

STOP WORK ON MAY DAY!

THE SETTING ASIDE of the first day of May as a workers' day originated in America in 1886, when there were a series of strikes for the eight-hour day. It was a day when workers traditionally demonstrated their strength and solidarity by taking strike action.

In this country, this worthwhile tradition has long since been removed from the calendar and transferred to the nearest Sunday, when production would not be affected. The Labour Party did this a long time ago and the Communist Party gave up May Day the year after Herbert Morrison banned their march in 1946. Since that time, they have marched separately on the first Sunday in May. In Spain, workers for a number of years have been defying Franco's laws. Despite threats of arrest and imprisonment, they continued to celebrate May Day in their thousands. While in the Soviet Union the state shows off its military might.

In 1961, the Rank and File Movement organised another separate march on the Sunday and from this it was hoped to organise a May Day march the following year, but these hopes came to nothing. However, since this time, members of Anarchist groups in London and the Syndicalist Workers' Federation have held meetings at Speakers' Corner, come rain or shine, on May Day.

In Liverpool dockers, engineers and other industrial workers are stopping work on May Day in support of the busmen's struggle against the Government's pay policies. Council tenants are also taking part in a rent strike.

This year, the Labour Party is only holding a meeting in Trafalgar Square

and the Communist Party will once again march from the Embankment to Hyde Park. However, an attempt was made last year to interfere with capitalist production. Although the numbers were small, it was an attempt to revive May Day as a Workers' Day. It was organised by the Association of Rank and File Print Workers and it is mainly by their efforts that a May Day Committee was set up to organise a demonstration this year.

1968 is an appropriate time to make some show of defiance to the employers and the Government. Workers are facing wage legislation, rising rents and prices and, in South East London, many are facing redundancies. The May Day Committee want to make this as big an anti-Government demonstration as possible. They do not see the issue as one of asking trade union leaders or the Government to do anything, but just to tell them, that for their part, they are going to fight the anti-working-class policies. They ask workers to: 'Show this Government—and all Governments—that the workers have had enough of being pushed around and now mean business'.

I think it is important to spare no effort to make this demonstration a success. Raise it at work and in your union branch. We will be assembling at Tower Hill at 11.45 a.m. for a meeting, followed by a march to Mrs. Castle's new Ministry, where a message will be handed in telling her and the Government that we are prepared to fight their policies.

P.T.

Freedom of the Park

We reported in FREEDOM last week that a FREEDOM seller at Speakers' Corner was arrested and charged with obstruction. Last year there was continuous harassment of our newspaper sellers in Hyde Park and it was stopped only after a vigorous campaign on the part of other publications, the Sun newspaper and the National Council for Civil Liberties.

We are reprinting George Orwell's

selling newspapers in the street is technically obstruction, at any rate if you fail to move on when the police tell you to. So it would be legally possible for any policeman who felt like it to arrest any newsboy for selling the *Evening News*. Obviously this doesn't happen, so that the enforcement of the law depends on

NO POLITICAL ISSUE is more enthusiastically mulled over and casually alluded to in Britain's pubs these days (where as everybody knows, of course, you just don't talk about politics) than the race 'problem'. The blacks are always good for a laugh.

This week, however, in the absence of yet another horror story in the continuing Kit-E-Kat saga—be it from Brixton, Notting Hill or Smethwick—the talk, one imagines, has been on a more serious level.

At last a 'serious politician' has leant his prestigious weight to the sick and fear-impelled slanders that circulate about the country's black minority. Now, indeed, 'we know where we stand'. Those among the immigrant population who have believed Britain to be deeply racist have had their suspicions confirmed—from the highest quarters.

And support of so-called extremist sentiment runs as wide as it does deep. Mrs. Patricia Moss, for instance, 'a former model who now lives in Belgravia and was out with her baby daughter', told the *Evening Standard's* 'PICTUREPROBE' man: 'I agree with what Enoch Powell had to say and Heath was right to give him the sack.' We know where we stand, indeed!

John Enoch Powell, M.B.E., M.A., M.P., one-time Minister of Health, Financial Secretary to the Treasury, Professor of Greek at the University of Sydney, and, until last Sunday, spokesman on defence in the Shadow Cabinet (address: 33 South Eaton Place, S.W.1, tel.: SLOane 0088), is not mad.

A snake, as any keen-eyed televiewer will long ago have realised, he may be; but mad: no. Unlike Mr. Sandys, with whom he is now in (no doubt) scheming cahoots, he cannot really make any pretence of being a decent fellow. He is, above all, a politician. And, like most politicians, honesty does not become him. As all his supporters complain, his only sin appears to have been that he 'spoke the truth'. And that is something rare in those who play

the pageant of politics at the Palace of Westminster—particularly these days. With justification has he said that he was not propounding any policy which the Conservative leaders have not accepted. Heath can catch his votes in Bexley his way; Powell in Wolverhampton finds it profitable, evidently, to be less subtle.

In dismissing Powell, Heath, it is significantly said, 'gave way to pressure'. Even if this is a speculation unfair to the mild ex-grammar school lad, Heath has his own image to think about. There is in politics such a thing as *tact*—however reluctant Powell may be to avail himself of the quality. As *The Times* pointed out: 'In dismissing Mr. Powell Mr. Heath takes the known risk of having Mr. Powell as an enemy; that, fortunately, is less grave than the risk of having Mr. Powell as a colleague.'

It remains to be seen whether a Powell-Sandys coalition of the extreme Right, backed by the wide, dull spectrum of hangers, floggers and birchers, can galvanise themselves into a 'force to be reckoned with'. If not, they will have lost nothing. Powell has merely confirmed that across the breadth of British party politics the strong pox of racialism has yet to show all its spots—both on the Left and on the Right, in the largest of companies and the smallest of trade unions. They can bide their time.

To remind you, for instance, of the ban on coloured visitors and entertainers unanimously agreed upon by the 700 members of North Wolverhampton Working Men's Club only the day after Powell's speech: 'You have voted for a total ban on coloured people,' said the president. 'I hope you will support your committee in enforcing it.'

And how many of these men are Labour voters? Though racialist policies in the Labour Party go back further than the advent of the present Government (see Rev. Ken Leech's letter to *The Times* at the time of the Immigration Bill), the Kenyan Asians Bill means that the men of North Wolverhampton, and other Working Men's Clubs don't even have to stop voting Labour and still know deep in their hearts that they are doing their bit to keep the wogs down and the blacks well and truly out.

Mr. Powell's speech, as far as most anarchists are concerned, is of course obscene to a degree, but it certainly comes as no shock. In politics expedi-

ency is all; and when the crunch comes, human beings are nothing. Such is the folly of latter-day 'commitment', conventional-style. They scorn what happened at Grosvenor Square, and they call this respectable politics!

And is Mr. Powell an extremist? By any statistical definition of the word, surely not. How many deluded but delighted factory-hands and football-fans have been yelling 'Powell for P.M.'! this week all over the country. Surely not a few. You've probably heard them yourself. There is such a thing as extremism of the Centre; and because it has behind it all the economic and industrial might of modern capitalism, it is by far the most dangerous sort. With Mr. Powell, it is beginning to show its claws. (In Germany, of course, the process has already taken its course once, and is well on the way to doing so again.)

The Labour Party counts for nothing in the cause of progress and enlightenment. 'Will you be doing anything about them blacks?' a (not untypical?) Labour-voting housewife asks the candidate for Parliament in one of Dennis Potter's plays. 'Swarming all over they be, My Ronnie says. Like flies round a jar of honey.'

An embarrassed candidate replies: 'Well, of course, our policy is to look very closely at the Immigration Bill. . . . But I must point out that it is not our intention to exclude people merely on the grounds of their colour alone, you know. There's no place for second-class citizens in Britain.'

'That's what my Ronnie says. They should stay in their own places, shouldn't they?' she tells him.

When that play was written, not long ago, such sentiments were officially frowned upon within the Labour Party. They have since acquired the status of entrenched policy.

Powell has again confirmed what I've long suspected: the pillars of the Establishment are hollow. Inside there dwell a manner of rotent parasite and woodworm. And this week they really began to crawl out. 'Courageous', the speech was called, 'brave'. As well as the great man himself, Mr. Nabarro—the man who on radio told the world, 'I wouldn't want my daughter to marry a big, buck nigger'—had his telephone jammed with calls of congratulation and his hallway snowed down in letters of support.

But there is no need to get alarmed! When the prim wild-men of the National Front, Uncle Os Mosley and all, finally see their policies fulfilled, your rulers will still be in morning suits. We will still be a nation of 'moderates', still 'respectable'. From what I know of Sandys, for instance, he is genuinely a decent chap. If duty demanded, one feels, that he turn Jews (or blacks, for that matter) into soap, then he would do it; but with charm, with charm.

As for the Race Relations Bill, which the Tories as a party, for their own reasons, opposed on Tuesday, this can be no solution—as the comparative fates of Enoch Powell, white man, and Michael Abdul Malik, black man, bear witness.

Indeed you cannot legislate against prejudice. Men must realise before it is too late that 'personal interests' reach way beyond immediate, everyday concerns, and that a new and genuine social consciousness is required by all if we are to avoid Race War on a global scale.

By now it should be clear to all who are libertarian socialists, no matter what variety, that the road to peace and freedom through solidarity with men of all races lies with none of the currently constituted political parties.

In this country, as in Germany, an extra-parliamentary opposition is an urgent social necessity. 'Organised irresponsibility' is more rampant in Parliament today than ever it has been before. Men must become their own organisers. Away with laws! Let us see sense in the streets! J.M.

Calling London Workers!

Rally TOWER HILL 11.45 a.m. WEDNESDAY, MAY 1 (May Day) against Wage Freeze, Unemployment and Rent Increases Organised by: London Workers May Day Committee.

RITA Resistance Inside the Army

THE FIRST EUROPEAN issue of the American Army Group RITA (Resistance Inside The Army) has reached us here in London. Their European newsletter ACT has been entirely written by deserters and members of the RITA group. Pvt. Andy Stapp is trying to push the idea of a GI's union demanding the right of GIs to sit on courts-martial, elect their officers and the right to 'refuse to obey illegal orders to fight in an illegal war like that in Vietnam'.

This has shaken up the Army Brass so

much they have tried to throw Stapp out of the Army. But he is staying and demanding his constitutional rights inside the Army.

ACT is full of useful addresses and hints to fuck the Army Brass about. It is to be thoroughly recommended to any GI who has had a gut-full of the army. Anyone who can get a few copies into the hands of the GIs will be doing more to end the Vietnamese war than anything else so write to ACT, J-P Sartre B.P. 130-14, Paris, France.. M.W.

the discretion of the police.

And what makes the police decide to arrest one man rather than another? However it may have been with the magistrate, I find it hard to believe that in this case the police were not influenced by political considerations. It is a bit too much of a coincidence that they should have picked on people selling just those papers. If they had also arrested someone who was selling *Truth*, or the *Tablet*, or the *Spectator*, or even the *Church Times*, their impartiality would be easier to believe in.

The British police are not like a continental gendarmerie or Gestapo, but I do not think one maligns them in saying that, in the past, they have been unfriendly to Left-wing activities. They have generally shown a tendency to side with those whom they regarded as the defenders of private property. Till quite recently 'red' and 'illegal' were almost synonymous, and it was always the seller of, say, the *Daily Worker*, never the seller of, say the *Daily Telegraph*, who was moved on and generally harassed. Apparently it can be the same, at any rate at moments, under a Labour government.

A thing I would like to know—it is a

thing we hear very little about—is what changes are made in the administrative personnel when there has been a change of government. Does the police officer who has a vague notion that 'Socialism' means something against the law carry on just the same when the government itself is Socialist?

When a Labour Government takes over, I wonder what happens to Scotland Yard Special Branch? To Military Intelligence? We are not told, but such symptoms as there are do not suggest that any very extensive shuffling is going on.

However, the main point of this episode is that the sellers of newspapers and pamphlets should be interfered with at all. Which particular minority is singled out—whether Pacifists, Communists, Anarchists, Jehovah's Witness or the Legion of Christian Reformers who recently declared Hitler to be Jesus Christ—is a secondary matter. It is of symptomatic importance that these people should have been arrested at that particular spot. You are not allowed to sell literature inside Hyde Park, but for many years past it has been usual for the paper-sellers to station themselves just

Continued from page 2

BOOKS ON ANARCHISM

and kindred subjects

- The Grand Camouflage: The Spanish Civil War and Revolution (1936-39)** Burnett Bolloten 63/-
Caleb Williams William Godwin (remainder paperback) 3/6
Pioneers of Modern Design Nikolaus Pevsner 7/6
The IWW in Theory and Practice 2/6
A Question of Living R. F. Mackenzie 18/-
Escape from the Classroom R. F. Mackenzie 18/-
The Murder of Christ Wilhelm Reich (paperback) 18/-
Listen, Little Man! Wilhelm Reich (paperback) 16/-
Homer Lane: a Biography W. David Wills 40/-
The Hawkspur Experiment W. David Wills 24/-
The Barns Experiment W. David Wills (remainder) 3/6
Talks to Parents and Teachers Homer Lane 10/6
On Aggression Konrad Lorenz (paperback) 10/6
Summerhill A. S. Neill 30/-
Talking of Summerhill A. S. Neill 25/-
The Spanish Labyrinth Gerald Brenan 13/6
What is to be Done? N. G. Chernyshevsky (paperback) 11/6
Garden Cities of Tomorrow Ebenezer Howard 7/6
The Ego and his Own Max Stirner (paperback) 16/-
The Political Philosophy of Bakunin (ed.) G. P. Maximoff (paperback) 28/-

Postage Extra

Freedom Bookshop

(Open 2 p.m.—5.30 p.m. daily;
10 a.m.—1 p.m. Thursdays;
10 a.m.—5 p.m. Saturdays)

17a MAXWELL ROAD
FULHAM SW6 Tel: REN 3736

FREEDOM PRESS

are the publishers
of the monthly magazine
ANARCHY
and the weekly journal
FREEDOM
specimen copies will
be gladly sent on request.

Subscription Rates

FREEDOM only (per year):
£1 10s. (\$4.50) surface mail
£2 16s. (\$8.00) airmail
ANARCHY only (per year):
£1 6s. (\$3.50) surface mail
£2 7s. (\$7.00) airmail
COMBINED SUBSCRIPTION
FREEDOM & ANARCHY (per year):
£2 10s. (\$7.50) surface mail both
£4 15s. (\$12.50) airmail both

PUBLICATIONS include

Malatesta's ANARCHY 1/- (post 3d.)
Berkman's ABC of ANARCHISM 2/6 (+5d.)
Rocker's NATIONALISM AND CULTURE 21/- (+4/6)
Richards' MALATESTA: His Life and Ideas. Cloth bound 21/- (+1/3); paper 10/6 (+1/-)
Bakunin's MARXISM, FREEDOM and the STATE 7/6 (+5d.)
Berneri's NEITHER EAST or WEST 6/- (+9d.)
Woodcock's THE WRITER & POLITICS 7/6
Voline's NINETEEN-SEVENTEEN (The Russian Revolution Betrayed) 12/6 (+1/-)
and THE UNKNOWN REVOLUTION (Kronstadt 1921, Ukraine 1918-21) 12/6 (+1/-)
Annual Volumes of Selections from FREEDOM 1952-1964 each year's volume 7/6 (+1/-)
Full list on application.
FREEDOM PRESS
17a Maxwell Road, London, S.W.6
Tel: REN 3736

MUST PATCH ALWAYS MISS HIS FRONT BENCH PEE ?

