush aside without causing hardship and problems for others. But each one of us can win his leisure society within limitations so long as WHAT is it that makes a job of he can place the material side of life —and this includes careers and social status just as much as daily bread—in its proper perspective.

> The "simple life" is not as some imagine, hand-made sandals and raw carrots. It is "simple" only because it has discarded the artificial and dispensed with the organisation of leisure. It is complex, exciting, disturbing and not without tension or insecurity, because it is life of our own fashioning. And unlike the Hollywood utopias dreamed up on the sun-drenched beaches it can be achieved, or approximated, here and now, by those who want it enough. And, like lovemaking, once you have sampled it you will never want to look back!

*An important consideration, "Fear of leisure" is as much a maladie du siecle as "fear of freedom". Some people's obsession for work as an end in itself is less a positive attitude to life than an escape from the social loneliness and intellectual boredom that they anticipate from leisure.

BIGNESS IN INDUSTRY

RECENT article in FREEDOM on Geoffrey Ostergaard's survey of member participation in Co-operative Co-partnerships brings to the fore one of the questions which advocates of an anarchist social organisation have to face: the question of size and scale. "For anarchists," writes the author, "who have long insisted on the importance of small scale organisation, one further point of interest emerges . . . Member interest is inversely related to size: the smaller the society, the higher the member participation . . . One of the lessons to be learned from these worker cooperatives may be just this: those who wish to democratise the work process may well have to forego the advantages -and the disadvantages-of large-scale organisation."

From this deduction the next step that critics of anarchist ideas reach, is the opinion that George Orwell expressed about anarchism:

"If one considers the probabilities one is driven to the conclusion that anarchism implies a low standard of living. It need not imply a hungry or uncomfortable world, but it rules out the kind of air-conditioned, chromium-plated,

gadget-ridden existence which is now considered desirable and enlightened. The processes involved in making, say, an aeroplane are so complex as to be only possible in a planned, centralised society, with all the repressive apparatus that that implies. Unless there is some unpredictable change in human nature, liberty and efficiency must pull in opposite directions."

And the final conclusion often reached is that since there is no example in history of the deliberate rejection by a majority, or of a complex social organisation in favour of a simpler one; the possibility of an anarchist society is in fact receding; and since 'not even the gods fight against necessity', those who preach the desirability of anarchy are cherishing an illusion and are cutting themselves off from the reality of our day and age.

There is a great deal of evidence to support Ostergaard's argument, Orwell's is open to question; it is the third conclusion which seems to be totally misconceived. In the first place, what are anarchists after? A solution first, surely, to the question 'How shall I live?'. Nobody is obliged to cast aside his personal answer to this question because it hasn't a universal application, and on the personal level any argument about the social impossibility of anarchism has no validity. But most anarchists do want to change the society in which they live, and again on the social level the impossibility of an anarchist society no more invalidates anarchism than the imposibility of eradicating disease invalidates medicine.

BUT the really interesting thing about this kind of objection to anarchism is that it does not question its desirability, it merely observes that the size and scale of modern industry makes anarchism technically and organisationally impossible. Anarchists tend to react to this point of view in two ways. They may agree with it, but point out that mankind, once it has absorbed the technological revolution, may grow out of the frenzy for what David Riesman terms 'conspicuous production', just as the rich, when they cease to be nouveau riche grow out of the stage of Veblen's 'conspicuous consumption'. In other

open-mouthed people will start critically picking and choosing which of its attributes they wish to retain. Others may take the view that the very technical and productive advances which some people affect to fear or despise are, by making possible an end to the bondage of poverty and toil, the necessary precondition of human freedom, the very thing that makes anarchy possible. What really matters, they will say, is who controls the means of production. And then along comes the Labour Correspondent of The Times (29/4/57) to point out that while workers' control in the form of co-operative co-partnerships may "provide a means of harmonious selfgovernment in a small concern" there is no evidence that it provides "any solution to the problems of establishing democracy in large-scale modern indus-

The vital point which is so often overlooked in all these discussions is that the scale and size of modern industry is more a reflection of the social and economic ideas current in society than of actual technical complexity. The cult of bigness which makes oversize cars, oversize ships, and oversize aircraft (remember the Brabazon-whole villages were swept away to make a runway for it, and now it rusts in its million pound hangar), this cult of bigness pervades industry as much as any other field of life and it has nothing to do with complex processes. It also makes us exaggerate the actual extent of bigness in industry as Kropotkin found years ago in compiling the material for his Fields, Factories and Workshops, when he discovered that the economist's picture of industry had little to do with the reality.