EVALUATED IN SOME depth, the need for a contemporary condition of ethical anarchy is not a mere matter of idle philosophical speculation. Anarchy, like clean air, adequate nutrition, pure water and psycho-physical harmony, is an essential. It is a necessary prerequisite for the release of all that latent human potential for good and evolutionary advance. It is vital, if man is to rediscover and regain a natural, as opposed to normal, state of being. Anarchy is thus not a utopian daydream, not an eccentric fantasy but rather a fundamental part of the human roots of health and sanity. Bondage, fetters, chains, actual or imagined, are symptomatic of decay and death. To be liberated and free is to be healthy and alive. War and competition are causality factors of unspeakable mental anguish and physical suffering. Co-operation and peace, fluidity and harmony, are ultimately inseparable from real happiness and full realisation.

If this be true, in substantial part, it would seem that, once realised, these obvious truths should logically cause anarchist principles to be applied in everyday situations. It would appear that those in whom the seed of freedom has flowered should rationally act, as well as they are able, in accordance with deeply held anarchistic convictions. Anarchism is incompatible with, and utterly opposed to, authoritarian government and external coercive power. For individuals, who proudly and publicly identify themselves as anarchists, to indulge in the most obscene mental and verbal gymnastics in order to justify voting for some supposed 'lesser of two evils', at election times, suggests deeply ingrained and rather sickly masochistic tendencies. Alternately it may just indi-



cate extreme naivety; if such political vices as stupidity and ignorance can be, by an heroic stretch of the cynical imagination, associated with anybody holding anarchist tenets.

This leaves the strong and sane with the inevitable question of what to do when the parliamentary electioneering

voting circus rolls around again, as sadly it will; again and again. How to be constructive and meaningful in the midst of lies and madness? How to communicate hard facts at a time of mass brainwashing?

To run anarchist candidates would perhaps not be the waste of scanty funds it is generally considered to be, come the time for action. Such a welcome assault would surely generate a veritable harvest of valuable publicity (press, radio, tv) gloriously out of proportion to a meagre, albeit carefully managed, financial outlay. The famous four-legged veteran anarchist Patch only missed an official pee in the front bench, last time round, because insufficient signatories appeared to sign the nomination papers. Typical contemporary anarchist efficiency? As armchair comfort increases, the buttocks spread, the mind dreams, the pen soars and the legs ossify.

Alternately it would be quite inexpensive, and doubtless make a reasonable impact, if anarchists and sympathisers would group together and insert advertisements in the local press, explaining why they have no intention of voting. With a little imaginative manipulation, features publicity and prolonged correspondence, in the local news-sheets, should not be too difficult a gain.

Failing some miraculous national outbreak of sanity or the absolute success of intensified or sporadic anarchist campaigns, in actually stopping the foul

spectacle, simple disruption and communications sabotage should not be too quickly disdained. Leaflets could be printed, based upon the candidate's own handouts and issued in that villain's, and his party's, name. The sole differentiation being that the alternative leaflets would approximate much more closely to his actual intentions, rather than the shameless public-relations lies of the official pamphlet. Fake voting stations could be opened and closed at intervals to confuse public and police. Traditional weapons of selfish and uncivilised hoodlums could be transformed into vehicles of infinite service to the public good. A carefully discarded cigarette end could find its way inside a ballot box. Fire is an element with undisputed cleansing and fumigational properties.

If one participates knowingly in such a monstrous deception, such an unspeakable farce, then one is morally to blame for the elected government's subsequent atrocities. Whatever the real or pretended reasons for such foolishness, even if one's chosen party or candidate should lose, no voter can escape his responsibility. There is so much empty talk. It is perhaps time for some of us to act like free men. If, when the time for action comes, we huddle up tight within the comforting arms of our protective chairs, so be it, but please may we not stumble from those massive cushions to shamble off to vote for some overfed whore.

DAVE CUNLIFFE.

FREEDOM OF THE PARK

Continued from page 1

outside the gates and distribute literature connected with the open-air meetings a hundred yards away. Every kind of publication has been sold there without interference.

The degree of freedom of the press existing in this country is often overrated. Technically there is great freedom, but the fact that most of the press is owned by a few people operates in much the same way as a State censorship. On the other hand, freedom of speech is real. On the platform, or in certain recognised open-air spaces like Hyde Park, you can say almost anything, and, what is perhaps more significant, no one is frightened to utter his true opinions in pubs, on the tops of buses, and so forth.

The point is that the relative freedom which we enjoy depends on public opinion. The law is no protection. Governments make laws, but whether they are carried out, and how the police behave, depends on the general temper of the country. If large numbers of people are interested in freedom of speech, there will be freedom of speech, even if the law forbids it; if public opinion is sluggish, inconvenient minorities will be persecuted, even if laws exist to protect

them. The decline in the desire for intellectual liberty has not been so sharp as I would have predicted six years ago, when the war was starting, but still there has been a decline. The notion that certain opinions cannot safely be allowed a hearing is growing. It is given currency by intellectuals who confuse the issue by not distinguishing between democratic opposition and open rebellion, and it is reflected in our growing indifference to tyranny and injustice abroad. And even those who declare themselves to be in favour of freedom of opinion generally drop their claim when it is their own adversaries who are being persecuted.

I am not suggesting that the arrest of five people for selling harmless newspapers is a major calamity. When you see what is happening in the world today, it hardly seems worth squealing about such a tiny incident. All the same, it is not a good symptom that such things should happen when the war is well over, and I should feel happier if this, and the long series of similar episodes that have preceded it, were capable of raising a genuine popular clamour, and not merely a mild flutter in sections of the minority press.

(Reproduced from 'The Tribune').

PRISONERS & VICTIMS

DAVID URBANO was tried on April 18 in Madrid for the sole 'crime' of having belonged to the FIIL (Spanish Libertarian Youth) when living in France. The Director of Prosecutions is demanding six years imprisonment for this 'offence'. Julian Millan is to go before a Summary Military Tribunal for allegedly taking part in anti-Franco activities in 1962. In February, five workers from the suburbs of Seville were sentenced to five years imprisonment for having circulated the review *Presencia*. And so it goes on, each day and every day, workers and students being sent before courts-martial, for the crime of thought.

This, better than any speeches, gives an exact picture of the 'liberalisation' of the regime.

In France, first the young Anarchist militant Antonio Ros, and now three others—Jose Sos, Placida Aranda and Jose Peirats—have received an expulsion

order notwithstanding their status of political refugees, and without any concrete explanation. One wonders if this complicity by French police with Franco's wishes will have any effect on French 'progressive' opinion. We would need to be optimistic to believe it.

In Belgium, the anarchist militant Octavio Alberola has been thrown into prison for his anti-Franco activities. He has already been sentenced to expulsion on the day of his release. This is a clear concession to Franco's plenipotentiaries waiting in Brussels for their admission into the Common Market.

Even whilst writing, we have news of yet another anti-Franco militant, Magno Cuevas, resident of Tarbes, receiving a deportation order. Spanish political prisoners and victims of Franco's influence in the Common Market countries urgently need help.

ANARCHIST BLACK CROSS.
FIIL.

Anarchist Federation of Britain

General enquiries should be sent to the London Federation.

Demonstrate in a great anti-government march and meeting on Wednesday, May 1 (11.45 a.m. Tower Hill): Offer your help to the London May Day Committee, 29 Love Walk, S.E.5.

AFB ANNUAL CONFERENCE. Can a group take on the job of organising it this year (other than London). Contact LFA.
LONDON FEDERATION OF ANARCHISTS. c/o Libra House, 256 Pentonville Road, London, N.1. Business meetings first Sunday of the month. For details apply to LFA.
LEWISHAM. Contact Mike Malet, 61B Granville Park, Lewisham, London, S.E.13. Phone: 01-852 8879.
EALING ANARCHIST GROUP. Get into touch with Ken King, 54 Norwood Road, Southall.
KING'S CROSS GROUP. c/o Libra House, 256 Pentonville Road, London, N.1.
S.W. LONDON LIBERTARIANS. Contact: 14 Clapham Court, King's Avenue (Acre Lane end), S.W.4.

OFF-CENTRE LONDON DISCUSSION MEETINGS

3rd Wednesday of each month at Jack Robinson and Mary Canipa's, 21 Rumbold Road, S.W.6 (off King's Road), 8 p.m.
3rd Friday of each month at 8 p.m. at Donald and Irene Rounou's, now at 13 Saverne Road, London, N.W.3.
3rd Friday of each month at Dennis Fen's, 314 St. Paul's Road, Highbury Corner, N.1 (above Roundabout Self-Service).

REGIONAL FEDERATIONS AND GROUPS

ABERDEEN ANARCHISTS meet 1st and 3rd Wednesdays of month at M. Dey's, 142 Walker Road, 2nd and 4th Wednesdays at Liz Smith's, 3 Sinclair Road. Correspondence to either address.
ABERDEEN ANARCHIST FEDERATION (SWF) local group, Folk Song Workshop and Committee of 100, Collier Climbing Club. Contact Iain MacDonald, 15 Cotton Street, Aberdeen.
BEXLEY. Enquiries to 150 Rydal Drive, Bexleyheath, Kent.
BIRMINGHAM LIBERTARIAN AND ANARCHIST GROUP. All anarchists, syndicalists, individualists, etc., please contact Geoff and Caroline Charlton, 32 Swindon Road, Edgbaston, Birmingham 17 (near Portland Road). Note new address.
BOLTON. Get in touch with Les Smith, 22 Grosvenor Street, Bolton, Lancs.
BOURNEMOUTH AND EAST DORSET ANARCHISTS. Please contact John McCain, 14 Milton Road, Bournemouth (B'm'th 22279) or Tim Deane, Juliet, West Moors, Wimborne, Dorset (Ferndown 3588).
BRIGHTON. Get in touch with Nick Heath, Flat 3, 26 Clifton Road, Brighton. Poetry read-

ings 8 to 10 Pool Coffee Bar, Pool Valley, Brighton.
BRISTOL ANARCHISTS. Contact Susie Fisher and Adam Nicholson at 15 The Paragon, Bristol, 8.
CROYDON and area Libertarians alternate Fridays from April 26, 35 Natal Road, Thornton Heath, Croydon.
EDGWARE PEACE ACTION GROUP. Contact: Melvyn Estrin, 84 Edgwarebury Lane, Edgware, Middx.
FIFE LIBERTARIANS. Contact Bob and Una Turnbull, 39 Stratheden Park, Stratheden Hospital, by Cupar, Fife.
GLASGOW ANARCHIST GROUP ONE. Correspondence to Robert Lynn, 2b Saracen Head Lane, Glasgow, C.1.
HERTS. Contact either Stuart Mitchell at South View, Potters Heath Lane, Potters Heath, Welwyn, Herts OR Jeff Cloves, 46 Hughenden Road Marshalls, St. Albans, Herts.
IPSWICH ANARCHISTS. Contact Neil Dean, 74 Cemetery Road, Ipswich, Suffolk.
KILBURN, LONDON. Contact Andrew Dewar, 16 Kilburn House, Malvern Place, London, N.W.6. Meetings 8 p.m. every Tuesday.
LEICESTER PROJECT. Peace/Libertarian action and debate. Every Wednesday at 8 p.m. at 1 The Crescent, King Street, Leicester.
NORTH SOMERSET ANARCHIST GROUP. Contact Roy Emery, 3 Abbey Street, Bath, or Geoffrey Barfoot, 71 St. Thomas Street, Wells.
NOTTING HILL. Please get in touch with John Bennett and Marilyn Paddy, Flat 4, 88 Clarendon Road, London, W.11. Tel: 727 9745. Meetings every Monday at 7 p.m.
ORPINGTON ANARCHIST GROUP. Knockholt, Nr. Sevenoaks, Kent. Every six weeks at Greenway, Knockholt. Phone: Knockholt 2316. Brian and Maureen Richardson.
READING ANARCHIST GROUP. Contact Alan Ross, 116 Belmont Road, Reading, Berks.
ESSEX & EAST HERTS FEDERATION

Three-monthly meetings. Groups and individuals invited to associate: c/o Keith Nathan, 138 Penny-mead, Harlow, Essex.
Group Addresses:—
BASILDON. M. Powell, 7 Lingcroft, Basildon, Essex.
BISHOPS STORTFORD. Vie Mount, 'Eastview', Castle Street, Bishops Stortford, Herts.
CHELMSFORD. (Mrs.) Eva Archer, Mill House, Purleigh, Chelmsford, Essex.
EPPING. John Barwick, 14 Centre Avenue, Epping, Essex.
HARLOW. John Deards, 184 Carter's Mead, Harlow, and/or Geoff Hardy, 6 Redricks Lane, Harlow, Essex. Monthly meetings in 'The Essex Skipper', The Stow, Harlow.

LOUGHTON. Group c/o Students' Union, Loughton College of Further Education, Borders Lane, Loughton, Essex.
MUCH HADHAM. Leslie Riodan, High Street, Much Hadham, Herts.
NORTH EAST ESSEX. Peter Newell, 'Maybush', Maypole Road, Tiptree, Essex. Group meets first Monday in each month, 7.15 p.m. at 91 Brook Road, Tolleshunt Knights, Tiptree, Essex.

NORTH-WEST FEDERATION

NORTH WEST ANARCHIST FEDERATION. BUXTON ANARCHIST GROUP. Secretary: F. A. Gresty, Punchbowl, Manchester Road, Buxton.
CHORLEY ANARCHIST GROUP. Secretary: Kevin Lynch, 6 Garfield Terrace, Chorley, Lancs.
LIVERPOOL ANARCHIST PROPAGANDA GROUP AND 'HIPPI' MOVEMENT. Gerry Bree, 16 Faulkner Square, Liverpool, 8. Meetings weekly. 'Freedom' Sales—Pier Head, Saturdays, Sundays, Events.
MANCHESTER ANARCHIST GROUP. Secretary: Dave Poulson, 9 Boland Street, Fallowfield, Manchester, 14.
MERSEYSIDE ANARCHIST GROUP. Contact Pete Sacker, 22 Sandon Street, Liverpool. Meetings: First Thursday of month, 8 p.m.

SOUTH WALES ANARCHIST FEDERATION

CARDIFF ANARCHIST GROUP. All correspondence to—Pete Raymond, 90 Albany Road, Roath.
SWANSEA ANARCHIST GROUP. Contact J. Ross, 111 King Edward's Road, Brynmill, Swansea. Weekly meetings, 'Freedom' sales and action projects.

STUDENT GROUPS

EAST ANGLIA UNIVERSITY GROUP (Anarchists and Peace). Contact Dave King, 17 Havelock Road, Norwich.
LIVERPOOL UNIVERSITY GROUP. Contact us at the Bookstall in the Students Union Entrance Foyer every Friday lunchtime. May 3, 7.30. Students Union—Cartoon Archetypal Slogan Theatre, Dennis Gould and the Sound Structure Quintet, Brian Patten and Adrian Mitchell.
LSE ANARCHIST GROUP. c/o Student Union, London School of Economics, Houghton Street, W.C.2.
OXFORD ANARCHIST GROUP. Contact Steve Watts, Trinity College.
SHEFFIELD UNIVERSITY GROUP. Contact Robin Lovell c/o Students' Union, Sheffield.
SOUTHWARK COLLEGE (New Libertarian Front). Contact Dave Higgs, Room T/7.
SUSSEX UNIVERSITY ANARCHISTS. For details contact Francis Jarman, 16 Charlotte Street, Brighton, BN2 1AG.

LIBERTARIAN TEACHERS' ASSOCIATION

Meetings—discussions—activities. Contact Peter Ford, 36 Devonshire Road, Mill Hill, London, N.W.7.

PROPOSED GROUPS

EDINBURGH anarchists contact Konrad Borowski, 13 Northumberland Street, Edinburgh 3. Tel: WAW 7459.
TAUNTON LIBERTARIANS. Contact Jill and John Driver, 59 Beadon Road, Taunton, Somerset. Meetings alternate Friday evenings.
ELTHAM (Libertarian/Peace Action). Contact Terry Liddle, 83 Gregory Crescent, S.E.9.
FINCH'S (PORTOBELLO ROAD) ANARCHIST GROUP. Contact: Pamela Pearce, 385 Latimer Road, W.10. Meetings every Wednesday evening at Finch's.
LANCASTER AND MORECAMBE ANARCHISTS. Interested in forming a small but dedicated group? Contact Terry Ann Higgins and Phil Woodhead, 6 Beecham Street Central, Morecambe.
EAST LONDON. Contact Ron Bailey, 128 Hainault Road, Leytonstone, London, E.11. LEY 8059.

ABROAD

AUSTRALIA. Federation of Australian Anarchists, P.O. Box A 389, Sydney South. Public meetings every Sunday in the Domain, 2 p.m. and Mondays, 72 Oxford Street, Paddington, Sydney, 8 p.m.
DANISH ANARCHIST FEDERATION. Gothersgade, 27, Viborg, Denmark.
VANCOUVER, B.C., CANADA. Anyone interested in forming anarchist and/or direct action peace group contact Derek A. James, 1844 Grand Boulevard, North Vancouver, B.C., Canada. Tel: 987-2693.
USA: VERMONT. New Hampshire Anarchist Group. Meets weekly—discussion, individual action. Contact Ed Strauss at RFD 2, Woodstock, Vermont 05091, USA.
SWEDEN. Stockholm Anarchist Federation. Contact Nadir, Box 19104, Stockholm 19, Sweden.
SWEDEN: Libertad, Allmänna Vägen 6, Gothenburg V.
TORONTO ANARCHIST GROUP. Contact R. Campbell, 219 Torvork Drive, Weston, Ontario, Canada. Weekly meetings.
BELGIUM: LIEGE. Provos, c/o Jacques Charlier, 11 Avenue de la Laiterie, Sclissaint-Liege, Belgium.
EAST AFRICA. George Matthews would like to make contact. Secondary school teacher from UK. PO Box 90, Kakamega, Kenya.
USA. James W. Cain, secretary, Insurgency Anarchist Association, 323 Fourth Street, Cloquet, Minnesota 55720, USA.
GROUP (TREASON). Australian Anarchist, c/o Melbourne University Union or Paddy Evans, c/o the same.
MELBOURNE. Get in touch with Bob Hopkins, 34 Dorritt Street, Carlton, Victoria 3053, Australia. Public meetings at Yarra Bank, Melbourne.

Race & English Nationalism

UNTIL RECENTLY IMMIGRANTS to Britain were, generally speaking, officially welcome because they were economically useful. The Huguenots, fleeing from religious persecution, were skilled artisans and did much to improve the weaving trade. During the Commonwealth, Cromwell invited back (after a four-centuries absence) the Jews, whom he needed to set up a modern banking system. The Irish influx of the mid-19th century was encouraged as it provided a pool of cheap labour for the construction of the new railways and other large civil engineering projects. More recently, refugees from Nazi and Communist persecution have been welcome as they have tended to be industrious and thrifty and economic assets to their land of refuge.

Due to all this, Britain came to be regarded as a land of tolerance and a haven for the oppressed. Editorial writers and politicians frequently congratulated themselves and the nation on the prevailing decency and fair-mindedness.

The next influx tested this 'tolerance' and found it wanting. Between 1948 and 1963 immigrants arrived in large numbers who were mainly unskilled and sometimes even illiterate. Their coming here was encouraged by the British Government and big business as they provided a supply of labour for the dirty, poorly-paid jobs that Englishmen would not touch during those years of economic boom. Nationalised industries like British Railways and London Transport opened recruiting offices in the West Indies and Pakistan. Unlike the immigrants of the past, these newcomers could not readily assimilate into British life as they were not of European background and culture. Nor were they encouraged to assimilate by a great many people here, nor did many of them wish to. For they were coloured and were soon accumulated in racial ghettos in the big manufacturing towns and London.

It is hard to tell if the politicians had it in mind when they encouraged the coloured immigrants to come here, but from the Government's point of view the immigrants could serve a political purpose as well as serving the more obvious economic one. As well as doing the unpopular, low-paid jobs in times of boom, the immigrants could be used as a scapegoat in times of slump. This is actually happening.

The Commonwealth Immigration Act was passed in 1963 after the relatively mild slump of 1962/63. Today, in 1968, during the much more serious economic stagnation and unemployment that began in 1966, the door has been slammed even to would-be coloured immigrants who have British passports and are highly skilled workers.

Accompanying all this has begun a hubbub about coloured immigration and what should be done about those already here and this is now a bigger talking point than the ills and shortcomings of capitalism and government which are responsible for the slump. Coloured immigrants are now blamed for social ills as well as economic ones.



While in fact most coloured immigrants are far from being the 'cool cats' of Hippie mythology and are

quiet, sober, religious and admirers of the 'traditional British way of life', they are alleged to be responsible for the following: (a) the spread of VD (which spreads just as fast in all-white countries); (b) unemployment (but there are still vacancies that white workers don't want in hospitals, transport, etc.); (c) the strain on the Health Service (which would collapse if it wasn't for coloured doctors and nurses); (d) living off National Assistance (which few coloureds do after their first weeks in Britain); and (e) overcrowding in schools and the housing shortage.

There is some truth in this last but suppose Alf Garnett's dream came true and an extremist government came to power that set about kicking out all coloureds. Would there then be plenty of houses? Such a government of the extreme right would be too busy conducting a bloody-minded foreign policy to worry about houses. Thus orthodox politicians have (with the able assistance of the press) loaded the blame for their own follies on to the shoulders of coloured immigrants.

But the immediate danger does not come from orthodox politicians but from unorthodox, would-be politicians. After thirty years in hiding, English nationalism has re-emerged from its hole and taken the streets again. It is getting a wide audience. People who do not normally think much about politics have become vociferous about coloured immigrants and their supposed evil influence.

English nationalism draws support and inspiration from other things besides coloured immigrants. The slump and other economic difficulties, the loss of national purpose, apprehensiveness about the 'new morality' and the 'permissive society', the riots in US cities and the apparent complete failure of integration there, Michael Malik and the black racists, general fear of the future—all these things have acted as spurs to English nationalism.

Nationalists often argue that as Scottish, Welsh, African, etc., nationalism are generally regarded by liberals and radicals as mild and reasonable things, why get hot under the collar about English nationalism? The answer is that Celtic, African, etc., nationalism are mainly introverted, non-aggressive things, whereas English nationalism is permeated by an atavistic regard for the days of empire and frequently by a desire to re-establish the Empire in some shape or form. For instance, with the exception of one or two forays (which were part of an essentially defensive strategy), the Scots have not attacked England since Roman times yet English armies have frequently ravaged Scotland and ended up by conquering it. English nationalism hates Celtic nationalism like poison and sees the whole of Britain as its power base. Should English nationalism ever get in the saddle, there can be no doubt that it will suppress Celtic nationalism as thoroughly as Franco suppresses Basque and Catalan nationalism.

Nationalism (like fascism proper) has an elemental appeal at times of crisis. It seems to transcend class, religion, etc., and gives a great feeling of unity—a feeling that at last the confusion of the past is being cleared away and the nation or race can now, at last, march forward to its historic destiny (etc., etc.). It promises adventure and violence which attracts bored, rootless, city-dwelling modern people. In its sophisticated form, it (fascism) puts forward economic panaceas which are attractive to people who have no clear idea of economics.

How does one combat rising nationalism? As its disciples are governed mainly by their emotions, rational argument is useless. To fight with violence is simply to play into the nationalists' hands for, once

street fighting and meeting wrecking starts, the nationalists set themselves up as the champions of order and traditional values against the 'red anarchy' and win over more uncommitted, generally peaceable citizens.

To try to have a sensible or even coherent argument with many people on the subject of race is an impossibility. Shrill assertions that 'the blacks are taking over' or 'they're going to kill us in our beds' are the limits of many people's views on the matter. Equally difficult to argue against is the contention of nationalists that integration simply doesn't work (the US seems to show proof of this), and that racial tension and hostility were there before the National Front came along, and the nationalists are only stirring things up in order to finally solve the problem by creating a White Britain with the coloured people sent back to where they came from.

Perhaps the answer to this sort of thing is to appeal to peoples' material self-interest by pointing out that while nationalists might 'solve the colour problem' so far as Britain is concerned, they would at the same time set up a militant, ruthless state which would smash the unions, wage war and generally put Britain into a worse plight than is alleged to result from the presence of a few hundred thousand coloureds.

When I last wrote on race relations (in 1965), an answering letter stated that 'anarchy now is the only solution'. But the writer of the letter failed to state how anarchy

was to be achieved just like that. Perhaps the most practical thing is to work alongside liberals and other people of goodwill.

If the unorthodox, nationalist, would-be politicians start making real headway, and turmoil results with the nation split into two main camps, orthodox politicians (the so-called social democrats of the labour and conservative parties) will have the chance to step in (in the interests of order) and impose their authoritarian solution, a kind of fascism. Fascism is classically the answer of the classes of order to revolutionary situations which fail to reach a climax. In Italy, Germany and Spain, broadly speaking, the order-loving elements, tired of the continual dogfight between labour on the one hand and capital plus orthodox politicians on the other, muscled in to impose their 'solution'.

Perhaps orthodox politicians in Britain will give this situation a new twist by muscling in between nationalists and liberals. In the resulting set-up, the National Front will be banned, so will the Celtic nationalist parties, Colin Jordan will be in prison again, coloured women will still be scrubbing hospital floors and a polite euphemism will be used to describe the new regime. Things would be more centrally controlled, hierarchical and disciplined than ever, and there would be the degree of authoritarianism necessary for a nation with a second (technological) industrial revolution going on in its midst. R.J.

JOSEPH ARCH, Trade Unionist

THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF JOSEPH ARCH. MacGibbon & Kee. Fitterley Edition, 30/-.

READING THIS BOOK took me back to the morning of memory. Back to an early August morning at the beginning of this century.

We were traversing a large Essex cornfield—the day promising very hot. The tall wheat heads heavy with dew, which brushed the shoulders of my grandparent—a tall, powerfully-built man. I walked steadily behind him, sheltered and dry. The old man relived much of his boyhood when he walked these fields and lanes, often in the early mornings. On this day, he was quickly telling me that the field we were crossing was—in his youth—common land and as such worked in part by his parent. Now, all that remained to the Common Weal was the path upon which we walked. My elder spoke of one Joseph Arch, whom he held in great respect. Recounting the man's efforts on behalf of the farm workers, deprecating as scant reward the financial charges made against the Union founder. These charges Arch easily refuted, for he was a man of integrity, scrupulous in money, as in other matters.

Joseph Arch is one of the key figures in the history of British Trade Unionism. He began life as a farm labourer in early Victorian England, and at the age of fifty began the movement to organise the poverty-stricken farm workers, the majority of whom were born, lived and died in poverty. Because of the tied-cottage system—still in being today—those whose breadwinners were feckless, or offended, or suffered much ill-health—their plight was dire indeed. Their habitations, more often than not, despite the gardens and flowers, were unspeakable hovels. This was made even plainer when they were vacated.

Joseph Arch was able to continue his efforts on behalf of his fellows, because he had inherited a family cottage for his wife and children from a forebear who had purchased it for forty pounds. Thomas Hardy, who attended one of Arch's meetings, has recorded that there was a remarkable amelioration, which to an impartial auditor went a long way in the argument. The picture he drew of a comfortable cottage life as it should be, was well within the grasp of his listener's imagination. An old labourer in the crowd held up a coin between finger and thumb, exclaiming: 'Here's sixpence towards that, please God'. Nobody, who saw and heard Arch in his early tours through the countryside, will ever forget him and the influence his presence exercised over the crowds he drew.

It was common enough on inferior

farms to hear a farmer, as he sat on his back, midst a group of workers, contemptuously shout his orders and tirade to his silent hearers—turn his horse to heel and ride away. Arch was a fine skilled worker who increasingly had to travel further afield to obtain employment. Very, very many were victimised. The highest wages paid to men were ten shillings per week and the women were paid sixpence per hour for seasonable work. There was constant employment for boys of seven or eight years old at from 1/6d. to 2/6d. per week. The girls—mere children—were sent to service as soon as possible. Their parents often reluctant, but under necessity, glad to get them assured food, warm shelter and a start in working life. Local traffic was mostly horse-drawn in those days and horses used for work on the farm, which was very hard. At the day's end, the men could be readily seen either leading or astride their horses, their straw satchels slung over their shoulders, steadily making their way over fields, or along lanes to the homesteads and stables.

The 'Men of Dorset', by their lives, were well and truly set in the midstream of life on the land of England and Joseph Arch, a successor midst countless others, belongs to them and is sincerely honoured for it. The life and struggle of these times are recorded honestly in the pages of this book. Arch had a jingoistic attitude to foreigners—shared by his own elder—mainly due to limited vision and experience. But today, land-workers are widening the range of their ideas and gaining in freedom; increasingly realising that the primal evil is cruelty and the new world can be a kinder and better one. Yet, let it be remembered that Arch endured trials, accusations of speculation with the Union funds and other troubles. He sought nothing for himself. The Liberal Party gave him support and some money and he became a Liberal MP for a Norfolk constituency until 1902. Living his last years in his cottage, he was glad of a little help.

At the end of his life, Arch came to think that most of the Union aspirations had been attained. It was not so, as subsequent history has shown. And its task in the future, in face of increased industrialisation and the creation of huge holdings and estates with much foreign investment control, requires an active awareness of the many changes taking place, to perceive the trends going to form the pattern of the future, that the young may be attracted to the life and work on the soil of our country, in a manner of more full inheritance. 27.2.68. S. L. ROBINSON.

POPE, CATHOLICS & PEACE

PAUL VI has announced a 'Day of Peace' which will be held every year on New Year's Day. Under pressure from the warlike happenings in Vietnam he has evidently felt the need to recall the Church and the faithful to the meaning of evangelical peace.

After having shook hands with President Johnson and sent a diplomatic peace mission to Vietnam, the Pontiff has thought it opportune to review and polish up the themes of peace with justice and freedom of peoples and nations, which should be dominated by the Christian message, that is, by Catholic dogma and ritual.