AT a conference held a few years ago by the British Institute of Management, and the Institute of Industrial Administration, Mr. S. R. Dennison of Cambridge University declared that "the belief that modern industry inevitably tends towards larger units of production was a Marxian fallacy. It was not justified by developments in either this country or the United States".

"Over a wide range of industry the productive efficiency of small units was at least equal to, and in many cases surpassed, that of the industrial giants. About 92 per cent. of the businesses in the United Kingdom employed fewer than 250 people and were responsible for by far the greater part of the total national production. The position in the United States was about the same." (Sunday Times 15/2/53).

Again, those who think of industry as one great assembly line may be surprised to learn that "in spite of nationalisation and the growth of large private firms, the proportion of the total working population employed by large organisations (i.e. concerns with over 1,000 employees) is still comparatively small; such people constitute only 36 per cent. of the working population of some 8,300,000 men and women, and are far outnumbered by those who hold jobs as members of comparatively small organisations where direct personal contact throughout the group is a practical everyday possibility". (Mark Abrams: Bigness in Industry).

It is also revealing to study the nature of the industrial giants and to reflect on

6d.

cloth 21s.

GEORGE WOODCOCK:

New Life to the Land

Railways and Society

Nationalism and Culture

The Basis of Communal Living

What is Anarchism?

RUDOLF ROCKER:

TONY GIBSON :

Homes or Hovels?

words, when industrialised society is no how few of them owe their size to the longer a novelty, it is reasonable to as- actual technical complexity and scale of sume that instead of swallowing it all their industrial operations. In a recent broadcast under the title Have Large Firms on Advantage in Industry, Mr. H. P. Barker referred to two essentially different types of motive, the industrial and non-industrial. By the industrial motive, he meant

"the normal commercial development of a product or a service which the public wants; for instance, the motor-car industry or the chain store. There is also the vertical type of growth in which a seller expands downwards towards his raw materials, or a primary producer expands upwards towards the end products of his primary material. The soap and oil industries are such cases. Then there is the kind of expansion in which a successful firm seeks to diversify its business and its opportunity and to carry its financial eggs in several baskets . . . And, lastly, there is the type of expansion by which whole industries are aggregated under a single control because they cannot effectively be operated in any other way. Electricity and railways are examples".

One may well have reservations about the truth of Mr. Barker's last two sentences, and it is interesting that his other reasons relate to the financial structure of competitive industry, rather than its actual technical demands. When he turns to what he calls the non-industrial and less healthy types of growth, we are in familiar territory:

"Among these there is the type which starts and ends in the Stock Exchange and where the sole reason is the prospect of making a profitable flotation. Then there is a type of adiposity which often occurs when a successful company becomes possessed of large resources from past profits. The directors then look round for ways of investing the surplus fat merely because they have it . . . Then there is the type of large business born only out of doctrinaire or political considerations. Last of all, there is the industrial giant created primarily to satisfy the megalomania of one man".

THOSE industries where the size of the units is dictated by the technical complexity of production does seem to demand large-scale operations, for example steel rolling mills or motor car assembly are the very ones where automation is likely to reduce the number of people employed. Automation is seen by some people as yet another factor making for greater industrial contralisation, but this is only another expression of our centralist mentality. Mr. Landon Goodman in his new Penguin book Man and Automation puts the matter in a very interesting (almost Kropotkinian) light:

"Automation can be a force either for concentration or dispersion. There is a tendency to-day for automation to develop along with larger and larger production units but this may only be a phase through which the present technological advance is passing. The comparatively large sums of money which are needed to develop automation techniques, together with the amount of technological knowledge and unique quality of management, are possibly found more in the larger units than in the smaller ones. Thus, the larger units will proceed more quickly towards automation. When this knowledge is disdispersed more widely and the smaller units take up automation the patternmay be quite different. Automation being a large employer of plant and a relatively small employer of labour, allows plants to be taken away from the large centres of population and built in relatively small centres of population. Thus one aspect of the British scene may change. Rural factories, clean, small. concentrated units will be dotted about the countryside. The effects of this may be far-reaching. The Industrial Revolution caused a separation of large numbers of people from the land, and concentrated them in towns . . . The result has been a certain standardisation of personality, ignorance of nature, and lack of imaginative power . . . Now we may soon see some factory workers moving back into the country and becoming part of a rural community . . .

But the most remarkable evidence in favour of reducing the scale of industrial organisation comes from the experiments conducted by industrial psychologists, sociologists and so on, who, in the interests of morale, increased productivity, or health, have sought to break down large units into small groups. The famous experiment of Elton Mayo at the Hawthorne Works of the Western Electric Company, or the experiences of the Glacier Metal Company, or J. J. Gillespie's idea about 'free expression in industry', or the Group Production methods adopted by a Swedish firm, are all examples of this tendency. Their aim is by no means workers' control, they simply want to increase production or to reduce industrial neuroses, but they do indicate that the preconditions for workers' control of industry are there. All that is lacking is the demand for it!

VOLINE :

E. A. GUTKIND :

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

cloth 12s. 6d. The Expanding Environment 8s. 6d.

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

Anarchy 6d. Vote-What For? M. BAKUNIN:

Marxism, Freedom and the State. cloth 5s. ALEX COMFORT: Delinquency

JOHN HEWETSON: Ill-Health, Poverty and the State cloth 2s. 6d., paper 1s.

PETER KROPOTKIN: The State: Its Historic Rôle The Wage System Revolutionary Government Organised Vengeance Called Justice

Youth for Freedom paper 2s. Food Production and Population 6d. Who will do the Dirty Work? 2d. F. A. RIDLEY : The Roman Catholic Church and the Modern Age 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)

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

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

THE PROBLEM

In reviewing George Woodcock's recent book on Mexico, *- V. S. Prichett writes, "The Mexican lives in a country which has run with blood; but he rarely commits suicide or has an ulcer". Whether this is completely true of Mexico or not, this statement underlines a problem which is vital to all the advanced civilizations to-day. We are encountering a problem undreamt of a century ago and which is left out of account by most of the great writers on social and political theory. We have gained so much in a material sense yet a strange something prevents the general enjoyment of life. The state which Hobbes referred to as Felicity, and looked to a future of good government and material well-being to provide, has not materialized: Where lies the essential error of the technically advanced societies?

Two features categorize the technically advanced societies to-day. They have an extraordinarily high rate of mental illness, and their technical perfection is

*Reviewed in FREEDOM, 27/7/57.

PRIME MINISTER EXPERIMENTS WITH LESS GOVERNMENT

THE wrong conclusions will undoubtedly be drawn from those anxious to run society "by rule of law" (whether of the democratic or totalitarian brand) by recent events reported from Kerala where a Communist Government "took office full of good intentions, and is beginning to reap the bitter fruits of inexperience and partiality".

The Prime Minister of Kerala, Mr. Nambudiripad, a very curious communist indeed, has as his maxim:

"The best government is that which rules the least", and announced that the days when the police would be used in "anti-people fashion to further the colonial exploitation of the toiling masses by supporting the owning class, were over."

Whether the Prime Minister is genuine in his beliefs about the function of government time will show. What particularly interests us at the moment is the report on the behaviour of the people working on tea and rubber estates towards their employers. There have been outbreaks of violence against employers while the police stand by and preach "good manners to the crowd".

Commentators have been quick to note that owners and tenants of land in Kerala have been living in harmony for generations but now they are at each others' throats. This is the obvious result of years of inequality and an expression of resentment on the part of tenants at the change in government policy, faced with an untrained people who without the use of violence and some knowledge could really transform all relationships into one of equality. When sudden changes take place in social patterns the result is usually one of chaos, but need not be with a disciplined revolutionary people. Unfortunately in these conditions authority usually takes over before the experiment has had time to grow and settle.