So far, no harm in this. Catholics are not called upon to refuse to take part in wars and hence, if called up by the military authorities, they can continue to go out and kill each other on the fields of battle... even more than they do in the usual acts of rancour and hostility in the world of commerce, and so do all the other Christians of various confessions.

Paul VI has not even suggested non-violence as the only valid method by which Catholics can resist evil, as laid down by the apostle Paul and the early Christian martyrs.

Hence, the Catholic conscientious objector Fabrizio Fabbrini has sent an 'open letter to the Pontiff', published by various papers, in which the Pope is invited to take up a decisive position on the problems that afflict humanity; to condemn genocide in Vietnam; to no longer align the Church with the powers-that-be; to go on a peace mission to Hanoi; to consent to a peace campaign from below, according to the tenets of Gandhian non-violence; the union of young Catholics and non-Catholics in action for peace; to liquidate the structure of the Roman curia, which is so worldly and remote from the Christian spirit; to abandon all capitalist specula-

tion and all forms of Vatican power, and finally to abandon compromise and tactical and diplomatic manoeuvres and half-measures.

How did the high Catholic hierarchy reply? By ordering, through the Secretary of State, the arrest by the Roman police of 18 young Catholics and non-Catholics who were praying in the Piazza San Pietro on December 31 ult.

Cardinal Lercaro, on his own bat, has declared in a homily that one can no longer distinguish seriously and truly between total and partial war, between world war and apparently localized conflicts, since these can no longer be kept within safe limits; one cannot distinguish between one and the other, neither in the political nor strategic sphere. This is shown by the South Asian conflict which is causing repercussions all over the world, and the continual passing from limited to unlimited types of arms.

Now, one may ask, after this statement of a position, and in view of the precedent of Cardinal Spellman (who blessed the American Crusade in Vietnam), what new line of thought will the Catholic Church assume?

The condemnation of conscientious objection seems to be expressly made in a recent affirmation by the Pope, as stigmatized in the periodical *Nuovi Tempi*. So what now? If anyone who doesn't want to kill can be assailed by the maximum authority of the Catholic Church, what advice can one give the Catholic Pacifists? Still the same old one of the licity of their participation in 'just wars of defence' while, on the other hand, the *Codex of International Moral* (published by 'Civiltà Cattolica') and Cardinal Ottaviani have laid down that 'today it is difficult to distinguish between just and unjust wars'. From *Volonta*, March, 1968.

tr: jws.

Conflict in China

MARXISTS, HAVING a tendency to denigrate the revolutionary potential of the peasantry, very rarely mention the fact that the commune movement in China was started by the peasants themselves, unbeknown to the government. The first commune was set up in Sueping County in Honan province, when 27 peasant co-operatives united to form the Weihsing Enlarged Co-operative. They 'were concerned only with their own affairs' when they did this, yet the benefits for production were so obvious that the government took up the idea and soon the movement had swept China. Later the government found that 'local initiative was consistently outrunning government expectations, and that one of the government's primary concerns was how to control popular enthusiasm'.² Obviously the government didn't want any social movement to get beyond its control. But there were other reasons.

In spite of Fred Hoffman's statement that 'landlords and capitalists were long ago ejected from the social structures of the new China' (FREEDOM, 27.1.68), the contrary is true. After the war, the Chinese CP had a great success in 'enlisting the great body of Chinese intellectuals under the coalition banner of the Central Peoples Government at Peking. This enlistment of intellectuals, it should be noted, has gone hand in hand with a similar absorption of former warlords and military governors, both processes being obvious expedients of the transitional take-over period'.³

But how long was this 'transitional period' to last? In 1956 and 1957 privately-owned firms were partly taken over by the state. Take for example the owner of Wing On Department Store, Shanghai. After the state take-over he remained in power so that even in 1966 he was saying to himself 'If only I hold on to the power, keep my staff and the name of the store, some day a telephone call will make Wing On mine again!'.⁴ During the cultural revolution in Shanghai the offending name-plate 'Wing On Company' was removed by Red Guards, and the store was re-named, but whether the former owner was removed from office is not stated, though we can get a good idea from the fate of the director of Shanghai No. 3 Iron and Steel Works (see below). Thus, even in 1966, the *Liberation Army Daily* could say that the 'remnant forces of the bourgeoisie in our country are still fairly large'.

And so the 'remnant forces of the bourgeoisie' want to destroy the commune movement, the revisionist bureaucracy want to limit it and control it, and the Maoists want it to be universal, but at the same time control it.

Pity the poor peasantry!

But let's face it, Mao loves the idea of the 'workers' state'. He would hate to see the restoration of private capitalism, or China going the way of Russia. To try to create a 'workers' state' is a labour of Hercules for, as we anarchists know, such is impossible—every state must by definition have its rulers. Bosses are bosses be they dressed in pin-stripes and bowlers or blue overalls. Mao's idea of a 'workers' state' is one in which everyone and everything has the superficialities of proletarian culture. (Rather like Barcelona 1936 without workers' control.)

In order to attack the bureaucracy in his attempt to create this impossible 'workers' state', Mao used the army and also the students and workers, and in order to keep state control over the movement he relied on the cult of Mao-worship. But to destroy the bureaucracy completely would be to destroy Mao's power and the Chinese state itself, so the result was to give the appearance of limited bureaucratic power, by instilling 'proletarian culture' into the bureaucracy. And so each bureaucrat must do several hours manual labour each day and use public transport; but as far as their power is concerned they may as well have a daily rest: bureaucrats they remain.

Apart from Liw Shao-chi (who is the Maoists' chief revisionist enemy), the major opponents of Mao in the Peking Municipality were Teng To, Lia Mo-sha and Wu Han. These three controlled the papers *Frontline*, *Peking Daily* and *Peking Evening News*, in which they criticised the Maoist line in columns called 'Evening Chats at Yenshan' and 'Notes from Three-Family Village'. In opposition to the growth of the communes, they 'exploited certain economic difficulties caused by the grave natural calamities to concentrate on stirring up an evil flurry of attacks on the General Line and on bolstering up the restorationist activities of the landlord and capitalist classes'.⁵

Briefly, their programme stressed the need for scientific research work, criticism of the fact that the Party rejected their advice, the value of leisure activity, support for art, and the control of experts in their own field. They caricatured Mao-worship and claimed that the Party was 'running amok' during the Great Leap Forward. They also used the infamous slogan 'exploitation has its

merits'.

By September, 1962, the 'Three-Family Village Clique' was in retreat, but their control over Peking Municipality was not finally destroyed until the beginning of the cultural revolution.

But Mao wanted all the other forms of literature and art to be under the control of his faction. However, this was not to be revolutionary art but 'socialist realism' (in fact far from reality). As in Russia under the bureaucracy 'Smash the Whites with the Red Wedge' was replaced by a picture of Lenin with protruding jaw pointing the way to the glorious socialist future, so fine art in the Chinese tradition was to be replaced by a westernised representation of Mao surrounded by the adoring workers of the world, rather like the pictures of Jesus suffering the little children of all races to come unto him, that one used to see in Sunday School.

As art was to be subject to politics, 'The basic task of socialist literature and art is to strive to create heroic workers, peasants and soldiers armed with Mao Tse-tung's thought. . . . We should enthusiastically create heroic images of workers, peasants and soldiers. . . . This means that our writers must sum up the material from real life accumulated over a long period to create typical characters of various kinds'.⁶ What must be destroyed are 'works concerned only with love and romance, pandering to philistine tastes and claiming that love and death are eternal themes'.⁷

Some people, opposed to such strong state interference in the arts, said that 'the problem of the orientation of literature and art in our armed forces is already solved, and what remains is mainly the problem of raising our artistic level'.⁸ They claimed that 'the creative study and application of Mao Tse-tung's works by workers, peasants and soldiers' was 'philistinism, over-simplification and pragmatism'.⁹ They must have been having some success as the Maoists complained that 'the literary and art work in the armed forces has also been influenced to a greater or lesser degree by the black anti-Party, anti-Socialist line'.¹⁰

Nevertheless the Maoist's first success was with the Peking Opera which they soon had under their control acting solely as a propaganda organ. Soon workers were busy producing works of art for the glorification of those in power: 'Workers, peasants and soldiers are now writing many fine philosophical articles which express Mao Tse-tung's thought in a practical way. . . . The numerous poems by workers, peas-

ants and soldiers which appear on wall-newspapers and blackboards are especially noteworthy'.¹¹

Workers brought their creations to Peking University where they were criticised as works of art, which the government obviously did not like, but even it had to admit that they were poor, explaining to the workers: 'It is no easy matter to produce good models of proletarian literature and art'.¹²

But to criticise art inspired by the authorities is to criticise the authorities themselves, so the artists were attacked. 'They advocated "truthful writing" in order to seek out the "seamy side" of life in socialist society, and the rotten things left over from history, so as to paint our splendid socialist society in dark colours. . . . They argued that too many of our films dealt with the revolution and armed struggle and that unless a break was made, no really new films could be produced. . . . Other advocates of this theory were in favour of writing works with "human interest", "love of mankind", "insignificant people" and "minor events". The aim of these proposals was actually to lead literature and art astray from the path of serving proletarian politics.' Others 'slandered the vast majority of our poor and lower middle peasants as people in an "intermediate state" vacillating between socialism and capitalism' and 'repeatedly clamoured that our writing reeked of gunpowder and our stage bristled with guns, and that this was inartistic' and 'argued that the spirit of the age was a "merging" of the "different ideologies of the different classes" and that it included pseudo-revolutionary, non-revolutionary and even counter-revolutionary ideas'.¹³ (This could very well have been a left criticism of contemporary China.)

The artists who were saying all this were within the left spectrum. They were 'waving red flags to oppose the Red Flag, and donning the cloak of Marxism-Leninism and Mao Tse-tung's thought to oppose Marxism-Leninism and Mao Tse-tung's thought'.¹⁴ The Maoists found in them a parallel with the Hungarian 'artists and intellectuals who organised the Petofi Club and acted as the shock brigade in the counter-revolutionary riots'.¹⁵ They were thus helping 'imperialism, modern revisionism and the reactionaries abroad and the landlords, rich peasants, counter-revolutionaries, bad elements and Rightists at home'. The artists complained that the Maoists were 'overwhelming others by the use of position or power',¹⁶ to which the Maoists replied that 'there is only class truth in a class society, and no such thing as abstract truth above classes'.¹⁷ Moreover their adoption of the 'black banner of liberty, equality and fraternity'¹⁸ was a bourgeois sham.

Meanwhile hundreds of thousands of students were coming to Peking for mass rallies and education in Mao Tse-tung's thought. The schools and universities were closed. Later these groups of Red Guards went back to their home towns to bring the cultural revolution to industry, to make the managers adopt proletarian customs, to set up 'revolutionary committees' of soldiers, students, workers and managers to run industries and towns, and to increase production by persuading people to work harder for no more money. At the same time these 'revolutionary committees' would be controlled by the central government.

And so a strange situation was created. The central government, in its conflict with the revisionist bureaucracy and members of the old capitalist class, was using the army, youth and the workers as its weapon, hoping to control these three by the worship of Mao Tse-tung. Very dangerous when one considers the strong regional loyalties in China,

the fact that China has a native libertarian tradition going back thousands of years and that the Chinese anarchist movement had virtually entered the Communist Party en masse during the civil war. (See the letter from a Chinese Anarchist that appeared in FREEDOM about two years ago.)

The people now had the managers on the run. Why should they obey the dictates of the central government? Why take part in the Stakhanovism? Why should they not express their individuality? Why not press for a better standard of living?

And so reports began to reach the Western Press of faction fights among the Red Guards.

These reached such proportions that the Maoists dug up Mao's *On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People*, written in 1957, in which he said: 'But this freedom is freedom with leadership, and this democracy is democracy under centralised guidance, not anarchy. Anarchy does not accord with the interests or wishes of the people'. By 1967 the point was being made that this opposition was not Kruschevite: 'We are confronted by two types of social contradictions—those between ourselves and the enemy, and those among the people themselves. The two are totally different in their nature'.¹⁹ The latter included 'all sorts of petty-bourgeois trends of thought: anarchism, individualism, subjectivism, small-group mentality, "mountain-stronghold" mentality (i.e. local community power) and so forth'.²⁰

Advice was given that the two proletarian factions 'should not revel in "civil war"; they should not attack or revile one another or use physical violence and cause disorder in solving contradictions among the people'.²¹ So both factions were called upon to 'unite and forge an alliance on the basis of Mao Tse-tung's thought'.²²

The first alliance was brought about by Peking's literary and art workers (i.e. any worker who had anything to do with propaganda). Formerly the opposition had 'made big contributions in the struggle against the handful of Party people in authority taking the capitalist road, and yet, at the same time, because of differences in views and the influence of anarchism, departmentalism, the small-group mentality and individualism, a good many contradictions and disputes existed among the different revolutionary mass organisations'.²³ To celebrate the alliance supporters of both factions to the number of 14,000 people took part in a mass demonstration on June 10, 1967.

But the threat from the left continued. On February 3, 1968, the Hebei Provincial Revolutionary Committee was founded after smashing 'the class enemies schemes to undermine the great proletarian cultural revolution from the Right and the Ultra-Left'.²⁴

How did a left opposition line arise in industry? Let us take the example of Chen Ta-Tung, former director of Shanghai No. 3 Iron and Steel Works. This man 'during the early period of the great proletarian cultural revolution had carried out the bourgeois reactionary line and suppressed the revolutionary masses'.²⁵ Later some of the revolutionaries, after attacking him, considered that 'the self-criticisms he made were on the whole satisfactory'.²⁶ After this the Maoists wanted him to return as head of the factory committee. The left wing opposed this, 'afraid of the possibility of him taking revenge once he was again in the leading post'.²⁷ A section of the People's Liberation Army brought their weight to bear on the question and Chen Ta-Tung is now head of the committee that runs the factory.

This is important. The army is the main bulwark of Maoist support and it expresses most clearly the Maoist line. Whenever the Maoist

Red Guards have been in difficulty the army has shown off its strength in support of them as at Tsingtao: 'At the critical moment when the proletarian revolutionaries were launching a struggle to seize power from the handful of Party people in authority taking the capitalist road within the former Tsingtao Municipal Party Committee, Unit 6037 held an armed demonstration to support the revolutionaries'.²⁸

But let us return to Shanghai.

The cultural revolution began there when revolutionary rebels plastered the walls with big-character posters attacking the then present power structure for treating the workers 'in much the same way as the bourgeois employers do', for not letting them study Chairman Mao's writings, planting favourites in key positions, relying on experts and stressing material incentives rather than the workers initiative and political consciousness. As a result of this the Maoists were attacked and many of them imprisoned. Nevertheless, on November 9, 1966, the Shanghai Workers Revolutionary Rebel General Headquarters was set up. The leading members were however driven underground. The administration set up a rival 'Workers Red Detachment', and paid the workers massive bonuses to keep them on their side. The workers naturally accepted the money, probably thinking that if the Maoists won this would be their last chance of a bonus for a long time. Having got what they wanted from the bureaucrats they went home. Many factories closed down completely, railway traffic was interrupted and other public transport came to a complete standstill. The electricity and water supplies were sabotaged.