The Chief Minister in Kerala has stated that this change of method might be somewhat confusing, at We wonder how long it will take, however, before he reverts to former policies, or pressure is put on him by interested parties to do just this.

Club * * Malatesta

SWARAJ HOUSE, 32 PERCY STREET, TOTTENHAM COURT ROAD, LONDON, W.1. (Tel.: MUSeum 7277).

ACTIVITIES

Every Sunday at 7.30 p.m. London Anarchist Group Meetings (see Announcements Column)

Every Wednesday at 8 p.m. BONAR THOMSON speaks

Every Friday and Saturday: SOCIAL EVENINGS

ROUND THE BEND-1

proceeding to a point at which it may well be that in seeking to dominate their rivals in power, they will exterminate each other completely and efficiently. Now it may be that these two facts are not connected. The widespread mental illnesses of to-day which clutter up the hospitals which can give the sufferers little more than custodial care, and which hamper the working community more than any other class of disease, may be a problem separate from the problem of war. It is the contention of the present writer however, that they are both symptoms of a social malaise which is being erroniously studied under separate headings, the medical and the political. There is a lack of understanding between the medico-psychological theorists and the socio-political theorists. This lack of understanding has lead to some surprisingly poor stuff being written by men who are real experts in their own field: thus Freud's published correspondence with Einstein (Why War 1932) and Flugel's Moral Paradox of War are remarkable only for their neglect of the vital political issues involved. On the other hand the writings of most sociopolitical theorists, whether they are Fabians, Marxists, Cole-ites, anarchists or right-wing political economists, give no hint of why a society which is wellfed, well-housed, well-educated, etc., should not simply go right round the

All this is meat and drink to the necromancers of our day from the Archbish of Canterbury downwards. "Man has failed!" they declare, licking their lips over every sad misfortune. "Back you go to God on your bended knees!" Indeed there is a back-to-God movement sponsored by not a few triumphant irrationalists crowing on what they hope is the dunghill of the failure of a rational civilization. I do not intend to wade through the last five volumes of Toynbee's Study of History to make sure for myself, but according to Trevor Roper1 here is the gloating of a necrophilist who sees the future triumph of an antirational power ("the religion of Mish-Mash") because we have failed in our attempt to establish reasonable social institutions.

The anarchist finds himself in a precarious situation. On the one hand he is tempted to throw his energy into sup porting what is reasonable, constructive and socially valuable in our civilization -and thereby, getting caught in the toils of a lot of muddled reformism because of the prejudices of his potential collaborators; on the other hand he has the temptation to shout "It's all baloneypull it down!" and thereby play into the hands of the advocates of the religion of Mish-Mash who look hopefully forward to an awful collapse of Western civilization. It is therefore incumbent on the anarchist, if he is to open his big mouth at all, to try to understand the meaning of the more obvious features of the society in which he lives.

II. THE TRIUMPH OF SCIENCE

Our lives are quite extraordinarily protected from disease, parasites, violent attack, famine, flood and other natural

catastrophes. Considering most primitive peoples discovered living "in a state of nature" we may be struck by the highly insecure lives which they lead. They are prey to malignant diseases from bacterial sources like malaria, yaws, leprosy, smallpox; to the diseases of malnutrition at the mercy of climatic fluctuations, and even in peaceable societies like the Eskimos' to a high rate of violent death. It was the consciousness of the eventual conquest of disease, hunger and violent death which gave rise to the Malthusian doctrine at the end of the 18th century. Man evolved from his animal origins in pain and struggle in general conditions where health and vigour was the lucky chance of a few, disease and early death the fate of the majority. Only thus has the vast reproductive capacity of the species been kept in check. Malthus worked out mathematically that a single mated pair of humans would produce a population of two million million ancestors in only 40 generations, even if we allow the very conservative estimate of four offpring to each mated pair. For tens of thousands of years therefore, man has lived

on this earth in conditions in which the average individual was born to a life of danger, pain and early death. By his superior intellect and superior capacity for mutual aid, his species obtained dominance of the planet and recently, very very recently, has conquered physical disease and the problems of food production to the extent that a sudden and tremendous leap in the population has occurred and is proceeding all over the planet, where it is not checked by artificial methods of contraception. In Britain, this recent event began to take place towards the end of the 18th century; in the 19th century the population was still subject to the scourges of cholera, tuberculosis, syphilis, diphtheria, smallpox, etc., and the poor lived on the very brink of starvation, but yet sufficient advances had been made in medicine and social hygiene that the population doubled and trebled in the