Why were the workers opposed to the Maoists? An account of some of the Maoist's activities will give us an idea. 'In factories where members of the so-called "Red Detachment" had left their jobs, the revolutionary rebels heroically took their place, with one man often doing the job of two. Many worked two or three shifts at a stretch . . . some brought their bed-rolls to the factory and worked day and night'. (Mao's king-size version of the 'I'm Backing Britain Movement'.)

In the strike-bound factories the administration had collapsed, but the strikers began to return to work when they saw that the Maoists could run everything. Later a United Municipal Revolutionary Committee was formed, a union of the Red Detachment, the Maoist Workers' General Headquarters and elements of the People's Liberation Army. (*China Reconstructs* has pictures of the army scabbing during the strikes—the more things change, the more they remain the same.)

But this was one popular front the Maoists were not going to control. The people proceeded to have a ball in Shanghai as this following quotation from *The Times* (London, 7.2.68) shows:

'In Shanghai, which was genuinely seized by the Maoists in January, 1967, there has been a serious erosion of authority. An editorial in a Shanghai newspaper speaks of "the serious problem of anarchism". It says that this anarchism masquerades as a desire for individual liberty (sic).

'It mentions workers "who refuse to do work they dislike". Others, apparently officials, act entirely on their own initiative. Students go to school as and when they please.'

A short time later the Maoists were getting even more worried as the anarchist threat grew.

The Times (London, 26.2.68) had this to say:

'Peking today attacked the growing anarchism within China. According to the official newspaper *Peoples Daily*, even the "proletarian revolutionaries" have been affected by "this evil wave".

'In a strongly worded comment

Continued on page 5

Imprisonment of Students and Professors at Pahlavi University, Iran

SIX YEARS AGO Pahlavi University was planned for Shiraz in the hope that it would ultimately become the centre of advanced research in Iran. The old provincial university was corrupt and inefficient and the universities in the capital city were equally so and in addition were plagued with political unrest. The Shah gave the university his family name and instructed that it be modelled on the pattern of American universities. Pennsylvania University was asked to advise and assist in staffing it. Predictably the general social and political situation, coupled with administrative incompetence, have made the original objective impossible to achieve and now a series of student strikes have paralysed the university. In the latest and most serious strike 35 students and four Phds have been arrested and imprisoned. From February 20 till the end of the Iranian New Year holiday on March 30 there will be no classes and it seems likely that the strike will continue.

The strike and punitive reaction by the University Administration against the students and faculty was started off by a trivial incident. At a student social gathering on February 15, the Director of Student Affairs refused entry to some students, there was an argument and a scuffle and the Director brought the police in to the few students involved. The students regarded this as a private matter and objected to the police being brought in their club. Over the weekend the informal students' organisation built up this trivial incident into a major issue and by the following Tuesday were demanding the resignation of the Director of Student Affairs and the acting Chancellor Mr. Mataghi, also the elimination of foreign interference. Superficially this strike bears a close resemblance to some industrial strikes in Britain in which a whole industry comes to a standstill for trivial reasons unintelligible to the onlooker. The old proverb 'it's the last straw that breaks the camel's back' describes such a situation in which a long line of individually trivial incidents build up into something that is cumulatively intolerable. However the arrests and political accusations are quite different.

On Tuesday, February 20, mass meetings were held and the students threatened to close the main library down by force if necessary, so the administration officially closed the library to protect the foreign staff. On Wednesday the students held further meetings and in the evening 250 of them invaded the main administration block, locking themselves in and imprisoning the Director of Student Affairs—which led to his nervous breakdown a few days later. For the next three days student patrols could be seen on the roof and on Thursday morning the police isolated the students inside from the 800 students outside, cordoning off the whole area, establishing road blocks so that it was impossible to get within 100 yards of any entrance.

Hundreds of students could be heard chanting 'Mataghi is a thief'; which is nothing new as it is common knowledge that he escaped a smuggling charge by the intervention of the Shah. After the last abortive strike, foreign faculty members (who are difficult to intimidate) told the students concerned about his threats to the Iranian faculty, his lies and general incompetence in university affairs. Not willing to accuse him on the grounds that Mataghi had not received any higher education and knew nothing of university affairs, that let his own incompetence condemn him.

In addition to this, the students also invented the fanciful notion that he was in the pay of the CIA. Mr. Mataghi and the Governor-General at this stage let the students cool off and they correctly

reasoned that if they were left in control of the building without food supplies their aggressiveness and will power would break down. It was not a quick matter however, and four days later they had to issue an ultimatum saying that they would send in troops and police with rifles and staves to flush them out if they did not come out quietly.

A few hours later the students gave themselves up and 35 were arrested by SAARVAK, the secret police, and taken to the airport before going to prison. On the following Saturday, students were given another ultimatum, 'Re-enrol or drop out of the university' but this did not work out as about half of the stu-

dents enrolled and then most of them refused to attend classes and at this point some of the faculty refused to give lectures. By this time, the true feelings of the faculty began to show through the facade of faculty and administration unity, but no one had the guts to express it openly to Mataghi except one Iranian who put forward a resolution calling for a meeting of the faculty without Mataghi to discuss the matter. Not one of the brave new builders of modern Iran would second the motion that all agreed upon.

During the strike no mention of it was found in the press or radio news items, but the rumour grapevine came into full operation and news of the strike became common knowledge in the capital city and other universities. Due to their own inability to control the situation the administration became fearful for their positions and began looking in earnest for a way out of the mess, by finding a scapegoat. Mr. Mataghi told a meeting of the faculty that 'outside influences had caused the strike' but refused to name anyone on the grounds of 'security'. It was about this time that the arrests of faculty members started, but by March 10 the faculty had plucked up enough courage to successfully demand the release of the chairman of the English Department and soon afterwards they sent a delegation to Tehran to see the Court minister and absentee Chancellor Dr. Alam. He was asked to sack Mataghi and come to Shiraz and do his job.

THE BACKGROUND

In a country where corrupt practices were universal a few years ago, and still are to a lesser extent, in which the Royal Family finds no great handicap in having one of its members picked up by foreign police for smuggling narcotics, Mr. Mataghi's errors are not extraordinary; however, the student charge that he is paid by the CIA follows from the distrust people of high position are held in. Just a few days previous the former Prime Minister, Dr. Amani, was charged with corruption by the police and evidence shows he received vast sums from the Oil Consortium for services rendered to the British. To be fair to Mr. Mataghi, his record for opposing foreign influence is excellent. He risked his job two years ago trying to prevent university courses being taught in English and has infuriated the foreign faculty in the English Department by insisting they stick to the mechanics of teaching English and leave literature alone. In the last strike he wholeheartedly supported the students against the faculty after a male student punched and threw an English woman earnestly trying to explain the subtleties of Ernest Hemingway's *For Whom The Bell Tolls*, out of the classroom. When the faculty protested about this he took Iranian members of the faculty aside and said that if they did not keep their mouths shut, he would sack them, make it impossible for them to get a job in Iran and prevent them from getting an exit visa. The same brand of power-mad ignorance was displayed by SAARVAK interrogators who tried to use Barry Goldwater's book on Communism found in the possession of one faculty member as evidence of his communist activities.

On the other hand, a foreigner was accused of being CIA when he tried to photograph the demonstration. Students kicked and punched him till they got his camera and destroyed the film. No amount of reasoning before or after would convince them otherwise. Meanwhile CIA-trained SAARVAK used standard issue 8 mm. miniature cameras hidden on their person to photograph the lot. During the strike, on those rare occasions that Iranians pluck up courage to say something, faculty made references to the Oil Cartel, control of Iran by foreign industry, American and Russian manipulation of Iran. When Iranians educated abroad think this, imagine what the inexperienced students think.

In fact, CIA interference is very limited now, and the only reason foreign industry dominates Iran is that the Iranian Government has begged them to come. The real reason that foreign industry will always be in the dominant position is that Iranian engineers and economists prefer status Government desk jobs and dislike working in industry. Manufacturing, especially small scale light industry, is the key to Iran's future development, but the Iranian intellectuals are not interested in creating the dynamic to get it going and by their contempt for manual work, no matter how skilful, ensure its stagnancy. The faculty too seek a scapegoat for their own inadequacies in not providing the leadership in the drive for industrialization.

After the Republican Dr. Massadeh came to power in 1951 with CIA assistance, they removed him again when he violated American interests by nationalizing the oil industry. They put the inexperienced Shah back on his perch with a group of reactionaries for a Government. They showed the SAARVAK how to crush the spirit of politically-conscious Iranians and how to create so much suspicion and fear that no one would express his ideas openly. By the time they had reorganised the identity card system and duplicated files for every Government employee, introduced random sampling of mail and telephone calls and demonstrated the modern technology of surveillance, the Republican sympathisers were ruined, economically and socially, and many fled the country. Since then, to his credit, the Shah has virtually eliminated direct US meddling but the CIA-created organisational structure of suppression remains.

There is a kind of poetic justice in that the fear and suspicion created by American intervention is now bouncing back upon them. As for the future, SAARVAK interference in student affairs will continue, faculty will be aware of big brother standing at their back, thus making a suitable atmosphere for research impossible to achieve. After a respectable period of time, Mataghi will be kicked upstairs, but for a long time to come the suppressed and unnatural state of calm will continue to be broken by strikes.

BAKUNIN.

Conflict in China

Continued from page 4

by Jen Li-hsin, the paper gave a warning that unless the anarchist wave is halted the revolutionary committees that the supporters of Mao have set up to replace a large number of the old provincial and municipal administrations may be overthrown.

Jen claims that the anti-Maoists are deliberately encouraging anarchism "as a bridge to counter-revolution". The main attraction of anarchism, the paper says, is that it is lucrative. Some comrades are afraid that if they oppose anarchism they will find themselves in a less advantageous position than their fellow-workers who are making a profit from this "corrupt, reactionary, bourgeois wave".

Jen accuses "not a few comrades" of joining the anti-Maoist camp, of trying to sabotage the national economy, and degenerating into criminals. He calls for firm punishment of these elements. However most of those who have supported anarchism have been misled, according to him, and this group should be "patiently persuaded to alter their ideology".

"Although today's article is only one more in a long series of appeals for national unity, it strongly suggests that the breakdown of the central government's authority has become significantly more serious in recent weeks."

- *Highway 61 Revisited
- Blonde On Blonde
- *John Wesley Harding
- Judy Collins: Maid Of Constant Sorrow
- Golden Apples Of The Sun
- Judy Collins 3/4/5
- *In My Life—*Wildflowers
- Songs For Greek Lovers:
- (Mikis Theodorakis) (EMI)
- Greek Popular Music:
- Mikis Theodorakis (CNR) Holland
- *Important.

Recent Records

"If one group, party, or Government wishes to keep the artist in check, there is only one possibility, namely that the group itself becomes the instrument of the human life and of the time."—Mikis Theodorakis.

Mikis Theodorakis: *Greek Popular Music*. (CNR Netherlands KLP 4207.)
Judy Collins: *Wildflowers*. (Elektra.)
Bob Dylan: *John Wesley Harding*. (CBS.)

IMPOSSIBLE to justify such an unusual variety of records together, except that they have all been recently released. Judy Collins set a standard of informed symphonic accompaniment to songs traditional and contemporary on her previous record, *In My Life*, an LP on which Joshua Rifkin arranged and conducted the orchestral elements brilliantly. This album should be heard by anyone who doubts the power of song and poetry as an expression or weapon of anger, sorrow, ideas! (It contains songs from *Marat/Sade*; Brecht; Leonard Cohen; Jacques Brel; Beatles and Bob Dylan's *Just Like Tom Thumb's Blues* which has an incomparable Elizabethan backing.) *Wildflowers*, her second LP with Joshua Rifkin's arrangements, confirms the new tradition she shares: that of Georges Brassens; Jacques Brel; Arlo Guthrie; Phil Ochs, a new Phil Ochs on *Pleasures Of The Harbour*; Leon Rosselson and *The Incredible String Band*. Her own songs *Albatross* and *Since You Asked* seem very much the influence of the Canada poet and songwriter, Leonard Cohen; and remorsefully saddened by loss and what-might-have-been-love.

Leonard Cohen's own songs, poems with music, *Sisters Of Mercy*; *Priests*; *Hey, That's No Way To Say Goodbye*, are all demanding. Demanding the poet's ear: the public's voice. *Lasso Di Donna*, a ballad of Francesco Laudini, is a 14th century lament song with spine-chilling

beauty. A Goddess Lives!

Mikis Theodorakis, now released from jail and reunited with his family, conducted the session on this LP of *Greek Popular Music* (an LP released by CNR in Holland). Of the many recently issued records of bazouki (Laikki) music, this is the clearest example of Mikis Theodorakis's influence and songs—settings also to poems of Seferis; Gatsos; Kamenelis; Elitis. Beware the French LP recently issued, which is very poorly recorded. Maria Farantouri sings with a voice which combines the Blues feeling with the Greek experiences and character as interpreted through Theodorakis music and her very own spirit and voice. Wondrous. Her anthem—celebration and remembrance of the *Mauthausen* poems has to be heard live! (Mauthausen—the German Concentration Camp of World War II.) This same LP has *Marina* and *Varka Sto Yalo*, two Theodorakis favourites. Look out for it. (CNR No. KLP 4207.) Beautiful Pop!

Bob Dylan is a poet and storyteller in the Georges Brassens/Jacques Brel style. He always has been; but previously more easily placed into smallminded categories such as Woody Guthrie's stepson; Pete Seeger's cousin; The Beatles best friend:—Comparing *John Wesley Harding* with his very first LP, *Bob Dylan*, there is a very close likeness in rhythms and styles—if the songs have changed a great deal. He was given inspiration by Woody Guthrie (and indeed who has not?), encouraged by Joan Baez, raved about by Robert Shelton, critic.

This, his eighth LP, has simple backing of drums, bass, guitar, harmonica, with occasional help from an electric guitar. The songs are mostly disturbing ballads like *All Along The Watch Tower*; *I Pity The Poor Immigrant*; *I Am A Lonesome Hobo*; *I Dreamed I Saw St. Augustine*; vaguely distinct persons: wanderers; jokers; tramps; drifters; Robin Hood

gangsters; etc. Absurdly, the *New Society* review claimed that his 'tunes are always more important than the words'. Also that he 'seems to settle for that sorry wisdom. Mellowness maybe. It sounds like defeat'. Firstly in the majority of his songs, from *Talkin' World War III Blues* to *Chimes Of Freedom*; *Desolation Row* to *I Pity The Poor Immigrant*, the words are the story and the music. And his 'sorry wisdom' has been in every song Bob Dylan ever sung. For it is that quality of sober acceptance; that life is tragic; relationships and people change; seasons come and go but injustices continue; death is within his life, within every life.

Don't Look Back, his film, should be seen for his singing; for the triviality of touring friendships; for the business deal between his manager and the BBC; for him. For Bob Dylan: envied, hated, copied, revered, loved, listened to! Buy just every one of his LPs. Listen quietly to some four hours of Bob Dylan. Then relax and begin to follow your own thoughts and songs; ideas and poems. For Bob Dylan would echo the late and lamented giant of song and poetry: Woody Guthrie: 'You may have been taught to call me by the name of a poet, but I am no more of a poet than you are. I am no more of a writer of songs than you are, no better singer. The only story that I have tried to write has been you. I never wrote a ballad nor a . . . story neither one that told all there is to tell about you. You are the poet and your everyday talk is our best poem by our best poet. All I am is just sort of a clerk and climate tester, and my workshop is the sidewalk, your street, and your field, your highway and your buildings. I am nothing more nor less than a photographer without a camera. So let me call you the poet and you the singer, because you will read this with more song in your voice than I will'.

DENNIS GOULD.

—Woody Guthrie.
Discography:—Bob Dylan (CBS)
*Freewheelin'
Times They Are A Changin'
*Another Side Of Bob Dylan
*Bringing It All Back Home

A few weeks later the *Daily Telegraph* reported that the Chinese army was calling for more central control by the government.

The latest news (*Sunday Times*, 24.3.68) is that China has re-introduced conscription and the first people to be conscripted are the former Red Guards.

Nearly all this information has been obtained from the Peking press and from *The Times*, both of which are hostile to anarchism. We desperately need to know direct from our comrades how strong they are in China and what they are doing. It may very well be that for the first time since the Spanish Civil War anarchism as a mass movement is a serious threat to a government.

BOB BLAKEMAN.

NOTES

- ¹Felix Greene: *The Wall Has Two Sides*.
- ²ditto.
- ³Brandt, Schwartz and Fairbank: *A Documentary History of Chinese Communism*.
- ⁴China Reconstructs, December, 1967.
- ⁵The Great Socialist Cultural Revolution in China, Vol. 1 (Peking).
- ⁶Liberation Army Daily, 18.4.66.
- ⁷ditto.
- ⁸ditto.
- ⁹Liberation Army Daily, 7.6.66.
- ¹⁰Liberation Army Daily, 18.4.66.
- ¹¹ditto.
- ¹²ditto.
- ¹³The Great Socialist Cultural Revolution in China, Vol. 1 (Peking).
- ¹⁴Liberation Army Daily, 4.5.66.
- ¹⁵ditto.
- ¹⁶Peoples Daily, 4.6.66.
- ¹⁷ditto.
- ¹⁸ditto.
- ¹⁹Red Flag No. 10, 1967.
- ²⁰Peking Review No. 6, 1968.
- ²¹Red Flag No. 10, 1967.
- ²²ditto.
- ²³Peking Review, 23.6.67.
- ²⁴Peking Review No. 6, 1968.
- ²⁵ditto.
- ²⁶ditto.
- ²⁷ditto.
- ²⁸China Pictorial No. 2, 1968.

Building Workers' Claim

THE LEADERS of the building trade unions are notorious for the way they have loyally followed the Labour Government's policies on wages. Even with the Tories, they meekly accepted a lousy package deal giving 94d. per hour increase over a three year period. When the Labour Party came to power, they accepted the wage freeze and have voted for the TUC's wage-vetting machinery.

This support has been given against the wishes of the members. At last year's conferences, both the Amalgamated Society of Woodworkers and the Amalgamated Union of Building Trade Workers passed resolutions against the wage restraint. However, at the February conference of union executives, the leadership of the ASW, the largest union in the industry, voted for the TUC's 3½% increase. Now the unions, through their Federation, the National Federation of Building Trades Operatives, have submitted a claim for a 15% wage increase. Naturally, knowing how the union leaders have behaved in the past, building workers are very suspicious about the claim. How can men who have supported government policies at conference now submit a claim for a 15% increase.

So far, negotiations have been conducted under what has been called a 'veil of official secrecy' and all that the NFBTO are saying is that they want £17 11s. 8d. per week for craftsmen, £15 per week for labourers, with a 40-hour guaranteed week and three weeks annual holiday. On the face of it, this does not seem a bad claim if there were no strings attached, but from what is emerging from under the 'veil of secrecy', building workers will have to be very much on their toes if they are not to be saddled with a diabolical agreement.

Press reports reveal that the employers' first reaction was that 'no money could be paid at all'. However, the employers have put forward several demands which have been incorporated into the negotiations. They want the industry's National Joint Council to take control of a bonus system, laying out how these payments will be arrived at and what they will be. At the moment, the bonus rates are negotiated by the stewards and local officials at site level.

The employers also want a work study engineer, employed by the NJC, whose job would be to bring in time and

motion study and act as arbitrator in bonus disputes. Further demands are an elimination of restrictive practices, control of unofficial disputes, no guaranteed week where a stoppage of work occurs and annual holiday credits to be dependent on a full week's work. If workers leave jobs in breach of the Working Rule Agreement, the employers want some form of penalisation.

DECASUALISATION, ON WHOSE TERMS?

The NFBTO, in their *Builders Standard* of December, 1967, have said: 'That the whole basis of payment and employment be changed from the present hourly one to a weekly one. The Claim has been lodged well in advance of the time—November, 1968—when the next wage agreement should begin to operate. This was a wise move on the part of the unions, because if fundamental changes in the character of the industry are to operate as the unions envisage, then some considerable time will be needed to work out the details.'

What are these fundamental changes? So far the NFBTO has not been forthcoming. Obviously the decasualisation of the industry would be welcome, but on whose terms? Employers, and this is especially true of the big ones, now have a high volume of work guaranteed for years ahead. Unlike before, a stable labour force is now seen as a means of keeping costs down. The employers do not want a high turnover in labour as this keeps up their administrative costs and effects their planning and finishing schedules.

Decasualisation would be a fundamental change, but so would a reappraisal of the industry's wage structure and this seems to be the only way of getting round the opposition of the employers and the Government to a 15% wage increase.* Could this not mean some form of grading system with varying rates of pay for workers in the same trade? This type of agreement has already been signed in the Electrical Contracting Industry and has been referred to as a possible blue-print for the whole of the building industry. Employers, as a whole, are looking with envy at this 'slaves' charter'.

An agreement of this sort would not only suit the employers, but also the union executives. It would take away much of the negotiating that now takes place at site level and so weaken site

organisation. Militant workers could be hounded out of the industry. In fact an agreement of this type is a pure business deal between the unions, who are selling the labour of their members, and the employers, who are providing the necessary work.

COMPANY AGREEMENTS

While the electricians' agreement goes the whole hog, building workers can see the way things are developing by looking at the recent company agreement between the NFBTO and John Laings. This gives the unions 100% membership on their sites, an agreed bonus scheme and stewards being sent to school at Laings expense. It provides certain basic site conditions, such as a decent canteen, meals and adequate washing, toilet and changing facilities, but these are things that should be provided anyway. However, the whole agreement was drawn up and signed without any reference to the membership and gives the trade unions an easy access to members. The whole concept of a 'closed shop' is changing. Now, even the most reactionary trade union leaders are thinking along these lines with the employers and they see it as a means to control or expel militants from the union and then out of the industry.

A lot of building workers are only too aware of these developments and are doing something about it. At a recent meeting at the Conway Hall, called by the Barbican sites' workers, a committee was elected to get a campaign going to prevent any agreement, like the electrical one, being foisted on the rest of the industry and to make the union leaders come out into the open, letting them know in no uncertain terms that the membership will not wear such an agreement.

With the pay policies of the present Government, union leaders will become more willing to enter into this type of agreement. After all, Mr. Gunter, the ex-Minister of Labour, welcomed the one for the electricians and so it could become an example for other industries. Now is the time to stop it. Building workers should demand the 15% increase and the three weeks' annual holiday, but with no strings attached.

P.T.

*The Government is probably going to refer the claim to the Prices and Incomes Board.

The Unlicensed Theatre

CENSORSHIP OF THE ARTS, that ultimate defence weapon of human vanity, will not be ending in the theatre with the end of the Lord Chamberlain's powers. The latest public body exhibiting pretensions in the direction of theatre censorship is The Arts Council, under the direction of Lord Goodman.

In a letter to the *Sunday Times*, Lord Goodman stated that 'The Arts Council is not a censoring body. Our duty is to select organisations or people of a sensible and responsible character and to allow them complete freedom to choose the productions they wish to perform. Any other working method would not be respectable in relation to a large-scale system of public subsidy.' That is to say, The Arts Council is already acting as a moral censor in the allocation of its funds. We are all familiar with the type of person the establishment considers to be 'sensible and responsible'. And we are too familiar with what these people will do to please their masters. I would have thought that the duty of The Arts Council was to help artists, regardless of the impression they created in society—it was the work that mattered, and not the appearance of the man.

This statement must be taken as a taste of things to come, where all art, encouraged to be dependent upon the state to a greater or lesser degree, is obliged to limit its activities to state-approved expression.

Goodman's letter to the *ST* was an attempt to justify an earlier step taken by The Arts Council which, if the new

censorship bill is passed, will only be of a temporary nature. The Arts Council have issued a directive to all subsidised theatres stating that Arts Council funds cannot be used to 'subsidise illegalities', i.e. unlicensed plays.

This directive has now been challenged by Nicholas Fairbairn, an advocate, chairman of the Edinburgh Traverse, who considers it wrong in law. Mr. Fairbairn has written to the Scottish Arts Council substantiating his challenge with a legal argument that club theatres are not subject to The Theatre Act of 1843, which includes licensing provisions in its wording. Now the Scottish Arts Council may take legal opinion to clear up the situation that has arisen concerning the relationship of club theatres and the Lord Chamberlain's Office.

The Scottish theatre does at least appear to have its priorities right, which is more than can be said for its big brother south of the border.

However soon the Lord Chamberlain's powers are removed, The Arts Council, with its curious definition of duty, will remain, and, by censoring at source, must pose a far greater threat to free expression in the theatre than the Lord Chamberlain has ever done.

Under its present interpretation of 'duty', the title 'The Arts Council' is a misnomer. As far as theatre is concerned, it has too little to do with Art. Another title should be found which accurately reflects its present function of subsidising consensus entertainment.

I.D.

The Drama of the Emigrant

EMIGRANTS are living forces who escape from their own country. Men who begin by living at home, but have to leave and live in another's house, often under poor conditions.

We all know the gap left by a youth when he is called up for military service. Governments know it, and often exempt the sons of widows and others with family responsibilities, but they ignore, or pretend to ignore, the gap left by the emigrant, who is not always full of love for his native land, nor a source of wealth.

The first truth is the wealth represented by the arms of this energy-capital which the receiving country obtains, and these, at the same time, are lost by the old country, sometimes for good, sometimes just for a period.

Many put down roots in the new country, which becomes their own.

For the first few days everything is home-sickness. Because the emigrant has his own way of doing things and the people he used to call foreigners have theirs.

But from the moment he crosses the sea, or a frontier, he finds he is the foreigner. He sees his old idea of foreigners reflected by the people around him. As though the makers of public opinion were always trying to make the seas wider, and the frontiers farther away. They want to separate rather than unite. This, which is bad, is even worse

social revolution.

A. Uloth says that 'For good or ill we are living in Lilburne's Utopia right now'. I would say that for good or ill we are living in a society whose foundation-stone was laid as a result of fear gripping all sections of the property classes in 1649, fear which was a result of the activities of the Levellers, or in Lilburne's own phrase, 'the hobnails, clouted shoes, private soldiers, the leather and woollen aprons and the laborious and industrious people of England'.

In a way the same people who will make the next English Revolution.

I. R. MITCHELL.

More on the Levellers

I DO NOT KNOW whether Arthur Uloth's review of James Duke's book on 1649 is an accurate representation of the author's views (I am in the process of getting the book to find out), but in any case what he says is controversial enough to merit immediate attention. Since an actual Revolution in which the masses of the people were mobilized in order to kill each other (and in the course of which at least half-million actually were killed) is a unique occurrence in our history, it is obvious that this event should be fully understood, especially by those who are interested in repeating the occurrence. In this respect Arthur's review is not a contribution to socialist history, but is mainly a contribution to the cultural mystification practised upon us by the official 'experts' in our society—historians, writers, etc.

He begins with the assertion that 'the two movements described in this pamphlet were never more than minority movements'. Now this is just not true, and it reinforces what the above-mentioned experts would have us believe, i.e. that the course of history is determined by the actions, conflicts and ideologies of those at the summit of the social pyramid, the Cromwells and Clarendons, etc., and that the common people are just passive pawns or, in the case of people like the Levellers who cannot be obliterated from history, 'minority movements who looked forward to the Welfare State' (sic).

Although what Arthur says of the Diggers, whose three known groups never totalled more than 100 people is true, the Levellers were no mere sect, but expressed, more or less exactly, the class aspirations of the English peasants, artisans and petty shopkeepers; and they had probably more supporters at their height than any other group or party in England. For example, in the period May-June, 1646, the first of intense Leveller activity, the Levellers in the

army, received petitions of support from Essex (with 1,000 names), Herefordshire (1,200) and Norfolk (1,400). Three years later, when Lilburne was arrested for treason, 10,000 signatures demanding his release were collected in three days in London alone. They also successfully organized the army to resist embarkation for Ireland (they didn't form a united front with their fellow Parliamentarians to knock hell out of the Irish' as A. Uloth claims; many refused to go, and eventually only about half went, under duress), staged the two most effective mutinies in the history of the British army at Burford and Ware, and were, as Brailsford in his monumental *The Levellers in the English Revolution* shows, the driving force of both the march on London by the Army in 1647 and the execution of the King. These are the activities of no mere sect (although Cromwell and his kind probably muttered 'close-knit body of politically-motivated men'), indeed the existence of the Levellers was the most significant fact in English politics in the years 1646-49.

The review further claims that '... in 1649 the majority of the people were interested in religious not social questions'. This again is mystification and erroneous and reinforces the 'compartmentalisation' that passes for scholarship in our society. In an age when there was no mass popular press or other media, the pulpit was the most important way of winning men's minds to any cause. Social questions were expressed in religious terms, and religious issues concealed the class aspirations of the different social strata. Take for example this beautiful quotation from Winstanley's 'Law of Freedom'.

'In that nation where this Commonwealth's government shall be first established, there shall be abundance of peace and plenty, and all nations of the earth shall come flocking thither to see his

beauty, and to learn the ways thereof. And the law shall go forth from that Zion, and the word of the Lord from that Jerusalem, which shall govern the whole earth.' Religious? Social? Any distinction is meaningless. By the way, Winstanley was no 'religious mystic', for him Christ was universal freedom; God reason.

Finally although the estimate that there was 'no serious chance of a social revolution in England in 1649', is essentially correct, it conceals something far more important. The Civil War had been fought between, on the one hand, the monarchy, the declining aristocracy and the Anglican Church, which gave them religious and hence ideological justification and, on the other, the small, but close-knit capitalist class which had developed since the dissolution of the monasteries, the merchants and the country gentry—all of these groups were pariahs to the Anglican church because of their commercial habits, and Puritanism was their ideology. At the beginning of the war this second group had the active support of the mass of peasants and artisans, but as the Revolution progressed these people saw their hopes in Parliament come to nothing, and they revolted on a mass scale. It was this that led the two originally opposing groups in the Revolution to come together, driven by a common fear of unrest from the lower orders.

The peculiar character of British capitalism, where the aristocracy was not thrown on the dunghill, but continued to play an important political role, and where business was invested with feudal traits that are only now being eradicated, was the result of this coming together of these normally antagonistic classes in 1649, further developed by an exactly similar process in the early Industrial Revolution, outlined by E. P. Thomson in his *Making of the English Working-Class*. This in itself was a

when the emigrant has to go to work, like a mule at a well. Unconcerned by anything else but going round and round (in peace or war), without opinions. And this is only when they need him. At other times—no. When there are bad times and a shortage of work he is elbowed out by his very companions of toil the day before, who are full of this patriotic spirit which is so harmful to good relations between men.