To-day we live in a comparative paradise of absence from physical disease and hunger. Here are some of the figures taken from the 1956 Report of

the Medical Officer of Health for a Longdon borough, population 97,000 odd.

CAUSES OF DEATH 1956

Cause	Total
Tuberculosis	4
Syphilitic disease	Nil
Diphtheria	Nil
Poliomyelitis	1
Other infective and	
parasitic diseases	2
Cancer	216
Heart & circulatory diseases	390
Motor accidents	4
Suicide	25
Homicide	Nil
Stomach & duodenal ulcer	17

The above list is by no means complete of course, but it does show how the infective and parasitic diseases which used to be the main killers have been almost stamped out. It is the diseases of old age, cancer and heart disease which are now the main agents of death, for our population is growing increasingly older. Also we no longer kill each other intentionally in civil life except in cases of the utmost rarity (in a population of 40 millions the murder rate is; utterly insignificant) but about 5,000 people kill themselves every year.

Does it not seem strange that a human society, released from the age-old horrors of famine and pestilence should not find that Felicity of which Hobbes wrote and the Utilitarians planned for by their "sensible' approach to law? How would our Marxists explain the suicide of thousands every year-deaths with no class bias or connection with economic tension? How would our Fabians account for a populations of 150,000 in the mental hospitals-(a population which can be no larger simply for reasons of available space) in their scheme of things?? According to Stafford-Clark2 there are about 400,000 recognized cases of psychoneurotic illness in the general population to-day. Knowing the social shame which is attached to the label "neurotic" and deters sufferers from seek ing treatment until they utterly break down, it is impossible to estimate the number of the mentally sick apart from the recognized cases.

Can it be that the ordinary conceptions of "right thinking people" about the nature of society and proper social ends, are very, very wrong? If contemporary civilized society is going round the bend, it may be that anarchism, popularly supposed to exist only on the "lunatic fringe" of theory, has something very valuable to offer society to-day.

(To be continued)

The Hypocritical Archbishop

Continued from p. 1

ed a resolution that urged Britain, America and Russia to stop nuclear tests "at least for a trial period".

The Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Fisher, hailed the resolution as an "extremely powerful and important statement of Christianity."

He said that as Church representatives "we are utterly within our rights" in urging this "Christian piece of advice."

The statement was stronger than one introduced last week, which said merely that Christians "are justified" in asking Governments to stop tests.

COMMUNIST CATHOLICS REVIEW THE VATICAN

MEWS of the latest arrests in Hungary of Roman Catholic priests must have reached the ears of their comrades in China, because, according to reports, a meeting of Chinese Catholic leaders, claiming to represent 3,000,000 clergy and laymen, has denounced the Vatican's attitude to the Peking régime.

The Peking People's Daily said that at a 27-day meeting which began in Peking on June 17, more than two hundred churchmen, including bishops and priests, passed a resolution alleging that the Vatican "serves American imperialists and other capitalists in the world." The meeting also severely criticised

pro-Vatican elements within Communist China's Catholic Church, which in 1950 divorced itself from all foreign ties.

The meeting, according to the New China Agency, decided to form a patriotic association, pledged to maintain only "purely religious ties" with the Vatican. Chinese Catholics, it was stated, would obey Rome in matters of morals and dogma, but would "resolutely oppose any scheme concocted by the Vatican in. the form of religion which interferes with our country's internal affairs or violates its sovereignty or damages our patriotic movement against imperialism."

The Vatican may well make a pious show of protest but the Church has on other occasions been more than anxious to state that she is only concerned with morals and dogma and not with political conflicts. That is to say that only when political expediency demands such a course, as for example in Italy during the time of Mussolini's reign when the Church dissolved the Catholic Party according to the terms of the Lateran Pact to make the way clear for Mussolini to dominate completely the Italian people.

If the choice in China is between losing some power or coming to terms with the State we have no doubts as to which she will choose.

admittedly a long-term process. The

anarchist has to get across an attitude

and to make sure he educates, not mis-

The summing-up was opened on Mon-

day morning by Rita Milton and Philip

Sansom, who attempted to tie together

the information, arguments and view-

points of the three lecturers and to draw

conclusions therefrom. A wide discus-

educates.

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

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

EVERY SUNDAY IN AUGUST OPEN DISCUSSIONS

Questions, Discussion and Admission all free.

OPEN AIR MEETINGS Weather Permitting HYDE PARK Sundays at 3.30 p.m.

GLASGOW

OPEN AIR MEETINGS Maxwell Street Every Sunday at 7.30 p.m.

sion followed in which most of the comrades gathered expressed their points of view.

provided an opportunity for lighter exchanges-the high spot being the presentation of 'Anæsthesia', an anarchist version of the well-known film.

On the Saturday evening the social had

This is rather difficult to review. Perhaps we'll just say it was hilarious

and leave it at that. The Summer School ended with lunch in Monday, following a vote of thanks to the comrades who had worked so hard on the catering over the whole week-end, and of course all the preparations beforehand-particularly Mary Canipa and Joan Sculthorpe, backed up by Jack Robinson, who is permanently responsible for catering arrangements at the Malatesta Club.

Altogether a most enjoyable week-end which we hope has provided information, ammunition and inspiration for the anarchist movement for the next twelve months.

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) be made out to FREEDOM PRESS, crossed a/c Payee, and addressed to the publishers FREEDOM PRESS 27 Red Lion Street London, W.C.I. England

Tel.: Chancery 8364

The Summer School & Continued from p. 1

up labour of the past) is deemed superior to labour (the living vitality of the present).

Geoffrey Ostergaard maintained that the wages system is incompatible with a society of free men and women. The worker's status has now improved, but he is still servile and remains the means to somebody else's ends. The Collective Contract could be a method of bringing control of production into the hands of the workers collectively, though admittedly not control of the product-though this could gradually be achieved. The socialist revolution is the managerial revolution and that can be prevented, if at all, by assaults upon the wages system inside industry.

Contribution of the Social Sciences

Bob Green's lecture on the Contribution of the Social Sciences proved to be a fascinating exposition of how social anthropology, sociology, social psychology and psychology proper add to our understanding of ourselves and our environment.

Anthropology, by showing how other societies live, gives us fresh ideas upon our own values and motives. Workers in this field began by the study of more primitive societies and are now turning

The receipt of wages is a mark of in- to our own. The speaker gave examples ferior status (middle class professionals of Malinowski's work among the Troare paid salaries) and capital (the stored- briand Islanders, and discussed Northern Indians and the Spartans of ancient Greece, comparing the relationship between a competitive social pattern, a free sexuality and the incidence of neurosis or happiness apparent.

We find that if we have a society in which some relationships are competitive, all relationships tend to be competitive. But before condemning all competition we should recognise that there are two kinds: competition at the expense of others (as in commerce) and competition in a framework of co-operation to get the best out of each other (as in athletics, the 4-minute mile, etc.).

Bob Green put the cat among the anarchist pigeons by bluntly stating that a libertarian society could not exist without fast communications and a high level of modern technical development. Although some anarchists have so often denounced modern industry; it was not technology that was wrong, but the way that we used it. The abundance made possible to-day and birth control made governmental control through deprivation and repressive sexual codes unnecessary. Shortages tend to make for competition (though there are exceptions, like the Eskimoes) and competition makes for aggressiveness and authoritarianism. Plenty tends to make for co-operation.

The problem is one of education-

Published by Freedom Press, 27 Red Lion Street, London, W.C.L. Printed by Express Printers, Loudon, B.1.