These are the most dramatic moments of the emigrant's life. Hard for the one who relies entirely on his pay for his morale and livelihood. If he has no job, what then? Go back to your own country—we look after our own people first!

At these times they bring in special laws to share out the work—one foreigner in ten, contracts not to be renewed, or they only do certain types of work, the most heavy, and in certain places only.

Neither hard work, nor the locality are the worst. What hurts most is being marked out in a particular manner. As though being called a foreigner meant being a different kind of creature. In the world of today, if wealth were differently distributed, human well-being would be a fact. Instead, work is the principal difficulty for the worker (who is the creator of wealth).

tr: jws.

L'Esprit (25.2.68).

ANARCHY 87

The Penal System

ANARCHY is Published by FREEDOM PRESS at 2s, on first Saturday of every month

FROM PROTEST TO CHALLENGE

BOB BLAKEMAN has elsewhere in this issue made some points which we think are important to Anarchists and the movement. They are that on some issues it is important for us to give our support with other groupings on the 'left', that we should demonstrate, as at Easter with the VSC, in support of the German students and that we should take part in demonstrations such as on March 17.

As Bob Blakeman points out, we do not have to lose our identity and should at all times point out our own views on the issues and our revolutionary solutions. This we did on March 17 with the 'Neither Washington nor Hanoi' leaflet and the response to it was good, especially as most of those who took them favoured a victory for the NLF. This tolerance, a willingness to discuss and an acceptance of differing points of view, is a new and important development on the 'left'. Revolutionaries will have differing concepts but we can co-operate as long as we remain free to say what we think, but we should be there

with them on the streets.

Anarchists have for many years said that the Aldermaston march was institutionalised and once again the authorities have shown their ability and the effectiveness of incorporating movements of protest into harmless channels. We felt this at Easter, 1961, and broke away in Whitehall on our own demonstration, when the police and the CND marshals were getting everyone else to fold up their banners. We did it again the next year, spreading out across the road.

In 1963, with the added inspiration of the 'Spies for Peace' disclosure, we were even more successful. That year, despite the strong opposition from Peggy Duff and other CND organisers, the Anarchist banner headed a breakaway group to Warren Row and R.S.G.6, who were soundly denounced for their action. This year it was part of the march and Julie Felix played and sang to a row of coppers. It is now 'respectable' in the same way as it was 'respectable' in 1964 to occupy the whole width of Whitehall at the end of the CND march. The previous year, despite the opposition of the police and the CND marshals, Anarchists had done this and were abused.

The leaders of CND have always seen themselves as social democrats, asking governments to change their policies. They have never recognised that the State and the whole coercive apparatus is the enemy. They thought that exhortations would bring about the abolition of nuclear weapons.

When the Committee of 100 was formed, Anarchists became members, took part and were fined and imprisoned, but the vast majority who defied the law thought that by doing this they would bring chaos and force the Government to give up nuclear weapons. They did not succeed. Their commitment did not go far enough. When the State replied by imprisoning Lord Russell before the Trafalgar Square sit-down, they were shocked. We were all frightened and after that the support started to diminish.

This does not mean, as some are saying, that non-violent resistance is finished. It only means that the people

who took part, with their mainly middle-class backgrounds, realised what they were up against and were not prepared to carry on. People have seen that the Committee of 100 failed to change the Government's policies on nuclear weapons, but having failed, this does not invalidate non-violent resistance as a method of struggle. Equally, occupying the whole width of the road, breaking through police cordons, charging the police guard at the American Embassy are expressions of opposition to 'orderly' marshalled demonstrations in which the police and organisers co-operate so much that the whole thing has no effect.

Demonstrators want to make an impact. They want to physically challenge the system that perpetuates mass slaughter. A whole new movement is springing to life which not only wants to abolish nuclear weapons, but also wants to do something about the whole system we live under. They are not content to protest, they want to challenge and to assert themselves. They see that the attacks on living standards here are linked with the war in Vietnam. They want to run and control their own lives and from the recent turn of events, they have made a good start.

EDITORS.

FIFTH COLUMN

Right?

THE LETTERS in this week's FREEDOM signal a return to the good old days when the violent and the non-violent savaged one another in print week after week. I hope that the editors feel able to cut this new controversy when the relevant points have been scored.

Some of the violence boys seem to be leading with their chins—as Godfrey Featherstone did last week.

For example, it is true as I. R. Mitchell says, that the formal anarchist movement has not traditionally been non-violent. It is also true that FREEDOM is an anarchist paper. But it does not follow from this that FREEDOM should not print articles in favour of non-violence.

The fact that in the past anarchists have supported and used violence is no argument at all in favour of the support and use of violence in 1968. And it is still less an argument for the exclusion from the columns of FREEDOM of people who support non-violence.

Peter Kropotkin supported World War I. Peter Kropotkin was an anarchist. Therefore I. R. Mitchell should support World War III. And FREEDOM should close its columns to deviants.

It is significant that those who support traditional anarchist violence depend for their illustrations on the thinkers and issues of the past.

I. R. Mitchell quotes Malatesta's reference to violence as *morally justifiable*. This is a phrase without meaning. Morality is as obsolete as anarchist violence.

No purpose is served by trying to answer the question: is violence right or wrong? The answer depends on who you are—there is no code which people in general accept. The question of interest to anarchists is: will violence achieve a free society? This question will not be answered by appeals to Malatesta—or to what our fathers did (or didn't do) in 1936.

It will not be answered by abuse or by suppressing other anarchists' views. It will certainly not be answered by saying that certain anarchists are not entitled to the label.

Wrong!

MY REFERENCE last week to the Buganda tribe was inaccurate. Buganda is where the Baganda live.

There—Said it!

HAVING AVOIDED THE term in the past I can now use it: Enoch Powell, you are a fascist bastard.

WYNFORD HICKS.

Minority Scapegoat

IN THE LATEST issue of *Befreiung* (No. 4, 1968), there is an open letter quoted by a correspondent 'R.E.' of West Berlin, from a student body in the technical school of the Free University. Part of it runs as follows:

'This is not now a matter of shades of opinion, it is now a plain fact that all people of youthful appearance with dark glasses, a beard, or unusual clothes are no longer safe in this city. . . . We do not believe that the top dogs like Springer are so silly not to know the true causes of what is happening. We do not believe they are so silly that they do not recognise the characteristics of Fascism:

- The branding of a minority as the scapegoat, for canalising aggression arising through the repressive regime.
- The pushing off of all difficulties, especially the economic ones, on to that same minority.
- Militant anti-communism. Mobilisation of "healthy national sentiment" and "national sense of community". ("We Berliners.")

'This is why we declare war with them and their supporters. The students in this country—and we believe we speak for those not involved in "Left" politics—will not allow a brown-shirt movement like that of 1933 to arise from the abyss. The students will not be frightened off by police drubbings, tear-gas, pistols and prison; they will take up their constitutional right of opposition and do everything to prevent a repetition of what seemed done for in 1945. And everyone who willingly or otherwise furthers Fascism will have to reckon with us.'

trs: G.C.

MOVING FUND

Target is £500.

Received to Date—£378 6s. 6d.

PREMISES FUND

Target is £1,000 per year.

Pledges received to date—£397 18s. 0d.

Pledges honoured to date—£310 3s. 1d.

Anarchist Analysis

Dear Comrades,

The present confusion in the anarchist movement in Britain is not only confined to theory but also to action, as the recent Easter meeting in Hyde Park showed.

As I said in FREEDOM (13.4.68) the anarchist analysis can be summed up in the slogan 'Neither Washington Nor Hanoi'. It is important that we use this slogan as often as possible.

Trotskyist Vietnam groupings have criticisms of the NLF which are not expressed in their slogans. As a result idolization of the NLF and Ho Chi Minh exists among the rank and file.

After an NLF victory the Trotskyists will have to re-educate these people away from this particular 'follow the glorious party leader' attitude. If we continually use our 'Neither Washington Nor Hanoi' slogan our position will be honest, unconfusing, and anarchist. We cannot affiliate or join such non-anarchist groups as the VSC as we would have to 'recognise the NLF as the sole representative of the Vietnamese people' (VSC policy statement), which we should not do for all the usual reasons.

This is not to say that we should not join in their activities.

We should join in the activities of the other Vietnam groupings for the same reason that Bakunin fought at the democratic barricades in 1848, the Russian anarchists fought with the Bolsheviks against the Whites, the Spanish anarchists fought with the Socialists against the Nationalists, and the British anarchists have joined in CND demonstrations: because we have a common enemy. But at the same time we put forward our own line and slogans. We know that the statist are our enemies, but this time we will be ready when they attack us.

There are at least three Vietnam groupings: the Communist - inspired British Committee for Peace in Vietnam, the Trotskyist 'Vietnam Solidarity Campaign' and the Maoist 'Britain-Vietnam Solidarity Front'. Also the Trotskyist Socialist Labour League has Vietnam demonstrations. Usually none of these groups takes part in each others demonstrations. We do not have to fall into the trap of that sectarianism that is common among the pseudo-revolutionaries because their differences are about minor

Letters

points and personal rivalry among the leaders.

Our difference with them is one of principle and basic revolutionary analysis: that is why it is safe for us to join in their activities. When major anti-fascist or anti-imperialist demonstrations are being held we should join in them. When more than one major demonstration is being held we should join the more revolutionary action (the VSC being at least a political revolutionary group whereas the BCPV is a legalist group) and we should take into account the urgency and topicality of the action.

This is why I argued at the Hyde Park meeting that we join the VSC and march with them to the German embassy to show our solidarity with the German students.

The quality of the publicity we will get will be better than if we divide the anti-fascist forces by holding separate demonstrations at the same time as the Marxist groups do. The anti-fascists will be much more receptive to anarchist ideas if they know that we are uniting with others against the common enemy. Separate anarchist demonstrations where we would not get the support of the Marxists (such as outside the Chinese legation or the Cuban embassy) should be held at different times.

It is my opinion that we should hold a line based on an anarchist analysis and unite in action with the various Marxist groups now, or the anarchist movement in Britain will suffer such a defeat that it will take many years to recuperate.

To do otherwise would be to betray our anarchist principles and undo the work that has resulted in the growth of the anarchist movement in Britain over the last few years.

Fraternally,

Staffs, 16.3.68. BOB BLAKEMAN.

Avoiding Schisms?

Dear Comrades,

I don't want to go into G. Featherstone's 'analysis' (FREEDOM, 20.4.68) of the March 17 demo; apart from saying that such distorted pessimism about its aims and achievements are as ridiculous as the corresponding over-enthusiasm we are meeting on the same issue from other sections of the libertarian movement.

To me the most important point he brings up is the repeated assertions that if you are not non-violent you are fraudulent and hypocritical to call yourself an anarchist.

Now, to my knowledge, the anarchist-communist movement has never been non-violent; and as FREEDOM is an anarchist-communist organ, people who are non-violent (and who also find their views on the present international and domestic situation echoed by such revolutionary groupings as the Guardian, the NCCL, the PPU and the Disaster Emergency Fund) should not be continually airing their views in the paper; or if their views are aired let them be short, and with the Editorial mention that the anarchist-communist movement in this country is not non-violent.

There is nothing stopping these people from having their own paper and organization, as is the case in France, for example. In these circumstances relations with them could be on a non-sectarian basis, but with the situation as it is now, bitterness, confusion and

possible schisms are all we can expect.

If we are serious revolutionaries, and believe, with Malatesta that:

'The slave is always in a state of legitimate defence and consequently his violence against the boss, against the oppressor is always morally justifiable, and must only be controlled by such considerations as that the best and most economical use is being made of human effort and human sufferings.'

then let us attempt to put our house in order. I sincerely hope that I never again see tears being shed in FREEDOM for policemen injured by demonstrators, or appeals that we should send them money. These people have no claims on our humanity, their lives count for little.

Yours fraternally,

I. R. MITCHELL.

Aberdeen. *Malatesta: his life & ideas (Freedom Press, pages 53-4).

Gen. Franco's Bedsocks

Dear Editors,

In the absence of any decision on common action by anarchists we naturally differ in our opinions of demonstration tactics, ranging from the (majority) view that most anti-war demonstrations should be joined, to those who draw the line at working with supporters of a Ho Chi Minh victory, or those who will not co-operate at all with the so-called peace movement. We all accept anarchism within the normal interpretation of the word (or 'mainstream' tradition if you will). We reiterate our view that we are neither for the government in Washington nor Hanoi nor elsewhere.

Having made our position clear we accept the challenge of Godfrey Featherstone that we should dissociate with him and his brand of non-violent authoritarianism. We find the last two issues of FREEDOM have been devoted to the 'pacifist' case for which *Peace News* exists. On the one hand, there is the glorification of the Rev. Martin Luther King. Jack Robinson uses King's 'martyrdom' to further his own sectarian viewpoint, but omits to point out that his 'anarchistic' parson Luther King only talked non-violence when violence was unacceptable to the State. He could advocate it (e.g. intervention in the Arab-Israeli War; or support for the Second World War) when it was within legality. It is hypocritical to say violence did nothing for the Negroes, when on any plain showing there was no interest in their housing problems until they began using it. Jack Robinson needs this double-think to reconcile his anarchism and his pacifism, and we need not begrudge him it.

On the other hand, the glorification of the police is more serious. Godfrey Featherstone—though he equates anarchism with non-resistant Christianity and pretends to be an anarchist—makes it clear where his sympathies lie. He not only defends the police, he repeats lies made by police agents, and must be regarded in that light himself. He and those who think like him are not in our movement. FREEDOM must choose; it cannot be both a paper for anarchists and for non-violent authoritarians, including police sympathisers (your correspondent the *Peace News* editor makes it plain he has room for them, too). Fair enough to 'print other sides of a question' but one must choose between liberalism and anarchism, and the sickening adulation of M.L.K. by Jeff Claves on your front page and 'collect for a cop' within, makes it look as if you have chosen.

Some pacifists can no doubt be anarchists, but not authoritarian pacifists like Featherstone. The personality cult of the Rev. Luther King (Canon Collins

next?) has bred a new type of pacifist, who may be in the Dick Sheppard tradition but is certainly out of place in any anarchist movement. What would be the attitude of any of these to a situation vaguely resembling Spain 1936? 'A fascist might be killed. . . . That's what's going to happen, if such violence continues.' Medical aid 'to both sides'; send money for General Franco's bedsocks. This may or may not be genuine pacifism; but those who hold these views are not our comrades, not even our non-violent allies.

STUART CHRISTIE,
ADRIAN DERBYSHIRE,
JAMES DUKE,
ROSS FLETT,
ALBERT MELTZER,
MARTIN PAGE.

We are criticised by our comrades for allowing articles and letters to be printed in FREEDOM that do not necessarily reflect our editorial viewpoint. Our concern is the furtherance of anarchist ideas and believe that only through free discussion will the anarchist movement be able to make up its mind on the many topics that confront it. Were we to close our columns and our ears to the many differing counsels—the anarchist movement would break up into a thousand fragments.—EDITORS.

Sitarist of 'Tintagel' Fined

Dear Comrades,

Along with 12 others, I was arrested outside the Springer offices in the Daily Mirror building last Monday. I was knocked over by two policemen and my knees were badly damaged as a result. I and two French students—Jean-François Teitler and Pierre Brumberg—were taken in a police bus to Snow Hill Police Station. We were then charged with various offences under Section 39 of the City Police Act, ranging from threatening and insulting behaviour to assault and obstruction. All of this I was required to translate for the benefit of the French—the police interpreter proving incompetent. Photographed along with Jean-François and fingerprinted I was then put in a cell; refused bail to start with, but eventually released at the insistence of two other members of the group, and after about four hours in the cells.

Fines in the morning ranged from £7 to £26. Being myself totally breadless I would appreciate any assistance in the form of donations to pay for my own and the other folks' fines. (The French have had their paid already.)

13 Wisteria Road, P. H. CURRIE.
Lee High Road,
Lewisham, S.E.13.

'No Sich Person'

Dear Sir,

In case you have received any money for that policeman with the fractured spine (other than 'Vietnam' dollar bills), for whom P.C. Godfrey Featherstone appeals, and may be wondering if the good kind police will now charge you with obtaining money under false pretences, let me assure you on behalf of all peace-police-lovers that he really exists. I have taken him flowers. In the same ward, suffering from senility, are Dreyfus' correspondent, the man who wrote the Zinoviev letter, the Spanish Black Hand organiser, the Chief Elder of Zion, and other police pensioners.

Mrs. 'Arris (having no doubt learned nursing from her best friend, that pearl amongst women, Sarah Gamp) is tending them and 121 policemen besides.

Yours faithfully,

COLIN CANNONS.

DOWN, DOWN

FINANCIAL STATEMENT

Estimated Expenses:

16 weeks at £90: £1,440

Income: Sales and Subs.: £1,047

DEFICIT: £393

Merthyr Tydfil: P.L.L. £1; Oxford: Anon* 10/-; Leeds: D.S. 1/-; Berkeley: L.M. £1/16/-; London, S.E.17: R.R. 10/-; Cheltenham: L.G.W.* 10/-; Hove: G.M. 7/6; Chorley Wood: S.E. 4/-; New York: M.M. £1/4/-; Portlucano: D.R. £1; Heemstede: V.A. 4/-; Montreal: W.F. £1/9/-; London: L.B. 10/-; Ruislip: L.B. 10/-; Prestwich: B.S. 5/-; London, S.W.8: N.W. 14/-; London, W.2: R.E. 10/-; Gothenburg: I. J. £1; Colchester: J.T. 2/-.

TOTAL: £13 0 6

Previously Acknowledged: £219 13 8

1968 Total to Date: £232 14 2

Balance B/F: £393 0 0

TOTAL DEFICIT: £160 5 10

*Denotes Regular Contributor.

Tenants and Workers Unite!

IN 1960 the Tory-controlled St. Pancras Borough Council imposed savage rent increases on their tenants, accompanied by a differential rents scheme. Tenants' Committees were rapidly organised and a great campaign was set in motion to resist the increases. A mass rent strike began.

Court Orders were eventually obtained to evict two tenants and their families—Arthur Rowe and his son from 'Silverdale' and Don Cook, his wife and children from 'Kennistoun'. The two flats were barricaded, a Defence Committee was set up, and pickets were posted day and night for almost three weeks. When the Law struck (as you can read below) it was like a military operation. Twenty-eight bailiffs and at least 400 police were involved. After the evictions a near

riot developed, so great was the anger of thousands of working people in St. Pancras. Many arrests were made, six of us were sent to prison and many more were fined or bound over.

But the political parties used all their influence to get the rent strike called off and eventually the anger of the tenants was dissipated into a fruitless 'campaign' to get Labour re-elected in St. Pancras. They were, but did nothing about the rent increases and have since raised them again. However, the militancy of the tenants at least forced the Labour Council to re-house the two families who had been evicted.

The heroic failure of the St. Pancras tenants was due, not so much to the massive array of force used against them, as to the failure of London's workers to come to their assistance with direct industrial action. That a general stoppage of work might have been secured is proved by the fact that railwaymen at the Camden Goods Depot and workers on the vast South Bank

building site stopped work and joined in the fight after listening to direct appeals made to them by St. Pancras housewives.

GLC tenants can learn much from St. Pancras. If they intend to carry their present struggle against rent increases to the point of a rent strike (and without that they will just have to pay), then it is time NOW to start forging unity between tenants and workers. An Eviction Order has the full backing of the State machine—bailiffs, police and the armed forces if necessary. Those who defy this machine in their efforts to prevent a lowering of working-class living standards are entitled to THE FULL BACKING OF THE WORKING CLASS.

'If you evict the tenants, we will stop work' is the simple idea that will frustrate all the efforts of the State to impose savage rent increases on working class families. Not 400, not 4,000, not even 40,000 policemen could deal with that situation.

J.L.

BAILIFF'S REPORT ON ST. PANCRAS EVICTIONS

(Extract from 'County Court Officer', journal of the County Court Officers' Association, October 21, 1960)

THE RULE OF LAW

On page 245 is the inside story of the evictions of St. Pancras. The report is not complete in that it does not disclose the identities of those who took part. This secrecy is necessary in order to prevent any possibility of victimisation and it will have to be maintained for some time to come.

It was the secrecy beforehand which ensured the success of the operation. The subject was not discussed by telephone and sealed orders were delivered to those responsible by hand. In order to keep the time and place of the operation from all outsiders, the breaking-in had to be done by the bailiffs themselves. It was unlikely anyway that anyone could have been found with the courage and integrity to do the job.

Most of the bailiffs concerned were not actual volunteers but all had expressed their willingness to go if they were detailed. This was a very proper attitude and in accord with police and service traditions.

On this job trouble was foreseen; it was possible to plan from afar and assess the difficulties involved beforehand. During the operation, the bailiffs were well supported by the police. All too often trouble cannot be foreseen and even when it is bailiffs feel that they are not given sufficient help. Most bailiffs will agree that the show of force at St. Pancras was long overdue. This has shown the public generally that County Court Orders cannot be trifled with and has given many bailiffs great confidence in the strength of the law which they uphold.

Readers will be pleased to know that few of the bailiffs were injured and of those who were only one was off duty for any length of time. This bailiff was flayed with a long pole. He was hit on the head and neck and in protecting himself with his arms, had one arm badly lacerated.

Another bailiff was hit on the head and one had a crushed finger which required three stitches to close the wound. At Kennistoun House the use of oil made the bailiffs' job most unpleasant. One of them had inflammation of the eyes due to the oil which was splashed in his face. This required treatment but the bailiff recovered fairly quickly. Several others had clothing damaged by oil. The bailiff hit with a brick was rendered momentarily unconscious but he recovered fairly quickly and carried on with the job. The Treasury has agreed to pay for all damage to clothing and the authorities have made it quite clear how much they have appreciated the bailiffs' efforts in this operation. The St. Pancras evictions will

go down in history and the bailiffs involved can be justifiably proud of the part they have played.

At 6.20 a.m. on Thursday the 22nd September, four plain vans drove off from a central assembly point, conveying two parties of bailiffs, 28 in all, to execute warrants of possession at Kennistoun House and Silverdale blocks of flats in the Borough of St. Pancras, within the jurisdiction of the Bloomsbury County Court.

Many of the bailiffs had been loaned from the Shoreditch, Clerkenwell and Willesden Courts and had reported for duty early that morning. It was a miserable morning, a thin drizzle of rain fell, but all were in good spirits and confident of success.

It was known that the tenants had gone to extreme lengths to barricade their flats, that all buildings were carefully picketed and that there were many sympathisers lodging in the premises to repel any effort at entry. Plans had therefore been made in closest co-operation with the police for the bailiffs to execute the warrants simultaneously early in the morning without giving any warning of their approach.

At 6.30 exactly, each party arrived, jumped out of the vans and rushed past the pickets guarding the first entrance to each block of flats.

The flat occupied by the defendant Cook at Kennistoun House was on the fourth floor at the very top of the block. All the landings were occupied by pickets. They were still rubbing the sleep out of their eyes when the bailiffs swept past. The surprise was so complete that a main barricade at the head of the last flight of stairs was still not secured. The bailiffs went through. Now began the task of entering the flat itself entrance to which had to be gained from the balcony running the length of the building. This was completely blocked with pianos, timber and barbed wire and as the bailiffs sought to cut the wire and remove the obstacles they were attacked by sympathisers from the roof armed with sticks. Bricks were thrown and filthy oil fuel poured down from drums installed above the flat. Meanwhile rockets were fired and alarm bells sounded to summon assistance to the tenants. One officer was badly injured by a ferocious assault from an individual armed with a pole and had to be taken to hospital. Another received a blow on the head from a brick thrown at him and though rendered very weak carried on with his task.

Unknown to the tenants, two enterprising bailiffs had made their way through the roof and crept along the rafters until they were over the defendant Cook's flat. They cut through the plaster and dropped through the ceiling into the bedroom.

All communicating doors had been boarded up and some time and labour

Freedom For Workers' Control

APRIL 27 1968 Vol 29 No 13

ENGINEERS' WAGE CLAIMS

NEGOTIATIONS between the engineering employers and the unions have reached a deadlock. The employers' offer has been described by Mr. Scanlon, President of the Amalgamated Engineering Union, as 'insulting', while Mr. Jukes, for the Employers' Federation, has called the union's claims 'phenomenal and fantastic'.

A lot of attention is focussed on these claims because they affect such a large proportion of the working population. They are seen as the trend-setting agreements for the rest of industry. This feature of the negotiations has taken on added significance, because of the Government's legislation on wages. If a substantial breakthrough is made by the unions, with their claim affecting nearly three million workers, then the Government's wage policies are finished. However, we are a long way from that position.

The proposals by the unions and the employers for an agreement are miles apart. The employers are offering another three-year 'package deal', which would give pay increases, in six-monthly stages, totalling £2 10s. for skilled workers, £2 for semi-skilled workers, while unskilled and women workers would get only 30s. These increases would give workers, after the three-year period, minimum time rates of £15 7s. 8d. per week for a skilled fitter and £12 7s. 4d. for unskilled workers.

The union's claim is for an immediate all-round pay increase, bringing the

skilled man's wage up from £12 17s. 8d. to £15 per week and then in stages, over three years, to £20. They also demand another three days holiday a year, making a total of three weeks and the establishment of equal pay for women.

It can be seen that the gulf is tremendous and Mr. Fielding, President of the Engineering Employers' Federation, announced: 'We are jolly well not going to give an all-round increase, even if we have a breakdown of negotiations and we have strikes.' The executives of the 30 engineering unions, for their part, will meet on May 1 to consider their position.

The employers' offer represents a lot more than just a series of increases. They are coupled with detailed proposals for increasing productivity and the whole offer rests on the unions accepting the following 'guidelines'. 'A maximum utilisation of all productive resources and the most effective deployment and use of man-power. Restrictions on the economic utilisation and transfer of labour, which were not based on consideration of skill or ability to do the job, were contrary to the well-being of the industry and will be eliminated. There must be an acceptance of up-to-date and recognised techniques for analysing or evaluating methods of production, including method study, work measurement, job evaluation and the agreement domestically of conversion factor for bonuses.'

Employers would also like a comprehensive national agreement on bonuses and said that over-manning and use of skilled workers on jobs that could be carried out by semi-skilled men should be examined. They certainly are not giving anything away. These proposals for productivity certainly bring in far more than the employers offer on wages. But then this is what it is all about. This is what the Labour Government wants.

The proposals are a direct attack against all the hard-won achievements made by the rank and file in the factories, such as job control. They are very important, because they make all the difference to intolerable work conditions, making them at least comfortable and human. The bonus system also comes under attack and the proposals would prevent, or, at the very least, tighten up against workers achieving a high bonus earnings to supplement the low basic wage rates. It is important that no concessions on these lines are made to gain any wage increases.

On the face of it, there does seem very little room to manoeuvre and the national papers are talking of strikes or, as the *Guardian* correspondent says: 'That senior AEU officials would prefer members to go slow and work-to-rule rather than take immediate strike action or ban overtime.'

But I, for one, am sceptical about any action being taken. I know a new feeling of hope and a willingness to fight exists amongst engineers and this feeling has expressed itself in the election of Hugh Scanlon, but how far is he ready to go? For if action is taken, then the men will be acting in defiance of the law. Will some formula be worked out whereby Mr. Scanlon can save face because the other unions did not want industrial action?

A stand does have to be made and the engineering industry is one that the Government will deem vital to safeguard against any excessive wage increases. Will Mr. Scanlon and his executive take up the cudgels and defy the wage laws? Or will a compromise be worked out? We shall see!

P.T.

Contact Column

This column exists for mutual aid. Donations towards cost of typesetting will be welcome.

Porton Demonstration. Saturday, June 1—Meeting at Salisbury Market Square, followed by march to Porton. June 2—Leafletting. June 3—Disinfectant Ceremony. Information from M. Dukes, 25 Cranbury Ave., Southampton.

Woman Graduate, trained teacher, refugee from State school rat-race, seeks position in congenial, progressive infant school or office accessible Greenford, Box No.

Public Meeting—Ealing Green, 3 p.m., April 27, 'Peace'. Speakers include Jim Huggon, Malcolm Miles.

Open Air Meeting—2.30 p.m., Saturday, April 27, Broadwalk, Harlow Town Centre. Help welcome.

Public Meeting—3 p.m., Sunday, April 28, Moot House, The Stow, Harlow. 'Violence?—and Revolution'—Roger Barnard.

Saturday, April 27. Demo to Elliott Automation, Lewisham (makers of radar for US in Vietnam). Assemble 12 noon Eros House, Brownhill Road.

New Life: an international Newsletter: communitarian projects, mutual aid schemes, and the struggle for sexual freedom. Subscription: £1 per year. Specimen copy 2/6 (blank p.o.) to: NEW LIFE, 15 Camden Hill Road, London, S.E.19.

The Free Bookshop, Coleherne Mews, Wharfedale Street, Earls Court, S.W.10. We obtain books from people who no longer want them. Ring PAD 2409 and we will collect them. The books are FREE to anyone calling Weekday evenings 6-9.30 p.m. Saturday and Sunday 10 a.m.-6 p.m.

Accommodation wanted, London-Camden area. Cheap unfurnished permanent room wanted by girl. FIN 3138.

Room Vacant in mixed community from beginning of May. Girl preferred. £12 monthly. Box No. 8.

Help wanted. Will somebody come in to Freedom Press two hours per week to lick stamps?

The May Day Manifesto Committee are holding a conference on April 27, 11 a.m., at University College, Gower Street, W.C.1. I am attending and wish to know if any anarchists are interested and would be attending. May Day Manifesto is a non-sectarian group working for an alliance of leftwingers generally. E. Jarvis, 91 Burleigh Road, Enfield, Middx.

Student, London, urgently seeks worthwhile part-time work—social, or for a radical organisation. Box No. 7.

Free Modern Jazz. Ladbroke Hotel, Notting Hill, Wednesday evenings.

East Anglia. If you're near Ipswich, call on us. We stock all Freedom Press publications, and have FREEDOM and *Anarchy* regularly. Orwell Books, 44 Upper Orwell Street, Ipswich, Suffolk.

If you wish to make contact let us know.